

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING, SELECT, AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

#### Standing Committee on Communication

**Clerk Assistant:** — Mr. Speaker, as chairperson of the Standing Committee on Communication, presents the first report of the said committee which is as follows:

Your committee has considered the recommendations of the Public Documents Committee, under The Archives Act, contained in retention and disposal schedules comprising sessional paper no. 120 (amendment to schedules 295 and schedules 307 to 325 inclusive) of the fourth session of the twenty-first legislature as referred to the committee by the Assembly on December 4, 1991.

Your committee recommends to the Assembly that the recommendations of the Public Documents Committee on amendment to schedule nos. 295 and schedules 307 to 325 inclusive be accepted.

**Ms. Murray:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster:

That the first report of the Standing Committee on Communication be now concurred in.

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

Motion agreed to.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Jess:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to you and the members of this Assembly, 12 students from Marcelin Kihiw School, grades 10, 11, and 12. And I will be meeting with them after the question period for pictures and refreshments. I'd like you to welcome them now.

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

**Mr. Renaud:** — Mr. Speaker, I would also like the Assembly to welcome the students from the Marcelin School. This school is one that I attended from grades 4 to 12 and it's a fine school, and I see it's still doing well. I'd like you to welcome the guests.

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

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I know all members of the Assembly will want to join with me in welcoming back to the Chamber a member who served with great distinction for a period of time that I think all of us envy — I think I'm correct — from 1964 to 1982. I refer of course to Walter Smishek who was

minister of Finance, minister of Municipal Affairs, and served with distinction in the Blakeney government. I know all members will want to join with me in welcoming him back today.

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

**Mr. Jess:** — Mr. Speaker, I would also like to welcome Mr. Smishek back, and draw to the attention of this Assembly that Mr. Smishek started out in what is now Redberry constituency.

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

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Grain Transportation Systems

**Mr. Britton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a few questions I'd like to ask the Premier. And, Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier, who has left everyone shaking their heads a little bit in their confusion on your position on grain transportation . . . The Premier was quoted as saying he supported a shipment of grain, both through the traditional port system and to the rail system.

Mr. Premier, I don't think you can have it both ways. Would you like to explain to us what you meant by that?

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

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With respect to the minister, to the member opposite, I don't see a particular confusion, because to the best of my knowledge, in order to get the grain to port, you need the rail system. And I support both the usage of the rail system and the port system in order to get our wheat to international market.

I think what you're talking about is the conflict that apparently is arising on the west coast with respect to the movement out of the Vancouver ports versus Seattle ports.

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

**Mr. Britton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, supplementary. Surely the Premier knows that when there's an order for grain, that in today's world countries don't hoard up a whole bunch of grain. They expect their grain to be delivered within a month.

And what I'm saying to you, Mr. Premier, what are you saying? Are you saying that you will allow the grain to go through Seattle if necessary, if there's a strike — which we can expect. What are you telling us? Will you see that the grain keeps going through the ports, Mr. Speaker?

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

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I leave it to you, of course, to decide whether the question is in order or not, but I can say to you, sir, that I don't believe, the last time I checked, that the Government of Saskatchewan is responsible for the administration of ports.

I will however say that our position is that we believe the grain product, which is produced so ably by our farmers here in Saskatchewan, should be shipped to those who buy as quickly as possible, as efficiently as possible. And we favour, where possible, a Canadian mechanism for doing so.

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — We think the idea of Canadians helping Canadians at all stages of the game is the right way to go and frankly, if there's a shortage of capacity with respect to the Vancouver ports, then we should be looking to the federal government to increase the capacity.

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

**Mr. Britton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Premier then explain to us when it would be right to use the Seattle port? When is the right time to use that?

Mr. Speaker, once again the Premier is waffling on this question. In fact, I would be surprised if he wasn't ready to set up another review to study the matter before he put his foot in his mouth again. When thousands of farmers, Mr. Speaker, are going broke, prices are at historic lows, and our population is dwindling, how can the Premier of a province which has half of the population, half the farm population in Canada, how can you come down squarely . . . how come you can't come down squarely on the side of the farmers instead of protecting your union friends? Could you answer that?

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

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I say with the greatest of respect to the member from Wilkie this is a question which he has exaggerated to incredulity. The position of the government, any government, whether it's a PC (Progressive Conservative) government, a Liberal government, or NDP (New Democratic Party) government in the province of Saskatchewan, is in a position which says that we should be supporting our economic engines, of which farming and agriculture is very important if not the prime one; and that we should be doing everything that we can as Canadians to make sure that our product gets to market as quickly and as efficiently as possible.

I prefer doing it through the Canadian mechanism and the Canadian port system, and that's been my position consistently throughout the piece. You ask me when do I favour Seattle? I can't answer a hypothetical question. I'll need to know what the circumstances are, but my preference is, as I've said before, as I think the preference of all good Canadians should be, to make sure that the Canadian system is up to speed, to be competitive world class and first class, to quote an old phrase.

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

**Mr. Britton:** — New question, Mr. Speaker. The Premier is refusing really to tell the Saskatchewan farm families where his priorities really are, which only proves I think, Mr. Speaker, how much influence his party has . . . Barb Byers and George Rosenau have over their policy.

Mr. Speaker, I'm asking the Premier, will the Premier today give this House and the public of Saskatchewan his assurance that when the next strike occurs, which it inevitably will, his government will support the opposition in demanding that the federal government make the handlers of grain, inspectors, and graders an essential service? And if not, why won't you do that?

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

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I would answer the hon. member as follows. I say this with the utmost of sincerity. For nine and one-half years, sir, you were a member of the government which was in authority and could have, and should have if you felt in that position, advocated it so that the federal government would take an appropriate position. To the best of my knowledge, you either did not advocate it or, if you did, you had no success in doing it.

But I would say, secondly, to the hon. member the following: the most important point is that that is the old politics, the politics you're talking about — the politics of trying to divide and conquer. The politics of division is the old politics.

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

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — It's the old politics. I would say to the hon. member from Wilkie what we've got to do, because of the challenges facing this country and this province, is not to seek enemies and to pull apart, but to pull together to overcome those obstacles. And that's what you should be doing.

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

**Mr. Britton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since the Premier refuses to make any commitment whatsoever, ducking the question . . . Mr. Premier, do you not realize that every time a strike occurs when there is a shipment of grain going to whatever country that the Saskatchewan farmer loses those sales? And even when the price is as low as it is, those sales are very important.

Now, Mr. Premier, since you refused to make any commitment whatsoever, would you show the farmers of Saskatchewan how much support you are giving them by telling us today what you have in your plans to get another \$500 million into the hands of the farmers before Christmas?

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

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question for the time being is the answer that I have given his leader and have given to the House before. The Prime Minister has stated in his meeting with me that he would review with the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Agriculture Canada the positions advocated by the concerned farmers and the coalition of farm groups. I'm awaiting a response from the Prime Minister in this context and then the farmers and the farm organizations will be meeting again with our people and anybody else that is involved to see what the next steps should be taken.

In any event, as the hon. member knows, the federal government itself alleges that the \$800 million which is . . . a portion of that which belongs to Saskatchewan — the forms are in the mail — as good as it is, it comes that far for the December period so we should see how far it goes.

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

#### Staff Changes at SPMC

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the minister responsible for Sask Property Management Corporation. Madam Minister, your government has said the reason for the 400 or so firings that your government has done over the last six weeks, that there is . . . the reason for it is for down-sizing the government and that the mass firings are not political. At the same time you personally have engaged in a hiring spree that shows that this is not your motive.

I want to ask you Madam Minister, who is Frank Quennell, what specifically was he hired to do, and how much are you paying him to do it?

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

**Hon. Ms. Carson:** — Mr. Speaker, Frank Quennell was a special advisor that we brought in in the transition team to look at Sask Property Management Corporation. That corporation is under a great deal of difficulty. It has a lot of complaints from departments with it. We're looking at reorganizing that department. At this stage, Mr. Quennell is no longer with Sask Property Management.

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

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the same minister. She did not answer my question. I said: what's his responsibility, what's he getting paid to do it? She did not answer how much.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, my further supplementary. I understand that Garry Beatty, who worked for the member for Riversdale in the old NDP government, has been brought back to master SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation).

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask her . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . She can answer that. But I want to ask also a brand new question. I have here, Mr. Speaker, I have a leaked . . . Ah, she can answer two at once. She's . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. The member has already indicated he's on two subject areas. Is he going on a third or is he asking a question on the two that he's already mentioned? I want the question.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Speaker, I just said I would like to know that. I didn't say I wanted her to answer.

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

**Mr. Muirhead:** — My new question to the minister, my new question to the Minister. I have a leaked document. Mr. Speaker, I have a leaked document in my hand from

SPMC, and I will quote this, Mr. Speaker. It says in part, quote:

Leslie Martin, a legal research assistant, reporting directly to Mr. Frank Quennell started work with the Corporation on Monday. She will be doing projects and investigation for Mr. Quennell . . .

Madam Minister, who is this Martin and exactly what project is she doing and what special advisor is she working for and what is she investigating?

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

**The Speaker:** — Order. I'd just like to draw the attention of the members that you cannot in a particular question ask a number of detailed questions of which the minister more than likely will not have the answers. Question period is meant for policy, and I ask the member to redirect his question without the details.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Speaker, if the minister can't answer these questions, will then she take notice and give me the answers please. And I'll go on with another new question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I can't help it that the new ministers can't answer these questions. We know we've had three or four questions asked before at the same time.

I have another quote, Mr. Speaker. I have another quote:

. . . Tony Darnell and Pat Brown, former employees, are conducting a number of reviews as well as examining some files."

And then the memo tells staff to co-operate with these two people. Madam Minister, who is Tony Darnell, if you want a straight question. Who is he? I'm asking you a straight question. Who is Tony Darnell? Who is Pat Brown? What are they reviewing for your special advisor and what files are they investigating? Now that's about as straight a question as you can get.

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

**Hon. Ms. Carson:** — Mr. Speaker, it's not that the minister doesn't know the answers to the questions. I think it's just the member doesn't know what the questions are himself.

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

**Hon. Ms. Carson:** — Mr. Darnell had worked formerly with the Department of Supply and Services. He was very knowledgeable about how that department worked before. We brought in some people who had experience because we feel that department is a . . . that corporation is a corporation out of control. It had very little accountability. It's very inefficient. There's a great deal of concerns expressed about that department, and we're trying to bring in people who can look at it, reorganize it, and tell us in effect what the government should be doing with it. These people are short-term contracts and they will, as soon as the job is finished, be released.

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

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Speaker, to the same minister. I didn't ask about all her kind of answers about the qualifications and what he's doing. I asked what he's being paid and exactly what he's doing for the advisor. You didn't answer the question.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I have another quote from this memo. They don't want to hear about these quotes from their own memos, from their own department.

I would also advise that Mr. Francis Schmeichel has been engaged as an Administrative Assistant to myself and is located in the President's Office.

Madam Minister — and this is another straightforward question — please, will you answer my question. Why does your special advisor need an advisor to advise the advisor and what is the role of the new . . . (inaudible) . . . Now those are straightforward questions. Please answer them.

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

**Hon. Ms. Carson:** — Mr. Speaker, this was a corporation that in the last three years went from 7 managers to 26 managers. There was a 300 per cent increase in the cost of the managerial level. I don't think the former government is in any position where they can criticize this government for taking on the issue of trying to make sure that the corporation in the future will be managed much more efficiently and much more effectively than it was in the past.

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

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My final question.

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

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Would the minister not agree, would she agree that these 4 or 500 firings that you did a blood test on to see if they were blue or red or what; that anybody that had a tinge of blue were fired and hired by your blood test. Is that what you've done, Madam Minister? That's exactly what you've done.

**Hon. Ms. Carson:** — No, Mr. Speaker, that is not our intention. We intend to hire competent, qualified people unlike the last government.

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

### Farm Foreclosure Moratorium

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, your party leader and your rural candidates promised immediate action to impose a moratorium on farm foreclosures in the recent election. Given that farm families in Saskatchewan are losing their farms every day and your government's failure to act on this promise is continuing to cause serious and irreversible damage to many, many farm families, when, Mr. Minister, will you see and when will we see your Bill to impose a moratorium on farm foreclosures?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — The commitments that were given in the election campaign were to immediately begin discussion with the financial institutions. And those discussions are ongoing, and we're very pleased with the discussions. And when the announcements can be made, we will make them.

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

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the same minister. I truly am pleased to hear that meetings will be taking place, and I'd like to ask the minister of this new, open, and honest government to tell me and the thousands of Saskatchewan farmers who are wondering the same thing: what will you be asking of these lending institutions, and what proposal will you be making to the banks when you meet with them?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — We have already met with the financial institutions, including the publicly managed ones, and the discussions on the matters of concern to farmers are being raised with them. We're looking for both short-term solutions and long-term solutions and have committed ourselves to an ongoing discussion with them to get agreement on both.

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

### Government Policy on Gambling

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance . . . pardon me, Minister of Justice. You made comments recently concerning computerized slot machines being allowed in Saskatchewan. The whole gaming industry in our province from bingos to casinos and horse racing and lotteries should be re-evaluated. And there's tremendous potential within these industries. And at the same time, due largely to the lack of planning and control by the previous government, there are problems.

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

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Particularly, sir, in the bingo industry. Will you please tell us, Mr. Minister, what the overall plan is concerning gaming in Saskatchewan before any changes are made or any new concepts are going to be introduced.

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for that question, and I agree very strongly with certain parts of her preamble, particularly the fact that this policy or the policy in this area seems to have drifted along without any firm direction and without any overall concept of where we want to go with this kind of gambling activity.

I have undertaken a review in connection with the matters that she mentioned in her question, and this review is ongoing. We're trying to discuss the problems with all of the people who seem to have an interest in it. And the member will know that there are many such people who have an interest in these questions.

I have not arrived at the point where I make any

recommendation to my cabinet or caucus colleagues yet, but I hope to be able to do that early in the new year.

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

**Ms. Haverstock:** — This is a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. As I suggested in my opening question, Mr. Speaker, we do have legalized gambling in Saskatchewan under our present laws. But although governments have allowed gambling, they have never dealt with it from the standpoint of economic potential. And there is tremendous potential for an overall plan which would connect tourism and non-profit agencies and I believe would generate employment as well.

There are problems as you have pointed out, and the bingo industry is the subject of much controversy. Will this government take another look at the recommendations of the bingo inquiry which were completely ignored by the previous government which actually commissioned the inquiry at great expense to the taxpayers of this province?

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes. We'll be revisiting that report as well as taking a careful look at experience in other jurisdictions. For example, many jurisdictions have already gone to the so-called video games or the video gambling, electronic gambling, whatever term you want to use. These are complex questions and we hope in time to be able to produce a coherent policy.

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

**Ms. Haverstock:** — A final but new question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. This question pursues the same line of questioning that I was trying to have answered by the Minister of Justice.

The situation in the Saskatchewan horse racing industry is continually deteriorating, sir. And the past government was presented with a plan to assist the industry in its revitalization, but the two-year funding package was cancelled after the first year just as the program was beginning to generate some results.

I would like to ask that . . . Recently I know that the government has granted permission for Teletheatre betting to be conducted in selective hotels in Saskatchewan to increase the betting revenue for horse racing. In recognition of the value of the Saskatchewan horse racing industry to our economy and the difficulties that it's faced, will you be consulting with the horse racing industry about the areas selected for placement of slot machines with respect to the effect that it's going to have on Teletheatre betting?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — I appreciate you didn't ask a more specific question because I might have had to decline to answer. But I do have a meeting set up with the industry and I will raise those questions with them. Thank you.

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

#### United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister responsible for the Families. And in light of a resolution or a motion that is sitting on the books in this Assembly regarding the United Nations convention of the rights of the child. And the motion was asking the government to allow for public discussion and debate regarding this question.

I realize we've had notice from the Minister of Justice that there will be a statement given, but I would like to ask the minister if the minister would at least have allowed a public debate on this question before endorsing the convention or the charter.

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — I'll attempt to answer that question, Mr. Speaker, although I'm not the minister responsible for that particular foundation. But I'll answer it because later on the agenda of the House there will be a ministerial statement in connection with the ratification by Canada of the UN (United Nations) Convention on the Rights of the Child.

It may be, as the member says, that it would have been to advantage to have debated the resolution prior to the announcement of Canada's ratification, but the ratification has taken place and is being announced in parliament today and is being announced in other legislatures, those that are sitting today.

So we thought it appropriate to bring on the ministerial statement today. And the member will of course have an opportunity to express his views, at least in a preliminary way, in response to the statement that I plan to make.

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

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

##### United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today, Wednesday, December 11, 1991, the Government of Canada is formally ratifying the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. The convention is a legal document setting out international standards and obligations that guarantee rights and freedoms to children, defined as persons under 18 years of age.

Canada's ratification of the Convention on the Rights of the Child follows two years of federal-provincial consultation. Because much of the subject matter of the convention falls within the legislative jurisdiction of the provinces, the federal government requested the approval of the provinces before it ratified the convention.

In Saskatchewan, the Department of Justice co-ordinated an interdepartmental review of programs, policies, and legislation to ensure our province could offer our approval of Canada's ratification. The review determined that, by and large, Saskatchewan currently complies with both the letter and the spirit of the convention.

The convention on the rights of the child sets out special protections for children. Many of these protections or guarantees are the same as those contained in the

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. In Saskatchewan, basically all of the protections stated in the convention are provided through our network of social policies and programs.

The convention affirms that actions taken on behalf of a child must be taken in the best interests of the child. It affirms that children's rights must be respected without discrimination of any kind. It recognizes a child's inherent right to life and the responsibility of ratifying nations to ensure the survival and development of the child.

It ensures a child's right to a name and to a nationality. It affirms the right of children to the highest attainable standard of health, including the right to access facilities for treatment and rehabilitation and the responsibility of ratifying nations to strive to ensure no child is deprived of access to such health care services. It recognizes the right of every child to a standard adequate for the child's physical, mental, spiritual, moral, and social development.

The convention also affirms the importance of parents in the upbringing of children. In this country the importance of the parental role is already well recognized, but the convention provides another safeguard. Provisions of the convention, relating to parenting, stress that the ratifying nation must respect the responsibilities, rights, and duties of parents in providing proper direction and guidance to a child in the child's exercise of the rights stated in the convention.

It emphasizes the right of the child, as far as possible, to know and be cared for by his or her parents. It states that a child shall not be separated from his or her parents against their will. Exceptions to this provision are allowed, subject to careful review in cases such as abuse or neglect.

It acknowledges that the best interests of the child will be the parents' basic concern and therefore states that parents have the primary responsibility for the upbringing and development of the child. It provides that a child's education be directed to the development of respect for the child's parents, as well as for his or her own cultural identity, language, and values.

Canada's ratification of the convention is subject to two reservations exempting our country from compliance with two provisions of the convention. Canada is reserving the right not to apply the provisions of the convention dealing with formal legal requirements for adoption to the extent that these requirements may be incompatible with customary forms of care among aboriginal peoples in Canada.

Canada is also reserving the right not to detain child offenders separately from adult offenders where separate detention is not appropriate or feasible. This exemption takes into account Canada's current Young Offenders Act which allows detention of young offenders in the same facility as adult offenders in limited circumstances.

Canada's support of international standards for the protection and care of children is vital. Saskatchewan is a

leader in the development of social programs that strive to ensure a basic standard of living is provided for all members of our society. Yet we continue to hear almost daily of instances where children in our community suffer as a result of not having the proper care, attention, and support.

The fact that every child does not grow up with the protections and basic rights, in spite of the programs and services and legislation that we already have in place, is a clear indication that much, much more can and must be done. Each of us shares the responsibility to ensure that every child in this province has shelter and food, has a safe, supportive, and loving environment; and has the developmental opportunities to achieve their fullest potential.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand in this Assembly today and confirm Saskatchewan's support for the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child and to state our ongoing commitment to ensure that every child has the protections and guarantees stated in the convention.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to stand here today and commend the minister for his support of the children and the convention, albeit, Mr. Speaker, that I just want to bring to the Assembly's attention and as I indicated in a question just a bit earlier, that there are a number of people and organizations not only across the province but across this great nation of ours and certainly in other countries that do have a few questions regarding the charter.

No one, Mr. Speaker, is saying that children shouldn't be protected or that we shouldn't identify ways of protecting our children. But we also realize that parents have a responsibility in bringing their children up in the protection of the child and in giving their child a high standard of living.

And we also realize that around the world, many countries of the world, and even in our own province, there are children that unfortunately do not have the parental guidance and direction that is needed.

And so this convention has laid out some guide-lines and rules by which we can accept and reach out and certainly offer children the rights they deserve — a right to a healthy life-style, a right to education, a right to a healthy and fitting life-style, Mr. Speaker.

I also want to bring to the Assembly's attention that not only do children have rights but I believe parents have responsibilities. As parents, it is our responsibility to not only raise our children, give them a good home, give them a loving home, and give them good, high living, moral . . . a moral standard to live by and standards to grow up on and to look to, but also we have a responsibility to give guidance to our children. And many parents . . . In this room there are many parents, and we've all realized the difficulties we have in raising our children.

But I think, Mr. Speaker, we want to recognize that our children have some rights. But I also want to bring in one fact that I have a strong feeling on, and I believe many of the groups that have contacted our caucus and possibly even contacted members on the government side of the House, the fact that this charter maybe doesn't go as far . . . or far enough, the fact that we don't give recognition to the unborn.

And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the recent plebiscite, the recent election, the plebiscite indicated that people across this province really believe in strengthening the rights of the child but also going a little further and recognizing the unborn in our society.

And I want to bring that to the attention of the minister of this House and indicate yes, we in this Assembly and we on this side of the House certainly recognize the rights and the needs of giving our children a healthy life-style, a healthy home, and a healthy environment to grow up in.

And we want to commend the government for the ratification. But we would like to have had . . . or given the people of this province and this Assembly an opportunity to debate it. And I thank the minister and I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### **Bill No. 11 — An Act to amend The Municipal Revenue Sharing Act (No. 2)**

**Hon. Ms. Carson:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Municipal Revenue Sharing Act (No. 2).

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

##### **Bill No. 12 — An Act to amend The Assessment Management Agency Act**

**Hon. Ms. Carson:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Assessment Management Agency Act.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

##### **Bill No. 13 — An Act respecting Certain Payments to the Meewasin Valley Authority, the Wakamow Valley Authority and the Wascana Centre Authority**

**Hon. Ms. Carson:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill respecting Certain Payments to the Meewasin Valley Authority, the Wakamow Valley Authority and the Wascana Centre Authority.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

#### TABLING OF DOCUMENT

**The Speaker:** — Before orders of the day, pursuant to

section 68.7 of The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act, I hereby table a letter from Her Honour, the Lieutenant Governor, establishing the membership of the Board of Internal Economy.

#### BEFORE ORDERS OF THE DAY

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Before orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I would seek leave of the House that item 21 under motions be moved to item 1, which if passed will allow me to participate more fully in the proceedings of this Assembly. The place where this item currently stands on the order paper prevents its consideration for many, many months, Mr. Speaker.

Leave not granted.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### QUESTIONS PUT BY MEMBERS

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the question put by members, no. 16 I believe, be converted to motion for return (debatable).

**The Speaker:** — Motion for return (debatable).

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — I would ask that this question too put by members, no. 18, be converted to motion for return, debatable.

**The Speaker:** — Motion for return (debatable).

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I would ask that this question put by members, no. 19, be converted to motion for return (debatable).

**The Speaker:** — Motion for return (debatable).

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the question put by members, no. 20, be converted to motion for return (debatable).

**The Speaker:** — Motion for return (debatable).

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I would ask the question put by members, no. 21, be converted to motion for return (debatable).

**The Speaker:** — Motion for return (debatable).

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — I would ask that the question put by members, no. 22, be converted to motion for return (debatable).

**The Speaker:** — Motion for return (debatable).

Before the minister makes a statement on 23, I have a statement to make. Question 23 requests information for more than one department and therefore is not in order in the form of a written question. The question is ruled out of order but it may be resubmitted in the form of a notice for motion for return.

(1445)

#### 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.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. At the outset I want to join, I'm sure, with every other member who has spoken in the throne speech debate thus far in extending my own congratulations to you, sir, for your election to the high office of Speaker in our House.

Mr. Speaker, your experience in this parliamentary process and your commitment to this parliamentary process and your dedication to know that the parliamentary process will work in this House, will serve you very well, Mr. Speaker, in the days ahead. Although, Mr. Speaker, as I watched the question period today and observing some members of the caucus opposite, it struck me that your experience in the class-room over the years may also serve you well in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to extend my own personal congratulations to every other member of this House who has been elected or re-elected in October. We are, each of us, in line for four of the most interesting, rewarding, demanding, perhaps frustrating years of our lives, Mr. Speaker.

And I would want to say, in my view, Mr. Speaker, that no matter where we sit in this House, whether it be in the opposition caucus or whether we sit as an independent member or whether we sit on the back bench or the front bench or somewhere in between, Mr. Speaker, in my view there is not a bad seat in this House.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — And any of us, any of we who are privileged to sit in this House should count it as a rare and important privilege to serve the people of our province.

Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to occupy this particular seat in the legislature, I want to extend my deepest thanks to the people of Moose Jaw Wakamow for all those who laboured so hard to elect this candidate in the recent election. It is my commitment to them that my first responsibility in this legislature and in all aspects of government will be to represent those people of Moose Jaw Wakamow, Mr. Speaker.

And while congratulating, let me also extend my personal congratulations to those members of our House who have been appointed to the Executive Council, to the cabinet of our government. Mr. Speaker, we have a small transition cabinet, and yet within the confines of that small transition cabinet, Mr. Speaker, we have more women represented in the Executive Council of cabinet today than we have ever had in the province of Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — And my congratulations to the Premier and to those four women who are providing leadership for our province. Mr. Speaker, it is a small cabinet. In fact I note, Mr. Speaker, not many months ago it would have taken two cabinet ministers, two associate ministers, and a whole back bench full of legislative secretaries to do the work that any one of these cabinet ministers is doing today.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, these individuals have undertaken a tremendous, tremendous work-load on behalf of the province and the people of Saskatchewan in this transition time, and we owe our gratitude to them.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, one passing note about our new cabinet. For the first time, Mr. Speaker, you will recognize in many years, for the first time in many years, we have in Saskatchewan again a Minister of Agriculture who is at work full time and a full time Premier.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, the times of transition are never easy, but this cabinet and this government have begun the task. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks in the throne speech debate today I wish to reflect a little on the challenges, as I see them, that face our new government and our province, and to reflect equally on the opportunities that are before us.

Mr. Speaker, when I consider the situation that we find ourselves in, both in terms of the province and as a new government, I'm given cause to remember that famous paragraph written by Charles Dickens many years ago with which he opened his novel, *The Tale of Two Cities*.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask all members to reflect upon these words and see if they do reflect the times in which we find ourselves as a province and as a government. Charles Dickens wrote:

It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the season of Light, it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair, we had everything before us, we had nothing before us, we were all going direct to Heaven, we were all going direct the other way.

Mr. Speaker, those words to me capture the mood which we, the government, meet here and in our province generally. Although I reflect further that Charles Dickens may have in fact been writing about our nation in 1991 because I ask members to note that he began the second paragraph of his book with these words: There were a king with a large jaw . . .

Mr. Speaker, these are in many ways the best of times and the worst of times. We would seem to have everything before us as a government with a brand-new mandate, and we would seem to have nothing before us as a legacy of the former administration.



On one hand we seem to have one foot on the way to heaven, and with the other foot on the way to . . . well directly the other way, Mr. Speaker. These are the best of times and the worst of times. Mr. Speaker, I ask all members to consider the situation that we as a new government inherit, the challenge which is before this new government. From the former administration we inherit lawsuits against the Government of Saskatchewan, lawsuits brought by Saskatchewan people who have been unfairly treated by the administration — lawsuits making us liable for millions and millions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, in our first few weeks of government we have encountered and uncovered a whole raft of what are called personal service contracts, Mr. Speaker. Such things never existed before the previous Tory administration — personal service contracts guaranteeing people like Mr. George Hill \$435,000 a year, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in my view there isn't a person in Saskatchewan or a position in Saskatchewan that's worth \$435,000 a year. Never mind paying that kind of money to a man, and what did he give us? What did Mr. Hill give us for \$435,000 a year? Well he gave us our power bill in one envelope and our gas bill in another envelope. And then we find, Mr. Speaker, upon entering government, \$1.35 million tucked away in a trust account, Mr. Speaker. I wish members opposite would explain to this House and explain to the people how they view that as a proud record.

And then, Mr. Speaker, we find contracts like this one employing an individual with a contract for \$30,000, and what has he left to do? Play golf. Play golf, Mr. Speaker — \$30,000 to play golf.

Mr. Speaker, we inherit as a new government this kind of personal service contract. We inherit a situation where many of the assets of our province have been sold off or given away. We inherit a situation, Mr. Speaker, of massive public debt.

Mr. Speaker, you will remember and all members will recall, in 1982 in the operations of government there was a surplus that was indicated in Bob Andrew's initial financial statement of \$139 million in the bank, cash money, available for that government to use. Today, Mr. Speaker, in that same account, we have an operational deficit of somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$6 billion.

Mr. Speaker, that's the situation that we inherit as a new government. And it may be no wonder that it may seem to us as the worst of times. Mr. Speaker, not only have these people emptied and laid bare the cupboard, Mr. Speaker, these people have put a mortgage on the cupboard. Mr. Speaker, not only are there no more golden eggs, these people have cooked our goose, Mr. Speaker.

It wasn't so many months ago that some of us were in this room when the former member from Melfort, at that time government House leader, third in command of his government, not many months ago that some of us were in this House and saw him stand in this place and reject

his government, tell the truth. He told the truth about Fair Share. He rejected his government, he quit his government.

And he said, Mr. Speaker, that day he said to this House and to the people of Saskatchewan, he said this province is on the verge of bankruptcy. On the verge of bankruptcy — from the third in command of the former administration.

Mr. Speaker, as rare as it was, that particular Tory minister was telling the truth. Mr. Speaker, this province is on the verge of bankruptcy. So the challenge, the challenge, Mr. Speaker, is that on the one hand we have a bankrupt province; and yet on the other hand, we have unaddressed needs crying out from every corner of our province and every sector of our community.

The needs of the farm families of Saskatchewan, the needs of rural Saskatchewan are well-known in this House. We have a rural Saskatchewan on the brink of economic collapse. We have quotas on our universities, young people being denied access to education. We have long outstanding matters of injustice involving our native and Metis people. We have increasing demands upon our health care system. We have roads that have gone to pot, Mr. Speaker. We have small businesses that are simply trying to survive month to month. We have municipal governments struggling to keep afloat, unaddressed needs from every corner of our province.

And, Mr. Speaker, we have spoken at length in this House about the crisis in the family farm and the crisis in rural Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, it's not only in rural Saskatchewan, and it's not only on the family farm where there is pain and crisis these days.

Mr. Speaker, as I went door-knocking in the month of October, among all of the homes in the constituency of Moose Jaw Wakamow, Mr. Speaker, not a day would pass but that I wouldn't meet another family with boxes packed preparing to leave our province . . . (inaudible) . . . another family struggling to make ends meet month to month or another household where they're burning the candle at both ends to maintain part-time jobs or a single parent trying to exist on minimum wage. Mr. Speaker, the pain is not simply in rural Saskatchewan; the pain is general. We are all afloat in this province on a very stormy sea.

And how can we forget for even a moment in this House, Mr. Speaker, particularly on a day when we have recognized the UN declaration for the child, how for a moment in this House can we forget that in northern Saskatchewan we have children living in conditions that are not unlike third world conditions? How can we for a moment forget that just blocks from this legislature, blocks from these marble steps, there are children who go to school hungry on a daily basis?

Mr. Speaker, these are the challenges we face. These are the unaddressed needs of our province on the one hand, and on the other hand we've got a bankrupt treasury. Mr. Speaker, these are difficult times to be in government — that may seem to all of us to be the worst of times. And the worst of times, Mr. Speaker, made all the more difficult by

the financial mess that has been left behind by the member from Estevan, the member from Thunder Creek, the member for Rosthern, member from Morse, and the others.

Mr. Speaker, just let me, if I may for a moment, with an aside — I have listened with interest as the members of the Conservative caucus have entered debate in this House, particularly the member from Estevan. And you know it just seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the member from Estevan and others over there have not quite grasped the reality of what happened on October 21, Mr. Speaker. They have not quite grasped the enormity of their rejection by the people of Saskatchewan, the enormity of their defeat.

One would expect, Mr. Minister, a government that has been turfed out in that manner would express at least a modicum of humility, at least a modicum of embarrassment for having their record and their philosophy so rejected by the people of Saskatchewan.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have observed day after day the same arrogance that I say put them in the condition they're in today. Mr. Speaker, I don't know if they recognize yet the enormity of their defeat.

(1500)

Mr. Speaker, what is clear is that our province and this new government has been left with a massive challenge: a bankrupt province and needs crying out from every corner. And it may seem to us that these indeed are the worst of times. And you know, Mr. Speaker, I guess that's where the story ended. If that were the end of the story, I don't know why anyone of us would want to be in this legislature. I don't know why anyone of us would want to be a part of government.

But these are not just, Mr. Speaker, the worst of times. They are, as Charles Dickens put it equally, "the best of times." And, Mr. Speaker, I am of the view that in every crisis there is an opportunity. And it is, Mr. Speaker, crisis.

It is challenge that history shows has brought out the very best in Saskatchewan people. We in Saskatchewan are not a people who wring our hands in despair and give up, Mr. Speaker. And I can tell you, we are not a government that is willing to wring its hand in despair and give up either.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — It is just the contrary, Mr. Speaker. This throne speech which we debate indicates that we are a government ready to undertake, as the throne speech quotes, "a new beginning," Mr. Speaker. We are not a government that will be prepared to wring our hands in defeat. We are a government prepared to make a new beginning.

Mr. Speaker, we are a new government given a strong mandate by the people of Saskatchewan. We have members elected from every walk of life and from every corner of our province. We come here with experience in government and with members who are brand-new to the

political process.

But what unites us, Mr. Speaker, what unites us first of all is that we come to this House with a commitment to the principles of social democracy, Mr. Speaker. That's what unites us, and we each in our own and our common way come with dreams for our province, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, with Robert Kennedy, we are and will be a government that does not simply see things as they are and say why; we are a government who will dream of how things might be and say why not?

Mr. Speaker, we dream. We in this government dream of a province where at the turn of the 21st century, like the soup kitchens of the 1930s, the food banks of the 1980s and '90s will be a thing of the past. Mr. Speaker, we dream of an end to poverty in this province, and we say why not?

Mr. Speaker, we as a government dream of a Saskatchewan where the democratic institutions in our province are as open and as honest and as appropriate to our times as they are anywhere in the free world, Mr. Speaker. We dream of a new democracy in Saskatchewan, and we say why not?

Mr. Speaker, we are a government that dreams of a province where women and children and men can live and walk in their communities and walk on the campuses of our province without fear, without fear of violence, Mr. Speaker. We dream of a new society without the fear of violence, and we say why not?

We dream, Mr. Speaker, of a province where dignity is restored to the farming enterprise and where the rich land of our province may continue to feed the hungry of our world. We dream of feeding the hungry, and we say why not?

Mr. Speaker, we dream of a province where working men and women can enjoy the best of labour standards and the best of occupational health and safety, and we say why not? Why not in Saskatchewan?

Mr. Speaker, in my view it is intolerable, it is intolerable that workers are injured, killed on the job, and those responsible seem to go off scot-free. Mr. Speaker, we dream of a province where the working men and women enjoy the protection of their society.

Mr. Speaker, we dream — this dream was identified by my friend and colleague the member from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden in her moving of this throne speech — we dream of a province where environmental protection and enhancement and conservation can be a model for all the nation and all the continent, and indeed for all the world. We say why not here in Saskatchewan?

Mr. Speaker, our province longs for new vision and new direction and new confidence. And, Mr. Speaker, this government and this throne speech is that new beginning, Mr. Speaker.

How do we take our dreams and make them reality? How do we translate the dreams that we bring to this House as

individual members and as a new government? How do we translate them into reality? How do we strive toward the goals we have set?

Well, Mr. Speaker, we do that on the principles of social democracy. That's how we do it. We do it on the principles of social democracy which as broadly and as simply stated are these: We can accomplish by working together that which we cannot accomplish by working alone.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, in this province when we join together, when we unite in common cause, when we work together in Saskatchewan, there is very little that we cannot do. When we are divided, there is very little we can do. When we work together there is very little we cannot do, Mr. Speaker.

You know, Mr. Speaker, my whip, when asking me if I could be prepared to enter the throne speech debate today, he called and he said, do you have a song in your heart? Well how little did he know. In fact I do have a song in my heart, Mr. Speaker. It was a song that my parents enjoyed singing, and their generation, in difficult times and challenging times. It seems to me it's a song that's not inappropriate as the theme song to the times which we are now in. And it's a song, Mr. Speaker, about social democracy and it goes like this: Well we ain't got a barrel of money, and maybe we're ragged and funny; but we'll travel the road, sharing the load, side by side.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, that's how we're going to do it. That's how we're going to do it — side by side — workers and farmers, rural and urban, native and non-native, young and old. From the oldest grandparent in our province to the newest immigrant arriving today on the aircraft, we're going to do it, Mr. Speaker, travelling the road, sharing the load, side by side. Mr. Speaker, that, in my view, is social democracy, and that is how this government intends to proceed.

Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying we will not reach all of our goals. We will not in our time achieve all of our dreams, succeed in all that we undertake. But this government will not forsake the journey.

I listened with interest in this throne speech debate as the member from Estevan delivered a little Christmas homily here in the House. I think therefore I can be excused if I bring to my remarks, not a quotation but an illustration from scripture.

Mr. Speaker, you and members will remember that scene when the slaves of Israel escaped the oppression in Egypt and found themselves there on the shores of the Red Sea. To their front, the waters of the Red Sea; on each side, the imposing mountains; and behind them, the Pharaoh's chariots. Mr. Speaker, some of them wanted to give up; some of them wanted to return to the bondage of Egypt. And it was in that crucial moment, Mr. Speaker, that the divine command came to Moses, saying, go forward, go forward. And they did, Mr. Speaker. They entered the

stormy sea. They went forward. They did not hesitate. In faith and confidence, they went forward — just as this government, Mr. Speaker, intends — in spite of the challenges, in spite of the odds against to go forward.

And, Mr. Speaker, what I find of particular note in the account of the exodus in the Old Testament is that most never saw the promised land. They never made it. Moses died before they got to the promised land.

And, Mr. Speaker, many of us will not see the full realization of our dreams, either in this session or in this lifetime. But I tell you, Mr. Speaker, we in this government will not forsake the journey.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — So I'll end, Mr. Speaker, with the place where I began. Again from *A Tale of Two Cities*, another quote, and this quote is from a conversation between Defarge and Madame Defarge. He says:

It is possible — that it may not come, during our lives . . .  
We may not see the triumph.

(But, returned madame,) We shall have helped it.

Friends, members of the legislature, we will be judged in this House and our government will be judged. The test that I shall apply to our government, and indeed to this legislature, is the test that Franklin Delano Roosevelt identified in his second inaugural address in, I believe, 1937 when he said:

I see a nation one-third of whom are hungry and homeless, and the test of our progress will not be in how much we add to the abundance of those who have much, but how we meet the needs of those who have little.

And, Mr. Speaker, if we in this government shall have helped meet the needs of those who have little, I for one will leave this House satisfied with our work.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, because I believe this throne speech is but the beginning of the first few steps on the road to a better province, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand in this government and support this throne speech.

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

(1515)

**Mr. Lyons:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I first of all want to say and publicly congratulate the member for Moose Jaw Wakamow for his speech, a very moving and very powerful address indeed. And I know we have all been heartened by those remarks.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate you for your election as Speaker. And I want to say that it's not one of those pro forma congratulations, Mr. Speaker. It's a heartfelt congratulations because all of us in the Assembly know that your election as Speaker is a result of

the respect shown to you by members of all sides of the House and not as a result of some back room deal or some other type of thing which would cast a stain on your election.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that you will have the co-operation and the support of myself during your tenure here as Speaker of the House, to spite the fact that now and again we may agree to disagree on certain interpretations of the rules, as has been known to have happened in the past.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I stand here today and I want to thank the members of the constituency of Regina Rosemont. And by the members of the constituency I don't just mean members of the New Democratic Party, but all those people who lived in the constituency who gave me their confidence and support in a manner which can only be described as overwhelming. Despite some controversies that were engaged in prior to the election and that I happened to be involved in, the people of Regina Rosemont granted me the opportunity to speak on their behalf in this legislature. And for that I feel very, very humble, and I must say, very privileged to do so. And I make a commitment to those people now that no matter what the issue or no matter what the times, that their voice will be heard in this Legislative Assembly, and their voice will be heard within the government caucus and on their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, and within the context of the previous speaker's remarks, I'd like to talk a little bit about what the events of October 21 meant, to the way I see what happened on October 21 and what it represented.

And I can only, Mr. Speaker, define the overwhelming victory for our party on October 21 as a mandate for change. That October 21 represented a verdict by the people of this province and rejection by the people of this province of the right-wing agenda which had been followed by Conservative parties. Whether they were in Saskatchewan, whether they were in British Columbia, whether they were in Ottawa, whether they were in Britain, whether they were all around the world, people have said no to that right-wing agenda. On October 21 here in Saskatchewan they said it in no uncertain terms, Mr. Speaker.

And the reason they said it, the reason they said no to the right-wing agenda is the people of this province, I believe, are aware of the crisis which confronts us — not only here in Saskatchewan, but the crisis which confronts us on a global scale.

If we look around the world we will see the kind of things which have been replicated here in this province manifesting themselves, some in greater terms, some in greater scope, some in greater interpretation, if you like, within the global context.

If you look at the question of hunger, we have hungry children here in Saskatchewan. And that hunger represents 40,000 children here in the city of Regina alone. And that hunger of the children is part of the global hunger which is felt by children all over the world,

whether it's in North America, whether it's in Europe, whether it's in Asia, whether it's in Latin America, or whether it's in Africa. There was something that is happening on a global scale which is causing children to be hungry. There is something that is happening on a global scale that is putting the needs of those children not foremost but is burying those needs beneath a mountain of hunger, malnutrition, and deprivation. The statistics speak for themselves; 100,000 children a day die from hunger on a global scale — 100,000 kids die because they can't get enough to eat. That's like every three days or every four days the city of Regina and the city of Saskatoon combined are getting wiped out.

Imagine if you will, Mr. Speaker, those two cities filled with children; they are decimated every three or four days. They're gone. They are dying from . . . because we have not been able to provide them with the food they need to live. And I guess child hunger represents the worst manifestation of the global crisis. But there are many others.

There's a global crisis in health care. People are dying each and every day because there's an inadequacy of health care. People are dying and are forced to live in circumstances which cause them to die because they don't have access to education on a global scale. People are denied the basic right, the right to live, because somehow the system on a global scale is not meeting their needs.

Mr. Speaker, the problems that we face here, as the environmentalists say, cannot be dealt with solely by looking at the problems that we face here. They have to be looked at at least at that level of the global crises.

We have a national crisis. That global crisis is reflected on a national level here in Canada itself, Mr. Speaker. We have a constitutional crisis; we have an economic crisis; we have a crisis of confidence in terms of political leadership. We have a country like Canada which is blessed with the riches that have been given us, blessed with a population, a small population, which should be able to utilize those riches.

We find ourselves in the kind of crisis which we see happening when we look to eastern Europe and Yugoslavia for example, where in fact the very fabric and unity of this country is threatened because there are things, there are forces at work, which are causing solutions to those problems not to be implemented.

And, Mr. Speaker, we have a provincial crisis. The provincial crises were ably pointed out by other members in the Assembly. Of course the most obvious crisis is the one of feeding the hungry kids in our province. And for nine and a half years the Conservatives failed to meet the basic needs of children.

We don't have to go to the Third World to see the crisis in health care and education and in housing. All we have to do is look to the North to see the kind of circumstances that people in towns and villages like La Loche or in Stony Rapids or in Black Lake or Fond-du-lac are forced to live in because the system has failed them, Mr. Speaker. Because the system has failed to provide even basic and

adequate needs for them.

We come across situations in this province, Mr. Speaker, which are totally contradictory to any rational notion of humanity. We see for example, liquor subsidized in northern Saskatchewan while the former Conservative government put an end to food subsidies. It says something about the priorities of that government, the former government, Mr. Speaker, in terms of trying to deal with the crisis that we face here at a provincial level.

Mr. Speaker, as I began the speech, I said there is a rejection of the right-wing agenda. And that agenda has become to be known in terms of political economy as the neo-Liberal agenda — neo-Liberalism. The concept of free-market forces working out there, unfettered, unbridled, the market weaving its magic, things happening — the idea and notion that somehow if the market and if big business and the corporations are left to do their own thing, then somehow we'll all become more prosperous for it.

Well if we start here in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, we had nine and a half years of unbridled capitalism in this province — nine and a half years in which the proponents of that neo-Liberal agenda worked their magic in the market-place. And what did we end up with, Mr. Speaker? We ended up with a fiscal crisis of the state; that is, the provincial government not having enough money in the coffers to provide even basic, adequate services for the citizens of this province.

We've seen that neo-Liberal agenda at work in this province for nine and a half years; seen the degradation of the educational system. We've seen the degradation of the health-care system. Need I remind members of what happened to the school-based dental plan for children?

We've seen that neo-Liberal agenda at work in all sectors of this economy in which certain people did get rich. Certain people enriched themselves at the expense of everybody else, Mr. Speaker, at the expense of the great majority of the citizens of this province. Because the ideas of neo-Liberalism are the ideas, the same old story of the old capitalism from the '30s or the capitalism from the 1800s; that is, the ideas of Adam Smith and the ideas of all those ideologues who say, if we allow some to enrich ourselves, then the others will be able to get trickled down upon.

Well what's happened, Mr. Speaker, is that the greed, the outright greed of those who enrich themselves haven't even left crumbs on the table for the other citizens of this province to try to fight over. What's happened, Mr. Speaker, is that for the last nine and a half years their political agenda, driven by their economic dogma, has left this province in a state of financial and fiscal ruin; has resulted in the lowering of living standards for the great majority of citizens of this province; has resulted in a province which used to be the beacon of progress in North America left floundering, left floundering like a flattened dog on the roadside, Mr. Speaker, because that's what happened. That's what happened as a result of their neo-Liberal agenda here in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Lyons:** — Well some members say it's more like a dead skunk in the middle of the road, Mr. Speaker. I can appreciate that symbolism particularly when it comes to the smell that's left over as a residue and that kind of odour . . . odoriferous emanation if you like, that comes from the kind of patronage that we have seen regarding the things like George Hill's contract calling for \$1.3 million of severance pay. Some people got rich, Mr. Speaker. The rest of us got it in the neck.

That neo-Liberal agenda, Mr. Speaker, as I said is something that is not peculiar here to Saskatchewan. We see it in Canada and we've seen the results of that neo-Liberal agenda when it comes to items like free trade.

What's happened, if you noticed in the news yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that 300 to 400,000 permanent jobs, good paying jobs, which have been lost in this country as a result of that free-trade agreement signed by the Mulroney government in Ottawa and supported by the former government here in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, that neo-Liberal agenda has lost us long-term, permanent, structural jobs that Canadian people need to keep their body and soul together, to feed their families, to be able to provide themselves with opportunities — educationally, and what have you, culturally, recreationally. Those jobs have been gone so we've seen an increase in the unemployment rate. And it's a structural increase, Mr. Speaker, because the neo-Liberal agenda isn't working. We've had it since '84 federally; we've had it since '82 provincially, and what have been the results?

The proof is in the pudding, Mr. Speaker. The proof of that agenda is in the pudding and that pudding has gone rotten, tastes sour, and has been thrown out on October 21 by the people of Saskatchewan. And when Brian Mulroney gets the courage to call the federal election, will be rejected *en masse* by the people of this country because they've said: enough is enough.

We're not going down that path any more and we were not going to be trod upon and exploited as a result of the ideologues of the Conservative Party, whether provincially or federally.

And that neo-Liberal agenda, Mr. Speaker, consists of a number of notions and actions. The first notion is the freedom of the market-place. Let the market-place rule because the market will decide all. And we've seen what's happened in Canada when that notion has been put into effect.

Airlines, for example, and the deregulation of the airline industry — has that improved airline service to the people of Saskatchewan or not? When you talk to people who travel, who wish to take vacations, who want to go visit friends and relatives in other parts of the country, what they're saying is that they're finding it harder and harder to do and more and more expensive to go, to utilize a service which because the Tories have done away with the railway system in this country — an affordable service, a service which used to be affordable — that they're not even able to utilize the existing transportation

infrastructure.

That notion of the liberalization of the market-place, that notion that the market must rule, was rejected by the people of this province on the 21st. And they're saying, we do not want you as a government — that is those on this side of the House — to follow that agenda. The agenda we want you to follow is the agenda of us, we, the people of Saskatchewan.

(1530)

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to talk a little bit about that, but first perhaps I should just mention that some of the notions that have come up or some of the slogans that have arisen as a result of the neo-Liberal agenda, I think should be examined rather closely by all members of this Legislative Assembly as well as all legislators throughout Canada.

The first concept that's arisen is that of globalization. Now what does globalization mean? Well behind the notion of globalization as presented by the neo-Liberals is a thought that the spreading of the productive apparatus on a global basis will enhance the life of people all over the globe; that their living standards will be raised, that the magic of the market-place... because of the global domination of the multinationals, that somehow those people around the world will benefit.

We here in Canada, we hear the members from the Conservative caucus talk about globalization in glowing terms. They talk about it as if it's some kind of magic formula which is somehow going to solve the problems that we all face on a global scale.

What has been, Mr. Speaker, I would ask, what has been the result of this notion of globalization? Has it been a globalization of prosperity? Well, Mr. Speaker, statistics and the facts say otherwise. The notion of globalization, the actuality of globalization has not led to prosperity for people in this province; it has not led to prosperity for people in this country; and has not led to prosperity for the peoples of the world.

There is a very interesting report, Mr. Speaker, that you may at some point of time want to avail yourself of. It was a study done by the University of Ottawa. Michael Cassutovsky is the name of the person that led this study. It was a study of the effects of globalization and what it meant for the people of the world.

Well first of all it said that the reason for globalization has become clear. The reason for globalization is one and one only. The moving of plants and productive apparatus out of countries like Canada, out of provinces like Saskatchewan is for one reason only, and that is to find cheap labour.

And it's not just in Canada but it's also in the United States; it's also in Japan; it's also in the European Economic Community where industries which were indigenous to those areas have been taken, lifted up, and put into the low wage countries.

And Mr. Cassutovsky finds, and the study by the University of Ottawa finds, that the average rate of pay for

workers in industries which have been moved from the so-called first world to the low wage countries, the average daily rate of pay is 3 to \$4 a day. In countries like Malaysia, in Singapore, in low wage colonies like Hong Kong — all those areas of the Third World which have been industrialized as a result of globalization have meant not an increase in the living standards of the people there, but in fact have meant a decrease in the living standards; that it's resulted in an increase in poverty, an increase in violent crime, has resulted in a forced march from the countryside to the cities in which people are forced to live in the kind of dire poverty that we know well when we visit northern Saskatchewan; that the ability of the globalization, instead of meaning the globalization of prosperity, has meant a globalization of poverty.

And, Mr. Speaker, this is the underlying, fundamental economic challenge that we here in Saskatchewan will face in the coming years, because we are not divorced from the global economy. We cannot be an autarchic economic entity, an entity which operates by itself alone. As John Donne said: "no man is an island" and no woman is an island unto itself. Neither is Saskatchewan a political entity unto itself.

But the question that we have to face, Mr. Speaker, is this. At the base economic fundamentally we have to... have to face is this question. Do we accept the dictates of the global capitalist economy? Do we become, in other words, the handmaids of the multinationals who now make the major economic decisions in this province, in this country, and on this globe? Do we become their handmaids or do we strike out down a path which is different from that dictated by the multinationals?

That's the fundamental and the overriding political and economic question that we, Mr. Speaker, I believe have to face. And fundamentally our record as a government will be judged on that basis — our ability to operate in what is essentially a hostile economic environment. The ability to create jobs, the ability to provide social services and educational services and health services, our ability to clean up the mess, as we say, left by the Tories will be fundamentally structured by our response to that hostile economic environment.

And, Mr. Speaker, when I speak of a hostile economic environment, let me give you a few statistics done by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund on what's happening as a result of the increase in globalization. By the end of the century, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank — institutions, by the way, dominated by the large multinational-driven state entities, the United States, the EC (European Community) — by the end of this century, 6 billion people will be on this planet, 5 billion of which will live in the poor countries of this globe.

So five out of every six people on this planet will be living in a country which has suffered under the effects of globalization; 15 per cent of the population of the globe, Mr. Speaker, will live in the rich countries. And those rich countries control 80 per cent of the world's wealth.

Now when I say that 15 per cent of the population that

live in the rich countries will control 80 per cent of the wealth, I'm not talking, Mr. Speaker, obviously, about all the people who live in those rich countries, because if we look around in Canada, we will see that in Canada 75 per cent of the wealth in Canada is controlled by 10 per cent of the population and the bottom 40 per cent of the population in this country controls .54 per cent of the wealth. So obviously that 15 per cent is misleading in the sense that it's not all those people. It will be a very small group of those people.

Three billion people, Mr. Speaker, by the end of the century will share in only 5.4 per cent of the total wealth of this globe. Three billion people will have to share a pie which is only 5 per cent of the whole pie.

The World Bank, not necessarily known to be a friend of the socialist movement around the world, also has this to say: that in the two years since the neo-Liberal agenda was implemented in Poland and Hungary — in only two years — the same level of economic disparity which presently exists throughout Latin America has been introduced in Poland and in Hungary, Mr. Speaker. The same kind of division as between classes and as between income distribution and as between levels has now been introduced as a result of that introduction of that neo-Liberal agenda. Imagine that — just in two years we see that kind of disparity.

What the other side of the coin and which is relevant to this province . . . has been in the three years between 1988 and 1981. According to the University of Warsaw's sociology department, in 1988 73 per cent of Polish workers supported privatization. By March 1991, that support had dropped to 27 per cent.

Now when you take the kind of conflict that we've had in this province over privatization and put it in that context, you will see why people throughout the globe, whether it's here in Saskatchewan or whether it's in newly privatized Poland, say this is not the way and this is not the system which is meeting our basic economic needs, and we're rejecting that system.

And before the members opposite get up on their feet to take exception to that, I'm not here talking about the liberalization of freedom. There's not one member of this Assembly who doesn't support the right to free speech, the right to assembly, the right to be able to determine democratically their own future. And all of us here rejoice in things like the fall of the Berlin wall and the death of Stalinism in eastern Europe.

But along with that glasnost, if you like to use the Russian term, comes the perestroika. And what's happening throughout eastern Europe, and in fact in the Soviet Union itself, is a rejection of that model because that model in eastern Europe is the one that the people of Saskatchewan and the people of this country have been hit with. And the people throughout this province and this country rejected that and are rejecting — did on October 21; will do it in the next federal election.

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

**Mr. Lyons:** — The president of the World Bank, Michael

Candessus I think summed it up best when he was talking about the neo-Liberal agenda and its effects in Poland over the last two years. What he said is there has been a lowering in the real production and a notorious increase in unemployment.

And doesn't that describe what happened to us here in Saskatchewan over the last nine years — that neo-Liberal agenda which the people of Saskatchewan were faced with.

Some members may take exception, Mr. Speaker, to using the term neo-Liberal. As I said, it's a term from political economy, but I do believe it's very apt. It's a very apt term when we come to talk about the politics here in Saskatchewan on that level because in my mind, Mr. Speaker, and in my experience, having grown up in another part of the country along the east coast where we were plagued by a series of Conservative and Liberal governments, that fundamentally there is no difference in the economic policies pursued by the Conservatives and those pursued by the Liberals.

For example, all we have to do is reflect back to the last provincial election prior to October 21 and what do we hear the member from Saskatoon Greystone, the Leader of the Liberal Party, say about the fiscal crisis that Saskatchewan faces? We all know, Mr. Speaker, in this Assembly, that the tax system in this province and in this country is unfair, is inequitable, that the rich pay little and the rest of us pay a lot.

And what was the position of the member from Saskatoon Greystone? Here we are in a province, here we are in a province with food banks. Here we are in a province that has a crisis in the education system and the health care system, and what does the member from Saskatoon Greystone say during the last election? Those traditional mechanisms which have provided funds for us here, the resource sector, what did she do? She stood up and she said, my gosh, golly gee, I demand that the NDP guarantee us that they will not increase taxes to the wealthy. I demand, I demand that they guarantee that the NDP will cut oil royalties, will cut oil royalties to a level below that of Alberta.

In other words, what she's saying, Mr. Speaker, and what she said is the same thing that the Tories have done in the past nine and a half years. She has no plans to reform the economic system of this country or of this province. It's the same old neo-Liberal agenda that we've heard time and time again and that's got us into this mess.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, can you imagine going to the defence of the oil companies against that of homeless kids and kids that don't have enough to eat? I would ask the member where does she think the money is going to come from, if not from a fair share of resource revenues to the people of this province. But no, she doesn't want that to happen.

(1545)

Mr. Speaker, yesterday on my desk arrived the third-quarter report from North Canadian Oils Limited, an oil company headquartered here in Saskatchewan. I

open it up to page 6, the condensed consolidated balance sheet, and under an area entitled, liabilities, I see a number that says \$83 million and across from that number, deferred income taxes — deferred income taxes.

So here we have the nine and a half years of the Tories plus the member from Saskatoon Greystone rushing to the defence of oil companies that have the ability to defer \$83 million in income tax and the whole year hasn't been done yet. How much more income tax are they going to defer by the end of their fiscal year, Mr. Speaker? Right?

No, no. No, no. For the member from Saskatoon Greystone, it's okay that the neo-Liberal agenda be followed, that there's more wealth transferred from the backs of working people, from the backs of farmers, from the backs of small business into the hands of oil companies, into the hands of banks, into the hands of her corporate friends who she's hoping is going to bankroll her rise to political prominence in this country, Mr. Speaker.

And there, Mr. Speaker, is the fundamental difference between the two old-line parties and we on this side of the House. Mr. Speaker, we say that the people of the province will not be the hewers of wood and drawers of water for the rich corporations and for the wealthy; that the wealthy are going to pay their fair share and that the people of this province are going to get the break, not the corporations getting the tax breaks in the system which is unfair to all of us here in Saskatchewan and all of us here in Canada.

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

**Mr. Lyons:** — Mr. Speaker, on October 21 the people of this province rejected that neo-Liberal corporate agenda for Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, we will as a government march down a different path. We will be getting our fare of resource revenues so that there won't be hungry kids here in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. We're going to be getting our fare of taxation revenue from the wealthy so that we can put our kids in a decent school, Mr. Speaker. We're going to ensure, Mr. Speaker, that seniors have the right to good quality, the best quality health care that we can afford, and those that can afford to pay, will, Mr. Speaker, despite what the Conservatives say, despite what the Liberals say, because we are not beholden to the large corporate multinationals who bankroll.

You know, Mr. Speaker, when I stand here it's funny seeing them trying to fight over who's going to write the cheque. The Liberals and the Tories, they're saying . . . standing up for the corporation, hoping that these corporations will write the cheques to pay their path, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the member from Saskatoon Greystone can talk all she wants about the new politics. The fact is her version of the new politics is a new cheque in the Liberal Party's bankroll as opposed to an old cheque in the Tory Party's bankroll. They're singing from the same song sheet when it comes to economic development. They're singing from the same song sheet when it comes to taxation, Mr. Speaker, and it's a song that the people of Saskatchewan have refused to sing and will not sing, Mr.

Government, and will . . . Mr. Speaker. And it is a song, it is a melody which will not be played by members of this side, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as I began, there is a crisis on a global scale. It's a crisis in the environment. There's a crisis in hunger. There's a crisis that each of us have the ability here as members of this legislature to affect in our own corner.

Mr. Speaker, we will think globally but we will act locally. And in acting locally, we will develop the kind of democratic, community-based economy which doesn't rely on the investment decisions made by large, out-of-province multinationals, but will rely on the strength and the ingenuity and the will of the people here in Saskatchewan to put into place; and which will rely, Mr. Speaker, on the kind of public enterprise which built this province in the first place.

Because, Mr. Speaker, when you take away one of the cylinders from that engine, that engine doesn't run very well. The Tories took it away; Ross Thatcher did it in the past; the member from Saskatoon Greystone hopes she'll have the opportunity to do it in the future. But the people of this province, Mr. Speaker, the people of this province will say, we want all those cylinders to function. We are going to use the tools that we have, and we will build the province by any means necessary, Mr. Speaker — we will build the province by any means necessary.

The neo-Liberal agenda is the old agenda from the past. We're going to go forward with a brand-new agenda to build a brand-new Saskatchewan over the objections of the Liberals, over the objections of the Tories, but with the support of the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. And I thank you very much for the opportunity.

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

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me a great deal of pleasure today to enter into this debate on the throne speech and congratulate once more Mr. Speaker for assuming his position in the chair. I can assure Mr. Speaker that I will try to get to my feet quicker in other circumstances and save the House some of the . . . what just took place here.

I would like to take this opportunity also to congratulate Her Honour on the job that she did in presenting the throne speech. As always, Her Honour adds a great deal of dignity to this House and to our province. I must say also, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to extend to the constituents of Thunder Creek my appreciation for returning me to this Assembly for the third time.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, Thunder Creek doesn't have a long history in this legislature, at least not in recent times, but it is known as one that takes its politics very seriously in our province. A number of prominent politicians have come from that part of the world. As a matter of fact, I've had the distinct responsibility and pleasure of representing the farms of two former premiers in this province.

I think it goes without saying that people in that constituency take their jobs, their farms, their families,



very seriously. They take their politics very seriously. And over the time that Thunder Creek has been in existence, it has always returned politicians who have been from the centre to the right, shall we say, as their representatives in this legislature.

People there I think, when one goes out campaigning, don't ever mince words with their representative; they always pretty well lay things on the line. And I think to be an MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly) in that particular constituency you have to stay on your toes or you won't get returned. So the confidence that they've shown in me in this recent election when the New Democratic Party swept this province basically, I really appreciate.

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

**Mr. Swenson:** — Mr. Speaker, I do say to the government of the day that they did win a very large majority, that they have the confidence of the people. They attained 50 per cent of the vote in this province. And obviously the people in this province were looking for changes in direction, that there were some areas that the former government took part in that perhaps didn't fit with the agendas of people. And I respect that, Mr. Speaker, as one must always respect the ultimate will of the voter.

And I say my congratulations to many of the new members of this House who were elected in a particular NDP government. Many of these members represent rural ridings — ridings that in the past in this province have for the most part sent either Liberal or Conservative members to this legislature.

And I say to these new members, you have a tremendous responsibility to bring to this House because you represent people that have traditionally had very, shall we say, small "c" conservative values, and they expect that their representatives will also reflect those values.

One thing I think, Mr. Speaker, that is obviously clear to me in this throne speech debate . . . And I must say that Her Honour didn't particularly have a lot to work with when she presented on Monday December 2 to this Chamber, the Speech from the Throne. This is my seventh Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, and I must say that it certainly is the thinnest.

One thing that has become very evident to me as I've listened to the debate over the last six days is that some members of this legislature, and particularly the NDP, the new NDP government, have not changed their ways from the days in opposition. They certainly are not short on sanctimonious rhetoric, and we just had a good case example of this — the member from Rosemont who gave similar speeches while in opposition.

And although those speeches, Mr. Speaker, are always delivered with a lot of fervour, and obviously that member has a well-read library at home when he talks about world affairs, they clearly point to one thing that I haven't heard either in the throne speech or any of the speeches from members in this Assembly. And that is, where is this government going to take us? Where is the plan that people in this province are expecting from a

new government?

I sat in this legislature now, as I've said, for six and a half years, Mr. Speaker. And I have listened to the NDP opposition over five years prior to now — before that when there was a few of them over here — and I've always heard a great deal of criticism. But I've never really heard a plan that would fit the province of Saskatchewan into the 1990s.

They talked a lot about the salad days in the '70s when Saskatchewan was booming and there was lots of money to spend. And we know that that alternative, which at that time consisted of big government, big unions, nationalization, things like land bank, aren't applicable today in Saskatchewan or in Canada.

So we know their past well, and we are expecting something different in the future. And I found it kind of interesting, Mr. Speaker, during the last campaign, the campaign manager for the NDP Party, a well respected former member of this legislature and certainly a man that knows politics, would make some statements in the *Prince Albert Daily Herald* that I'd like to read into the Assembly because I think they corroborate what I've been saying in my opening remarks.

And this is to quote Mr. Messer: Jack Messer told the Saskatchewan New Democratic Party's annual convention Friday what Conservative leader Grant Devine has been saying throughout the campaign. Messer said the party had a good campaign organization and an election planning committee that worked long and hard.

And after all this work we came out with no platform. A lot of people were saying it's not like the NDP. We have to have a New Deal number three. Party supporters expected a complete platform, but they began to realize that there was no overall policy plan midway through the campaign," Messer said.

I know a lot of you were showing a little bit of concern, but the discipline and the strategy and the logic of that contributed largely to us winning this election.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I find that a little bit irresponsible from a former cabinet minister in this legislature, a man who sat both in opposition and government, that the NDP Party would be so crass as to tell the public in this province that they didn't have a plan, did not intend to have a plan, and that they simply were going to cash in on mistakes that were made by the former government.

And certainly they did cash in, Mr. Speaker, on those mistakes. But I think the people of this province deserve better from a political party.

And I know, Mr. Speaker, that when you first ran for this legislature back in the early '70s, that the Hon. Allan Blakeney, a former premier of this province did put forward a plan. It was a plan that was controversial in some areas but it was a plan. And that the former Thatcher government of the day did not particularly have one at the end of its mandate.

And Mr. Blakeney took that plan. He put it forward to the people, and he won many constituencies in this province because of that plan. He simply did not campaign on the mistakes of the Thatcher administration. And I think a lot of people in this province, particularly CCF/NDP people could take a lot of pride in the fact that that plan was laid out and that people had a clear choice of what to vote for.

(1600)

People in this province deserve better than to simply have blatant manipulation of the electoral process simply to gain power, simply to gain the reins of power. Power for power's sake alone, Mr. Speaker, is not enough to run a government upon.

I listened a little earlier in the day, Mr. Speaker, to one of the member's opposite, a member who I know quite well, a member who I have a great deal of respect for, a man of the cloth. I must say that he did some of the finest marryings and burials in Moose Jaw that I've ever heard. But the member talked about dreams, and dreams for the province of Saskatchewan. My father always had a saying on our farm that you've got to get up in the morning and dream a little because that's how you'll create something.

And I'm proud to say that I'm the fifth generation of farmer in Saskatchewan on my particular farm and we have created a lot of things over the years. My grandfather dreamed, after the '30s blew most of our land away, that he would plant tree rows and bring the land back into production. My father dreamed in the early 1970s that we would irrigate our land with the effluent water from the Moose Jaw sewage system, and today we're doing that.

You've got to have those kind of dreams in this province in order to create a home for your family and create wealth and create the things that our society has come to expect. But along with those dreams, Mr. Speaker, one must get down to work, because when you dream all day nothing gets accomplished. And without a lot of hard work and individual initiative, you won't get to that dream.

And so far, from what I've seen of this particular session of the legislature, there's a lot of dreaming going on by the government and no hard work. We haven't seen, Mr. Speaker, a budget document presented in this legislature. And I thought surely after five years in opposition with so many criticisms, that this new administration would have sort of had a plan — a fiscal plan where they wanted to go.

Instead we have seen a government that seems intent on only one thing, Mr. Speaker, and that one thing seems to be fulfilling some of the political wishes of their friends. And that political wish of people like Barb Byers and George Rosenau is to punish the Conservative Party and the Conservative opposition, instead of getting on with the real agenda.

And I think for that reason, Mr. Speaker, they haven't done things like bringing in the freedom of information Bill that was passed in the last House by all members who sat in this House. It was a unanimous vote. All this government had to do, Mr. Speaker, was come in and proclaim that particular piece of legislation, and I'm sure

that all members would have supported it. But instead they don't want to do that. They have excuses of why freedom of information shouldn't be available.

But this new open NDP administration is now embarked upon a very partisan course. We have seen the appointment, Mr. Speaker, of a committee behind closed doors. And I remind this legislature that not even Joseph McCarthy had his tribunals behind closed doors. We have a committee that supposedly is going to set a new financial direction for this province. It is going to examine, as the current Premier said, how we've done things in the past and how we will learn from those experiences and we will do things better in the future.

**An Hon. Member:** — Not too far in the past — '83.

**Mr. Swenson:** — As my colleague from Rosthern says, we don't want to go too far back though. We don't want to talk about nationalization. We don't want to talk about some of the things that were done in previous governments. We only want to define very narrowly some things that have happened since 1983. And primarily they have keyed in in the area of privatization.

Now this committee, Mr. Speaker, not only meets behind closed doors, Mr. Speaker, but it has three admitted NDP partisans upon it who will then vote in secret as to what particular transactions will be talked about and will not be talked about.

And when you tack that on, Mr. Speaker, with things like Mr. Messer becoming an interim, and I'm sure soon to be permanent president of SaskPower, and the denial in this House of members opposite to tell us what his salary and remuneration and fringe benefits will be.

When we have the members opposite embarked upon a process of firing all of the boards and commissions in the province and replacing them with cabinet ministers — boards and commissions that, I might add, Mr. Speaker, now seem to have been solely staffed up with members of the now infamous law firm from Saskatoon. And I will only repeat the one name, Mr. Ching, because the other two are now members of this legislature and I wouldn't want to cast aspersions upon them. But this particular law firm has even had to change its name because now the members are all employed, along with their cabinet minister friends, in running the province of Saskatchewan.

So this, Mr. Speaker, is this new open government that has all these dreams. And so far the dreams are strictly limited to doing political hatchet work.

Mr. Speaker, it really makes me wonder when we think that we have to empower the Gass Commission with quasi-judicial powers — a very first in this province that I'm told, Mr. Speaker, as far as doing financial review — quasi-judicial powers, behind closed doors, out of sight of the media, out of sight of the public, if we aren't simply on a political agenda. The auditor of this province, Mr. Speaker, has those abilities, to staff and call before the *Public Accounts Committee* . . . call before the Public Accounts Committee under oath, I'm told, anyone that they wish to talk to. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, in your

time in this legislature there was even the circumstances of a person being called before the bar of the legislature, and I believe it had to do with the hospital situation in this province.

So there were forms available to the government, forms that were available to all members of this legislature to examine in detail any particular fiscal transaction that may have occurred in the province of Saskatchewan.

Instead we have a Finance minister who comes out in front of the commission's announcement with an inflated budget deficit, a deficit that is so wild, Mr. Speaker, that it doesn't even really deserve comment.

And I won't read into the record the entire transcript from the *Leader-Post* on November 23 in Bruce Johnstone's article, Mr. Speaker, because the member from Wilkie did it the other day. But I will read one excerpt out of that particular document, Mr. Speaker, because I think it reinforces what I've had to say here today.

These few examples (Mr. Johnstone says) show the NDP was (far) more interested in tarnishing the Tories' already-tarnished reputation for fiscal management than providing an accurate picture of the deficit.

Of course, people outside the province — who don't understand the subtle nuances of political debate in these parts — might mistake Mr. Tchorzewski's bogus budget deficit for the real McCoy.

Well I guess the highlighted word in there would be "bogus", Mr. Speaker, because one can't say anything more for that particular document that was released.

And it comes down, Mr. Speaker, in the face of concerns by Saskatchewan people, Saskatchewan taxpayers, for a long time. And as I said before in my opening remarks, Mr. Speaker, the former government did not do everything perfectly. The former government, Mr. Speaker, the former government made mistakes.

I was the newly-minted minister responsible for SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation), Mr. Speaker, who shut down GigaText. GigaText, in everyone's mind I think, Mr. Speaker, was a mistake — I think one that started out being a opportunity but then turned into a mistake.

And I say to these new back-benchers here today that this is probably the highlight of your election, because as you come forward with a plan and as you start to make decisions in this legislature, you will make mistakes, believe me. Probably the safest members in this legislature today, as far as their seats are concerned, are the 10 members sitting here.

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

**Mr. Swenson:** — Because these 10 members have been elected in the face of a sweep. And as your government, as your front bench, as your treasury benches start to make decisions, they will make mistakes. And it will be

up to you to make sure that you hold them accountable.

There was three very pertinent questions put to the public of Saskatchewan in the recent election campaign. Those questions deal with how people in this province expect to be governed and how some of the moral questions that we have in our society should be handled. And I think it's incumbent upon all members of this legislature to think about those questions as we go through our processes in this Chamber.

People like the Association of Saskatchewan Taxpayers, Mr. Speaker, have clearly said that there must be changes in the way that governments handle the public's money. Other organizations around the province have said that very clearly.

And I accept, Mr. Speaker, as a member of a former government, that criticism. I respect that as a former cabinet minister who was forced with making decisions on a daily basis in this province.

But clearly on the question of balanced budget legislation in this province, the people spoke overwhelmingly that they want balanced budget legislation in this province and they want government to listen and they want all levels of government, Mr. Speaker, to listen. They want their federal government, they want their provincial government, they want their municipal government, to listen to that word.

Also, Mr. Speaker, they spoke very clearly, I think, on the issue of abortion. People in this province for a long time have been torn on this particular question, but one thing became very evident, Mr. Speaker. The people do not feel that they have a responsibility to fund publicly people who would wish to use abortion as a means of birth control in this province. And I think that as we as a legislature deliberate questions in the health care field, as we deliberate questions that have pertained to the family, that we think very clearly about how the people spoke on that particular question.

And thirdly, Mr. Speaker, they said very clearly that they want a say in the constitutional process of our country. They will not accept constitutional deals being done behind closed doors.

And, Mr. Speaker, I clearly remember that all members of this particular legislature, except three, voted in favour of the Meech Lake accord. The now Premier of this province voted for it. But clearly, Mr. Speaker, people in Saskatchewan did not like the process that went along with the Meech Lake accord. This Premier, who prides himself on being somewhat of a constitutional expert, has a long history of doing constitutional deals behind closed doors.

(1615)

One only has to remember those events which occurred in 1981-82 in a kitchen in Ottawa, when the current Constitution of Canada was repatriated to this country without one of the major provinces being a part of it. That deal was done in that kitchen basically with three individuals. And I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the

current Premier's long-suit constitution does not get a similar-type deal; that he and his colleagues do not trade off the wishes of the people of Saskatchewan which they enunciated very clearly in that plebiscite, and that was that they have the right to vote as individuals on how any constitutional change will take place in our country.

So I'm saying to the member from Riversdale, early on in your mandate, be honest and open with the people of this province when you think about changing their destiny as we did with the constitution when it was brought home from England.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the NDP government truly wanted to have an open government, as I said earlier, I think they really could have set the stage by proclaiming the freedom of information legislation. Because I think I clearly heard people around this province say that they want more access to government, they want more access to their members, and that they want more access to the levers that are available to influence government.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to go to another area, an area that certainly is very dear to me and certainly to most of my constituency, and that's the area of agriculture.

Thunder Creek basically has no choice but to live and die with the agricultural economy. It is made up of grain farms, of mixed farms, of irrigation along Lake Diefenbaker. It by and large is totally dependent on the small towns that lie therein, on how agriculture survives in the 1990s.

And I really wonder at what I've seen in this legislature so far from this new NDP government as far as agriculture goes. When the members of the opposition tried to have an emergency debate on that particular topic, members of the government already upon their election felt that it wasn't worthy of an emergency debate. They said no, we are going to bundle a bunch of people together and we're going to go off to Ottawa and that we'll lay it squarely where it belongs, and that is upon the federal government.

Well I agree in part, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government has a tremendous responsibility to agriculture in this country. In these times when one down on the farm has to fight the international grain wars out of your back pocket, it makes it darn tough. And I fully expect that our federal government should do its duty and help us fight those wars; that it should go to GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) and represent us properly; that it needs to be part of a safety net process that allows all farmers to plan for their future; that the federal government has to be there with third lines of defence in order to get us through those ups and downs in the commodity prices.

But provinces also have responsibility, Mr. Speaker. Members opposite talk about the things that they're going to do in many other areas to solve the problems of Saskatchewan. I've heard members opposite talk about Indian land claims. I've heard them talk about the area of social services. I've heard them talk about the areas of education and health. Clearly they believe that as a provincial government they have the ability to intervene

in those areas and make significant contributions, even though those areas, Mr. Speaker, also have significant federal responsibility.

Just recently we have seen the provinces of Alberta and Manitoba further come in to backstop their agricultural situation. They have come through with money in very difficult fiscal times to help their agricultural economies out because they full know that this winter will be one of the most difficult on record for farm families.

I heard the other day, Mr. Speaker, that net farm income in 1991-92 will be probably on the same level as 1971. And this is even with billions and billions of dollars by both federal and provincial governments being pumped into those farm economies over the last decade. But all I have seen, Mr. Speaker, from this government is the excuse over and over again that they leave it with the federal government, that they ride on the coat-tails of the former premier who did go to Ottawa and who did get a very significant sum of money for agriculture in Canada and certainly agriculture in Saskatchewan.

And when this government has the opportunity, with very little money, to make sure that farm families in this province, farm families all across the constituency of Thunder Creek, have the opportunity to access cash near-term, rather than waiting till spring, they have not done it.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened very carefully to some of the things that members opposite have talked about in this legislature as far as money goes. And I hear about a \$300,000 plane trip to Ottawa that the Minister of Agriculture and the Premier embarked upon to take their friends and other people to Ottawa.

I hear about \$300,000 being spent on this Gass tribunal which is being held in secret. I hear about \$300,000 being stripped from the Sask Works program. I hear about \$300,000 probably going into the pocket of the new president of SaskPower.

And I say to members of the government in this legislature, you add those up and you're half-way there, boys. Another million and a half bucks and you could have got 200 million for farm families before Christmas. Have you done it? No, they haven't done it. Have you talked about it? No, they haven't talked about it, Mr. Speaker.

But you know, the funny thing is about all these \$300,000 that I've identified being spoken about in this legislature, those are all political things, Mr. Speaker. They fit the political agenda of the government, therefore they're all right. They fit the political agenda of this new, open government, therefore those \$300,000 expenditures are all right.

Well, Mr. Speaker, two and a half million to three million dollars would have got all of that money into our economy for Christmas time in this province, but they have chosen their political agenda over the agenda of agriculture. And I'm sure that as many of these new rural members go home over the Christmas break, people are going to ask them why that was the agenda they chose

instead of the one that would have brought money into the pockets of families all across this province.

Mr. Speaker, I quickly want to go to a couple of other areas that I think are important because this government, I think, in its early stages has shown us that on the economic development side it doesn't have any plan. The member from Rosthern asked some very pertinent questions the other day about how the government was proceeding with a certain endeavour. They didn't have any answers for it. We've seen how they scrapped Fair Share Saskatchewan even though the current Premier is on record in many places in this province as saying that he would review each move individually, that in certain circumstances it might make sense for the economy of a certain area. But no, he had to satisfy his political agenda; therefore he would can it. But there were jobs going with that particular program, Mr. Speaker, and those jobs will have to be replaced.

The community bond program — probably something that will be remembered as a hallmark by people in this province for many years to come, introduced by the former government — community bond program alone will not sustain rural Saskatchewan. It's going to take a concerted effort by all of the economic areas of government to bring about an economic agenda that can rebuild many of our communities who have been hit so hard by our agricultural problems.

We see the closing down of trade offices, simply to get rid of people instead of simply replacing the people and carrying on with trading with our neighbours in other countries around the world.

Mr. Speaker, a classic example is the potash industry. The Potash and Phosphate Institute has been doing preparatory work in China for many years. When I was there last January on a trade mission, with the trade commissioner from Hong Kong by the way, we were able to talk to the Chinese about some of the advances that PPI (Potash and Phosphate Institute of Canada) have been making, demonstration projects. And that particular visit resulted in another 400,000 tonnes of Saskatchewan potash being sold.

That sale of potash employed people in this province, Mr. Speaker. It created jobs and it created wealth that this province can then redistribute to the people in this province. Closing down those trade offices served no purpose other than to satisfy the agenda of the current government which is totally political.

Mr. Speaker, I can see that my time is running short, but I want to say to this legislature and to the people in my constituency who saw confidence to send me back to this legislature for a third time, that we will be watching very carefully the plan that we hope will evolve from this government. And so far, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, there is no plan.

But when that plan finally surfaces and in whatever form it takes, that we will be here to, yes, criticize as an opposition should, but also to place alternatives before this legislature — something the previous opposition in this province did not do — to place clear alternatives in

the area of agriculture, of economic development, of reform of this House, of ways that Saskatchewan taxpayers will feel more comfortable with how their money is spent. And we will propose those alternatives, Mr. Speaker, because I think that is what the people expect of an opposition. They expect us to continue to work hard for the people of this province.

And as that plan unfolds, Mr. Speaker, I hope that these people are not so narrow-minded, so ideological that they cannot see the promise that can come from things like privatizing Trans Gas, for instance, the economic benefits that could accrue to this province by allowing shareholders rather than taxpayers to pay for the pipe that must be buried in the ground of this province to transport natural gas to our homes and our farms and our cities.

And the same with the area of atomic energy, Mr. Speaker — that members will not be so illogical and ideological that they will not grab hold of some of the opportunities that are presented to this province with our vast uranium resources, so that we may develop them for the future.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, the plan is a little thin right now. And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I will not be able to support the throne speech.

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

The division bells rang from 4:31 p.m. until 4:38 p.m.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

#### Yeas — 50

Romanow	Calvert
Van Mulligen	Murray
Thompson	Hamilton
Wiens	Johnson
Simard	Trew
Lingenfelter	Draper
Teichrob	Serby
Koskie	Whitmore
Shillington	Sonntag
Anguish	Flavel
Goulet	Roy
Atkinson	Cline
Kowalsky	Scott
Carson	Wormsbecker
Mitchell	Crofford
MacKinnon	Stanger
Penner	Knezacek
Upshall	Harper
Hagel	Keeping
Bradley	Kluz
Koenker	Carlson
Lorje	Renaud
Lyons	Langford
Pringle	Jess
Lautermilch	Haverstock

#### Nays — 10

Devine	Martens
Muirhead	Britton

Neudorf  
Swenson  
Boyd

Toth  
Goohsen  
D'Autremont

## MOTIONS

### Address be Engrossed and Presented to Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member from Swift Current:

That the said address being engrossed and presented to Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor by such members of the Assembly as are of the Executive Council.

Motion agreed to.

### Ways and Means

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Canora:

That this Assembly, pursuant to rule 87, hereby appoints the Committee of Finance to consider the supply to be granted to Her Majesty and to consider ways and means of raising the supply.

**The Speaker:** — The Government House Leader will need another seconder.

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — That motion should be seconded by the member for River Heights.

Motion agreed to.

(1645)

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### SECOND READINGS

#### Bill No. 2 — An Act to amend The Medical Profession Act, 1981

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to rise today to move second reading of An Act to amend The Medical Profession Act. Mr. Speaker, the amendment to The Medical Profession Act deals with the regulation of locum tenens physicians, that is physicians who provide temporary services in the province. Typically, these physicians have provided services in rural areas by filling in for the local physicians who may want to take some time off to further their education for example.

Increasingly, locum physicians are relied upon by communities to provide services for a longer period of time. The existing provisions in the Act are becoming unworkable as they were originally intended to deal only with locums working on a very short-term basis.

The existing Act is also not clear in detailing the authority of the College of Physicians and Surgeons to issue locum permits and specify conditions on those permits as they

do in the case of other medical licences. The proposed amendment will clarify the college's authority in this area.

The current Act limits locum physicians to a four-month permit and is not clear on how many permits can be issued. The College of Physicians and Surgeons has recently adopted a policy which allows them to issue several four-month permits to the same physician. However this is administratively awkward for the college, and it can of course create employment insecurity for the physician. It also does not create a stable practice situation for the community.

Mr. Speaker, the government and the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan recognize the difficulty that rural communities face in this area as well as the need to effectively regulate locum physicians. This amendment will allow the college to specify the qualifications, length of locum permits, and conditions of permits in the by-laws pursuant to the Act.

An important feature of the new locum physician by-law will be longer terms for the permits, Mr. Speaker, up to two years in many cases. Another important feature will be a requirement for the locum physician to practise in a specific community for up to five years. This will also allow locum physicians sufficient time to meet the college's requirements for full licensure should these physicians want to remain practising in Saskatchewan. It will also assist some rural communities to retain their physicians for longer periods of time, resulting in the provision of more stable medical services to the public.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment is fully supported by the College of Physicians and Surgeons, the Saskatchewan Medical Association, rural communities, rural hospital administrators, rural physicians, and locum physicians. The efforts of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan to ensure competent, stable medical services in rural areas are supported.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of an Act respecting an amendment to The Medical Profession Act.

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

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's my understanding after having discussed this with the Government House Leader, that we will be going through for second readings, items 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10 today. And in my opinion, all of our critics here are keenly interested in the Bills as they have been presented, and of course we are very keenly listening to the second reading speeches of the ministers that are promoting these Bills. And because we are still doing consulting with the various agencies that are affected by this, I would now ask that this debate on second reading be adjourned.

Debate adjourned.

#### Bill No. 5 — An Act to amend The Liquor Consumption Tax Act

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I'll be moving second reading of the Bill No. 5, An Act to amend The

Liquor Consumption Tax Act.

This Bill is in the same form as the one introduced by the previous government last April. Unfortunately as with other pieces of legislation, that Bill was never passed and it died on the order paper when the former government prorogued the legislature as we'll well remember, back on June 18 of 1991.

Subsequently the former government passed regulations which purported to achieve what this Bill would have and should have done at that time. They passed the liquor consumption tax reduction regulation to remove the GST (goods and services tax) from the liquor consumption tax base effective January 1, 1991 and to reduce the liquor consumption tax rate from 10 per cent to 7 per cent effective April 1, 1991.

Mr. Speaker, although we agree with these changes, we certainly do not agree with the manner in which it was done. We do not believe that the permanent adjustment to the tax base or to the tax rate should be done or made by order in council behind the closed doors of cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, over the past few years established democratic institutions and traditions in our province have undergone significant stress. Unilateral changes such as the tax change initiated by the former government have radically altered and endangered many of these important traditions.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we are proceeding with this Bill in the Legislative Assembly which is the proper forum for such changes to take place. In this way we enhance the role of the Legislative Assembly, opposition members, and the public.

Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 5, An Act to amend The Liquor Consumption Tax Act be read a second time.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that debate on this Bill be now adjourned.

Debate adjourned.

**Bill No. 6 — An Act to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act**

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise to move second reading of Bill 6, an Act to amend the superannuation Act. The objective of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is to provide a restricted retirement option to employees who have age and service totalling at least 75 years. This Bill is necessary because of the actions taken by the former government. As a result of budgetary decisions made in the 1991-92 process, as well as privatization measures, a number of positions were abolished. These amendments will allow the eligible individuals to access restricted retirement option. This Bill will provide comparable benefits to that of the early retirement program offered to individuals in 1987.

The benefits provided to an employee are, first, an unreduced pension from the old defined benefit plan or an increase in equity for the new money purchase plan; secondly, a one-time payment equal to one day's pay for each year of service; and third, bridge benefit of 350 per

month until age 65. Mr. Speaker, these amendments will provide some relief for those government workers affected by initiatives undertaken earlier this year.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to move An Act to amend The Superannuation Act, and I move that it now be read a second time.

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

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that debate on Bill No. 6 be now adjourned.

Debate adjourned.

**Bill No. 7 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act**

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to rise today to move second reading of The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act, 1991. The amendment proposed in this Bill will require a by-election to be held within six months after a vacancy occurs in the Legislative Assembly.

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

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — Mr. Speaker, this amendment is made necessary by recent events in the province of Saskatchewan and I want briefly to allude to those events.

We had on December 19, 1989 the then member for Kindersley, Bob Andrew, resign from the House. The people of Kindersley and the Kindersley constituency remained unrepresented in this House from December 19, 1989 until the last general election, a period of more than 22 months.

The second case that I want to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, is the constituency of Indian Head-Wolseley where the former member, Graham Taylor, resigned from this House on January 18, 1990. And the people of Indian Head-Wolseley were unrepresented in this House until the last general election, a period of more than 21 months.

In the case of the Turtleford constituency the then member, Colin Maxwell, resigned from this House on June 30, 1990. And again the people of Turtleford were unrepresented in this House until the last general election, a period of about 16 months, Mr. Speaker.

And finally in the case of the Souris-Cannington constituency, the former member, Eric Berntson, resigned from this House on July 19, 1990. And that constituency remained unrepresented in this House for a period of 15 months, Mr. Speaker.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, this is a situation that cannot be tolerated in a democracy.

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

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — The Bill that we present, Mr. Speaker, is a very important democratic reform designed to ensure that no constituency will be unrepresented in

this House longer than the period provided for in the Bill.

The Bill also provides that if a general election is called after a by-election is called but before the by-election is held, the by-election will not be held. That's a provision just in the event that those two time periods get in too close . . . just get too close together, too close a conjunction.

These amendments, Mr. Speaker, will make the law of Saskatchewan consistent with the law in other jurisdictions and will, as I said, protect the democratic rights of citizens to representation in this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of an Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act.

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

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that debate on this Bill be now adjourned.

Debate adjourned.

**Bill No. 8 — An Act respecting the Tabling of Documents and Certain Consequential and Other Amendments to Other Acts resulting from the enactment of this Act**

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to rise today and move second reading of Bill No. 8, an Act respecting the Tabling of Documents, 1991. Mr. Speaker, for some time now Saskatchewan residents have been demanding information from their government that is timely, relevant, and accessible in order to ensure accountability to the public. They're interested in having access to better information as to how their tax dollars are being spent.

The current government when in opposition emphasized financial accountability to the public. We believe a well-informed public is essential in setting spending priorities.

Through this Bill today this government is acting on its pre-election commitment to keep the public well informed.

The current Act has been found to be confusing and difficult to interpret and apply. Currently some government organizations are not required to provide financial statements to the legislature by a date imposed by law. This Bill will require improved financial reporting by these organizations.

Gone are the days when public documents are released months after the close of a fiscal year.

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

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — The provisions in this Bill will require government organizations to submit their financial statements to the legislature within specified time constraints. It requires more financial information to be made available by the government. Improved financial reporting will result in more control over spending and improve accountability to the public. In the

same way, consistent and timely submission of financial statements will provide more useful information.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative to restore public trust and confidence in the institutions of democratic government in Saskatchewan. If safeguards are in place and the rules well understood, the worst abuses of the political process evident in recent years will be avoided. This Bill moves us far along that path.

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in moving second reading of an Act respecting The Tabling of Documents Act, 1991.

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

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that debate on Bill No. 8 be adjourned.

Debate adjourned.

(1700)

**Bill No. 9 — An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1984**

**Hon. Ms. Carson:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise to move second reading of Bill No. 9, An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1984, and Bill No. 10, An Act to amend The Local Government Election Act.

The first Bill amending The Urban Municipality Act restores wards in cities over 100,000 in population for the next civic election.

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

**Hon. Ms. Carson:** — The Bill provides that wards in these cities, namely Saskatoon and Regina, are retained for at least two elections. By doing this, our government will be correcting the mistake made by the previous government.

Mr. Speaker, these amendments also permit councils of all other cities, towns, and villages the option of adopting the ward system for the 1994 elections. No prior referendum is necessary to exercise this option, therefore any urban municipality in the province will be able to use a ward system in the next round of local elections.

This legislation responds to the overwhelming demand by voters in the largest cities to return to the ward system. Members of this House will recall that three years ago, the former government abolished the ward system that was in place in Saskatoon, Regina, and Prince Albert. The ward system was abolished in spite of the objections of municipal councils and votes of electors calling for the retention of wards. For example, in a referendum held in Regina in 1988, 74 per cent of the voters supported the ward system. After the last round of civic elections in October of this year, we heard almost universal criticism from voters and candidates about the undemocratic nature of the at-large system for local elections. I think the voters were telling us that at-large city local democracy does not function very well in the absence of wards.

It is a responsibility of the province to ensure that local elections are democratic. That is why the legislation



ensures elections every three years, and ensures secrecy in voting, for example. And that is why this Bill ensures a ward system will be in place in the two largest cities for at least two successive elections.

Mr. Speaker, SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipal Association) has consistently called for a return to the ward system for cities. And both SUMA and the Provincial Association of Resort Communities have been asking for the option to be available to resort communities. The option of a ward system will be useful where resort communities are situated near each other along a lake shore. It will allow the residents to form one municipality while retaining their individual representation on council through wards. Members should note that wards are an established feature of rural municipal government and of rural school division elections.

Mr. Speaker, let me expand on the reason why the public is calling for a return to the ward system in larger centres. People want to ensure that all areas of the city are represented. They want to get rid of what some people call bed sheet ballots containing so many names that it is impossible to make an informed choice in the polling booth. And they want to know who on council to approach and who to hold accountable when they have concerns with city hall.

Candidates for city council have also been asking for a ward system so that they do not have to be well off financially to run for office or be bankrolled by some group with a vested interest in council decisions.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to mention the second Bill, The Local Government Election Amendment Act, that makes some amendments that are consequential to the main Bill that I have been describing. The second, companion Bill refutes all references to the split vote . . . to split ward or at-large system that the previous government offered as an option in 1988 amendments, which all cities decline to use.

I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that we want to give municipalities an opportunity to comment and suggest amendments to this Bill before it is passed. If they feel strongly that options provided are insufficient to satisfy the desires of urban voters, we will want to look at making amendments. We believe this is a good Bill, but we intend to allow municipalities time to review it.

Unlike the former government, we will consult the municipalities and allow them the opportunity to study it and respond with any suggestions for change.

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

**Hon. Ms. Carson:** — Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of the Bill No. 9, An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1984 and of Bill No. 10, An Act to amend The Local Government Election Act. . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Just Bill No. 9.

**Hon. Ms. Carson:** — Bill No. 9.

**The Speaker:** — Yes, I recognize the point of order.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — This is highly . . . Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I think is highly unusual, the procedure that the government is using here in trying to do two Bills at one time.

**The Speaker:** — I think the member's point is well taken, and I would ask the member for extreme clarity in this House. Would she move Bill No. 9, second reading of Bill No. 9, first.

**Hon. Ms. Carson:** — Mr. Speaker, I just move the Bill No. 9 at this time.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — I thank you, Mr. Speaker. In that case I would move that Bill No. 9 be adjourned.

Debate adjourned.

#### **Bill No. 10 — An Act to amend The Local Government Election Act**

**Hon. Ms. Carson:** — Mr. Speaker, based on my previous remarks, I move second reading of Bill No. 10.

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

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that debate on Bill No. 10 be now adjourned.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:08 p.m.