

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Hagel:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to this House, to you and through you to all members of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, seven people who are seated in your gallery. These are people, Mr. Speaker, who take a great deal of interest in the goings on of this Assembly, and they have in common, Mr. Speaker, that they have all been successful candidates who have come from exciting nomination campaigns and will be representing the New Democratic Party in their constituencies in the next election.

Mr. Speaker, I won't conclude my remarks by asking all members of the Assembly to wish them every success in the next political campaign, but I will conclude by asking all members to welcome them to this House today.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce them and have them stand as I introduce them, and to introduce them in the order in which they were nominated as New Democrat candidates.

First of all, Dale Flavel who will be contesting the constituency of Last Mountain-Touchwood. Glen McPherson who will be the New Democrat candidate in Shaunavon. Armand Roy who will be the candidate for the New Democrats in Kinistino. The Rosthern candidate, Mr. Speaker, will be Kim Dmytryshyn. Grant Whitmore, the candidate for Biggar for the New Democratic Party. Ron Bishoff, the New Democratic candidate in Thunder Creek. And Mary McGuire who will be the New Democratic candidate in Moosomin.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask all members of this Assembly to show them an enthusiastic welcome to this building here today.

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

**Mr. Prebble:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to all members of this Assembly, two visitors from my constituency who are in your gallery, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to introduce Mrs. Eileen Stone and Annemarie Buchmann-Gerber, who are both visiting from the constituency of Saskatoon University and the new constituency of Saskatoon Greystone, Mr. Speaker. And I would like to ask all members in this Assembly to join with me in welcoming them to this legislature.

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

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to draw the attention of the members of the House to a guest who is visiting with us today, a gentleman who's been leading the battle against the goods and services tax in Ottawa, the Member of Parliament for Yorkton Melville,

Lorne Nystrom.

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

**Hon. Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too would like join with the opposition in welcoming the guests that we have in your gallery, Mr. Speaker.

I make a habit of trying to introduce to the Legislative Assembly all guests that come from my constituency. And I would certainly like to welcome Kim Dmytryshyn here as well, and I hope you have an interesting proceedings today. I know that you've got a perfect view of the proceedings from up there, Kim, and I assure you that I will work very hard to make sure that you have that view for many, many years to come.

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

**Mr. Hopfner:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask through you and to ask all members of this Assembly to welcome Mr. Jim Hampson from my constituency. It's 300 miles and we don't get many people visiting from the riding here in Regina. And I'd just would like to indicate also, Mr. Speaker, to you that Mr. Jim Hampson holds the vice-presidency for our region on the Progressive Conservative provincial executive, as well as my vice-president for the constituency. I ask all members to welcome Jim Hampson.

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

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Seeing that almost everyone in the Speaker's gallery has been introduced, I'd like to introduce someone from my constituency, Gary Scott from Aylesbury. He's been in talking over problems pertaining to many people in the constituency of Arm River. Gary Scott is not like other people in the gallery — he's not a candidate — but I will say he's definitely a Progressive Conservative. I ask all people to welcome Gary Scott.

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Work Proceeding at Rafferty Project

**Mr. Lyons:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the minister responsible to the Souris Basin Development Authority. Mr. Minister, I have here an editorial from the March 20, 1990 edition of *The Minot Daily News* which discusses a talk given to the Minot Kiwanis Club by our buddy here in the legislature, Mr. George Hill, head of the Souris Basin Development Authority. Mr. Minister, that editorial states he, Mr. Hill, also disclosed that even though work on Rafferty has stopped, Saskatchewan can go ahead with river channelization, building of causeways, mitigation, and other necessary steps.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, do you agree that despite your agreement with the federal government, work can go ahead on digging river channels, bulldozing trees, building golf courses, building causeways? Would you

not consider that work to be contrary to the letter and the spirit of the federal-provincial agreement on Rafferty-Alameda?

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

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, the specifics of what work was able to continue on the Rafferty project was clearly spelled out in the agreement and announced at that time, clearly spelled out, and it was determined by the engineering panel and that was determined. That is the only work that's going on, that which was determined at the time of the agreement

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

**Mr. Lyons:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the same minister. Mr. Minister, I've read that agreement. You made an agreement with the federal government to halt work on the Rafferty-Alameda project while the review was going on. In return your government receives \$1 million a month from the federal treasury. At the time the agreement was signed, you said that only work on the dam necessary to ensure public safety would be continued. Building golf courses, digging river channels, building causeways in the Souris River basin does not seem to fall under that definition, Mr. Minister.

My question is this: would you agree, Mr. Minister, that if you undertake such work as you are now doing, that you are receiving money from the federal treasury under false pretences?

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

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, we are receiving no money from the federal government under false pretences. Any work that is being done and that will go on prior to the completion of the review, which is now under way, will be work which has been agreed to in the agreement that was referred to by member and by myself and in the agreement which was allowed by the engineering firm that the federal government agreed would be the body . not the engineering firm, I'm sorry, the engineering panel which the federal government and our government agreed would be the panel which would determine which work should carry on.

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

**Mr. Lyons:** — Mr. Speaker, if I may, another new question to the same minister. Mr. Minister, given the statement that you've just made to the House, I wonder, sir, if you would mind tabling before the legislature, in the spirit of non-partisanship, in the spirit of co-operation, any correspondence that you have had with Mr. Lucien Bouchard, federal Minister of the Environment, the independent environmental review panel which is outraged at the work which is presently going on, or that engineering panel to which you just referred.

Mr. Minister, I'm afraid I cannot accept your word on this. Would you please table any correspondence or documents which supports the position you now take.

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

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, the member stands in his place and says that the review panel which is now under way is outraged at work that is now going on. I'm not aware that that's the case. I don't believe that it is the case.

Mr. Speaker, as I have stated before, at the time that the negotiations were complete with the federal government for the licence to remain intact but for construction to stop on the Rafferty project, we announced that that construction would stop and that anything that was carried on for the purposes of the stabilization of the structure, the integrity of the structure as it had been completed to that point, all of that work would carry on. Any work would carry on that would . we determine that.

That work is going on, that work will continue to go on, and the engineering panel will have the authority to determine which work will go and which work will not.

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

**Mr. Lyons:** — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Supplementary question to the same minister. Mr. Minister, you've stated before the House that that was the agreement with the federal government. That's not the understanding of anybody here in Saskatchewan or across Canada as to the nature of that agreement.

Do you have a secret accord with the federal government which outlines the continuing of work to go on, and if so, will you table it? And, Mr. Minister, will you table all correspondence between Mr. Bouchard, between the independent review table, and between the engineering firm that supports your contention that that work is legal and is not contrary to the . . . you taking \$1 million a month from the federal treasury on this question, sir. Will you table those documents?

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

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, the member, as he has done on several occasions in the past, will characterize any discussion or any negotiation that goes on between two governments as some kind of clandestine, secret operation.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to you and I'll say to the House and the public of Saskatchewan, I have been absolutely forthright from the beginning of those discussions with the Hon. Mr. Bouchard, as it related to the Rafferty-Alameda project, as it related to the judgement that was brought down by Mr. Justice Muldoon, as it relates to all of that process. We've been very forthright about it.

We've concluded those negotiations. We announced to the public of Saskatchewan, including that member, that we have an agreement for a million dollars a month during the period of delay, up to a maximum of 10 months. That's clear and that's open. And the amount of work, as I've stated in other answers today and have stated on other occasions, the work that will carry on will be that work which is determined by the engineering

panel which is necessary to carry on, and that's by agreement between the two parties. There's no secret accord and there is nothing to table because of it.

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

### Privatization of SGI

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Economic Diversification and Trade, that minister responsible for privatization. Mr. Minister, I see here by the *Star-Phoenix* that the province is still considering SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) share sale — big headlines in the *Star-Phoenix*. I want to quote from that news story, Mr. Minister, and it says:

The province hasn't abandoned the idea of selling shares in the general insurance side of the Saskatchewan General Insurance, says the minister responsible for SGI Grant Schmidt.

Mr. Minister, can you tell the Assembly today why your government continues to push its right-wing ideological push for privatization when everyone in the province, or at least the vast majority, are opposed to this idea that is leading us to rack and ruin and has led to the outflow of 65,000 people in the last four or five years?

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

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the opposition has asked that question because I have been waiting for the opportunity to explain to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the people of Saskatchewan and hopefully to the opposition. I know I will have to repeat this several times for the opposition to understand this, but this is not a question of ideology, Mr. Speaker. This is a question of good business and diversification of Saskatchewan.

We have a successful general insurance company in this province that is operating contrary to all business practices. It is only allowed to do business with 4 per cent of the Canadian market, our population. It cannot take a larger share of the Saskatchewan market because we can't afford to take a bigger risk. One big storm would wipe out all of the company if it hit one location like that storm that hit Edmonton. So the business practices would tell you that this kind of a corporation should be able to do business across Canada.

I believe it would be good business practice to expand this company so that other Canadians can also do business with this company. And if we expanded it, it would immediately create new jobs here in Regina, and jobs is what we need in this province. So I hope the opposition understands that this is an important business concept and has nothing to do with ideology.

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the minister. I want to ask the minister, in light of his last answer, and I want to quote from what you said in Saskatoon. And I quote:

He (referring to you the minister) plans no legislative bill to sell shares in the general insurance operation but is working on another way to do it. His plan is still "fuzzy" but he expects to have more to say on the topic in another month or two.

Mr. Minister, are you confirming today to the Assembly and the people of this province that you do intend to privatize SGI? Is that what you're telling us here today?

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

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Mr. Speaker, let me make this perfectly clear, perfectly, absolutely clear — that it is the intention of this government to have SGI for ever for ever. It is also a business consideration that we expand SGI so that we can create new jobs and bring other Canadians' money into this province. That is the clear intention. We are exploring those possibilities. We are looking at every angle, and we are looking at the possibility of doing this without the opposition obstructing progress in this province.

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to that minister. I want to tell you, the reason the people of the province are suspicious when you get in your place and promise to keep anything for ever is that the Premier promised that with the gas tax at the time of the last election, and we know where that's at.

I want to say to and I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, and quote to you that in your comments of that interview, you said, I don't like to use the words "privatize." You said, and I quote, you don't like to use the word "privatize." Well, Mr. Minister, I want to ask you: don't you realize that selling off the assets of the province to your friends is privatization by any other word? Isn't that what you're doing when you sell off SGI to your friends?

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

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Mr. Speaker, the proper terminology probably would be "people-ize" this company. We will people-ize this company. If this company belongs to the people, we were prepared to give them a certificate of title. And I have thousands of friends in this province; the government has hundreds of thousands of friends in this province. All of the people in this province should have an opportunity to have a certificate of title to their very own company.

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

### Lay-off Notices to Stand-by Fire Crews

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources. Mr. Minister, for the past two years there have been 16 individuals from the Buffalo Narrows region, namely Michel village, St. George's Hill, and Dillon, who have worked on a stand-by crew to battle forest fires, on a system where eight work for two weeks and the other eight work for the next two weeks.

Earlier this week, Mr. Minister, three weeks before they were to be called back to go to work, they were told that their jobs were abolished. Would the minister explain this decision to the House?

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

**Hon. Mr. Kopelchuk:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't think anyone more than I is concerned when people lose their jobs. And when the hon. member from Athabasca mentioned it in his throne speech, I was immediately concerned and went to my department to get an answer to this question. The truth of the matter is that this program that we had on an experimental basis for the past two years is being changed. We're going with a new and improved program, and we are going through the formalities of informing these people that the program has come to an end. A new, improved program is going to be put into place, and we will give the people who worked on the previous program, because of their experience with the past program, very reasonable consideration to be part of this new program.

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

**Mr. Thompson:** — New question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, you know full well that when you give them their lay-off notices, they were not informed that there was any new program. The jobs were abolished and that was the end of the issue. My new question to you, Mr. Minister, is: the Buffalo Narrows area is not the only region which had such stand-by crews. Can you tell this House how many people and how many other crews also lost their jobs and where those crews were located?

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

**Hon. Mr. Kopelchuk:** — Mr. Speaker, I believe, and I could be corrected on this, but I believe there's a total of about 32 people who were involved in this program in the Dillon, Turnor Lake, and Patuanak areas. They are all . let's put them all in the same category, Mr. Speaker, and I would just bring to the attention of the hon. member once again, that when this program was put in place two years ago, it was under the understanding that the program was on an experimental basis.

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

**Mr. Thompson:** — New question, Mr. Speaker. Most certainly the individuals that were working on those crews were never told that it was experimental, and it came as quite a shock when three weeks before they were supposed to go to work that your department informed them that they had lost their jobs.

Mr. Minister, unemployment in northern Saskatchewan is currently running as high as 70 and 80, and some places 90 per cent, in some communities, and there are few jobs at this time. Now you have decided to narrow that field even more. Can you tell the House why, at a time when you should be doing more to create employment in the North, you are instead cutting it back? And, Mr. Minister, will you reverse that decision? I'm asking you today to reverse that decision and cancel those lay-off notices and

hire those individuals back.

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

**Hon. Mr. Kopelchuk:** — I would once again, Mr. Speaker, draw to the attention of the hon. member that this is a formality; that this program has come to an end; a new program has come into place at this time.

Of course, who can tell what our fire-fighting situation will be like this year. Conditions are not good. It would appear that we will certainly need all the manpower that is available. And I will once again assure you that these people will get all the consideration in the world to be part of this new program.

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

**Mr. Thompson:** — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I ask you the straight question, Mr. Minister: will you write to those individuals that were on those crews and reverse your decision and guarantee them that their jobs will be there three weeks down the road? Yes or no?

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

**Hon. Mr. Kopelchuk:** — Mr. Speaker, I repeat for one more time that I will assure the member that these people, because of their experience on the previous program, will be given every consideration under the new program.

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

#### **Bureaucratic Undermining of Farm Security Programs**

**Mr. Upshall:** — Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture I will direct my question to the Associate Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, on January 22, 1990 edition of the *Davidson Leader*, the member from Arm River was quoted as saying he brought to your attention the fact that certain bureaucrats are undermining Saskatchewan farmers. He states:

I get very angry when I hear reports that bureaucrats are not doing their jobs, and instead are sabotaging the farm protection methods.

Mr. Minister, my question to you is: could you tell us what farm protection measures are being sabotaged by your bureaucrats, and exactly how is this being done?

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

**Hon. Mr. Hardy:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to first of all start out by saying that the system out there, the system that serves the farm communities, whether it's the rural service centres, the lands branch, the Department of Agriculture, those are very professional people who have been there for many years, who have served this province well.

And I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that those systems are undermining the farmers. What I believe, Mr. Speaker, is that we have drought out there. We had drought over two-thirds of the province last year, one-third in severe drought. We've had drought in two consecutive years.

We've had drought in three out of the last five years.

We've had low farm prices. The farmers need help. They need help. They don't need help from being criticized by the opposition. They need help from this government, they need help from the federal government, and they need some good rains and moisture and good farm prices.

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

**Mr. Upshall:** — Mr. Minister, new question. There was just one item you missed, Mr. Minister, and that's a Tory government that's not standing up for farmers. And that's the main problem in rural Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Upshall:** — Mr. Minister, in an advertisement in the same newspaper the member takes exception with a statement made by your deputy minister, Mr. Jack Drew, to the effect that the farm picture is looking better and that there can be optimism because now things are turning around.

Just to give us a little better understanding of just what's going on in that department — and I'm not sure who's going to answer this one — but can you tell us, Mr. Minister, do you agree with your colleague or do you agree with the deputy minister?

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

**Hon. Mr. Hardy:** — Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to make it understood that this government has helped the farmer in financial assistance since 1985 to 1989. I went through here in my speech the other night, Mr. Speaker, and listed them all out and I won't go through it again. But I believe it was around \$825 million that has been put directly into agriculture by this government, into subsidies and interest rates, write-downs, and crop . and not crop insurance — without crop insurance. Crop insurance has put \$1.2 billion into this province in the last four years, Mr. Speaker — \$1.2 billion.

And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the main subject that should be talked about here today is not whether one of the deputy minister believes, as I do, that we have a good opportunity to turn the province around. I believe if we have some rain, that the price goes up reasonably well, that we can well have a turnaround in this agriculture in this province because the farmers out there are capable of doing it. All we need is the opportunity to meet those needs.

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

**Mr. Upshall:** — A new question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, you've had eight years of opportunity and things are continuing to get worse because of your failure to implement a long-term program. And the point to be made here is that no wonder things aren't going anywhere with support for farmers from your side, because you can't get along. And I guess maybe the hundred people you're going to call in to give you some advice may be able to straighten the mess out.

Mr. Minister, the same ad, the member states that of the cases reviewed . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I'm having some difficulty hearing the hon. member from Humboldt and ask members to give him that opportunity to speak.

**Mr. Upshall:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I understand why the members opposite get a little edgy when it hits so close to home about their lack of being able to control the farm situation. Mr. Minister, the member states:

Of the cases reviewed by the Farm Land Security Board, those who end up with a case prepared for the courts are getting better settlements than those resolved through mediation.

Mr. Minister, do you agree with this assessment, and if so, have you made any changes to the boards to correct it?

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

**Hon. Mr. Hardy:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what changes have been made to the mediation board, if any. I believe that we have been able to work with the financial institutions to some degree to get some write-downs to help some young farmers stay on the land. I believe they've been working particularly with the credit unions to get particularly the farm operating loans available to farmers. And I believe they've been able to work with governments and such things as the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and other organizations to look at how we can serve to get the operating money needed for the farmers.

And in regards to the farm debt review, there's been ongoing . and I have to take notice if you needed the names or change of the mediation board.

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

#### Meeting of Finance Ministers in Ottawa

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Finance. Mr. Minister, I have here a newspaper article which reports on a meeting of Finance ministers with Michael Wilson, the federal minister, in Ottawa last Tuesday. My question to you, Mr. Minister, is: is it correct that you were not one of the ministers in attendance?

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

**An Hon. Member:** — Yesterday you criticized the Minister of Finance for travelling.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. It is not the Minister of Justice but the Minister of Finance who's answering the question.

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is correct. I was not in attendance at that meeting.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — New question, Mr. Speaker, to the same minister. Mr. Minister, you pretend, and your government pretends, that you're fighting the goods and services tax, which this meeting was all about, but yet you

can't even find time in your schedule to meet with the federal minister to protest this tax, while you can find time, you and your colleagues, to travel the world on junkets throughout the whole year of 12 months of the year.

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

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Minister, this lack of political involvement on your part and your government's part is playing into the hands of the federal Minister of Finance who is taking this one clear message from your lack of action in this issue, and that is that when push comes to shove, your government is going to roll over and play dead and agree with that GST (goods and services tax), as you did earlier.

Mr. Minister, I ask you: how are the people of Saskatchewan to believe that you're really in opposition to this tax when you are not prepared to go to such an important meeting and make that position clear to the federal Minister of Finance?

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

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I said the hon. member was right when he said, when he asked, was I at the meeting in Ottawa, and I said no. But what he didn't ask me is, did I meet with Mike Wilson this past Saturday at 7 o'clock in the morning to discuss the very same issues that were going to be raised in Ottawa. I met with him at 7 in the morning, covered the issues, didn't fly to Ottawa, and saved the taxpayers some money and made our points, Mr. Speaker.

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

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Member from Meadow Lake, would the member from Meadow Lake come to order, and the member from Regina Elphinstone. Order, order.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

### Clean Air Policy

**Hon. Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in this Assembly this afternoon and inform the House that together with my colleague, the hon. Minister of the Environment and Public Safety, we're announcing a public consultative process to develop a clean air policy for Saskatchewan. The process will consider such environmental issues as acid rain, ozone depletion and global warming. Specifically, it will focus on how to reduce emission levels of sulphur dioxide, carbon dioxide, nitrogen oxides, and volatile organic compounds, while sustaining economic growth. Our energy resource base has been an important factor in the economic development of Saskatchewan. We recognize, however, that the development of our energy resources must be done in an environmentally responsible manner. I am very pleased with the historic environmental record of energy producing companies in Saskatchewan.

However, emerging environmental concerns such as global warming are creating new challenges for both our

energy producers and consumers. Since all sectors of society are impacted by and contribute to the emission of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases, it is important that these groups have the opportunity to participate in choosing our province's responses to global warming.

To that end, the Environment minister and I have announced a consultative process to develop a clean air policy for Saskatchewan. The provincial round table on environment and economy will play a leading role. The round table will review air quality standards in the province, will review the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders in maintaining our air quality, and will develop recommendations for action to reduce atmospheric emissions.

Coincident with the work of the round table, the provincial Departments of Energy and Mines and Environment and Public Safety will hold public consultations beginning with the release of discussion papers this summer and followed by public workshops in the fall. This public consultation process will examine the broad range of policy responses available to Saskatchewan and recommend specific actions.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Speaker, there are times when one can stand up and welcome an announcement by a government in a ministerial statement. And although the sounding of the words sounds positive and impressive, I think there is no reason for the public of Saskatchewan to feel any confidence that this government is on top of the environmental issues and is prepared to do anything about them.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, what this announcement is all about. It is the same announcement which this government made in the throne speech of 1989 and did absolutely nothing about it, and there is no reason to believe that they will do any more after this announcement one year later.

Mr. Speaker, it is this government that cut back the monitoring of emissions into the air in Saskatchewan in a very dramatic way about two or three years ago. Now they're going to study the impact of the damage that may have been done because of that cut-back that the government made. This is the same government that passed in 1987 a new Clear Air Act and failed to proclaim it until two years later in 1989 because it couldn't get its act together to act.

This announcement, Mr. Speaker, I regret to say, because the issue is so important, is nothing more than an excuse by this government to do nothing and to stall and to delay, just as its Consensus Saskatchewan proposal, in the hope that somehow it will get it by an election while the government sits on its hands and does nothing, while our environment is being destroyed all around us, creating a threat not only to vegetation and the ecology, but creating a threat around the world to human existence itself, Mr. Speaker.

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

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### SECOND READINGS

#### Bill No. 2 — An Act respecting Family and Community Services

**Hon. Mr. Martin:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This government is taking a new and innovative step today within the second reading of The Family and Community Services Act.

As Minister of the Family, it'll be my privilege to begin the work anticipated by this new Act. Mr. Speaker, The Family and Community Service Act establishes a clear new legislative base with which to strengthen and assist families in our province. It provides vision and direction for our families and for the Family Foundation created last fall to support families in Saskatchewan.

The purpose of the Act is contained within one clause mandating its general powers, Mr. Speaker. That mandate is to develop services that will strengthen families, to foster the healthy development of children, and to provide local services and support for families. Mr. Speaker, these important phrases succinctly state three general ideals of the Act and the Family Foundation.

First, we will work to strengthen families, all forms of families. Our society is one in which many cultures co-exist, each with its own heritage and in many cases with its own view of what a family is. It is also a society in which differing values and behaviours are tolerated and accepted, Mr. Speaker. Recognizing the diversity of families is a fundamental element of this Act.

Secondly, the healthy development of children is a central purpose of the Act and of the foundation. Our children are our greatest resource. They will build our future. They deserve our utmost care and our utmost protection. Creating an environment in which children can learn and mature and in which they can be safe and protected is one of our highest objectives. Governments and societies have an obligation to prepare our children for an economic role in life. Children are educated and trained to learn skills that they will use in the market-place, and that's important.

However, Mr. Speaker, we believe that governments and societies should also be concerned with preparing our children as family members and care givers. The Family Foundation will promote that ideal.

Third, the foundation is concerned with our communities. Strong caring communities are vital to strong families. Our best solutions to family problems will be found in our communities by the people who experience them day to day. If we are to strengthen our families, it will be in partnership with the communities. Subsequent sections of The Family and Community Services Act describe how we will serve Saskatchewan families and Saskatchewan communities.

First of all, we will listen to them as we have been doing for the past few months. Mr. Speaker, the Act emphasizes

listening to rural and urban families, to schools, churches and religious organizations, service agencies, and other organizations that have an impact on families. We will research ideas and trends in Saskatchewan communities and society to understand how families are changing, and we will help communities develop services that support family life.

Mr. Speaker, by listening and working together in partnership with community groups, agencies, and individuals, we will find the local solutions that work for families.

In addition to describing the foundation's work with communities, The Family and Community Services Act elaborates its vital policy leadership role. Within government, the foundation will speak for family concern, acting as a bridge between local problems and government programs. Issues and priorities identified by Saskatchewan families and organizations will be translated into policy and into programs.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the message and the idea will be coming from below, not from government, not from bureaucracy, but from the people. Because, Mr. Speaker, the best solutions to family problems will be found in our communities by the people who experience them day to day.

The Act provides for the monitoring of all government programs, services, and initiatives affecting families. It asks that recommendations be made to improve them. It asks that economic and social policy be carefully evaluated. It asks that the means of developing family living skills through government programs be recommended.

Mr. Speaker, the Act makes it clear that the Family Foundation's policy leadership role is to stem from its connection with families and communities. Government policy is to be guided by the input and priorities of the public. Discussion and listening are to be the starting points of policy change.

(1445)

Under its previous legislative base, The Family Services Act, the Family Foundation is working with communities and government. This work has been fully consistent with the mandate and principles proposed in The Family and Community Services Act.

I will make brief reference to three current initiatives. Extensive consultation and dialogue has been undertaken on family issues. Mr. Speaker, since assuming my cabinet portfolio last October, I have met with leaders in about 20 communities across Saskatchewan and dozens of community and provincial organizations. I have also had a number of opportunities to listen to the views of Saskatchewan youth on families. I have found there is much to be learned from such dialogue with our young people.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that my wife and I have four daughters has been a good learning experience for me to learn from you. They do have much to say. This dialogue

is continuing to work — the work that was begun last year.

In conjunction, Mr. Speaker, with the symposium about families, the highly successful interprovincial conference held here in July of 1989, discussions were held with over 100 community leaders, more than 200 non-government agencies with municipal, business, professional, religious, educational, cultural, recreational leaders, and with dozens of Saskatchewan families.

A second important initiative has been the forums about families program. These are community designed and delivered workshops and seminars. They are oriented towards family living skills and personal development of family members. Participants explore such subjects as: parenting skills, marriage preparation, understanding child behaviour, family budgeting, drug awareness, caring for ageing parents, communication within the family.

Mr. Speaker, our young people tell me that parents don't listen. Our young people have a great deal to say, and they want to express their thoughts and they want to express their feelings to their parents. They only want their parents to listen.

Mr. Speaker, 23 forums about families have been completed to date across the province with 2,600 participants. A hundred and fifty forums are planned for this year; about 84 are already scheduled. I attended one, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, this morning at LeBoldus High School here in Regina.

A third initiative concerns hunger. This problem has rightly gained much attention in Saskatchewan. In looking for solutions, we began by discussing the problem with our communities. In November I wrote to every school board in the province asking for input. I have met with individuals across the province who are running volunteer feeding programs for children. I have discussed the issue with school boards and principals, with nutritionists and school teachers, public health professionals, civic officials and many others, including, as I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, the volunteers who are delivering this program and who should be commended for their unselfish attitude towards these young people who need the food.

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

**Hon. Mr. Martin:** — These people have told me several things, Mr. Speaker. They've told me that education and support to families will help alleviate the deeply-rooted causes of hunger; that communities should be active participants in designing solutions, and, Mr. Speaker, they will be; that we should be wary of government starting new feeding programs for children. With their input, I have made recommendations to cabinet on hunger initiatives which I expect to be announced, Mr. Speaker, in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to discussing . The discussion of this Bill is an opportunity to tell the members of the legislature and the public of our vision for Saskatchewan families and Saskatchewan communities.

The Family and Community Services Act represents a commitment to working in partnership with families and with communities. It describes our mission of building bridges between families and family members, and between communities and government.

It is a commitment to the men, women, and children of Saskatchewan to value and prepare them for their contribution to our society as family members and as care givers. It is a commitment to the families of Saskatchewan that all government agencies will consider the impact their decisions have on families. It is a commitment to the public that our concerns about families will be translated into government and community action.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to move second reading of The Family and Community Services Act. Thank you.

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

**Mr. Pringle:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks if I could on this Bill, and I intend to move to adjourn the debate after my remarks, in that I would like to study the minister's comments and see what, if anything, is in the budget tonight in terms of real support to families, Mr. Speaker.

I was struck by the minister's comment, and I agreed with him about the need for a partnership between communities, between communities and government. And I agree with that; we agree with him on this side of the House.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the need for partnership exists not just in the last few months, as he talked about; the need for partnership should have occurred over the last eight years. And so, Mr. Speaker, I can only say to the minister that we support the need for partnership, but not just at election times.

Mr. Speaker, let me make very clear at the outset of my remarks, I want to make this very, very clear that we on this side of the House, we strongly endorse supporting Saskatchewan families. We strongly endorse supporting Saskatchewan communities. And I want to make that very clear. Our governments generally over the years in Saskatchewan, our citizens in this great province, have a proven record of doing just that — of taking care of families, of building communities.

They've got a proven record of doing that by providing meaningful jobs throughout the province; by utilizing an effective mixed economy in doing that; by providing a good educational system over the years, a good health care system, often the envy of all the world; by having a positive and a constructive social safety net.

Again, in many years, the envy of other provinces across Canada. And, Mr. Speaker, a history of being open and honest over the years with the families and the communities of Saskatchewan. That's a general proud record of governments, typically provincially, Mr. Speaker, and, Mr. Speaker, by supporting the agricultural farms and families and the small-business people in small towns and in the cities, and so on.



So our province over the years, Mr. Speaker, has done well. It is unique. Our province is very special and it's a proud place to live, Mr. Speaker, and we in this province have pioneered in many, many areas, very progressive legislation in the support of families and in the support of communities.

Mr. Speaker, for most of the last 50 years it has been our party that has been in government and been part of and partnership to a lot of the things that I've just talked about. We've been working with Saskatchewan families, we've been working with Saskatchewan communities, and we have been part of the building that the minister talks about, part of that caring and part of that compassionate and supportive environment that we take pride in in the history of Saskatchewan.

My focus today is in supporting families and supporting communities and the need in reinforcing the need to support families and support Saskatchewan communities in these very difficult times, Mr. Speaker. However, Mr. Speaker, I might say that the record of this government over the last eight years has just been the opposite to the kind of society that the minister just said that we want to build in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, it has been a record of tearing down supports to families. It has been a record of leaving communities exposed to the pressures of the world market-place.

Mr. Speaker, they have not been protecting communities. They've been putting communities in a situation where young people have had to flee from the communities and flee from the province. And, Mr. Speaker, this is almost a unanimous view of the people in Saskatchewan. This is a Saskatchewan consensus that that's how these people have behaved.

So, Mr. Speaker, we welcome any initiative — and I want to make that very clear — which is supportive to families, which is supportive to communities, and which builds, Mr. Speaker, if it is sincere, and of course that is the test, Mr. Speaker, here. This PC government, the public is telling me, cannot be trusted. They have absolutely no credibility at this point. They're going to have to earn the respect of the public of Saskatchewan. And there are many examples of why they have no credibility, and there are a vast majority of people think that it's too late already.

Mr. Speaker, they say one thing and they do just the opposite, and the examples are numerous, whether its taxation, health care, privatization — you name it. And the best indicator, Mr. Speaker, is what the people of Saskatchewan are saying to me — that's what the small-business people of Saskatoon Eastview are saying to me — the best indicator of how this government will behave in the future is how they have behaved in the past, over the past eight years. That's the best indicator, Mr. Speaker.

The minister talked about the family symposium of last July, almost a year ago — talked about what a great symposium that is, Mr. Speaker. And there were good ideas from that symposium. Mr. Speaker, so far he has done nothing with the recommendations from that symposium. And that's why, Mr. Speaker, after one year

one has to question their seriousness about helping Saskatchewan families and helping Saskatchewan communities.

Now this minister has been in place for six months, Mr. Speaker; he's been floundering badly for six months. He's been making insensitive statements towards poor people. He's been making patronizing statements towards poor people. And I don't say that he did this consciously; I don't think he did. And I just don't think he realized the insensitivity because he is part of the government that is out of touch. But he's been making insensitive statements towards poor people, in a sense blaming them for the poverty that they find themselves in.

Mr. Speaker, what are his accomplishments today? After six months and some 250, \$300,000, he has not even been able, until today, in six months to articulate to the public of Saskatchewan what his mandate is. His accomplishments to date is he's published a facts sheet telling the public what great things the Government of Saskatchewan is doing for them.

I would like to go on record as saying, Mr. Speaker, I have examined this thoroughly; this document that has been published by this minister is misleading. It's misleading to the public of Saskatchewan. That's what he's done, and this document is misleading.

He's put two social workers into schools, and I don't quarrel with that. I'm not saying that's not a good initiative. But he thinks that that's solving the problem. On a certain level, that's a good idea, but that's not dealing with the problem. At the time that he announced that, it took three ministers to announce that initiative, and it took a lot of pride in trying to convince the public that they're dealing with poverty.

He talked about community forums today, and I give him credit for going around the community to listen to what the people have to say. Mr. Speaker, I'm aware that in the community forum of Weyburn, what did the public tell him? They said, we don't like your policies; we don't like your policies on taxation. You're hurting Saskatchewan families; you're hurting Saskatchewan communities. We don't like your policies on store hours. You've shown no leadership there. And we don't like your policy on allowing liquor advertising, Mr. Speaker. That's what they told him.

So, Mr. Speaker, the role of this minister today, after six months, he's been a cheer-leader for the government. He's basically been a smoke-screen; his role has been a smoke-screen. He didn't even acknowledge . He hasn't even acknowledged in this House that we have the second highest rate of family poverty in all of Canada, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it took a long time before he would acknowledge that poverty existed in this province. And, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of where this minister has impacted upon his colleagues to put one peanut butter sandwich in the tummy of a hungry child, one additional sandwich in the last six months.

And, Mr. Speaker, what he has done is he's defended —

and that's why I say he's insensitive — he's defended the very hurtful policies of this government which in fact has put more stress on families, more stress on communities. It hasn't helped them.

So, Mr. Speaker, in six months this family minister and his department has made no difference, absolutely no difference to the hurtful PC policies of this province. In fact, as my hon. friend says, he has cost us money with no tangible results.

(1500)

Mr. Speaker, I submit that unless we see some concrete evidence which we haven't seen in the last six months, that this minister's role is one of a public relations initiative. Who else but this PC government would establish an expensive ministry, fund it, staff it, remodel the offices, pay the minister \$90,000 a year, but not be able to tell the public what his mandate is.

Mr. Speaker, that's why we're in trouble in this province, because we have this kind of knee-jerk planning. They identify a problem and they try and solve it with a public relations initiative. Mr. Speaker, I can only conclude — I hope I'm wrong — but I can only conclude that on the surface, this ministry appears to be nothing but a public relations exercise.

And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it appears to be a sign of desperation. And I cannot stress too much that no other government since the last Tory government 50 years ago has done more to hurt families, has done more to hurt communities in the province of Saskatchewan. They've put tremendous stress on families, yet they've cut the service and supports to families, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, they have put tremendous stress on communities, and they in fact have eroded the supports to communities. They have not stood up for Saskatchewan with the hurtful policies of the federal government, as my colleague from Humboldt outlined very clearly yesterday.

The new super minister has never in this House acknowledged that out-migration is a problem despite the fact that some 55 net people have left this province in the last five years; 60 per cent of them are under the age of 34. He has acknowledged that that's a problem. How on earth is he going to deal with it if he's not going to acknowledge it.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of communities, we've seen in the last four or five years 1,000 families come off the farm. And this is a government that in eight years has failed to protect our rural communities by providing long-term support programs and failed to deal with the other issues of land transfers and input costs and the interest rates, and so on.

Mr. Speaker, here's a minister — and it's very unclear in the Act, and I'll have a lot of questions for this minister — here's a minister who has a department. In fact the Act doesn't say he's even setting up a department. But here's a minister who is in charge of a department, it has no power, he has no power, he has no authority to ensure that his cabinet colleagues will be influenced. There's no

authority here to indicate that. There are no resources, as far as I can see, outlined here. He's got no programs. Mr. Speaker, that's not good enough. That's not good enough. The public is not going to be fooled unless this minister can deliver.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the government has found itself in political difficulty. And no wonder! with privatization, the secret deals, withholding information, the financial mess they've created in the province, savage cuts to health care and education and social services, record level taxes on Saskatchewan families, and that they're . the rate of high unemployment.

They're low on the polls and the Premier was confronted with the question of, what are we going to do. Well let's establish a ministry of the families, and we can talk about how we value young people, about how we value families. And, Mr. Speaker, we've heard now for a year how important that young people are to the province and how valuable families are, and they continue to leave in record numbers — 23,700 net out-migration last year.

So what they say about families and their record, Mr. Speaker, are quite the opposite. Mr. Speaker, they decided to say, well we want to be a kinder and a more gentle government and that we want to listen. Well, Mr. Speaker, part of listening is whether or not you hear the message. And for the minister to get up and say that we've been in partnership and we've worked closely and co-operatively and collaboratively with communities and families, just simply isn't true. If that's how he views what this government has done, then he's out of step with the Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there's nothing new in this Bill, Mr. Speaker. If the government was sincere, if they were sincere, there is nothing in this Bill that the current ministers of Social Services, Education, and Health, for sure, shouldn't already be implementing on behalf of families and communities in the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, they should have already been doing this if they were sincere and concerned.

Many of the ministers, including the Premier, talked about taking politics out of government, Mr. Speaker. That was kind of the thrust to their throne speech. And I'm not surprised they would say that. Mr. Speaker, their political record is not good, and frankly, regarding Saskatchewan families and Saskatchewan communities, their record is one of betrayal, of deception, and of extreme hardship placed on Saskatchewan families and Saskatchewan communities.

And I say to the minister that the public of Saskatchewan, unless the nature of your support changes, that the public of Saskatchewan has had enough of your kind of support to families and communities unless it takes a different form, Mr. Speaker. Because your approach to Saskatchewan communities is tearing down rather than building. The dental plan is a good example, Mr. Speaker.

And so despite his rhetoric, the public is going to be waiting to see whether or not there is some substance to what the minister is talking about.

Mr. Speaker, the minister talks about consensus in Saskatchewan. The minister talks about the vision of this government. Mr. Speaker, I note that he was so impressed with the vision in the throne speech that he didn't even get up to speak on it.

Now here's a throne speech that talked about the importance of families and young people and how this government was going to strengthen the fabric of rural Saskatchewan and communities and support families. The Minister of the Family didn't even speak to the throne speech. So obviously I'm left to conclude that he saw nothing there of any substance. And so I didn't see him defending the vision of the throne speech, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there are some things that the Saskatchewan families have a consensus about with regard to the way this government has treated families and communities. There's a strong consensus across the province that Tory times are tough times.

There is a strong consensus across the province that this government has broken just too many promises, Mr. Speaker, that they've got absolutely no credibility. There's a consensus about that, Mr. Speaker. There's a strong consensus in Saskatchewan that there are too many food banks. There's a strong consensus in Saskatchewan that this government has wasted too much money. There's a strong consensus that 20 cabinet ministers and 10 legislative secretaries is a waste of money, Mr. Speaker. And there's a strong consensus that this government has been involved in mismanagement unparalleled by any government in Canada, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Pringle:** — Mr. Speaker, there's a strong . yes, there is lots of consensus in Saskatchewan. There's a strong consensus that this government has taxed all of us to the hilt and there's just no room for families and communities to breathe, Mr. Speaker. There's a strong consensus that the policies of this government have been directly related to, during the last three years, record levels of personal and business bankruptcies, Mr. Speaker.

There's a strong consensus that we can't continue to lose 1,000 families off the farm every year, Mr. Speaker. And there's a strong consensus that this government should quit foreclosing on family farms, Mr. Speaker, quit taking legal actions against family farms.

And there's a strong consensus which touches every family in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, that out-migration has got to be turned around. Mr. Speaker, out-migration is tearing apart families. If the Minister of the Family was concerned about families, he would speak to the new super-minister to see about turning that situation around. Mr. Speaker, there's a strong consensus that we can't afford to lose 55,000 people over the last three years. We can't afford to continue on that trend. And there's a strong consensus that when our youth leave, Mr. Speaker, that there goes our future.

But there's also a strong consensus that we cannot continue to see children going to school hungry, Mr. Speaker. The Family minister says that from his

observation around the province there's no need for a school lunch program, Mr. Speaker. And that's why I say it's one thing to go out and listen, but unless you hear what people are saying to you, Mr. Speaker, that minister is going to make no difference to the well-being of the lives of Saskatchewan families and communities. Mr. Speaker, there's a strong consensus in rural Saskatchewan that the dental program was a bad decision and that the government should reverse that decision if they're concerned about families.

There's a strong consensus that we have had the worst job creation record in the last three or four years, and that there's something got to be done with that. And there's a strong consensus among senior citizens and their families that the home care program has got to be restored to its proper funding levels.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on. There is a lot of consensus in Saskatchewan already, but this government is not listening. Mr. Speaker, there is consensus on many, many other issues that create hardship on Saskatchewan families, and it's not just the opposition that's saying that, Mr. Speaker.

I'd like to comment for a minute on an article in today's *Leader-Post*, March 29, and the headline is "'Fierce' Sask. pride disappearing: study." Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a study that was released today . . . released Wednesday by the Saskatchewan Red Cross. This is not the opposition — the Saskatchewan Red Cross — a very in-depth study of some 2,150 Saskatchewan people, which is a pretty good sampling Mr. Speaker, a cross-section of Saskatchewan people.

I'd like to make just a few quotes from this release. It says:

Feelings of pessimism, hopelessness, and despair are pervasive in Saskatchewan society, according to the Red Cross study released in Regina Wednesday.

The survey of 2,150 Saskatchewan people suggests concerns about deteriorating health (Mr. Minister of Health), social and economic conditions are grave and the whole sense of community (the sense of community which the minister was just talking about) is threatened in a province that has long prided itself on its small-town neighborliness.

And I continue quoting:

"Sixty-seven per cent of all respondents were feeling pessimism, hopelessness, and despair about the future of this province," the study said.

Mr. Speaker, what an indictment on this government, with this kind of feeling throughout the province.

I go on to say, Mr. Speaker, despite what the minister just said about them as a government, community building. It says:

"There was a distinct feeling that the 'spirit' or concept of community was disintegrating . . ."

It's a study of over 2,000 Saskatchewan residents, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it goes on to say that . well, it states that the report is not designed as a report card on any particular government. Then they go on to say, but:

the commissioner of the Saskatchewan branch of the Canadian Red Cross Society, had some advice for Finance Minister Lorne Hepworth just one day before this evening's introduction of the provincial budget in the legislature.

"Listen to the people of Saskatchewan," she advised.

"This (report) is there to help you chart your course . . . "

Well, Mr. Speaker, here's 2,100 people. Here's the commissioner of the Saskatchewan branch of the Canadian Red Cross telling the government to change its course.

Now the Minister of Education doesn't like this. But he's the one that has got a crisis in the technical system in the university and K to 12, and he doesn't like this. So obviously the public of Saskatchewan has touched a nerve with the results of this survey, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, and then she goes on to say that:

The most disturbing element of the report has to do with the deterioration of the concept of community . . .

And that is exactly what my colleague from Humboldt said yesterday about the way that policies of this government have allowed Saskatchewan communities to be eroded. The concept of Saskatchewan communities is deteriorating.

Now this flies in the face of everything that the minister just said, Mr. Speaker. Then she goes on to say:

There is "growing intolerance, cynicism, and criticism by urban and rural people for each other . . . "

Well I'm not surprised, Mr. Speaker, because this government has pitted urban people against rural people; they've pitted low income people against business people. That's been their strategy, Mr. Speaker. They have contributed to a growing intolerance in this province, Mr. Speaker, and it's reflected in this study.

(1515)

So, Mr. Speaker, pardon me if I'm being a little bit cynical about this government's record with what the Minister of the Family says their record is today. Obviously the public of Saskatchewan doesn't believe him, doesn't agree with him, and, Mr. Speaker, would be quite leery of the commitments that he's making today.

And many of those surveyed — I quote here again:

. . . were concerned that there was not a co-ordinated approach to delivery of health care and social services . . .

Exactly what our colleagues have been saying for some time, Mr. Speaker — haphazard planning in economic development, haphazard planning in financial management, and haphazard planning in the provision of the human services.

Mr. Speaker — and I quote one last part here — it says:

Many of those surveyed in the 14 to 18 age-group said there was no point in getting a good education because there are few jobs available even for those who do apply for them.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if that's the view that young people have about this government — first of all, they can't get into university because this Minister of Education has allowed quotas to be put on the university, and then they're saying, even if we get an education, we can't get a job in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, that's what our young people are feeling this way. That's a tremendous . They should be having some fun and associating with their peers and learning to be young people. They're worried about if they get an education there's no opportunities for them anyway.

So there's a study that I hope that the Minister of the Family and all of his colleagues look very closely at, Mr. Speaker. That was released yesterday. Over 2,000 people participated, almost a thousand personal interviews, and I would say that the results of this study represent what I said earlier about a consensus that exists in Saskatchewan, that this government is not supporting families and is not involved in community building.

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, and I'm drawing my remarks to a conclusion here, that the best indicator of how a government will behave in the future is how they behaved in the past. I think that's a reasonable proposition that you would agree with.

Now after eight years of insensitivity, after eight years of insensitive firings, after eight years of arrogance and hardships on Saskatchewan families — the 200 potash workers, for example, last year that were fired and were into this gallery crying and pleading with the government to reverse that hurtful decision — after eight years of those kinds of hardships on families, Mr. Speaker, it'll be hard to believe that this minister will be able to redirect the priorities of this government in the wrong-headed direction that it's going in now.

I wish the minister luck. I will give him credit if I see any concrete results coming from the activities of his department. I certainly will. I will give him credit, as we will on this side of the House. But, Mr. Speaker, I say very clearly that the public of Saskatchewan will be watching to see if there is any real change in direction by this government. And maybe we'll start by seeing that tonight in the throne speech.

**An Hon. Member:** — Budget.

**Mr. Pringle:** — Mr. Speaker, but the throne . in the budget, thank you.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech offered no vision that I could see, that we could see on this side of the House, obviously that the Minister of the Family could see, because he didn't speak to it; he didn't support it.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill does not give the minister any powers that his colleagues don't already have. I think that's important. And it's going to be very difficult to take the Minister of the Family seriously unless we see some concrete signs in the budget tonight where families and communities are going to be supported and unless we see a change in attitude by this government, Mr. Speaker, one where they'll be honest with families and honest with communities of the province, a change in attitude where they will develop sound economic policies and abandon their right-wing privatization approach which maybe single-handedly has had the greatest negative impact on Saskatchewan families and communities.

We look for a change in attitude in education, in health care, and we look for a change in attitude and some concrete action for farm families and small-business people. Mr. Speaker, we look to see if — we're going to be looking to see if there is any concrete support in social programs which are required more than ever in difficult times, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are also going to be looking to see whether or not there is a proved sense of tolerance and sensitivity by this government in relation to particularly minority groups and low income people.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, if there is concrete help in the budget tonight, if there is concrete help that this minister can demonstrate where he's making a difference, I will give him support, I will give him credit for that.

Mr. Speaker, there are many questions in this Bill. There are questions regarding the intent of the Bill. There are questions regarding the powers that the minister does and does not have, and I will want answers to those questions.

And, Mr. Speaker, the minister is going to have to convince me, while I believe that he is sincere and well-intentioned, that he is going to have to start making — I saw him on TV last night, the night before last — he's going to have to start making some comments that show some sensitivity, that show some understanding of the problems that families face if he is going to be taken seriously, that the Minister of the Family is going to make any difference. And I would urge him, I would urge him to very seriously look at the recommendations from the family symposium last year and urge his colleagues to be supportive to some of those.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, I will have more remarks at another time. I would like to study the minister's comments today, see what's in the throne speech tonight, Mr. Speaker, and . the budget speech tonight. I've got to get the throne speech out of my mind, Mr. Speaker. And I wish to . For the mean time, Mr. Speaker, I've got some colleagues who will want to speak on this Bill. I request that we

adjourn the debate at this time.

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

Debate adjourned.

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — Mr. Speaker, because it is near 3:30 and the Assembly must prepare itself for the budget tonight, and by agreement with the House Leader, I would move that we recess the legislature until 7 o'clock tonight.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.