

## EVENING SITTING

## SPECIAL ORDER

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

## ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the address in reply which was moved by Mr. Sonntag, seconded by Ms. Hamilton, and the amendment thereto moved by Mr. Britton.

**Mr. Goulet:** — As I said just before supper, I'll be speaking against the amendment and supporting the original motion.

Now just before supper I'd covered the aspect on responding to some statements made from the members from the other side, mainly from the member from Wilkie and the member from Kindersley. And we were talking about deception and not caring and not having the courage. These types of themes that they were using were precisely that which they themselves were reflecting, not only in the 10-year history of Saskatchewan but still today.

It's very important that when we look at this, that indeed in many cases when you have made a mistake, a mistake of this proportion, should be looked upon very carefully by them and start accepting some of those things that are hurting Saskatchewan people today.

I mentioned something about the North; now I want to move into aboriginal people. I think it's very important on Indian and Metis issues for me to cover not only the history of land but also the aspect of self-government and inherent right, as well the justice system and the need for self-reliance as well as the importance of our culture, customs, and traditions. So I will start out by making a summary statement in regards to the history of the three parties, the Liberals, the NDP (New Democratic Party), and the Conservatives.

As I mentioned just before supper, the Liberals when they were in power spent about 2 per cent of their budget, approximately \$8 million, for the North and for aboriginal people. And I had mentioned as well that Progressive Conservatives when they were in power had spent a little over 1 per cent, which totalled \$58 million in the year 1989. And I'd mentioned in the last year the NDP were in power we had spent 4 per cent of the budget, over 4 per cent of the budget and about \$128 million on the North and for Indian and Metis people.

And I was saying that this was about \$70 million more than what the Conservatives had spent approximately seven years later. So the record in the *Public Accounts* was very clearly that the NDP will be helping not only northern Saskatchewan but Indian and Metis people in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now I mentioned earlier that the Conservatives did not even bother in their 10 years in power mentioning the North or Indian and Metis people. I went through the

aspect of the throne speech and the benefits to the North in regards to the areas of jobs and developing housing, sewer and water, and so on. But I was trying to do a comparative analysis on it.

Now I want to get into the topic of the issue of self-determination and self-government. I feel that it's very important at this stage in history, especially in relation to the experience as it related to Meech Lake, that Indian and Metis people were an important part of not only Confederation but the whole history of what was called, at that time, British North America.

And Indian and Metis people have been also an important player throughout this development of government which has proceeded, you know, not only from the proclamation of 1763 — you know, after the Seven Years' War — but the Quebec Act of 1774 and then onwards to the BNA (British North America) Act of 1876 which is now of course the Constitution Act of 1982.

And I think that in regards to self-determination, a lot of the people during 1982 to 1987 felt that we had to start giving, you know, recognition to Indian and Metis people. A lot of people had felt a certain degree of injustice, which I will reflect back, especially in my comments on land, a little bit later. And in regards to the inherent right to self-government, I really feel that a lot of the public have moved on support on this issue ahead of a lot of politicians in Canada.

But I want to say that as far as the NDP here in the province of Saskatchewan, we are remaining in the forefront of recognizing that inherent right, you know, to self-government. And we are proceeding to move forward with that position in regards to the constitution. And I think that's a very important and qualitative improvement over what happened in Meech Lake.

So I would like to also mention that in relation to the constitution there is always the issue of justice. And we see what happened — I mentioned just before supper — what happened in the United States when there is a feeling that the justice system may not be fair. And we have seen that in regards to our initial understanding even on the case of Nerland and the inquiry, you know, that our government is proceeding on with.

But I think what is more important is an overview on justice itself. We are having reviews not only for Indian people but also for the Metis people in the province of Saskatchewan. And we're looking at the very important area of youth. There's a lot of youth out there and there's a lot of issues relating to the youth on stresses in life and the hardship that they're going through. As it relates to justice we are looking at that issue and particularly as it relates to Indian and Metis people.

We're also looking at the issue of policing and legal representation as well as sentencing, court services, and corrections. So we're more or less looking at it at a fairly comprehensive overview and we have built on our fine tradition of co-operation and are moving forward in these areas. And I was very, very happy when I saw this particular topic in the throne speech.

When I look at the issue of self-reliance, a lot of the people will say yes in the area of politics and the right to be responsible for themselves and the right to say yes, we can be self-governing. But in any country in the whole world the most important question all the time is the issue of self-reliance. And when we're looking at the history, you know, the economic and the socio-economic aspect of life has to be part and parcel of any form of self-government. So we're looking at this issue as well in regards to self-reliance. And I was again very pleased to see that in the throne speech.

I also saw in the throne speech, combined with the preceding statements, the need for the respect, the true respect for the culture, the customs, and the traditional values of Indian and Metis people. And with that I think I will say a few words, you know, in Cree in a reflection of that. And I would like to pay respects to the listeners who are Cree speakers out there, as well as all other cultures that are represented in the province of Saskatchewan.

Many times many of the Cree speakers will come and thank me for having spoken Cree in the legislature and explaining the proceedings, and also explaining that which was put forth in the throne speech. And so with that, I will say a few words in summarizing the content of the speech that I was making. So with respect to all the languages, you know, in the province of Saskatchewan and Canada and the world, I would like to say a few words in Cree.

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

I was just giving an overview in Cree in regards to the throne speech that the member from Moose Jaw says . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And that means of course, you know, our regular complimentary comment here in the legislature.

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

**Mr. Goulet:** — And so I'd like to proceed now on the area of land. And in the issue of land we look in historic terms on land. When we saw a lot of the Europeans moving into North America, a lot of them had been displaced from their lands in Europe. And many of them . . . and even in the modern day history in Asia or South Africa, and in many places, there was a lot of displacement of land. There was therefore a great feeling of concern for the people in regards to, you know, coming into North America in over the past couple and 200 years . . . 300 years and really seeing the vast, you know, amount of land here in North America.

And as history proceeded, the Europeans and the First Nations of North America started making treaties and dealing with the land issue. And that became to be the essence of international treaties during that time.

When the treaties were made though, a lot of the land was not properly done. There were not . . . It was not fully concluded, so there was outstanding land entitlements. And when we created . . . when the province became a province in 1905, we did not have the rights to the resources. And when we had that Natural Resources

Transfer Agreement, it was recognized in a particular clause here on section 10 that the land entitlement would be respected.

So when we now look at the history of that time, I would like to let the people of the province know that a lot of the land issues during that time, as far as the settlers were concerned, had been settled. Now let's take a look at the land, especially today when a lot of farmers are losing their land, you know, to the financial institutions and it makes it very difficult to look forward to the future when you are losing that land.

(1915)

But just during . . . by the time the 1930 Resources Transfer Agreement had come into place, approximately 31 million acres of land had been transferred to the settlers in the province of Saskatchewan through the free Homestead Act and on the paid Homestead Act that came in, you know. Just around prior to the 1930s approximately 6 million acres had been there, so approximately 37 million acres had been there for the settlers, which totalled over 900,000 by 1930.

Now when you look at the relationship on the corporate side, we saw that the amount of land provided for the railroad companies in the province of Saskatchewan was 15 to 16 million acres of land. We had 15 to 16 million acres of land for the railroads, of which about 6 million was for the CPR (Canadian Pacific Rail).

When we looked at that aspect as it relates to the Hudson's Bay Company, there was about 7 million acres of land for the Hudson's Bay Company in western Canada, of which over 3 million acres of land were in the province of Saskatchewan alone. So here we are, we had about 37 million acres of land on the Homestead Act and then we had about 15 to 16 million acres of land in regards to the corporations and about 3 million acres of land for the Hudson's Bay Company. The schools themselves got 4 million acres of land at that time, but a lot of people don't recognize this.

You see this in Chester Martin's 1935 history, one of the famous historians in Canada of which I take these facts and figures that I'm throwing out. He said that the treaty land settlement at that time was 1.2 million acres — 1.2 million acres for people who had the original control and authority over this land. So there was approximately a million acres of land in regards to aboriginal people, a little over a million acres on approximately over 60 million acres of land, you know, for the new peoples. And so when people talk to me about the history and when I read Chester Martin's history, then I recognized the degree of the history of the fight for fairness that Indians have been searching for in the province's history.

So when we're preceding towards in our throne speech, you know, the settlement of the outstanding land entitlement, you know, I was indeed very pleased that we were indeed looking at that.

Today when the government was around, the government on the other side was providing 12 million acres of land for Weyerhaeuser — 12 million acres of

land for Weyerhaeuser — but only they would not proceed to do a proper settlement although they had the chance for it. And when I looked back on it, I saw that even the Primrose Air Weapons Range had 1.5 million acres of land. I did a little bit of research and I found out that the parks in Canada have five times more land than Indian land in Canada — five times more park land. We also found out that there was, even in Saskatchewan, three times more park land than there is, you know, treaty Indian land.

So when we talk about settling of land, that is exactly what we mean, that indeed the land is something that needs to be looked for. So on a concluding comment I would like to say this. I was very pleased with the sense of compassion and the sense of fairness of this budget, not only as it related to the North but as it related to Indian and Metis people. As we're looking for, you know, the constitutional solutions for self-government and for other issues such as land, we have to realize that government needs compassion, and that is what I saw in the throne speech.

So with that, I would like to say very clearly that I support, you know, the original motion on the throne speech and I go against the amendment.

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

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, I've had an opportunity yet to congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker. And I would like to take this opportunity to do so, and as well congratulate all the members of the Legislative Assembly who were re-elected or elected for the first time.

The throne speech, Mr. Speaker, talks about reform to the health system. And we in Saskatchewan are very proud of our history in medicare. We're proud on this side of the House, and also on that side of the House over there, to be New Democrat because medicare is without doubt our most honoured accomplishment.

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

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — For 20 years after the CCF (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation) came to power in 1944, this economically poor, sparsely populated, and isolated prairie province led the way for the whole continent in its development of publicly administered health care services. In 1945 cancer care was made free. In 1947 Saskatchewan was the first jurisdiction in North America to introduce universal medical care insurance in accordance with the five fundamental principles of medicare: comprehensiveness, universality, accessibility, public administration, and portability.

This province pioneered a health care system which became a model for the rest of Canada, Mr. Speaker, and for the world. And we did it because Saskatchewan people translated Saskatchewan values into practical programs to benefit our people. The health system owes its success to the pioneers of medicare, to the men and women of Saskatchewan, to Douglas and Lloyd and Blakeney, and to many, many others. And now it is time,

Mr. Speaker, to change, to move to a new generation of medicare.

Change is very exciting but it is also very, very difficult. If we are to make changes quickly and effectively we must do so as a community, as an entire province pulling together. And today I want to invite the legislature and the people of Saskatchewan to join me and our government in a genuine, honest, and open discussion of why we have to change and where that change might take us.

And let me say, Mr. Speaker, that as I've travelled throughout the province in the last few months, communities all across the province are ready to embark on that change. In the health care changes we shall preserve the basic principles of medicare — universality, accessibility, comprehensiveness, public administration. But that doesn't mean that every available health care service has to be fully funded by the taxpayer.

With new technologies and new procedures, the health industry is growing rapidly, Mr. Speaker, and the increases in health have been greater than the rate of inflation. And still, until very recently, all governments in all provinces have been united in their devotion to the expenditure of a great deal of money on health services. And I still believe that we can and we must fund essential health services — hospitals, doctors, nurses, special care homes.

But if we are to maintain universal access to basic health care services, we cannot continue to provide unfettered funding when, as a province, we face the reality of a crippling debt. There must be a long-term strategy to improve services and to reform the system. We simply must do more with less.

There is so much that can be done, Mr. Speaker, in the area of reform, that will reduce costs and will improve health care and the health of Saskatchewan men, women, and children. These changes are long overdue, and they should be done regardless of our dire fiscal situation, although the fiscal situation may speed up the rate of change.

In the last 10 years, what we have seen is the *status quo* in health care maintained. We saw the Murray Commission at an expense of \$1.8 million, I believe, Mr. Speaker, travelled throughout this province and come up with recommendations that were not implemented by the former government.

Communities, however, across this province, Mr. Speaker, are ready to respond. And we've witnessed that already as we've moved with major health reform in the cities of Regina and Saskatoon, where we amalgamated the hospital boards and Wascana Rehab in Regina, for example, under one interim umbrella board to remove the duplication in health care services, and to consult with the community to determine the extent of the Regina Health Board and the Saskatoon Health Board's mandate in the future.

These were major changes. And those two cities pulled together and they have done a fine job in establishing their interim board and working towards the objectives of

co-ordinating and integrating health care services and providing a real continuum of health care services for the people in Regina and Saskatoon and area.

And now we are witnessing the same phenomenon, Mr. Speaker, in Prince Albert, which just earlier this week or towards the end of last week, have signed an MOU (memorandum of understanding) to do a very similar thing, but they are even going further than Regina and Saskatoon. And I'm telling you, the citizens of Prince Albert and the health care providers in Prince Albert are proud of what they've done, Mr. Speaker, and they have every right to be so.

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

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — These changes are positive, they make sense, Mr. Speaker, and they will provide major savings to the taxpayers of this province. But more on the reasons for structural reform later.

Now let me briefly review the system as we now have it. There are a few important characteristics which I hope give people pause for reflection. First, the system works for most people but not all. People who are relatively well off, well educated, and white have as a group very good health status, among the best in the world. But native people, poor people, and uneducated people continue to have relatively poor health status, even while using a lot of health services.

The World Health Organization, Mr. Speaker, defined health as being virtually anything that impacted on physical and mental well-being, and that anything that impacted on physical and mental well-being should be taken into consideration in the provision of health care services.

And as you know, Mr. Speaker, as opposition Health critic, that is the definition or the scope of health care services, rather, that I brought to the attention of the members opposite when they were in government, on numerous occasions.

That means, Mr. Speaker, that things like environment and housing and socio-economic status, racism and sexism, and all these things, impinge on a person's health. And therefore, a department of health should be concerned about providing services to reduce or eliminate those problems.

Second, Canada as a nation and Saskatchewan above all, have built the health system around a large network of institutions. Our province has the most hospital beds per capita in the world. We have more hospitals than Quebec, with a population six and a half times as large as ours. The special care home situation, Mr. Speaker, is similar. In short, in Saskatchewan more than any other jurisdiction in the world, health and health care have come to mean beds and more beds.

Third, the relationship between health spending and the health status of the population is growing a bit distant. Canadians are healthier than Americans. But Americans spend 1.5 times as much as we do per person. Our health status is worse than that enjoyed by Japan and the

Scandinavian countries, who spend less than we do. And the citizens of Greece, Spain, and Portugal seem to be as healthy as we are despite spending much less than we do on health services. Surely this is food for thought.

(1930)

Fourth, for decades there has been a growing consensus that the key to good health is prevention, not cure. Life-style changes achieve more concrete improvements in health than dramatic surgical advances. Wonder drugs are indeed wonderful but good nutritional habits may be far more important. MRI (magnetic resonance imager) machines are no doubt dazzling achievements but are powerless against fetal alcohol syndrome or the hopelessness and illness that come with unemployment and poverty.

Fifth, most analysts of the health system agree that not enough of the health dollar goes to prevention and health promotion.

And six, the incentives in our funding system have encouraged high-cost services and a focus on sickness. Health care workers, and I include doctors, nurses, therapists, and a host of other occupations, are paid, Mr. Speaker, for what they do, not what they achieve. In health care the process has been the product and this too calls for rethinking.

As Health critic before the last election and now as Minister of Health, I have been advocating a shift in the health system towards a more wellness-oriented approach. Health care providers and the public at large are understandably anxious to have this concept more fully explained.

In the coming weeks I will be releasing a document which will set out in some detail what we mean by wellness and today I want to outline some of the main principles and objectives and their implications for our health system.

The corner-stone of the wellness model is that it is better to prevent ill health than to cure it and better to promote healthy life-styles than to intervene after the fact. In embarking on a wellness model, we recognize two fundamental facts: one is that the system we have all developed over the past few decades is reaching the limits of its effectiveness; the other is that health is more than just health care. In fact for many people the key to improved health has nothing to do with doctors or hospitals or expensive machines but may have everything to do with sewer and water, housing, and the environment.

These realities suggest a number of key changes in the way we think about health and the way we provide services. I cannot go into detail about these changes today but I can share with you the general approach. The wellness model will be just a slogan, Mr. Speaker, unless wellness-oriented programs get more emphasis and more funding. The community-based health sector is small. Home care, public health, and other community services account for under 10 per cent of the health budget. Put simply, their share will have to grow.

I spoke earlier of the enormous number of beds we have in the system. We do not need all of these beds. We can eliminate many special care home admissions with improved home care, Mr. Speaker. We can shorten hospital stays with improved home care, day surgery, and more effective hospital discharge planning. We can look at how we prescribe and use drugs, order tests, make referrals, and do a thousand other things, Mr. Speaker, that add up to \$1.6 billion per year.

In going over the key characteristics of the health system, I neglected perhaps the most important fact of all. For the most part we really don't know very much about how effective and efficient our system really is. The debates are loud and long but there's no clear resolution, and one argument is as good as the next. Health services are largely unexamined and unevaluated. The result is that services come and go because of lobbying and interest group advocacy, and change is often arbitrary.

Earlier this year the government announced the establishment of the Health Services Utilization and Research Commission. The new function of the commission is to look at how we use health services and recommend how we can do so more effectively and more efficiently. The commission will provide solid, scientific evidence on which to base changes. In addition to conjecture and opinion, the debate about services and resource allocation will include scientific evidence now, Mr. Speaker.

I can think of no better way to build a consensus for change to the benefit of both the citizens and their wallets. If the commission is successful in its work, it will change more than just a service here and a regulation there. It will have a profound effect on how all of us — government, service providers, and the public — think about health and health services. It will encourage us to think more carefully about costs, and outcomes, about whether we're getting value for money, and about what really underlies good health.

But government clearly has a responsibility to lead. And this is a challenge we take up with great optimism, and in a spirit of renewal. The changes we make will be to improve the health of our citizens. That is our goal, that is our focus, and that is our mandate. Our mandate is not to spend money and build buildings, even though we will do these things as they are required. Our mandate is to do whatever government can to make people healthy. If we can do that without some services we have delivered before, we will do it. If we need to change some services, we will do it. If we need to create new services to meet contemporary needs, we will do it.

It will no doubt be tempting, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. members opposite to claim that all of this talk about the wellness model and the need for change is mere camouflage for our urgent fiscal agenda. Frankly, we could justify changes on the grounds of saving money alone. The people of Saskatchewan know the enormous debt burden we carry and have elected the New Democrats to return us to fiscal sanity.

The wellness model may indeed save us money, Mr. Speaker. After all, if people are healthier and if we can

deal with problems before they become serious and expensive, costs will go down. But the wellness model is not about money; it is about health and the way to achieve it. We could build 50 new hospitals and 5,000 more special care home beds today without improving health. We have an obligation, Mr. Speaker, to renew our health system so that people use it to help them become well and remain well, not only to fix them when they are sick.

Finally, I want to talk about the role of government and its services in producing and maintaining health. Obviously, our services and our funding are important. Much of the system is unquestionably necessary and useful, but a little reflection leads us to admit that the healthiest people are those who don't have to use very many services at all. Healthy people have a combination of good genetic luck, adequate incomes, self-esteem, support of families, friends, and communities, and good life-styles.

The government can create some of these benefits, but not all. It is wrong for any government to promise good health and it's wrong for people to believe it is the government's job to deliver it. All the government can do is fund and deliver services that create opportunities for good health. The rest is up to individuals, families, and communities, and, alas, to nature and to the luck of the draw.

In the coming months — and I hope years — we will try to turn our sickness system into a wellness system, but it will not be easy. Some things we can change quickly, others will require changes in attitudes and values. There are many, many thorny issues to tackle. And we all know that the *status quo* always has a big following and a strong lobby. But this government, Mr. Speaker, has the political will and the good intentions to see this reform through.

I fully admit that change can be slowed down, or even in some cases halted, if partisanship destroys all opportunity for constructive debate. If we in the political arena confine our agenda to bickering and grandstanding and scoring points, the health system and the public will be the big losers.

Certainly we will misstep and certainly there will be issues on which reasonable people will disagree. But I want all of us in the legislature to contribute positively to this change. At a time when major change is required, it is hard not to recall the atmosphere of 1962, and I do not want to see this province relive the level of bitterness and hysteria experienced during that period.

Our system is far from ideal and our finances are in a shambles. We have no choice, Mr. Speaker, but to change — and change we will. And the change will affect cities, and it'll affect rural areas, and it will affect institutions, and it will affect workers — and it won't be easy, Mr. Speaker. And it is the right of the opposition members to oppose every measure and take up the cause of every vested interest. But I am convinced that people all throughout this province are anxious and willing to participate in the reform and to work together to improve the health system and to change the way we think about and approach the delivery of health care services.

People are pulling together throughout this province, Mr. Speaker, and I've witnessed it over and over again. In spite of the tough times, in spite of the anxieties that surround change, I find communities all over this province coming forth with proposals as to how they can co-ordinate and integrate their board system and how they can move to a more wellness-oriented system. They are optimistic about the new direction and want to do their part in participating and helping the health care system change. All of us have had some part in creating this health system and all of us have a responsibility to promote wellness — not just in our people but also in our balance sheet, in our health care system, and maybe, Mr. Speaker, even in our politics. Thank you.

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

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again it's a thrill and a pleasure to speak in this House on a throne speech. I was just thinking tonight it's my 14th year, but I believe it's the 16th throne speech that I have spoke in, but I am not exactly sure about that, but it's been quite a few.

So I want to say thank you to my constituents of Arm River. I say thank you for electing me and sending me back to represent them. I said this last fall after the election, but I thought I should put it on the record again seeing that they might have thought we were not even here any more, because we haven't even been sitting all winter. So my constituents have wondered where I've been. They know I've been looking after them out in the constituency, Mr. Speaker. They know I've been looking after the constituency, but they'll think the legislature in Regina has just closed down. Because never in my 14 years, Mr. Speaker, never, never in my 14 years has this House come in this late.

Now I know . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm talking about in a spring session, Mr. Speaker. I'm talking about a spring session . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — . . . in a normal spring session, cause we said last fall in December, everything was supposed to be normal and that should have brought us back in here March, no later than the 15th of March.

But even having said all this, it's . . . the NDP kept using, the government kept using this as an excuse, that they had to put a budget together. They repeatedly used these words, that we were only elected in October. They said, we were only elected in October. The budget process doesn't normally start this late. We need time to fully prepare the budget.

It seems odd that their counterparts in British Columbia didn't have any trouble did they, Mr. Speaker? They had no trouble putting a budget together.

Well anyway, they finally got up the courage and slowly but surely the NDP have let the people who voted them in, the people who put them on the government side of the House, the NDP, Mr. Speaker, have let them down.

(1945)

**The Speaker:** — I'd just like to remind the member that his lectern is hiding the mike. If you could just move the lectern over a bit. Thank you.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — I think, Mr. Speaker, that without a mike they can hear me. Mr. Speaker, the people in this assembly have always heard me with or without a speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I don't mean that kind of speaker.

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

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Speaker, the NDP have inflicted more pain and more hardship onto the people of Saskatchewan in the short six months than a government ever in the history of this province.

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

**Mr. Muirhead:** — The NDP increased taxes and cut back funding. In six short months, Mr. Speaker, the NDP broke nearly — I won't say all, nearly — every promise they made to the people of Saskatchewan. They just about got them all. They raised taxes, engaged in blatant patronage and eroded our health care and education systems.

Now let's just go back, Mr. Speaker, to election time when the Leader of the Opposition at that time, the member from Riversdale, he said it over and over and over again. And I'm going to repeat it over and over again for the next four years so we don't forget it. Then he said: I will balance the budget; I will lower taxes; I will create jobs; I will go to Ottawa and get money for farmers, and I will keep all the farmers on the land.

Now, Mr. Speaker, six months later he's having a problem here. And I mean I feel sorry for him because he's going to have a problem. The only one that I think he can live up to of all those promises is maybe in time balancing the budget. But I'll get it to later on in my speech. He may be able to do that but on the backs of whom? On the backs of who? On the backs of the sick?

**The Speaker:** — Order. I would remind the members when the Minister of Health spoke there was no interruption. Now I expect the same courtesy to be extended to the member of Arm River.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Speaker, the NDP announced after the election — quite proudly I might add — that they won the election by not having a plan. Their campaign manager, the new president of SaskPower, was quoted in the newspaper stating this fact. I quote, Mr. Speaker:

And after all of this work, we come out with no platform.

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

Jack Messer said, Prince Albert *Daily Herald*, November 16, 1991.

So it was their plan. That was their plan. Jack Messer told this to the NDP party faithful. They had no plan, no policy, therefore no mandate. All they offered the people was empty promises. They won the election really, Mr. Speaker, on deception.

Now agriculture is where I'll be probably spending most of my time talking about tonight although I've got some comments to make on health and education, especially after I heard the Minister of Health talk tonight. I must be making some corrections to her remarks tonight.

The NDP promised to support agriculture and the rural way of life. They said they would:

... negotiate with the federal government to stop the off-loading onto farmers ...

They said they would obtain 1.2 billion.

... \$1.2 billion the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool has identified was needed by the agriculture sector ...

Well it's sure too bad for the sake of the farmers in this province, Mr. Speaker, that they couldn't have got that \$1.2 billion because that's exactly what our farmers in Saskatchewan need. We need that to survive there right now.

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

**Mr. Muirhead:** — They said that GRIP (gross revenue insurance program) had to be changed. They said they had to change GRIP so that it pays the cost of production for farming. They're going to change GRIP so at least pay the cost of production for the farmers. Mr. Speaker:

Cutting out the red tape associated with GRIP and NISA is another goal of the NDP.

They're going to cut out all the red tape.

I'm not making these promises up, but took them from a newspaper article, and the article came from during the election. The Moose Jaw **Herald** October 17, 1991, on page 2.

Here's another one, Mr. Speaker:

Banks and credit unions will be asked not to foreclose on farmers until a debt-restructuring program is put in place under an NDP administration ...

If they don't comply ... (the member from Riversdale) hinted, a moratorium on foreclosures ... (would) be imposed upon them through legislation.

*Leader-Post*, October 1, 1991.

What happened, Mr. Speaker, to these promises? If you travel on No. 11 Highway to Saskatoon, which the members that still drive cars and don't fly planes, will see the signs — and excuse me for using his name — Mr.

Romanow, where is our moratorium? It's on the signs all the way from Regina to Saskatoon. Where is our moratorium? It was promised.

It's a betrayal. Have any of our farmers seen any money from Ottawa from this government? There's been money come from promised money. The NISA (net income stabilization account) money came, the \$10 an acre, \$5 came last fall. And I know that the Minister of Agriculture has even tried to take claim to that. But he had no claim.

He went to Ottawa, and made a few flights down there — in fact several flights, flight after flight after flight — and I was talking to him at several occasions when he said, well I got you some money — you're getting that \$5 an acre. Well for goodness' sakes, who's he trying to kid, Mr. Speaker? Who's he trying to kid?

That money was ... You know where that money came from. Grant Devine made a flight that was successful. Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I mean the member from Estevan. When he was the premier of this province, he was very successful in going to Ottawa and get money for farmers, but this government has no success there.

They saw the NDP taking endless flights. We saw them. They were taking endless flights to Ottawa. They were just a-flying down there. They were taking people and paying their way. They took the Leader of the Liberal Party. They took other people.

I wish they had asked me. I would have gone and I would have paid my own money. I wouldn't ask the taxpayer to take me down there. But you just took groups, plane-fuls down there. And they want money, but to no avail. All they succeeded in doing was spending more money, but not receiving it, and in the process proved that their flights were flights of fancy.

And GRIP, Mr. Speaker, what worry about GRIP? Let's talk about GRIP. That has been changed so dramatically. Mr. Speaker, the GRIP has been changed so dramatically that the farmers cannot make any head or tail of it at all. It's really serious.

And if any member of this House thinks they know more about crop insurance and about farmers than I do, well I challenge them. They may know as much but not any more. I'll challenge anyone.

And I know how to read what the farmers are thinking. And they are not happy about the new changes and how they got fooled into it.

Farmers have been asked to continue to participate in a program without the benefit of knowing how much coverage they will have for their farms. They don't know how much they're going to have. It's a just a guess in the wind. Premiums are going up substantially for both GRIP and crop insurance while coverage is going down.

Now if that's improved GRIP, improved crop insurance, please somebody from that side of the House, when they're up talking, explain to me because I cannot explain where this here additional coverage for less money is going to be coming from. Because it's not there. It is not

there. Individual coverage is gone; therefore, risk area records of seeding and production will affect the outcome of your farm's figures.

Speciality crops. Mr. Speaker, this is serious. We try to encourage people to diversify in the farm and grow something other than wheat. So here they got it, on the new program, speciality crops like lentils, canary seed, and canola are under pressure because the pay'll be the same as for wheat.

So if something happens and you get hailed out, dried out, and you can't spend \$100 an acre approximately — it costs approximately \$100 per acre to grow lentils, just for the cost — and only collect . . . on the average of this province you'd only collect maybe a hundred dollars if something fails. Even the market is higher, Mr. Speaker. They didn't even insure this any wheres near what the market price is. At least on wheat they've covered us now for a few dollars more than what the market is.

Mr. Speaker, no one will deny that GRIP program needed some changes. I'll stand here and say that it needed some changes.

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

**Mr. Muirhead:** — No one ever said that the GRIP program was perfect. We want changes, Mr. Speaker, for the better, not for nothing. This program is absolutely . . . well it's just nothing there for somebody that gets an average to a poor crop. And I want to go through some of the figures and show you.

Why didn't you look, Mr. Speaker, at Alberta and Manitoba? They made some minor modifications. There's a big difference between fine tuning a program and cutting a program. There's a big difference.

Farmers feel short-changed and with good reason. Each and every one of these concerns were brought forward to the government's so-called information meetings being held throughout the province. Each and every question that concerned farmers were evaded. They had one in Bethune. They had one in Craik. They had one at Davidson. And they were invaded, they were not being . . . they were not answering the questions because they didn't know the answers. They said ask the member from Rosetown, he brought it in. They were just brought in real quickly, just like that, brought in. These people were said, go out and sell this to the farmers. Go out and sell it. Go out and sell it.

The so-called experts, I felt sorry for them. The ones in the know couldn't answer the farmers' questions; I felt sorry for them. I know, Mr. Speaker, I'm quite familiar where the member from Elphinstone's farm is, I could go through the figures and tell him how much money he's going to be short this fall. That's because he's dry down there and he's going to be short a lot of bucks; he's going to be back here in cabinet this fall, Mr. Speaker, he's going to say, please Mr. Cabinets help save my farm, help save my farm.

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

**Mr. Muirhead:** — I know and I think it will happen because he's the power-house, the member from Elphinstone is one of the main power-houses for the cabinet and still represents, he represents the farmers in Saskatchewan because he is the only real, true farmer that understands and I give him credit that he does understand. I give him credit that he understands and that's why I think we'll see some changes the proper way. He'll start to look into what blew but he'll have to find out when he gets that not-so-good a crop down there. Hey, boy, my own cabinet blew it; my Minister of Finance blew it, that's what he's going to say, to save money.

Farmers were so upset, Mr. Speaker, and they were so confused by the changes that they had to take matters into their own hands. They're holding their own meetings throughout the province, trying to figure out what to do. At these meetings they have been asking the government to revert back to the 1991 GRIP program, the program that we on this side of the House developed, Mr. Speaker. The farmers have said they will not stop until the new NDP GRIP is gone . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, the member from Elphinstone asks what program did I sign up for. I had no choice, I had no choice, I didn't have . . . the member from Rosetown-Elrose made the statement the other day, I am so proud to announce that there's 300 new people signed up for GRIP.

You know maybe there's 300 new farmers like me, because I didn't have . . . I'm not a new farmer but I never carried crop insurance since 1980. I thought it was a conflict to carry crop insurance when I was a minister and I didn't take it. I could have nothing to do with it whatsoever, but I put crop insurance on this year so I had to take the 1992, I had to carry the 1992.

**An Hon. Member:** — No choice.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — No choice. So don't anybody, you know, say to me in this House, what did you take, the '91 or the '92? As if the member from Arm River had a choice and my constituents don't have one. I mean how ridiculous can we be.

I was in this rally in Regina, Mr. Speaker, there was approximately a thousand farmers there.

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

**Mr. Muirhead:** — We didn't do like . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . there was, I was there and I counted every one of them, and when I got to 996 I had to count the four NDP MLAs (Member of the Legislative Assembly) who were there to make it the even thousand. Now that's kind of playing with the figures but that's what the media said approximately.

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

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Approximately, approximately 1,000 people. So let's don't fool around with the figures here because when you have rallies . . . I've seen you have rallies out here and you bring the people, the union people, to gather out here to give you your numbers. We didn't gather them up. We didn't go gather them up to



come to farm meetings in this city.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution calling for the Government of Saskatchewan to reinstate the 1991 GRIP program was passed unanimously, but I can't. I can't say it was because there were a few NDP MLAs at that meeting and they wouldn't . . . a couple didn't stand up at all. I seen them. They didn't stand up and vote, but the rest of them — the other two or four, whatever was there — they stood up and they voted against it.

(2000)

**An Hon. Member:** — Are you finished?

**Mr. Muirhead:** — No, I'm not finished, Mr. Speaker. The member from Elphinstone wants to hear me for a while yet.

The NDP did not consult . . . The biggest mistake they made was they didn't consult with farmers to change the GRIP. Now you tell me, Mr. Speaker, and the members opposite, when they're going to change GRIP. They talked about it all last summer in '91, they talked it in this House, they talked at election time — changes to GRIP, changes to GRIP, and the farmers want changes to GRIP.

So what did they do? Leave it till the end of March-April to hold meetings to tell them what they're going to get. Why didn't they have those same meetings, Mr. Speaker, the same meetings in December or January and ask those farmers what would you like for changes because you're the ones that said you wanted to change?

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be very fair. If someone had asked my two sons and some of my neighbours at election time, would you like to see some changes to GRIP, they would have said, well sure we do. But I'll tell you what kind of changes they want. Here's what they want, Mr. Speaker.

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . vote NDP.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — The member from Elphinstone is being kind of foolish here tonight with his foolish talk because he's not being serious. He's not taking this serious at all. He is not taking me seriously and that means he's not taking the farmers of Saskatchewan seriously because I say I'm speaking on behalf of more farmers than he is, and that he ever did.

Here's what farmers said they wanted for changes. Say your farm . . . The minister of Crop Insurance is here. Here's what they wanted. You can go and ask; you'll get 9 out of 10 will tell you this. That if my coverage was say 25 bushels an acre — or 30 or 20, whatever it is — and if I reach that coverage but I happen to grow a much better crop, I want that wheat to be mine from 25 and over, something like the program of this year if you get a good crop. If you get over, they wanted that, but they wanted the old GRIP up to that point. Then the second thing they wanted was the premiums to be taken off at the elevator as they sell their grain.

Now that's what they wanted. That's the two main things they wanted. And if this government had been elected,

we would have worked with the federal government because we almost got that in last year. We just about got it. We were running late; we were working on the . . . to helping the irrigated farmers in the province that . . . We helped them.

The member from Morse was in cabinet. He came down to Outlook to speak to all the . . . along with a couple other members — the member from Thunder Creek I believe was there — when they had a real problem and saying, this is not suiting us, and they talked to the irrigators there one night and said, what do you want? What will help you?

So they laid out their plan and they came back to cabinet and that's what they got. But are the farmers able to talk to you people? Are they able to talk to the Minister of Agriculture and to the minister of Crop Insurance? Can you go to cabinet to give them something they want? No, sir.

Nobody will tell me . . . I'm going to run the minister of Crop Insurance through a little example, if he wants to know how good this program is. I'm going to use his own example. Mr. Hartley Furtan came to meet our caucus here for a part of a day, explaining this your GRIP program and moral hazards. He kept talking about, we had to deal with moral hazards.

I got two statements I want to say about moral hazards. In the meeting in Davidson a farmer stood up and said: I'm sick and tired of the government and you saying about moral hazards. I see five agents here tonight and three or four adjusters. Now will one of them, without giving any names, stand up and say, did anybody see somebody farming to take in . . . farming the system and calling it a moral hazard?

Another farmer got up and says: yes, you bet I did. I did not put fertilizer on last year because of GRIP. And the first farmer said: oh come on now. You're not being fair at this meeting because you told me you didn't put it on . . . the fertilizer on because it's a \$2 wheat. That's why he didn't put the fertilizer on. You wouldn't find a farmer out there that wouldn't have spent more money if it had been 4 and \$5 wheat, so let's face the facts.

This government over here has called farmers a moral hazard. When I was minister of Crop Insurance under this government, crop insurance takes care of moral hazards. It's up to them. If there's a moral hazard, blame the minister of Crop Insurance because they're not doing their job.

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

**Mr. Muirhead:** — He's not doing his job.

We set up a system that if an individual was farming for crop insurance or abusing the system, Mr. Speaker, what they would do is they could report it to Crop Insurance or maybe an adjuster would see a farmer that's abusing the system and if they weren't spraying . . . I'm going to use one name here tonight which became very, very well known throughout the province and that's Mr. Laird from Davidson. He didn't believe in using chemical, which he

had his God-given right not to use chemical. But they denied him crop insurance. That government denied him crop insurance.

So I looked at this thing and we looked at it as fair as we possibly could and took it to the board and we said, well this man and quite a few more like him feel that they have the right not to use chemical but how do we get covered for crop insurance? So we come up with a system that an adjuster would go there two or three times, whatever was necessary, to do a weed count. They got their crop insurance coverage under that method. And that was a very fair method and Mr. Laird is a very happy man today. And Mr. Laird, I am proud to say, wasn't happy with that government who he supported for many, many years. He was a great help to me in that Davidson area, going out and saying, that government, the NDP government that I supported — he knows I am saying this here tonight — that I supported that government and they would not support me, and this PC (Progressive Conservative) government were fair in crop insurance and looked at my problems right and properly.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about a moral hazard in the NDP. Their own figures, Crop Insurance's own figures . . . and I brought this to the attention of Mr. Furtan. And we'll use a farmer that his coverage is 30 bushels an acre but he gets in this specific year, 10 bushels an acre. And they're saying the market is \$3.02 a bushel, but we're going to use 3. So 10 times 3, he is going to get \$30 from the market-place. Three dollars a bushel at 10 bushels an acre. He is going to get . . . they tell him that the revenue insurance is going to be \$30 an acre. Then he puts a claim in for crop insurance because he only got 10 bushels an acre, for another \$43 an acre. So he got a total of \$103 an acre on a 10-bushel crop. If he gets that so-called 30 bushels an acre, he gets \$90 from the market-place, he gets another 30 from revenue, he gets 30 bushels an acre times \$3 a bushel.

**An Hon. Member:** — You've got it all wrong.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — I have not got it all wrong. He'll get . . . that shows them right there, Mr. Speaker, that they do not understand. It is 30 bushels to the acre times \$3 a bushel is \$90 an acre from the market-place. He gets another 30 from revenue. That is \$120 an acre. He doesn't get crop insurance so naturally he has done better at 30 and there is nothing wrong with that.

So if he goes to 40 times \$3 a bushel he gets a hundred . . . This is right off their own figures, right off your papers. Right off your own papers. And it's correct. Your own papers are correct, Mr. Speaker. The government's figures are correct here. Forty bushels an acre times \$3 a bushel is \$120 an acre, plus the \$30 for revenue is 150. So it goes on up.

But I said to him, Mr. Speaker, what does zero bushels give this man? What does zero bushels an acre? If he has a drought or the grasshoppers eat it or if he has hail or whatever, what does zero? If you want to talk about moral hazard, zero gives him zero from the market. He still gets his \$30 from revenue; that's if the price of wheat stays at the \$3 a bushel. He gets his \$30 but at a 30-bushel coverage he gets \$90 an acre from crop insurance which

gives him a total of 120. So, Mr. Speaker, talking about moral hazard, he's going to take a look at his farm and he's going to look at his pocket-book, he's going to look at the bank. And he's . . . They're after me and I haven't got the money to go borrow more money, and at 10 bushels to the acre, the grasshoppers are trimming off the edge, it never came up very good, and it's not a cloud in the sky — and what am I going to get if I don't spray at all? So he looks at zero bushels to the acre and he gets \$120 an acre; and at 10 bushels to the acre he gets 103. That is exactly the way it is if the price of wheat stays at 3.

Now that's your figures, and Mr. Furtan looked at these people right here. They looked at this caucus when I brought this to their attention and he didn't say anything for a moment. He says, yes you're right, but when do you get zero bushels to the acre? When do you get it? Now that's exactly what he said.

Talk about a moral hazard. You're encouraging people, you're encouraging them. It's not what you said, it's not what you said. It's not what the government said, Mr. Speaker, when they said, we're going to stop this moral hazard; we're going to get those farmers and we're going to make them do this and we're going to make them do that. We're going to control, and they're going to stop abusing the system.

Well I'll tell you, the only system that they didn't abuse here is their own treasury. That's why they done this in the first place. That's not hard to figure out what went wrong here.

I must go back. I missed one thought that was in my mind. It was about an EA that works . . . executive assistant, executive assistant that works for the Minister of Agriculture in his office. He comes from my town of Craik. I know him quite well. Mr. Speaker, this gentleman said to me, Gerald, you would get more coverage on my farm last year under the new GRIP than you would have under the '91 GRIP. So he went through it and he proved to me that he would have got \$15 an acre more, and I admitted that. But I said, what was your total yield? Best crop I ever had in my life — 40 to 45 bushels the acre.

What would have happened in a drought to that man? Let's go back and talk about that. Let's talk about the normal crop. When we come out with GRIP — this government last year — when we come out with the GRIP added to crop insurance, you take one or the other or both, and it was estimated on an average crop that you would be paying out \$1.3 billion to the farmers of this province — 1.3 billion. All right? The crop was extra good, excellent crop in the province — second best in the history of this province — and the price of wheat went up a little. So I think it's going to be, from what figures I'm picking up — this is just approximately — about 7 or 800 million is going to be paid out. But what would have happened, Mr. Speaker, to the treasury, if they had've had a 1988 crop? What would have happened? They would have been paid out 2.8 to close to \$3 billion.

That's why I want to make this very clear in this House, Mr. Speaker. That is why we got the changes in GRIP. The minister from Crop Insurance and the new Minister of Agriculture could not stand up to the Minister of Finance

who says, you've got to control this. You've got to keep that buck from going out to them farmers because this government can't balance budgets if we get one poor crop in the next four. We won't be able to handle it.

So they knew better. The member from Elphinstone knows that I'm right; he knows that they're going to pay out much less money to farmers. And if they get a real poor crop, they're not going to pay out much either because the premiums, the high premiums will pretty well cover it.

What's going to happen to the farmers in Saskatchewan if they get . . . There's a lot of silence here right now, isn't there, Mr. Speaker, because they know I've hit a nerve. It's the Minister of Finance that has said to this Treasury Board, and has said to the cabinet, you, Mr. Minister of Agriculture, and you, Mr. Minister of Crop Insurance, you've got to go out and sell something I know you don't believe in; you've got to go out and do it. Well I'll tell you, you're not selling it. You'll never sell it to this side of the House and you can't sell it to your own people.

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

**Mr. Muirhead:** — You can't sell it to your own people. Mr. Speaker, they're asking me why did I hop out. I hopped out in 1980. I hopped in this year because I'm farming again this year and I had to have something, I had to have something. And I will say it's better than nothing.

**The Speaker:** — Order. I think if the members want to interfere, they could get together with the member from Arm River after he's finished. In the meantime, let the member from Arm River make his speech.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to just go through a few pages of their own throne speech here, just touch on a few things in here.

"A Mandate For Change," they've got in their throne speech — "A Mandate For Change." There's a few of them in here that's well put together.

We come together today, in the spring of 1992, a time of renewal, to set a new direction for Saskatchewan. The people have given my ministers a mandate for fundamental change.

Well that's correct, Mr. Speaker. They did; they want to see it. Then it goes on to say:

A community that lives beyond its means will not long prosper. People want my government to get their financial house in order.

Now let's be honest. They're saying that we didn't have our financial house in order and we did, we did — there's no two ways about it — we did create a deficit under the nine years of our government. But why? We didn't do it on the backs of people like they're going to do it. The premier of ours in those days, the member from Estevan, said, my treasure will be on the line and it will go for farmers; it will be on the line for farmers.

(2015)

Now is that what you people are doing? You just shut her right off when I just finished talking about it, Mr. Speaker, they shut her right off when the Minister of Finance says to the big boys, no money for farmers, cut them off because we've got to do what we promised to do, balance these budgets and that's great. I hope we can balance the budget and I give all the credit to you if you could do it but for goodness' sakes don't do it on the backs of thousands of farmers that are going broke out there, losing their farms every day . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . we'll get in to some of that.

You've got, at the bottom of the page here it says:

#### Putting Our Financial House In Order

My ministers are determined to restore common sense and competence to the management of the public treasury. Government must learn once again to live within its means.

Okay, promise to manage the financing of the province with good management. Now how are they going to do this? There's the problem they're going to have and I'm going to tell you the problem you're going to have and I sure hope and I pray that for goodness' sakes that they have good luck doing this and I would give them the best of wishes to be able to balance budget and not cut people back.

What's going to happen when you, the Department of Parks, I just mentioned a few here, Highways, Environment, urban funding, rural funding, senior citizens drop-in centres and any sports complexes . . . you can't tell me that those aren't very important departments that I just mentioned. Two-thirds of the budgeting on the average from this province goes to health, education and social services, so if you start cutting back and cut and cut, it's only a smoke-screen out there, Mr. Speaker, that they're saying oh, we're going to cut back \$400 a piece.

I heard tonight on the television news that for car expenses, that they're going to save a million here and a million there. That sounds great and the people out there say, oh boy they're going to balance the budget by cutting back on some guy that has to take some more money out of his pocket to survive. That isn't it at all. You are going to have to get into it because you can't cut out all these departments when . . . say we'll just use the example a \$3 billion budget, we'll just use for example. That means 2 billion goes to health, education and social services so where are you going to . . . if you cut back like we did, that's what caused the problem.

We had to in 1986, '87, we had to cut back 25 per cent. We were told by the same people that you get your money from, where your Minister of Finance just went to New York to borrow money and he's told the same thing exactly, that you have to be within your means. And they said to us, you must cut back 25 per cent and we did. We cut back 25 per cent in 1986, '87 and if we had to cut any more it would have been on the backs of Parks, Highways, Environment and Agriculture and Urban and Rural Affairs and that's pretty serious stuff to get into because I guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, when these nice

people over here go to tell all these people, you're going to have all these cutbacks, I don't know if they'll be very happy with you. When you got tough times, there's a budget that one person wants to see balanced, and that's his own.

The farmers out there and the business men in this province would kind of like to balance their own budgets. That's who they want to see balanced budgets. And I'm not opposing balanced budgets. I think it's very essential, and I'm wishing you good luck in balancing budgets. But we've already found out in the last six months, we've already found out how you're going to do it. And you got people wild. You got them really upset when you played around with kind of teasing them there for a little while with health premiums.

Let's just . . . Oh yes, I noticed here in "Jobs and Economic Opportunities." There's one here that really I'm going to follow through. And I think our caucus is going to really follow through and see if this is going to happen. They're talking about future jobs in this province. And when I see this one here, this is a smoke-screen. They're saying:

In total, there are currently more than 700 companies which have expressed an interest in either relocating to Saskatchewan or expanding their operations here. If these businesses proceed with their plans, they have the potential to create or maintain more than sixteen-thousand jobs.

Well I'll tell you, that's a smoke-screen because I wish them good luck again. But it isn't going to happen, and you know it. You're just using nice words to be read from the podium here. You're just using nice words to make people happy — this government's going to create. They're not going to do it. I wish you can, but it's not going to happen — not going to happen.

You talked about the population went up under the Conservatives. It's sure going down under the NDP. It's just the lowest it's been since 1930s. The population in this province is the lowest now it's been and they've been going steady since the election — steady. They're just leaving this province. And that's sad. That is sad, Mr. Speaker, when people are leaving this province. Well I've got a son that's going to leave to go out to British Columbia just for a six-week job to try to get a few bucks to help survive the farm. Now that's not a job in Saskatchewan. Find my son a job in Saskatchewan. Find their sons jobs — and their daughters. Find them one. Find them one.

So if the government doesn't do it, you got to go and . . . They don't have things coming into the province. You don't have things booming. And there's no jobs, is there? Yes, 700 companies talked about. So why I brought this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, why I brought it to your attention, because we're going to watch very carefully and see if that's a smoke-screen. We're going to watch if it's a smoke-screen or whether it's just forgot about in a few weeks. We're going to watch you very carefully.

Now there's something here that really bothers me here when you get this here NDP government talking about free trade. They sure got it all straightened out in their

mind here.

They said here that:

. . . Canada-United States Free Trade Agreement is a source of economic disruption and uncertainty. Canadian exporters continue to be subjected to trade harassment by American competitors.

The GATT negotiations still under way in Europe, will have a profound effect on Saskatchewan economic future. Yet, the federal government has done little more than provide provinces with after-the-fact briefing on its negotiating positions.

Similarly, the proposed North American Free Trade Agreement, with the United States and Mexico, offers Saskatchewan few benefits, and much cause for concern. Ottawa continues to bargain with limited involvement from the provinces.

Now they said . . . they go on to say how they're going to get involved and they're going to control the United States and Canada . . . or United States and all of Canada and Mexico to get a proper agreement for Saskatchewan. Well good luck, little socialist Saskatchewan. Good luck if you're going to take on the United States and Mexico because . . . and all of Europe — to try to get all these things to happen. It's only a smoke-screen. You know you can't make it happen.

**An Hon. Member:** — We'll give it away to them.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — No, the member from Swift Current says he's not going to give it away. Well I agree. One thing you can't take away is the soil from this province. It's here for ever. God put it here and God's going to take it away.

We all know, Mr. Speaker, that our biggest problem in this country, that our biggest problem is that we had about a third of a century . . . we've had . . . the NDP have had control of a lot of provinces in Canada and Trudeau had control of Canada for 17 years and there's what we're suffering for today. We all know that. When Trudeau went into government in the late '60s there were I believe 16 or \$17 billion deficit, and when he left, a \$187 billion deficit.

Well the interest alone on that money will go for ever and ever so you'll never get it. And we took over a deficit from you people that created a 300-and-some thousand . . . We took over three-some . . . I don't know the figures but's it's . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No. My member says it's four and a half billion. But I was given the figures. It came out of the Gass report, out of your own report, your own people — three-point-some billion dollars that we took over from you people. But you don't . . . You like to holler and yell when I'm at you on that. Take the deficit on that and take the interest and run that around till 1992 and see what you got.

If you had left us in 1982 a clear slate, an honest, clear slate, we wouldn't be in this position today. Now they can laugh all they want but that is the facts and they know it. It's very, very clear.

Just exactly the same, the way they left us in 1982, Mr. Speaker, is exactly the same as when a farmer tells me, or a business man, that where do I go from here? I just missed my last fall's payment and I don't know whether I can make my next payment or not. I said, you got no place but out or do some negotiating because once you miss, then the interest is going to get you.

Well that's exactly what you people did to us. You left us that deficit, hidden deficit. I mean really a hidden one. It was really hidden and it came out very clear. It came out very clear, and you take and compound that interest right through until 1992 and say what you've got. You got a lot more than the total deficit today. It's exactly came out of his books.

They like to use smoke-screens over there, Mr. Speaker. I see in the throne speech, I marked another little mark beside the GRIP program which I hate to go back into but I'm going to. They said here, "My ministers recognize that much more needs to be done for the 1993 crop . . ." They're already saying it in their throne speech that we've got to improve the GRIP program for '93.

I want to tell you what happened in the town of Craik when they had their GRIP meeting out there. The most intelligent question that the farmers said that was answered by their individual they had there that night, is when a farmer got up and said, this hall was rented last year for a GRIP meeting and the Department of Agriculture rented again tonight; have you got your lease for next year? And that's exactly what they're thinking. When you know you're going to change it for '93, why did you ball them all up in '92 for? Why did you do this? Why didn't you let it go?

Mr. Speaker, also in the throne speech they're talking about a . . . they say that the federal government owes us. They just absolutely owe us and they want to hang their hat. There's \$500 million is still owing to Canadian farmers to cover grain deficiencies for the 1991 crop year. It was very clear a year ago when they come out with GRIP that it was a rich program, a mighty rich program. And that's exactly your third line of defence was built right in that program.

And what did you do? You threw it away and said, Mr. Federal Government, give us the money. You threw what the farmers had to have for security, you threw it away. You threw it right away. And I'm hoping that the federal government will try and see fit to give us some more money out here, but so help me I don't know how they can even look at you when you threw what the good thing we had away. You threw it away.

When I've got a neighbour that tells me yesterday that, Mr. Muirhead, I was covered for \$147 an acre on my farm last year. I produced 45 bushel average. I just barely collected enough not quite to get my premium back but good enough on a good crop. But he said, on the new program it looks like I'm going to be covered for about 112 or 15 if wheat stays at \$3. If it goes up I'll . . .

So that's about a 35, \$40 cut-back for this farmer. Now that's a tough thing to have to happen and that's the same

way right across. The only group of people that are pleased with this program, the only group of people that are pleased with it, is some areas where they just don't know what drought is. And they get good crops every year and they're . . . they have a . . . maybe if they get a 40-50 bushel crop they'll do quite well on GRIP. But in my area and all this big vast area to the west, and all below no. 1 highway, that great big grain growing area is where they're so disturbed about this GRIP.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk just a few minutes about health care. The Minister of Health tonight up and mentioned all the so-called people that brought medicare to this province. And I agree with her. But she left out the most important one that introduced medicare to Canada, and that was John Diefenbaker, and don't anybody deny that John Diefenbaker didn't.

Mr. Speaker, I got into an argument in this legislature, and it went into *Hansard* and went out into a paper, and I had an NDP from my riding write letters to the editor that I was wrong. We did a research and put it back in and he had to apologize to me that yes, in 1937 John Diefenbaker is the first one to talk about a free medicare program for Canada. The very first one. So I was kind enough to say that the people she mentioned, they had a great part of the health care system of this country. And Saskatchewan has the best. But don't take it away from the one of the greatest prime ministers of this country. The greatest statesman this country's ever seen is John Diefenbaker.

I was not surprised, Mr. Speaker, when I see this government break their promises to support farmers. That didn't surprise me at all. I knew they couldn't live up to their promises. There they didn't get their vote there and so they knew that they didn't have to.

But when I first heard about the NDP's intention to introduce health care premiums, that at first, it kind of surprised me. Then I got thinking about it that maybe they had no choice in the matter. Because I'm going to say, maybe this is not . . . the statement I'm saying is not on behalf of my party as me as an individual.

I'm saying that I believe that that's the right thing to do with health care premiums and deterrent fees, but not by you guys. You are the wrong ones to even think about it. You said you would never do it. But I'll tell you right now, if the member from Estevan had even thought it in his mind, even thought it, every television set in Saskatchewan would have blown up. But you people got . . . you thought you got away with it. But I don't even believe for one minute that you're even thinking of putting the health care premium on. It was that trickery, that Minister of Finance again.

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

(2030)

**Mr. Muirhead:** — He says we're going to charge the people that go to see the chiropractors, we're going to put deterrent fees on, we're going to raise the drug plan up and we're going to charge premiums for health care, we're going to charge a deterrent fee. And so their party goes wild and the letters come in, and the opposition

attacked you a little bit that you're the wrong people doing it. But they knew it was only just a front because we're going to back off and just soak the middle class with more income tax — personal income tax. You had that planned in the first place.

Don't think that you're fooling the old member from Arm River, because you're not and you're not fooling this here people on this side of the House. Because that's exactly what you're doing and I want all people listening tonight to understand and to believe that's what the motive of this government was, because they knew they would not get away with putting deterrent fees on and health premiums. Not in this time, but I believe that maybe they'll find out that maybe they'll have to and another . . . they'll probably have the tax and then we'll still get the premiums. They knew that they couldn't get away with taxing the sick.

But they've had enough cut-backs already. They've cut back on hospitals, they're taking about closing hospitals. Goodness they're going to . . . when we were sitting over here, I can remember when the health critics from here would scream and holler if there was one patient and one empty bed some place that somebody couldn't get into. Used to scream and holler and call us criminals.

I can remember the Minister of Health sitting here one day in about 1986-87, and said that there's somebody died for the lack of a hospital bed — brought the name of the family right to this legislature, and just said shame on you Mr. Government over there, closing down beds. And really what it was that the hospitals in Saskatoon . . . this happens all over. I guess they have to have holidays, the nurses — and there was some of the wings they had . . . the administrators of the hospitals didn't fill those beds. So this put this here opposition right on high didn't it? They just went wild when they found out.

So don't think you're fooling us. You'll do anything. This government, Mr. Speaker, will do anything they absolutely have to to balance this budget because that's the thing . . . the one promise they think if they can do that, deliver on that one, people will not notice the other.

Actually, they put a stop to all health care facility projects for rural Saskatchewan. And then they start talking about the health care premiums, of course. Now, it looks like maybe they're backing off, but I guess we won't really know until Thursday.

Mr. Speaker, it was a big thing in my area that this government said we're going to restore the school based dental program. What's happened to that promise? Where did it go? Are you going to do it? Are they going to do it? There's no such a thing . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member from Quill Lake said they're still looking for the equipment. Well I'll tell you, if that's how crazy this government is, that they're not going to live up to their promise because they can't find the equipment, well I'll tell you, no wonder we got a problem.

I can't believe this, Mr. Speaker, that they're not putting the dental program back in because they can't find the equipment. They can't find the equipment. Now isn't that something? What about the promise to the drug plan, to

reinstore the drug plan to zero? What happened to that? Where did it go, Mr. Speaker? Gone.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health, I wonder if she would remember a statement she made in this here House. And it's in *Hansard*, August 21, 1989, and I'm going to read it into the record again.

The opposition is going to fight for health care. We're going to stop any cut-backs and changes to medicare.

It's going to fight the erosion of the principles of medicare . . . I feel rather certain we'll be having a change in government next time around and then the public isn't going to have to worry about these problems.

Louise Simard, *Hansard*, August 21, 1989.

What in the world, Mr. Speaker, is her constituents thinking tonight? What in the world would they be thinking tonight?

Mr. Speaker, remember the NDP pledged to devise the finest next phase of medicare and hospitalization, which will pioneer for the 1990s health care what Douglas did in the 1960s. Remember that pledge? You were the people that made it. How can the members across the floor hold their heads up when they're in their constituency? I'll bet you they had a lot of trouble the last few weeks and they had a lot of trouble in their own caucuses and everything else. I'll bet you it would have been interesting to be a little mouse in the corner of those caucus rooms in the last few weeks, to have it on tape.

I feel sorry for the . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — I think there were too many mice in there.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Yes, I think there were too many mice because too many words were getting out. Those mice talk. I have a feeling that they were just deceived by the old-guard rhetoric as the people of the province were. They were deceived by the front row — the front row. I wonder if the member from Redberry knew how hollow all of his party's promises were. I'll bet he's gone through quite an initiation process.

We on this side of the House, when it comes to health care, we can hold our head high, and we're going to hold our head high. We didn't make these suggestions. We done the right thing. We put in the drug plan. It was moderate, the people after a while accepted it because you've got to have control. And it did; it worked. It saved the province a lot of money. But what are these people talking about doing? Doubling it.

We did not raise people's expectations to such a level that they now feel completely betrayed. We didn't do that, Mr. Speaker, to the people of this province. We were honest about the need to make changes to the health system and the current Minister of Health boldly said, changes were not needed. She said, changes were not needed. And she stood here tonight for half an hour and

said all the changes we have to have. But here she said before — they're not needed.

We over here don't have to be embarrassed that our major supporters are now being quoted left, right, or centre about how they are deceived by the party of their choice. You people can't blow that over there. Put your heads down because they should be down, every one of you.

And I'm not talking about the Barb Byers, the George Rosenaus, either. I'm talking about the real people of your own party, the NDP that said this would never happen. You promised them that you'd protect health care. You said that you would never, ever put premiums on; you'd return all these things. But you broke the promise to them. You must be going through horror out there.

What about the elderly, whether in your party or not, just the elderly in this province who they were told how the health program would be improved? You told them that at election time — it would be improved.

I'm talking about the poor who were told the drug plan would be introduced. What about them? What are you doing about them? You're just . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Raising their rates.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Yes, raising their rates. Your members in Saskatchewan, your federal counterparts — they must be getting pretty nervous by now, Mr. Speaker. They must be getting pretty nervous, especially when they've got an election coming up here right now. NDP MPs (Member of Parliament) are hopping mad. They don't agree with or like the direction their buddies, like the member from Regina Dewdney, are heading.

I'm certainly very proud and very happy for the people of Arm River that just in April of this month, that we opened a health facility in Craik and one in Imperial because, I'll tell you, under the present government there won't be many of them happening, if any, out in rural Saskatchewan. We opened up new health facilities in those two towns and the member from Last Mountain-Touchwood was there. He's seen the big crowds of happy people. There was over 300 at both towns. One was on a Friday, the next was on a Saturday the next day, and he was there and was a very nice gentlemen the way he handled himself and I thank him for the way he handled himself in my constituency. And I was very proud of him and he's seen what a happy group of people we had. So I thank the member from Last Mountain-Touchwood for coming and speaking at the opening of these two facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to talk for just a few minutes before I close, on a couple of subjects. Education — just a few words on education. These are two departments that I'm really worried about over the next four years of the mandate of this government — that's Health and Education.

There's something happening in our school system out there and it's not just happening in Saskatchewan, it's the whole socialistic agenda moving right across North

America. It's attacking our young people, and if we don't, as adults, face up to what's happening in our schools . . . and I know there's members across there that will know what I'm talking about, the member from Swift Current, the member from Nipawin, and many more. I'm just familiar with what those people believe. That there's something happening in those schools out there in that school system that is not right and proper for our children to be learning in our schools.

So if the Minister of Education thinks for one minute, if she stays the Minister of Education, that she's not going to be attacked by people like me to keep our schools right and proper and our educational system for our young people in this province, she's badly mistaken. Because we're going to be on their back, and we're going to be on hard, because I've heard statements coming from the Minister of Education and the Minister of Health that doesn't sit well with me as an individual on my moral beliefs. And I'll be attacking them in this House as hard as I can for everything that I can possibly do to fight for the people in this province on some moral standards.

If the Minister of Health thinks that she's fooling the people of Saskatchewan with her saying, I want to keep that bad Mr. Morgentaler out, well, sir, I'll bet you they talk on the telephone as much as any two people Morgentaler talks to, putting up a front for the people of Saskatchewan. You know perfectly well where she stands. The people in this province know where she stands. We know where . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I think the member is getting too personal and making a personal attack. It's all right to attack the policies of the minister but in this House we should not attack the personal beliefs of an individual and I think he is going a little too far.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I don't attack them personally, I just attack the government on their stand on abortion.

**An Hon. Member:** — Shame on you.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — And shame on them. I don't know why, Mr. Speaker, that somebody would have to say to me that from what I'm saying morally, that had to say shame on me. I think that somebody should be ashamed of themselves. I don't know who it came from but boy, I'm not very pleased with that remark, and I'm talking about our future of this province and the future of our young people, the future of this province as a whole.

We call ourselves in North America, we call ourselves a Christian nation and are we? I have a friend, a week from today leaves for Russia, because I belong to an organization called expanded youth ministries and they're handing . . . the next two weeks while schools are closing in Russia, they're handing out thousands of Bibles, little Bibles. They're just hanging out for them.

But in this province here and in Canada, nearly all of it, our system is don't mention the word of God in a school; it's against our thoughts in this Christian nation. So I want you to take heed because I'm going to be on you for a long time because you've got some good members over there

that agree exactly what I'm saying.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I just want to say that I'm also very happy, I'm very happy, that in the educational system in Arm River, as far as schools are concerned, that I was able to deliver for the constituents of Arm River over the last eight years a new addition to the school in Holdfast; \$300,000 addition to the school in Imperial; a brand new school in Craik and a new school in Davidson, and I'm going to tell you about the new school that's just being built in Kenaston now. This was approved in the 1991 budget along with several others. And when the election was on, the contractor from Davidson, Con's Construction, got the contract to build the school. I got to him and said, go scratch some dirt because it's the NDP are going to win this election and they'll be putting a moratorium on any further building of schools. And I understand that most of them have been stopped, but Kenaston is going ahead because we got the jump on them.

But I feel sorry for what's going to happen if this here government . . . They backed off for now. They were going to close down . . . They even talked about closing the school unit office in Davidson and maybe Outlook or Watrous or one or the other and eventually move them into Saskatoon. I can see it happening.

It goes back to when the NDP were in power and some of the older people will remember in '49, '50 when they brought in the school unit then. And everybody said, oh boy, oh boy this is going to be wonderful. Then they said, well we might as well close a couple of schools because it's too much to administrate all those old country schools out there.

(2045)

So that's the system, close the schools down, got the school units. Well now they've got the school units and that's been working fine. And now they're going to start closing the school units and making bigger school units, and you watch the schools close. This government, I tell you, as long as I'm the member from Arm River, better not try closing these schools that I'm talking about here tonight, that we built good schools for education and I think the plan of this government will be to close those schools and move them. Because the socialistic plan of North America with young people is to get them into dormitories, away from their parents for five days in a week. That's what they're going to want to do. That's their plan; that's the socialistic plan of North America.

Mr. Speaker, it's been a pleasure to speak in this House tonight. And I'll definitely be voting for the amendment and thank you.

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

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Before I start my speech, I want to make a few comments about the hon. member from Arm River's last statements, or some of the last statements that he has made. I think he was quite reckless with some of the facts. He talked about, in 1982, where they inherited this large debt. I want to indicate to the hon. member from Arm River that

in 1982, what the Conservative government inherited was a \$129 million surplus on the deficit side.

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

**Mr. Thompson:** — A \$129 million surplus and the long-term debt of the province at that time that was in the Crown . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Will the members on both sides please let the member from Athabasca have his say. If you wish to yell, go into your lounge and yell out there and let the member speak. That's his privilege and his right. I recognize the member from Athabasca.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just was indicating that the surplus in 1982 that the Conservative government inherited was \$129 million and there was a long-term debt of approximately 2.8 billion that was in the Crown corporations for expansions to the Crowns. Now, Mr. Speaker, that long-term debt in this province is \$14 billion. And what has happened is accumulated deficits by the Conservative government over the years has created that long-term debt. And what we used to have when we were in government was the rating of a AA rating. It's now approaching BBB. And that was created by the Conservative government. I wanted just to bring that fact out, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Thompson:** — I want to also congratulate the mover and the seconder, the hon. member from Meadow Lake and the hon. member from Wascana Plains for the excellent presentation as the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne.

I also, Mr. Speaker, want to thank the constituents of Athabasca for showing their faith in re-electing me for another term. And I sincerely look forward to the next three years of working on their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I rise in this Assembly to offer a few comments in support of this important throne speech. I am proud to be part of a government that has already started to put things back together in this great province. I am proud of the principles and ideals of the New Democratic Party. And I use this opportunity to tell the people of Saskatchewan that the mandate they gave us on October 21 will be honoured, will be delivered, and by working together we will succeed in turning this great province around.

Mr. Speaker, this throne speech delivered a very important message to all Saskatchewan people. It dealt honestly and realistically with the very serious problems we all face. And it offered a hope that finally after 10 years of free spending and mismanagement the people of Saskatchewan finally have a government that is accountable.

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

**Mr. Thompson:** — A government that is not afraid to face a tough challenge, and like a breath of fresh air deliver policies and programs for the benefit of all Saskatchewan



people, not just the privileged. Not just the privileged few who happen to be on the good graces, in the good graces of the government at that particular time.

Today I am not going to go through the list. We all know it well. And the people of Saskatchewan have passed judgement on the sorry record of the former PC government.

Mr. Speaker, they are where they are because they did not keep the faith. They did not keep promises. They did not provide honest government. And in the process they almost drove this province into bankruptcy. That is the record. Those are the facts. And while it will not be easy, we have rolled up our sleeves, and working with the people of Saskatchewan, we will get through it together. And the future will be brighter in the long term for our children and for their children. Make no mistake about it. Count on it. It is going to happen.

So where do we stand today? What do we face? How big are the problems and what can be done? I recall so vividly prior to the election when members opposite would howl in derision when we'd challenge them on their statements about the size of the deficit.

Remember when the then minister of Finance took such exception when we accused him of hiding the true size of the deficit? Remember when the minister from Estevan tried to assure the people of this province that we have turned the corner, the deficit was under control, that it would come in at \$245 million. What a cruel joke, Mr. Speaker.

They got away with it in 1986 when they hoodwinked the public, but the public was not to be fooled again. Mr. Speaker, the financial crisis we face today is a direct result of close to 10 years of Tory mismanagement; 10 years of deals, patronage, wild spending and incompetence; 10 years the people of this province endured some of the most incredibly incompetent actions by any government in our history. But no more.

The people of Saskatchewan expect their new government to be different. And we are. They expect honesty, integrity and fairness, compassion and leadership. The very things that were lacking between 1982 and 1991.

Mr. Speaker, dealing with this kind of challenge is not new to New Democratic Party governments. Tommy Douglas did it in 1944. Allan Blakeney faced the same challenge in 1971. And today we find ourselves face to face with the biggest challenge of all.

Getting a handle on and addressing the question of debt and deficit to ensure that we are able to get this thing under control before it totally controls us and everything we do. It is truly amazing that the former government would allow this situation to get so out of hand, but they did.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan did not create this mess. We did not create this mess, but we both know who did. We all know who is responsible. But establishing responsibility is only part of it. We now must

address it. And the people of Saskatchewan, working with this government, will get through it. But it is not going to be easy. The throne speech is very clear in outlining how we intend to address this crisis. It is very clear that today's tough decisions will mean a brighter future tomorrow for the people of this province.

We cannot spend ourselves out of debt. We cannot ignore this enormous deficit and we cannot just arbitrarily hack and slash with no regard for the consequences of those decisions. It will take the commitment of us all, the fair application of decisions, a commonality of purpose, working together, and working through to find solutions.

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

**Mr. Thompson:** — Mr. Speaker, there is no clearer indication of proof of the difference between the way the former PCs ran this province and the priorities we have set, than what is happening in northern Saskatchewan. Ten years of disappointment, 10 years of neglect, 10 years of turning their back on the people of northern Saskatchewan — that is a record of the former PC government.

Mr. Speaker, the former government seemed to believe that if you ignore a problem long enough, it will go away. Year after year I would stand up in this House, along with my colleague from Cumberland, to plead the case of northern people. And year after year the arguments would fall on deaf ears. They were more interested in GigaText and Joytec than they were in providing employment, sewer and water systems, jobs, and educational opportunities for northern people.

Mr. Speaker, I am very encouraged by the steps already taken by this new government to respond to the challenges we face in this part of our province. Our government will reach out to our northern communities, and working with them, we will find ways to provide jobs, adequate housing, and educational opportunities. No it will not be easy for us. For sure it will take time. But we are not afraid of challenge. We are not afraid to meet that challenge head on, and we will work hard and long to make sure that we do what we can.

Today we are spending over \$500 million a year on interest payments on the Conservative deficit. What a waste. Think of how that money could be used in northern Saskatchewan. The former PC premier obviously believed paying bond raters and bankers hundreds of millions of dollars was no problem. But when it came to the North, inaction and disdain were his guiding principles — cancellation of the northern food subsidy; inaction on housing, roads, education, and improvement to health care. That was the record, and that was the reality.

And that was another reason why the former government is now sitting where they are, in opposition. For 10 years they did nothing, Mr. Speaker. I am very pleased that this government understands the challenges of northern Saskatchewan and has the commitment to act.

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

**Mr. Thompson:** — The northern works program will make an important difference to this part of the province. Aside from the 150 jobs that will be created in many northern communities, and the additional resources to provide conventional water and sewer services to 17 communities that are without those basic amenities, is certainly welcome.

The commitment to work with our northern communities to address the serious housing situation where about 40 per cent of current housing is in need of repair, it is also something that is overdue and this government is to be commended for tackling this situation. New home construction and renovations coupled with the job creation is good news for northern residents.

Mr. Speaker, a decade of neglect, that was the record of the members opposite. This government has a commitment to northern Saskatchewan. The throne speech signals that commitment and I fully intend to work very closely with my colleagues and the residents of the North to address and move on those matters that have been neglected for so long.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech signals the arrival of the new reality. The reality is simple. We simply cannot afford to ignore the huge deficit. It must be dealt with. It must be brought under control. This government, working with the people of Saskatchewan, will get the job done, facing the challenge and working through this barrier of debt. We will have a brighter future tomorrow.

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

**Mr. Thompson:** — In closing, Mr. Speaker, thanks to the former PC government we face hardships today. Thanks to this government we will face a brighter future tomorrow. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support this Speech from the Throne and I will be voting accordingly. Thank you very much.

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

(2100)

**Ms. Bradley:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to have the opportunity to rise in this House to add my response to the Speech from the Throne and to the motion before this House which was moved by the member from Meadow Lake and seconded by the member from Regina Wascana Plains, good friends and competent members.

It is safe to say that my friends and colleagues have accurately represented the feelings that our entire caucus is experiencing right now — that is frustration and anger at what the previous government did to this province. We are all having to deal with that anger and then try to move on to positive action.

I am pleased that the throne speech was able to convey a strong message of progress in spite of the staggering financial situation that we are forced to contend with. The member from Regina Wascana Plains referred to having to spend time cleaning up the mess before we can start to rebuild and provide hope to the people of this province.

What we have all been through during the long, mean years of Tory rule has been far worse than any natural disaster, worse because the destruction was both deliberate and malicious.

I would now like to relate only one personal example of how angry it makes me when I see the waste and mismanagement of the previous administration in reference to one of their megaprojects. The project I refer to is the Rafferty-Alameda project and the new Mainprize Park.

Earlier this spring a concerned constituent of mine asked me and a group of MLAs to tour the project. I saw the partial construction of a 21-hole golf course. Plans were for three extra holes being lit for night golfing, computerized sprinkling system, electronic boat launch, a shed full of equipment for the golf course, a fence they say worth maybe a million dollars, or maybe more. And the list of goodies goes on.

The next day I met with a hospital and nursing home board in our constituency who are having trouble making ends meet. They have people on a waiting-list and not adequate enough home care in their community. It angers me the way money was spent, and now to no fault of our government and to no fault of our citizens, we are struggling with tough decisions on cut-backs and increased taxes.

Now no one is against having water in southern Saskatchewan or a park, but how was the project managed or should I say mismanaged? The Leader of the Opposition, when he was premier, constantly tried to tell the people about what a wonderful project he and the former deputy premier, now Senator, had concocted.

But let's look at the facts. The Rafferty-Alameda project was to have cost the province \$42.5 million. Instead, the province's share is now expected to be over 155 million. Why? Because as the Gass Commission pointed out, there was a lack of accountability in managing this project. The Souris Basin Development Authority was given complete control over this project. Yet the directors of this Authority have all had a vested interest in seeing the project go ahead at all costs. None of the directors had any responsibility or interest in insuring that the project remained within budget. This was so typical of many of the Tories' business deals.

Cut a deal at any costs. As long as there is a signature on the paper, the previous government was happy and considered themselves big time wheeler-dealers. They did not care if the province was taken to the cleaners or if proper procedures were trampled upon. The important factor to them was they got a deal.

The Rafferty-Alameda project is just one of the messes that have to be cleaned up. Besides being financially disastrous, the Tories also ran roughshod over environmental concerns and court injunctions. They felt they were beyond due process and regulation, that they could do whatever they wanted. They bullied their way ahead instead of taking the time to have appropriate environmental assessments done. The result has been to leave behind a legal mess as well as a financial one.

Yet in spite of all their blundering and pushing their way around, what do we have to show for their incompetence. We have a physical structure that may be flawed. We have acres of land that have been bulldozed and destroyed just in case the mud-flats actually collect some water. Hardly the shining example of success that the former premier tried to convince us it would be.

So how long do we wait? Is it this year, next year, 50, a 100 years? Is that when your mess will prove itself to be worthwhile? Like I said, this is just one example from an entire legion of waste and mismanagement practices. And now we are having to clean it up.

The people in Bengough-Milestone constituency did not cause the 10 straight years of annual operating deficits. And they know perfectly well that our government did not cause the massive debt. Yet they do understand that it is irresponsible to continue spending wildly. That sooner, rather than later, the house will come crashing down as long as the financial base is allowed to crumble.

Our party did promise to get the province's finances in order and we are doing just that. We know that tough choices will have to be made in order to keep our future secure. But we have to regain control of our finances in order to have any freedom to allow . . . to follow our own agenda, freedom for the future of our children and our grandchildren in this province.

And I must say I am appalled when I hear the opposition criticize us here tonight for financial management. They put this province into this massive debt and now we pay one and a half million dollars a day on interest — interest alone — and what could we have done with that money in this province for the people of this province.

The Gass Commission was the first step. Before we can begin to rebuild, we had to know the total extent of the damage. We had to know the reality. Knowing just how bad things are is critical to be able to plan for the future. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that in the throne speech we heard last week this government proved that no matter how bad things are, it is already taking action to make improvements.

The wellness model for health care is the beginning of the expanded definition for health care. Yes, some changes to the system will be required. Because of the financial situation, some of those changes will be less than what we would want them to be, but we are still moving forward to achieve our goal of keeping people well. Our version of cutting down on the use of expensive health care procedures is to implement a program that is focused on preventing illness in the first place.

I am looking forward to some of these changes, and I know that the people and the health professions in my area are prepared to help make the wellness model work. They know they have a lot to offer, and they know that by consulting and co-operating with each other that even the most thorny problems can be resolved. My constituents are ready and eager to participate and be involved with the decisions that are needed to make a better health care system in this province.

I am confident that fundamental changes to the education system will also be brought about by the new Saskatchewan Education Council. This government understands that no one person is going to be able to solve our problems, but by putting our heads together with people from other organizations, and encouraging open and honest debate, we will discover the solutions needed. Education is as basic a need in our society as health care. Only by providing access to quality education programs can we begin to address some of the inequity and unfairness that is readily apparent within our society today.

As a resident of rural Saskatchewan and as a teacher, I am keenly aware that educational opportunities must be available to all people in this province regardless of where they live. I was impressed with the active role constituents of Bengough-Milestone took in the review of the Scharfe/Langlois report. And just to clarify for the members opposite, the Scharfe/Langlois report was commissioned by their government, who maybe did have a hidden agenda.

A number of concerns were raised about this report, and our government listened to their concerns. And no action has been taken on the Scharfe/Langlois recommendations. And just to clarify in saying that I also realize that developing and implementing programs to improve access to education is not just a one-shot item. Fair access to education must be constantly encouraged and nurtured. Changes and innovations will have to be ongoing, flexible, to meet changing needs.

Mr. Speaker, this government understands what is required in modern society. The Speech from the Throne showed very clearly that this government is prepared to make fundamental changes in how our institutions function, but changes only in consultation with all stakeholders. We are not interested in showy ribbon-cutting ceremonies. We are not interested in erecting costly monuments of questionable worth. But we are interested in people and in creative responses to increase lifelong learning opportunities for all of our citizens. We are interested in programs that meet the changing needs of the 1990s.

We know that we are all in this together and that the only way we can get out of this mess is to work collectively and by ending the adversarial approach that so many of us are tired of.

The other day my nine-year-old daughter said to me: You know, Mom, I used to think MLAs and cabinet ministers were really special people who knew everything. But you know, you're all just people.

Well I take this as a compliment and I'm proud of being "just people." What my daughter has implied was that she used to think MLAs and cabinet ministers were somehow above everyone else, though I want to stress that that is never the case. No matter what position anyone holds, that person is always "just people." The trouble starts when elected representatives start thinking that because of their position they are somehow better than the next person.

I am confident that this government will do an excellent job of representing the people of the province because, as members of this government, we must consider ourselves one of the people. We don't have any delusions. We are just people like everyone else. But we are people who take our service to this province very seriously. We know that we cannot solve problems on our own or by ourselves.

The GRIP program is a good example of what I'm talking about. We know that we certainly can't untangle the mess of politics and bureaucracies of this program overnight. But our farmers need help. After consulting with farmers and farm groups, we made steps to improve the program. We know that it is not perfect, but we also know that ongoing consultation with some flexibility is essential in order to give farmers the protection they need.

But it is just those two ingredients that members opposite ignored when they were cohorting with federal government to create this program. No consultation. No flexibility. That has been the recipe for disaster practised by the Tories when they were in government. The previous government signed into an agreement with GRIP that cost our farmers and our taxpayers more than any other province in Canada.

It is really a shame that the members of this opposition cannot give up their political games even on a topic of such importance as agriculture. At the request of the opposition, this House agreed to enter into a special emergency debate to help farmers. We agreed to this debate even though there was a chance of risk in delaying the presentation of the budget to the House. The government made accommodation for the opposition's seemingly sincere concerns. And what was the outcome of this emergency debate?

Incredibly, we witnessed all nine leaderless opposition members vote against a motion, a motion urging the federal government to work with us to assist farmers; a motion that called on the federal government to meet its outstanding commitment to provide farmers with the \$500 million deficiency payment for the 1990-91 crop year as soon as possible — and to deliver on its commitment for a third line of defence program this year as agreed to at the recent first ministers' conference. And they voted no.

They voted no to extend the federal government's consent to the deadline, the deadline to be extended which is mutually agreeable for farmers, the provincial government and the federal government.

And they voted no to accept the request of farmers to establish a review commission to design a long-term farm income stability program, based on the needs of farm families and the actual cost of production.

They initiated this motion. But when it came right down for them to put their money where their mouth is, they proved that they were only interested in playing politics to begin with. The people of Saskatchewan are fed up with those kind of political games and with good reason.

(2115)

Mr. Speaker, as a new member of the legislature, I was surprised and shocked by question period on Friday. I could hardly believe that the opposition would focus their questions around the fact that we knew how badly they mismanaged this province. That we knew they bankrupt this province. That we knew they cooked the books. And that we should have known not to trust their documentation or their Minister of Finance. I honestly wondered if I was sitting in the legislature or if this was a tale from Alice in Wonderland, or should I say Tories in blunderland?

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

**Ms. Bradley:** — Mr. Speaker, the throne speech sends a clear message that we will change the face of politics because we do believe in democratic principles and we are not afraid to work together with other people. That is why we will have a code of ethical conduct and a conflict of interest Acts this session.

This government will extend the opportunity of meaningful participation to opposition members through the use of all-party committees. This government and its members do understand the importance and the need for co-operation. It remains to be seen whether the members from the opposition are capable of learning that basic lesson.

Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward to the upcoming session. I feel our success as a government will hinge on the basic principles and premises of honesty, accountability, and fairness in putting our financial house in order; of restoring public faith in the ability of politicians to serve the public interest; of giving hope to the less fortunate and bringing the people of this province together.

Yes, there will be challenges, but I am confident that those challenges will be met in the spirit of co-operation and consultation that Saskatchewan people expect. And I am pleased to support the Speech from the Throne.

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

**Mr. Langford:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a pleasure to enter the throne speech debate. Let me first echo some of my colleagues in congratulating the mover and seconder, the members from Meadow Lake and Regina Wascana.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the constituents of Shellbrook-Torch River for allowing me the honour of representing them. I will do everything within my ability to maintain their trust and continued support.

I rise today to speak in favour of the Speech from the Throne. This throne speech is clearly the best, at least in the last 10 years. Mr. Speaker, a decade of Devine rules has brought the province to its knees.

We have inherited a total debt of nearly \$14 billion dollars. That's about \$14,000 for every man, woman and

child of this province. Needless to say, the financial state of this affair is unacceptable.

How did we get into this mess? The answer: nine and a half years of PC waste and mismanagement. On the one hand, they gave breaks to their corporate friends — Cargill, Weyerhaeuser, Pocklington. On the other hand, they spent money like drunken sailors, demonstrating a no to public accountability. For example, the Tories spent over 357,000 for spaces in the Regina Renaissance centre that it was not even using. Although alcohol worth \$15,000 was delivered from the Saskatchewan Liquor Board to the legislative office of the PC minister responsible for the Liquor Board store. And just last week, we discovered that \$439,000 was spent by nine government departments or agencies for advertising services they never received. These are just a few hundred cases of PC waste and mismanagement.

Mr. Speaker, my government, through the throne speech, has committed itself to the monumental task of deficit restructuring. With the highest per capita debt in the nation, we must learn to once again live within our means.

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

**Mr. Langford:** — Interest payments on the debt alone are the third largest expenditure in the province's budget, a staggering amount of over a half a billion dollars. If we fail to act promptly, the people of Saskatchewan will lose their freedom to financial and viable public services and to the plan for the future.

This government is determined to control government spending and thereby reduce the deficit. To this end, recommendations of the Gass Commission will be implemented and amends to The Provincial Auditor Act and The Financial Administration Act will ensure early release of the Provincial Auditor's annual report and the *Public Accounts*. Furthermore, the Provincial Auditor will be given greater access to the books of all Crown agencies. My government, Mr. Speaker, has already taken many steps to reduce the deficit: Fair Share was cancelled; unnecessary trade offices were closed; spending and advertising and travel were cut; the smallest cabinet in 20 years was appointed; and SaskPower and SaskEnergy bills are now mailed in the same envelope.

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

**Mr. Langford:** — Be rest assured, Mr. Speaker, that this New Democratic government will successfully retire the current debt just as we have done in the past after taking over from bankrupt Liberal regimes, at the same time, in the grand tradition of previous CCF and NDP governments. We will hold the values of fairness and compassion close to our hearts. If we all pitch in together, keeping in mind the spirit of community and co-operation, the Saskatchewan people will be able to overcome the financial crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn my focus towards agriculture . . . (inaudible) . . . and international grain trade war. Our farm families are under severe strain

including support program. Saskatchewan's 60,000 farmers are forecasted to lose an average of \$15,000 each this year. Provincial farm debt is now more than \$5 billion. Much of the blame for the current farm crisis can be directed at the PC Party of Saskatchewan.

Though they paid plenty of lip service to the plight of the farmer, their concern was largely confirmed to election time. In reality they eliminated the weed control program, the pest control program, grants for soil, and feed testing and funding for agriculture fairs. Furthermore they reduced grants for veterinary travel and clinics, and cut back on fundings to 4-H clubs and the Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute.

Tory support of their federal counterpart, Canada-U.S. Free Trade initiative, further undermines any real commitment to farmers. This agreement has eliminated the two-price system for wheat, costing Saskatchewan farmers 127 million annual. The Free Trade Agreement also threatened the continued existence of supply management and marketing boards.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the PCs introduced a hastily put together and very flawed program called GRIP. It was just in time for an election campaign. New Democrats sincerely believe that protection of our province's farm family is fundamental to economic revival. We have already made a number of significant improvements to GRIP, making it more responsible and regional based. Still negotiations are continuing so as to move GRIP towards a cost-of-production formula. A deficiency payment of one-half billion dollars is still owing to Canadian farmers for the 1990-91 crop year, and my government will continue to make sure that Ottawa pays its fair share towards sustaining a viable farm community.

Mr. Speaker, New Democrats recognize the seriousness of farm debt crisis. Accordingly we will make amendments to the Saskatchewan farm security Act so as to implement recommendations of the Farm Debt Advisory Committee.

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

**Mr. Langford:** — Farmers can be rest assured with the New Democrats as government. After all, our movement grew out of the farmers' protest movement back in 1932.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to turn my attention to an issue of special concerns to my constituents, and that is forestry. In 1986 the Prince Albert Pulp Company was sold to the U.S. multicultural Weyerhaeuser. It was a sweetheart deal, if there ever was one left. Let me remind the members of the term of this agreement. Weyerhaeuser got the P.A. Pulp for \$236 million, but the pulp mill . . . Weyerhaeuser made no down payment. Instead the deal was financed by a 30-year government debenture at 8.5 per cent. Weyerhaeuser did not have to make any payments to the government unless profit on the pulp mill exceeded 12 per cent. Weyerhaeuser also gained control over 5 million acres of forestry and the Tory government promised to build 32 kilometres of road per year for Weyerhaeuser.

To this date, Mr. Speaker, Weyerhaeuser has not paid any

of the principal, this in spite of the fact that this corporation made 1.5 billion in profit world-wide from 1985 to 1989. The PCs said cash flow problems were to blame, but I remind you of a commitment made a couple of years ago by my colleague, the member from Athabasca, and I quote: how many Saskatchewan farmers were excused for dealing with their financial commitments because they had a financial cash flow problem? Or business people in the province: how many Saskatchewan workers were excused from paying income tax because they had a cash flow problem?

(2130)

Mr. Speaker, we have gone from pulp cutters to harvesters. The result has been lost jobs. This in turn caused out-migration of people and led to school and hospital closures — Canwood, Paddockwood, Smeaton, Meath Park, Shellbrook, Choiceland are just a few of the towns that have suffered the consequences.

Tourism — an important industry in my constituency — places like Christopher Lake and Candle Lake came to mind especially. Mr. Speaker, my government believes that our province's forests should be farmed wisely, not mined. To this end we will amend The Parks Act to increase the amount of land committed to the provincial parks and protected areas, adding over 215,000 hectares to the Saskatchewan provincial park system. The Critical Wildlife Habitat Protection Act will also be amended to add 607,000 hectares of Crown land to the protection of this Act.

Mr. Speaker, let me bring this address to a closure by again expressing my support for the throne speech. Saskatchewan is definitely facing difficult times but if we all work together, we shall overcome. Thank you.

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

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to rise and make a few comments tonight with respect to the throne speech. I intend, Mr. Speaker, to speak today in rather broad terms about the direction that the government is going and I want to compare the direction of this government and that it's taking with some of the directions taken by the previous government. I want to talk a little bit about the philosophical differences between the government led by the member from Riversdale, Saskatoon Riversdale, and compare it with the philosophical underpinnings that was led by the government previous and which was modelled more after the Mulroney and the Thatcher and the Reagan governments abroad.

I will then talk very briefly, Mr. Speaker, about some of the directions we're taking in education and in health and in social services, and I will be making a comment about the antics of the member from Thunder Creek Friday last.

But before I do any of that, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate you for the dedication that you have shown to your work to date and for the attempt that you are making, and I believe rather successfully, in setting a tone, a new tone, a positive tone for this legislature.

I know that to preserve the democratic principles and the methods that we are trying to do in this legislature is very important because it's really preserving those . . . preserves the British parliamentary system. And there are many places in the world that look at us with envy and awe, and wonder how we are able to make changes in this country and this province without taking to arms and without bloodshed.

And one of the reasons is because of the sanctity that we put on our system of government and the system that we use to make changes in our society. It's a very valuable and very treasure to be able to use the X on the ballot to effect changes as opposed to having to use arms or insurrection.

I want to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on the work that you are doing to enhance a role of the private members with your Committee on Rules changes. And I expect something to come from that before too long. And I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that your tenure will add dignity to this legislature.

I know it takes patience and it takes co-operation on the part of all members here. We will try to do some new things, and some things might not work, but I hope we have the flexibility to go back and change those things which are not working.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech, particularly the first throne speech of any government, sets a general direction for the course of the government. The throne speech has to take into account the realities of where we find ourselves and then it points us in the direction that we want to go. My Premier and his cabinet colleagues have been working very hard since the day after the October election. And they have assessed, they have consulted, they have analysed, and they have innovated. And this Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, represents the essence of the direction that they are showing through this government to the people of Saskatchewan. And as part of the New Democratic caucus, I'm proud to be able to support the contents of this throne speech and I do so on behalf of the people of Prince Albert who elected me to the legislature.

Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents worked long and hard in the October election of 1991. They worked hard to help elect a new government and they worked because they saw a need for a change. They often told me that it hurt them to see our province, a province so rich in resources and people with abilities, it hurt them to see the province going backward. It hurt them to see services cut and it hurt them to see our province's finances suffer such devastation.

Many people had to move from Saskatchewan for financial reasons, Mr. Speaker. Many more in our province now depend on social assistance and on food banks for their existence. People feel, and did feel over several years, that they were losing control over their livelihoods. They were losing control over their livelihoods as the previous government was losing control of the finances of the province.

My constituents and people across the province worked

for a change and they voted for a change. And it is with a deep sense of responsibility that I support this Speech from the Throne as the blueprint for that change. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because, Mr. Speaker, this blueprint, this throne speech, accepts our reality. It accepts the problems that face us. It accepts the fact that we are deeper in debt than we have ever been. It accepts the rising social problems. It accepts things like a loss of population, particularly in the rural area. And it accepts the cynicism that is facing politicians across Canada today.

But more than that, it shows a way out. It shows a way out of the tunnel of financial despair. It shows us through the throne speech and through the actions already taken by my leader, the member from Riversdale, and by my cabinet colleagues, in things like setting up the Gass Commission to show a direction to get the financial mess back in order. This follows up on it. We look at actions like the Premier's decision to go with a small cabinet to make the necessary adjustments quickly and as efficiently as possible. It shows us the direction out of the tunnel. And if we look down the tunnel, Mr. Speaker, we can see that there is a flame down the end of the tunnel. It's a little too far away yet to feel the warmth, but I assure you, Mr. Speaker, if we follow the leadership of our Premier and our cabinet colleagues, we will feel the warmth of that flame.

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

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — It's all about change, Mr. Speaker, and I recall a statement about change that I must attribute to Dr. Stirling McDowell, a friend of yours and mine, a former chief executive officer of the STF (Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation) and of the Canadian Teachers' Federation. I recall Dr. Stirling McDowell speaking to a convention saying words of this essence. He said the only sure thing that any one of us can change is ourselves. The only sure thing that any one of us can change is ourselves. How true. And when we change ourselves we also change that which we have influence over.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan changed themselves; they changed the way they voted; they changed their expectations of the role of government; and we in the government of Saskatchewan are changing the way governments will act. Our motivations are different than the motivations of the government previous. Our actions are different than the actions of the government previous and the results will be different than the results from the government previous.

To answer how it will be different, I want to take a little time to talk about the purpose of government and to talk a bit about political processes. I've always adopted the belief, Mr. Speaker, that politics can serve a lofty purpose. I've always had the belief that government was a way for people to work together to do the things they valued as being desirable. Good government and good politicians work as a team on behalf of constituents to provide for things like education and health, transportation and, in the case of social services, to care for those marginalized by events or by circumstances.

I've always believed that it was up to the people elected to

government to construct, and to preside over the administration of, the means by which to accomplish these desirable things. Mr. Speaker, that belief is something I've held for a long time. But I must admit that I was somewhat shaken during the last few years when I saw the political scene in the western world dominated by people like Reagan and Bush and Thatcher and Mulroney and our former premier. Because these neo-conservatives had a different philosophy. They espoused values which on the surface appear to have some appeal. And I'm talking about values like individual responsibility and individual ownership and individual initiative.

To get . . . to realize these values they embarked on deregulation and privatization and free trade. The unfortunate part about it is an over-emphasis of those values, leaving out the values of community and co-operation, ends up in an emphasis that came . . . with which came the practice of using government money and taxpayers' money for individual benefit. And that, Mr. Speaker, has been very disconcerting to me and very disconcerting to many members and, indeed, very disconcerting to the people of Saskatchewan.

What we saw was an emphasis on using government money for private profit rather than for the common good, Mr. Speaker. There was two ways that that happened. First of all there was wasteful spending in government, and I will deal very specifically with some of that in a moment. And secondly, there was the abdication of government responsibility to corporate dominance across North America or across Canada, specifically in Saskatchewan.

Let me deal with the first one and give you one example. Only two weeks ago, within the last two weeks, Mr. Speaker, we had an auditor's report tabled in this House. That auditor's report — a special auditor's report — that auditor's report was about I would think close to three or four centimetres thick. It was the thickest auditor's report I've ever seen. It was . . . I think it set a record for the amount and the number of things that it dealt with.

(2145)

In addition to that auditor's report, last January the Public Accounts Committee asked the Provincial Auditor to review all government organizations and to report on instances where they made payments to . . . where they did several things. First of all was to make payments to employees not working for them; and where they made payments to advertising agencies for goods and services not received; and where they provided goods and services to ministers of the Crown without charge and where they provided goods and services to other government organizations without charge. Well, this special auditor's report is now public. Some of it is now public and it's rather shocking.

And what I'm doing, Mr. Speaker, is I'm bringing to your attention and to the attention of the House, one of the ways that the government previous wasted the money of the taxpayer, wasted the money of the taxpayer. And if it hadn't have been wasted to the extent that was wasted, we wouldn't be in the debt situation and in the desperate

debt situation that we are now.

So what was it that the auditor found? Well to answer the question, were there any payments made to individuals not working for employer organizations, what the auditor found is, when he looked, was that there were 32 people hired by government corporations that were paid a total of \$1.198 million, when they actually worked as ministerial assistants and not for the corporations.

What was happening is that government was finding a way of kiting money inside government. They were using Crown corporations to pay for the political aides of the ministers. Now this included payments from the Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan. This included payments from Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan, in this case over \$300,000 for four people. This included payments from Saskatchewan Government Insurance. The cost of our licences to our cars, part of the cost was being used to subsidize costs for ministerial aides — political aides for the minister.

The Saskatchewan Liquor Board supplied money for ministerial aides — four people, over 100,000. Saskatchewan Power Corporation paid for seven people — \$180,000. SaskTel — \$90,000. The Water Corporation — over \$200,000.

Mr. Speaker, what we have here is a government off-loading onto the Crown Investments Corporation. Now it used to be that there was money and profits made by the Crowns, and then this would be transferred into general revenues, and that would reduce our tax load. That was the way . . . that was the whole theory behind some of the Crowns. The Crowns were used to bail out government.

Now in this particular case, after you get Crowns being drained of money in this manner that I just mentioned, plus other means, we have a situation where the Crowns are no longer solvent. And we have a situation where the taxpayers' money now has to go back to bail out the Crowns.

Now why? Here's one of the reasons. Because of the way they were mismanaged. The Crowns were misused. And it's . . . the public is . . . well I think the public would be just as appalled as I am when I learned of this, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I talked very briefly about government corporations being used to hire people. What else did the auditor's report come up with? In addition to that, there were several organizations which reported that they paid over \$3 million to 79 employees that did not work for them. They paid people who did not work for them.

And this included the Crown Investments Corporation for 113,000. It included the Department of Agriculture and Food who paid for nine people that didn't work for them; they worked for somebody else — \$537,000. This included the Department of Human Resources, Labour and Employment — and I'm just selecting from the list, Mr. Speaker; there's a whole page of them — 226. This included the SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) again for \$186,000.

And there's one here, the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation had 29 people on their payroll that didn't work for them. Twenty-nine people cost the taxpayers of Saskatchewan \$629,000. Well where was it that these people worked, Mr. Speaker, all these people, all these 79 employees? Well it turns out that 49 of them worked for Executive Council. That is the group of aides that works directly under the premier, the former premier, the member from Estevan.

You see he wanted to make it look as if he was running a lean government. So he had 49 people hidden down in his Executive Council who were being paid by the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation that did not come out of their funds. And what kind of work were they doing? Do you think they were working for the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation and managing the affairs? No. They were there; they were PC hacks. Their main job was to try to get the member from Estevan re-elected. I guess they didn't do a very good job. Mind you, they did get paid enough. Forty-nine people on Executive Council costing a total of \$1.88 million. That was 49 people of the 79 who were paid for by other departments.

Now there were some also that were given work in the Future Corporation. Some were asked to work for United Way. Strange that the minister, that the government opposite, wouldn't, if they thought the United Way should be subsidized — and perhaps it should be — but why not be honest about it? Why not do it up front and clean?

Mr. Speaker, that's not enough. There are several organizations that paid over 600 . . . seven organizations in government that paid over \$600,000 to 19 people and nobody really knows where they worked.

**An Hon. Member:** — Ghosts.

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — My colleague, the member from Moose Jaw Palliser, calls them ghosts.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Health hired a ghost who they paid \$99,702 for. How do you lose a \$99,000 ghost? That's the record of the government opposite, the government previous who now sit opposite.

There were five people who were paid by the Saskatchewan Liquor Board a total of \$138,000 and nobody knows who they are or where they are. More ghosts.

And there was one that the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation paid, — that's in addition to the people they paid for in the Executive Council — that cost \$67,000, and nobody knows who that person is.

Mr. Speaker, it's small wonder that the auditor was frustrated over the years when he may have had a suspicion or an inkling that these kind of things were going on, but he had no way of accessing the information, and when in his previous reports he mentioned repeatedly and repeatedly that his work was stifled because he did not have the access to the information he



needed.

Mr. Speaker, it's not just that they were making bad deals while they were in government, but in many cases they paid out money and got nothing back for the money.

And I want to refer now to payments to advertising agencies for goods and services which were never received, paid for but never received. This is a report of the Provincial Auditor, Mr. Speaker. That's where these figures are taken from, a special report of the Provincial Auditor in response to a request by the Public Accounts Committee.

And why is it mentioned here now? Because this is the place that these things have to be brought up. This is the Assembly in which governments previous and governments current are to be made accountable for their actions. It's no point raising this some place in a dark room or in a corner of the building. It's got to be done in a public way, Mr. Speaker.

And I think when the people of Saskatchewan hear the full story of what the members opposite did — they already have a pretty good feeling of what they did — but when they hear the full story, they will tell their children and they will tell their grandchildren, and the Conservative Party will never be elected in this province again for the next 50 years, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — I want to detail a couple of the places where the money was paid out but nothing was paid back, but no services were received, Mr. Speaker. And most of these were advertising agencies. And it's interesting that there is one firm here that seems to be quite dominant. Now would anybody care to guess which firm that would be?

**An Hon. Member:** — Roberts Poole.

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Do I hear the word, Roberts Poole? And do I hear the word Dome? Dome, the advertising company of record. Community Services, Department of Community Services paid Dome \$4,000. We don't know quite what for, but they did pay it to them. They didn't get anything for it. And then later on they paid Dome Media Buying Services another \$5,000.

Department of Education paid \$24,000 to Roberts & Poole. There may be some services that they . . . Roberts & Poole might want to provide to the Department of Education for \$24,000 at this stage.

There was money paid to the Department of Energy and Mines . . . by the Department of Energy and Mines to Dome Advertising for \$2,000. And right through, this list is littered with that company of record — Dome.

Mr. Speaker, there are two or three other things that the auditor uncovered in this special report. One of things that he uncovered was that the Saskatchewan Liquor Board paid expenses totalling \$16,000 for ministers of the previous government to attend Big Valley Jamborees. You'd think that somebody with a ministerial salary might

be able to afford to go to the grounds, to pay his own — his or her own — way into the grounds, to pay for the food, to pay for the trailer rental, alcohol, and miscellaneous expenses. But there was some help there from the Saskatchewan Liquor Board.

Wasn't just to go to the Big Valley Jamboree that the Liquor Board helped the ministers, according to this report. Liquor Board also provided about \$19,000 worth of liquor to ministers' offices without any written request to do so, Mr. Speaker. Now the Liquor Board does not have any policies authorizing this, Mr. Speaker. It's rather mysterious how this would all come about.

But the important thing at this stage I suppose, Mr. Speaker, is that the knowledge be made public and that the ministers, and particularly the back-benchers opposite, think awhile before they start pointing fingers, and that they point the fingers inwards a bit.

Mr. Speaker, these things which I have mentioned, I will . . .

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

The Assembly adjourned at 10 p.m.