

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Ms. Haverstock: — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to this Assembly, Dr. John Egnatoff who has joined us behind the bar today. Dr. Egnatoff was the member for Melfort, the Liberal MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly) from 1948 to 1952. He has been a major contributor to our province and to our country.

He was a Russian interpreter for the U.K. war office on allied command for Austria in 1945 and 1946. He's been president of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, the school trustees association, the president of the Canadian School Trustees' Association, and has held many other esteemed positions.

Both he and his wife, Mildred, remain active, contributing citizens of our province, and I think we should be most grateful for their commitment.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to just join my voice in support of the very eloquent statement made by the Leader of the Liberal Party for Dr. Egnatoff who is a prominent Canadian, but really a prominent Saskatonian first and foremost. And the list of accomplishments that have been recited by the Leader of the Liberal Party is indeed very impressive.

On behalf of the government and members on this side, I too would like to extend a welcome to a former member of the Assembly and an outstanding Canadian.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — I too, Mr. Speaker, would like to join the Leader of the Liberal Party and the Premier in welcoming Dr. Egnatoff here this afternoon. Dr. Egnatoff and I have had a long-standing relationship. He may not be aware of it, but when I was going to teachers' college back in the '50s, he taught me all I know in English and I will never forget that. Although I don't know if Dr. Egnatoff would be willing to admit that in public, that I am a living example of it. But certainly, sir, I would like to, on behalf of the official opposition, welcome you here this afternoon.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Rolfes: — I wish at this time to join the members. I know all of you will be very jealous to know that Dr. Egnatoff is a constituent of mine, and I want to inform you people that John has reminded me enough, more than once over the last 17 years, that he is not responsible for me being here.

But having said that, Dr. Egnatoff, I do want to join the other members in welcoming you here, particularly as a previous member of this legislature, and also for the

excellent service that you have performed, not only for the people of Saskatoon but for all Canadians. And I join the other members in welcoming you here and hope you have a very fine day in Regina.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Sale of Piper Aircraft Corporation

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier regarding the ineptitude his government is showing towards economic development. Mr. Speaker, we now hear that the Piper Aircraft deal has been withdrawn to sell the company to Cyrus Eaton.

Mr. Premier, I understand that the Piper officials have become aware of events through the media that concern them — specifically five things that they wish to re-evaluate.

First, they are aware that the government has stated the new company would be immune from paying its foreign debt under a special law. Secondly, they are aware that the government retroactively cancelled contracts with individuals as one of its first legislative acts. Thirdly, that they have read media reports that the government intends to retroactively cancel contracts with Saskatchewan farmers. Fourthly, they know the government has cancelled an agreement with another government and the Atomic Energy corporation of Canada for research and development. And finally, Mr. Premier, they are informed the government intends to renege on its partnership with the two other governments and Husky Oil in regard to a major business venture.

Mr. Premier, will you confirm that these facts are a major part of the reconsideration of the people in the U.S. regarding the desirability of doing business with your government?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to say that one thing is clear here, that no one will accuse the folks on the other side of not having a vivid imagination.

What is happening with Piper very clearly is there has been a memorandum of understanding signed between your colleagues and friends in Manitoba, the Conservative government in Manitoba, and the Government of Saskatchewan, along with the Eaton group and the Blues from San Diego and the Hill family here in Regina. In order to get that memorandum signed, there was a slight delay in putting the papers to the court. That will be done in the very near future.

Obviously the Piper Aircraft Corporation is under section 11 of the Bankruptcy Act in the United States. A court will decide whether or not the sale takes place, and that will be done in the very near future. And in essence nothing has changed from last week before you read in the paper that there had been a change in the Vero Beach situation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, it is now known that Mr. Eaton, who apparently is receiving 23 per cent of this deal for nothing, went bankrupt as recently as 1985; that he had been living on social security; that he had no personal assets of significant value, not even a car; that he still has major personal debt; and that he has a record of many failed deals. This is all a matter of public record, Mr. Premier.

And I ask you now: will you table the results of any and all investigations and research your government conducted before getting the people of Saskatchewan into this deal with Mr. Eaton so that we can all be assured of the fact that this government is doing the job for Saskatchewan people the way they should be.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting that only a few months ago the people on the other side of the House were pushing us to get the deal with Piper. What he's referring to about Mr. Eaton was common knowledge back in December 1991. The researchers really do have to catch up on what's happening with this whole event of Piper.

But I want to make it clear to you that in making the arrangement with Manitoba, with the government there, and trying to attract Piper Corporation to Saskatchewan what you have to realize, that the people operating and managing the new company would in fact be the Blue family out of San Diego who have a great deal of experience with manufacturing aircraft and also the entrepreneurs from Regina, the Hill family.

We are being backed up by the Manitoba government and also, as we have told you publicly, a SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation) loan that would do bridge financing on the project if in fact the court found that the Saskatchewan bid was the best one being put forward.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well the minister has danced all over the place in regard to this deal. I think the people of Saskatchewan would like to know what research and background checks that were done leading up to this deal in the partnership with Cyrus Eaton.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that this is very, very different to the previous government's GigaText and Supercart and many of the deals that they got involved in. There's been a great deal of due diligence done on the project by Ernst Young. They have done a very thorough report that indicate that at price of 64 million the company would be viable in Saskatchewan and in Canada.

I guess I find it curious that the same old wrecking crew have this very negative attitude towards economic

development. And I would ask you, sir, to join with us, like your colleagues in Manitoba have done, to try to create economic development for the province as opposed to all of this negative rhetoric that is coming from your side and we've heard for this first week of the session. Come with us, join us, and if the deal is right, bring it to Saskatchewan and create hundreds of jobs.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The opposition would be happy to join with you in saying that this deal would be good for Saskatchewan, if indeed you are able to pull the deal together. It looks at this point that you're not going to be able to pull the deal together, and that's why there's such concern.

Right from the beginning, Mr. Premier, your government promised that they'd be open, accountable and provide information on every deal that they put together. Well we see no tabling of any documents to support that claim. And now I would ask, Mr. Premier, would you table all documents and information regarding the Piper Aircraft deal?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that the members of the Conservative caucus were earlier criticizing us for putting too much information out, that we might lose the deal as a result of putting the information out. Now today they're saying, put all the information out because the deal is in jeopardy. It's really difficult to keep up with your . . . with the cogs slipping in your mind as to what we should be doing, either putting all the information out or not putting it out.

But I can guarantee you though, sir, is the simple fact that in due course we will be making public the due diligence report, unlike any of the circumstances surrounding the deals that were made by the previous government. In those cases where due diligence was done, they weren't made public and in most deals you didn't know due diligence and that's why we're \$15 billion in the hole.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Government Investment in Bi-Provincial Upgrader

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Energy, who I presume is answering the questions regarding the Bi-Provincial upgrader at Lloydminster.

The minister has been quoted as saying that his government will not participate in any cost sharing of cost overruns at the upgrader and that his preference would be to reduce the province's equity rather than put in any more money.

Will the minister tell the legislature whether or not he and the other partners have agreed on this position. And if he does not have that agreement, will he tell us what process is being done to achieve that agreement.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Thank you. The matter is under review and is under discussion with the other parties involved. I don't want to get into an extensive discussion of what those negotiations ensued. What we have said publicly is that the matter is under review. But I don't want to get into the discussions extensively.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess I should direct the next question to the toy Associate Minister of Finance, by his own definition. This clearly shows, Mr. Speaker, this project has been a tremendous boost to the economy of the entire north-west portion of the province. The direct and indirect jobs, the feedstock for upgrading, and the subcontracts and the upgrading of the infrastructure have all had a very great impact on an otherwise depressed economy, Mr. Speaker.

Will the minister tell us what penalties will be imposed on Saskatchewan for failing to contribute proportionately to the cost overruns?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much. In answer to that, let me say to the minister that we have fulfilled all our contractual obligations. We agreed to contribute towards the initial construction of the Bi-Provincial upgrader. We have fulfilled those obligations. At no time did we say that we would contribute additional sums above and beyond what we contributed.

I gather the Hon. Jake Epp in the House of Commons suggests that Saskatchewan might be subject to some penalties. I would prefer it if Mr. Epp had been a little more specific. I think if he reads the contract before he makes such statements, he'll find out that we have fulfilled our obligations. We are simply not in a position to assume any more obligations.

Members opposite, when they were sitting on this side of the House, assumed far too many debt obligations for this province to carry, and we have said we're not going to continue with that policy which has been so disastrous for this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Supplementary to the associate minister. Mr. Speaker, the minister is clearly, and I think intentionally, generalizing about penalties because he knows this will cost taxpayers significant dollars while at the same time diluting our province's equity in the project.

Will the associate minister also tell the House what impacts our diluted equity would have on our share of the subcontractors, our share on the feedstock supply, and will he table in this legislature any internal agreements, government studies, that will show us what these associated costs will be to the province?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — The matter of our equity, our equity both prior to this decision and afterwards, has not yet been determined. Suffice it to say at this point in time it may well be that our equity would not be diluted. It may well be that the other partners would put in the money as a loan and not as equity. There are any number of possibilities with respect to the further financing of this.

We have just said, thanks to 10 years of Conservative mismanagement, we're not in a position to continue with it, and we'd rather be excused this round.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Britton: — New question, Mr. Speaker. Well we know now, Mr. Speaker, that this government is bankrupt of any ideas how to create wealth. They have cancelled the energy agreement and thousands of jobs. They are very much in danger of losing the Piper Aircraft project. They lose the economic benefits of the . . . economic spin-off of the AECL (Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd.) agreement.

Mr. Speaker, will the Associate Minister of Finance, now today, will he today admit that his government has taken a short-sighted view of economic development for this province by reneging on their moral obligation to co-operatively fund the upgrader and bring the many economic and financial benefits to the province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Speaking, Mr. Speaker, speaking of short-sighted views, one of the many things about this agreement which concerned us was that there was no guarantees for this province that we would get any of the jobs or economic benefits back. There never was an agreement which defined our benefits. So I say to members opposite that there was a good deal of short-sightedness, but it took place before October 21, 1991.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Information on GRIP

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister responsible for Crop Insurance. The Crop Insurance Corporation has a group of professional people who are dealing with the farmers at this time — their agents. Their responsibility is to sell the farmers the GRIP (gross revenue insurance program) program in an honest and factual way. And the agents are doing that to the best of their ability.

And it's not enhanced by the fact that they only found out what that program was going to be on the 27th of March, but they have a whole . . . a lot of difficulty in communicating that to the farmers. Has the government given the agents any direction on how to sell the programs currently being offered, and is the government encouraging the agents to be open, honest with the producers about the program?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Thank you. A very short answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is yes; we are encouraging the agents to disseminate all the information possible. We realized it was in a very short time frame that we had to sell this. This is one of the reasons we extended the deadline to May 15. And we've instructed the agents to be sure that they re-call all the clients and be sure that they have all the information. So yes, we are indeed doing that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Our office was in . . . or attention was focused on a letter that we received in our office from the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Corporation. It says "Dear Marketing Agents," and I will quote some of that to you in a moment, it says — and this is a quote: Under the terms of your agency agreement, you are not in a position to speak out against the corporation, government or the program. The views that you provide are to be those of the corporation and not your own personal beliefs.

Did you tell or instruct them to send — your president and chief executive officer — did you instruct him that he was supposed to send this letter to all the marketing agents?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, we do indeed expect our marketing agents to act in a professional manner as the member opposite has said. They are professionals. They have a . . . they are employed by the corporation. They have a duty to disseminate all the information truthfully and honestly and in an unbiased and non-political way to our clients, and we expect them to do so.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Does the minister also agree that he should allow the agents to compare the '91 to the '92 GRIP in relating the information to the producers?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, we will allow agents to compare anything to anything, but we want them to have truthful information. The issue not is '91 GRIP and what you would have and could have; the issue is what's available for the farmers so that they can make the best possible management decisions this year. And that is why we are trying to get our agents and our corporation employees to disseminate the information fully as to what the options are that so farmers can see the options and make their reasonable choices, management choices, that are best for their farm. And do that on the basis of a program that's before them, and not on fairy tales about what might have been if the program hadn't changed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, another statement that comes out of the letter, it says this: As a corporation, we are prepared to initiate appropriate action if this contractual obligation is not met. The action taken could include termination of the agent contract.

And I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if it is really true that you were prepared to fire the crop insurance agents if they tried to be honest with the farmers about the programs they were being offered.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, the letter says very clearly that we expect the agents to live up to their contract. And I think any employee has the obligation to live up to his contract. And we will certainly terminate somebody who does not live up to the terms of employment.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister. What system will the government establish to determine whether or not the individual crop insurance agents are being open and honest and forthright with the farmers? And who are they going to get to police that?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, we have employees and agents of government who are in charge of running the Crop Insurance Corporation, and they are in the position to make management decisions that have to be made. And we certainly do not do this on a political basis, although that may have been the practice in the past.

This is a matter of professional work, of delivering to farmers the information that they . . . very vital information that farmers need to make decisions. They need to have that information in a clear fashion, and we expect our employees to deliver that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — I have a question now to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. In light of the fact that you're going to have people investigating whether the agents are in fact dealing forthright and dealing with the same kind of focus that the minister of Crop Insurance said, which other agencies are also going to have their licences suspended?

Are SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) agents going to have their licences suspended if they don't agree or if they're selling two insurance companies? Are they going to have their licences suspended because they don't agree with the government policy? What about licence issuers? Are they the next ones to go?

You've got 60,000 farmers on the ropes with a contract that is technically illegal and has been admitted so by the deputy minister of Agriculture. Are you going to allow that kind of an existence to go on with your ministers continually day after day? The other day it was the Minister of Agriculture; today it's the minister responsible for Crop Insurance. Are you going to keep that going?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure where the member opposite is coming from on this. I

don't know that demanding that employees do their job and be supervised is somehow contrary to . . . We have these people with a contract. They have a job to do. They're employees of the corporation, and we certainly will supervise and expect employees to perform. And I don't know . . . If the members opposite are suggesting that an employee does not do his job, that he should continue to receive his wages, I think that's certainly not the way we operate.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — First of all, Mr. Speaker, they don't have a legitimate leg to stand on, legally or morally or ethically as it relates to the date the contract was issued and the date that you were supposed to provide information. Now you're saying also, under the terms of your agency agreement, you're not in a position to speak out against the corporation, the government, or the program. What's next on the line — what they do in the community, who they vote for?

And I'll tell you something, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you something else. The people in my constituency who are agents are NDP (New Democratic Party), they're Liberal, and they're Conservative. Do you want to fire them all? The question I have for you, sir, is are you going to have police going after the agents in short order here now in order to investigate them and supervise them in dealing with the people that they're dealing with?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, I think that we will go after the agents to do their job as we do with any employee. I'm very amazed that he should bring up politics. I don't know what the agents' politics are and I'm not going to be the one who's policing them. And we're not going to do it politically as it has been done in the past. These people are expected to do a job. And when they take government money to do a government job, we expect them to do the job. I don't know what's so unusual about that, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, question for the minister responsible for crop insurance. Why did you ask, through your legal counsel, the farmers in the case in Melville to post a \$750,000 bond?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, if he's referring to the court case, I think I would be ill-advised to answer on that at this point.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, the information that was provided to us from the court said that there was 750. Your legal counsel asked your advances at the court case to provide . . . that the farmers were to provide \$750,000 worth of a bond to the court just in case they lost.

So now, why? My question to you is: Why did they do

that? Did you try to scare off the farmers? Why? Did you try and make it so difficult for the farmers who are approaching the Queen? Did you do that with the intention of making them not able to do that?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, I think farmers suing the corporation have the same legal rights as anybody else, and I'm assuming that this is a normal court proceeding, and I do not want to comment on a specific case here.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

Mr. Whitmore: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With great honour and pride and with tradition I wish to speak today on the throne speech that the Lieutenant Governor brought down last week. But first though, I wish to commend you, Mr. Speaker, on how you conducted the House again in this second session of the Legislative Assembly, and I know that you will provide the control and the decorum that is required, the public demands of this House. And I know we can count on you for that.

I also wish to thank the mover and seconder of the throne speech, the member from Meadow Lake and the member from Regina Wascana Plains, on their introduction of this throne speech. I think they did a very good job of that, and also being my seat mates, I would be regress not to . . .

The Speaker: — Order. The member will have to move that podium over because it's reverberating into the mike. We can't hear you.

Mr. Whitmore: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Am I heard now? I don't think I'll start quite at the beginning, but I don't know if my thanks was portrayed to the members of . . . my seat mates from Meadow Lake and the member from Regina Wascana Plains, thanking them on moving and seconding this throne speech.

As I say, this is a throne speech of pride and tradition. It gives me great pride that I speak about this throne speech, because it lays down a road-map, a blueprint of where this province is going. We are facing serious economic conditions in this province of Saskatchewan. We are seeing a previous administration that left the economy of this province in rack and ruin. We are seeing an agricultural community that is severely depressed.

But this also relates too to the question of tradition, and

the tradition I relate to is the crossroads that took place in 1944. The throne speech that was brought down by a CCF (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation), later to become the New Democratic Party, in 1944 is not unlike the same throne speech we have brought down in 1992.

We are talking about change, a mandate of change, the same mandate of change that was talked about in 1944 by that government under Douglas. We are seeing an economy that faces the same problems that were not unlike 1944, an economy that had just come out of a severe depression, an economy that was also facing, and a citizenship that was facing, the ravages of war, being World War II.

They were facing serious decisions in order to protect their citizenship of this province and to provide new light and new hope for those people. And, Mr. Speaker, the throne speech that was brought down last week by the Lieutenant Governor does the same thing. It brings the question of change and brings a sense of hope to a province that has been desperate for hope for 10 years.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whitmore: — In the throne speech of 1944 at the tenth legislature, six points were brought down respecting that throne speech, and I would like to quote those:

1. It must recognize the responsibility of the people of this Province towards the members of the Armed Services as they return to civilian life . . .
2. It must create a government organization sufficient in scope to meet the needs of the postwar society;
3. It must implement legislation that will guarantee at least a minimum degree of economic security for rural and urban working people of this province;
4. It must pass legislation that will endow a greater measure of social welfare upon those who, through no fault of their own, find it impossible to earn a satisfactory living;
5. (And) It must implement legislation that will recognize the importance of social enterprise in the economic life of the community;

Interesting words stated a little less than 50 years ago and those words are echoed today. As they say, history seems to repeat itself sometimes — when we talk about quality of life and how we outline in this throne speech the question of quality of life and the importance of social programs and income support programs.

We heard our minister speak in social services the other day in terms of how people were treated by the previous regime under social welfare. And I say to you, it was a crime, truly a crime to see the downtrodden treated this way. And we have to take action, as this throne speech speaks, about us putting these people first in terms of a quality of life.

The throne speech of 1944 also referred to something else — hospitalization and medicare. The first time in North America the idea of bringing forward hospitalization and it took 20 years to bring forward medicare. But it was the steps, the first steps of that dream by the premier then of T.C. Douglas.

That dream continues again in the throne speech of 1992 by this government. We are embarking now on the next phase — that phase being the wellness model, preventative care, community-based preventative care. This is very significant in terms of the medicare situation and I think it's appropriate, looking at the anniversary of medicare's inception 30 years, that we are embarking on this. And again it was with pride that I talk about that in terms of the throne speech.

It's interesting too when we talk about the constitution, when we talk about a strong Saskatchewan and a strong Canada. I guess the province of Saskatchewan has always felt in terms of the constitution that we have not always had a strong enough voice in terms of a national viewpoint.

And this was outlined in terms of the '44 throne speech, that these areas were remiss in terms of a constitution. And as we know at that time that constitution was not Canadian. That was still the BNA (British North America) Act held in England.

But it did recognize the need of the national viewpoint as we do now, in terms of that throne speech again now, 1992, talking about that strong Saskatchewan, the need for a strong Canada and a strong central government so provinces like Saskatchewan are not lost within the realm of what's going on. These are important steps.

It also recognizes too now, in terms of 1992 when we also talk about the theme of putting people first, is the question of aboriginal rights. For far too long this segment of society has been ignored, downtrodden, and trampled as society has gone forward. It is now time to say an end to this. It is now time to take the initial steps to repay the debt that we owe to aboriginal people. These steps are small. They will take time. But they are the steps that are necessary in order to protect aboriginal people, to give them what is rightfully theirs and always has been, which has been taken away in history.

The other area too that 1944 talked about was two particular areas: the importance of the co-operative movement and the importance of Crown agencies, the questions of the mixed economy and that balance that is required in a fragile economy such as Saskatchewan's.

We have seen 10 years of what private enterprise does to the province of Saskatchewan. We have seen when government money is wasted to attract fly-by-night operations to operate in the province, some that don't even have the time before the ink was dry that they're bankrupt. We need to work together as was done in 1944 to use the resources that we have here in order to achieve that.

I'd then like to also quote again the area of the throne

speech in 1944 and how it applies to 1992:

It is the feeling of my Government that the time has come when governing bodies must realize their responsibilities in the sphere of economic life. When resources that are rightfully the property of the community are being exploited, then the members of the community must be adequately compensated and protected. When enterprises that should be properly recognized as public utilities are being operated by private interest to the detriment of the general welfare of the people of the Province, then it becomes the duty of the Government to act on behalf of the people to make sure that these enterprises are conducted in such a way as to yield the maximum benefit to the entire community. It is the policy of my Government to achieve these ends by every constitutional and financial power at its disposal.

These words ring well in respect to what's gone on in the past 10 years.

In terms of the throne speech now, we've seen the recognition of the public utilities particularly SaskPower and being involved in co-generation projects, which is to me seeing a project that will greatly benefit rural Saskatchewan, seeing small projects, not megaprojects, that will at a much less cost, benefit those people. And to me that is a strong step in terms of a Crown agency providing that economic relief in our society.

But at the same time, when talked about in 1944, the question of public utilities and being rammed by the private interests, I can't forget the debate of SaskEnergy. I cannot forget the debate where the members opposite had decided it was time to remove a public utility from public control. And I say shame to that.

The people of Saskatchewan spoke in terms of how they felt about public utilities. Clearly they wanted protection there. They saw that as an economic benefit. They saw that as a right.

And as a government here, as we outlined in the throne speech, this will continue to be area protection for the economy of Saskatchewan.

The other area too, when I talked about co-operatives . . . And co-operatives have a special meaning in my life, being involved as a Wheat Pool delegate for many years and also involved in local co-ops and also having my money in the credit union system. That in 1944 it was recognized then the importance of the co-operatives, and how we saw the incorporation of the department of co-operatives.

What did we see from the members opposite in 10 years? A removal of that department. A removal of that recognition of how important that segment of society is in Saskatchewan. And we are talking about corporations that are using money and using talent and people within the province of Saskatchewan and they were ignored.

But I'm glad to see that a step has been made in this throne speech recognizing co-operatives to participate in

community bonds. Again this is a very important step. I think this is long overdue.

The other area I want to deal with in terms of the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, is the area of open and honest government. It's very curious the discussion we had today in terms of question period and discussing open and honest government. And when we saw 10 years of a closed government, when we saw governments that, in terms of politics, brought politics to the lowest level; in terms of the public service removed that independence of the public service, removed the ability to have a public service that is professional . . . And that is a step we must take now in order to do that.

(1445)

Also bringing forward legislation — information that people can see how the public interest has been treated in terms of the filing of annual reports. We're seeing that now in terms of the Saskatchewan Transportation Corporation. And as they always say: it's always the tip of the iceberg — one-tenth is on top, nine-tenths is underneath. So I wait to see the nine-tenths. And I think truly then the members opposite . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right . . . will hold their heads low in that area.

I think the other areas of democratic reform in terms of private members participating more in the House are very important. I think the area, too, in terms of members . . . in terms of this House being open, in terms of more committee participation.

Also the question of elections — when they should take place. Looking forward to legislation in that area, because as we have seen in terms of the members opposite, a total disregard for the democratic system last June; a total disregard when they knew that it was time to face the piper and face the people.

We talk about budgetary delays. Had we had the election June of last year, if we had had that election, the budget would've been on time, the people would've spoken sooner, and thirdly, an NDP government would've been that much closer to solving the problems in this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whitmore: — As I said, Mr. Speaker, as I opened, I am proud to speak to this . . . to the reply to the throne speech. As I said, it is a question of pride and a question of tradition. It is with that pride and that tradition that I will take the message out of this government throughout the province of Saskatchewan to tell the people the direction we are taking. And the future of Saskatchewan, I think, looks very bright in terms of this blueprint we have outlined. Thank you again, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Scott: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It is an honour and a privilege for me to have the opportunity to speak in support of the throne speech. As the Honourable Sylvia Fedoruk, Lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan, said in her opening remarks:

We come together today, in the spring of 1992, a time of renewal, to set a new direction for Saskatchewan.

This new direction is required because of the legacy of destruction and devastation left behind by the previous government which chose to squander and pillage and plunder this fine province and the great people who live here. We find ourselves today, after nine long years of Tory rule, facing the highest deficit per capita in Canada.

We find our assets and precious natural resources given away at fire sale prices to friends and multinationals. We find our once proud, efficient Crown corporations crippled. We find our children living in poverty and on food bank lines. We find our seniors looking in dismay as they see the province they proudly built by hard work, scrimping and saving and through a spirit of co-operation, now lying in virtual ruins.

The previous government will long be remembered for its scandals, corruptions, patronage and illegal acts. To many people in our province it is inconceivable that a group of Saskatchewan citizens elected by the people to serve the people and represent them in the legislature could have done this horrendous disservice and betray the people of Saskatchewan.

Over the last couple of years we have witnessed these pirates quietly sneaking away one by one with their pockets full, leaving a trail of destruction for someone else to clean up.

Mr. Speaker, clean up this mess is what we and the people of Saskatchewan are going to do. The people know and this government knows that we are not responsible for this mess. At the same time, we know that we need to get our house in order and indeed our province in order because our children now living on the outskirts of hope certainly do not deserve to inherit this despicable and irresponsible deficit.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Scott: — The deficit is the number one concern among the people of Saskatchewan. The people are prepared to pitch in and work towards dealing with this overwhelming obstacle.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan are still wounded and bleeding from the unscrupulous antics of the previous rogue government. There lingers a strong mood of distrust for government and authority. And rightly so.

However our government is committed to open, honest and accountable government. This has already been demonstrated by a number of initiatives including the Gass Commission. A number of other steps are outlined in the throne speech which will help restore public trust in government.

Mr. Speaker, for a government to be successful we need the trust and co-operation of the people. To receive public confidence and support, this government must be open, honest, and accountable.

In my constituency of Indian Head-Wolseley, agriculture is still the economic base in spite of the reign of terror by the former premier who dubbed himself the friend of the farmer. The so-called friend of the farmer has left farmers with record debt loads, record farm foreclosures, record off-loading onto the province by the federal government, and the most unstable farm economy in the history of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to work with farmers and communities in rural Saskatchewan to restore the agriculture economy. We are also prepared to lobby Ottawa and make them live up to their responsibility of picking up the bill on federal agriculture aid programs. After all, it was Mr. Mulroney, along with his number one cheer-leader, the former premier of Saskatchewan, who promoted free trade and the subsequent loss of our two-price wheat system so that today in Canada the farmer gets 6 cents from a loaf of bread on the store shelf.

Mr. Speaker, the number of initiatives brought forward in the throne speech regarding the protection of our environment is impressive and shows real commitment and leadership. The conservation strategy for sustainable development, the environmental charter of rights and responsibilities Act, the Environmental Assessment Commission, and the strong commitment to our environment by the government will ensure that there will be no more Rafferty-Alameda boondoggles in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Scott: — A boondoggle that sees the Rafferty dam virtually bone dry after four spring run-offs and one of the wettest summers on record. A boondoggle that sees the Alameda dam with a shifting foundation that no engineer will endorse as being structurally sound. A boondoggle that was plagued with controversy and court actions. A boondoggle that resulted in a hundred million dollar cost overrun. A boondoggle that was biasedly and falsely promoted in the nationally televised production titled *wet Dreams in the Dust*, a production that cost Saskatchewan taxpayers over \$800,000.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan should never again be asked to shell out hard-earned tax dollars for a premier's pipe dream. And in addition, our environment should never again be subjected to such a ruthless and callous assault.

The announcement to increase the amount of land committed to provincial parks and protected areas, along with the commitment to include an additional 1.5 million acres of Crown land containing important wildlife habitat in the Critical Wildlife Habitat Protection Act, is to be applauded and will certainly be viewed very positively not only in Saskatchewan but throughout Canada.

The Critical Wildlife Habitat Protection Act is a very unique piece of legislation which allows traditional uses by agriculture lessees, such as grazing and haying, to continue on our Crown lands. However, this Act does prohibit the clearing, breaking, and draining of these Crown lands or the sale of these lands which are very

important to sustaining wildlife populations.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech deals with many other positive initiatives such as jobs and economic opportunities, quality of life and putting people first, which provides direction and hope for our people. The travesty of injustice left behind by the previous government will not soon be forgotten, but we must move on.

If we don't clean up the mess and get this province going in the right direction, who will? If a government is open, honest, and accountable to the people it serves, and if the people from all segments of society are willing to do their fair share, we will begin to rebuild this great province. For it was the spirit of co-operation, hope, hard work, personal sacrifices, and determination that made Saskatchewan one of the best places in the world to live.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Scott: — Mr. Speaker, the people in my constituency are telling me they are prepared to do their part in rebuilding Saskatchewan. And, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that I have complete faith in our government. We have one of the most knowledgeable and respected Premiers in the nation, and a crew of cabinet ministers and MLAs second to none. And most importantly we have the genuine and hard-working people of Saskatchewan to work with as we prepare our province for the next generation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Scott: — I am proud to support this throne speech. But before I close, Mr. Speaker, lest we forget, the interest on our deficit during the 10 minutes it took for these remarks amounts to roughly \$13,880. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jess: — Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying how honoured I feel to be representing the grand constituency of Redberry in this the second session of the twenty-second legislature. My commitment is to uphold the faith they have placed in me.

Mr. Speaker, this is a crucial year in the history of our nation. Not only will we be celebrating Canada's 125th birthday, but we could very well witness the ultimate disintegration of this fair nation.

As a ninth generation Canadian I feel especially concerned about the fate of our country. We must approach the constitutional discussions with an open mind and put narrow self-interest aside for the betterment of Canada. Only this approach will ensure the continuance of this nation.

Just as I am deeply concerned about the fate of my country, I am equally troubled about the state of my province. Frankly speaking, the wholesale destruction perpetuated in Saskatchewan by the PC (Progressive Conservative) Party sickens me. Facing the total debt of nearly fourteen billion, our province lies on the brink of bankruptcy.

Mr. Speaker, I feel a special attachment to Saskatchewan. Both my parents were born here, and my grandfathers both were original signers during the campaign to establish the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool back in 1923. It is therefore very disheartening to view the dismal state of agriculture that exists today in our fair province. The Tories deserve much of the blame.

They introduced the very flawed gross revenue insurance plan, or GRIP. They dismantled the Saskatchewan beef stabilization program resulting in the loss of many processing jobs, as well as a significant drop in cattle numbers. And just the other day, the Tories voted against a resolution calling for the federal government to deliver on its commitment to provide farmers with the \$500 million deficiency payment for the 1990-91 crop year.

(1500)

The Liberals, Mr. Speaker, are not without fault either. The Trudeau years saw the dismantling of the Crow. These years also witnessed changes to the usury Act, which negatively impact on the farmers' cash flow. These actions are also responsible for much of the current farm debt crisis. How much better off might we be if the interest had never been allowed to go above 12 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, our New Democratic government realizes that protection of our province's farm families is fundamental to economic revival. Our government has made a number of significant improvements to GRIP, in particular making it more market responsive. Still, negotiations are taking place to move GRIP toward a cost-of-production formula, to reduce producer premiums, and to increase Ottawa's share of the cost. Unlike the Tories, we New Democrats believe that Ottawa still owes our farmers their share of the half billion dollar deficiency payment. Rest assured that our government will continue to pressure the federal Tories to honour that commitment.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jess: — Mr. Speaker, in consultation with farm groups and lenders, appropriate recommendations from the Farm Debt Advisory Committee will be acted upon. As New Democrats, we realize that security of tenure has always been uppermost in the minds of Saskatchewan farmers.

Our government is firmly committed to job creation. The time has come that our leading export shall no longer be the young people of this province. There are positive signs that we are turning this around. Between October and December of last year, Saskatchewan's population actually grew by 254.

The opposition seems to think that they had some great new ideas during their term of office — new ideas such as jobs for people who really didn't work. Or in some cases, pay cheques for people who didn't really exist.

Well that brings to mind the historical fact about an early Liberal government in this country. They were discovered to have had horses on their payroll. However, unlike

some of those hired by the former Tory government in this province, they were indeed whole horses.

Unlike the PC Party, we New Democrats do not have a narrow-minded faith in the market-place. Accordingly our government will amend The Community Bonds Act to make co-operatives eligible for financial support. Likewise we'll also use our Crown corporations to stimulate the economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, the plight of our aboriginal people can no longer be ignored. The time has come when they should be treated fairly and equitably. Our government recognizes and will promote self-determination for Indian and Metis people. The recommendations of the Saskatchewan Metis Justice Review Committee and the Indian Justice Review Committee will go a long way towards furthering that goal. Most importantly our government is sincerely committed to the settlement of outstanding treaty land entitlements.

Faced with a deep financial crisis, we must find innovative ways to deliver quality services. The wellness model of health care is an effective response to this crisis. A more community-based and directed system based on prevention of sickness will usher in the next generation of medicare.

The Health Services Utilization and Research Commission will identify areas for improved efficiencies, while a provincial health council will give consumers, health providers, and community leaders much needed input. The people of Saskatchewan can be reassured that an NDP government will uphold the fundamental principles of medicare.

Mr. Speaker, our New Democratic government has a sincere commitment to the environment and sustainable development. We have already demonstrated this commitment by cancelling the AECL/Saskatchewan Power memorandum of understanding. Another example of a Tory bad deal.

This agreement would have cost the provincial treasury \$25 million and would have quickly taken us down the road to a CANDU 3 nuclear reactor, even though the province's energy needs are covered until at least the year 2003. Instead our government created the Saskatchewan Energy Conservation and Development Institute which will study all energy options in an objective manner.

We will introduce the environmental charter of rights and responsibilities Act, and an environmental assessment commission will be set up to ensure open and effective assessment of major economic development projects. Furthermore, SaskPower is now evaluating potential co-generation power projects.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude this address by affirming my support for the throne speech. Saskatchewan faces difficult times, but this is also a time of great opportunity. By capturing the spirit of co-operation and community, fairness and compassion, Saskatchewan people will be able to weather the storm.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's been a little while and a long while in waiting to get a chance to speak to the Assembly in response to the throne speech, Mr. Speaker. At the end of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will be moving a motion, seconded by the member from Kindersley, and it will be an amendment to the throne speech motion, sir.

Mr. Speaker, what a speech the throne speech was. Too bad, Mr. Speaker, there was no answers to the many questions all of us have. It's been a long, long wait — several long months, in fact. And the member for Redberry was just talking about what a wonderful job they were doing and what a terrible job my government was doing, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to point out to you some of the points that the members brag about in the throne speech — things that the NDP want to take credit for. And this is just a small summary because I realize that you aren't really fussy about a whole bunch of readings.

Mr. Speaker, the Spar Group in Swift Current. That was the former PC government and the now Premier uses it as an example of waste and mismanagement. Harvest Meats of Yorkton was expanded and supported, and at the time the Premier, today's Premier, the leader of the opposition of the time, said it was an example of SEDCO being abused. Advanced Technologies was initiated by a community bond offering under the former PC government.

And of the more than 700 companies considering locating in the province, more than 700 began consideration under the former PC government — part of our global decentralization initiative. The now Premier said it was cruel to force employees to move from their homes.

The electro co-generation proposal, Mr. Speaker, was called for and developed under a previous PC government. The now Premier called it piecemeal privatization of SaskPower. SaskTel International was created by the former PC government in 1985. The then leader of the opposition said it was an attempt to fragment SaskTel.

The Round Table on Environment was created by the previous PC government, and the now Premier called it a half-hearted commitment. Now they're bragging about it. The state of the environment report was initiated under our government, Mr. Speaker, the Dumont technical institute. And, Mr. Speaker, that's just a small portion of the things that we've done and the now NDP government are trying to take credit for.

Mr. Speaker, there's a time to criticize and I think there's a time to take credit for what you've done and time to give credit for what others have done. Mr. Speaker, this government don't seem to be able to do that.

Mr. Speaker, the wait has not only been long just for the members on this side of House that have been asking and seeking answers from the NDP government, but also hard for the people of Saskatchewan who are already feeling

betrayed.

Mr. Speaker, it was hard to watch the news and listen to the radio and hear each day of more and more betrayals, of more and more deception from a government that promised so many things, from a government who promised openness and honesty.

And, Mr. Speaker, it's even worse not to be able to question the government for these actions. The NDP government has been running scared for several months. They have been making changes to everything, from GRIP, health boards, and all other boards behind closed doors.

Last year the NDP said they would get more money for farmers and address the farm crisis in Saskatchewan. The NDP said they would take care of seniors and those with lower incomes and eliminate poverty altogether. They said, Mr. Speaker, they would freeze taxes. Those were promises they promised — freeze taxes.

The NDP said they would provide open and honest government. They said they would put more money into health and education. And all the time the NDP are fighting for something called a social charter. Just what is a social charter? Well if the goings-on in the past few months in Saskatchewan go along with what the NDP think a social charter is, it means taxing phones and cars, paying more for electricity and natural gas. And, Mr. Speaker, to top it off, they are talking about premiums on health care, and I say talking, Mr. Speaker, because personally I don't think they will do it. I think it is budget by media. And that's some social charter. Mr. Speaker, the only thing to be gained through the NDP social charter are the populations of Alberta and other provinces.

Now the NDP are proposing premiums — premiums from the people who wave their hands in the air claiming to follow the footsteps of one Tommy Douglas, the NDP who've said they would restore our province's health system. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are now led to believe that not only the uproar from the general public, but the uproar within their own caucus have caused the NDP to withdraw from that proposal. And personally, Mr. Speaker, I would hope so.

(1515)

And I would hope so not because, Mr. Speaker, we have campaigned on a platform of no medicare premiums. What we're saying, Mr. Speaker, is they promised not to do it, and they're breaking their promises. That is to me was where the betrayal . . . that's the betrayal of the people of Saskatchewan. That is where the deceit comes in.

Mr. Speaker, this is from the NDP who claimed year after year health care was underfunded and that four or five per cent increases given by our government, the former PC government, were not enough. They said it was not enough, Mr. Speaker. They said they would do so much better and provide so much more.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it's sad. Mr. Speaker, I say it's sad

because there is no one person in Saskatchewan — not one senior, not one university student, not one parent or child or teacher — that has not affected by the NDP's betrayal, not one. And I challenge any member in this Assembly to find me one.

Everyone in this province is paying for more health, education, power, phone, car insurance, and boy, the list goes on and on. And we haven't even seen the budget yet. What are other hardships will that bring? Heaven only knows. And this is a government that said four and a half billion dollars is enough; any government that can't live on that budget should not be a government. That's a quote, Mr. Speaker, from one of the senior ministers on that side of the House before he was in government.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP made a lot of promises and many of you remember the document that I outlined in this House. We remember, Mr. Speaker, all the promises that you were making and all of the banns that you were asking us to make. In fact, Mr. Speaker, they made promises that in 1991 dollars totalled over \$2.7 billion in each year.

Those figures have yet to be challenged, Mr. Speaker. I done an update last year, the last year we were on that side of the House, and those figures have never been challenged. They've never been challenged. And I'm glad to see that the choir leader is here, Mr. Speaker. I was beginning to feel a little lonesome up here without the . . . Mr. Speaker, I challenge the member to audit those figures and come back and prove them wrong. Promise . . .

An Hon. Member: — Change like it did in '82, Murray.

Mr. Britton: — Yes, the same thing. And, Mr. Speaker, while we're on the subject, let us remember these are extra programs, these are extra services the NDP promised. This is the extra services you promised to the people of Saskatchewan. And that's a lot of money, 2.7 billion over and above the 4.5 billion that we were spending.

And, Mr. Speaker, I tried to point out to the members that that was a lot of money. I tried to point out to the members at the time that it was not reasonable to try and force us to spend more money.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP knew at the time they could never deliver on those extra services. They couldn't deliver on the goodies to the public. They knew what they were promising. They knew it was a load of boloney. Can I use that word? The Gass Commission proved that, Mr. Speaker, but they didn't care; they went and done it anyway. They didn't listen to anyone, Mr. Speaker, even though they knew the pie-in-the-sky promises were so expensive and they knew that those promises alone would make it impossible to deliver, given the economic times.

But something is much worse, Mr. Speaker — something that I think is unforgivable. They knew, Mr. Speaker, they knew at the time that they were making those demands on us and those promises to the people, that they could not deliver.

The Premier may deny it and the Finance minister pretends to still be in a state of shock. But, Mr. Speaker, they knew. They knew by their own Gass Commission, they knew by the chairman of the Gass Commission and the prospectus and many other forms of proof — they knew. They can't deny, Mr. Speaker, any longer. I have people . . . I met people yesterday, Mr. Speaker, who were saying to me, how much longer do they think they can fool us? They're saying to me, they did not fool us at all. And while they did vote for them, they are very disillusioned right now.

What's worse than that, Mr. Speaker, what's worse is your deception, the deception of the NDP, Mr. Speaker. And I'm talking about the deception, the blatant manipulation of the people of this province. Mr. Speaker, that is unforgivable.

A couple of my colleagues have mentioned many more of the pre-election promises spoken by the NDP, promises I know the NDP had no intention of keeping, but nevertheless promises they thought would get them elected. The election of deception. The 1991 election will be remembered for a long time by the people of Saskatchewan as the election of deception.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the NDP said a lot of things before they became government. And it is obvious that the public believed what they said, and if they hadn't the NDP would never be sitting on that side of the House today. The people of Saskatchewan put their trust in those people. And it is interesting to see the NDP set a new world record for back-peddalling since getting elected.

Just what did the public get in return for their votes? What did they get? Well, Mr. Speaker, parliamentary rules forbid me to use the words I would like to use, but let's just say the public got a much thinner pocket-book. They also got told, Mr. Speaker, some pretty tall tales. The real word that fits here is also unparliamentary. But all of the members here and all the members on that side of the House and everyone else here today knows what the word is.

Mr. Speaker, in fact for those of you who still might be a little unclear, I would like to quote the *Leader-Post* article in front of me. Mr. Speaker, this is . . . and I know from previous you don't like me to read the whole thing so I won't do that, sir. But this is an article in the Regina post and it's by a very well-known political editor and I think everyone should read this. But I will just quote a couple of things. February 6, '92, Dale Eisler. Dale Eisler wrote this. I wasn't going to mention the man's name, because I didn't know, you know . . . but he wrote it, Mr. Speaker. The members asked who. It's here, I'll table it.

The NDP will defend this purge by hiding behind the deficit argument and claim it is all part of downsizing and the elimination of redundant positions.

But that is just more of the deception. (The fact is) that (this) is (a) planned, orchestrated and well executed . . .

Mr. Speaker, the whole article is, I think, defined in the

last two words by Mr. Eisler, and I quote: "They lied." That's what he said. I quote, Mr. Speaker, "They lied."

Mr. Speaker, that's what the people of Saskatchewan got. Now I didn't say that. He's referring to the NDP government in the article . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I don't know. If I am, I'm sure I will be told. And it is certainly not my object to be unparliamentary, but I do believe that we have to tell the truth once in a while.

Well, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . in this House, yes, in this House. Well, Mr. Speaker . . . In fact, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to . . . no, I won't, no.

But like many things that the NDP are trying, Mr. Speaker, is trying to defend their actions. And I quote: "But that is just more of the deception." And that is not all Mr. Eisler says, Mr. Speaker. There is much more — much, much more. And I would suggest you read it, if you want to know what the people of Saskatchewan think about you over there.

And, Mr. Speaker, now I've been in politics for a few years, and now I have read Mr. Eisler's column many times. In fact I know what it's like to take a few hits from Mr. Eisler myself. But in all of the years that I've been here and all of the columns I have read, I have never seen or read Mr. Eisler call any government what he did the government opposite me today — never. Which would indicate to me, Mr. Speaker, that he felt quite strongly about his article . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You'll have to speak up if you want me to respond.

And I guess it just doesn't get any more straightforward than that, Mr. Speaker. The people have been deceived, misled, and betrayed. Yes, they have been betrayed.

And what is worse, Mr. Speaker, is the members opposite don't care. That's what's worse, they don't care. It isn't possible for them to claim they care and still do what they are doing to this province. You don't care. You sit there and you smile and you giggle and you chuckle because you are government. You think that the end justifies the means.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the NDP care, they are talking out of both sides . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. I would ask members not to interfere when a member of the House is speaking.

I would also draw the attention to the member of Wilkie to make his words through the Chair rather than to individual members in the House.

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I realize that I was out of order a bit there.

How can the NDP, Mr. Speaker, claim to care about the lower income people of Saskatchewan while they are raising power rates, phones, car insurance, and everything else in sight. Mr. Speaker, every person has to have lights, power. They have to have a phone. As a matter of fact we want our old folks to have phones so they can call for help if needed.

Mr. Speaker, all of those things are being raised. The power rates are being raised. And we hear the chuckles going on. I guess the old folks don't need them. But, Mr. Speaker, this is their answer to eliminating poverty. Creating it maybe; eliminating it, I don't think so.

How can the NDP claim to care so much about education when they are slashing funding, stopping the construction of much-needed schools, and looking to close rural schools all across this province. Is this caring, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, how about the farmers? What are we doing for the farmers? Well I have calls from constituents every day with all sorts of questions and complaints about what the NDP is doing. And farmers are among the angriest.

The NDP told the farmers they would get \$500 million immediately from Ottawa. The now Premier said he would go down and demand \$500 million. Well I guess he hasn't gone down there yet, because we haven't got the money.

And he would improve the gross revenue insurance program, GRIP, so the producers would be much happier. Sounds good, Mr. Speaker. Sounds good.

(1530)

The NDP said, we will consult with farmers and farm groups from all over the province to ensure we get the best deal possible for our farmers — farm groups and farmers. Now they consulted with the farm groups, but not with the farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I was up in Paradise Hill when there was a rally there. The media from Lloydminster was there. They were trying to get an audience with the agricultural minister. He wouldn't even answer them. He wouldn't commit himself to an interview. And who was he meeting with? Invited, invited people. The farmers were trying to get to talk to him. They wouldn't . . . He wouldn't even listen. He wouldn't even meet with the farmers, but he would meet with invited people whom he could probably depend on their support.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that doesn't sound so bad either. But what has happened to the GRIP? What's happened to the GRIP program? It's bad, Mr. Speaker. In order to try and fix one component, they ruined the whole thing. All of . . . everyone knew that there had to be some fine tuning to that program. Farmers told us. They needed some reason to do their best and grow the most they could and not be penalized. We knew that. That had to be fixed. And they fixed that.

Mr. Speaker, what we have now is something that the more you grow, the more you get; the less you grow, the less you get. That's not what insurance is all about. Insurance is when you lose something, you have something there to start over again. That's what insurance is about. And I've got farmers, Mr. Speaker, in Wilkie who tell me the so-called improvements the NDP made to GRIP will make the program far too expensive and they can't afford it. They can't afford to belong to this program . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well I'm pleased to know I

have a new choir leader.

Farmers are about to upset the changes made to GRIP, Mr. Speaker, because it was supposed to have been improved, considering the input of farmers and farm groups. The NDP said, Mr. Speaker, we will make it better. We will improve the program. We know farmers.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, considering how farmers feel about the changes, I think the only farmer the Minister of Agriculture and his GRIP group spoke to were the figures on his Fisher-Price toy farm. One reality . . . Mr. Speaker, one really has to question how good a program is when 1,500 farmers have to organize themselves just to be listened to, just to have the input they were promised by the government. It happened in Regina, it happened in Shaunavon, it happened in Paradise Hill, and it's happening in towns and every coffee shop across the province.

But you know what, Mr. Speaker? The NDP don't care. They don't care. They are government and they don't care what the people say. Mr. Speaker, for those not attending the farm rally at the Agridome in April I want to tell you almost 100 per cent of the producers voted to restore GRIP to the original 1991 program. And I think the only people voting against the original 1991 GRIP were a couple of former NDP MLAs.

And when the crowd had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to vote on the new 1992 version of GRIP, even a few of the NDP MLAs would not stand in support of their own new and improved GRIP. That should tell you, Mr. Speaker, a little bit of something about the new and improved program. After all, Mr. Speaker, like one farmer said: there's a big difference between fine tuning a program and gutting it.

The bottom line here is that farmers have been betrayed along with the rest of the people, the rest of the people of the province. Just like Mr. Eisler said — he said the big "L" word, Mr. Speaker.

This government has made some pretty interesting choices. While the people are being told to tighten their belts, executives like Jack Messer and Carole Bryant are building bathrooms in their offices and are driving \$50,000 cars. I understand that has been looked at and maybe there's some changes because the people have found that the cookie jar was there and they had their hands in it.

While we're being told by the government we're all in this together, co-operate and we'll get out of this together, keep a stiff upper lip, personal assistants to the Premier are receiving 80 per cent pay hikes — 80 per cent pay hikes.

The Speaker: — Order. I would like to draw to the attention of the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster that she had her opportunity to participate in this debate and I would appreciate it if she did not interfere with the present member speaking.

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I guess we take the comments from where they come from.

Mr. Speaker, we certainly are not in this together. When some people get 80 per cent wage increases, hospitals, education, welfare people are being cut back, how are we all in it together? How can some people drive Lexus cars and other people not even have a car to drive and call it all in here together?

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are not in it together. And while the government runs behind closed doors to make all these secret decisions, the public reaches a little deeper into their pocket, Mr. Speaker, to pay for these programs that we're all in together.

Mr. Speaker, I had one constituent say to me: the member from Riversdale said over and over that 4.5 billion was enough to run this province. He said he would do away with harmonization because the government didn't need any more money. He said that, and he did it. About the only promise he kept. He said he would do away with harmonization; the government didn't need any more money. If this is true, why am I paying so much more and getting so much less? This question was asked me, and I think it's a good question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the member from Riversdale or one of his colleagues to answer that question. Why are we paying more and getting so much less? Is that not a fair question? — particularly when we have a quote from the members when they were not in government saying: 4.5 is enough, we don't need any more money. I think it is a fair question. I would like somebody to answer that for us.

Mr. Speaker, another question. Why are we taxing the sick? The leaks that we're getting says that there's going to be about a hundred per cent raise in the minimum on drugs. Well, Mr. Speaker, who buys drugs? It's the sick. They don't go buying drugs for fun, I don't think — some people may but generally most people don't.

And why are you raising every utility in sight? All the old folks need . . . all the poor people need light, heat. Why are we doing everything that they said they would never do? That is, Mr. Speaker, what we call deception. That's why we're saying, you said you didn't have to do it, you wouldn't do it, and the people of Saskatchewan believed you. They believed you. They voted for you. You're now government, but you're still doing it anyway because you don't care.

The member from Riversdale said: we don't need any more money. He said with proper management he could live easily within a 4.5 billion budget and deliver all of his promises. That's what he said. He could deliver all those promises with 4.5 billion.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that the member from Riversdale had no intention of keeping his word. It is unfortunate everyone in Saskatchewan is paying for his dishonesty.

Mr. Speaker, the lawyer from Riversdale had a choice between a few cents on a hamburger or raising telephone and insurance, of all things even contemplating health care premiums. That shouldn't have even been on the table according to their past record, according to the things they said.

The now Minister of Health was in this very House, said never, ever would we ever put on health premiums. And in fairness, I don't think they will. I think the flak that they got through their media budget . . . they've chose to withdraw from that.

So what did he do? He chose to impose a flat tax on everyone. He decided it was better to put more of a burden on lower income people — on seniors, single-parent families — to impose taxes that everybody has to pay rather than gain \$200 million from a voluntary tax, Mr. Speaker. And I say voluntary because there was a choice. Under the harmonization, Mr. Speaker, when I talked to my constituents, I like to use an analysis like this. If I met a friend uptown and it was getting close to Mother's Day and I would say to him, have you bought something for your wife, and he'd say no. So together we go to a store and he buys a \$4,000 fur coat for his wife for Mother's Day, and I buy a \$2,000 coat because that's all I can afford. The guy that pays the most pays the most tax. That is voluntary tax, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I don't pay tobacco tax. I don't pay any tobacco tax. That's voluntary because I don't smoke; that's a voluntary tax. That's a self-inflicted penalty that you pay. If the same two people went to a restaurant, one had steak and lobster and the other had a hamburger, who'd pay the most tax? The guy with the steak and lobster. That's voluntary tax, Mr. Speaker. But now even the poor people, everybody has to pay that tax.

Where's the promise of living within \$4.5 billion? Mr. Speaker, the election of deception, that's where it is. That's where it is, Mr. Speaker. And I can just imagine in a NDP caucus meeting, it's like all of the members arguing over who gets to break the next promise.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let's look at it. We've already broke a couple of promises to the seniors and to lower income families, not to mention university students, the sick. Well I guess, Mr. Speaker, that just about covers everyone. And it's a sad thing, Mr. Speaker. It's downright unconscionable and totally unacceptable to the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, pretty soon now the government will have to stop betraying the people of this province because there will be no people left to betray. Mr. Speaker, before I conclude, or as I conclude, I would like to table this motion, move an amendment to the motion, seconded by my colleague, the member from Kindersley:

That the following words be added to the motion:

But regrets that the government has misled the people of Saskatchewan in their partisan effort to break clear commitments not to increase taxes or impose health care charges; and further regrets the government's continuing campaign against individuals and their families by political firings, restrictions on freedom of speech, threats to retroactively break legal contracts, and its campaign of political terror in regard to the entire body politic of the province; and further regrets that the government has failed to provide any

economic leadership or positive solutions to the challenges facing our people.

Mr. Britton: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank you for the time and that's all for now.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1545)

The Speaker: — If the members will just give us a moment.

Order. I am somewhat concerned with a particular phrase in the amendment and I was wondering whether the member would entertain to delete a particular phrase. If a member were to use these words in debate, I certainly would rule it out of order. And the phrase that I am concerned about is "its campaign of political terror in regard to the entire body politic of the province."

That if — order — if a member were to use that in a speech in the legislature, it would be ruled definitely out of order and unparliamentary. And by deleting it I don't think it does . . . takes away from your amendment at all. If the member would accept my suggestion that he delete it, I would recognize the seconder and they could then present a new motion with that phrase deleted.

If that is not unacceptable then I think I would have to rule the whole amendment out of order. Order.

Mr. Neudorf: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, or perhaps a point of clarification on your part, which aspect of that phrase is that which would make it unparliamentary for this House?

The Speaker: — Easy enough, two words: "political terror." Simply, it's the two words, political terror. And I think that that is a phrase that is simply not used in the legislature and I would certainly rule that out of order if anybody used that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If he has a point of order, I will recognize a point of order. Does the member have a point of order?

Mr. Neudorf: — I'm looking for clarification.

The Speaker: — Order. Order. I have given an option to the member from Wilkie to either delete that phrase in his amendment, which I say takes nothing away from his total amendment; if that is unacceptable to the member, then I will rule the whole amendment out of order. I am quite prepared to accept a deletion of that phrase and let the seconder continue and move another amendment with the same seconder, with that particular phrase deleted. If that is acceptable to the member, then the seconder can continue.

Mr. Britton: — Mr. Speaker, for the expediency of time, rather than redo the whole the thing, we will accept your ruling.

The Speaker: — All right then, the amendment . . . In the amendment to the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, it has been moved by the member for Wilkie, seconded by the member for Kindersley:

That the following words be added to the motion:

But regrets that the government has misled the people of Saskatchewan in their partisan effort to break clear commitments not to increase taxes or impose health care charges, and further regrets the government's continuing campaign against individuals and their families by political firings, restrictions on freedom of speech, threats to retroactively break legal contracts, and further regrets that the government has failed to provide any economic leadership or positive solutions to the challenges facing our people.

That is the amendment that is before us, seconded by the member from Kindersley, and the debate will continue on the main motion and the amendment.

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the government for finally reconvening the legislature so we can receive answers to our many questions. I must say though that I'm not surprised by the lack of plan in this throne speech. After hearing the throne speech, I am convinced the NDP didn't have a plan and still don't have a plan. There are many words that can describe this government. Some of my colleagues have quoted editorials. Some have quoted constituents, and I have a few of my own.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the member from Riversdale is a successful politician. His party won decisively in the last provincial election. His many years as an MLA are tangible proof of his political skill. Unfortunately and perhaps not surprisingly, political skill seldom translates into trustworthy leadership.

The differences between a politician and a premier are many. A politician looks for the success of his party. A premier looks for the success of his province. A politician thinks of the next election, while a premier thinks of the next generation. A premier wishes to steer, while the politician is sometimes satisfied to drift depending on which way the wind is blowing. Mr. Speaker, the member from Riversdale is a politician, not a leader. In fact the article that I have with me today from the *Leader-Post* of January 31, 1992, states, and I quote: "Back in the days when he was (in) opposition leader, Roy Romanow promised the moon, the stars and more money to (the) Saskatchewan's civic leaders."

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is true that the member from Riversdale made a lot of promises during his stint in opposition and during the election. And the choices that he made during the first six months of power point to the conclusion that he is indeed a politician and not a leader.

The most obvious examples with this member's litany of broken promises . . . the member from Riversdale and the rest of the NDP were fully aware of the province's financial situation from square one, but not tell the public so. No, Mr. Speaker, the member's own Gass inquiry stated that the province's books were always open, and there was no hidden deficit. In fact, the NDP concedes the point by stating in the prospectus filed in April that they have talked about here in the last few days, and I

quote: the 1991 financial statements have been prepared using accounting principles consistent with previous years. Department of Finance believes the 1991 financial statements present fairly the financial position of the province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this very document signed by the Minister of Finance to present to the United States, a sworn statement that proves the books were in order, and proves the many deficit figures the NDP have been throwing around is a hoax.

Bruce Johnstone put it well in his editorial on November 23, 1991, Mr. Speaker. The article says, and I quote again:

You'll recall last week that Finance Minister Ed Tchorzewski solemnly announced that the deficit for 1991-92 will be \$960.3 million, rather than the \$265 million projected in the spring budget.

"I am sure . . . the people of Saskatchewan will be . . . shocked as I was to discover the extent of the deficit, and how badly they had been misled," said Tchorzewski, with a straight face.

Yet honest Ed knew (all along) that the \$960.3-million deficit is as phoney as a three-dollar bill.

Close quote. Close quote. A smoke and mirror show, Mr. Speaker. Instead of being honest they chose to make up figure after figure of a deficit that has roamed anywhere from \$500 million to \$1.2 billion on a given day. Instead they choose to mislead the public so everyone could be ready for the big NDP axe to fall on their heads. So instead of saying, you've betrayed me, the general public will say, well at least you've spared my life.

So when the elaborate hoax to convince the public . . . so why the elaborate hoax to convince the public that the member from Riversdale had no idea what the province's financial situation was, that there was a hidden deficit? Because the member from Riversdale is a politician and not a leader.

He knew the restraint measures the former Tory administration were implementing to address the deficit problem were in part unpopular with the public — measures such as wage restraints, cut-backs to the civil service, and harmonization of the E&H (education and health) tax. A leader would have recognized these as necessary for the well-being of the province for future generations. But, Mr. Speaker, the member from Riversdale is a politician and what he craves is power — power for power's sake.

Mr. Speaker, prior to the election the member from Riversdale exploited the public's distaste for strong medicine and went one step further. He promised that an NDP government would be . . . among other things, remove the provincial sales tax, increase funding for health and education, end poverty, and balance the deficit and budget. Having won election based on these promises, the member must now scramble to find excuses to break the promises he knew he could never keep.

So now we have an unprecedented campaign by the NDP government to try and convince the public that it's somebody else's fault, despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary. Good politics, Mr. Speaker, but bad leadership.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — While there are grand words in the throne speech about medicare, Mr. Speaker, the NDP government is intent on its betrayal. The so-called wellness model is as empty a slogan . . . designed to hide the closure of hospitals, user fees and cut-backs they said they would never do.

A commitment to open and non-partisan government has proven to be a hollow one. We have seen oral contracts, oral contracts for some of the top Crown presidents that cannot be released to the public because they do not exist. What a way to be doing business in this province. Now we have the president of SaskPower with an oral contract — never seen before. The appointments to boards and commissions have been including such notable experts as the former NDP MLA for Estevan. Just defeated candidates, the defeated candidate in my riding, Kindersley, recently got an appointment to the STC (Saskatchewan Transportation Company) board.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Campaign managers for the NDP party, NDP lawyers, and NDP election workers — all of these people obviously more than qualified according to these folks across the way. We have seen hundreds — over 500 to be more precise — political firings by the NDP, all the way from top bureaucrats, those that have been with the government for over 20 years, to secretaries and single mothers trying to do their jobs.

After such actions, Mr. Speaker, the member from Riversdale gloats, gloats in the throne speech of hiring over 580 people, new people. I don't think it's anything to brag about, replacing workers fired by yourself in the past few months and replacing them with NDP appointments — every single one of them.

Mr. Speaker, the member from Riversdale said it takes courage to do these things. He said it takes courage to take the steps his government is taking. He's one to talk about courage. Where was he, the member from Riversdale, when 600 farmers were on the front steps here asking for an opportunity to speak with him? Where was he then? Where was the courage then? Or how about even bigger demonstrations, like the one at the AgriDome? Where was he then?

(1600)

Where was the NDP . . . Where was the member when NDP were cancelling energy agreements? I will tell you where he was, Mr. Speaker; he was ducking his responsibility, skirting reporters and the rest of the public. Some courage. The member obviously needs a new dictionary to define what the word means.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech also speaks of jobs and economic opportunity. What possible connection do the new contracts for Spar Group in Swift Current or Harvest Meats in Yorkton have with an NDP government? What possible connection? Well everyone in the province is happy to see these companies prosper. I for one certainly don't see any connection between them and an NDP government. They are trying to take credit for everyone else's work, Mr. Speaker.

There are other examples as well, like the community bond corporation. It was a program developed by the previous administration and well accepted across this province. Now the NDP wants to take credit for these new jobs and investment, like that of Advanced Technologies in Weyburn is creating through the community bond program.

All of these projects mentioned in the throne speech have nothing to do with the NDP and everything to do with the former Tory administration. And I would like to thank the NDP for complimenting the former administration by including them in the throne speech.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Mr. Speaker, the NDP solution for economic development is creating another Crown corporation: SaskEnergy. While the rest of the world is turning toward privatization to renew and invigorate their Crown corporation, this government wants to set up a new family of Crown corporations.

The NDP also speak of GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) and other trade agreements and claim to want to be part of these negotiations. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, no company or organization would want to enter into any contracts with this government given their record of breaking them. Just look at the public employee contract, the AECL pull out, and now the breaking of contracts with every farmer in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I asked my friends in the farm and business sectors if they would enter into a contract with this NDP government and the answer is a resounding "No!" No, they would not enter into an agreement with these folks.

Why would anyone believe the NDP would honour a contract? No one believes this Premier or this government. They have absolutely no reason to believe them.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting that the throne speech says the "Long-term stability for our farm families is central to our economic recovery."

What kind of cruel joke is the member from Riversdale trying to pull off at the expense of our province's farm families? At farm demonstrations all over this province, at government-sponsored informational meetings all over the province, farmers have categorically rejected the 1992 GRIP program.

One farmer called and said the new GRIP program doesn't stand for gross revenue insurance program any longer. It stands for get ready incoming poverty 1992

NDP style.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Considering the rate increases and coverage decreases . . . premium increases and coverage decreases maybe the NDP should take his suggestion and change the name to exactly that.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP defend the changes made to the program claiming they take care of moral hazard, claiming farmers were working the program to benefit themselves. What about the moral hazard of the government, Mr. Speaker, the real moral hazard the farmers of Saskatchewan are faced with — the same government that stated any changes made to the GRIP program would be received by farmers in written form before March 15.

Well I'm a farmer in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, and I didn't get written notice. Did any of the NDP MLA back-benchers that are farmers receive written notice? Did you receive written notice, any of them? Not a single one of them; not a farmer in Saskatchewan received written notice of the changes. Another contract broken.

I ask the Minister of Agriculture and the Premier of this province: don't you believe in contractual obligations? Mr. Speaker, the farm community often confirms a deal on a handshake, but this NDP government has shown them a new kind of leadership, and it's not an honourable one.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP government's example says, forget the handshake, go ahead and sign a contract, and hope for the best because if it doesn't suit us, we'll break it — just break it to suit themselves.

An Hon. Member: — Deemed to have been written.

Mr. Boyd: — Deemed to be written, exactly that. The contract that they are trying to put on to farmers now was, we have deemed to have received notice. That's what the farmers of Saskatchewan have to live with — deemed to have received notice from this government. These contracts are not worth anything.

Not only are they trying to force farm families to enter another contract, the NDP GRIP contract for '92, but they are also saying to the farm families to sign a waiver saying that the changes are just fine. Well they're not fine with me. I have a copy of the waiver in my office and I have no intention of signing such a thing.

Well, Mr. Speaker, all the member from Riversdale had to do was look out his office window on Monday, April 27, and he would have found out that these changes are not just fine. It's no longer farm families that are taking . . . it's no wonder farm families are taking the government to court. The NDP are breaking the law.

Mr. Speaker, when I say every single farmer in this program is upset, I wonder why the back-bench NDPers in this government don't stand up to the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture. They talk to their neighbours, they know this program is contractually wrong, morally

wrong, and it's a program that farmers do not want. It's as simple as that.

Where is the member from Saskatoon Broadway, you know, the member from the famous farm family who said her father went to jail in support of farm families. I think it would be an appropriate time for her to follow her father's footsteps and stand up to her caucus, stand up for the farm families of Saskatchewan.

Does that member and other members of the . . . farm members of the NDP caucus understand the changes that have taken place by their own government? Do they realize the contract has been broken? Does the member from Swift Current realize the contract has been broken? Do they realize the coverage is down? Do they realize the program is no longer predictable? Do they realize the program is no longer bankable? Do they realize they no longer have a guaranteed per acre target revenue?

Mr. Speaker, the rural members opposite must not understand the program or they certainly would not support it. I know the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster has told people in her constituency that they should have an option of either '91 or '92 GRIP. I would like to ask her if she's caved in to her caucus?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Or will she stand today and say that she would like to give the farmers of this province the opportunity to choose? I spoke to farmers here on Monday, April 27, that were from her constituency. They said they went and visited her in her constituency office and asked her that very question: should farmers have the option — '91 or '92. And she said yes, they should have the option. That's exactly what she told people in her constituency. I sincerely hope that she just didn't make that comment to her constituents just because she thought that that's what they wanted to hear.

It would be interesting also to know what the member from Shaunavon has been telling his constituents — 1,200 people from the surrounding area joined at a meeting at Shaunavon to condemn the program; condemn it. And we also understand a number of them went to his office and ripped up their party card in disgust with this program and with this NDP government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — I would like to ask that member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster once again, Mr. Speaker, do you still believe the farmers of this province should have the option between '91 and '92 GRIP? No response, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — Order. A member, he may not be aware of it, but is not to refer to any comments made by other members while they are in their seats. And I would also advise him, and I would appreciate if you'd direct your comments through the Chair rather than through other members in the legislature.

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that I certainly appreciate your ruling on that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like you to ask the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster, does she support changes . . .

The Speaker: — I would also like to remind the member, he's not to involve the Speaker in the debate in this legislature.

Mr. Boyd: — Sorry, Mr. Speaker. I guess I'd have to direct that question then to the Premier in question period some time in the future. And we'll ask him at that point to accommodate us with an answer from . . . whether the member from Cut Knife-Lloyd believes the program should be optional.

Has the Premier of this province listened to the farmers of this province? I don't think he has. He wouldn't even go out on the steps of this legislature on April 27 to speak to them about the program. Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the Minister of Agriculture was also not listening that day.

I think someone like the Premier should have gone out there and tried to bail him out. The Minister of Agriculture, I think, has to wonder, Mr. Speaker, does he have the support of the Premier, especially considering how the minister has totally screwed up this GRIP program. He probably wonders if he has the support of his cabinet and the further support of the NDP caucus.

Mr. Speaker, the most important consideration the Minister of Agriculture should be thinking about is, does he have the support of the farm families of Saskatchewan for these changes? No, he does not have it. And I think it's becoming increasingly clear; province-wide, farmers are banding together to show this government that indeed they do not have the support of the farm community. That's why they're taking this government to court.

I guess, Mr. Speaker, we've all been growing accustomed to the NDP breaking promises. They are the promises from here to eternity that the NDP government has reneged on.

Why should the people of this province believe anything this government and this Premier has to say any longer? Not even having the Premier go on province-wide television was able to convince the people of Saskatchewan that the NDP and the Premier didn't know the economic conditions of this province. His address was a good preview for the television program that came on next, *America's Funniest People*.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — If only it had been titled, Saskatchewan's least believable man. Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment to the motion by the member of Wilkie as put forward and second that amendment.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1615)

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, I will be of course voting against the amendment and voting for the original motion.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make my address in approximately three major areas. As soon as I make my introductory remarks, I want to shift into the issues of the throne speech as they relate to northern Saskatchewan, and also to the issues relating to aboriginal peoples, because the throne speech talks about the great need for compassion at this stage in our history. And I believe that the throne speech lays out some of the basics that we'll need to build on as we move forward into the future.

Now in regards to the member from Wilkie and the member from Kindersley, I would just like to make a few comments on some of their statements. I noticed that, you know, the member from Kindersley was making a comment on a handshake and so on. And I remembered we were sitting here at the last time in the legislature when the member from Estevan was doing a lot of handshaking in Quebec inside a big limousine, when he gave away over \$5 million of our Saskatchewan taxpayers' money to GigaText.

And I remember doing a lot of handshakes in many other areas where we've lost millions and millions and millions and hundreds of millions of dollars. So when he talks about a handshake, we know that the handshake of the . . . from the member from Estevan has been highly destructive for the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — I might say that the other word that has been talked about by the member from Wilkie was the whole issue of deception. I find it absolutely amazing that the member can talk about deception. We know that the greatest deception that has occurred in the history of the province of Saskatchewan as far as the whole area of fiscal accountability, you know, has been that which has been committed by the previous Conservative government.

The greatest deception always occurred also around election time. I notice that the last time back in 1985 when we were preparing for the election and finally had it in '86, wherein I was first elected in Cumberland constituency, they said that the total deficit during that year would be approximately, I think it was about 375 million. Well it ended up to be about 1.2 billion at that time. It was \$800 million out. When you're out by \$800 million by the former member from Lumsden who is now talking about . . . you know, they were talking about patronage a little while ago — who is now of course a person in our justice system.

Now this person of course was \$800 million out now this previous election. The other fact is this, that they said that we would be \$265 million in deficit for this year, and actually it's turned out to be over 900 million. So again, as far as deception goes, it's \$700 million. So in just two years, as far as Conservatives are concerned, and just in case the member from Wilkie has forgotten about this, and the member from Kindersley, the total amount just of those two years is \$1.5 billion. That's how much the deception was — 1.5 billion.

The member from Kindersley has asked me again because I think he does not know that in the last sitting the

Tories were very poor in their mathematics. But it takes quite a while for them to start understanding, you know, the meaning of accounting and accountability, and I'm pretty well happy to present them with those figures again.

Now as it relates to another theme that I overheard being thrown around was this theme about not caring and also the lack of courage. And they specifically talked about the issue of leadership. But when I looked at the leadership from across . . . when I looked at that aspect, a lot of people have been asking who is showing up at the farm gate in regards to the huge gatherings.

Well the member from Estevan never really did show up at one of the largest demonstrations in the history of farmers in this province over at Rosetown. He wasn't there. He didn't show his face. There was absolutely no courage, you know, by the member of Estevan in that regard.

And when the farmers arrived here in the legislature and addressed some of their grievances, I said, where was the member from Estevan? He was nowhere to be seen. Somebody said that he was over in China. I don't know what he was doing in China, but some people were saying that when we privatized . . . Taylor at that time, from the legislature, and having the fancy offices over in Hong Kong, somebody said that maybe he was out visiting those offices and looking at the value of those offices there.

So when we're talking about not caring and not having the courage, here we have their leader not showing up at some of the biggest demonstrations in regards to the farm crisis in the province of Saskatchewan. And again, not even showing up at that when we were here. And that's where I say hey, if there is a leader that doesn't care, it's the leader of the Conservatives and the member from Estevan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — The other thing I've noticed, you know one of the members across mentioned in their remarks was the whole issue of public ownership. And of course the opposite of that was privatization. Now of course our government operates under the principle of a mixed economy approach. And we see the very, very strong importance in our throne speech in regards to the tremendous development, you know, provided for by private industry, and we well recognize that.

We also recognize the aspect of course of public ownership and also co-operatives in the province of Saskatchewan's history. Now when I looked at the issue of privatization and how much it had cost us, you know, through the past, I would like to remind the members that one of the reasons why there is such a tremendous cumulative debt of 9 billion is the fact that we did sell off part of the Crowns. And when you combine that 9 billion with the Crown sector, we have approximately \$14 billion in the cumulative debt. Now part of the reason there of course, as I said, is privatization.

I remember when we were looking in regards to

Weyerhaeuser in the last two years when we were in government last time, we were making 20 million and 21 million for the people of the province of Saskatchewan. And part of this money we then utilized for the people of Saskatchewan, whether it was into building roads or whether it was into building and improving our health and educational system.

So we were utilizing, you know, the money that we gained from the public . . . (inaudible) . . . in regards and putting it back into the economy of Saskatchewan. Now that it happens, it is very important to know that the same company, Weyerhaeuser, hasn't paid one penny in regards to the public treasury as relates to the principal sum on the money that they used, you know, in this province. So I'd like to mention that.

And as a member from the North as well, when we look at Cameco, we used to own of course the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation. And when the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation was around, it was one of the finest companies in the world. It was one of the best companies in the world.

We were getting about 20 per cent return on investment on that company. And we were making 52 and \$61 million in the last two years of operation. So we were making over \$110 million, you know, in the last two years of Cameco. And we were reutilizing that money for northern development which this government, either when they were in government or in opposition, never even mentioned, you know, in northern Saskatchewan for aboriginal people.

And so when we talk about privatization and how much it's benefitted the province, well there's a whole history of privatization and now we're supposed to give us, you know, the greatest benefits in the history following the Maggie Thatcher formula. And really what it has left us is in tremendous debt that all the future of our children are going to have to pay for.

And I'd like to delve into a little bit of a detail on one of the privatizations that occurred in one of the major debate in our final case, and that was the whole debate on the PCS, on the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. And I remember after six, seven years of operation of the PCS by the Tories, we had lost from about 2,200 jobs to about . . . We had about 2,200 jobs in that potash industry and we dropped down to about 1,200 jobs.

Now during that time one of the most important things that came about in that debate was the information that we shared with the people of Saskatchewan. And that information was this. We looked at the of course the Liberals who always are governing in the same fashion as the Tories. So I looked at it in broad historical terms during that debate. And I remember that time when we were debating, Mr. Speaker, that in the last six years of the Liberals, we were able to gain from the corporations, which were basically American corporations. And I remember the member from Kindersley talking about America in his last comments just a little while ago. It reminded me about the former leader of the Conservatives who tried to annex Saskatchewan with the United States; I think his name was Collver.

And their mind is always in with the Americans. And I remember at that time the Liberals were in the same boat as well. Ninety per cent of our potash industry of course was owned by the Americans. And at that time, when we looked upon it, how much of a return did we get in regards to paying for our medical services or paying for our health or paying for our system?

And I remember during that time of the debate that in the last six years of the Liberal government we were only able to get about 15 to \$16 million a year, a little over \$2 million a year in the last six years of Liberal rule in the province of Saskatchewan as far as our potash resource was concerned. They said at that time of history that potash was like oil was to the countries in the Mideast. And sure it was, because we had the best potash deposits in the world.

So when we look at the history, we saw this Liberal government looking at about 15, \$16 million. And then when we came into power back in '71, a lot of people were talking about that terrible, terrible socialist tradition, that we were going to go in and expropriate all the mines in the potash industry and start our new company. And really nothing happened in regards to that since.

We tried to come out with a reasonable approach of regulating the potash industry. We tried to do it by taxation and trying to get proper information at that time in relation to how much return we would get from the potash companies. And in fact we were unable to get good co-operation from the companies who were 90 per cent owned by the American corporations. And we were unable to get the information to be able to do proper planning for the future of our children and of our families and the seniors in our communities.

So when the debate was on during that time in regards to potash, therefore the election was called in '75 and there was a great scare that we would completely bring Saskatchewan under a great fall and that would be the worst economic disaster Saskatchewan would have because those NDPers were going to have public ownership of the mines.

And so in '75 of course we were taken to court by the companies, and we did lose the court case. And, you know, from there stemmed the need for a special section of the constitution in being able to sell potash internationally which was 92(a), which we were able to attain through the good work of the attorney general of that time and premier Blakeney. At that time the attorney general of course was the member from Riversdale.

(1630)

And we were able to then get the information that was required in regards to the whole potash scene as it related to the constitution. So we make gains for the people of Saskatchewan, and the member from Riversdale who is now our Premier was a strong part in regards to this history.

So when we look at the throne speech debate and we're looking at the new era, it's very important to look at this in

historic context so when we are dealing with things we know what happened in the past and where we're going forward into the future. So when we looked at that aspect and the companies fought us tooth and nail during that time in that '75 election, we did win the election and the people gave us a nod, and we went ahead. And by the fall of that year we had the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan formed because in legal terms we could only start out by developing it through the corporate legislation of the province of Saskatchewan to establish the PCS at that time.

Now when we look at that six years hence from there of NDP rule and a lot of people said that the corporations would not be benefitted. We had balanced budgets every year. All the 11 years that the NDP with the public corporations had balanced budgets. We've never missed in the 11 years of power with the public corporations.

And then when we looked at those six years of power of NDP, we find that in regards to how much money went to the public treasury it was \$986 million. You compare that to the Liberals who in six years went 15 and \$16 million. We were able to get through the corporations the \$986 million to the public treasury, which we then had one of the greatest histories of building the province in the areas of health and in the areas of education, and in the areas of road building.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — So when I see the members talking about this scare that they always talk about in regards to the Maggie Thatcher new tradition, which I predict that they would have never won that election if they hadn't changed their leadership. She was going to have been turfed out, and the only way they could do it is come out with a new leader. And that put the people out a little bit on a stop gap measure, and they narrowly won the election.

But I would say that in regards to the Conservatives under years of privatization, they privatized. They started privatizing. That's all they could do is privatize and give away money to their friends and give away money to the big companies.

And, you know, during that period in time and within a six-year period we looked at the six years of Tory rule in the province, how is it related to the potash company of Saskatchewan, and the amount of money that we received was \$274 million — over \$700 million lost into the public treasury. That was because of the royalty tax rollbacks and everything, because they had to pay for the election promises because of the monies that they received from the corporations.

So that is the history of the province of Saskatchewan just in regards to the public treasury as far as the time when we had public corporations and PCS running full blast. Liberals were 15, \$16 million to the public treasury; \$986 million . . . \$984 million for the people of Saskatchewan when the NDP was here, was around. And when the PCs took over it was 274 million. And we lost over \$700 million.

So when we're looking at trying to understand the situation of our debt, you know, our accumulated debt which is now 9 billion, you know, plus 5 in the public sector, in the public corporate sector, it's absolutely amazing when I hear the member from across, you know, talking about the fact that it was privatization that was the basis of Tory strategy. And yet it was privatization which lost us a thousand jobs in potash and lost us \$700 million in revenue.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — I want to now head into the issue of the North, and I know that there was a lot of things covered in the throne speech which lays out part of the framework in regards to the future on building our great province. I look at the issue of North and aboriginal people therefore in my next statements.

As it relates to the Conservatives, I find it absolutely amazing that in all their years in power it was absolutely shameful, it was absolutely terrible that they did not even mention people of northern Saskatchewan during those years. They did not mention aboriginal people. They did not mention Indian and Metis people because they were scared that if they mentioned Indian and Metis people in their throne speeches or mentioned the North, they figured that it would scare away the vote or something.

They were scared to deal with Indian and Metis people in a public fashion. The only time that I heard them during that year when I was a member was negative comments. When we look at the history of racism in the world and we look at what's happening in the United States, we know that some of the leadership from across were very, very negative when it came down to Indian and Metis people.

And I remember, you know, talking about disparaging comments that were made by the members, and I won't name them. And it's very, very, very important when we look at this that leadership — whether you're on this side of the House or on that side of the House — has to be able to have a leadership of compassion, a leadership that respects people, a leadership that says yes, we will be fighting racism and a system of oppression that puts and keeps people down.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — So when I look at the new government, I look at in comparative historical contrast with the Conservatives that didn't even have the decency to mention Northerners and Indian and Metis people in their years of power.

When we listened to the original throne speech, we talked about . . . in our last sitting on the House, we talked about economic development and the need for economic development corporations in northern Saskatchewan. That was our first Bill in the House in our last sitting. We put northern Saskatchewan people first as it related to economic development corporations. That's what our government did. Now when I look at this throne speech, we are now dealing again with northern issues.

One of the most devastating aspects of people in the

world, one of the greatest senses of culture and identity is the whole issue of work. That indeed when you look at work, it is such an important aspect that when it starts shifting in global proportions right now in the international context, there's many displaced workers here and there in this and that country, this and that state, and this and that province.

And it's very important to recognize the fact, the interconnection, not only between the well-being, when we talk about the wellness model, the well-being of people as it relates to jobs. When we look at jobs, we recognize that when you look at the historical works, the Canadian Mental Health Association had a book called unemployment, its . . . body and soul, back in 1982. Now whether you look at . . . What they've showed in that text was this: that for every 1 per cent rise in the unemployment rate, there is a 4 per cent rise in suicides. For every 1 per cent rise in unemployment, there is a 4 per cent rise in suicides.

There is a lot of stress that it puts on families. When unemployment hits, people start blaming each other, fights take place in families, people from the same community start shooting each other down because they are unable to get the jobs. We knew that in regards not only to the crisis in northern Saskatchewan, we are now seeing it in the rural areas. We knew the tremendous problems that unemployment causes.

And when we look at the throne speech, we are starting to see a framework being built. We are seeing that in northern Saskatchewan we are having a northern works program. A lot of people have said hey, that's a start. We've got about 150 jobs upcoming, you know, this coming year. And we want to be able to continually look at that and say hey, there's another aspect as well.

I would like to look at a little bit of the history therefore on jobs during the Conservative reign as it relates to northern Saskatchewan. When I was working with the former member of Cumberland, Lawrence Yew, in regards to northern Saskatchewan, right off the bat we recognized the aspect that the Conservatives, when they got elected in 1982, quickly did away with the monitoring committee to look after jobs, environment, contracts for small businesses, and workers' health and safety. We had a monitoring committee looking after that aspect when we were in government in 1982.

The Conservatives, when they come into power, didn't have the decency to even call up these people who were membership in that committee, because in their own textbooks they figured we didn't even exist in northern Saskatchewan. There was absolutely no way that they would recall such an important committee that wanted to look at employment in the mines.

Within a short period of time during that time from '82 to '84, the numbers of people working in the mines, which had been around 50 per cent and 55 per cent . . . I remember when the NDP were around when it dropped down to 47 per cent at the mine and there was a lot of people saying, what goes here; how come we can't live up to the 50 per cent? And there was a lot of cry out there during that time. But at least we were hovering around 50

per cent on the employment of people at the mines.

When the Conservatives came in that employment rate dropped down to about 10 and 15 per cent, one-fifth of what the NDP record was. It took a lot of work by the member at that time, from the two members from the North, the member from Athabasca, and the member from Cumberland, looking at this issue all the time. And through their work and their effort they were able to come out with a little bit of a better figure and shamed the government into trying to get a little bit of a better deal for the people in the North.

And as time went on, the figures did rise to about 25 per cent. But I might add that the figures were a little bit different than the original figures when the NDP was around.

When the NDP was around we had tougher criteria. We used the definition of a Northerner as 15 years and half your lifetime. When the Conservatives came into power they changed that definition, which meant you could be counted as a Northerner within three years. So their set of statistics is very different than ours. Ours was on a tougher criteria and yet we had 50 per cent of the people hired, and theirs was dropped down to about 10, 15 per cent. So part of the improvement in the record was because simply of a change in the definition of a Northerner.

(1645)

So when we look at the jobs issue and we are trying to start out with a new northern works program of 150 jobs, that's a very important plus, you know, for the people of the North. A lot of the people, as I mentioned before, talk about . . . when I talked about the mental health association and I talked about poverty and unemployment, it's very important to recognize that this issue was not only recognized by important groups such as the Canadian Mental Health Association, but it was also recognized by the major work, you know, just a few years back on sustainable economic development and Brundtland Commission report.

The Brundtland Commission report talked about the need to be able to look at jobs and environment in unison, that we needed to look at balanced jobs and economic development. And at that time also they said we have to look at the question of poverty, because poverty when people are oppressed and conditions and when they were not even recognized by the people in the North, they also . . . and when they didn't have sewer and water systems, there was a lot of environmental problems at their community level as well as the jobs question.

So when we were looking at it, it's important to look . . . therefore not only are you looking at jobs and environment, but it has to be balanced in the equation to poverty because it is an important part of the equation on that Brundtland Commission.

That's why when people, you know, continue to fight for jobs at the rural level or at the urban level, that you have to look at the history of the North, and recognize that when you look at a community and the unemployment rate, you know, after all these years of Tory rule is about

80 per cent in a lot of the communities. So we have to start looking at a way of improving this aspect.

The aspect as it relates to the environment is also very important. The sustainable development in our new environmental assessment body will be very important in being able to come out with something that balances, you know, the aspect of environment as it related to the throne speech.

The other thing that's very important is economic development has to be looked upon in regards to balancing it off with the health of people at the community level. Because unless you have a healthy population to go out and work, it is just not simply a question of simply getting a job. A person has to be physically and mentally healthy in a job situation.

And in many cases part of the issue lies in at the infrastructural level of communities. One of the things that was very slow in coming as far as the Conservatives were concerned, was a sewer and water system and the development of sewer and water system that was highly neglected, you know, by the Conservatives.

When we were in power during the '70s, the sewer and water systems developed to a great extent in the North, especially in the southern fringes of northern Saskatchewan. And we were proceeding at a rate that we would have probably finished off the sewer and water systems already if we had been in government. There was still left about 15 communities without sewer and water.

And the Conservatives have been going on a snail's pace on this. While they were pretty quick at giving \$5 million to GigaText or \$122 million to Cameco, in regards to the sales of the shares on Cameco, they were very slow in building the infrastructure of the community when it related to having good drinking water, you know, for the children of our community.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — Our health costs are rising in the North basically because that basic need of water and sewer is not there. And the throne speech has made an important point that we are going to be proceeding with the need for sewer and water development in northern Saskatchewan.

The other aspect as it related to the North is this. For many years one of the crises in the North occurred when the Liberal government that was operating the federal government. They created a condition where there was less help for people in the promotion and the development of housing. So the housing crisis, you know, fell back in '81. And CMHC (Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation) and the housing, you know, went down. And we had our own Saskatchewan Housing Corporation which, you know, had been part of this important development. We had built a lot of houses in the North.

Now when the Conservatives took over in '82, what happened was this: the housing crisis went down. I want to tie that back into the jobs and to the suicide rates. In my own community alone, in a three-year period following

that Tory rule and the Liberal rule from the federal level, about 13 people committed suicide in my own community. That amounted to over 1 per cent of the population.

When we look at that figure, that 1 per cent population, that's about 18,000 for the city of Regina — 18,000 people. If 18,000 people committed suicide in the city of Regina in a three-year period, we would have a world catastrophe. When it happened in the North, in my home town in Cumberland House, the Tories didn't even mention it. All they did was cut back on the monitoring committee for mines and the jobs that we needed in the mining industry. All they did was keep on cutting back on the important services — community health workers in northern Saskatchewan and everything like that during that period.

So when we look at the important question of having jobs in the housing industry, I was very pleased when I looked at the throne speech, that we were going to go back to start working on housing, that we're going to get new houses and we're also going to be working on renovations.

A lot of people said that we need jobs to rebuild our own houses. Because there was a lack of a maintenance program by the Liberal and Tory governments at the federal level, they lagged behind from what the needs of the people were and also lagged behind because of the Tory strategy on housing, you know, during the years of Tory rule. A lot of the people said, hey some of our houses have become very run down. We want to be able to come out and have a . . . They asked us when we were running for election to come out with a renovation program. And now I see in our throne speech a renovation program for the people of northern Saskatchewan.

So that is a very, very important aspect because when I looked at the North there, when the Tories never mentioned anything about the North in their 10 years of power, when they never mentioned anything about Indian or Metis people in their 10 years of power, when I looked at this government, we looked at the aspect of jobs in northern Saskatchewan on the northern works program. We were able to say yes, we're going to deal with the poverty question and review the issues as it related to social services in northern Saskatchewan.

Yes we would look at the environmental question that the North was concerned about. Yes we would look at sewer and water systems. Yes we would look at housing. Yes we would look at these things and be able to work out in not only a spirit of compassion, but a spirit of co-operation with the people of the North and for Indian and Metis people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — I want to say, in my introduction I mentioned that I would be dealing with the North and I would be dealing with aboriginal peoples. But I want to interlace that a bit with the issue on education.

Having spent a few years in the field of education as a teacher and as a consultant and as an administrator

working in teacher education and also being a principal of a community college and having also worked as the executive director of Gabriel Dumont Institute, I was very pleased in the throne speech when we looked at the need for a continuous change in our educational system. I saw the aspect of a Saskatchewan Education Council being set up, as well as reviews being done in SIAST (Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology) on the improvement of our delivery services to our students, who are our future in this province.

I also looked at the aspect of distance education, but again an important aspect that was neglected by the Tories who had never mentioned Indian-Metis people. I was very impressed with the fact that the Metis people in this province, who were completely forgotten by the government and even the leader at that time made disparaging comments about the Metis, that indeed we looked at the fact of the Metis being referred to in our throne speech. And we are now looking at a Dumont Technical Institute in the province of Saskatchewan.

We will be proceeding, therefore, with a Dumont Technical Institute. And many of the Metis people have been saying, look, we have strongly fought for jobs; we are looking also to being able to stand up with the same certificate as any other Saskatchewan resident. We want to be able to say that these certificates count.

And the Dumont Technical Institute will be a very important addition in regards to being able to deliver services to the Metis and non-status Indians of the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — As it related to the throne speech, I would like to move on into the issue of Indian and Metis people.

I would like again, for historical context as I have done as it related to the province as a whole and as it related to the North, I would like to introduce my remarks by making some historical concepts of expenditures that is related to Indian and Metis people.

When I looked at the history of the Liberal governments and the Conservative governments as it relates to Indian/Metis people in the North, this is what I found out when I checked out the *Public Accounts*.

The *Public Accounts* of course state what was spent by the province of Saskatchewan on a yearly basis. And while some of the information is not 100 per cent complete, I would say at least from looking at it, it's pretty close. So when I looked at the records, I found that when I looked at the last and the best years of the Liberals, I wanted to know how much they spent on Indian/Metis people in the North. This is what I found out. Out of their total budget of expenditures they spent about 2 per cent of their budget and it totalled 8 million at that point in time in history.

When I looked at the Conservatives and I looked at their 1989 figures, their expenditure for Indian/Metis people in the North was 1.2 per cent. It dropped from the Liberals. And their total expenditure was about \$58 million.

When I looked at the NDP here back in 1982, I looked at the figures. We spent over 4 per cent of our budget on Indian/Metis people in the North. And the amount at that time was \$128 million. We spent about \$70 million in that one year more than the Conservatives did as it related to northern Saskatchewan, on Indian and Metis people.

So when you look at it in historical context, when we look at the historical context, we spent over two times more money . . .

The Speaker: — Order. It now being 5 o'clock, I do leave this chair until 7 o'clock this evening.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.