

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me a great deal of pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Legislative Assembly, 22 grade 11 students seated in the Speaker's gallery, your gallery, sir. These 22 students are from Thom Collegiate in the great constituency of Regina North. Their teacher is Ms. Hubbs. I will be meeting with these students for pictures at 2:35, refreshments, and hopefully to entertain any questions they may have at that time.

Please join me in welcoming this group from Thom Collegiate.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Solomon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would also like to welcome some of the students . . . or all of the students from Thom Collegiate. Thom Collegiate is located actually on the west . . . across the street on the east side of my constituency, on the west side of Regina North. And some of the students here today do live in Regina North West, so I'd like to welcome the students here this afternoon and wish them a very pleasant afternoon. And I hope that you enjoy the question period that you'll be witnessing in the next 25 minutes. Thank you.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Report of Commission on Directions in Health Care

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health or, in his absence, the Associate Minister of Health. Mr. Speaker, we heard originally that the Murray commission report would be completed some time towards the end of 1989. I think it was December of 1989. We subsequently heard that it was going to be postponed until some time in March. It's now March 27. We still haven't received the report. It appears that as the date for an election moves ahead, Mr. Speaker, the date of the release of this report is also moving ahead.

So my question to the Associate Minister of Health is whether or not he can give this House a commitment today as to a firm date that this report will be released to the public, or is he going to politicize this report by withholding it until it's politically expedient to release it?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Wolfe: — Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say that I'd like to commend all the people of this province and the people across this province that made reports to the commission. As you're probably aware, they made those reports to the commission over the course of two years.

The commission has worked very hard to put together a report to give us a sense of direction and a choice of policies for the future.

I'd like to say that the report is a tribute to the people of this province, and we anxiously await for that report to be made available to us.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, a number of health care professionals have been touring this province . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. It seems that there are a number of people want to enter today's question period. They'll have their opportunity. At the moment it's the member for Regina Lakeview.

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have been anxiously awaiting the release of this report, Mr. Minister. The date for its release is constantly being postponed. Can you give this House a firm commitment today as to the date of the release of this report to the public? We want to know, Mr. Associate Minister.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Wolfe: — Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say that I'm very pleased that the member opposite is now requesting the report that I understand she opposed being put together. I'm very pleased to see that she's requesting that it be brought forth too, and I would hope that the report will be made available to us and to the public in a short period of time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Associate Minister, I have here a document which purports to be part of your department's budgetary request for this year regarding your public affairs and the Murray commission report. In this you are asking apparently, according to this document, for \$750,000 to spend in promoting this report.

Now, Mr. Associate Minister, why does your department want three-quarters of a million dollars of the health care budget for more public relations? Is this the best way that your department can find to spend this three-quarters of a million dollars, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Wolfe: — Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say to the members opposite and to the people of this province that I know that there are those people across this province, and especially amongst the members opposite, who would choose not to consult, who would choose not to take to the people what is probably one of their highest priorities, and that being the health care system of this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, the Murray commission budget was approximately \$1.8 million. You've spent

\$1.8 million dollars having a number of health care professionals listen to the people of this province. They've now put together this report. Are you not satisfied with this report, Mr. Minister?

This is a totally self-serving political exercise on your part, contrary to what you promised in the throne speech last week. Don't you think, Mr. Associate Minister, this \$750,000 would be better spent, this three-quarter of a million dollars, in dealing with nursing shortages, shortages of public health nurses, shortages of dental care services in rural Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Wolfe: — Mr. Speaker, I sense that the member opposite probably hasn't done her homework again. And she talks about pieces of paper and things that are being presented, and I know that in the past we've had pieces of paper presented to this House and to the people of this province. And I remember a letter that was sent to the people of my constituency, another piece of paper that talked about closing hospitals. And I don't know if the members opposite need to be reminded of that.

She talks about \$1.8 million for a study to look at the health care system of this province and to come up with a direction in the future. And I want to remind the members opposite that the health care system of this province is a tremendous responsibility. It's also a tremendous expense for us all — some thirteen hundred million dollars, fourteen hundred million dollars a year in the current year. And I think that \$1.8 million put to studying direction of the health care system an appropriate amount and actually money that's probably very, very well spent, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, after you've spent \$1.8 million, why would you be asking for a further three-quarters of a million dollars to advertise what your interpretation of this report is?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Wolfe: — Mr. Speaker, there are those opposite who would choose not to consult. There are those opposite who would choose not to discuss such things as the use of drugs and the fact that drugs and more drugs may not necessarily mean better health.

But we choose to consult. We believe that if health care is a high priority, and it is a high priority for us; the people should have a say, Mr. Speaker. And we should take the report to the people and we should have their comments before anything is done with it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Goods and Services Tax

Mr. Shillington: — My question is to the Premier on the subject of the goods and services tax.

Mr. Premier, the Saskatchewan public's most serious

criticism of your leadership, or perhaps I should say lack of leadership on the subject of the GST (goods and services tax), is not the fact that you have been hesitant to voice their concerns, although you certainly have gone to any lengths to avoid a public discussion.

Their bitterest criticisms concern the fact that you apparently say one thing in Saskatchewan and something quite different in Ottawa. Their worst suspicions were confirmed again yesterday when none other than Michael Wilson, on a hot-line show, in answer to a question about his response to your opposition, said, they have been sitting around a conference table for two years helping design the tax, and then he went on to say: for them to suddenly say this tax is all wrong is a little disingenuous; I mean, if it was all that bad, then why did they waste their time and mine sitting around the table for two years?

Couched in diplomatic language, Mr. Premier, what the federal Minister of Finance is saying that you have been blatantly dishonest, not only with the federal government but the public of Saskatchewan. Isn't that a self-evident conclusion from his comments?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, we have continuously said in the legislature and across Saskatchewan, and indeed across the country, that the GST proposal is too high and it's too complex and it's too poorly defined to be implemented, and that they should either scrap it or they should redesign it, or both.

As a result of our continuing to put pressure on them, they've already dropped it. And, Mr. Speaker, we are continuing to put pressure on them to make sure that they do make the changes appropriate so that the business community and the farming community, as you know, and others across this country will benefit from a reformed tax system.

The last time that you and I talked about it here you were suggesting that we have one tax. And that was the NDP proposal. So that you say if you're going to have it anyway, then combine the provincial tax with the federal tax so that there's only one.

Now we had some discussion about that here. We have taken the arguments about its complexity and about its level all across Canada, Mr. Speaker, and we'll continue to do that, so in fact they redesign it and define it in a manner that is appropriate for Saskatchewan as well as Canadian people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — New question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, I hear what you're saying. It's just so inconsistent with everything that you're doing.

Mr. Premier, it's your ill fortune to live in the day of the printed word when some record is kept of what you've said. I want to quote from you two headlines from the Regina *Leader-Post*. "Devine stands ground in support of sales tax." That seems to me to fall just a touch short of

opposing it. Again, “Devine, odd man . . .

An Hon. Member: — Devine odd man out.

Mr. Shillington: — Well that much is accurate. “Devine odd man out among the premiers on the GST.” Mr. Premier, Michael Wilson has a varied reputation, but he’s not thought of as either stupid or dishonest. He says you passed up your best opportunity to make your opposition known when the tax was being drafted. Why on earth should the public believe you, Mr. Minister, when you say it wasn’t so?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, we have been making recommendations to the federal government on the tax and the tax proposal. From the outset when they suggested they could take off the thirteen and a half, we said, as members opposite in the legislature said, we would like to see the tax reformed. We would like it lower, and we’d like it simple, and we’d want to make sure it increases productivity and jobs here in Canada.

We have continued to make those representations to Ottawa, and as a result of that we’ve seen them reduce the tax. They now consider making it simplified, Mr. Speaker, and we’re making sure and want to make sure that any changes that the farmers ask for are being delivered.

Now the hon. member stands in his place now and says that he’s changed his position. He is no longer in favour of one tax. Well then he’d have to stand and deny what he said here on the record, because it’s in *Hansard*. The NDP support one tax, the GST plus the provincial sales tax together. Now that’s what you said in this legislature, and it’s on the record, and we can go back and read that over and over again. So you could stand there and say, well, for heaven’s sake, this is tax reform, Mr. Premier, and you encourage tax reform.

I’ll only say one more time is that you’ve stood here in the legislature and said you support one tax, which is the GST plus provincial sales tax at one time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Well since the Premier seems to be suffering from amnesia, let me quote from you; let me quote for your benefit from an article in the *Star-Phoenix*. The paragraph says, the headline is, “Devine odd man out among premiers on the GST,” and a paragraph reads:

The exception was Premier Grant Devine who stood his ground throughout the weekend, challenging critics to come up with a better alternative to the Wilson scheme.

That doesn’t sound, Mr. Premier, like decisive, hard-hitting opposition. It doesn’t seem to be what’s being described.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Premier, you have an opportunity, however, to do better. During last year’s session we put

on the order paper a motion opposing the goods and services tax and your government wouldn’t call it. My question, Mr. Premier, is whether or not you will instruct your House Leader to call motion number 10, which now stands in my name and which expresses this House’s opposition to the Goods and Services Tax? Will you instruct your House Leader to call that motion or bring forth a similar worded one of your own?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that I have been very much against the federal sales tax, which is thirteen and a half per cent. And the hon. members on that side of the House are not against the federal sales tax — they’ve been encouraging it — which is now up to thirteen and a half per cent. And they haven’t said one word about reducing that tax, which has an implication for consumers and business, manufacturing and farmers. I have always said I’m against that thirteen and a half per cent tax, and I am looking for alternatives.

Now the member opposite stands in his place and says, well for heaven’s sake, he now supports the fact that he would have a federal sales tax at thirteen and a half; he has no alternative.

I will ask all members of this legislature or parliament: what’s the alternative to the thirteen and a half that’s there now? I believe, Mr. Speaker, we should look for alternatives because that is an unfair tax. And I will continue to ask the federal government to come up with better ways to reduce that tax burden on farmers, businesses and consumers in this country.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — New question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, perhaps the third article to which I did not refer best summarizes your behaviour today. The sub-headline is “Divine flip-flops on earlier stance.” Mr. Premier, we know you’re in desperate trouble when you want to get the subject of the sales tax — something you once said you’d abolish and now stands at 40 per cent higher than it ever was.

The subject, Mr. Minister, is the goods and services tax. Will you make common cause with us and take a simple, effective step. Pass a resolution of this House stating this Assembly’s opposition to the goods and services tax. Will you take that simple, effective step?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has made his proposal in this legislature, and I’ll go back and review it as I find it in *Hansard* with respect to him proposing one tax — the GST plus the provincial sales tax as one tax — and we will review that and we’ll see if in fact that’s the position that the NDP wants to take in Saskatchewan now, or indeed across Canada. And I also will review the record, Mr. Speaker, with respect to what the other NDP counterparts have said across Canada as well. If you’re in favour of the federal sales tax and the GST plus the provincial sales tax in one position, Mr.

Speaker, we'll certainly find out and perhaps you'll have your opportunity to stand and defend that here in the legislature.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Travel Expenses of Cabinet Minister

Mr. Anguish: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is also to the Premier. Mr. Premier, I have here a list of out-of-province travel from the '88-89 fiscal year of travel that was taken by that old Liberal that sits to your right there. And for the six trips that were taken on this sheet that was put up by the Department of Finance, the minister spent \$99,816 — \$99,816! In one trip alone to London, Mr. Premier, after you exclude the airfare, it would have worked out to about \$3,000 a day. Now can we expect this type of extravagant spending to stop, Mr. Premier?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I'm very pleased to respond, Mr. Speaker, because what that information shows — and the opposition has referred to it now at a couple of times — is they have said that the minister spent that amount of money, that I spent that amount, or my travel costs were that amount. In fact that is simply not true. And if you read the information that was tabled before the Assembly, that those trips included all the staff that attended the various meetings, all the staff that had attended the meetings, and there were several . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Now I had to interrupt the minister in the midst of his answer because some hon. members just refused to stop interrupting him. It was difficult to hear him. And now I'm going to give him an opportunity to finish his answer if he so desires.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I indicated that the material that was given to the hon. member during estimates last year about the cost for my travel, included that of the officials that attended the various functions . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes it did. And if you take a look at the information, the hon. member, take a look at that information and it lists the number of officials that attended as well and I think you've been . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I'd like to bring to the attention of the hon. minister that, you know, we can carry on debates with people in their seats who make a comment. However, that's certainly going to drag out the answer to an unknown length and is certainly not conducive to question period. Next question.

Mr. Anguish: — New question to the Premier. I don't know why the minister gets so defensive. Of course there were other people. We know that he wouldn't be able to travel on his own anyway. In fact, on the trip to England there were four people.

But I want to ask you, Mr. Premier, in light of what you're saying in the throne speech, will you assure us that this type of extravagant spending will stop and that you will table today the guide-lines where you refer in the throne speech of saying restrictions on travel and advertising

have been implemented.

So will you today tell us, Mr. Premier, what those restrictions are, what are the guide-lines, and can you table them for us here today so we don't have a minister spending almost a hundred thousand dollars a year on travel from out of province?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Fortunately I've just been handed a copy of the information. I didn't believe that the hon. member would pursue it if he had fairly read the information. And right, the total figure is \$99,816.72. The number of persons accompanying the minister during the total of those trips was 20 — 20, Mr. Speaker, in total, in total. Mr. Speaker, including myself, we're dividing 24,000 into that; it's considerably less number than the hon. member indicated.

So I don't think you have fairly interpreted the numbers. That in fact those meetings were with financial community in the various centres set out, and the information given during estimates. And I suggest to the hon. member, in fact, that our meetings with the financial community has been to the benefit of the province, and we've had the hon. members raise borrowing issues in the past that we have got as a very preferred rate as a result of our contact with the investment community.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — If that many people travelled with you, what we want to really know is, who stayed home?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Elimination of Travel and Advertising

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Premier, I direct my question to you. In all seriousness, will we expect this kind of spending to continue by ministers? You said in your throne speech restrictions on travel and advertising have been implemented. So will you table today those policies, the guide-lines that you're issuing to your ministers, to your legislative secretaries, so that we can know what these restrictions are? We want to know that you're taking a new, co-operative approach and curbing the expenditures.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — I have said to the hon. members that we have cut our salaries, and we have reduced the size of government, and we will define the amount of travel. And we have set up a monitoring mechanism under the Deputy Premier to do just that, Mr. Speaker, and we'll be staying with it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — A new question. How can you be believable, Mr. Premier? What we want to know is what the guide-lines are. You say you've reduced your down-sizing, but yet on throne speech day the line-up of cabinet ministers was so long they hardly get across the

front of the room. I mean, your benches were empty. You've taken no one out of the cabinet. You've reduced the number of departments. Will you table today the regulations and the guide-lines that are curbing the extravagant spending by your government. Where you refer to, I say again, in the throne speech, "restrictions on travel and advertising have been implemented . . .

Will you table those regulations here today or not, Mr. Premier?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I can only say to the hon. member that we have reduced the size of cabinet; we have cut our expenditures and our salaries; we have, Mr. Speaker, reduced the size of our government; we have caused savings . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. The Hon. Premier is attempting to answer the question. He can't answer if he's consistently being interrupted. He can't do that; nobody can. I think we should show of him the courtesy of allowing him to answer.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I was just saying to the hon. members that we have cut our salary, and that we have reduced the size of government, and we have reduced the size of cabinet, Mr. Speaker. And I'll point out to the hon. members, we have a smaller cabinet than the NDP administration had in the early '80s, Mr. Speaker. I make that point again. This is a smaller cabinet than the NDP had in their administration, Mr. Speaker. And we will be constraining and are constraining travel, particularly out-of-province travel, Mr. Speaker, and will continue to do that.

But the hon. member says, well, show me. I have already shown him that we have cut those kinds of expenditures, and we have cut our salaries.

Let me say one last thing, Mr. Speaker. When interest rates were 21 per cent in this province, I didn't see any cuts on that side of the House, Mr. Speaker, not one cut in salary and not one reduction.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — I don't know why the Premier would want to live in the past like that, Mr. Speaker.

What we want to know is what you're going to do about the extravagance of your government. You say you cut your salaries. That cut in salaries wouldn't make up 10 per cent of the interest that we pay on the debt every day — every day — not 10 per cent of what we'd we pay in one day. It's a miniscule amount.

You said that you have guide-lines and we want them tabled in the legislature. I would have to assume that you don't have any guide-lines or regulations to curb your extravagance in your government because if you had them, you'd table them. It's deceitful to do that.

The other thing that we want to know, Mr. Premier, is in regard to your polling, the political polling that's done by

your government. Decima has very good contracts with you. Are you considering also putting polling into that category where you refer to in the throne speech: "restrictions on travel and advertising have been implemented . . ." Would you put polling into that as well?

And finally, one last time, if you have those regulations, are you going to table them in this House, or are you just throwing yourself on the mercy of the Saskatchewan people, saying, believe me?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, in my discussions with the people of Saskatchewan, when we say that we are cutting our salaries and we're reducing the size of government, he may say that it's nickels and dimes, but if you look after the nickels and dimes, then the dollars look after themselves. And that's what people are telling us, Mr. Speaker.

And, Mr. Speaker, I will say to the hon. member as well: when they want protection in terms of interest rates, when they want their family protected and their home protected and health and education expenditures there, Mr. Speaker, they expect us to play our part and they expect all administrations to have played their part.

I'll remind the members opposite, when they had a very, very large cabinet, interest rates were running 21 per cent, and I didn't see one dime taken out of their salaries, not one cent, not one nickel, not one quarter. And they stand over there now, Mr. Speaker, and say, well, for heaven's sake, you have cut your salaries; I want to see, are you going to cut the rest of it? We have, Mr. Speaker, and the people appreciate that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's an honour for me to have this opportunity to briefly address the Legislative Assembly regarding the Speech from the Throne for the fourth session of the twenty-first legislature.

I think it's only proper to begin by congratulating the member of the legislature for Moosomin on moving of the throne speech, and as well, the member for Nipawin on his seconding of this throne speech address. These two members particularly articulated and expressed the many important elements that were contained in the throne speech that we heard a few days ago.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, let me extend my appreciation to the Lieutenant Governor for her address and support of the Speech from the Throne, and it was particularly well delivered.

This legislative session and the address from the Speech from the Throne both mark a crucial time in our history, Mr. Speaker. We have entered a new decade, a decade which has already seen extensive and unprecedented upheaval around the globe.

Just look at East Germany, Mr. Speaker. A little over one week ago the people of East Germany literally voted to end the existence of their country. When I had an opportunity to be visiting with Berlin people, Mr. Speaker, about trade, the MTN, the multilateral trade negotiations, one of my officials was at the wall in Berlin.

And if we want to talk about the change in attitude world-wide, I can't think of a better example and an illustration than I'm about to present to you. This official that was with me has relatives that are in Hungary, Mr. Speaker. And you might be somewhat close to that situation. And when he was visiting with an East German border guard and they were talking at the wall — which is unique enough in itself — the East German border guard took off his cap, took off his badge, and he handed it to the Canadian that was standing there, from Hungarian descent. And he says, it's yours for 20 West German marks. He sold them his cap and he sold them his badge. And a few months earlier, if he'd been that close to him, he'd have shot him.

Mr. Speaker, the changes that are going through the world today towards democracy, towards free markets, towards freer trade, towards openness, the glasnost, the perestroika, to put it in Soviet terms, are extremely and historically significant. We see changes in South Africa moving towards democracy. We see elections all over the world where they didn't used to have elections. And people are voting for democracy, they're voting for openness, they're voting for liberalized borders, they're voting for markets.

You just have to pick up a newspaper any one of the few days that . . . in recent days, and you see the headlines that speak for themselves, Mr. Speaker. Today in *The Globe and Mail* — Hungary has voted, and Hungarians have voted for not only democracy but they've voted for free markets and free trade world-wide. The headline in the paper says, "Free market wins support of Hungarians in elections." "Vote in Hungary routs out (the old) left." Dramatic change that we didn't think was believable a few weeks ago or a few months ago.

This is February 20. A party preaching capitalism could win power in the Soviet Union, the editor there says. Because there's no longer a monopoly on power. They've opened it up to democracy. And in fact, imagine in the Soviet Union the newspaper there is quoting a headline saying that a party preaching capitalism could win power.

Another headline. This is *The Globe and Mail*, March 19. Conservatives win in East Germany by a wide margin. People have voted literally to cancel the country. It's the

end of East Germany. They voted for democracy, for markets, for trade, and for openness and to build and productivity.

In the Soviet Union here's another one. And it just says: Gorbachev seeks to end monopoly. He wants to compete democratically. The Communist Party has come to an end as the only single party. The Soviet multiparty system ahead, as communists give up monopoly. That's in *The Globe and Mail* as another headline in recent times.

In East Germany here's a headline that says: East Germany enshrines freedom of the media for the first time in East German relations for the last 40 to 50 years. The love for democracy is quoted in the *Star-Phoenix* and the *Leader-Post*. In Bulgaria the new party leader is calling for an overhaul before they have a May election so that in fact democracy can move ahead.

Very interesting things here, Mr. Speaker, and I'll just touch on a couple others. In the Soviet Union they plan to restore the private use of land, particularly for farmers. Now imagine in the Soviet Union, since the revolution of 1917 they haven't had the private ownership of farm land, and they're thinking about that in the Soviet Union.

One that I found particularly interesting and this was in *The Globe and Mail* of March 7: the Soviet Union plans to legalize the private ownership of factories. Mr. Speaker, what we're seeing here all over the world . . . and here's one: the draft plan to sell Polish state companies, and they're going to allow the privatization of companies in Poland. And this one is in the *Financial Times*, March 7: an East Germany moving towards privatization as a result of recent elections.

My point is, Mr. Speaker, we haven't seen this kind of change in world politics and world economics and world social systems like this maybe ever, and certainly for the last 100 years. That kind of change is dramatic. That kind of change is happening every day. That kind of change is causing all kinds of modifications and ramifications even right here in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

We are not left untouched by what's going on in Europe as a result of their move towards free trade in 1992; 12 countries, 300 million people, they are moving towards a common market, a free trade agreement. We're not left untouched by what they do to our commodities, our prices, our life-styles, what they do in the environment, a combination of things.

We will not be left untouched by what they're doing in the eastern European blocs either. We must be prepared to manage change, Mr. Speaker, and this Speech from the Throne talks about us managing change in the 1990s and the 21st century. That's what it's about. Either we will stand by and be independent victims of change, or we will unite and manage that change to our benefit.

And make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, what we see happening in the world wide is not going to stop. Change is here. And the people of Saskatchewan know that and they want a government, members of the Legislative Assembly, that understand change and that will work with people in building a consensus to find out and to

strategize how to best manage that change, because as sure as we're standing here, change is here.

In Saskatchewan, farm families probably know better than anyone else that the international subsidy wars, the impacts of high interest rates, and trade restrictions and trade policies, internationally, affect us right here at home in the towns and villages and the farms. They'll be the first to tell you, as they did me yesterday, for example, that we must be prepared to manage those changes.

The economic and political restructuring of the East bloc countries and the economic restructuring world-wide presents major challenges for our province. But I also believe that there are many opportunities to be captured by Saskatchewan people if we're prepared to manage that environment we see today.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased that the Speech from the Throne gives us a framework in which to plan the direction of Saskatchewan's social and economic future well into the next decade. It is a framework that draws upon our traditional strengths of government working in a partnership, in a co-operative way with people through consultation, and it is a framework that provides clear and innovative ideas to capture new economic opportunities.

Imagine the opportunities, Mr. Speaker, that might be there with 400 million people in the Soviet bloc.

Our relationship with the people in Kazakhstan is one that is just beginning. They have 20-some million people, Mr. Speaker, and they're prepared to trade with us, do joint ventures with us, and they're opening up. And they say, we want to move towards democracy, markets, freedom, capitalism. And I'm not being at all partisan. They want a mixed economy of people owning farms and factories and businesses and having the opportunity to trade world-wide in a free basis. All men and women world-wide want that. And look at the opportunities for Saskatchewan in our capacity to produce food, paper, petro-chemicals, manufactured goods, with a good relationship.

We must, Mr. Speaker, be prepared to take advantage of these changes. In my consultation with the people of Saskatchewan, they've identified four fundamental priorities that they want us to address in a partnership with the people and government and the private sector. These include the following.

First, an expansion and the diversification of the Saskatchewan economy. They've said to me clearly, and I'm sure they've to members opposite, we just can't afford to only grow wheat and expect it's going to be good all the time. We need to have alternatives.

If we're going to process forestry, we're going to have to make paper. If we're going to process our natural gas, we're going to have to make fertilizer. If we're going to process our meat, we're going to have to make bacon. If we're going to process our heavy oil, we're going to have to make gasoline and diesel fuel and petro-chemicals. And they've said to that to us, Mr. Speaker — we must diversify and we must broaden our economy.

Second thing they've said is that their community is just as important as their family. They want their communities protected. They want to see new growth in their communities. They want to see opportunities for them to control the destiny of their community, rather than just leave that community's future up to the slings and arrows of international trade or international political movements that we see world-wide that are causing the changes we see today.

Third, they want to see an awful lot of opportunity for young people in the province, the growth and the well-being of Saskatchewan people, that human resource. We have educated and exported a million people since 1935 — educated and exported a million people. No other jurisdiction in Canada can say that. Our population is about the same as it was in 1935, and we've had a Liberal government, a CCF (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation) government, NDP government, and Conservative government, and our population is about the same as it was in 1935.

We have educated these children, but what we have failed to do is take the educated individual and combine it with investments so that you could have the job and the opportunities here.

We've spent more time arguing about it than we have building it, Mr. Speaker. And you can look to Alberta, you can look to Ontario, you look into British Columbia, you look into Quebec, you could look at the whole country. Canada's population has doubled since 1935. It was 12 million people; it's 25 million now. Saskatchewan's is about the same.

What's the difference? We have had the oldest, longest political wars that you can imagine, right here. But we spend more time arguing about whether we should build it than actually build. We've been blessed with resources, communities, and people. And we've educated a million young people and we've exported them all over Canada and the United States and every place else.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what the people are telling me is that yes, educate them, but also bring investment in so that you can combine that beautiful young resource, the mind, with investment capital, and create the opportunities and the prosperity so people will not only live here but they will stay here and move here and move back here to the province of Saskatchewan.

Fourth, they've said they want to see efficient management of resources. And we talked about it here in question period today. They want to see managing our own salaries; they want to see managing our own travel; they want to make sure that we do not waste resources, whether it's in health or education or in highways or in agriculture, wherever it may be.

Mr. Speaker, to guide the development of Saskatchewan's future in relation to these four key areas that people have talked about, people have said to me they want even greater involvement; they want to participate in how we arrive at these four areas and implement these plans for diversification, for community stabilization, for opportunities for young people, and the

management of resources.

(1445)

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech emphasized the previous success of this process, the process of Saskatchewan people working in a partnership to govern and to strengthen the province. A history of co-operation and working together.

We look now at the fact that even when we provide equity opportunity participation programs, we can raise almost \$2 billion from Saskatchewan people if it's for Saskatchewan projects.

And we've offered bonds from power bonds to potash bonds and telephone bonds, and some of them convertible to shares. Saskatchewan people, because it's for Saskatchewan, have put up almost \$2 billion. Now that, Mr. Speaker, is taking education and combining it with investment to create those opportunities. As a result we see our manufacturing sector up 600 per cent. Six hundred per cent increase in processing, manufacturing, and diversification in just the last little while in our history, the last 5 or 6 years, as a result of us taking education and combining it with investment opportunity, capital, and putting it to work to create new opportunities. And \$2 billion of that — almost \$2 billion — raised by Saskatchewan people themselves.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne says if we can get employees involved in new initiatives, labour-sponsored venture capital programs or other targeted tax things that would allow people in towns and villages, farmers to invest, then in fact we can create our own diversification in stronger communities.

Well from our experience, Mr. Speaker, and from what we've seen in the last few years, indeed Saskatchewan people are prepared to invest in their future, in their children, and in their communities.

Mr. Speaker, as announced in the Speech from the Throne, the creation of Consensus Saskatchewan is clearly a brand-new and innovative mechanism in which Saskatchewan people can rightfully be part of the decision-making process.

Some critics have said about Consensus Saskatchewan that if you're asking all these people to come in and design the strategies for diversification and for protecting community and developing that human potential and managing resources, then obviously you don't have the ideas yourself. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have ideas, and you've seen diversification, public participation, natural gas processing and manufacturing. What the people have said to us is, it's only the tip of the iceberg.

We want to be involved in how we carry those strategies right down to our town and our community.

The biggest single argument and criticism that I've heard about paper mills or upgraders or fertilizer plants in Saskatchewan is that they're not in every single town and community. That's the biggest single criticism. They want to see it in Rosetown. They want to see it in Melfort. They

want to see it in Kindersley. They want it in Yorkton and they want it in Midale. They want it in Torquay. They want it in Caron, Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the biggest single criticism is that there are not enough of them. We want them all over the province. We want to see that diversification, that processing. Take those young people, those capable young people, and put them to work in the local community with investment, and then create the opportunities. That's the criticism.

They waited and waited and waited for 50 years, since 1935, to finally say we could process our natural gas and make fertilizer for the province that has half the farm land in Canada. And we should, Mr. Speaker. We should.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — And they waited 50 years, 50 years, Mr. Speaker, to say, why couldn't we finally process our forestry industry and make paper? And, Mr. Speaker, they've said, we've waited and waited, and finally in the last few years we are now making our own paper. And they're saying, can't we make other products from that paper or from the forest industry? Can't we involve independent operators? Can't we involve smaller communities and towns and businesses and expand that operation? And the answer is: of course!

Do you know what they say to us? Let us be involved in that; let us be involved. Not in a handful of projects, but in projects that involve people and communities all across this great province of Saskatchewan.

Consensus Saskatchewan is going to the people and saying, yes, there's strategy; yes, there's economic opportunity; and yes, we have strong people and strong resources. But the strongest one is the people working together, building a consensus, implementing that strategy, and making sure that we catch up to other provinces in the next decade. That's what Consensus Saskatchewan's all about. That's what's in the Speech from the Throne.

The fact that some people, and I can understand why that we . . . normally governments don't get many bouquets from the opposition, but the fact that people or critics would even say we shouldn't involve the people, and I've been hearing that for some time. I mean, even in our agriculture programs, they say, well we did this in '84 and '85 and '86 and '87 and '88 and '89, and every time we involve the people in getting consensus on agriculture programs or on diversification the critics will say, well you're only doing it because there's an election.

We don't have an election every year, Mr. Speaker. We've been doing this and doing it. And right now the people tell me that they want to be intimately involved in this strategy with all the change going on around the world. They want to know what the options are.

The Minister of Finance had his meetings with people all across this province. You know what they told him and they've told me. They said: Mr. Premier, under these conditions I'm not so sure that we can afford the grants

and the subsidies that we have had over the last few years, and until times change, turn around, I think you're going to have to cancel those or postpone them. And I did.

Now that was a province-wide consensus. And people told me and told my ministers and told people from all across this legislature on the government side, that's what they better be doing because under these circumstances we can't afford it. Now that wasn't easy for me to do, but it was the right thing to do. And it came from a consensus.

So anybody opposite or anybody any place else that says, I don't think they should be consulting with the people, or Consensus Saskatchewan is not a good idea, well you ask the people. And I'll dare say, Mr. Speaker, the people want to be involved. All over the world they want to be involved right now, like we've never seen before, and not only in the Soviet Union, and not only in the Warsaw Pact countries, and not only South America or Latin America, Nicaragua or the Pacific Rim — everywhere. With the technology and the communication and the speed of change, people want to be intimately involved in all the decisions that are going on.

In this government, with this Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, the people will be involved in Saskatchewan. That's what Consensus Saskatchewan is all about. I think they will be disappointed in the critics who say people don't count or listening to them doesn't matter.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the building of this province goes well beyond political careers, as you and I know. The members opposite should know, if they're really sincere about diversifying and building in their towns and communities and cities, whether it's Moose Jaw or Prince Albert or Estevan or Weyburn or North Battleford, then they should be thinking about the kinds of things that the people want to build. And I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, they want to see growth and diversification.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out this province was built on the process of people working together through co-operation and consultation. And we are on the verge of a major and significant economic diversification breakthrough in this province — 600 per cent increase in the last few years. The key ingredients are fundamental to the strength of our society and our economic future. Co-operation and consultation: these are the foundation stones upon which we will overcome the challenges of the future, the challenges of international change, the challenges of weather, and certainly, Mr. Speaker, the challenges of the odd political career that pops up in the history of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I am therefore very pleased that the development of Consensus Saskatchewan will strengthen the process of consultation and co-operation and allow for Saskatchewan people, all of Saskatchewan people, to have a mechanism where they can be, and eventually be, active participants in that process.

Let me just say a couple of words about the four main things that people have said to me, Mr. Speaker. The first is agriculture and diversification. It is extremely important that a province that holds half the farm land in this country, has 65 per cent of the people in this province

living outside the two major cities, all across this province in towns and villages, that we understand and respect and treat with a great deal of sincerity rural life and rural families in a way of life that I believe is unique in all of North America, maybe the world. We've developed dry land agriculture and dry land farming in rural communities, and a life-style that is absolutely unique any place in Canada, and certainly in many parts of the globe.

We stressed in our Speech from the Throne that the farm family and those rural communities are extremely important. I don't know how anybody could do otherwise. I have been disappointed in previous administrations because they did not, but I think they've paid the price.

Mr. Speaker, we can't turn our backs on these towns and villages and smaller cities that are based in producing food as something so close to the good Lord that I don't know how you'd get any closer. These are good people doing good work, providing one of the strongest sources of economic activity provincially and nationally and internationally that you're going to find.

There's no substitute for food. Agriculture and food is the largest industry in Canada, and indeed the world. We all need food all the time. And we've got a way of life that is precious to that industry. And we cannot and should not and we will not abandon that way of life or those people.

Saskatchewan farm families need help because they're taking on other treasuries, and I've spoken on that before in a resolution in the House. I would just say again — when a Saskatchewan farmer outside of Regina or outside of Meadow Lake or outside of Tisdale is forced to take on the German treasury, the French treasury, the Great Britain's treasury, the United States treasury and others, alone, it's not fair.

And we cannot let those individual farmers take on those international conditions by themselves. It's not fair. I've described in this legislature what I saw when I was in Europe — European farmer: very inefficient, small little plots, getting \$700 a tonne for wheat and we get 150. And the difference is subsidized from the treasuries. And the consumers there spend 20 to 25 per cent of their disposable income on food; we spend 10 to 11.

Mr. Speaker, we can't let our farmers be forced off the land by German or French or British treasuries so that we don't have hardly any left, and then they can charge us what they like. We can't let that happen.

Mr. Speaker, international interest rates, international wheat prices, the exchange rates, all have a major impact on our industries and particularly our farmers. The Speech from the Throne, and you'll see in our budget, directs our focus and our attention to make sure that there is fair play internationally. Just as the Soviets and the Hungarians and the Czechoslovaks and others want fair play — in democracy and politics and trade and social and economic policy — we want and deserve the same.

And it's not good enough just to stand up and say, well

it's all easy to be fixed, and you can stay right at home and if I'm in Europe . . . You know, some people will say, well he shouldn't be in Berlin or he shouldn't be talking in Brussels and Geneva. I will only say, the farmers that I took with me didn't say that.

We heard people in the Soviet Union and in the Eastern bloc countries sound an awful lot like western Canadian farmers, saying what the western Europeans and the United States is doing is totally unfair. We're taking on their treasuries. They wreck our prices. They drive up interest rates. They hurt our exchange rates.

Mr. Speaker, we will not abandon them. This Speech from the Throne puts our shoulder, our heart, our soul, and our head right behind rural families. And it's going to stay there, because we will win. You'll see the Saskatchewan farmer and rural communities come out on top of this because we'll eventually get those subsidies turned around internationally. If it takes all the political will and the whole Legislative Assembly to get on a bus and go East, or in fact key members going jointly all the way to Geneva and Brussels, those kinds of things may be necessary to make those changes, but we have to make them.

Well we have no choice but to help them and we're going to help them. Our priorities certainly include, in our motion here, to have money and restructuring and the kinds of economic and financial programs here to help Saskatchewan people survive — \$500 million now, \$400 million later, a billion dollars in a contingency fund. Just increase the initial price of wheat a dollar a bushel. Try that on for size. If the federal government just stood in its place and said, the initial prices for wheat will be up a dollar a bushel for 1990-91, look at the change in the attitude in Saskatchewan, and that still would only be pittance compared to what they get for wheat in Europe and in the United States in terms of their subsidies.

Just try that. Lower interest rates, a better exchange rate, higher priced wheat — and that's what the market is prepared to pay — that's what we're asking for. In this Speech from the Throne and the budget you'll see that over and over again.

(1500)

I will say that our own restructuring will be there, Mr. Speaker. In terms of our agriculture credit corporation there are things that we can do. I have asked the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities to work with us as a board of directors in managing change in the agriculture credit corporation. And the SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) has agreed to that, and I really appreciate that.

Senior members of our municipal governments from across the province have agreed to sit down and say, yes, we'll help you change your ag credit corporation. Well that's exactly what . . . A consensus, Mr. Speaker, a consensus of municipal councillors from across Saskatchewan, through their board of directors, saying, this is the way you should run the provincial bank. We've asked for that; they've agreed to participate. It's a first, and we're going to continue that consensus, Mr. Speaker.

The second thing is that I've met with agriculture groups recently, as early as yesterday — or as late as yesterday — and the same thing comes up. They say there's not one simple answer. You have to go at cash, you have to look at restructuring, you have to help some people that are in trouble — a whole combination of those things.

The ministers of agriculture from the neighbouring provinces also formed a consensus, as did this legislature — a consensus, a new, brand-new, solid consensus that we would say to the federal government on interest rates and on prices and exchange rates: that's squarely in the federal bailiwick and that's where it belongs.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne has caused those things to begin to take place, the Consensus Saskatchewan, municipal consensus, a legislative consensus, ministers of agriculture from across the Prairies, farm groups, Mr. Speaker.

Now that's the history of Saskatchewan. And it's a history, Mr. Speaker, from time to time that has been very successful. That's why we are reuniting and rekindling that flame of co-operation. If you can get people working together in a co-operative fashion, then they are very, very strong.

A word about the stabilization of communities, because you're going to hear more about this in the budget, but the Speech from the Throne touches on it. We are going to — and I'm sure you've heard, Mr. Speaker — introduce the concept of community development bonds.

Let me just say a couple of things about them. What people have told us is that often, as we're diversifying and building and we've seen in the past, we've used too much debt. Farmers have used too much debt. Communities, when they do projects, will come to SEDCO or some other people and they borrow too much money; then they can't pay it off. And then when you owe the money, what happens to the interest rates often? They go up and down, and usually go up. Haven't seen them come down recently.

People have said to us, as we travel across the province in this consensus-building exercise: why don't we use our own money? Why do we always have to take our savings and our pensions and give it to some pension manager and he ships it down East so they buy shares in the Royal Bank or some other institution? And it all goes out of the province. And when we want to build something, what do we do? We borrow it back and pay the interest.

And people will say to me over and over again: you know, this is getting a little ridiculous. Look at the debt in the farm community — 5 billion, \$6 billion. Look at the debt in other organizations. Why don't we use our own money? We've got billions in pensions money. We've got billions in savings. Why don't we invest in our own community?

Well, so he said, well that's a good idea. How do we do that? They said, well if you're prepared to lend us money, maybe if we come up with our own and you're prepared to back it up and go into a joint venture with us, and we

won't owe anybody any money; we'll just build it on equity.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that got our attention. I'll tell you, that really got our attention. That's how the co-op movement built their refinery over here in Regina. Not on borrowed money; on cash. The whole community participated on the strength of the local people building themselves.

And the community development bonds, Mr. Speaker — the hon. member says I'm glad I realize it — I will say to you, Mr. Speaker, the largest project in the history of Saskatchewan is the upgrader in Regina, which is a joint venture between this government, the Co-op, and the federal government, Mr. Speaker. And I'm very proud of that project because it's based on us taking a strong equity position, taking the base of the refinery that was there, and taking some brand-new technology.

That's what people have been waiting for for generations. That upgrader should have been built years ago, years and years and years ago. But it wasn't. But it takes that kind of foresight, that kind of co-operative attitude, and that kind of courage to build.

Mr. Speaker, I will say the community equity bonds, the development bonds that are there, will be managed by the local community. If you put up some money, and I don't know all the towns where you've lived, Mr. Speaker, but if you found one where you live, say Cupar or something, and if Cupar wants to build a project and if the people are prepared to put money into a project there, the Government of Saskatchewan will guarantee the safety of that money. We'll guarantee it.

And they put that together with the business idea and a plan and build a processing or manufacturing plant like you've heard at Dysart — manufacturing furniture held together by velcro. It's the people's money and the Government of Saskatchewan puts its reputation behind it and backs it. Guaranteed. No borrowed money. We take solid equity and put it in there.

Now they may go to Sedco or a local bank for cash flow on operating any other kind of business. But every community says it's for their community; it's for their kids; it's for their future, managed by them and backed up by the government.

Mr. Speaker, think how much stronger that is than borrowing money from New York or borrowing money from banks or borrowing money from somebody else and paying all that interest that leaves the community. Just think where the interest is going to go. It goes back to Cupar.

If people finance the power project in Nipawin — say it's \$300 million Mr. Speaker. We used to go to the banks. I would say, with the greatest respect, the NDP and the other administrations used to go to the banks and borrow \$300 million in New York. And they'd say, well I'm going to build a power project. At 10 per cent money, that was \$30 million a year that left Nipawin, or left Saskatchewan and went to New York. At 20 per cent money, that's \$60 million a year that left this province and goes to the international bankers — 60 million a year!

And that's where the interest rates were when the previous government was in here. Twenty per cent interest rates and they were borrowing money from international bankers to build or buy — they didn't build; they bought things — but just the principal alone, just think of it.

What if you had local people put up their money and you paid the interest to them? Three hundred million dollars we did on a Power bond. We said to the people of Saskatchewan, with no support from the critics on the other side — they said, we'll offer a Power bond for Saskatchewan people so we can build the power project, and we'll give you 10 per cent return on your money.

What happened? Well despite the critics, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you what happened. The people of Saskatchewan bought Power bonds like you've never seen. They were dying for that opportunity — \$300 million worth. And at 10 per cent return, 30 million a year goes where, Mr. Speaker? To New York? No. To Toronto? No. To Tokyo? No. To the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

That's what the equity will do and that's what every community can do. You raise your money, we'll back it up, and the return goes into the community so one, it's for your community alone. You manage it, it's for your future and your kids, and you're not paying the interest outside the province.

That's consensus. That's a history of the province of Saskatchewan. That's diversification; that's building.

All those people, Mr. Speaker, can have an opportunity to build, and you can go to town after town after town, and you can say to them, would you like to see some building? And they'll say, yes, sir. And you say, join me. You invest in your town and the province will back it up. And you will see building like you've never seen before and no interest going outside the province; all the return going to the people of that town and that town only.

Now people have told me, yes, Mr. Premier, we've had some difficult times in agriculture. Interest rates up, drought. We've had low prices, we've had grasshoppers. But your idea of building with local people's money on equity and cash rather than debt is the right way to go.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe in that so much. I believe in that as an economist, as a parent, as the Minister of Agriculture, and as the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan.

People want to build in their communities with their money under their control. And they're going to get it. From this Speech from the Throne and the budget you're going to see, they're going to have every single opportunity to put as much money as they want into their communities for the 1990s and the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, in the diversification of communities, just a couple of other points. I was really happy to hear the Lieutenant Governor introduce the 40-40 plan for telephone subscribers, with 40 minutes of toll-free calling to exchanges within a 40-mile radius. Forty minutes, no

long distance calls in a 40-mile radius. Imagine what that means to rural people, towns, and the villages. You're phoning for repairs, you're phoning for the 4-H, you're looking at your hockey schedule. All of those things. Mr. Speaker, they have been waiting for that, and with new technology and the kinds of leadership that you can have in technology, that's possible.

We will continue with the rural gasification program, Mr. Speaker, and individual line service, because natural gas to towns and villages and farms does what? It encourages that diversification that there will now be money to build on. If you've got natural gas coming into your community, and many do now as a result of our program, they can have manufacturing and processing at costs that are competitive with anybody in the world. Now that's taken \$300 million, but, Mr. Speaker, it's obviously the infrastructure that's necessary.

The same thing, Mr. Speaker. We will be initiating, and continue initiating, novel and new programs for social and economic well-being of aboriginal people. And I've had some very good discussions with Chief Roland Crowe and other members of the aboriginal people that I believe will bear fruit for not only a year or two or three, but obviously for decades to come.

Let me just say, with respect to health and education, the kinds of programs that we're prepared to finance and initiate, Mr. Speaker, are substantial. New base hospitals, the fact that we're prepared to make rehabilitation centres, drug rehabilitation centres, our focus on preventive medicine, on mental health. The fact that we're prepared to take on and address many of the issues of the day, including some of the social problems and social diseases like AIDS (acquired immune deficiency syndrome), Mr. Speaker, is something that I raised three or four years ago, and some would scoff at and some critics would say, well, you know, you're a little bit out of line, Mr. Premier. Mr. Speaker, I was not out of line.

It must be addressed and it is being addressed. We have the possibility of helping families and people. Our family foundations and our forums on the family, which will include 150 meetings and forums, will be particularly important for making sure that we have health care that is delivered right into the hands of the people of Saskatchewan, wherever they live, rural and urban.

I'm particularly proud too, Mr. Speaker, of the tremendous increase in our technical capacity and growth in our base hospitals in Regina and Saskatoon, particularly. And the new expansions, the technology, the specialization, and combined with Dr. Murray's report, I believe that you will see Saskatchewan at the very leading edge of health care technology here in the province of Saskatchewan.

With respect to the efficient management of resources, Mr. Speaker, the fact that we will include the people of Saskatchewan in managing and being prepared to deal with all the resources we have and deal with the priorities; the fact that we have said the family is extremely important, the farm is very important, the community and health and education — those five — help us manage our resources so that we can do

a first-class job in those areas is something that is extremely important and will require the partnership of Consensus Saskatchewan.

I want to ensure that we have a partnership for social and economic and technological development that will be surpassed by nobody, not a single province, not a single administration in this country.

We are going to implement a set of guide-lines for ethical conduct of cabinet ministers and legislative secretaries. I want to investigate the benefits of access to information rules and laws for the privacy of personal information. Press Ottawa to fully assume its responsibility for services for Indians, particularly in the province of Saskatchewan.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the steps that you see in the Speech from the Throne, and the steps that you will see in the budget, show that the government has laid out a format that can ensure a prosperous future and a relevant future for the towns and the villages and the people in the province of Saskatchewan.

This government proposes to lead the province through the next decade and into the next century on an agenda that is driven by the people of Saskatchewan, developed through broad consultation with people from towns and villages, farms, urban, rural, in all corners of the province.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I will inform you that I will not be supporting the amendment on the motion but I strongly support and will be voting in favour of the motion, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1515)

Mr. Hagel: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure to enter into this debate in response to the Speech from the Throne for the fourth time, Mr. Speaker, and to bring some thoughts to this debate on behalf of the constituents of Moose Jaw North — people, Mr. Speaker, who I think can be quite accurately described as the salt of the earth; people who have got their feet solidly on their ground and have their heads somewhere below the clouds, Mr. Speaker; people who have an understanding of what it takes in this province to have a government that responds to the people and to the needs of the people today.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to begin first of all by extending my compliments to Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor for her presentation of the Speech from the Throne. It was certainly her presence that added dignity to the tradition that has been long-standing in this House, and the dignity unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, which was not reflected in the content of the speech. And I understand it is not Her Honour who writes the content.

Obviously in my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, I will be addressing some of my disappointment in the contents, but do compliment Her Honour on the presentation and the continuing of a fine tradition in this democratic process that we all celebrate here.

I also want to compliment the mover and the seconder, Mr. Speaker. It is an honour that is envied, and I compliment them for having had that honour in bringing their views of this Speech from the Throne to this Assembly.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make some reflections on the remarks of the Premier just presented in this House before presenting to this House some of my own observations about the Speech from the Throne. And as I listened to the words of the Premier brought to this Legislative Assembly, as the Premier outlined his enthusiasm for this supposed statement of vision, a statement of political blueprint, of action, Mr. Speaker, I have to say, in all honesty, that I stand here with a bit of sorrow in my heart.

It was a sad day, Mr. Speaker, when we had the Premier of the province, the leader of the government addressing his government's statement about their vision and about their blueprint; that he stood in his place for 45 minutes, and in that entire 45 minutes he only received support of applause from his own colleagues once, half-hearted. Their most enthusiastic response, Mr. Speaker, was when he was done and he sat down and left. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that is a sad statement for the government and its failure to project vision.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — But it's kind of typical; it's kind of typical, Mr. Speaker, because it is my view, as I've looked at this process of the Speech from the Throne and the response and the presentations from all members on that side, including the Premier, that what we have just heard today, just before me, Mr. Speaker, is that we have heard a sorry Tory, a sorry Tory. We have heard from the sorry Tory. Mr. Speaker, we have just finished listening to the leader, the man charged with the responsibility of leading the sorry Tory strategy for re-election. That's what we've heard.

And I'll comment on that later because this, Mr. Speaker, this whole exercise is a reflection of the sorry Tory strategy for re-election. That's what it's all about.

It was kind of interesting, the Premier began his remarks, Mr. Speaker, in the same way as every other member on that side of the House by making reference to the eastern bloc in East Germany and what is happening in that part of the world, and some more directly than others and some only by implication, Mr. Speaker, implying it is a vindication of this government that we have here in Saskatchewan today.

Well, I say, Mr. Speaker, I say that there is some accuracy in the analogy, and there is some implication with what is going on in East Germany for those of us in Saskatchewan today. But I point out, interestingly enough, Mr. Speaker, that when polls have been done through Eastern Europe and throughout Europe, the people in that part of this world are saying, we've had it with extremes. We're tired of extremes. Communism is dead and I agree, Mr. Speaker, and I say hurrah. The fact of the matter as well, Mr. Speaker, is that in the western world unfettered capitalism is also dead and I say hurrah.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Speaker, it seems interesting to me when I read and I look at the polls of what the public opinion takers in the eastern blocs are looking for the opinions of the people, what are they saying? What they're saying, Mr. Speaker, is that what they want in that part of the world is social democracy. Social democracy. Mr. Speaker, the people in that part of the world are saying they've had it with the extreme. Where they want to go is where Saskatchewan has been from 1944 to 1982. They want to go to social democracy. That's where we've been until this government came to power and, Mr. Speaker, not only the people of Europe but the people of Saskatchewan want to go there again.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Speaker, when we look at the consequences of governments that govern with extreme ideologies, it's interesting. Some of the political scientists will say politics is a circle and the extremes at both ends are really just beside each other in a circle. And I think there is some truth to that, Mr. Speaker, when you look at what happens when governments govern with extreme ideologies.

In the eastern bloc, Mr. Speaker, with communism, and here in Saskatchewan with this PC Party's version of unfettered capitalism called privatization today, we have had people experiencing the same negative impacts, the same devastating effects in their lives, and responding in the same way. What do they want to do? They want to change their governments, Mr. Speaker, and they have a desire to leave.

And perhaps it is with more wisdom than we sometimes appreciate that the most common riddle being asked in Saskatchewan today — it was quoted on the CTV (Canadian Television Network) show *W5*, and the news media across the country are saying it as well — we've all heard it a thousand times. People in Saskatchewan across this province and across this country are saying, what's the difference between East Germany and Saskatchewan? And we've all heard the answer. The answer of course, Mr. Speaker, is that East Germany doesn't have a PC government and they can still leave by train.

That's what they're saying. That's what they're saying across this province and in our country. And, Mr. Speaker, I think there is some wisdom about the response of the people to governments of extreme ideology. I find it interesting as well, Mr. Speaker, when I listen to the Premier and his talk about democratic reform, as he says, that's what's going on in East Germany; that's what's going on in the eastern bloc today.

Mr. Speaker, there is one party, one political party in this province that stands for democratic reform. It is a political party which released two weeks ago a paper entitled *Democratic Reform for the 1990's*. It was released by my colleague for Saskatoon Eastview. There is one party in favour of democratic reform in Saskatchewan, and that is the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Democratic reform. In the Assembly here today in question period, the Premier, who claims to have already implemented some guide-lines that cut government waste, refused to lay them on the table for the members of the opposition and for the media and for the people of Saskatchewan. He says, trust me. Trust me.

Mr. Speaker, if this government had a record of open government, perhaps people would be inclined to say okay when he says, trust me. But what's been the record? We've seen over the years that I have served in this Legislative Assembly, Mr. Speaker, in my view, a clear erosion of the principles of democracy.

We've seen this government attack the auditor. We've seen this government attack the Legislative Counsel. We've seen this government sabotage public accounts and Crown corporations by refusing to meet. We've seen this government gerrymander the boundaries so that in the next election they will hope to have a natural advantage based on their historical strength. We have seen, Mr. Speaker, in Bill 5, on the first days that I came to this Assembly, a move to take business out of this Assembly, out of the people's Assembly, and to move it behind closed cabinet doors.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen for the first time in Saskatchewan history, in the last legislative session, closure used to end debate, and then not only that, followed only hours later by the motion to use closure on closure, the second time in Saskatchewan history, within hours by this government.

We have seen this government refuse to answer questions for over two years. Mr. Speaker, I say there is clearly only one party in Saskatchewan for democratic reform, and that's the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a government that for some strange reason has experienced an amazing coincidence. Since it has been in power, there have been people to blame all over the place, everybody but them. We saw it. First of all, Mr. Speaker, it was the poor that were to blame for our problems in Saskatchewan. And so we cut social services. And we had the minister of the Crown only months ago say, our children aren't going hungry in Saskatchewan. They're not there.

We saw then this government say, well, in addition to poor people we've got other problems . . . other people that are causing our problems in this province. It's the workers. And we saw changes, Draconian changes to the labour legislation in this province.

Ah, Mr. Speaker, then we went on to say, but we've got other people causing problems for us. It's those seniors, those seniors that keep going to the doctor. And when he gives them prescription, they go home and they get their medicine and they take it. And that's part of our problem. Oh, we've got to cut into that one.

Then they said, in addition to the poor and to workers and

to seniors, we've got some other problems here. They're the cities. They're soaking up too much money from the province and so we have to cut back the funding to the municipalities and the school boards.

Ah, Mr. Speaker, and then they said, but in addition to the poor people and the workers and the seniors and the people in the cities, we've got students. Those are part of the problems. We're going to have to restrict their access to post-secondary education.

And now, Mr. Speaker, in this Speech from the Throne repeated by the Premier here today, now we have got the ultimate attack — we're under attack by the world. Not only from within, we are under attack by the world.

Well I say, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier, there will be people who say that you are looking paranoid. There will be people who say that you look like you're on the run. But I've got some good news and I've got some bad news, Mr. Speaker. The good news to the Premier is this: Mr. Premier, you are not paranoid. Mr. Premier, the bad news is this, is that the people of Saskatchewan really are out to get rid of you and your government and the waste and mismanagement, and on that there is consensus.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — And on that there is consensus.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Premier, the great hero of agriculture in Saskatchewan, didn't have a whole lot to say today. But as my colleagues and I travel this province trying to understand the plight of those in rural Saskatchewan and what they look to their leaders, their political leaders to respond, there's one clear statement that we keep hearing over and over and over again. They keep saying, for heaven's sakes, take the politics out of agriculture. Take the politics out of agriculture.

Look at agriculture and the problems that we are facing today as a problem that needs solutions, and it needs to be addressed in this Assembly every year and not just in the year of an election.

You know, it's kind of interesting, Mr. Speaker, when we reflect on Saskatchewan history. Since Saskatchewan became a province in 1905, there have been only two times in our history in which we had a Conservative government in Regina and at the same time a Conservative government in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, we saw premier Anderson in Regina and prime minister Bennett in Ottawa take Saskatchewan into the Dirty Thirties. And then again, Mr. Speaker, we saw the Premier, the member from Estevan, and Prime Minister Mulroney take Saskatchewan through the horrendous eighties.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this may be a coincidence. This may only be a coincidence. It may be only an amazing coincidence. But I tell you, Mr. Speaker, what the farmers of Saskatchewan are saying. They're saying they've had enough of politics in agriculture. They've had enough of PCs in Regina and Ottawa at the same time, and they're not going to take the chance again. That's what they're

saying, Mr. Speaker.

(1530)

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the words of the Premier. There was one word I was specifically interested in hearing from him. And, Mr. Speaker, I'm referring of course to the P-word.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I got the Speech from the Throne and I opened it up and I looked through and I read it; couldn't find the P-word. Took the thing and gave it a big shake and the P-word didn't fall out. It's not in there. And I listened very carefully to the words of the Premier, and from his mouth did not utter the P-word. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if you want to get the Premier and the ministers of the Crown today to say the P-word, you've got to take them up to the top of a 15-story storey building, hold him out over the edge and then they just squeak the P-word out.

Because you see, Mr. Speaker, contrary to a year ago, to the last legislative session in the Speech from the Throne, in which the Premier predicted that this was the Alamo for the NDP — this was going to be the bitter end, the cry of the people, the people were crying out, he said — the people have consensus. They have a government which wants to charge forward and give them the P-word.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the word privatization did not utter from the Premier's lips. It did not not. It is not in the Speech from the Throne because pure and simply, Mr. Speaker, there is a consensus. There is a consensus, and the consensus is that the people have had way too much of privatization and they're not going to have anything more to do with it or the government that brought it to the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — And so the Premier says, the Premier tells us, he says the P-word's on hold. The P-word's on hold. We can't say the P-word. It's on hold. Shhhh. No more P-words.

Well simply put, Mr. Speaker, simply put, when the Premier says that the P-word is on hold, I don't believe him. And you know why I don't believe him, Mr. Speaker? Because I know that in May of this year, May 13 to 16 in Saskatoon is a major, a major international conference on the P-word.

Now Maggie was going to come. We all know that this was organized by that Tory front group, the institute for private enterprise. Yes. We know that Maggie Thatcher was going to be there to come and tell the people of Saskatchewan about the wonders of the P-word. Maybe she'd get around to the poll tax. But unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it seems that Maggie won't be able to make it. She's a little preoccupied with the people and her own cabinet, and her own P-word back in the U.K.

But do you know what? When I opened up the brochure advertising this major conference on privatization, what

should appear but the smiling face of the Premier and a little message to the people of Saskatchewan. And let me tell this Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan what the Premier has to say about the P-word. Now this must have been written . . . I suspect this was written before the P-word, the P-word edict was issued. But under the provincial coat of arms, under the title Premier of Saskatchewan, what does it say? It says this, and these are the words of the Premier. He says and I quote:

As Premier of Saskatchewan, I am pleased to invite you to the 1990 International Privatization Congress (oh, he said the P-word) in Saskatoon, May 13-16, 1990.

And then he goes on to say:

The Institute for Saskatchewan Enterprise plays an important role in promoting valuable discussions on privatization. (There's the P-word again.) Saskatchewan is the leader in Canada . . . (Listen to this.) Saskatchewan is the leader in Canada encouraging public participation (which we all know is the public . . . that's the polite P-word.) Saskatchewan is the leader in Canada encouraging public participation in new areas of our economy. We are excited about the economic renewal this participation is creating. Delegates from around the globe . . . (This is our new world-globe-trotting Premier.) Delegates from around the globe will gather at this conference, testimony to the timeliness of the world-wide interest in privatization.

There's the P-word again. Oh, if the writer in the Premier's office could dash around Saskatchewan with an ink eraser, Mr. Speaker, these would all be gone.

And then he concludes by saying:

I invite you to come to Saskatchewan to continue the dialogue on the merits of privatization (the P-word slipped out again) and to share your nation's experience in that area. See you in 1990.

And then there's a signature over the words, Grant Devine, Premier of Saskatchewan. The brochure goes on, Mr. Speaker, to list the Premier of Saskatchewan as a keynote speaker.

The super minister for the economy has said within the last few days that the privatization of SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) is still on go. And I say to this House and I say to the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, that the battle against privatization is not over. The battle against privatization will not be over until the PC government is gone and the seat for the Premier of Saskatchewan is held by the member for Riversdale as premier in charge of the helm of the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Well, Mr. Speaker, that's my response to the Premier's comments today. And as I look at this Speech from the Throne and conclude obviously that it is

in abject failure in terms of providing a vision or a plan of action, a political plan of action for the government, I have to say in all honesty, Mr. Speaker, that I'm not surprised.

Because what we have seen in the Speech from the Throne is nothing more than a continuation of a political strategy that was hatched last September — when the Premier called together his major Decima polling folks who had taken their humungous polls at cost to the taxpayer of our province, and Nancy McLean, his medium adviser from Toronto, and he got them together and he said, tell me what to do.

And they looked at the polls, and his eastern media adviser said to him, Mr. Speaker, she said, Mr. Premier, the people of Saskatchewan don't like what you're doing. And then she said, Mr. Speaker, if you keep telling the people of Saskatchewan what you want to do, come the next election they're going to tell you where to go.

And then she said, Mr. Speaker, she told the Premier, Mr. Premier, you have only got one option, and that is to go back and revisit 1985 if you have any hope at all of being re-elected. For heaven sakes, don't tell people what you're going to do. For heaven sakes, don't tell them what you've done. Mr. Premier, you are going to have to become as sorry Tory, a sorry Tory.

And so what was hatched, Mr. Speaker, was the sorry Tory strategy for re-election, and that's what this speech is all about. And we saw the evidence of it last fall. Last fall he said, we've heard from the people and we're sorry. And he said, just to show that we're going to be different, because we're not going to be the same, we're going to be different, and he kicked out four of his cabinet ministers. Out they went. And just to show how in touch he was with the people of Saskatchewan in came eight new ones, Mr. Speaker, eight who had managed to hide their light under a bushel for years. All at once he discovered eight of them, eight of them, just sitting there waiting to give a new direction to the people of Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, then what did they do? They all got into their new cabinet, great big, cabinet minister cars and airplanes and they went off to Maple Creek, went off to Cypress Hills, and they got fitted with hearing aids. They must have because the Premier came back home and he called a news conference. He called a news conference like one has never been called in the western world by any political leader before. He called a news conference and he said, my cabinet ministers are going to return phone calls now. What an announcement. What an announcement. He said, not only that, if you write them a letter, you're going to get one back. And he said, not only that, we're going to be doing more listening because we've got more ears, more ears, more listening.

Well, Mr. Speaker, then to show how in touch he was with the people of Saskatchewan he took Graham Taylor and he took Bob Andrew and he sent them off to Hong Kong and to Minneapolis at \$100,000 a year — \$100,000 a year, and they've got their ears open in Minneapolis and Hong Kong.

Ah, but, Mr. Speaker, somehow we're supposed to

believe that this is a new look. This is a new look. This is the new repentant sorry Tory government, and somehow things are being done different behind those closed cabinet doors in the province of Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, one gets the impression as the Premier travels this province these days with this new sorry Tory strategy, and his speeches to the people of Saskatchewan go something like this: he always introduces himself by saying, hi, I'm your PC Premier and I'm sorry. I'm a sorry Tory. I'm sorry I cut your prescription medicine plan. I'm sorry I took away your school-based children's dental care program. I'm sorry about the flat tax and the sales tax and the lottery tax — really sorry about that lottery tax — and the gas tax, and that I said the goods and service tax was a good idea.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — He says, I'm sorry about health cuts and education cuts and social services cuts and ignoring the environment and the roads falling apart. I'm sorry about hungry children and poverty and bankruptcies and low minimum wage and high unemployment and people leaving Saskatchewan.

I'm sorry I privatized the highways' workers and the dental therapists and Sask Minerals and Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation and Saskoil and the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. I'm sorry I said I'd privatize SGI and SaskPower.

I'm sorry about GigaText and the way we treated the auditor and about Chuck Childers being a half a million dollar man, and now about STC (Saskatchewan Transportation Company).

He's says, I'm sorry. I am sorry that the minister of privatization resigned, couldn't get himself a job in the private sector and so I had to appoint him to a fat government job. He's saying, I'm sorry that I said as long as there was a sales tax they would never pay tax again. Then I put it back on, then I gave back, then I increased it, then I kept half of it, and now you're paying it all, only more. But golly gee, isn't a guy entitled to make a few mistakes?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Besides — he goes on to say, Mr. Speaker — besides, we were way out ahead of the people, way out ahead of the people. But I'm as sorry as I can fake it, and won't you please forgive me till the next election?

Well I say to the Premier, I say to the Premier, Mr. Speaker: Mr. Premier, you are not half as sorry as the people of Saskatchewan. You say you're listening. You say you're looking for advice. If you're listening, I've got one word of advice, one word of advice and the word is this: resign! Resign and let the people decide!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Well, Mr. Speaker, we in Saskatchewan have paid dearly. We have paid dearly for this government's ideological experimentation called

piratization. We have paid in the most expensive price possible — with our people.

We came to the end of 1989, Mr. Speaker, with 8,000 fewer people working in this province than just a year before. We finished 1989 with a unique distinction, Mr. Speaker. In 1989, in all of Canada, there was only one province in all of Canada that had actually a reduction in the size of its labour force. One in all of Canada last year, Mr. Speaker.

And who was it? Was it Prince Edward Island? No. Must have been Nova Scotia then. No. No, it wasn't them. Well then surely it is that perennial poor sister of our Canadian federation, surely the only province that lost, that had a reduction in its labour force in 1989, was poor old Newfoundland.

Some Hon. Members: — No, no.

(1545)

Mr. Hagel: — Well, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are right. It wasn't Prince Edward Island or Nova Scotia or Newfoundland. In 1989 only one province had a reduction in the size of its labour force, and that province was Saskatchewan — Saskatchewan, the home of piratization — the only province in all of Canada that saw its labour force reduced.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, in 1989 we saw a human tragedy take place in this province. In 1989 we suffered the second greatest loss of people this province has ever seen. In 1989, Mr. Speaker, there were 23,700 people more who moved out of Saskatchewan than moved in, over half of them between the ages of 15 and 34. Our best and our brightest and our boldest with the greatest amount of initiative — our newly educated, our creative citizens.

And I hazard a guess, Mr. Speaker, when I say there is not a single person in this room today whose life has not been touched by the loss of people from our province, every one of us has had a relative, a son or a daughter, a best friend, a next door neighbour leave Saskatchewan because they gave up on our Saskatchewan.

What a price to pay for this right-wing experiment in ideology called privatization. And since privatization hit the government benches all hell-bent for leather, Mr. Speaker, in 1985, this province has lost. We have had a net loss of over 65,000 of our citizens, 65,000 more who left Saskatchewan than came in. Simply put, Mr. Speaker, that is a tragedy equivalent to taking the cities, the entire cities, our third and fourth largest cities in our province, Moose Jaw and Prince Albert, and putting them to a huge moving truck and taking them over one of the Saskatchewan borders. What a tragedy. What a legacy. What a statement about the accomplishments and the impact that this government has had on the people of Saskatchewan!

Well, Mr. Speaker, it hasn't stopped this year. In the first two months of this year we have lost a net . . . we've had a net loss of another 3,000. The indictment goes on and the people of our province are paying the price. And I say, I

say, Mr. Speaker, it's time. It's time we say to the people of Saskatchewan, stop packing your bags, and it's time that we all get together in a true consensus and send the Premier from Estevan and the PC Party packing from the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to bring to this Legislative Assembly a few brief remarks on the one and only new, brilliant, creative, innovative idea in the Speech from the Throne. It's a wild and woolly exercise, Mr. Speaker, called by the government Consensus Saskatchewan, and called by the people of this province, con Saskatchewan.

Now what did the Premier have to say before he got sat down by Nancy and Decima back in September that hatched this sorry Tory strategy? Mr. Speaker, our Premier had to say, back in October of 1987 . . . He was a little bolder in those days. Back in those days he was willing to say what he thought. And what did he have to say then?

Mr. Speaker, I quote from an article in the *Star-Phoenix* entitled "Despite protest, Devine vows to stay the course." The article leads off with these words:

Premier Grant Devine says he was elected to make decisions and that is just what he intends to do.

And then he goes on to say, and I quote again. This is the Premier speaking:

There are some choices that have to be made that are not always not popular in everybody's eyes (boy, he had that one right). The question I always have to ask myself is: if you don't make these decisions, what did you get elected for?

And then, Mr. Speaker, in the latter part of the article, the Premier says again, and I quote:

While many people are having difficult times, they have to believe that you have a vision about where you're going and about where the province could go, and if they believe that, then they'll stay with you.

Well, simply put, Mr. Speaker, when the pollsters and the media advisers sat down with the Premier, they said: Mr. Premier, that's your problem in 1990 — they don't like your vision and they aren't sticking with you. You want to get re-elected, you're going to have to fake it. And that's what con Saskatchewan is all about, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — So now he's singing a new tune; the Premier's singing a new tune. He says, we're going to have to take the politics out of politics. Well we're going to take the water out of ducks . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well we won't diverge to what the Premier had to say about ducks. It's not relevant to this discussion.

But what does the Premier say, Mr. Speaker? He says we've got to take the politics out of politics. Well of

course he wants to take the politics out of politics. You see, when politicians talk about their differences, people compare them. People say, there's politician A, politician B. There's the member from Estevan; there's the member from Riversdale. When they compare, they say there's party A, there's party B; there's the PCs, there's the New Democrats. Of course he wants to take the politics out of politics because every time the people of Saskatchewan compare the two, he comes out the loser.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — And so he says, I'm sorry, but we're listening. We've got our ears open and we've got more ears in cabinet than we ever had before, and they're all open. And we won't do what the people don't want. We won't do what the people won't want, he says, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in this Speech from the Throne, they formally announced a miracle of modern medicine — a miracle of modern medicine. They announced that the PC cabinet and the PC government has gone into rigor mortis before it died, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Well, Mr. Speaker, what is this brilliant new idea called con Saskatchewan? What's it all about? Well let's take a look. We've aroused the interest of the Deputy Premier, and unfortunately she's been saddled with being responsible for this. So what has she told us? What's this committee all about? What's this con Saskatchewan all about, Mr. Speaker?

Well what they've told us is that they're going to get together 100 people who are all going to come together and tell the government where to go. In my home city, Mr. Speaker, they had a radio call-in show. They asked people, are you in favour of con Saskatchewan or do you think it's a lousy idea? Mr. Speaker, they were opposed 4:1. Twenty-one people said they thought it was a lousy idea; five people said they thought it was a good idea.

One of the ones who thought it was a good idea said he thought it was a great idea. They should get these hundred people together and then they can all agree and tell the government to call an election. That was one of the supporters for the idea.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Well, we're going to have a hundred people from around Saskatchewan. They're going to have 12 chairpersons, 12 chairpersons. Nobody can be a community leader. Nobody can be there if they've ever been elected to something. They all have to be people who represent nobody, they represent nothing, but have more vision about the future of Saskatchewan than the PC cabinet.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I point out to the Premier, there is a committee that exists in Saskatchewan already. It is a committee that has 64 members. They

come from all walks of life. They come from all over the province. They are already being paid by the taxpayers. If you ask their spouses, they'll tell you they're meeting with people 26 hours a day. They're meeting daily in this building, and they're called members of the Legislative Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Well, Mr. Premier, I point out as well that of those 64 there are 30 who get extra pay to make plans and to make decisions and to show leadership. They sit on that side of the House and they are called cabinet ministers and legislative secretaries. And I say, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier, if you can't figure out a way to get this committee of 64, led by your most brilliant 30, to solve the immense problems facing the people of Saskatchewan, then it's time to let the citizens of this province choose a new committee with a new consensus and a new mandate. That's called an election, and you have a responsibility to call one.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Well, Mr. Speaker, clearly Consensus Saskatchewan is nothing more than a public relations gimmick, and a shallow one at that, hatched to try to save the Premier's hide. And it's quite accurately called con Saskatchewan by the people of our province. And at the end of the day it is merely a symbol of a government that's out of touch, either out of touch or afraid to say what it wants to do. You can draw no conclusion other than that.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to turn to one other matter in the Speech from the Throne. The Speech from the Throne was very well presented, and it was basically a serious exercise, but it had a joke in it, Mr. Speaker. It had a joke. On page 14 of the Speech from the Throne it had a joke. It said, and I quote, "Waste will not be tolerated." Mr. Speaker, it got not a bad laugh that day from every corner of this Legislative Assembly.

And let me point out just a simple example. We have in this Legislative Assembly today four more cabinet ministers than when we left at the end of August last year — four more. Each of them gets an extra \$36,000 more than they made when they left in August of last year, plus of course they all have their staffs and their offices and their cars and so on. And now we're putting them to good use, the Premier tells us, because he's got one of those cabinet ministers, is working full time to prepare for the election. He's not consulted with us. The member from Souris-Cannington has not consulted with us — best I can tell, Mr. Speaker, this is a cabinet minister paid for by the people of Saskatchewan to organize the PC campaign, at an extra \$36,000 a year plus office staff and expenses.

Well then, Mr. Speaker, in addition this has been a government of firsts. They like to tell us how much they are a government of firsts. Well they got another first, Mr. Speaker. For the first time in Saskatchewan we have a new kind of minister — it's called an associate minister. And associate ministers, as best as we can understand, are there to help the real ministers. They also get extra money and they get offices and staff and cars and the rest of the wad.

Now how many we got? Remember now, this must be an experiment. I am sure the Premier has consulted and all across Saskatchewan people are saying, we need some more ministers to help the real ministers. So how many we got in this little experiment in Saskatchewan? We got one? No. We got two? No. No, no. We got three associate ministers, four more ministers than when we left in August, one assigned full time to work in the PC campaign, three to help the real ministers.

(1600)

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, we've got 10 legislative secretaries. Now what's a legislative secretary do, besides collect another \$8,000 a year and have a staff and an office and stuff? Well I point out as well, Mr. Speaker, that most provinces will have one or two legislative secretaries; we've got 10. We've got 10. One of them is snoozing over in the back there and I am sure that he's . . . I won't accuse him of sleeping; I think he looks as though he's having great thoughts at the moment.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we've got 10. We've got 10 legislative secretaries. What's a legislative secretary supposed to do? They are supposed to help ministers. Now just let me get this. Just a second here. We've got associate ministers who are supposed to help ministers, and we've got legislative secretaries. We have three associate ministers, 10 of those legislative secretaries, and they're supposed to help ministers.

So what does that mean, Mr. Speaker? What that means is that we have ministers' helpers helping ministers' helpers help ministers! Ministers' helpers helping ministers' helpers help ministers. That's what we've got in Saskatchewan. That's a lot of ministers needing a lot of help. And so is it any wonder that we got con Saskatchewan? I conclude that the sentence, waste will not be tolerated, as nothing more than a cruel PC joke on the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Well, Mr. Speaker, there are some things that the throne speech didn't say. We've got massive population loss in Saskatchewan today. No plan. We have a critical need for stimulation of jobs in Saskatchewan. No plan. We have students who will be looking for work as soon as a month from now. No plan.

People are irate about the federal PC government's intention to introduce the GST. And in opposition to that, here in Saskatchewan, we have no plan. People are already paying more taxes than they can handle. They're looking for tax relief, and what do we give them in the Speech from the Throne? No plan.

Mr. Speaker, we've got the insidious flat tax that has affected people in my constituency and they're telling me about it now, as they're filling out their income tax returns. We find, for example, somebody in my constituency with \$25,000 income paying provincial income tax rate, not of the 51 per cent officially, not at 51 per cent, but 73 per cent when you factor in the flat tax; 73 per cent provincial income tax for somebody with a

\$25,000 income.

Somebody with a \$40,000 income that's been by my office, Mr. Speaker, has said, now it must be more, right, because they're making more. No, they're paying 65 per cent, still more than the 51 per cent officially, but less than the person with \$25,000 income. The flat tax is unfair; it's insidious. And what do they say about the flat tax? No plan.

So, Mr. Speaker, I conclude by expressing, as I did at the beginning, my disappointment in the Speech from the Throne. People in Saskatchewan are looking for hope. They're looking for hope and instead they got hype. People in Saskatchewan are looking for substance, and instead they got fluff. People in Saskatchewan are looking for leadership. Instead they got a government whose battle cry is, "Don't just do something, stand there."

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne is clearly a speech without vision, a speech which lacks any kind of a sensible blueprint for political action in the interests of Saskatchewan people, and I will take my place indicating to this House that I will be voting against the motion and in support of the amendment moved by my colleague, the member for Eastview, adding the words to the motion that this House,

. . . regrets that the provincial government has betrayed Saskatchewan families and Saskatchewan communities with the sham of its Consensus Saskatchewan proposal; by its continued wasteful mismanagement of the province's finances; by its failure to provide jobs and strengthen the economic base of all Saskatchewan communities; by its failure to develop an economic strategy which protects the environment; by its abject failure to provide long-term financial security to Saskatchewan farmers; and furthermore, has failed to protect the province by following the lead of the Federal Government on the policies of free trade, privatization, deregulation and the goods and services tax.

Mr. Speaker, I will stand for that amendment against the motion, and I will be happy to stand, at some time in the not too distant future, in support of a Speech from the Throne which will be led from a government, which will be read from that seat, Mr. Speaker, when there is a government in that side, a New Democrat government lead by the member from Riversdale. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased also to be entering into the throne speech debate. It's been quite some time since we've had the opportunity to exchange debate in the legislature, and I'd like to start off by congratulating a couple of our members who have been married since the last session: the member from Souris-Cannington and the Speaker. I'd like to congratulate them on that.

I'd like to congratulate the new appointments to the

cabinet and the mover and seconder of the throne speech — in fact congratulate all the cabinet, all cabinet and legislative secretaries, all 30 of them. And I'd also like to congratulate the appointment of our Clerk, which has happened since we last met. And I'd like to also welcome the pages to this Assembly. I hope that your experience here is a fine one and one that you remember for many years to come. Even though the debate in here sometimes has much to be desired and the decorum sometimes has much to be desired, it's an important part of the way our society works and our system works, and I hope you do have a very good time here.

I would like to mention briefly the content of the throne speech itself. Part of the problem was, Mr. Speaker, is that the throne speech started off on a false premise. It started out by saying that the rest of the world had declared economic war on Saskatchewan. And that's totally a false statement. So the the whole throne speech, I think, is suspect after starting out and making a comment that the rest of the world had declared economic war on Saskatchewan. That's totally wrong. The whole economic system throughout the world is struggling, and those countries where they're accusing . . . where this government accuses them of declaring economic war on us are struggling for their survival, struggling for their own very survival.

And at least they stand up for their people; they listen to what their people are saying to them. This government does nothing. This government sits back, sits on its hands and accuses people from outside of our own country for the economic problems and the ills and the woes in the province of Saskatchewan. It's hypocritical, Mr. Speaker, because there is no question that the blame lies solidly on the shoulders of the members opposite, the members of this Conservative government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — What's happened is that this government, Mr. Speaker, has lost all of its credibility. It has no credibility with people in the province of Saskatchewan. And why doesn't it have credibility? Because it's just not believable. It doesn't matter whether it's a cabinet minister that speaks or whether it's the Premier that speaks or whether it's a document that comes out in the form of a budget, what's true today may not be true tomorrow. If they want to change it in Decima through Nancy McLean and Allan Gregg, those pollsters from Toronto say it should be changed because the public reaction is bad — oops, they change it; whoops, oh boy, got to change that. Another change.

The deficit budgets, every budget that they've brought in has been a deficit budget. And they haven't met their projections. They can't even have credibility on the deficit. The deficit is always higher than what's been projected by this government. And I predict that the budget that comes down on Thursday night will be yet another deficit budget that our future generations are going to have to pay for because of the waste and mismanagement of this government, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — The broken promises, the deficit budgets, the scandals, and now corruption; this government cannot have credibility with the people in the province of Saskatchewan.

You look at the Supercart issue. They're in court now. I thought Supercart had long since passed; it happened early in the administration. But now Supercart is in court — one of the crown jewels of this government.

You look at GigaText. Well GigaText should have been in court. Guy Montpetit was in court, who was the principal of GigaText, in Montreal for defrauding someone out of \$39 million. And he defrauded, I maintain he defrauded the Saskatchewan government as well, in collaboration with members of the cabinet, but we can't get our money back. They won't tell us where the money's been spent.

Look at the dental therapists. The dental therapists ended up in court and beat the government in a court case. They got a settlement from the court.

The bribery, the bribery of officials within STC, the alleged bribery that's there going on in a Dallas court-house over the past couple of months. Kickbacks, under-the-table deals.

The government has no credibility with the Saskatchewan people. How can they establish credibility? They don't stand up to the federal government. Let's look at agriculture for a few moments, Mr. Speaker. I think everyone in Saskatchewan recognizes that agriculture is in crisis. And it's not because of economic war being declared on Saskatchewan, it's war declared by a Tory administration that is unsympathetic. They've declared war on the people in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now we remember a while ago there was a deficiency payment went out to the agricultural community, a billion dollars put out into the agricultural community. It helped saved the Tory government in the last election. There's no question about that.

But they're going to get all that money back. They're going to get every cent of that money back from the farmers. And I'll just review a list here of some federal cuts and new costs to farmers that are between the year 1989 and 1982. Freight rates, \$40 million; branch line rehabilitation, \$48 million; commodity-based loans, \$14.5 million; dairy export programs, \$7 million; livestock feed board, 1.7 million; crop insurance, 200 million; advance payments now that the interest is coming on to them, \$81 million; western grain stabilization levy increases, \$273 million; fuel tax rebates on the excise, \$250 million, and on the sales portion, \$174 million. That totals \$1.1 billion, Mr. Speaker. Does the figure ring a bell? Is that not the same amount that they got from the deficiency payment? The farmers, is that not the same amount they got? Now they're getting it all back.

In addition to that, Farm Credit Corporation has just increased their interest rates on their loans. The farm production loans were given out a while ago, \$25 an acre. The Tory administration said, we're going to help you, we're going to give you money. So they gave them

\$25 an acre; now they're foreclosing on their farms, Mr. Speaker. Six billion dollars worth of debt in Saskatchewan, \$6 billion worth of farm debt. Chartered banks hold about 1.6 billion, federal government holds about 1.5 billion, the provincial government holds about 1.5 billion, the credit union holds about a billion. And does this government do anything about the farm debt? No. Over 50 per cent of the farm debt in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, is held by public institutions, Farm Credit Corporation with the federal government, Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan with the provincial government.

And they're trying to blame it on someone else. It's always someone else's problem. It's never their problem. So how can they have credibility? They don't stand up for Saskatchewan people. If the federal government wants Meech Lake passed, they will pass it. If the federal government wants to take away from the farmers in Saskatchewan, that's okay, they accept it. If the government wants to put through the goods and services tax, that's okay, our government accepts it. They don't stand up for Saskatchewan people and they have no credibility with the Saskatchewan people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — The agricultural problem is a complex one, Mr. Speaker, and I think that most members of this Assembly would know that — a very complex problem. But there are solutions. And some of the solutions are: one, to restructure the debt, and this government would have influence over 50 per cent of that debt.

Secondly, farmers need some kind of an assured income. They can't have their yo-yo jerked every time this government wants to make political mileage. Farmers now have to take into consideration the political climate and the political mood of this government to do their budget projections on their farm. That's not good enough, Mr. Speaker. We need income stability for farmers in the province of Saskatchewan.

And thirdly, Mr. Speaker, we need intergenerational transfer of farm land. I've talked to far too many farmers who want to retire. They set up their children in farming. They were debt-free themselves, but because they put up their land as security for their children to farm, they lost their own farming operations as well. And that's not good enough, Mr. Speaker. We want intergenerational transfer of farm land in the province of Saskatchewan. We don't want the banks and the government foreclosing on people and destroying their hopes and dreams as this government has done.

(1615)

Mr. Speaker, the long-term solutions to agriculture are more complex than that, and we recognize that. But this government is brain-dead in terms of new ideas for agriculture. They talk about diversification, but what do they do about diversification of agriculture? They want to build a bigger and bigger agri-business. If it keeps going the way it's going we'll have a serf system, so the Cargills and the Continental Grains and the huge, huge food chain companies of the world can come in here and have

our Saskatchewan people work as serfs for them. And that's not good enough.

Diversification in agriculture has to be more than new ways to deal with wheat. We have to look at non-traditional things in agriculture. We have to look at combining grain farming and livestock with other things that'll make that farm operate. But does this government think of that? No, they don't.

They've lost their credibility with rural Saskatchewan. They've lost their credibility with urban Saskatchewan, and they will try and re-establish credibility by putting money into the hands of farmers before the next election, much needed money. But it won't work this time around. The Saskatchewan agricultural community was bought in 1986, and they will not be purchased again to go to the polls and vote for a Tory government that has decimated the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Consensus Saskatchewan is a joke. And already the member who spoke before me, the member from Moose Jaw North, pointed out the lack of understanding to put in something like Consensus Saskatchewan. ConSask is right. People believe that they've been conned in the province of Saskatchewan. People say what do the back-bench members of the Conservative Party do? Well I say first off, there aren't any back-bench members. They're almost all cabinet ministers or legislative secretaries.

And secondly, Mr. Speaker, when they do go out and try and listen, they don't like what they hear, because the question that's most often asked in the province of Saskatchewan today is, when is there going to be an election? And when you tell people that this government could go until October of 1991, it sends shudders down their spine. They turn pale and they think, oh my goodness, we thought it would be sooner than that because they're into the fourth year of their mandate.

The people in Saskatchewan want an election. Consensus Saskatchewan is not going to be telling this government what they want to hear. It's not going to be telling them what they should hear. It's a public relations exercise for a government that has really gone astray. Bankrupt of ideas, brain-dead, desperate to hold on to power, but without the ability to do it, because you've destroyed your credibility with Saskatchewan people.

There is not a one of you on a provincial scale that has credibility in the eyes of the public. Some individuals may have credibility with people they know in their own ridings, but as a government you have no credibility. You don't have credibility in the North. You don't have credibility in the business community. You don't have credibility in the farming community. You don't have credibility with seniors. You don't have credibility with youth. You don't have credibility with wage-earners. You only have credibility in your own minds, ladies and gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, there are some very important things that we have to deal with in Saskatchewan. One of them I've already mentioned is agriculture. Secondly is the environment.

The environment is a crucial question that must concern all of us, Mr. Speaker. It must not only concern people in this legislature but people throughout the province of Saskatchewan. Every individual must make a commitment to do what they can about the environment. The environment could well not sustain life on our good planet earth for many more generations to come, Mr. Speaker, because of the way that we have treated it as a society, as a consumer-oriented society.

We have to look at sustainable development. And this government that's so keen on building a pulp mill in Meadow Lake — I say, Mr. Speaker, don't bother building the pulp mill. Let's look at some kind of sustainable development to recycle paper.

Mr. Speaker, do you know that office quality paper, if you want to get recycled office quality paper, you have to purchase it from the United States of America. Paper that's collected in Canada for recycling, anywhere where they collect for recycling, they send it down to the United States of America, they recycle the paper, they send it back up here and we have to buy it.

Mr. Speaker, I say we have to look at sustainable development in terms of putting that mill in Meadow Lake as a recycled paper mill and not a pulp mill, Mr. Speaker, not a pulp mill that's going to have unproven technology. There is proven technology in recycled paper and we have to look at those types of things for our future, Mr. Speaker.

And I challenge this government to start using more recycled paper. Reams and reams of paper come out of government, Mr. Speaker. Reams and reams of paper are used every day by the Government of Saskatchewan. How many trees we have to chop down, the clear cutting of our forests that we have to completely wipe out to put that paper onto the desks of government. This government should be using recycled paper, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to close off by talking a bit about something that's very dear to me, and that's the sense of Saskatchewan community. I think if anything else this government has done that's an atrocity, it would have to be the sense of destroying the Saskatchewan community.

This government, more so than any time in the history of our province, has taken away the ability of people to control their own lives. The small-business people, the youth — anyone in Saskatchewan has less control of their own lives now than what they did when this government came into office in 1982.

Rural Saskatchewan is withering on the vine; urban Saskatchewan is experiencing severe socioeconomic problems. Crime rates are up; people live in poverty; people don't care about anyone but themselves because they're struggling for survival. The sense of Saskatchewan community is struggling for survival, Mr. Speaker. And I don't believe that we can stand by and allow this government to destroy the sense of Saskatchewan community.

It used to be that Saskatchewan people could stand up

and do things for themselves, but with this government you can't do anything for yourself any more. They talk about the East bloc countries and the death of communism. And I say congratulations, hurrah to the death of communism.

But I also say, Mr. Speaker, that greed and incompetence and raw capitalism will do the same thing in North America. And the people are saying in North America, set us free of this system as well. They don't want to be dominated by a government that rather than letting Saskatchewan people do things for themselves, they bring in Chuck Childers from Chicago; they bring in the Weyerhaeusers from Tacoma, Washington; they bring in the Cargills to dominate our agricultural sector.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan people want to do it for themselves. They can do it for themselves because they have the capability and they have the desire. But they can't do it right now because this government has taken away their means to do it for themselves.

Saskatchewan people can achieve anything they want, and Saskatchewan people can be anything they want to be, given the opportunity. But the opportunities are closing. Many opportunities have completely closed because of the policy of a government that doesn't have a plan for the future. They don't care about the future. They care about power and they care about today.

Well we care about today as well, Mr. Speaker, but we care about the future because we want Saskatchewan people to do it for themselves. We want Saskatchewan people's aspirations and desires to reach the highest pinnacle they can, not to be decimated and downtrodden by a government that is turning into as bad as any of the East bloc countries would turn into.

They even have their own way of presenting themselves. And do you know what the biggest joke in Saskatchewan is today, Mr. Speaker? It's when one of the members opposite comes to a person and says, I am from the government; I'm here to help you.

Mr. Speaker, if we don't find ways of putting back the sense of Saskatchewan community, we're doomed to failure of the people. They've destroyed trust in government. They have destroyed the perception of politicians in Saskatchewan because they want us all lumped together.

But there is a difference; there is a difference in terms of how Saskatchewan should be developed. The public in the province of Saskatchewan know what they want, Mr. Speaker. They know that they don't want a Tory government any longer.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — The days of the Saskatchewan community are rapidly passing us by. The time is here where you don't stop and pick people up on the road any more. If someone has a flat tire, people are scared to stop and help them change the tire on the road. People have to lock their doors in every place in Saskatchewan now. People don't join together in a sense of community, not

like they used to. They're fighting and struggling for survival.

It used to be when the barn burnt down everybody would get together and rebuild the barn. Now they sit around and wonder whether or not the government's going to come along and promise them a new barn.

Saskatchewan people feel like they're dangling on a chain. The wedge that's been driven into the Saskatchewan community by this government between the rural and the urban has been a vicious, shameful attack on Saskatchewan people. They've tried to divide people. They want to keep people ignorant, because an uneducated public or a deceived public can't make informed decisions. And we all have a role to play in ensuring that people have quality education and access to information.

The credibility of this government is gone economically, it's gone politically, and it's gone morally, Mr. Speaker. The sense of Saskatchewan community will be redeveloped, not by us as government, but by Saskatchewan people given that opportunity, Mr. Speaker.

And I want to close by saying that we have failed future generations if we do not get back on with the job of developing our sense of Saskatchewan community. We have failed people if we don't get back to that, Mr. Speaker. And I don't know how we can with this government in control of power, because that's all they appreciate is raw, crass, unblatant power — blatant power. What's leadership today is something else tomorrow.

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, not for Consensus Saskatchewan, the time has come for the people in the province of Saskatchewan to rise up and throw this party out of government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, I don't feel I want to take any more time here today, but I do look forward to the debates on the legislative agenda and the budget. We don't know what the legislative agenda is going to be yet, Mr. Speaker. We don't know what the budget's going to be. But I do look forward to that and I look forward to a more productive session of the legislature than we've experienced in the past.

When the government talks about more co-operation, about listening, I think it's a big sham, Mr. Speaker, but we want to give that an opportunity to work. And, Mr. Speaker, if it doesn't work, it'll just entrench more and more what the people in Saskatchewan think about this government.

If this government does not work in co-operation and consensus building in this legislature when we hand out an olive branch to them, it'll even further destroy their credibility. And I guess the court that'll take care of them will be the people's court in the province of Saskatchewan that will throw them out of office with a resounding defeat come next election time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1630)

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I welcome the opportunity to take part in the throne speech debate today, Mr. Speaker. It, needless to say, is often educational, it's informative, and considering the last two speakers, I would add the word, entertaining.

I have to say, particularly in listening to the member from Moose Jaw North, there were moments when I thought I was in something called the gong show, and I say that with a degree . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . In keeping with the good sense of humour that the member from Moose Jaw North is portraying, Mr. Speaker, I would say that I felt like I was in the audience and perhaps he was the participant. However, it was entertaining, to say the least.

One of the things that disturbs me, Mr. Speaker, in listening to the throne speech and the last gentleman's remarks has to do with what I call attitude, pure and simple. Doesn't matter what political stripe it is, it's called attitude.

And it has to do with what you believe people can do, and in fact what they should be doing in a democratic country like Canada, and like Saskatchewan; and how you perceive the strengths of the people, their role to government role; how you look at the democratic process itself, and what each one of us can contribute to it no matter what our political philosophies or our leanings.

And I would never go so far as to suggest that every member on the opposition benches should be sent packing out of this House or packing out of this province; or that each and every member over there is crass and has nothing but the meanest of intentions in dealing with policies for government. How on earth have we got to this stage in Saskatchewan in 1990 when we have a political party that believes that of other political parties?

There is one word for it, Mr. Speaker, and it's called intolerance. Intolerance of other people's ideas, intolerance of their political philosophies, intolerance and lack of acceptance that each one of us with different ideas and different political philosophies can come together and in fact agree upon a direction for Saskatchewan in the future. That attitude I think, Mr. Speaker, overall is foreign to the people, young and old, male and female, in Saskatchewan. I think it is very much a foreign attitude.

I go back to the days of my grandmother, the pioneers of this province, and they had tough, tough times. They were isolated. Oftentimes, no technology — such things as telephone; for sure no electricity, gas, rural gasification, those types of things. But they had a sense of community, and they did not have any degree of intolerance for the community that lived around them.

So I find it interesting in the year 1990 to sit in this great

institution and hear that kind of intolerance coming from some members, Mr. Speaker. I think it's a sad day, but I also think it says something about what we as Saskatchewan people have to do for the future, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address my remarks today to a topic that has been mentioned upon several times today, Consensus 100 in Saskatchewan. And I want you to know that I indeed support the framework that the throne speech lays out in creating a partnership, facilitating a partnership for people in this province, from the workers' side to the business side to the corporate side to housewives, to moms, to dads, old and young — a framework for a partnership for the future.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that in fact that partnership in the future is going to be indicative of the kinds of new opportunities that are going to present themselves to our residents within Saskatchewan and in fact determine whether they are ready to accept those opportunities or not.

Mr. Speaker, this partnership is also going to ensure that some very sound objectives are met through sound management of our province's financial resources. We've spent a fair amount of time, as have my hon. colleagues across the way, in talking about fiscal responsibility. We've also spent a lot of time in talking about the financial position that this province finds itself in, why it is there, what it's going to take in order for us to get out of this financial situation.

Mr. Speaker, there's been a lot of discussion over the past couple of days, or the past several days, on what Consensus Saskatchewan is all about. And, Mr. Speaker, if I had to put one word to Consensus Saskatchewan it would be this: change, pure and simple — change.

An Hon. Member: — It's a change all right. Short change.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well the member says short change. Consensus Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, is about change. Not change in one sector but change right across the province — change within people, change within our communities, our institutions, perhaps our laws, the way we do things. Changes outside of our boundaries that are taking place that affect our students, where they will be going in the future; our farmers, our business people, both men and women, and, Mr. Speaker, our politicians. Our politicians should never be excluded from this discussion of change in the world and change in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, Consensus Saskatchewan, it's about changing the way that governments do things. It's about changing government systems to make them more flexible with other changes that have been happening around them. It's about change and being responsive to rapidly changing times in which we live.

We've seen changes in the world. We only have to turn the TV on at night or pick up a newspaper or turn the radio on at least once a day, and you will hear about changes that are happening, and reforms — sometimes government reforms, but for certain, change. From Russia to Romania, South America, South Africa, Germany, both

East and West, and provincially in Canada from one province to another, you will see things being done that in fact indicate change is taking place in that province.

But the changes in the world, Mr. Speaker, I think it sends a message and it says that people all over the world are demanding a greater say in their government and their government systems, that they want to have a say in decisions that affect their lives, not only at home but in their work place, in their homes, their communities.

And along with that they're also demanding equality.

If there is one interesting thing to note when you look at the changes that are taking place in the world, Mr. Speaker, whether it's technology, transportation or something else, the one thing that has become clear is that the larger and the more set the institution, the more unlikely it is to accept change in an orderly fashion.

And I would say today that there are a lot of people in our province that would say one of the slowest factors of change are politicians and, in fact, government, partly to do with its size or perhaps some inflexibility that is built into the system, but nevertheless they do not change.

There are also experts and people around in looking at this factor that would say people are ahead of the politicians when it comes to knowing the changes that are going to be happening in their future and their acceptance of those changes now.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the Leader of the Opposition and his remarks in reply to the throne speech. I have to tell you I had some surprise with some of his remarks. He suggested that somehow consulting with the people of the province was not an appropriate function of a democratically elected government, and I invite his members to go back and read *Hansard*.

He also suggested that the only consultation necessary was in the 28 days of an election campaign. Now most of you people have been in an election campaign. I mean, you tell me about consultation on a 28 day campaign, one on one basis with each member in your constituency, and you would have to go a long way in exaggeration to have anybody believe that in fact that is the very best mechanism of doing it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that more than ever the people of Saskatchewan need an ongoing say in government processes. I also believe that their futures, Mr. Speaker, their futures will have a say on government, final decisions on government policy, government financing, and those things that affect them on a more regular basis. I think if the public are involved in those kinds of decisions, Mr. Speaker, that the decisions can only be stronger because of the broad consultation that will take place.

Consensus Saskatchewan and the idea of giving people more input into the decisions of government, Mr. Speaker, is consistent with a number of changes that have developed and are continuing to develop, not only in our province but in Canada also, and world-wide, Mr. Speaker.

For example, Mr. Speaker, we have the trend toward reforming government. We have the movement towards decentralization. Now that's a word that we often debate, toss around back and forth, opposition to the government side. I'm not sure that any of us have set aside the politics long enough to really sit down and discuss the benefits or, if you want, perhaps the down sides to decentralization. We never seem to get by the political philosophies in talking about what is best for Saskatchewan and the contributions that can come from the people out in the communities.

The movements that have been taking place, Mr. Speaker, have been transcending all national boundaries, all governments, political parties. In fact there are those who would suggest that the trends are marking the end of a time that has seen what can only be defined as very hard line political philosophy.

Over the past several years, Mr. Speaker, we in Saskatchewan have been in several consultative processes, and they have been an ongoing process. But I believe we are seeing the acceleration of consulting, the need for building consensus.

For example, Mr. Speaker, I go back to several years ago in education. There was the development of a core curriculum. It's one of the few programs in Saskatchewan, and in fact went through two stripes of government. The NDP — I think the member from Regina Centre will remember some of the discussions that were prior to our government coming in to do with directions and the review and the reform in education.

Well, Mr. Speaker, not much changed when the government changed, on that issue. We knew that it was needed. The people, the parents, students were saying that you needed to do a review within education.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that consultation process dated back in fact to 1981. A committee had been established, and in 1983 there was another committee put into place and in fact held approximately 40 consultation meetings throughout the province. And they collected briefs, they held public meetings.

A questionnaire was also distributed and I believe they had, out of the total that were sent to parents and teachers within the system, about 26,000, mostly parents, took the time to fill out those questionnaires on what they thought the education system should be for their child today and for children in the future.

(1645)

All of those consultations, Mr. Speaker, resulted in something called *Directions*, the final report, and that was released in February of 1984. The process, Mr. Speaker, was in fact one of coming to a consensus. Of course not everybody agreed on everything that people saw, but there in fact was a point where that consensus took place, and it was developed around the issue of the basics, as many people refer to, or core.

And while you and I may know the basics of reading,

writing and arithmetic, there were some elements that were added for the future, and one was of course computer literacy.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a consultation process in the health care sector. The government will soon be releasing the report of the health care commission, and that also conducted public meetings in order to find solutions to many very difficult questions that are facing our health care system for the future. I know from attending a couple of them that they were attended by members of the opposition, and I think that's good, Mr. Speaker. You had both the opposition and government members in meetings with the public, being conducted more or less by the public.

Many of our ministers, Mr. Speaker, have been holding public meetings, including the Associate Minister of Economic Diversification and Trade. Those have been going very well. People are interested. People want a voice. They want a say. They want to share their ideas of what is happening in their community and where they think it should be going.

We have had exactly the same process in agriculture, the environment. Member from Regina Rosedale is interested in the environment . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Rosemont, I'm sorry, you're right; I'm not sure where the other one is. The point is that, Mr. Speaker, the mechanism has been there and they have been targeted to various issues, but nothing as an umbrella over several issues, and the impact on government finances concerning them.

Mr. Speaker, Consensus Saskatchewan will hold open town hall meetings in communities all across the province in order to give the people of Saskatchewan a say in the decisions that will affect their lives. Those meetings are public, Mr. Speaker. We have given our commitment to the opposition that in fact they are public, and that will be upheld.

Mr. Speaker, there's some tough decisions to be made. The agriculture industry is at a crossroads. The world trend towards self-sufficiency and grain production has led to the loss of many of our very best customers. We find ourselves in the cross-fire of trade wars between Europe and the United States, and that has had the effect of lowering the value of our agriculture production to less than what it cost to in fact produce it. And those begged the question, Mr. Speaker, how do we support the need for diversification into food processing and other agriculture related industries, while at the same time maintaining the level of support to the farmers that they need?

The health care system. We've seen tremendous advancements in medicine to do with technology over the past few years, but we also know that that has come with escalating costs. How do we deal with those ever-increasing pressures that quality health care places on our financial resources? How do we deal with the ageing population, knowing full well that the future is going to see fewer workers supporting more people like you and I that will be retired?

The same financial pressures exist in our education system. As we move further into the information age, it is clear that quality education is an investment in the future. Education is costly. But, Mr. Speaker, if anyone has ever thought it is too costly, I would suggest that they perhaps consider the cost of ignorance. How do we ensure that our province's young people will continue to receive the sound educational footing that is going to create opportunities for them in the future?

Diversification of our economy; the creation of new opportunities for people; people creating new opportunities, particularly young people. And how do we do that in our rural communities?

Well, Mr. Speaker, those are only a few of the main questions to be asked. There are many, many more. And it is also only a few of the pressures that many of the public services are feeling.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe as government, when you step back and you look at the questions that are facing you, the needs of the public and what the public are saying, there is a choice to be made. Government could step back and they could make all the decisions, unilaterally, on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan, or we could simply let the people of Saskatchewan have a say in the decisions that directly affect their lives.

The other day, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition somehow suggested that listening to the people is an abdication of power, an abdication of power. He also said that is really not the role of a democratically elected government. Well, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House believe that that is in fact the opposite.

Consultation is indeed the role of a democratic government, and consultation for democratic governments in the future will even become more important than they are today. Mr. Speaker, it is a role which is complementary to the functions that MLAs and cabinet ministers already perform. And when I say MLAs, I include the opposition MLAs.

Mr. Speaker, in the years ahead governments will act not so much on behalf of the people as in conjunction with the people. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the 1990s will see a movement from representative democracy to something called participatory democracy.

Mr. Speaker, today we live in a representative democracy. Our people in our constituencies vote for us and they send us in here and we vote on issues in here representing our people. In other words, our people in our constituencies have elected someone to do the voting for us.

Mr. Speaker, we created a representative democracy about 200 years ago, and it was a practical way to organize democracy. Direct citizen participation was simply not feasible, and so we elected people to go off to the capitals in the world, to represent and to vote, and then they would come back and tell them what happened. The representative who did so was probably doing a good job and probably got re-elected. The one who did not was probably turned out.

For 200 years, Mr. Speaker, that system has worked well, and parts of it will continue to work well. Communications, travel and technology have changed; that it is going to reform our democratic system and move it, not only from representative democracy but one, in fact, that individuals will have an opportunity to participate at a much more direct level than what they do today.

Mr. Speaker, the world has changed, the world is changing, and that changing is coming at an accelerated pace. We as politicians must adapt to keep pace with the change. The people in fact are ahead of the politicians. And the member from Quill Lake, you know, sits back and laughs, and if there was ever one dinosaur in this Assembly it has to come from the likes of the member from Quill Lake.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Change at the best of times is difficult Mr. Speaker, but the people of Saskatchewan have constantly lived with change.

Mr. Speaker, reforming government is another change that society is going to go through. Mr. Speaker, we have been seeing the changes, the reforms taking place in other governments. Who are we to say that that will not take place in our own government system in the province of Saskatchewan when we see it happening around the world? It doesn't make sense. We stand back and in our arrogant manner that the NDP are suggesting we are isolated from the world around us when nothing is further from the truth. Nothing is further from the truth, Mr. Speaker.

We are part of the world, and the world is closer to us than it has ever been before in its entire history of civilization. Politicians today have to face that reality and have to put in the mechanisms that they are going to be able to deal with those changes, and that, in part, includes democratic changes to the government system, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, these reforms, these reforms, not only do they give people a say in the system, not only is it a sharing of ideas the government can pick up from the people, but it can bring more public accountability and accessibility to government. And, Mr. Speaker, that is needed.

Mr. Speaker, we are seeing more public hearings and inquiries. You know, the other day the Prime Minister, for example, he just announced that there will be . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Fortunately, two members who have already spoken in this debate still had more to say. Unfortunately they'll have to wait for the next time around. At this point the Deputy Premier is speaking.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we noted the other day the announcement of the Prime Minister — there was going to be a public hearing. It has to do with the discussion going on in Canada right now on Meech Lake. The New Brunswick proposal on Meech Lake was one in fact of calling for public hearings,

and the Prime Minister has agreed to do that.

I think what that says, Mr. Speaker, to all of Canada, that public participation in decisions to be made by governments at all levels in fact is what the public are demanding, and that in fact is what governments are going to have to move towards, because after all, governments are a creation of those people if people vote for them, put them there, and they expect the best of their assistance.

And when they think that it's time for these systems to change, in part, the public will dictate that, and that's what the public have been doing for a couple of years, Mr. Speaker. They are demanding a greater say of what happens in their government, how their government works, and the systems to be put into place.

Mr. Speaker, there are those across the way who say that, you know, the MLAs in here, or the government, is elected to make these decisions. On one hand that is true. On the other hand, being a democratic society, Mr. Speaker, we pay heed to the opinions of the people that in fact elected us. I see in no manner whatsoever that this is an abdication of responsibilities. The responsibilities are drawn clear. And in fact, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to my hon. colleagues, the opposition across the way, that leadership, as defined in 1930 or 1940, is going to have a much different definition in the 1990s. And what you are going to be seeing is leadership that knows how to listen, when to listen, and when to follow, and to be able to facilitate as to what they will be saying, Mr. Speaker. That will be the 1990s.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that greater participation by those involved in government is the way of the future in all types of organizations. I believe that it is happening around the world, it is happening in other governments . . .

The Speaker: — It being 5 o'clock the House stands recessed until 7 p.m.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.