

EVENING SITTING

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the address in reply which was moved by Ms. Murray, seconded by Mr. Flavel, and the amendment thereto moved by Mr. Toth.

Mr. Renaud: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and fellow members of this Assembly. It is indeed a pleasure and an honour to represent the constituents of Kelsey-Tisdale in this Chamber for the first sitting of the twenty-second legislature for the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I am not the federal Minister of Finance but I did go and buy a new pair of shoes before my address to the Assembly. The one good thing, Mr. Speaker, is that I did not have to pay PST (provincial sales tax).

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Renaud: — On behalf of the constituents of Kelsey-Tisdale, I want to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election. You have their support and their confidence.

Mr. Speaker, you are very familiar with the constituency of Kelsey-Tisdale. Some of your family farmed for many years in the Etomami area near Hudson Bay.

You are also aware, Mr. Speaker, that the constituency of Kelsey was represented for many years by John Brockelbank Sr. of the Bjorkdale district. This brings to mind another Speaker of this Assembly, John Brockelbank Jr., who so ably served this Assembly during the Blakeney administration.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Renaud: — Mr. Speaker, I wish you the best in your work for the Assembly.

I also wish to congratulate our Premier. It is clear to me that this government is one of action, not simply words. It is clearly a government in touch with the needs of our communities and our province. In particular, I believe that he is leading by example and resetting the priorities of government. The selection of a small, efficient, and competent Executive Council, Mr. Speaker, makes it possible to conceive of a leaner, more efficient government, a government that puts priorities of individual Saskatchewan citizens in Saskatchewan communities ahead of politics and pomp.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Renaud: — Mr. Speaker, I represent a constituency that supports the people-first approach to government. It is a large rural constituency that reaches from Tisdale to Hudson Bay to the Manitoba border, and from Prairie

River in the North to Nora in the South. It is a constituency of towns, villages and hamlets and family farms.

Some would say that we maybe shouldn't spend our time talking about our constituencies, but, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important to talk about the strengths and the concerns of each and every constituency in this province. And we are proud of the many accomplishments of our communities and our people, Mr. Speaker.

The Tisdale Recplex is an example of these accomplishments. It is a magnificent complex built in conjunction with the elementary school and which shares the auditorium, the curling rink, the skating rink, meeting rooms. It's home to the AAA Midget Trojans and the Tisdale Ramblers and a large indoor rodeo. It is the centre of the community and it was built by community.

Another example of community spirit, Mr. Speaker, is the Porcupine Opportunities centre which includes an activity centre, skilled workshops, skilled industry, laundromat, a SARCAN depot, a retail store, and residential services for the mentally disabled people of our region. These facilities are located in Porcupine Plain — built by community, community spirit, neighbour helping neighbour.

And in Hudson Bay, Mr. Speaker, the creation of the forest vision by community, workers, and industry is a document envisioning the future of sustainable forest in north-eastern Saskatchewan. Hudson Bay is also home to magnificent snowmobile trails, forestry week, the junior B hockey team, the Hudson Bay Saints. It is also home of the Hudson Bay Rider high school football team which has won the provincial title three out of the past five years.

And how about our people, Mr. Speaker? Let's look at our political heritage for a moment. People like the John Brockelbanks, father and son; Sandy Nicholson, who we recently paid tribute to; or John Messer; the Hon. Minister of Finance; and the Hon. Minister of Education — roots from our constituency of Kelsey-Tisdale, Mr. Speaker.

Our constituency is also made up of people like the Saskatchewan Roughriders' Bob Poley from Prairie River, Saskatchewan; and Jim Clunie from Tisdale, a member of the Canadian professional water-ski team, who captured the world water-ski title this year.

Mr. Speaker, Kelsey-Tisdale is a constituency that is known for its parks, lakes, and fertile land. Kelsey-Tisdale was named from Tisdale, which is the largest community in our constituency, and also from the fact that Henry Kelsey passed through this area in 1690. Recreation, tourism, forestry, and agriculture provide for a good quality of life for the blend of ethnic groups that have settled in this region.

Our communities have a diverse mixture of ancestries, including our Indian and Metis brothers and sisters, Mr. Speaker, that have functioned co-operatively in the regional development associated with Kelsey-Tisdale constituency. The people of this region have diversified industry that is complementary to the natural surroundings. Some examples are alfalfa pelleting plants,

plywood plant, an aspen plant, many private saw mills and outfitting camps, grain bin manufacturing, and egg carton production from waste paper, value-added products from wild fruit and honey — just to mention a few.

Despite the strengths of our community and our diversity, the people of Kelsey-Tisdale have experienced the hardship that has infected our province over the past decade. I wish to outline some of these areas in which the people of this constituency have seen difficulties, have sought change, and have put their faith in a government that has promised to work for change.

In Kelsey-Tisdale, Mr. Speaker, the driving force of our local economy is agriculture. We are known for our diversified agricultural base — canola, flax, alfalfa, honey production. We are also known for cereal grain production and livestock. Even with this diverse agricultural base, Mr. Speaker, our family farms continue to struggle for survival. The farm gate crisis has spread throughout our constituency even though we have some of the richest farm land in the province. The best of farming practices, Mr. Speaker, has not solved the problem of low prices, high input costs, and farm debt. Farmers in Kelsey-Tisdale are being forced off the land in record numbers.

There is another serious situation in the farm community. Many of our farmers are nearing 60 years of age. Many would like to retire in dignity, Mr. Speaker, but cannot force that additional debt on their sons and daughters who want to take over that family farm. Fewer young families on the family farm results in our rural communities becoming involved in the rural crisis. Communities like Bjorkdale, Chelan, McKague, Carragana, Eldersley, Crooked River, Archerwill, in fact every community in Kelsey-Tisdale, are seeing the effects. The first signs are usually important community services that begin to disappear. And we have all seen this in the past nine years, Mr. Speaker. Maybe it's the closure of a school or of a church or of a business or of a curling rink.

Mr. Speaker, the survival of rural Saskatchewan is dependent upon bringing in of young families on our farms. These people will provide hope for the future of agriculture and for the future of rural communities. They are important to the maintenance of the quality of life we desire in our communities.

Mr. Speaker, on October 21 the people of Kelsey-Tisdale helped elect a government which they trusted with their concerns, concerns about protecting a way of life based on agriculture and rural communities. They said yes to family farms and no to the corporate farm agenda.

Mr. Speaker, agriculture and rural communities clearly have been our priority during the election and now. Only a little more than 30 days into our mandate the farmers of Kelsey-Tisdale are applauding our Premier for his . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Renaud: — Yes, applauding our Premier for efforts in helping them with the recent trek to Ottawa.

This was a trek to Ottawa by a Premier and ordinary farmers who wanted to talk to Ottawa about the farm crisis and make the federal government aware of the seriousness of the situation, the need for more and immediate cash infusions, the farm debt problem, and the need for improvements to GRIP (gross revenue insurance plan).

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the farmers of Kelsey-Tisdale know they now have a government that has their interests as a priority.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Renaud: — Forestry and small business are another area of keen interest to the citizens of Kelsey-Tisdale. Indeed forestry is central to the economic health of many of the communities in my constituency. Many people in Hudson Bay, Weekes, Carragana, Mistatim, Erwood are dependant upon the industry for employment.

The forestry industry is no longer as strong as it was a decade ago. Foresters, loggers, mill workers are being laid off or have no job. Independent operators are receiving smaller and smaller logging contracts, and industries we have grown to depend on such as Saskatchewan Forest Products, MacMillan Bloedel, and Simpson Timber have simply slowed down or shut down.

For an example, the result of the closure of Simpson Timber has meant that 600-plus jobs were lost in the forest industry in Kelsey-Tisdale over the past year and a half. Many of these people, Mr. Speaker, are still unemployed. Many of these people have joined the exodus from this province.

The state of our forest industry is caused by a policy introduced by the previous government, Mr. Speaker. It was a policy of having no policy. It was a lack of support to sustainable forestry enterprise. It has eroded the forest management process that promotes sustainable employment and forestry.

This industry is also important to tourism in Saskatchewan. We offer a tourist industry that has the best hunting, fishing, camping, and family recreation. Mr. Speaker, with the closing of many local recreational sites in our area in favour of *Get Smart*, this industry is also under extreme pressure.

Many of the jobs that have been lost in this industry were a result of the lack of vision for forest resource by a previous government that favoured multinational megaproject development and ignored the importance of forestry to this province.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, that our government has repealed the expanded PST.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Renaud: — The PST has been so harmful to the family businesses of my constituency. Small businesses and industry were closing down day after day. Workers were out of work and were forced to join the ranks of the

unemployed or were seeking the help of Social Services or simply leaving the province for work elsewhere.

I found it interesting and very disappointing that in our constituency, Mr. Speaker, nearly 900 voters have made the exodus since 1986. This does not count the number of children that would have left with their parents. Too many of these people, Mr. Speaker, are standing in the line of the unemployment office, Social Services, or the food bank.

For those people who have stayed, I can tell you that they were very disappointed in the direction of the previous government. They were aware that our communities were dying. Our richest resource, our young people, were leaving in record numbers. The main streets of fine communities were shutting down, and those excellent small businesses were gone.

(1915)

On October 21 my constituents asked for a new direction. They asked for leadership. They elected a team of people to lead the way through our economic situation. They wanted a government with compassion and with understanding. Our constituents, Mr. Speaker, are not asking what they can get from government; they're saying what can we give to our society that will turn the current malaise into opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, on October 21 the people of our fine constituency said no to this province's large debt and reckless spending. They said they did not want to be sent a bill of more than \$5,000 for each man, woman, and child in the province for spending they did not benefit from.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Renaud: — They said no to the idea of taxing an extra 7 per cent on many necessities that would strike hardest at the poor, at the seniors, the pioneers of this province, who are now living on fixed incomes, or at the young people, many of whom are working at minimum wage.

The constituents of Kelsey-Tisdale are a strong lot. They believe in community, and neighbour helping neighbour, and co-operation, sharing in community spirit. They believe in the Saskatchewan way.

Mr. Speaker, it is this belief in the Saskatchewan way of co-operation that has brought together farmers and labourers, seniors and young people, and the people of various ethnic backgrounds. It is this belief that helped found our province and continues to hold our communities together. Many of our seniors today came to Saskatchewan to settle and to pioneer.

I look at my wife's parents and others who are of Ukrainian descent. Many of these pioneering people came to Saskatchewan because they felt the need of freedom and the ability to earn a living as they chose. I am proud that our Premier was one of the first world leaders to welcome the independence of the Ukraine.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Renaud: — It is appropriate that we recognize and support the reforms that are taking place in the Ukraine. This area of the world has provided our province with strong people of pioneering spirit. Mr. Speaker, these pioneers knew that joining together to fix wrongs and to give what they could so their children and grandchildren could have a decent place to live, a place to be proud of, and a place of freedom, was the right way.

Our seniors, Mr. Speaker, out of a concern for their children and grandchildren, want to protect and strengthen a way of life that they have struggled for. These seniors voted for a government that holds these democratic socialist ideals. These people voted for a New Democratic government, a government that holds the value of the person above the value of the almighty dollar.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Renaud: — On October 21, Mr. Speaker, my constituents said yes, we want an education system for our children that is based on desire and opportunity, not on the size of a person's pocket-book. They said yes, we want a universal medicare program, a program for rich or for poor. Mr. Speaker, our constituents said yes to Main Street, Saskatchewan. They said yes to the development of good quality jobs for our kids right at home. They didn't vote for the moving of jobs without concern for the workers and their families or without concern for the cost to the taxpayers. I want you to know, Mr. Speaker, the people of Kelsey-Tisdale said no to that wasteful and inhuman political ploy.

They said no to the spending of large amounts of tax dollars on companies that didn't need it and that created little in the way of permanent jobs. And they said no to the secret deals to friends of the government and secret contracts to top officials in the public service and Crown investments.

Our constituents did say yes, Mr. Speaker, to a government that promised to govern in a way that produced trust in our parliamentary system and their politicians. On October 21 the voters in Kelsey-Tisdale stated that they insisted on a government that would open the books and continue on a plan of open and honest and accountable government.

And since the election, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken to many people of Kelsey-Tisdale constituency, and I want to say again — and I can tell you honestly — that are proud of our Premier for accompanying a group of farm people, farm organizations, and other government officials to explain to Ottawa the real situation in rural Saskatchewan today.

They are proud of our new direction as promised in the election campaign and now publicly endorsed in the throne speech. Mr. Speaker, I trust that with God's grace I can represent my constituents, each and every one, toward a goal of betterment of our constituency and our province with honesty, integrity, and fairness.

I support a new beginning, Mr. Speaker, and therefore I will be supporting the original motion and rejecting the

amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Scott: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and congratulations on being elected Speaker of this Assembly. It is a great privilege and honour for me to be here in the Saskatchewan Legislative Assembly representing the diverse and unique people of Indian Head-Wolseley constituency in our great province.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this is the first time in two years that the people in the Indian Head-Wolseley constituency . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Scott: — . . . that the people in Indian Head-Wolseley constituency have been represented in this Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, my decision to seek election to the Legislative Assembly was based on the fact that the people, life-style, and natural heritage of Saskatchewan are very important to me. And we deserve something better in the way of leadership, direction, and priorities than what the previous government delivered.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Scott: — The secret deals, scandals, sell-outs, and patronage have destroyed our trust in governments. Something as basic as honesty, fairness, accountability, and compassion should not be too much to ask for and expect from elected officials, for without these basic principles we have nothing.

Mr. Speaker, the Indian Head-Wolseley constituency is typical of rural Saskatchewan. Agriculture is the main industry. As a third-generation farmer myself, farming is a way of life for me and hopefully my children will some day take over the family farm. A number of small towns are situated throughout our constituency. Small businesses are the backbone to these rural communities and every effort must be made to support and assist small business in Saskatchewan.

Five Indian reserves are located within our boundaries. We, as the Government of Saskatchewan, and the federal Government of Canada, must work with the Indian people to resolve long-standing issues.

Our constituency has one of the highest ratios of senior citizens anywhere in Saskatchewan. This group of people is very important. They've built this province and made it one of the best places in the world to live, and they have knowledge and experience that only time can buy. We need to ensure that our seniors have comfort and security in their retirement years. I believe that leaders and decision makers should utilize the valuable information and expertise offered by our seniors. After all, they have been where we are now.

Mr. Speaker, our greatest treasure is our children. All of us, through our own families, friends, communities, schools, churches, and organizations have some

involvement with children and in turn contribute to their growth, learning, and well-being. It should be our goal to leave our children a world that is as good, or hopefully a little better, place to live than when we inherited it from our forefathers. The greatest threat to our children, and future generations, is our deteriorating environment. Tough decisions and commitments are required now, Mr. Speaker, if we are to deal with these unprecedented challenges.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of history in our constituency. At one time, Indian Head had a higher population than Regina. Just over 100 years ago, the largest farm in the world was located at Indian Head. This 64,000-acre farm was acquired at a cost of about \$1 an acre, and the wheat produced sold for 88 cents a bushel. It is interesting to note that, even with these attractive prices, the farm eventually went broke. It is also interesting to note that a few years ago some of the land from the original farm sold for \$950 an acre. It is little wonder that the farm economy is in trouble today with the price of wheat at \$2 a bushel.

Mr. Speaker, everyone in Saskatchewan is well aware of the importance of agriculture and the problems associated with the industry. There have been boom and bust cycles in this risky business throughout history. Things will change, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is there are five more people to feed on this fragile planet every two seconds. And over 100,000 people starve to death every day. No one is making more land. In fact, productive agriculture land is being lost at an alarming rate through development, erosion, salinity, and urban sprawl.

Mr. Speaker, when the trade wars end and Saskatchewan farmers can compete fairly on world markets, we will once again have a successful and thriving industry. Meanwhile it is imperative that every measure be taken to protect and preserve the important family farms in Saskatchewan until the good times return.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say how pleased I am to see the throne speech of December 2 contain the announcement that legislation to provide for the expansion and harmonization of the provincial sales tax will be repealed. This unfair tax heaped upon an already overtaxed society was totally unacceptable and clearly rejected in the recent election.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that in 1950 in this country 50 per cent of the taxes were paid by individuals and 50 per cent by businesses and corporations. Today, individuals pay over 80 per cent of all taxes while businesses pay less than 20 per cent, with many big businesses and corporations paying no tax and, in fact, carrying tax credits into future years.

Mr. Speaker, an area of great concern for me and many other people in this province is our natural heritage and environment. Among our greatest assets are our fertile soils, clean air and water, productive forests, rich oil, gas, and mineral deposits, and diverse wildlife populations. It is important that we utilize these resources responsibly, manage them wisely, and protect them for future generations.

For example, Mr. Speaker, the history and record of wildlife conservation achievements in this province are second to none in North America. The importance of the area now known as Saskatchewan to wildlife was recognized by our forefathers when the first migratory bird sanctuary in North America was established in 1887 at the north end of Last Mountain Lake.

For decades Saskatchewan has led the way to save the endangered whooping crane. In 1941 there was only 21 whooping cranes in the world. Today, as a result of dedicated conservation efforts, there are nearly 200 of these regal birds in existence.

In 1929, out of concern for dwindling wildlife populations, sportsmen organized in this province. Today the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation has the highest membership per capita of any other wildlife conservation organization in North America. In 1937, in response to the devastating drought, Ducks Unlimited launched its very successful and much admired wetland conservation work on the Prairies. In 1942 naturalists came together, eventually forming the Saskatchewan Natural History Society, which is well-known and respected across the nation.

More recently, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan was selected for the launching of the North American waterfowl management plan. This 11th-hour effort to salvage our dwindling waterfowl resource will see upwards of \$400 million pumped into Saskatchewan over the next 15 years.

The former Conservative government received much-deserved and widespread support and praise when The Critical Wildlife Habitat Protection Act was passed in 1984. Unfortunately, the same government in its dying days took major steps to undermine and destroy this landmark legislation. This popular and vital legislation must be retained as it is imperative that critical wildlife habitat on our Crown lands be protected for the benefit of all people and future generations.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Scott: — Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments of Saskatchewan people in the conservation of our natural resources has been impressive, but much remains to be done. In a mere 100 years we have changed the face of southern Saskatchewan from one of the most productive ecosystems in the world to one of the most modified landscapes in North America. Consequently, we have witnessed many changes in our once rich natural heritage.

(1930)

In the 1950s, 20 million ducks returned to our province each spring. In recent years fewer than 4 million ducks have made the annual trek, a decline of over 80 per cent. In 1960 there was 500,000 white-tailed deer in Saskatchewan. Today fewer than 250,000 survive. Some 20 per cent of our native plants are deemed to be rare and endangered, and half of all the endangered species listed in Canada are found on the Prairies.

The loss of natural habitat continues at an alarming rate. In the five-year period from 1976 to 1981, we lost just under 2 million acres of natural habitat. Broken down, this loss works out to 44 acres an hour, day and night.

Mr. Speaker, the loss of natural areas and the associated plant and animal species is not limited to Saskatchewan, but in fact is a world-wide crisis with species becoming extinct on an hourly basis.

The widely acclaimed Brundtland report on our common future, the world commission on environment and development, states that in order to ensure species diversity and survival a minimum of 12 per cent of an ecological region must be maintained. To date, less than 5 per cent of our natural landscape is secure under some form of protective status in southern Saskatchewan. The Brundtland Commission report concludes that we have 10 years to reach the 12 per cent goal, or in many parts of the world, including Saskatchewan, it may be too late.

Mr. Speaker, this government must take immediate action with serious and determined commitments to achieve the 12 per cent goal here in Saskatchewan by the year 2000. In many cases this will be our last opportunity as a society to set aside representative samples of our vanishing natural heritage. Mr. Speaker, our children will not have the opportunity to make the choices in front of us today. If we fail to look to the future and act responsibly, our children will be the losers.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Scott: — Concern for our environment is the number one issue in our society and indeed around the world. In fact the 1990s have been dubbed the decade of the environment. The public is no longer prepared to sit back and see our environment exploited and plundered for short-term economic gains or political agendas. Our environment and resources are far more important than politics and politicians.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the specific item mentioned in the throne speech under the heading "Democratic Reform." I quote:

As a first step in this direction, legislation will be introduced to ensure that by-elections are held within six months of a vacancy.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Scott: — I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks that it has been two years since the people in the Indian Head-Wolseley constituency have been represented in this legislature. Myself and other voters and taxpayers in my constituency are not proud of the fact that we must surely hold the record in Canada for being without representation in any legislature for the longest period of time.

We applaud the government's commitment to hold by-elections within six months of a vacancy occurring, so that people will never again sit for years unrepresented in this legislature.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Scott: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize and thank a very special individual — my father, Reg Scott. Like many of our parents, he lived through the Great Depression of the 1930s. He went overseas during the Second World War to fight for our country so that we today may sit here in this Chamber in a free and democratic society.

He returned home to farm, and together with my mother raised a family of six children. When I discussed with dad the idea of getting into politics, he was as usual very supportive and offered very good advice. Unfortunately my father has not been able to partake in the excitement and activity surrounding my election to this Assembly, as he is bedridden in a losing battle with cancer.

In his absence, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, thanks dad for all your help, guidance, wisdom, and love over the past 44 years.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Scott: — Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say thank you to the people of the Indian Head-Wolseley constituency for their support and trust. I am committed to serving my constituents to the best of my abilities, and I look forward to working with them in the months ahead.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege, honour, and humbling experience to sit in this Legislative Assembly and represent the very fine people of the Indian Head-Wolseley constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Speech from the Throne and I do not support the amendment. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Speaker, it is definitely a pleasure to once again speak on the throne speech in this House.

Before I go through my remarks, I'd like to congratulate all the members that were re-elected and a special congratulations to the new ones that have been elected and have now heard a lot of them speak in this House. And I'd also like to again, as I did in question period, congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment as Speaker.

Just a few words, Mr. Speaker, about my constituency. I see quite a few of the members are doing that, just so that all so many new members kind of know where your boundary lines are and what not. I have one of the largest constituencies in the province of Saskatchewan. I represent 25 towns. There's no other constituency that has that many towns.

And it's the old Diefenbaker riding between Regina and Saskatoon. I'm very, very proud of that, Mr. Speaker. It takes in from just out here by Keddlestone to within about eight miles of Saskatoon. The boundary lines are between the two lakes, Last Mountain Lake and Diefenbaker Lake. And I'm very proud to represent this riding. And I'm very proud that the constituency of Arm River, the members

re-elected me for my fourth term of office in this legislature.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — I had a real good organization, Mr. Speaker. They worked hard for me. They've been a loyal bunch of people.

I'm so proud to be able to say that in 1977 we put 51 polling captains together in our team and we've only had one that has left us — and he just moved to the city — in those 13 years. And I'm very proud and I want to say thank you to them also. And I'm going to make sure that they get a copy of *Hansard* so they know that I'm saying that about them, because those are the kind of people that see that you return.

There isn't a member in this House, Mr. Speaker, that has returned that doesn't get here by a good bunch of people that have to elect them. It's the people. I don't care whether you're on the other side of the House or whether you're in the Liberal Party or the Conservative Party, you still have to be well liked and well respected in your constituency. You would not be representing this House. So I want all members on all sides of the House, all three parties, to be proud that you're here, that you're representing in this institution. I'm proud. I'm very, very proud that I've been representing, if I finish out . . . if the Lord lets me live for another four years, I'll have 17 years in this House, and that's to me quite an achievement.

My towns have done quite well in the last years. Some of our smaller towns, our farming communities, some of the smaller towns have a little smaller and moved to the bigger points. Now some of the bigger points of my riding are the towns of Craik and Davidson, Outlook, Allan, and Dundurn, Hanley; them are my bigger towns. And these towns have done quite well.

And one of the things I'm very proud of is the community bonds that come into my area. And they just seen what the government did, and they jumped right on it, and we have Imperial, Davidson, Outlook, Hanley forming one now, if the new government doesn't stop them; Davidson forming one now, if they don't stop them; but the town of Elbow, Mr. Speaker, the town of Elbow has two of them. They're a town of 300 and they raised — in 10 days — raised \$1 million to start up an industry in Elbow. And I am proud of the town of Elbow, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — And I am proud that my constituency . . . and I'm glad for them that they've took advantage of community bonds and helped their town, and I'm just hoping and really, Mr. Speaker, I'm really hoping that the government opposite don't say that's enough of community bonds. I kind of think they will. They've come out now and said, oh the pond is dry and no more community bonds. But they'll likely go ahead because they know when they see a good thing. But, Mr. Speaker, what I think will happen, they'll come out with some other new name. It'll be the same thing, but it won't be giving any credit to the past government. And I think we got to give a lot of credit to what's happened in this

province over the last nine years.

Now the members over there are going to say, oh we were bled dry. The country's broke. The country went broke because the PC's (Progressive Conservative) . . . I heard so many people speak over there. There's been new members speaking, and I'm not going to get into individual names — not very many — that were really going after the government. They bled this here treasury dry. For what, Mr. Speaker? What do we bleed the treasury dry for? We've bled the treasury dry, if we could, for farmers — for farmers, Mr. Speaker. And when you bleed the treasury dry for farmers, you're also helping the business people in this province of Saskatchewan, and we know that, Mr. Speaker, and they know it.

They get up here with all their speeches and all their talk. And they talk away and talk. They know very well. Every representative in this House, Mr. Speaker, every representative knows quite well that our farmers . . . There's a lot of them spoke here. I'm looking at the member from Nipawin now; he got up and spoke. And he made a very nice speech and he was having a little hesitation, along with a few others, when they had to say that there's been nothing for farmers in this province. They had to pretty near bypass some figures awful quickly there.

But what I'm worried about, Mr. Speaker, is the members opposite. I don't know one, including the new Minister of Agriculture and the new Minister of Rural Development, that understands this farm scene. They don't really understand. No they didn't even get elected by farmers in this province.

Mr. Speaker, there was approximately 650,000 voters in this province and 150,000, approximately, voted Conservative. There's only 125,000 farm votes. So if the member from Kinistino, and from Indian Head-Wolseley and Redberry — these people that spoke and said, we were elected by farmers . . . they were elected maybe by the town of Kinistino, maybe the town of Indian Head-Wolseley, maybe the town of Meadow Lake, maybe those towns, but they didn't get elected by the farmers that live on those farms and cast the vote.

We are representing the farmers. We, the 10 people on the Conservative side, are still the spokesmen for the farmers in the province of Saskatchewan. And, Mr. Speaker, I don't want anyone to ever forget that, because that is a fact. There isn't anyone . . . I'll challenge anyone in this legislature who understands the rural Saskatchewan like I do. I have spent more time in rural Saskatchewan going across this province, visiting with farmers, visiting with farmers in debt, farmers in problems, business men, and I know where the vote came from . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You'll find out.

The Speaker: — Order. Could I ask the members please to let the member speak. Don't interfere with the member's right to speak in this Assembly.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Speaker, I've been speaking in the House for 13 years and I've always been thrilled when I speak in this House. Whether I make a good job of it or not, it sure riles the other people up. And boy they sure get

awake in a hurry. I've watched here people speak and I've watched their own colleagues speak and so help me, there was a hardly . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . they done a little bit of that, but not really. But it sure riles up some people when I speak because you know you hear the facts.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — Now let's talk a little bit, Mr. Speaker. Let's talk about the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if he knows what it means of the Farm Debt Review Board section 16, section 20, Farm Land Security Board mediation services. I wonder if he understands all that.

(1945)

I wonder if he understands when even the time comes for the farmer to even go to the court room. He wouldn't know. He doesn't know when they go over to a section 16. He doesn't know when you got the . . . how section 20 works. I'll tell him, and he doesn't know.

I challenge him to come in this House and explain as Minister of Agriculture what this government on this side of the House, when we were government, what we did for farmers.

You talk about moratoriums; we're going to get into that later. But if you want to talk about moratoriums, there's been one put together by this government — safety nets — to save farmers like you wouldn't believe.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . where did you ever get? Where? No place else in North America is the safety net as we have in Saskatchewan. All across Canada you have the Farm Debt Review Board, where a farmer can go to in trouble, whether they're foreclosing on his tractor or taking some land away, whatever. He can go there on his own free will.

But all other places, Mr. Speaker, in Canada, every other province-and I am speaking the absolute facts-every province in Canada other than Saskatchewan, you go from the Farm Debt Review Board right to the court room — in six months your farm is gone. It's gone. Only in Saskatchewan do you have to serve notice to the lender to the Farm Land Security Board through a section 22, and then you've got two to three years to try to salvage your farm.

And the plan was there, Mr. Speaker. The plan was there. What we had in mind — and you know it quite well — that after about two or three years you v.t. your land back or else you . . .

An Hon. Member: — Better explain v.t., Gerry, I don't think they understand.

Mr. Muirhead: — Well they might not understand. That is voluntary transfer your land. When you volunteer to transfer your land back. In case he didn't understand what I said, when a farmer is losing his land and he chooses to

v.t. it back, it means to voluntary transfer. Now that should be simple enough for the member, Mr. Speaker.

Now I'm not going to dwell on that part any more, but we may have to get back on that a lot in this House in the next few months, the next few weeks. I talked to one of the members today; he figures we're going to be all through by Thursday or Friday. He thinks we can have the throne speech vote on Wednesday night — Wednesday at 5 o'clock — wrap up the business in two days. Well, Mr. Speaker, I've got news for that member that told me that, because unless we have something for farmers . . . and when I mean farmers I'm talking about every business man and almost every individual in the province of Saskatchewan. You save the farmers. You'll put money in the hands of the farmers. The business men that you represent here also have a chance to survive. And this government is not doing that.

They can so, oh well we're brand new. I heard the member from Canora stand here yesterday in question period, or maybe it was today: we've only been here a month. Well my goodness, I've sitting over there listening to you talk about your plan for nine and a half years. What plan? I mean it's unreal. I mean it is unreal to go out and misrepresent the people in the province of Saskatchewan like you people did. You misrepresented them, and your people of Saskatchewan are going to see it because you said, we will have a plan to save the farmers in Saskatchewan. And if you lose one, one farmer, he said you've lost too many. The member from Redberry spoke back here. He said you lose one farmer, it's too many.

But you might be losing and I think, according to the Farm Land Security Board and the courts, that you're losing maybe one an hour about now. You're losing about one an hour, and they're going to snicker about it. There has been farmers going down by the hour. Here's the Minister of Agriculture . . .

The Speaker: — Order.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture will now be able to hear some of my remarks and I'm just going to . . . I'm just now going to, Mr. Speaker, challenge the Minister of Agriculture like I did when he — and I'm not supposed to say when you're not here so I won't say that . . .

The Speaker: — Order. I think the member knows well that that is not . . . that is unparliamentary and we simply don't accept that in this House. I wish that you would refrain from doing so.

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I get excited once in awhile and I just stood up there.

Mr. Speaker, in June or July of this year the PC government put a moratorium on Agricultural Credit Corporation which you could not take . . . foreclose on anyone. The only time you could, if maybe they were going out of farming and they were having an auction sale or what not. That's the only time they could come in and really take over on a farm. Now we're going to be getting into this very, very seriously with the minister over the next little while here.

Are you going to be foreclosing on people, farmers and clients of Agricultural Credit Corporation? I think they are, Mr. Speaker, because I've heard some ACS (Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan) employees said that things have now changed since the 21st of October — that that moratorium is not there. And so we're going to be challenging and asking the Minister of Agriculture to stand to his feet in this next while, in question period or whatever, inside this House or outside the House, and tell the people of Saskatchewan where they stand when it comes to these farmers.

You won an election out there telling people in Saskatchewan . . . even the city people voted for you because, oh the NDP (New Democratic Party) are going to save the farmers. You said you had a plan and here's the big thing that you haven't come up with. You said, we'll we put the plan together, there'll be a moratorium. It'll be the first legislation in this here session this fall.

Where is it, Mr. Speaker? Where is this legislation for a moratorium they're talking about? We don't even know anything about it, whether it's a debt moratorium on all farm debt or whether it's just on farm machinery or whether it's on land.

Mr. Speaker, they haven't said one word. They used to sit here, the last few years and challenge us, oh you're afraid to put a moratorium on because you're afraid to attack the big banker, the big lender. Where are they, Mr. Speaker? Here's where they are. It's the same thing exactly. What they said about us . . . I challenge them. They're afraid of credit unions. They're afraid that they're going to go broke if they have a foreclosure . . . or if they have a moratorium.

Well they don't understand because they could put a moratorium on. I believe in a moratorium if they got a good plan. We had a plan; a lease to own. And you know that was announced at election time by the Premier. It was announced at my nomination on September 27, a lease to own so you will not lose one farmer off this land. Once he goes through the courts he loses that land and he's gone through the court system and it's gone. He is offered a leaseback or a lease to own.

Now, I think this is very important, Mr. Speaker. This is the most important thing facing all Saskatchewan right now — is what is the NDP government going to do about the farm scenario, the farm crisis in this province? This is what's on everybody's mind.

I go home on the weekend and that's the first thing, what are these NDP that just got elected . . . I'm keeping in mind now, I'm in my home town in Craik where there wasn't very many votes for NDP, I'll tell you. I said I have. . . Mr. Speaker, someone said at the back there, a voice said, what was your answer? I said I've got hopes that surely to goodness that the member from Riversdale that made these promises will keep his promise.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — And you know, Mr. Speaker, he's got quite a promise to keep. He promised one big promise at

election time — balance the budget, lower the taxes, create jobs, go to Ottawa and get lots of money for farmers and spend more money on GRIP. Now when I came in here about a week after the election — maybe four or five days — the media said, what's your plan in your caucus of 10 when the House opens up and there's opposition? That's exactly what I told him: we're going to make sure they keep their promises.

So, to whoever said that in the back — what did you tell them? I'm telling them that we're going to try to do our best as an opposition that they keep their promises. Yes, they raise their expectations and we're going to see that they deliver. Because as I said before, Mr. Speaker, we are the 10 people right here that are here on behalf of the farmers of Saskatchewan. We've always spoke for farmers and we always will be.

Mr. Speaker, the last couple of weeks of the election I could hardly stand the comments, as I drove along in the morning, that came on from the NDP and their ads and from their own people talking. The first thing they're going to do is go to Ottawa and get some money. We're going to go to Ottawa and get some money. That had to be the big thing out there. But I wonder who in the world did they think they were kidding. Every individual in this room knew that there was no way that they could go to Ottawa and get some more money.

Between the media and the NDP, they just done a tremendous job of hurting the premier about not being at the Rosetown meeting. But when you had the Rosetown meeting going on and the rally with the 4,000 people, our premier was dealing with the Prime Minister of this country and got \$800 million.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — Eight hundred million dollars, my friend. Now everybody knows that they're getting that, too, because the forms are out for the five bucks an acre. I don't know when we'll get it, but we're going to get it. It's coming. Maybe the feds in Ottawa have been slow on delivering, but they've always delivered when they promised they would—every time.

I've heard the figures and I forget exactly what it was. — several hundred thousand dollars for this trek to Ottawa. I don't know why they didn't ask somebody like me to go with them, because they might have had some better results.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — But I wouldn't have been saying to the Prime Minister of this country, come on; we've just gotten \$800 million, and we want some more. I would have been saying, we thank you for the \$800 million that Grant Devine got. I would have been saying something very, very serious. And I would have been serious. The \$800 million, get it to us as soon as you can. We'll let the ink dry on the cheque and then we'll come for some more.

And then I would have been saying, what about getting this NISA (net income stabilization account) out here faster? What about getting the stabilization here faster?

That's what they should have been done down there. And why didn't they, Mr. Speaker, why didn't the Minister of Agriculture, if he understood agriculture, go and talk to Farm Credit down there and see if they would put a moratorium on farms out here? Go talk to your Farm Credit people down there. Go to the source where the problem is. But he doesn't understand.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I make the prediction that we'll sit here for four years, and the member said three and a half years. I wonder if I heard somebody else say three years. They must be scared already, Mr. Speaker, that they're not going to be able to hang in there for four years.

Mr. Speaker, I'm also the critic for the Public Service Commission. The NDP promised, Mr. Speaker, to do away with patronage. They promised but this hasn't happened. What about this mass firing in Crop Insurance? What's going on, Mr. Speaker? I just couldn't believe what happened.

An Hon. Member: — I could.

Mr. Muirhead: — Oh yes, they could understand all right, Mr. Speaker. They understand because they only fired the Crop Insurance that had 44 days in service or less, because they didn't belong to a union. Once you get 45 days in, you kind of got them in your . . . you're friends, haven't you? There it is my friends because everybody that got the letter in my riding is 44 days or less. You didn't dare go to 45 days; you get somebody that worked 45 days because they would have been one of your union buds.

But I think behind all this that really . . . They're smarter than what they look like in this House. They know. They know, Mr. Speaker, they know that these bins have to be measured in Saskatchewan. I think the auditor of Saskatchewan, the Provincial Auditor, will see to that they do in time. It will have to be done. It must, must happen. They fired 271 auditors is what they did. I haven't found one farmer in my constituency, since you done this, that aren't angry that their bins didn't get measured — not one. And they're laughing so that means they don't understand.

All right, Mr. Speaker, we'll just tell you why they're laughing because they don't understand. If I was a farmer I would want a professional to come and measure my bins. I would want a professional. It's almost the same; what you've done is just have a letter from Ottawa and said you didn't file your return, send in what you think you owe us. That's just about what they did.

(2000)

Mr. Speaker, I was the minister of Crop Insurance for three years, and I know exactly what they're going to get into. They're going to be coming along with their audits, over with this next year or two, and they're going to tell the farmer that's got his cheque and he's spent all his money, and they're going to say, hey, you owe us . . . There's a mistake made; you owe us 3 or 4, \$5,000 back. And they're going to be kind of upset, aren't they?

When I had auditors when I was the minister, when

auditors went and done an audit, when the farmer watched the adjuster measure the bins, he had hurt feelings if he owed money back. But so help me, Mr. Speaker, how many hurt feelings are you going to have if you left that farmer there to try to guess what's in that pile of wheat in that quonset? If he'd moved the auger about four times and got a hump here and a hump there . . . These here non-farmers don't know what I'm talking about. A couple of members over here do. I challenge any farmer in here that he couldn't come within a hundred bushels of measuring his own bin — can't do it — and then give it back to Crop Insurance in metric. Come on, now.

We've got farmers out there that can't even climb their own bins because we have right now in Saskatchewan . . . We have in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, one-third of our farmers are over the age of 65. Now lots of them are 75. Just see how they can . . . I talked to a farmer the other day that said, I couldn't believe it when the adjuster found wheat in that bin; I was sure it was empty. I was sure it was empty.

But I really think that they're smarter than what they're letting on. They know that they have to do a blood test on these 271 adjusters. That's what she's all about. So I'm going to predict here that these adjusters are coming back in one by one by one. But I want to make this statement in front of God and man and everybody in this room: when I was the minister of Crop Insurance, there was only three adjusters that got fired — three in all of Crop Insurance and they wouldn't keep their mouth shut and kept campaigning while they were measuring bins. And there's the only three that we done. The rest were NDP, Liberals, Conservatives — you name it — and if they were doing their job we left them there and I challenge anybody to find any different.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — But will this government do that, Mr. Speaker? No way.

And then they never even thought about . . . They never even had any feelings for these 271 people that were depending on this money. Some of these people that had Crop Insurance jobs out there were desperate, put their names in to try to get a job. And here we have a government that said, we're going to create jobs, and the first month they fire 271. I just can't believe this. We've got government employees with years of experience are openly being intimidated by NDP supporters — now listen carefully — their own colleagues, Mr. Speaker. What kind of threats are being made? I'll tell you. That any government employee without an NDP membership will lose their job, is the most popular. This is happening right now. Midnight phone calls, Mr. Speaker, instructing hard-working individuals to pack their desk and ready themselves for dismissal is another popular threat. Now that's happened, Mr. Speaker, and I can prove it. Shocking stories, but they're true.

Exactly the same they did to my good old buddy from Pense, Jack Nichol. When the NDP was elected in 1971, they walked into his office — he worked with the Securities Commission — and said, give us your key,

Jack; you've got 15 minutes to get out. They haven't changed. They're the same as they were in '71; they're the same in 1991; and they're going to be the same.

There's a man in Prince Albert right now, just got fired this last week. Works for SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation).

An Hon. Member: — What's his name?

Mr. Muirhead: — Well I'd like to give you his name but I'm not going to do that to the man. You're going to hear it in the press pretty soon anyway. It's coming out through Prince Albert. You'll find out.

He's worked over 20 years for government but he just got bombed the other day because he took a leave of absence and was a campaign manager for a Conservative candidate. Now that's what you call pretty dirty politics when the man has worked and done a good job for 20 years. You'll know his name fast enough. You'll probably wish you never asked me or would ever find out.

Ask the members of the Saskatchewan Construction Association how they feel about this NDP government and its empty promises. Just ask them. Ask them, my friends, ask them. In particular ask them how they feel about the member from Saskatoon Fairview. Just ask them. That member, Mr. Speaker, is proposing — and I'm also the critic for Labour, so I'll be involved with him — is proposing that the NDP government maintain a union-contractors-only policy on provincial construction projects.

Now look at that. One member is clapping.

An Hon. Member: — Who was it?

Mr. Muirhead: — It's not hard to tell who it was. Mr. Speaker, the members across the way have conveniently forgotten that one of their election promises was to adopt an open tendering process for all government contracts. But they have to, Mr. Speaker, they've got to say their thank you's to their union people.

I sat here for about four Thursdays in a row when we had this terrible display out here about Fair Share Saskatchewan. There's about 15 to 20,000 civil servants in Regina and about 500 to 6 . . . 700 gathered out there. And my wife and I watched three or four Thursdays in a row, and it was the worst, despicable display I've ever seen. They had people out there, standing up there with placards on: don't take my mommy away; don't take my little child away from me. Well I never heard such carryings on in my life because there isn't one person in the province of Saskatchewan believes such trash as that.

I had four people in my riding that were getting moved to different towns in Saskatchewan that weren't able to go, that came to me. They weren't able to go over good reasons — good reasons. And they came to me and we were able to work out a good plan for them, their family to stay right here. I had over 20 that phoned me and wrote me and said, I'm not being moved, please give me a chance to take one of these people's places.

If it hadn't have been for the NDP and their dirty tactics, and the media going right along with them, we wouldn't have lost this Fair Share because you know that decentralization and Fair Share is exactly the same thing. You know it as well as I know it. Every one of you know it. There's no difference.

In the town of Davidson they were so excited when we announced Fair Share out there, by the time they . . . All they had to do was read some papers and listen to some propaganda from you guys: well I'm not too sure about this now. But now they're wondering what's happened. Hudson Bay's wondering what happened. Oh, we thought we could vote NDP and still get decentralization. They found out what they're getting, an . . . (inaudible) . . . who cancelled everything was good for rural Saskatchewan.

You know where your vote came from. You were elected before this election was ever called, and maybe two years prior, with every seat that you had tied up in Regina, Saskatoon, Moose Jaw, Prince Albert, and North Battleford. You knew you didn't even need a farmer. And you don't need a farmer, you think, to get re-elected. But, Mr. Speaker, I've got news for them. They've got to have some farmers out there, and if they get so angry in the next four years, you're going to be gone. And I mean gone.

We know, every one of us know in here, that we just barely got through the election of 1986. You beat us by half a per cent of the popular vote. And if you had have won, you guys would have been turfed four years later. Nobody could have survived. Nobody's surviving in government right from Texas right to Prince Albert in the grain belt. You all know that. And you won't survive over four years unless you keep up to the . . . keep all these promises you've made.

And I really hope for the people of . . . for the sake of the people in the province of Saskatchewan that you do keep your promises, being that we have to have you there again.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — The people of Saskatchewan come first. They are first. I'll stay in opposition for ever if you'll take care of the people in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead — There's no politics comes from the member of Arm River. I'll tell you, I'm for people and you know I am. And if you doubt me, then you should have followed me around for the last . . . 20 years this summer I started campaigning. I was the campaign manager for Doug Neil when he was elected in Moose Jaw, and I've had a lot of experience with people. I love people and I try to help people the best way I can. And that's why I got re-elected. And if you think it was easy getting re-elected with the Liberal member stopping every time she went through Davidson . . . and she had a right to do that, and she did a good job, and she made me work, I'll tell you that. Yes she stopped at the Husky, she stopped at the airport in

Davidson, she stopped at Dundurn, she stopped at Allan, she stopped at Outlook. I tell you I didn't have much problem with the NDP member. There was no problem keeping you people down.

The only way that I was able to come out of that election, I was able to say to a lot of people that were thinking about going Liberal, you know that they're really, really . . . Mr. Speaker, what I said to them, that they haven't got a plan at all. Their plan is . . . And I hate to say this to a new member in the House, but she's going to have to get used to hard knocks. That's the way this place is in here.

But their plan was to split the vote and elect you guys. And I know that I had enough of my friends that were getting Liberal patronage out of Ottawa that says, the first thing we got to do is we got to vote Liberal, defeat these guys, put them in and then we come in.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Speaker, it kind of backfired because the Liberal member sitting here by herself wondering why she can't get a motion passed in this House.

An Hon. Member: — Why don't you help her?

Mr. Muirhead: — Well maybe we will, but I would like to see . . . I challenge one of you people. Mr. Speaker, I challenge one of the NDP to sign one of her motions for her because then we'll know where the real tie is. We'll know where the real friends is.

Just back to this decentralization and Fair Share for a minute, Mr. Speaker. We'll just go back for a few minutes, just for a moment.

We heard all these stories out in front of the legislature between the media and the NDP and the unions talking about all these people have to move out of these cities and what a crime and what terrible butchers we are. But where are the NDP now? Are they worried about Crown Life and Farm Credit? No sir, you're not worried about their little grandpas and grandmas that are going to be left without the grandchildren down in Ottawa, are you? You don't want them out here. You don't care about them.

Crown Life and Farm Credit. That's okay now if they're coming in, but you didn't want them to leave this sacred Regina, this sacred Regina. When the Liberals were in power way back in the early days in this province, there was government agencies all over these little towns in Saskatchewan.

It was the Allan Blakeney regime that said let's bring this government all to Regina and make ourselves a bunch of bureaucratic backers, and we'll be here for ever. That's what the plan was. The member from Riversdale knows I'm right. He's sitting right there watching.

An Hon. Member: — He's only on page 10 of a 40-page speech.

Mr. Muirhead: — Oh gee, I've got a long ways to go here yet. I got some words here about Barb Byers and George

Rosenau. I got a few words here about Barb Byers and George Rosenau. Mr. Speaker, they're the ones that you really had to please. You know that they were really . . . I think that there's three people in this province of Saskatchewan that you could pretty near put as your main campaigners out there. It is Barb Byers and George Rosenau, and the man the president of Sask Wheat Pool. They're all in the same pot together, only he's a better man than the union people.

So I was very, very disappointed, very, very disappointed when farmers say to me in my constituency, which seat does Garf Stevenson have? Which seat does he have? He's the biggest spokesman after the election. And he was, Mr. Speaker. He was giving your announcements out there. We're going to do this, and we're going to do that. The province hasn't got any money. The province hasn't got any money. The feds have got to pay.

Well I'll tell you, when we were sitting over there in government and Garf Stevenson wouldn't stand up and say, hey, PC government's out of money . . . but boy, he's sure on your side now. I'm very disappointed in him, and I mean to say it publicly. And I'm a Wheat Pool member. I was on the board of directors of our local . . . on the committee for 13 years, and my family still hauls wheat to the Wheat Pool. And I'll tell you, the people in the town of Davidson or Craik are very disappointed, and I think the next election you'll find that he'll be gone.

And also, Mr. Speaker, I was thinking over the weekend, if I ever heard of a conflict in this here tribunal, this witch-hunt you guys are into — boy, I tell you — he's involved in almost everything, he's going to look into . . . somebody representing the Wheat Pool shouldn't even be near. I say, Mr. Speaker, to the member from Riversdale, he should look this one over very carefully. Look it over very carefully about this one individual. That's quite a conflict. And I'm serious about it. If you want to be really, really, you know, really be fair about this witch-hunt you're on, and see how much terrible things the Tories did over the last nine years, why don't you put the media on your . . . as a representative? Why don't you pick a representative over there? Why don't you put me on there? And I'll sit and watch; I'd like to be on it. I challenge the member from Riversdale to put me on there as a member just to be a watch-dog, because I want to see if all the truth comes out.

But oh, Mr. Speaker, I don't think we want to get into witch-hunts too much because the member from Arm River knows too much. We might talk about some era back before 1971. We might talk about how Allan Blakeney come from native Nova Scotia in 1950-51 and how he started a law practice right here in this city of Regina; and in 1952 belonged to the Securities Commission; in '53 become the chairman of the Securities Commission; in 1960 become an MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly), and in 1970 he become the leader of the NDP Party. In 1971 he become the premier and he also become a millionaire-and how did he do it? Because, Mr. Speaker, because they all know . . . I don't think they want me to continue, Mr. Speaker. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, they want me to continue, but I will. Because I'd like to get out old *Hansards* and show you the contracts that went to that old, old law firm

\$275,000, \$300,000. Service Printers — the member from Riversdale will leave if I start talking about Service Printers, I'll tell you.

The Speaker: — Order. I've now warned the member twice. I know the member knows better than that. Let's not get carried away and use practices that are simply unparliamentary in this Assembly. I must ask the member to refrain from doing so.

Mr. Muirhead: — I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry. I did know better than that.

Let's, Mr. Speaker, talk about the plebiscites in this last election. There was three very important ones. To me this abortion vote was very, very important.

I wonder what they're going to do about it, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if they're going to listen to the people of Saskatchewan. I wonder if they're just sitting there, Mr. Speaker, wondering if it's going to go away. I wonder if they think they can just have Morgentaler come in and build clinics and nobody's going to say anything about it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I say to the members opposite, don't try it. It isn't going to happen. There will never be a Morgentaler clinic in the province of Saskatchewan as long as I'm a member of this legislature. It will never happen. And I know I've got lots of support on the other side. The member from Nipawin, a born-again Christian, he'll stand up. The member from Moose jaw, a United Church minister, he'll stand up and be counted. And I know a lot of you will stand up and be counted. And you'll help me on this here fight to make sure that we'll be killing no babies with taxpayers' money in this province. There'll be no Morgentaler clinics. Never.

(2015)

The problem is that the fight that we'll have. I think Morgentaler himself knows that he's got an in here. He's got an in because he said if we can just get rid of the past government and get the NDP in, I'm away.

I just pray to God that it won't happen, Mr. Speaker. I just pray that God will have enough . . . will be able to speak to enough people, enough members, enough people in this province that the Morgentaler clinics will go away.

I'm also the critic for Health, Mr. Speaker. And I want to go back on something that happened when we were elected in 1982. We were able to go throughout this province very sincerely yet sadly saying that the NDP put a moratorium on nursing homes and hospitals in rural Saskatchewan. Not on the funding but on building more.

Their plan was to build nursing homes in the cities, build us the high-rises and bring them in. This really bothered me. And I'm so thankful that when we got elected in 1982 that I belonged to a government and to colleagues that said, let's build nursing homes in rural Saskatchewan so that people can keep their loved ones in their hometown.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — And I'm proud to say that I did my best

for my constituents of Arm River. Maybe that's why they seen that I got back here, because we had a nursing home built. We doubled the size in Davidson, doubled the size in Outlook; built new and opening an integrated facility in Craik. And we're opening one in Imperial now. We're building one that . . . there's one coming up in Hanley. We've caught up for eight years of NDP government moratoriums. We caught up in Arm River.

But I'm asking them and I'm asking the Minister of Health that she would continue on to finish the one that we started in Hanley. The plans are in place. It was written in blood that it was going to be, and I ask her not to let the good people of Hanley down.

Mr. Speaker, I have some information that hospital boards are being culled by NDP MLAs. Now I hope this information is right, but I'm going to give it as it was given to me. NDP MLAs are instructing . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm just giving this information, Mr. Speaker, in this legislature as it was given to me. NDP MLAs are instructing hospital boards to stop any and all movement toward future planning. Mr. Speaker, in the Kinistino riding the hospital board was instructed by the NDP MLA sitting on the government side of the House to stop his plans for Kinistino's integrated facility.

Now I say that, Mr. Speaker, in sincerity. And if the member from Kinistino can tell me that that's not true and prove it's not true and have the board tell me it's not true, then I will apologize in this House and take it back. But this was what's given to me. Mr. Speaker, I'm getting rid of the pages fairly fast here. I'm turning them over without getting into them because we kind of covered them as I cuffed off. We kind of covered a lot of these pages.

What they're using mostly for excuses, Mr. Speaker, why they're not going to . . . We heard it from the member from Canora today. We can't do this. We can't do that because we haven't got any money.

Well they'll find money. They found money for the trek to Ottawa. They'll find money for the things that they want, but we must have the member from Rosetown-Elrose stand up in this House — and I'm challenging him again — and say what he's going to do for farmers and what is going to happen because they must know.

I want to leave this with you, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture, that unless you act and act fast, that through the boards unless you stop this foreclosing of farmers and the final actions, by the end of February it will be too late for several hundreds and hundreds of farmers because that's about the end of taking land away for another year.

Mr. Speaker, if the member from Riversdale brings forth a Bill in this House that will keep farmers on the land on this province, I will second your motion. Mr. Speaker, I am talking . . . I am having a little debate here with . . . But, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely say that. I sincerely say that, Mr. Speaker.

If this government will bring forth Bills — and bring them

forth very quickly — that will do what the member from, I believe it was . . . I forget which one it was back here that said that we cannot lose one farmer, that one farmer's too many. Bring forth the Bill that's going to keep farmers on this land, and you bet I'll support it. And I'm sure the member from Estevan will too.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — Thank you. That's good. Now I can tell the credit union, the Royal Bank that the PCs are advocating us.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Speaker, too many people on the opposite side of the House and too many people in the province of Saskatchewan are always worried about the lenders and what's going to happen to the lenders and what's going to happen to the credit unions. Why don't they worry about the farmers?

Let's go back to 1935 when they had to bring in . . . when prime minister Mackenzie King brought in a Bill to absolutely save every farm in the three western provinces. But they had a good plan at the end, a real good plan — a Farm Debt Review Board or a Farm Debt Adjustment Board. That's what it was, Farm Debt Adjustment Board, 1939. That has to happen because if they really understood agriculture — the member from Riversdale and the Minister of Agriculture really understood it — that you can't hurt a bank for taking . . . put in foreclosure or whatever it is on land. You can't hurt them at all. Because the way it is now, if you take the land away, they put it up for sale; there's no money to buy it and it's just leased back to the neighbour or back to him anyway.

Now if they had listened to our plan, the lease to own, they'll all stay there. And if you can't get through the boards, I don't believe that absolutely like they've said, that you can't lose one farmer, and I'll stand up here for all farmers of Saskatchewan to say that I don't believe that absolutely every farmer should have a way to stay on that land. Because there is some farmers that just can't be farming. But I think we've got rid of most of them, the ones that abuse the system. They've got them. They've gone. They've gone.

When I was elected, there was 76,000 landowners in this province; now there's roughly 62,000, and the good farmers are left. You can't tell me that anybody can stand up here and says you've got to save absolutely every farmer because there's one or two in every community that's impossible. It's absolutely impossible. I'm sorry to say that, and I think that you'll . . . it just sounds like motherhood to say we've got to save them all. Well I'd like to be able to say that because I'm a kind-hearted man when it comes to a farmer. I'll challenge anybody. There's been nobody has sat with as many farmers and as many hours that I have.

And I want them saved, but boy if they don't want to save themselves, and they're just sitting there waiting . . . I know farmers right now in my riding, I've told them that what you're doing, you're not even trying to help yourself. I've got one I talked to the other day. You're not even trying to help yourself and I'm sorry — this man even voted for me — I'm sorry I can't help you because you're

just sitting waiting for the NDP to put on a moratorium so you can ride some more years out. Now that kind of stuff . . . let's face it, let's be responsible people.

An Hon. Member: — Are you saying you'd support the Bill?

Mr. Muirhead: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd sure support a Bill, but I know that the member from Riversdale isn't going to support a farmer who isn't going to help himself. He will not do it. You have to first help yourself. You've got to do like I did with my parents in the 1930s and '40s. We'd get up in the morning and went to work and done what we had to do ourselves to keep ourselves on that farm. And we didn't look out and say, Mr. Big Government what are you going to do to save me today? We did that job ourselves first. And that's what we have to do.

Every farmer that I go out and try to talk to and try to help, the first thing I try to do is to work through their stress problems and talk to them. And say, you've got to pull yourself together and work yourself. Do every possible thing to keep yourself on this farm, then look towards the people of Canada to help you stay there. That's my feeling on that, Mr. Speaker.

But I'm very pleased to hear tonight, Mr. Speaker, that there's perhaps a Bill coming forth. Because we heard it very clearly. Will you support a Bill? And I said, yes I will if it will save farmers. And I'm sure that we all will on this side of the House, if it will save farmers. But don't trick us.

Mr. Speaker, we know that the member from Riversdale, we know that the Premier of this province . . . we understand each other very well. We do. And you know that I am honourable enough to keep my word.

An Hon. Member: — And I know there's a millionaire around here. Boy it isn't me. It's you.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Speaker, I will say in answer to that — I guess he didn't ask me the question — but I've always liked the 13 years responding to some of his remarks. I guess I could say to that, if I was a millionaire, you better go talk to my two sons about that because they're having an awful battle staying on a farm.

They're having as big a battle as anybody else's sons here. And it don't take long to lose a few dollars. But I happen to love my two children, my two sons, more than any other constituency in Arm River. And my pocket book and anything I've got goes to them. And I'll tell you, it's getting pretty light.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP had a campaign out there that was hard to beat. As I said before . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Speaker, I'm so glad that they applause because I said they had a campaign that was hard to beat, but it's going to be hard to keep. It's going to be hard to keep. Because I say, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier, try to balance budget, lower taxes, create jobs, go to Ottawa, and get money and enrich the GRIP

program and enrich the NISA (net income stabilization account) program, and create jobs — you can't do it. You can't do it, but we'll sure help you on this side of the House to do it.

The member from Indian Head-Wolseley spoke here tonight, and he had nice remarks. But there's something I must say about him, about his actions on Rafferty dam. I never seen such carryings on in my life as the people in this province the way they carried on over stopping Rafferty dam. I heard a spokesman from the NDP or this government just in the last couple of weeks, saying that Rafferty dam is one of the worst things that has ever happened to Saskatchewan because what it's going to do is the water is all going to leave Saskatchewan and go down to the States. Well I'll tell you, that's got to be the stupidest statement, Mr. Speaker, I've ever heard because we know that that's a false statement; that the dam is to hold the water back into Saskatchewan and keep from flooding Minot. And so, we have people that listen to those kinds of statements. They listen to them.

The member from Indian Head-Wolseley, he was talking about gophers and deers and whatnot. He seemed to be against that the gopher would have to move over about 50 feet and dig another hole so the water could flow.

(2030)

Mr. Speaker, while we got the members in such a happy mood, maybe we should just talk a little bit about what socialism really is. I want to tell the story, Mr. Speaker. I want to tell the story the time I cast my first vote, when I voted wrong when someone straightened me out about socialism. It was about 1950.

It was about 1950. Tommy Douglas was just in his swing. And I was casting my first vote. And my mother had gone to school with Tommy Douglas, and she says, Gerald you're going to vote today but don't vote for Tommy; He's a pretty good guy but he doesn't believe in what we believe in. He believes in socialism, which is a creeping paralysis. It's a communism. So I get on my horse, Mr. Speaker, to go and vote, and on the way to town I thought, why should my mother tell me how to vote. So I voted for the CCF (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation).

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — But, Mr. Speaker, the next morning wasn't such a happy morning for me. The next morning was a morning that I have never forgotten, and that's 41 years ago. And I never will forget and I challenge all the members here not to forget this.

I was milking cows and delivering milk around town and I went in to the mayor of the town of Craik — Frank Parks his name was — and handed him a quart of milk. And he knew my parents would be Conservative or Liberal and he said, yesterday was another sad day for Saskatchewan; Tommy won again. I said, I don't think it's so bad. I said, I won my vote.

And he said, sit down there, boy. He said, sit down and I'm going to tell you a story and it's about Labour England. And they needed a Labour government after the war

because England was knocked down, battered into the ocean, and what they needed was a Labour government, for the rich to help the poor and the poor to help the rich and the big corporation to help the little corporation and the little one to help the big and so on. It's going to be great. It's exactly what England needs.

But I tell you, Mr. Speaker, he drove his hand into my shoulder and I have never forgotten. He says, now I promise you in 25 years that England will be broke because socialism will not work without a hard-working free enterpriser to pay the bill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — And none of you forget that because that's what socialism's all about and that's what you people all believe in. We've just got to share and share alike till the province and the country has nothing.

We had 17 years of Trudeau, who couldn't have been any more socialist than you people are. And we had from 1944 to 1982, we had the NDP or the CCF, less the seven years with Thatcher, and so help me that's what's happened to Saskatchewan. You can't even get people to invest in Saskatchewan until the PC's are going to be here for ever. They won't do it because they don't trust you people.

Why do you get elected? Why can we elect seats on the west side of the province and we can't elect them on the east? Because the west side is closer to Alberta. They know how to vote over there. They know how to invest their money. They will invest it. That's why we've got the member from Kindersley here, Morse, and Maple Creek. That's why they're here.

But you can't get them on the east side because it's too close to what's been traditionally NDP Manitoba — it's been traditionally through the years. And so has Saskatchewan. They won't invest in the government. The money's in the bank account in Saskatchewan and in Manitoba. But in Alberta, they invest.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I predict, I predict that this NDP government by March of 1992 will be down to 40 per cent on the polls, and by October a year from now down to their lowest, 30 to 35. They've never been lower than that because there's not a government that can stay popular right from Texas to Prince Albert, in the grain belt of Saskatchewan. It just isn't that way. I've talked to custom combiners in my area, and there's a lot of them that said — you've talked to farmers in Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas — oh, if we could just get rid of that Republican governor things would be all right. If we could just, in the next state, get rid of that Democratic governor, we'd be all right. Then to get to Saskatchewan, if we could just get rid of — the name that I can't mention here — and Mulroney, we would be all right.

But, Mr. Speaker, that isn't the way it works. No government in North America is too popular today because they've got a tough job. But so in closing, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely want to say to the Premier of this province that I wish him God's blessing and Godspeed to help the people of province of Saskatchewan. Thank you

very much ladies and gentlemen.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whitmore: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate you upon your election as Speaker. I know your personal sense of fairness will bring honour to the position.

Mr. Speaker, fellow members of the legislature, I am proud to reply to the throne speech on behalf of the people of Biggar. And I wish to acknowledge the member from Saskatoon Broadway who was born and raised in the Biggar constituency . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whitmore: — . . . where her parents and family still reside and farm. I also wish to recognize the member from Moose jaw Wakamow who served as United Church minister in the Biggar constituency at the community of Perdue and where his spouse is from and his in-laws still reside.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whitmore: — But the proudest thing that I wish to say this evening, Mr. Speaker, is that the nine and a half years of drought are over.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whitmore: — Mr. Speaker, Biggar has now returned to the New Democratic Party and to serve the government side.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whitmore: — Biggar has a long tradition in the CCF and NDP government since 1944. Woodrow S. Lloyd, under the Douglas government, represented Biggar from 1944 to 1971 in many cabinet positions. First as Education minister, he brought Saskatchewan education from the little red schoolhouse to the most respected education system in North America.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whitmore: — Then to premier, Mr. Speaker, where he guided the most significant health care program in Canada — medicare.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whitmore: — And against personal threats and intense political pressure he stood firm to achieve success for the Saskatchewan people, and ladies and gentlemen, later for the people of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whitmore: — From 1971 to 1982, Elwood Cowley most ably represented Biggar under the NDP banner.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whitmore: — Under the Allan Blakeney government, Elwood played a key role in Saskatchewan people taking an active interest in resource management. The benefits of resource revenue provide Saskatchewan with the ability to do more for its people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whitmore: — It is a privilege to follow the members with distinguished service to the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. But as I said earlier, that the nine and a half years of drought under Tory government has seen a health care system deteriorate; hospitals built but without proper staffing; waiting lists that increased to a dangerous level. I say shame; I say shame.

The resources: pulp and paper sold off; the Weyerhaeuser give-away where northern Saskatchewan's given to private interest and taken away from proper resource management for the Crown; a potash industry sold off at fire sale prices. And the last sale that took place, individuals in Saskatchewan, ordinary individuals, couldn't participate in that sale — in an oil industry holiday for nine and a half years that cost this province \$2 billion. Add that to a deficit, Mr. Speaker.

Now the question of agriculture. I certainly appreciate following the member from Arm River this evening. The question of the land being taken over by financial institutions, that's a proud record—a proud record to talk about 1.5 million acres that are now owned by financial institutions. I think if you check in what's going on these days, you will find it much-higher than what it is.

GRIP, the kite that they tied to, GRIP. We as a party listened to the farmers in terms of what changes are required in terms of GRIP. A meeting at Rosetown where 4,000 farmers were asked the question by a speaker there: what do you think of GRIP? Do you like it or not like it? Four thousand stood up and said no, we do not like the way it works. Ten thousand stood up in Regina and said the same thing.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whitmore: — We did not act as a public relations agency for the federal government when it came to GRIP. Manitoba and Alberta had difficulty with the program too. Sounds like another deal that was signed on the back of a cigarette paper.

The question of, you know, what's been done? The question was asked by the member opposite: look what we've done for farmers. And he talked about the question of right of first refusal, and it was announced during the election. Where were they in the past nine and a half years? Why did they wait until October to make that announcement?

On October 21, 1991 the people entrusted us to rebuild, to rebuild on a philosophy of strength that guided Douglas, Lloyd, and Blakeney; a philosophy of common sense, co-operation, and community. Her Honour spoke of that in the speech, a new beginning based on these three elements. And we don't have to run outside the province to find such elements. They're in our

communities. They're in our history as a people who built the province out of adversity. And I want to speak today about two communities in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, that actively pursue that philosophy, Harris and Perdue.

Harris is a community of 250, suffering from the economic malaise of declining population, a weakened farm community, and persons travelling farther for service. Harris has a strong community spirit, from the local Lions club that works extremely hard to provide recreational and cultural services, to the local co-op that serves Harris and Perdue, which thrives because of a commitment to community-based business approach.

That framework is the means that these people use to turn back problems. They formed a committee by which they formed ideas. They took a common sense approach, Mr. Speaker, to promote the town, by attracting people either by advertising housing available or small businesses. By placing ads in the newspaper six new families have moved in; six new families that provide economic activity for local business; six new families that provide economic activity for . . . to help the school; six families that use recreational facilities; and more inquiries are being received.

The town council is also talking about building a facility to house a doctor's office for one-day visits, and attracting a hair salon, possibly a small business. Each provides a service that is needed in that community. No, these are not big steps. No, they are not megaprojects. They are concise steps to provide a solid future. They are steps that are not high cost, but have high returns. And these are steps, Mr. Speaker, that are based on common sense, co-operation, and community spirit.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whitmore: — The community of Perdue had a desire to build a new town hall to serve as a recreational facility. Once they determined it was a go, the community canvassed the local community and raised \$113,000 out of the community. Then construction began, entirely on a volunteer basis. For two years during the winters many people gave time and resources for construction, from local farmers as electricians, to those who prepared meals for crews. And if you ever have the opportunity to attend that hall — to anyone in this room — look at the floor. That floor is 5,000 square feet of hardwood. Individuals literally scoured the province in search of used wood from old town halls to vacant farmyards.

(2045)

That was only half the task. Next was the sanding. For one full winter individuals worked in their local shops sanding each piece by hand. Were these people foolish? No. They saw a task through the effort that could provide service but with an attitude at keeping an eye on dollars spent.

A bowling alley was placed in the complex, which in four years paid for itself, and now it pays the utility bill for the rest. A small library was incorporated into the doctor's office. And the continued fund raising has paid for the facility.

Now the question becomes: how does this relate to the government of Saskatchewan? It is the sense of community and co-operation that elected me, and it is that message the Premier carries wherever he goes — be it to Ottawa with farmers. It is that element, the new beginning, common sense to spending, and fair co-operation. To work with all elements of society is to work our way out of this malaise, and most importantly, community spirit—a spirit that lives. It is based on hope, but is based on a desire to work together, based on a tradition that this government stands for. Community spirits will make Saskatchewan great.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whitmore: — Mr. Speaker, when I speak of Saskatchewan's spirit of co-operation, I think of the province's greatest leader, Tommy Douglas. And I want to end my remarks today with his words. I believe they're as true today as they were 30 years ago, and he said:

We cannot individually solve all the world's ills, but we can create the kind of social climate in which men will choose good rather than human destruction. Even one can work in human society so that steadily and effectively we can build a co-operative commonwealth in a nation and all the forces of reaction shall not prevail against it.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Johnson: — Mr. Speaker, I thank you for recognizing me. And first of all, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to congratulate you on your successful election as Speaker of the House. And what a race it was. From the blocks to the finish line, your opposition was not to be seen. And I think that bodes well because what it means is that we have an individual that everyone respects in the Chair.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Johnson: — I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that you will give this Assembly just the right amount of leeway to keep it interesting for the member from Saskatoon Greystone. Because in the paper she seems to think that sitting in the Assembly and listening to what people have to say is a waste of time and that she feels ashamed.

Mr. Speaker, I'm somewhat surprised at her outlook on that, and I'd like to just quote to you what was reported in the Saskatoon paper:

I've never seen such built-in waste of time in my life as when one sits in the legislature . . . I mean, I can't believe it. The entire focus seems to be on wasting time. My husband asked me this week after the first or second day, "Well, how are you feeling?" I said, "I feel ashamed."

And, Mr. Speaker, I think the member feels ashamed for someone who has claimed to be the moral opposition, to sit in this Assembly and then to criticize other members from other constituencies for speaking about the

concerns of their constituency, and for putting forth what they expect to see in the next four years. Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that as a member she used her fair share of time to do exactly the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to thank the people of the Turtleford constituency for the confidence that they have shown in me, and by electing me to represent them in the Legislature. I am honoured again to represent the people of the Turtleford constituency as their member and I assure them that I intend to represent all the people to the best of my ability.

It has been many months since anyone has stood in this House to represent the people of the Turtleford constituency. In fact, at the time of the election, the Turtleford constituency had been without a representative for almost a year and a half, because the previous member for the Turtleford constituency, after assessing the political climate in the province of Saskatchewan, jumped from the Tory ship for a job in eastern Canada. And I say, after he had assessed the political climate, because according to an article in the *Star-Phoenix*, the former MLA for Turtleford had won a bottle of Scotch for predicting the outcome of the election in Saskatchewan. He knew where it was at.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservative premier had denied a voice to the people of the Turtleford constituency for 17 months. The constituency was abandoned by the Tory administration as were three other constituencies — Kindersley, Indian Head-Wolseley, Souris-Cannington — that they'd also been abandoned and that the premier was not calling a single by-election although there was four seats in which to do it.

Mr. Speaker, not only is the representation in this Assembly lost when there is not an MLA, but access is lost for the whole structure of government. There is no one to advocate the interests of the constituency or the residents. As one constituent confided in me, he had never had the opportunity to ask an MLA to do anything for him and he thought he probably never would. But it had bothered him after a while when he realized that there was no possibility for him to ask anyone when there was no representative.

Mr. Speaker, in the throne speech, the New Democratic government has made a commitment to the people of Saskatchewan that legislation will be introduced to ensure that by-elections are held within six months of a vacancy. Mr. Speaker, that I believe, will be good legislation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Johnson: — The people of the Turtleford constituency want a government that's accessible, they want a government that's accountable, and they want a government that does not neglect or abandon them when it seems of interest to the government to do so. On October 21 that is the message that the people of the Turtleford constituency delivered. And, Mr. Speaker, as I've said before, I'll be supporting the legislation for a reasonable time period for by-elections to be held.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk briefly about the Turtleford constituency. It is a large rural constituency, stretching from Big River and Mont Nebo on the east side to Brightsand and Edam on the west. The Turtleford constituency is populated by people of many ethnic origins, the largest group being the Cree.

We have some oil production on the west side. The forest industry is clear across the north side, and the area around Big River is split between forest industry, trucking, farming, and tourism. By and large, agriculture is the backbone of my constituency and every community is affected by the farm economy. We are on the northern fringe of farmable land. Often we feel isolated from the rest of the province and most farm programs respond to the prairie conditions rather than the park belt.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to ensure that the unique requirements of my constituency are considered in future programs.

The Auditor General wrote in his annual report that was released on December 3, 1991: we were unable to find a single definitive statement of objectives for any of the safety net programs. I have spoken with farmers throughout the Turtleford constituency, first as a farmer and then as a candidate seeking the NDP nomination, and then as the NDP candidate for the election, and during this last month as a member of the legislature. And, Mr. Speaker, the remarks made by the Auditor General came as no surprise to the farmers in my constituency. Farmers of Saskatchewan have spent half the last decade trying to understand the federal programs. Frankly, the federal programs cannot be defended beyond the money they deliver which was less than adequate.

The federal programs have done nothing positive for farmers. The programs did not provide a direction to the agricultural community because there were no definitive objectives built into them. The programs failed to address any environmental concerns, and the programs not only divided the urban and rural community but they also divided the rural community as well.

The agricultural community is being destroyed by an ever-increasing pressure, Mr. Speaker, brought about by the federal Conservatives, and, until the election, with the blessing of the Tory Government of Saskatchewan. They believed in, and insisted on having, low prices for produce produced by farmers. Basically, it was a cheap farm gate policy for agricultural products and their green paper indicated that all through it.

And I'd like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that between 1970 and 1986 the price of consumer goods tripled, but during that same period the price the farmer received for his product only doubled. And the 1970 price for farm produce was a low year. The result, Mr. Speaker, is that farmers were placed into a very severe cost-price squeeze.

And I'd like to take some more figures in that particular direction. In 1949 the farmers received 60 cents out every dollar the consumer spent on food. By 1968 the farmer was only receiving 30 cents out of every dollar the consumer was spending on food. While the farmers'

share of the consumer dollar had dropped, the food processing giants had experienced a dramatic increase in profits. And an indication of that, Mr. Speaker, is that the farmers' average annual rate of return on equity for the period 1981-1987 was a negative seven and a half per cent, but the food manufacturers' rate of return on equity for that period was 14 per cent and the corporate food retailers' rate was 17 per cent.

If the large corporate structures are allowed to take over complete control of the food industry from production right through processing and to retailing, the consumer, I say, will see a dramatic increase in the cost of their food as the corporate sector functions on a bottom line.

Agriculture as we know it today is not only critically important to the economy of the Turtleford constituency, but I say to the economy of all of Saskatchewan.

The present international low grain prices were generated by government intervention, and I believe therefore that a solution should be programs that deal with the price of farm products. The farmer must be adequately paid for their production of food, and I say not more loan programs that only increase the farm debt and not programs that stabilize the price below the cost of production. And until such time as farmers are paid a price that covers their cost of production plus something to live on, and until such time as there is a predicted stability in the price, we will continue to have a crisis in the farm community and a problem in the province of Saskatchewan.

I would like to make some comments, Mr. Speaker, if I may, in regards to a large group, as I indicated, in my constituency. I've had the privilege of meeting with many of the Indian and Metis people in the Turtleford constituency, of listening to their concerns and talking to them. And I'm committed to working with these people to resolve the problems that they face today in building for a better future. I believe that we must respect the spirit and the intent of the treaties and respect the desire of the Indian people to control their own destiny.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(2100)

Mr. Johnson: — Mr. Speaker, a poet, F.R. Scott, wrote these words and I think they indicate very well why we must move towards respecting the desire of the Indian people. And it goes this way:

Till power is brought to pooling,
And outcasts share in ruling
There will not be an ending
Nor any peace for spending.

Mr. Speaker, I think that quote sums up the need to address the issues of importance to the Indian and Metis people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Johnson: — As you know, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan enjoyed a dental care plan that was

second to none when it was initiated by the NDP government in 1974 until it met an untimely and uncalled for death at the hands of the previous administration in 1987. The Saskatchewan dental plan was a school-based program and provided for free access to dental care for all children between the ages of 5 and 17. This care was provided by qualified dental technicians working from well-equipped dental clinics located in the schools across the province.

The Saskatchewan dental plan was a model which attracted international attention and envy because of its design, its delivery, and the quality of care. Indeed, an independent evaluation of the Saskatchewan dental plan conducted by three highly qualified and respected experts in 1977 gave the plan top marks, finding that the quality of work being performed by the Saskatchewan dental nurses was equal to or better than that being provided by dentists elsewhere.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this plan provided top quality service that was readily available and accessible to residents across the province. It did so very cost efficiently, as well. Further, because its focus was on preventive dentistry, the plan would have resulted in significant, ongoing saving to the people of Saskatchewan over a time.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Saskatchewan dental plan, as initiated by the NDP government and before it was destroyed by the Conservatives, was a unique and cost-efficient, non-traditional way of delivering quality dental health care uniformly throughout the province. Mr. Speaker, I believe that future health care will have to be provided in a similar manner through initiatives for Saskatchewan residents, delivered in an innovative manner in the same way as this program of dental care.

Mr. Speaker, before I spoke about the dental care program I spoke about agriculture, and how I assessed the situation. The past decade of low prices and *ad hoc* programs cannot continue, or rural communities as we know them will totally be destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke about the problems faced by the Indian and Metis community. These issues must be addressed in the spirit of co-operation, and solved.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken about the Tory indifference to the democratic process and their lack of sensibility towards the common man. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a New Democratic government will address these issues in the traditional Saskatchewan way, working with the people, for the people, towards a better future.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Johnson: — Mr. Speaker, it is for those reasons that I will be supporting the government, and I will be supporting the motion moved by the member from Qu'Appelle and Lumsden, and seconded by the member from Last Mountain-Touchwood. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to acknowledge the election of you to the Chair. I look very much forward to the first time we have an opportunity for a contest in this, the twenty-second legislature of the province of Saskatchewan, a contest of which I'm sure to lose, but nevertheless look forward to it in any event, Mr. Speaker.

I would also like to congratulate the returning members to this Legislative Assembly, those people who have been colleagues over the past five years. And I would like to welcome all the new members. It will a great experience working in the Legislative Assembly. No matter how many books you've read or how many times you've watched from the galleries or no matter how much you've talked about being a member of the Legislative Assembly, you never quite receive the full impact of that kind of an existence until you're actually in that role. So I welcome you here to the Legislative Assembly; it will be a great experience for you.

I would like also, Mr. Speaker, to thank those members who were defeated in the last general election, those members who were very dedicated and worked hard regardless of their political stripe. I say that the main motive for any member who served in this Assembly is to forward democracy and to forward good programs and all the good things for the people in the province of Saskatchewan. I especially will miss my colleague, Peter Prebble, who I think worked as hard as member of the Legislative Assembly that I've ever known, and certainly good work and hard work and dedication does not reflect whether or not you get returned to this Assembly, and I'll miss Peter, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — I'd also like to acknowledge the pages and welcome them to this Assembly. It'll be a great experience for pages as well as new members, and I hope that you share in some of the frustrations and some of the glories of this great institution that we all serve in and have a great deal of respect for.

I would like to also commend the legislative staff for the good work that they have done, and I anticipate you will do in the coming months and coming years to serve this Assembly so greatly.

I also want to . . . before I go on to the main body of my speech, Mr. Speaker, is to pay special tribute to what I refer to as the group of seven, who came back here after the massive defeat of the last NDP government. There were seven members. I think two of whom are in this Assembly tonight, and I want to pay tribute to you for the very good job you did in helping return New Democrats to government in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — I remember watching during that period of time from the gallery and as I recall it the seven members from the New Democrats that were elected sat in the middle of that side of the House and Conservatives completely surrounded them within the Legislative Assembly. And sometimes the shouting and the yelling was so loud, Mr. Speaker, that our members — those

seven members who were there — could hardly hear their own words as they spoke before this Assembly. And I'm very happy to see that they've grown and matured in terms of their respect for this institution and the value that all of us have to put on the public record as representing our constituents and the desires and wishes of ourselves, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — And in passing out thanks, last but certainly not least I want to thank the residents of The Battlefords constituency for showing confidence in me. And I would like to thank the literally hundreds of people who worked to help return myself here as a member of this Legislative Assembly, and I want to commend them and thank them for the work that they've done. And I look forward to serving them with distinction and honour in a government that's going to change the direction of the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — I paid particular notice to some of the speeches that have happened in this Assembly so far. I'm certainly proud of our new members and the quality of the speeches that they have put forward, as the first time you speak in the Legislative Assembly it's always a very intimidating and a very nervous experience for at least most people. And if some members who have spoken here for the first time did not feel nervous and tense about giving their presentation in this Assembly, I think you should step forward and offer training programs for all of the new members that may come into this Assembly in the future.

Some of the Conservative speeches I found quite interesting. You'd think that they were still in government. I paid particular notice to the member from Souris-Cannington, and you'd really think that they'd won the election the way he spoke in his maiden speech before this Assembly. What he doesn't realize, I'm sure, is that if there'd been a shift in the last provincial election of 3,164 votes, there wouldn't have been one single Conservative member re-elected in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Not one single member. It would have worked that there would have been . . . With that shift in vote there would have been two people to make an official party in this Legislative Assembly, and there would have been 64 members of the New Democratic Party in this Assembly. And I know that our workers in each and every constituency throughout the province were striving for that, for the very hard work they did in the past election campaign.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — I noticed the member from Estevan speaking today. My goodness, the scary thing about that speech is I think he actually believes what he was saying. Actually, the best speech that's come from the Conservative side so far has been the member from Arm

River this evening. I thought he gave a very good presentation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — I think much of what he said was inaccurate, but nevertheless the best presentation from the opposition in this Assembly so far.

I think that the Conservative members should look at why they were defeated so soundly at the hands of the Saskatchewan voters in the last election. One was broken promises, and I think that was likely number one. There isn't a single campaign promise that they made, like wiping out the provincial sales tax, like decreasing income tax in the province — all those promises were broken. The free telephone that was promised to my grandmother in 1982 — she passed away and still didn't get her free telephone. Can you imagine that? A legacy of broken promises by the Conservative Party in Saskatchewan, that's the number one reason why you were defeated in this Assembly.

I think the other thing is that you had some wrong priorities: \$369 million you have at risk to Cargill, you put at risk to Cargill while our farmers are going broke in the province of Saskatchewan; \$236 million to Weyerhaeuser while rural communities are dying in the province of Saskatchewan; \$5.5 million to Gigatext while children go hungry in the province. Saskatchewan has either the highest or second-highest rate of poverty in all of Canada, and that lies squarely on the shoulders of the member from Estevan and the government that he led destruction through the province of Saskatchewan. Twenty million dollars to Promavia to fly high, while De Havilland, a long-established company, is going broke in eastern Canada. Wrong priorities, members from the Conservative Party.

You talk about the NDP not having a program. I want to tell you that the first plank in the NDP program over this term of government is the commitment from every single member on this side of the House to make sure there's never again a Conservative government in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — I want to now turn to the speech and the time of the member from Saskatoon Greystone. I look at the article that's already been mentioned once this evening. And I quote, Mr. Speaker: Haverstock says time wasted. A special from the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix*.

What is the purpose of this institution, Mr. Speaker? Why are we here? Number one, we are here to preserve democracy, the main function of this institution. Number two, to pass, and amend, and delete laws. We're lawmakers for the province of Saskatchewan. We make law. That's how Bills come in, that's how statutes come about, and it becomes the law of the province of Saskatchewan. What's the third thing we do? We approve the expenditure of public funds.

I ask the member from Saskatoon Greystone, which one of those are a waste of time? Is it democracy that's a waste

of time? Is it passing and amending laws that are a waste of time? Is it approving the expenditures of the public purse that's a waste of time? I ask the member from Saskatoon Greystone what it is that wastes the time.

She holds herself up, Mr. Speaker, not to be a politician — not to be a politician as her candidates did around the province. But she participates in the political process. She thinks politician is a bad name. One of our jobs as New Democrats — and I plead with all our members to follow this course — is to restore the integrity in politician so it's not a bad word, so it doesn't have negative feelings about it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Seven years of Brian Mulroney in Ottawa and almost 10 years of Grant . . . the member from — sorry, Mr. Speaker — the member from Estevan. In their governments they have done more to destroy the integrity of this institution and the respect for politicians of anything else that has happened in the history of the British parliamentary system.

And we have the member from Saskatoon Greystone that comes here to participate in this institution and she perpetuates that myth, rather than trying to set the example that we are people who want to do a good job for our constituents and for the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(2115)

Mr. Anguish: — I would say that the member . . . Oh do I hear heckling from this member in the House? Do I hear heckling? Are we all politicians now, Mr. Speaker? I think so, I think so.

I would want to congratulate the member from Saskatoon Greystone for setting a record already. And I don't know whether you are even aware of having set a record by taking your seat in this Assembly. But you have set a record because your family member, hon. member, is the only family in the history of the province of Saskatchewan to represent three different political parties in this institution with two different people.

Your brother sat in this Assembly, hon. member. He came here as a Conservative. He represented the constituency of Swift Current. And then he followed his leader at that time, Mr. Dick Collver, to form another party called the Unionest Party in the province of Saskatchewan. And do you know what? The Unionest Party didn't have official party status in the legislature, just like the member from Saskatoon Greystone. And they wanted to have official party status.

And I want to deal with this whole thing about the member from Saskatoon Greystone who says in this article she wants extra money. What she's doing is she's saying she represents 23 per cent of the people in the province of Saskatchewan, so she wants something extra for that. She wants some kind of special status for that. Well what she's advocating is proportional

representation. And I'll talk about proportional representation and we'll see whether the member from Saskatoon Greystone agrees with the system of proportional representation.

But I want to go back through history a little bit, about Dennis Ham and Dick Collver. The Legislative Assembly recognized them as independent members up until April 25 of 1980. From April 25 to June 17 of 1980 they were recognized as members of a third party, and then finally on June 18 of 1980 they were recognized as members of a caucus. Now how did that come about?

Dick Collver at that time launched a massive filibuster in this House — a political technique that some members sometimes use to get a point across. And Mr. Collver at that time, in terms of calendar days, Mr. Speaker, filibustered for 11 days in this legislature; 11 days Dick Collver filibustered in this legislature, and finally the government that wanted to work in harmony and co-operation, and putting forth caring and sharing for what people represented, relented and allowed this member and the friend that joined him — the member from Swift Current at that time — and they finally did attain being recognized as a caucus in this Assembly.

But it was done with hard work — not throwing up your hands and saying, we represent such and such a percentage of the population of Saskatchewan, so you owe it to us to give us more money. No, they didn't say that. They presented their case, Mr. Speaker, in this Assembly. Waste of time I would think, 11 days doing that, but they made a point and they changed history. They changed history.

Well let's look at places that have proportional representation. Italy has proportional representation. How many elections do you think Italy has had since the Second World War, since 1945? Well as of June 11 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . What was that, 23? You're wrong. As of June 11, 1991, and I read from this press release: Promoters billed it as the first step in changing a political system that has come under widespread criticism in recent years because of parliamentary log-jams, consistent infighting, and revolving-door governments. Italy is currently in its 50th post-war government.

Fifty governments since 1945. Is this the proportional representation that the member from Saskatoon Greystone is advocating? Because in proportional representation anyone who has a cause can strike up a political party.

In Italy there are about 30 political parties that seek office. Eleven of them get enough support to form seats in that country's Assembly — 11 different parties. This Assembly has a hard time sometimes dealing with two political parties. I saw back in the past in the '70s where there were three political parties. Can you imagine this institution having 11 different political parties to deal with? I think not. One person can make a difference but one person cannot change the system. That's why we have a party system in the British parliamentary system.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — If you're going to carry the flag and win the war by yourself, you should all run as independents. Don't run as a Liberal. Don't run as a New Democrat. Don't run as a Conservative. Run as independents and you will throw the entire system into chaos, and it will be even worse than the criticism that the member from Saskatoon Greystone lays on it now.

And there are strange things that happen in the proportional representation system as well. Another place where they have proportional representation in the world is Australia.

They have in Australia something called the Australian Capital Territory — the ACT. And I was talking to a friend of mine who'd been in Canberra a while ago, and a few years ago, under the Hon. Bob Hawke's government. Bob Hawke wanted to have a referendum on self-government for this Australian Capital Territory.

Now the Australian Capital Territory is run completely by bureaucrats. Politicians have very little to do with it. The Australian Capital Territory is sort of a state within a state. But Robert Hawke, a good labour prime minister of that country, wanted to have a referendum on self-government so that people could have democratic representation in the Australian Capital Territory.

Do you know what happened when the referendum came? Seventy-five per cent of the people who voted on the referendum voted against self-government. They didn't want politicians representing them, what they wanted was they wanted the bureaucrats running the Australian Capital Territory. So what does Hawke do? He says, well we're going to have elections in the Australian Capital Territory anyway. And so he went ahead and he said, we're calling an election here. Well, within days 13 political parties had sprung up — 13 different political parties — and there were 17 different ridings or wards or whatever you want to call them, constituencies, within the Australian Capital Territory.

There were all kinds of parties. Some of them were called the party against self-government, the no self-government party, the no party party, and there was even one called the party party party party.

Well alas, a government was formed after the election, and one party couldn't form the government. And so they had to search out another party to join with them to form a government. Well, lo and behold, there weren't enough members in two parties to form a majority government so they had to get a third party in to get a majority government that could function in the Australian Capital Territory. So the final third party happened to be one of the abolitionist parties that were against self-government — actually were there to form the government — and they put a caveat on their participation that they had to have at least one cabinet post. So how quickly people sometimes change when they get into a situation where they don't want to participate, but if I get what I want I will participate.

And I'm not very complimentary to the member from Saskatoon Greystone for the way she conducts herself in the political forum in the province of Saskatchewan.

Notice there wasn't much applause for that member. I may not have the total support of my colleagues, but I wanted to pass on my comments on the way I feel that you conduct yourself above and beyond this institution.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — So, in conclusion of that part of my address here this evening, Mr. Speaker, I would have to say that I for one do not support extra funding and special status for any independent member that comes into this Assembly. We're all equals. Maybe some are more equal when they happen to form the government, but we are basically equals in the eyes of this institution. And that's why Mr. Speaker is there, to make sure that we're all equal in the eyes of this institution and no one has special status over another member. That's the basis of our system.

I want to now turn in the few minutes that I have left . . . I've likely passed several good places to stop — some would agree with that more than others — but I want to talk about the vision for the future that I, and I believe all of my colleagues have, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that we must change the system.

I think that if the system was ever more evidently flawed, it's been during this past decade that the Conservative Party has been in office in the province of Saskatchewan. All the devastating things that they have been able to do and inflict upon the people, the farmers, the workers, the small-business people, the institutions of this province, it certainly has pointed out that we have a flawed system. And I for one don't believe that New Democrats, or any other party, can come into government and be better administrators and make a flawed system that was a harmful system a good system again.

So I think that the first thing you'll find New Democrats doing is looking at ways to alter the system so there's more participatory democracy in the way we conduct, and in the way that we govern, ourselves. I think that we have to look at the future in terms of finding industries that are currently here, making sure they develop sustainability.

The big criticism that I've always had in terms of agriculture and the Tory Party in the province of Saskatchewan is that they don't want to develop sustainability in agriculture. They want to keep feeding out more cash at election time, more cash from Ottawa, more cash from Saskatchewan, more cash from somewhere, but they never pay attention to developing sustainability in the most important industry we have. And if they've done anything, they've tried to turn farmers into people who have to farm government programs and not farm the land. And I don't know of one farmer in the province of Saskatchewan that wants to farm government programs; they want to farm the land and make sure their crops grow and they feed the world.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — In new industry, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we have to look at sustainable development. If we

have industry coming to Saskatchewan, if it cannot sustain itself, if it can't be friendly to the environment, we shouldn't have it. It shouldn't exist in our province.

What else is our view of the future? We want fairness in the taxation system, Mr. Speaker. We will not allow another decade of darkness to fall on Saskatchewan farmers, Mr. Speaker. We will not allow small business to be looked at as the cash cow because they're struggling too, Mr. Speaker. And we will not in Saskatchewan allow the budget to be balanced on the backs of working people in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Taxation and the revenue to run this province, before we even get there, will be done by sound administration and changes, structural changes, Mr. Speaker, to make the system serve the people of this province better. New industries will pay the tax bill if more taxes are required. Resources will help pay the tax bill, Mr. Speaker, but we have to look at tax fairness in Saskatchewan.

Every time an NDP government or CCF government has been elected in the history of Saskatchewan or anywhere else in Canada, all the resource companies say they're leaving. And the Tories and the Liberals always help perpetuate that line, Mr. Speaker. But they never leave. And we know we have to work with resource companies. We're not going to drive them out of the province of Saskatchewan because they will develop the resources if the resources are here. And they know we've been fair in the past and they know we'll be fair in the future.

So taxation has to be overhauled, Mr. Speaker. We don't want any more flat taxes; we don't want any more surprises of harmonization of the PST in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. Tax fairness has to be a primary pillar of this government if we're going to be successful, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, something else we have to look at in this province is the creation of wealth, not just the distribution of it. New Democrats and CCF have always been good at the distribution of wealth in the province of Saskatchewan, but we now not only have to be good at the distribution of wealth, we have to look at the creation of wealth. Because over the past nine and a half years the member from Estevan and his government have virtually bankrupted the province of Saskatchewan.

(2130)

We are very limited in the resources we have left to do new and innovative programs in Saskatchewan. But we will. We will find innovative ways to do that. There are people who want to move to Saskatchewan, if they have hope for the future. There are companies that want to work here because they know that opportunities will be developed in Saskatchewan. And we must welcome those people into Saskatchewan with the view of creating wealth within our own province.

Saskatchewan could likely utilize twice the population that we have in the province of Saskatchewan. Just by the sheer existence of people, it creates wealth, Mr. Speaker.

We can't continue to have our brain-drain of our youngest and our brightest leaving the province of Saskatchewan. We welcome those people back to help create the wealth that's necessary for us to do the job we want to do in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I'll close off by just a small quote and attribute it to the former government. One of the drafters of the American constitution said that, periodically the tree of liberty must be bathed in the blood of patriots.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we don't do that in Canada and we've never done it in Saskatchewan, with the possible exception of the Riel rebellion — my friend who sits just behind me would be a greater expert on that than I am — but that's not the way we participate in Saskatchewan. We now participate in Saskatchewan with one of the most politically aware processes of this type of system anywhere in North America and possibly the world.

Over 80 per cent of the people in the province of Saskatchewan turned out at the last election to cast their ballot. Look across the border in Alberta. Less than 50 per cent of the people in Alberta that were eligible to vote, voted in the last election. Look to the land of the free and' the home of the brave down south. They never get over 50 per cent of the people out to an election. So I call on all members of this Assembly to work together with the most politically astute people of anywhere in North America and possibly the world, because we are going to make a difference in Saskatchewan collectively, as a people in a sense of community, and not by the single-issue cause of any particular member. Thank you for your time, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, I'll start out by congratulating you on your election. I would also like to welcome the pages as well as the legislative staff. I would also like to at this time thank my own administrative staff in La Ronge who are working for me on a daily basis and on behalf of the people of Cumberland constituency — Cec Allan and Doreen Senga.

I would also at this time like to say a special thank you to a former colleague of mine, the member from Saskatoon, Peter Prebble. I would like to say that as a member sitting with him in four years, that I learned to respect the person in regards to how he presented himself here in the legislature, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — When a lot of people talk about politics — and sometimes the negative feelings come out, and there are some people worried about truth and honesty, and people worried about integrity — I might say that as a person, that I've known, although, Mr. Speaker, we may have had disagreements on this and that issue, there was one thing that I knew about this person, that whenever he presented himself on whatever issue, he did it with integrity.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to reflect on my, I suppose, my thank you to the people of Cumberland constituency. It is my second time here in the legislature, and the people of Cumberland constituency have given me a great deal of support over the past four years and also during the election.

Many people would have thought that people in Cumberland, which supported the New Democratic Party by 61 per cent, would edge a little bit in regards to the devastating policies of the Conservatives in the past nine years. But when I looked at the electoral record, they voted for the new government to a high level of support, to the tune of 81 per cent. When I looked at this, Mr. Speaker, I recognized that this was not simply support for myself as an individual. What I was looking at, Mr. Speaker, was really the support for a system, the support for a system that allows them to stand up for their own rights. It is a system, Mr. Speaker, that we have come — and a lot of people have come — to admire right throughout the world.

It is our system of democracy that, when we run into a problem with governments and the governments are not listening, when governments are not paying attention to those things that we talk about in our daily lives, that we can stand up and say — whether we have people in three-piece suits or people in run-down clothes — that their vote counts the same as everybody else, and that they have the right to stand up and say yes, we have a right to be heard in this system.

And that is precisely what we saw in this election. It was a humbling experience, Mr. Speaker, in regards to the fact and the knowledge that people indeed will stand up and say yes, I want to be counted, I want to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, I would like — as I usually do in the legislature — to shift off, with due respect to all the languages of the province of Saskatchewan and the world, to shift off into my own language which is Cree, and summarize those things that I will be talking about. So in the next few minutes I will be talking about those important issues that have been mentioned in the throne speech and also that could not be dealt with, in some cases that have not been dealt with by the previous government in its relationship to the fiscal crisis. So, Mr. Speaker, I will then shift off into Cree.

(The hon. member spoke for a time in Cree.)

Mr. Speaker, I'll be going back into English in regards to my quick summary, as I've done in my own language, which is Cree. Then I'll reflect back on the details that I've just mentioned, in the English language.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's extremely important to go back to the original point that I made. I think people are standing up for themselves, not only in northern Saskatchewan but the world over. In regards to the whole issue of democracy, people sometimes see it in straightforward dollar terms, in straightforward social terms, or cultural terms. But really the essential question internationally is a question of the involvement of people.

When we look at involvement and the real consultation

of people, democracy starts working and it starts working better. When we look at the issue as it reflects back on the government in the past nine years, I must say, Mr. Speaker, that we saw very little of it, or only minute quantities as we reflected back on the history of northern Saskatchewan.

(2145)

When we looked at northern Saskatchewan for example on this throne speech, we are trying to work forward to the future, but the fiscal crisis of government — which is reflected in the throne speech, and how it then is reflected back on the Conservative policies — is the real, biting aspect that's very problematic for us in the future.

I heard the member from Arm River mention in his speech this evening the issue of the Fair Share program. Well I might add this much, as far as northern Saskatchewan they might as well have called that program fair scarce because we scarcely heard anything about it in northern Saskatchewan. There was absolutely nothing on Fair Share program in regards to northern Saskatchewan. Everybody knew that it was a political strategy for some of the key ministers to try and hold on to their seats, but they in return got right knocked off.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — And the other thing I'd mention is that, in regards to the North on that Fair Share program, we did lose a lot of jobs during those nine years. We lost a few hundred jobs in many areas, in the public sector and also in the private sector with their own policies, basically because a lot of things went downhill in northern Saskatchewan with the Tories coming in.

But that was the same also in the agricultural sector. I knew that there was approximately just over 1,000 jobs lost in the rural areas. Many of these jobs were recentralized back to Regina. The only time that they talked about decentralization was the very last year of office. The last few months they started talking about decentralization and Fair Share.

And that is the historical record of this government. It's the same thing in regard to northern Saskatchewan, which I will touch upon a little bit later on.

When I lived at northern Saskatchewan, therefore, back in '82, we lost a lot of jobs. But the particular strategy of the government at that time was a colonial strategy. A colonial strategy in many ways because the government opposite talked about the Department of Northern Saskatchewan of the day. But that Department of Northern Saskatchewan, with its problems, was many times better than what the Tory government did in nine years in northern Saskatchewan.

So when I look at that fact, Mr. Speaker, I started looking at the issue when I started running for the election back in 1985. When I was there in 1985, what the Tories did when they did away with a full-scale and full-fledged department that could stand beside all of their departments in Saskatchewan, they had an advisory council. All they

had was an advisory council. All they needed was an advisory committee in northern Saskatchewan.

One of the people mentioned that maybe what the government should have . . . well one of the leaders of the North said, these people don't need a sounding board, what they really need is a hearing-aid because they're not listening to the people of northern Saskatchewan, and that's what one of the leaders said during that time when they created the Northern Advisory Council.

An Hon. Member: — So what are you going to do now, Keith?

Mr. Goulet: — The member says, what are we going to do? We're going to do many more things that will be many more times better than what the member over there had done and accomplished.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — Well the member opposite says, what's your plan? Well the plan of the people was to knock off the Tories, number one. That was the number one plan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — And that same plan was to get rid of the terrible policies, and more particularly in northern Saskatchewan, but as it related to the farm areas and all over the urban areas and all other places in the province of Saskatchewan.

So that's the plan. So now I'll get back to your plan that you asked for the North. It was a devastating plan; it was a colonial plan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — Because this colonial plan was really only going at this Northern Advisory Council level. A lot of people have said, hey, this is an election strategy by the Tories. They said, this Northern Advisory Council will be knocked off after the Tories. They'll pretend to listen before the '86 election. And that's precisely what they did — '86 come around, the Northern Development Advisory Council came up with a series of recommendations in fishing, in trapping, in many areas.

But did the Tories listen? Absolutely not. They never, ever listened. Because two years later, after they got a new minister from . . . I remember at that time Maple Creek, became the minister in charge of the North. Well, she came over here and the first thing that she did was—she . . . (inaudible) . . . us. Now I don't know whether or not she was really ashamed of this thing — the Northern Development Advisory Council — but she did away with it. The amazing thing was that there was absolutely no consultation with people of northern Saskatchewan in regards to the putting together of this Advisory Council and there was no consultation to get rid of it.

It reminded me of a story on the first time in regards to the Conservatives when I first got into the House in '86. And I think the new members will have to hear this story because it was absolutely outrageous.

Well, when I got into the House, I saw this brand new highways map, which is shown of course to everyone who visits the province of Saskatchewan. And this highways map says, the North . . . it says, the North is populated with beautiful lakes and rivers but no people. This is how the Tories came to view the North — strictly a basis for simple resource exploitation for the benefit of big business in northern Saskatchewan. But they completely neglected the people and even put it down in their own literature that said the people in northern Saskatchewan did not exist.

Well anyways, the member from Maple Creek was bragging about the fact about our new development that was going to take place with the Northern Affairs Secretariat. First of all they did away with DNS (Department of Northern Saskatchewan). Now they had a junior department called the Northern Affairs Secretariat.

So they put this thing together in '88 and away they go. Then the member from Maple Creek comes up and she's got a real nice brochure. Actually it was not a brochure, it was quite a series of a few pages of newspaper. And she was visiting the North. And that was of course the first minister who had decided to visit the North. And I would congratulate the former member from Maple Creek, Joan Duncan, who did that. At least she had the wherewithal to visit some of the communities in the North.

So here she was visiting the North, and she said: all of a sudden, the North is alive. And I remember that time; I was in the legislature. And she got a little bit angry with me because I said, my goodness, after seven years you find out that the North and the people in the North are indeed alive. And to this day that policy of completely ignoring the North continued.

And I went in on the election, and part of the election, and again it was the same old story. The Tories were saying, we're going to get your advice and your consultation. And all they had in eight years was this task force for the North. So they said we're going to consult you, just like they were going to do with fair share. So Fair Share was a situation that was supposed to consult the people, at the last moment, after you're going to get devastated, and they're going to do the same thing in northern Saskatchewan. Well I'll tell you people weren't impressed because 81 per cent of the people voted against your ideas.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: —The other thing is, the Conservatives did a lot of subsidies, royalty tax roll backs for big companies, building roads for Weyerhaeuser — 32 kilometres — everybody knows that story. And also seven million a year for the privatized Cameco, into the privatized uranium mining company of Cameco. It was \$7 million a year that benefitted the mining company when they did this roll back, back after '88 when it was privatized.

Well the people who did trapping and fishing, this same government took away the subsidies for fishing sturgeon, for fishing pickerel. Now they've taken it away for northern pike. They've also taken it away for trout. The

only one that's left now is whitefish.

And when I look at that record, they have the same policy. They would subsidize . . . They subsidize liquor. They would subsidize wine, they would subsidize beer, they will subsidize whisky, they will subsidize everything in that area except food. They would not subsidize food transportation in northern Saskatchewan.

They not only knocked off the food transportation, they knocked off the fish transportation; they knocked off training programs in regards to young people wanting to enter into the trapping field. So when you look at this, it was not only a matter of not listening to the people in regards to the creation of new regulations in trapping and fishing, but it was just taking away whatever little help that the government had in regards to people from northern Saskatchewan.

Now one of the other things that I see is this whole issue of somebody mentioning, what is this whole thing about democracy? Why is the legislature so important? Why do we need to stand up here and discuss issues? Because I'll tell you when I got into the legislature, our government, one of the first things that it did was lived up to its promises.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — Something that the Conservative government couldn't do except for its rich friends and the big companies. In nine years that's all it was able to do. Those are the only promises that it would live up to. When we came into this legislature this time around, we put in the law on the legislation, the Bills reflecting not only the general interest of people of Saskatchewan by the repeal of the PST. But I'll tell you something. I was proud this week when the first Bill in the legislature was one on economic development corporations of northern Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — The economic development corporations in northern Saskatchewan were now on par with the economic development corporations in the South. The PC government had neglected to put them on an equal basis. They would be unable to get . . . the corporations in the North couldn't get into industrial and commercial activity because of the way the PC government had viewed the people in the North in their same old colonial fashion. We came up this week and we put in Bill No. 1 to change that and say, yes, the people of northern Saskatchewan and their corporations are number one on our list.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — As I look forward into the future, I can see my vision in this way. I would like to say, as I mentioned before, the importance of democracy and openness, which is mentioned in our throne speech. I would like to say also, in this week with the devastating reality of the 14 women, and also the fact that we saw the movie on Helen Osborne and the murder in The Pas, Manitoba, the tremendous level of discrimination, racism, and sexism

and handicapism that is still part of the system. One of my visions is to be able to look forward into the future and say, yes, we are going to work to do away with that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — I would also like to say that in northern development we have to look at economics and environment together, as well as poverty. We have to say yes, to sustainable development and be able to look forward to the future that way.

You know I would like to say yes, we have started on this throne speech towards a system of justice and fairness. So I look forward to working with the new NDP government of which I am part of, and say yes, not only to the people of Cumberland, but to the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — It now being 10 o'clock, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m.

The Assembly adjourned at 10 p.m.