

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — I think in light of Mr. Speaker's introduction, I can only assure the students from Robert Usher that I do attend here on a more or less regular basis. I say to the students, the Speaker and I are at least on good terms.

I want to introduce the students to you, Mr. Speaker — on a more serious state — I want to introduce these students to you and through you to the Assembly. There are 19 students from Robert Usher Collegiate on the northern boundary of my constituency, some of whom will live in Regina Albert North. They're accompanied by their teacher, Fred Steininger.

I look forward to meeting these students after the Assembly and to discussing with them what they see here today. I'd ask all of you to join me and welcome these students here.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to join my colleague, the member for Regina Churchill Downs, in welcoming the students from Robert Usher once again. Prior to the last election I had the honour of always being the MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly) to welcome Robert Usher. Pleased to see teacher Fred Steininger here with the students again this year. And again I ask all members to welcome the students.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to introduce to you and through you a group of 23 students from Walker School, grade 7 and 8 students from the constituency. They're accompanied here by Mr. Barlow and Ms. Avram-McLean. These students come to observe question period and I want to say welcome to them. I'm sure they'll find it enjoyable and interesting, and I'm sure all members would want to join with me in welcoming them here.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Carlson: — Yes, Mr. Speaker. I too would like to introduce a group of students from Melville to you, and through you to the Assembly, from St. Henry School. There's 30 grade 8 students accompanied with their teacher, Garth Gleisinger, and bus driver, Al Schatz. I will be meeting with them after question period. They're here to observe question period. And I would like all members to welcome them to the Assembly this afternoon.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Review of Milgaard Case

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, over the past two or three months an overwhelming number of experts, lawyers, and the public have been calling on the Saskatchewan government to commission an inquiry into the handling of the David Milgaard case.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that many troubling questions continue to be raised by Mr. Milgaard's lawyers and by the Supreme Court in the course of its review which called for a new trial.

My question to the Minister of Justice: will the Minister of Justice today not agree that his government reacted too quickly to the Supreme Court ruling and did not, as Mr. Milgaard's lawyers have said, adequately review the ruling before denying a new trial, before denying an inquiry, and before denying compensation to Mr. Milgaard.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the member for the question. It's a serious question and a very troublesome issue because, as the member has observed, a number of people have expressed their views on it. It's one that has concerned me personally since a very early stage since assuming this office, and I've taken every aspect, every step in the proceeding very, very seriously and have kept myself as well-informed on it as I possibly could.

I want to say that no one denied David Milgaard another trial. That was not at all what I tried to do when I stayed proceedings. We stayed proceedings simply because the evidence in the case is as old as it is, that witnesses have grown old, retired from the police force. I think one of them has died. Memories have faded, and that was obvious before the Supreme Court of Canada, where one of the important witnesses had no recollection of the event at all. On balance — and we had considered this question over a long period of time — we concluded that we did not have enough credible evidence to place before the court to justify proceeding. And on that basis we stayed the proceeding.

Following that, Mr. Milgaard was released by the federal authorities from the Stony Mountain Penitentiary. So we did not construe that at all as denying him a new trial. Rather, we made what we consider to be the responsible decision, as a Department of Justice, as an Attorney General, on the basis of the evidence that we had, and decided to enter a stay.

Now as to the rest of your question, with respect to an inquiry, I don't know what further inquiry there could be. The Supreme Court of Canada was presented with a huge amount of evidence. Heard evidence orally over 14 days, heard at least a full day of argument from all counsel, and everybody there had the opportunity to call whatever evidence they wanted to call, and did call a lot of evidence. And I simply don't know what's left to inquire into.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Supplementary to the minister. Mr. Minister, it would appear to me that the Supreme Court indeed, yes, looked at a lot of information and was able to derive from that information that maybe something was necessary, and maybe Mr. Milgaard may not have received a fair trial in the onset of the original proceedings, Mr. Minister.

But what we have before us now, Mr. Minister, is the fact that there is a growing cloud of mystery surrounding why your government is so steadfastly opposed to ensuring that all outstanding questions are answered. Minister, the Supreme Court have satisfied and has seen . . . we would like to see that justice is indeed done, and that the judicial system is upheld as we see it in our province.

Mr. Minister, if you continue to refuse to abide by the Supreme Court recommendation by initiating a new trial, will you at least do the very least that would satisfy public suspicion about the process that was followed, by initiating a public inquiry to totally clear the names of all those involved.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say with respect to the hon. member that the Supreme Court of Canada found, specifically found, that the trial had been fair; that there was no miscarriage of justice in the way that the trial was conducted. They specifically found that the jury, properly instructed as they were, were entitled to find David Milgaard guilty of the crime.

The Supreme Court of Canada did say that a new trial should be held. But in the following paragraph, as you will have noticed, specifically said, reminded the Attorney General — me — that I had the power to enter a stay. And then went on to say that if I didn't order a stay but went ahead and had a new trial, then they recommended that the federal Minister of Justice give a pardon, give a pardon to David Milgaard if he was convicted.

Now in entering a stay, I think that I was complying with the wishes of the Supreme Court as indicated in those last three paragraphs of the Supreme Court's judgement.

The Speaker: — Order. I think the minister has sufficiently answered. Next question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker, new question. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that your government's treatment of the judicial system may be indeed shameful. You apparently show no respect for recommendations made by the Supreme Court in the Milgaard case and it appears you don't have enough evidence. And how the case was handled by the players involved to conduct an inquiry, and in other matters like the GRIP (gross revenue insurance program) program, have no qualms about breaking contracts and retroactively sanctioning your actions.

Mr. Minister, will you please prove to the people of this province that they can have total faith in their justice

system by allowing a full and open inquiry into the Justice department's handling of the Milgaard case so that indeed competence can again be placed in those who administered the law at the time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court of Canada has conducted the most extensive public inquiry that you could possibly imagine in this case. Mr. Speaker, is the House aware that we provided, we ourselves provided, 25 volumes of evidence — 25 volumes of evidence. That the terms of reference of the federal Minister of Justice were wide enough to allow all of the parties to that inquiry to call whatever witnesses they want to, and they did. There is simply nothing left to inquire into. All of those questions were inquired into by the Supreme Court of Canada, or else the parties themselves deliberately decided not to call the evidence that might have been called.

We for our part called all of the evidence that we . . . was relevant to this case in order that the Supreme Court could do exactly what the federal Minister of Justice asked it to do: to determine whether or not there had been any miscarriage of justice in this case.

Now I simply at the end of the day don't know what is left to inquire into. Certainly there's no percentage having an inquiry to cover exactly the same issues as were covered in the Supreme Court of Canada, and I think that's what we would be doing if we ordered an inquiry in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Well, Mr. Minister, I can appreciate the problems that you may be facing and the government may be facing, but certainly I believe there are still many people around the province and throughout Canada who are questioning and wondering about our judicial system, of whether it is really fair; whether indeed Mr. Milgaard has been treated fairly, whether other individuals will be treated fairly; whether Mr. Milgaard has received due compensation for his time that he has spent behind bars; and certainly the Supreme Court has given you that option of either the new trial or a public inquiry or due compensation.

And, Mr. Minister, certainly the question has also been raised about the fact that is this government really open and honest or accountable. Are you refusing to open up your files on the case because maybe you believe that by doing so something or somebody might be brought out of the closet? If the government has nothing to hide, Mr. Minister, and if you're not without fault, why will you not allow a process of an inquiry to prove no innocence? Will you open up the case to a public inquiry, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, with respect, I don't know how many times I have to say it. All of the material that we had, all of it, was turned over to the Supreme Court of Canada. They had 25 volumes of material related to the Milgaard case. There was nothing withheld. It's all

open. It's all honest. It's all above-board.

Milgaard's lawyer has been through every scrap of it over and over again. Any evidence that could have been called by anybody could have been called before the Supreme Court and was. And the Supreme Court held that the actions of the police had been fair, had been proper, that the actions of the prosecutors had been proper, that the trial had been fair, that the jury verdict was a proper verdict considering the evidence that was before it. And what's left? What's left to inquire into?

And as to your question of compensation, I know of no basis on which the government of the province of Saskatchewan and the taxpayers of the province of Saskatchewan are obliged to pay compensation to a person under these circumstances.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Minister, Mr. Speaker, and to the minister. Mr. Minister, I believe you agree and I believe we all believe in the principle of innocence until proven guilty. And if given that the Supreme Court has called for a new trial, but you refused so that innocence or guilt cannot be proven without doubt, then will you, Mr. Minister, do you assume that Mr. Milgaard is innocent or guilty and therefore will you compensate him for 23 years spent in jail to possibly an error in the judicial system? Will the minister not admit that this reasoning demands that Mr. Milgaard be compensated or will you indeed, as I mentioned before, call for an inquiry to prove that justice was indeed carried out properly, thus proving that compensation is not warranted? Mr. Minister, you tell us you have the information there; well then, allow a public inquiry to show that.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — As to the question of innocence, Mr. Speaker, let me say the following. First of all, at the original trial a jury of ordinary Saskatoon people found Mr. Milgaard guilty. The matter was taken to the Court of Appeal on appeal; the Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. In other words, they were prepared to let the guilty verdict stand.

The matter was then taken to the Supreme Court by way of an application for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court, who reviewed the transcripts and denied Mr. Milgaard an appeal to the Supreme Court.

Then the matter was reviewed by the federal Minister of Justice, by the former Justice Mr. McIntyre, and their first decision was not to have an inquiry. And then on the second application, the Milgaard family were successful in getting an inquiry, and it came before the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court specifically said that it could not find Mr. Milgaard innocent either on proof beyond a reasonable doubt, on that standard, which is the criminal law standard, or on the basis of a balance of probabilities, which is the civil law standard.

Now all those people, all those people, refused to find him innocent and yet you're asking me today to stand in my place and declare him innocent. And I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I am not able to do that nor is it my function to do that.

Now as to the rest of your question, I think I've answered those earlier. There is nothing to inquire into so it would be irresponsible of me to order an inquiry. And I see no basis on which the taxpayers of this province should be asked to pay compensation to Mr. Milgaard in these circumstances.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Union-only Contracting Policy

Mr. Goohsen: — I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Labour. Wealth creation is the only way out of the economic problems of this province. So far, Mr. Speaker, the only time wealth creation is mentioned by the NDP (New Democratic Party) government opposite is when they crush economic development and job creation like AECL (Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd.) or perhaps when they read in the papers about how well the former administration did.

Mr. Minister, there is no question that a solid business environment is needed to ensure that job creation and wealth creation take place in our province. Mr. Minister, I am wondering how union-only contracting for government contracts fits into your extensive wealth-creation strategy.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — On the general question of job creation, Mr. Speaker, the budget will be addressing some of these questions, and in days following the budget appropriate announcements will be made concerning the question of job security.

On the question of a union contracting policy, the government has no such policy at the present time. I have assured the industry and everyone involved that before any such policy would be considered by the government, extensive consultations would have to take place. So in answer to your question, there is no such policy of the government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — Mr. Speaker, in view of the answer, which somewhat evasive because what it says is that we don't have the policy present time, but of course he alludes to the budget wherein there will of course be a decision made along those lines, and so I think I'll continue with my line of questioning.

In a study recently submitted to you, the Saskatchewan Construction Association showed very clearly that the union-only policy imposes unfair, unnecessary, and exclusionary employment policies on industry employees and employers, disrupts industry competition, has negative fiscal consequences for government and taxpayers, and has collateral harmful economic and social effects on the people of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my question to the same minister is: given these facts, can you tell us how this fits into fiscal restraint and your promise for open tendering?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — I can't think of what I can add to my previous answer, Mr. Speaker. The government has not adopted any such policy, and that's about all I can say. I'd like to help the hon. member further with an elaboration of that, but the simple answer is no, there is no such policy.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will pose a new question for the same minister. Mr. Minister, many labourers and most contractors have expressed grave concern over this policy. And I remind you, Mr. Minister, that over 90 per cent of the independent business communities in Saskatchewan is non-union.

And I remind you also, Mr. Speaker, that all through the past six months and even during the election campaign it was made quite clear to the people of Saskatchewan that the union people were going to be getting some kind of compensation or perks from this administration. And we say to you that this is where the direction is coming to.

Can you tell us who you have consulted with in determining these policies, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — I understand the member's problem, Mr. Speaker; he has to fight his way through that list of questions, and he's going to ask them no matter what the answer is.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — All I can say is that there is no such policy.

As to the perks of the trade unions, I think the most important perk is that there is a government in the province of Saskatchewan, as is the case with responsible governments everywhere, who are prepared to meet with all groups in society including the working people of this province and their representatives, and we're doing that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I have a new question. In the comments by the minister, he has said that there is no policy. And I wonder if he would be prepared to issue in this Assembly and outside the Assembly in writing his absolute assurance that there won't be any such policy. Because we have every reason, Mr. Speaker, to believe that we are being led down the garden path on this one.

My question, Mr. Minister. The Saskatchewan Construction Association has advised you on many occasions that the advisory committee you hand-picked does not represent the construction industry in Saskatchewan. In fact the committee that you hand-picked, Mr. Minister, is comprised exclusively of individuals from unionized firms and AFL-CIO (American

Federation of Labour and Congress of Industrial Organizations) affiliated buildings trades unions. In fact in a letter sent to you on April 29 — of which I have a copy here in my hot little hand — from the Saskatchewan Construction Association, which you know is the only industry-wide organization in the province . . . was given no formal input into these discussions.

Can the minister explain to this Assembly how this representation represents the industry when you leave out this very important segment of people?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, the mandate of the committee was the appropriate legislation which they, as the organized sector of the construction industry, may want to see introduced by this government. What kind of bargaining structures, if any, do they want? Do they want something like the law was back in the '70s? Do they want something based on any of the other provinces in this country which have such legislation setting up structures in the construction industry? And that's the basic mandate of the committee.

I asked the committee if they were prepared to give me any advice on the question of union contracting, and they said no. They said they didn't want to do that. So their mandate has been limited to advice and recommendations respecting appropriate bargaining structures, and I expect to receive their report in that connection just any day now.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Business Interest in Saskatchewan

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Economic Diversification and Trade. Mr. Minister, in your government's Speech from the Throne you spoke of 700 companies that are considering locating in this province and bringing with them a significant number of jobs. After six months in power, can you please tell this Assembly with how many of these firms your government is negotiating?

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to the member that we have in fact met with hundreds of business people from Saskatchewan and from across the country, as well as other parts of the world. And the numbers mentioned in the throne speech clearly indicate that there is I think a great interest in the province of Saskatchewan.

If you travel to Toronto, to Ottawa, and talk to business people, the fact that Crown Life is moving here, the discussion about Piper Aircraft, there is actually some enthusiasm about Saskatchewan for the first time in 10 years. And I say that in part because there's been a change in government, the removal of the extended PST (provincial sales tax). And I want to say to you clearly that there's a great deal of excitement. And I think over the next few months you'll be seeing announcements that will show that job creation in fact is one of the highest priorities of this government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the minister: given that these companies are looking for every competitive advantage in today's market-place, what consideration have you given to the effect that tax increases to the business community and proposed increases to the minimum wage will have on the willingness of these companies to come to Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to the member that her question is an important one because balance in the economy is very, very important. In the studies that were done by Crown Life, when they made the decision to move to Regina, they came to the conclusion that the city of Regina and the city of Saskatoon were two of lowest cost cities in the country to do business, taking in provincial tax, city tax, cost of housing, cost of power, cost of utilities.

So I want to indicate to you clearly that in setting direction for the government, the Minister of Finance along with the government is planning a strategy that will, over time, balance the books of this province, because of the huge deficit that we have, because that will indicate a confidence to the business people.

On the other hand, obviously we want to give the kind invitation and incentives for business that will make this an attractive place to be, and I think we're accomplishing that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Haverstock: — Mr. Minister, as you're well aware, in the last six months utility rates have gone up, other taxes have been placed on people, there has been an enormous amount of off-loading to the municipalities, which of course does not make our communities such a great place to come to at this particular juncture. And I am wondering if you could please respond more specifically as to what implications you think that increasing the minimum wage will have on businesses wanting to locate here, and more specifically, what tax increases to businesses are going to do to having people potentially come to our province?

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well I simply don't buy the argument that having people working at a poverty level is the best incentive to create employment. I just don't buy that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — I want to indicate to the member that during the 1970s when we had, maybe not the highest minimum wage, but a relatively high minimum wage, it didn't hurt the economy of Saskatchewan. In fact, those were the best years in the history of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Having said that, I want to indicate that I would be interested in knowing that if you aren't going to solve the debt problem, if you're not going

to deal with it, what kind of ideas you would have. And in saying that Saskatchewan isn't a good place to do business or a good place to live, I think you really are doing a disservice to the people of Saskatchewan. Because the analyses that have been done by many business groups across Canada indicate clearly that Saskatchewan in fact is one of the best places in the country to come and do business, and that's why many companies are now looking at coming here from both eastern Canada and from Alberta.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

STATEMENT

Lieutenant Governor's Audience with the Queen

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, by leave of the House I'd like to make a brief statement.

Leave granted.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Tomorrow in London, England, this province's outstanding Lieutenant Governor, the Honourable Sylvia Fedoruk, will attend the state opening of the British Parliament, and she'll then have the privilege of a private audience with Her Majesty the Queen.

I asked Her Honour to convey personally to Her Majesty the following message which I now read to the House:

In this 40th anniversary of Your Majesty's accession to the Throne, it is my privilege and honour to convey to Your Majesty the respectful and loyal greetings of the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

During these four decades of dedicated service to the people of Canada and the Commonwealth, Your Majesty has personified all that is good in our system of parliamentary democracy. You have helped us understand that the enduring values of family and community are at the heart of our civilization.

You have personally shown to the citizens of our multicultural province, and especially our aboriginal people, that the Canadian Crown is a vital symbol of non-partisan unity, of freedom, and of the rule of law.

The province of Saskatchewan has been privileged to receive Your Majesty four times during your reign. May I express the hope that Your Majesty will favour us with more visits in the years ahead.

My colleagues in the Government of Saskatchewan and I wish Your Majesty many more years of health and happiness in your reign as Queen of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to read the message. The Lieutenant Governor is there and I'm sure that all members will concur with the sentiments expressed in the message, at least I hope they do, and join me in extending best wishes to the Lieutenant Governor during her visit to the United Kingdom.

I might also say that, if my information is correct, that on this day, May 5, it is also the birthday of Her Honour, the Hon. Sylvia Fedoruk, Saskatchewan's Lieutenant Governor, so I think we should all wish her a very, very happy birthday. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of the official opposition, I would like to add our words to that of the Premier in expressing our gratitude to Her Majesty on the 40 years that she has been the sovereign of people of Saskatchewan and indeed all of Canada.

It's something I think a great many people in our province feel very strongly about. I know many people in my own background, even to this day, would think that we would be somewhat remiss, Mr. Speaker, if we did not take the opportunity as a legislature in recognizing these very important milestones in the monarchy.

Our government during the 1980s I think took a number of steps to recognize the importance of the Queen's representative in our province. And certainly some of the traditions which the Hon. Sylvia Fedoruk brings to this legislature are ones that we can be very proud of and I would, on behalf of the official opposition, like to echo the Premier's words of greeting and happy birthday to Her Honour.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order. Order.

Ms. Haverstock: — Mr. Speaker, I hope it's appropriate now to ask for leave to introduce some guests who have arrived to visit with us today.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Ms. Haverstock: — In the east gallery are 57 grade 5 and 6 students from Greystone Heights School in my constituency in Saskatoon. And it's a school of which we're very, very proud in our city. It's the only school on the east side of Saskatoon that hosts five class-rooms for gifted children as well as has an integrated program in their regular program for special needs children.

We're very, very pleased to have you here today. And I would like everyone to join with me in wishing them well and a good day in Regina at our legislature, and welcoming Mrs. Dyck, Miss Voitka, Mrs. Hnatyshyn, Mrs. Touet, Mrs. Durden, Mrs. Herbert, Mrs. Postnikof, Mrs. Schafer who are accompanying them today.

Please join with me in welcoming them and I'll be visiting with them at 3 o'clock this afternoon.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

Mr. Kowalsky: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to conclude my remarks on the address in the reply to the throne speech, Mr. Speaker.

And last night in the initial part of my remarks I had spent considerable time talking about the need for change and the need for change as perceived by the people of Saskatchewan. That change that the people of Saskatchewan perceived, they acted upon by electing a new government to the province of Saskatchewan and a new government is now presenting . . . this week we will be voting on a throne speech which outlines the change that people in Saskatchewan have been asking for.

Mr. Speaker, in that time that I spoke yesterday, I outlined that I had always adopted a belief that politics can serve a very lofty purpose. And I had indicated that I had the belief that government was a way for people to work together — to work together to do the things that we valued as being desirable.

And I mentioned that I believe that good government and good politicians work as a team on behalf of constituents to provide for education and health, transportation, and care for those that have been marginalized by events or circumstances in our society. It is up to us, as elected officials, to construct and to preside over the administration of the means by which we can accomplish these desirable things.

I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that my belief had been somewhat shaken in the last few years when I saw the political scene in the West dominated by people like Mulroney, Reagan, Bush, and Thatcher, whose conservative philosophy differs somewhat from the philosophy I'd been talking of earlier.

They talk about values which, on the surface at least, have some appeal to everybody — values like individual responsibility and individual ownership, individual initiative — but when released without balance, with values of co-operation and community and compassion, these values end up actually hurting the public.

What happened was that these governments embarked on a process of deregulation, of privatization and free trade which ended up using government and taxpayers' money for individual benefit. And so what we saw in the last few years was an emphasis where government money was used for private profit rather than for just the common good.

Then I spent considerable time, Mr. Speaker, giving several examples of how this had happened and particularly how this had happened in the government previous, the Conservative government previous — the wasteful spending that they had gone through as was outlined in the most recent auditor's report which is in addition to the wasteful spending that has been documented in the past over the last five years.

And I wanted to then talk briefly about a second way that this use of public money for private profit rather than the common good hurts our country and our province.

But before I get into that part, I want to indicate and come back to the contrast that is written into this throne speech with respect to government spending and to the accountability section of government spending, because right in our throne speech on page 2 we have a section dealing with open and honest and accountable government, to which my leader and our cabinet and this government is committed to.

And in here we indicate — black on white, Mr. Speaker — that we will make changes to The Provincial Auditor Act to ensure the early release of the Provincial Auditor's annual report and to improve the Provincial Auditor's access to the books of all Crown agencies — something very important and very fundamental, Mr. Speaker, to the working of a democracy. And that is so that the public should have full access to information, and to have it done in a timely basis unlike what the previous government in the last, particularly in its last term of office, was practising.

We are also making amendments to The Financial Administration Act to assure early release of *Public Accounts*. And there will also be a move to ask the members of the Assembly to adopt a code of ethical conduct which would reaffirm a high standard of behaviour to which all public office holders should aspire, Mr. Speaker. I'm proud to be able to support those particular initiatives behind the leadership of our Premier.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — Mr. Speaker, I now want to turn briefly to that second topic. I talked about wasteful government spending in the past. I now want to talk about something else that they did a lot of, and that is the abdication, what I would call the abdication, to corporate dominance, and that is a hallmark of the Conservative government in the western world, in Great Britain, in America, in Canada. And it's a result of that that is causing us to become less and less, to have less and less control over our lives through our governments and individually. And instead we see our livelihood and we see more and more decision making being made outside of our province and outside of our country.

In order to give an example by what I mean by that, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to refer to a controversy that is existing right now in my home town and in northern Saskatchewan with respect to the distribution of milk where we have the Dairy Producers Co-op, who has been delivering milk there for ever since I know of, being

challenged by a multinational, Beatrice milk. And I'm going to use that as an example, Mr. Speaker, to show you how it is that slowly we tend to lose power over our ability to regulate our own affairs.

(1445)

It is this trend, Mr. Speaker, which has caused increasing disparity across . . . not only in Canada, in Saskatchewan, but world wide. Mr. Speaker, some recent statistics have just come out nationally and internationally, and they've shown that since 1960, the time from 1960 to 1992, contrary to what we might have been trying to do, the poorer nations in the world are still getting poorer, and the rich nations are still getting richer, and the disparity between them is not increasing. And the reason that phenomena exists is because corporate powers are exceeding the powers of governments or powers of people to be able to control their lives. And we have as a result a shrinking middle income group.

Now let me give you the more specific example with respect to the bid by Beatrice to infringe on the Dairy Producers Co-operative right to distribute milk exclusively in the Prince Albert area. Mr. Speaker, there is a system put into place in Saskatchewan where milk distribution is controlled by a milk control board. The Dairy Producers Co-op, under licence granted by the Milk Control Board, have had exclusive monopoly to serve the market in the Prince Albert area. They have developed that market and they've served the market well. There have been no complaints. I didn't get anybody ever phoning me complaining about the quality of milk produced by the Dairy Producers, the freshness of the milk, and whether it was available or not available.

Through this distribution system, this supply management system, Mr. Speaker, we were able to have a plant in Prince Albert which employed approximately 40 people. There are also distribution plants in the North Battleford district, Yorkton, Weyburn, Swift Current, and Melfort districts which are affected. They also have a licence under this board. There are, oh, 20, perhaps more, big dairy farmers and numerous smaller suppliers who supply milk to this dairy. There are at least one and a half or two or three mechanics which would make their livelihood directly from keeping the trucks in repair. I would estimate there would be at least one gasoline employee less, perhaps more, if there was a loss of these jobs. But I'm giving you this background, Mr. Speaker, just to give you the impact of what this means to our particular town.

Now the market there was developed by the Dairy Producers and it has been served. And it's interesting that now once the market has been developed we have an internationally owned company . . . I believe it is now owned by Merrill Lynch. It used to be owned by Peter Pocklington and it used to be called Palm Dairies at one time.

What they have done is they've now made application and want to access the P.A. (Prince Albert) market. And the arguments that they use go something like this: well you should give people the choice — the typical argument used by any business who wants to enter a field.

And on the surface it seems to have some appeal because it is only natural for any consumer to say, well sure, I'm not afraid of choices. I wouldn't mind choice A or choice B.

But what happens in this case, Mr. Speaker, as in many cases with international corporations, is that while they are prepared to come in and on the guise of giving us a choice, what they are really after is access to a developed market. And I ask them, what do they give us in return? Will they give us a directorate on their board? Will they put a branch office into Saskatchewan? Will they give us any control over their distribution system? By us, I mean the people in Saskatchewan now who produce milk. Will they give the farmers any guarantee that they're going to have . . . they're going to take their products exclusively? I rather doubt it. I rather doubt it, Mr. Speaker.

What's going to happen instead, if they are given access, is that first of all in order to establish themselves they will undercut and they will offer incentives to merchants. They have already done so. They will offer incentives, financial incentives, for merchants to carry their milk.

Those financial incentives will exist just long enough for them to get their foot in the door. Long enough until they see the force that Dairy Producers Co-op, which is now in Prince Albert, established until it is forced to move and consolidate and go to Saskatoon. Long enough only until we lose those 40 jobs in Prince Albert. Long enough only until the farmers of Prince Albert and north will find it too costly to be able to compete with farmers that are closer to the source or to the producing factories in Saskatoon. In other words, long enough only to put a change into the life-style of perhaps a hundred families in our area.

This is a very insidious but continuing plan which has a detrimental effect and has had a continuous detrimental effect on the population of Saskatchewan, and will continue to have a detrimental effect on the population of Saskatchewan unless we do something about it, Mr. Speaker. Unless we say enough is enough.

It's this way, this type of luring that has led us to lose control over supply and management systems in other areas, Mr. Speaker. It is this type of propaganda and moves that has caused us to lose windows on the world of the oil industry and the potash industry.

Mr. Speaker, I know that now with trade agreements and attempts to have freer flow of trading, that we can't just sit back and ignore world trends. We have to yield. We have to consider new ways.

But I think what we need, Mr. Speaker, instead of giving in totally into the corporate agenda, and thus by doing so we give up control over our own lives and we allow somebody else to dictate our life-style, that we need to develop new ways — new ways of keeping control in this new world of ours. We have to be creative, and we have to depend . . . but we have to depend on our value system and not go along in total with the corporate value system. Because to do otherwise would be to turn Saskatchewan into a large part of that whole scene where the big dogs eat the small dogs in the market-place, and where we'd become more and more like the U.S. (United States) —

the U.S. which has perhaps in some cases the best, but in many cases the worst as well.

It will lead to a situation where fewer and fewer people are in that middle income group. And we've witnessed what happens, Mr. Speaker, we've witnessed just in the last . . . this last week what happens in a society where people feel like they are more and more powerless.

What a tragedy, Mr. Speaker, to have seen the devastation in Los Angeles. What a shock, Mr. Speaker, to have seen the spill-over into our own city in Canada, Toronto, last night. What a shock. Those things, Mr. Speaker, have racial overtones, but the real problem there was a disparity suffered by the people in the lower income levels, unable to access middle income, and feeling frustrated.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, that part of the solution to eliminate disparity is to eliminate the neo-conservative thinking of Margaret Thatcher, Ronald Reagan, Mulroney, and the government before us.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — Mr. Speaker, I now want to turn to briefly outline some of the initiatives which I am very proud of that my government is taking. And I want to do this very briefly. I want to in the field of education say that I'm pleased that our government, led by the Premier and the Minister of Education, has taken some action with respect to some of the difficulties that we're facing in education.

Mr. Speaker, only recently in *The Globe and Mail*, April 30, the Economic Council of Canada made a recommendation in their report, and they released this report just early last week. What they did in this report is they studied the education system in Canada and they predicted that if present trends continue, Canadian schools will send another 1 million young people who are functionally illiterate into the work-force during the 1990s. That was a quotation directly from *The Globe and Mail*.

And they also say that the vocational programs are being held in low esteem, especially in the business world. Well, Mr. Speaker, education is always in a transition and for us the quality of education is always under evaluation. I guess that's because we all feel that education is very important. It affects everyone. It affects every student, parent, taxpayer. It affects government.

The study identified several problems which I won't detail into the record, Mr. Speaker — but it's in — but they parallel some of the issues that have been recognized by my government. But in addition to the things that have been talked about in here, our government has also recognized the problem of rural school population which has to be dealt with.

I was very pleased to hear the minister release the Scharfe/Langlois report. It is generating some very vigorous debate, some good debate. The minister has distanced the government from the drawing of the map for possible new boundaries suggested by the

Scharfe/Langlois report. We're not going to be imposing any kind of new boundaries, but we are suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that there are things that we do want discussion on and we're looking forward to discussion about the public school system.

I'm pleased that the minister will be forming a Saskatchewan educational council to advise her on matters. I am very pleased that she has announced that there will be an inquiry into university education in Saskatchewan. It's very reassuring to know that the review of the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology is now ongoing. They will be meeting with the public in the near future. There have been many concerns over the way SIAST has been managed, Mr. Speaker, that have been mentioned to me. And I encourage all of those who have had at their disposal to go and speak to this review committee. And I am very pleased that there are moves being made by my government to provide equity and access for aboriginal students, Mr. Speaker.

In addition to what's being done in education, I also want to commend the Minister of Health for the health initiatives that are being taken by this government. This government is taking an approach which stresses wellness and the need to improve our collective well-being by enhancing our social and physical environment — words taken right from the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker. There will be an increased emphasis on community-based programs and services, and we're going to try to increase integration and co-operation between facilities. And we've already had the health boards in Saskatoon combined and in Regina combined under new, integrated city health boards.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, in Prince Albert, my own home town, the Holy Family Hospital, the Victoria Union Hospital boards, the boards of directors of Mount St. Joseph and the Herb Bassett Home and Pineland Home Care, all combined and agreed, signed a letter of agreement, whereby a health authority would be . . . the ministry would be asked to put up a health authority in the city of Prince Albert to integrate all of the three services.

This will lead us into a third phase of health care, Mr. Speaker, which I think will be very, very important to the people of Prince Albert and area and will likely serve as a good model for other areas of the province, because here we have an integrated service where the delivery system for acute care and for long-term care and for home care will be handled under one authority. And that authority will have all operating authority over all the areas.

(1500)

It was a co-operative agreement, something that people in our city are very, very proud of. The fact that it was generated from within the community with the support of our ministry and our department is significant. I look forward to working with that committee and I look forward to bringing the minister to Prince Albert to make an announcement regarding the naming of the new health board.

Last, Mr. Speaker, I want to pay a compliment to the

Minister of Social Services who has recently also announced several initiatives. And I want to make particular mention of one which is just announced on April 23, and this is a work training program for people who are now on social service and in need of work. And it's also of special interest to community projects and to non-governmental organizations who maybe have projects but don't have anybody to work on them. This is a voluntary program. We're expecting it to create jobs for about a thousand people.

There are really three criteria, Mr. Speaker. That is: there has to be some type of training opportunity on the job; it has to be a benefit to the community and provision to the community . . . or to the provision of services to groups within the community; and we have to have assurance that this work is not going to be taking other work away from local contractors or existing employees.

Anybody who may want to inquire about this, Mr. Speaker, should feel free to contact any of their MLAs' offices — the opposition offices as well as the government members' offices or the department. And I would encourage especially NGOs (non-governmental organizations) to give this their consideration. I know that a lot of us have been asked about is there any possibility of us employing somebody to do a specific thing — asked this by NGOs. The opportunity is now here.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close now by referring to some remarks made by the member from Thunder Creek last week.

As a parliamentarian who treasures this House and its traditions, I must say that I was appalled, somewhat embarrassed, by the actions on Friday of the member from Thunder Creek. And that's because his behaviour rebounds on all of us — those on this side of the House and those on that side of the House. It demeans a profession of politicians in the eyes of the public. And I need not remind us that our public image is already somewhat fragile.

Simply put, it was a cheap political grandstanding to cover what was a rather weak and indefensible argument. There were preachers who used to be instructed on sermon delivery. If you have a weak point, then yell like heck. Well that seems to have been his strategy.

I'd like to make two quick points, Mr. Speaker. First I want to compliment you on the firmness and fairness with which you handled the situation. No one could accuse you of doing anything but following the rules and procedures of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan.

In this House events occasionally approach a lip of chaos and you keep things from getting unbalanced. But more importantly and more disturbingly, the member from Thunder Creek acted in a way that simply confirms what we have known for a very long time, and that is that the Tory Party has little sense of history, no allegiance to tradition, and no concept of decorum.

Mr. Speaker, as the member from Meadow Lake said in his address moving the throne speech, we not only represent the moment, we represent the British

parliamentary tradition. We serve the people through the Queen and the stability that the monarchy represents. We uphold rules and we uphold the procedures handed down to us through the generations, and in doing so we serve democracy.

It's that simple, Mr. Speaker, and it's that profound. If you break a rule in the House, you apologize to the House, and then you go on. But not in this case, not in this case. The Tories on the other hand flaunt tradition. They despise the past. They turn their noses up on democracy. This was a move that was deliberately set up, and the House Leader as well did nothing to encourage an apology.

There are other examples, Mr. Speaker, when they have flaunted these traditions, our parliamentary traditions. The rules of the House say that *Public Accounts* should be submitted for public scrutiny within a reasonable time. Forget it, said the previous government.

Tradition and common decency say that by-elections should be called in due course so all people will be represented. Forget it, nonsense, said the ex-premier. Long-standing electoral traditions says that a general election will be called at least every four years. Well they didn't pay too much attention to that.

Parliamentary tradition says that we must pass a budget. Not as long as we can get another few billion from special warrants, said the former Finance minister.

The rules of this House say that we must abide by the ruling of the Speaker. What a laugh, what a laugh, says the member from Thunder Creek. Why should I when I can get myself on television? So he mocks our parliament, and he mocks all of us with his calculated ignoring of the Speaker's ruling. I say calculated because all he cared about was taking advantage of the moment. And as I mentioned before, the House Leader made no move to stop it — deliberately planned. Mr. Speaker, the Tory Party has been kicking its ball out of the sand trap for years, and finally its been caught.

So, Mr. Speaker, I take this time during this debate not just to comment on a single incident in a life of this legislature, but to point out to you and to members opposite that civilized behaviour is back in fashion, and the rule of law has returned to this province with your able assistance.

By the way, what was it that the member from Thunder Creek was trying to say? Something about that they knew we knew that they knew that they were fudging the figures or that we didn't know that they knew or . . . I'm not too sure, Mr. Speaker. They'll just have to let some future code-breaker figure out what he was trying to say.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you thought for a moment we were in a time warp last Friday. In naming the member from Thunder Creek, did you feel for a moment that this member was merging with the previous member from Thunder Creek, a member who had also perfected being banished from the legislature? Mr. Speaker, there are some traditions that need not be followed.

But let's deal with the substance of the issue, Mr. Speaker,

with which the member from Thunder Creek was dealing. And I have before me here a letter dated September 22, 1991. It was signed by the Premier, the now Premier, and it's addressed to the previous premier, and it says this:

I write concerning an issue of major importance to the people of Saskatchewan, that being the current state of the provincial government's finances.

And later on he says:

There are a number of reasons for my request . . .

First, (dealing with) special warrants. The public has no way of knowing whether these expenditures were according to the original budget estimates or not . . .

That was a quotation from the letter of the now Premier of Saskatchewan.

Second, (regarding) the flurry of pre-election announcements. In the final days before the calling of this election, your government committed Saskatchewan taxpayers to hundreds of millions of dollars in new expenditures, loan guarantees, and other financial arrangements.

We're referring there, Mr. Speaker, to things like the AECL announcement and Fair Share Saskatchewan, I believe.

Third, your government's . . . record on deficit forecasts. Voters recall that prior to the 1986 provincial election, your government presented a budget which forecast a budget deficit for that year of \$389 million. Within weeks of the election, you revealed the actual deficit was \$1.2 billion.

So he asks that . . . in this letter for a response to these situations. The response, Mr. Speaker, which I have also before me, which has been tabled in this House, to the now Premier of Saskatchewan from Lorne Hepworth who was the minister of Finance at the time. I want to quote a couple of things from it. One quotation on page 2 says:

As you can see, we have kept an extremely tight rein on 1991-92 provincial expenditures.

Boy, that's got to be the joke of the day. He also goes on to say in another part:

With the exception of the three items noted above, announcements made in recent weeks will not add to the 1991-92 provincial deficit.

Another quotation. And then, last of all, Mr. Hepworth says:

. . . there are numerous factors at play that must be taken into consideration. On balance, however, I see no reason to alter our target of a \$265 million deficit.

Now, now I ask the members opposite: have you asked yourself if you knew and if Hepworth knew when he wrote this letter? Did you know when Hepworth wrote

this letter that it was over 265? Did you know? And if you knew, then it was your job to tell him not to put this down, not to come around nowadays and ask somebody else if they knew — when you've supported them in the first place.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — Well, Mr. Speaker, we'll put that to rest.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan decided not to follow the path that was led by the previous government. They, on October 1991, decisively elected a new government because they wanted change. And, Mr. Speaker, the change that we're effecting in this government is one to put people first, is one to tackle poverty, is one to tackle education, tackle health. And in order to do that we first of all have to tackle the deficit.

There have been numerous examples, Mr. Speaker, that our government . . . and numerous examples of initiatives taken by our government. And I want to mention just today's initiative, put it into the record, because it was today or last night that the Associate Minister of Finance made an announcement publicly as to the direction we're taking with respect to cutting back on what we regard was wasteful and excessive spending.

In this particular case, Mr. Speaker, there was a . . . this is a follow-up to a situation where George Hill, the president of SaskPower, was paid \$450,000 a year plus perks. He was replaced by a chief executive officer who's getting \$150,000. I'm proud to say that that's quite a saving. I'm proud of that. I'm proud of that. The members opposite don't want to hear about it, but it's true. That's what's happening. As a matter of fact, all of our chief executive officers are being limited to \$150,000.

(1515)

The executive salaries and benefits which were in place under the former government, which they never said a thing about until it was brought to their attention . . . Now they squeak and holler a bit somewhat hypocritically. It's going to save Government of Saskatchewan \$1.5 million a year to change the benefits to executive salaries and other benefits. The new administration has reduced salaries for senior executives by 20 per cent. Car allowances which range from \$650 to \$800 a month will be reduced by 50 per cent. And no longer will golf club memberships and other club memberships be paid for by the government.

Mr. Speaker, it's our feeling that if you're going to serve the government, you should be prepared to do so without dipping into the public trough in the manner that was accorded by the previous government.

I want to close, Mr. Speaker, with one more remark, and that is an example that I think of often now when I'm wondering how to meet the people of Saskatchewan or how a politician should conduct himself with the people of Saskatchewan.

When I was a teenager living in North Battleford, I remember going to a rally where Tommy Douglas was the

speaker. And we were supposed to have dinner with Tommy that evening. I was about 14 years old. And I remember going there with some excitement and sitting and waiting around this table. And we were waiting and waiting and waiting, and Tommy didn't show up. And we were saying, we wonder what's happened?

And then we got a message that Tommy had been there all along in the room next door, and he was having a very important meeting. When the door opened, to my amazement, Mr. Speaker, out came Tommy and out came a woman who was widowed and was farming in an area north of North Battleford — very ordinary person. And she had some concerns regarding an issue pertaining to pasturing that were very important to her.

And Tommy Douglas took time from his dinner to go and speak to that lady and to listen to her story. And he pointed out to me, although I didn't quite realize it at the time, Mr. Speaker, how important it is that a politician sit and listen and be willing to listen to a person who's got something important to tell you.

Mr. Speaker, it's in that tradition that I support this throne speech, and I support my leader, because this throne speech represents something that represents a listening to the people of Saskatchewan. And I intend with my vote to continue to work to change the way the Government of Saskatchewan was working — to change the balance so that we're not working strictly towards individual greed but we have a balance, the individual rights with the balance of the community.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this opportunity to address the throne speech.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It indeed is nice to be able to rise today to discuss the amendments to the throne speech. This throne speech we felt was so devoid of anything useful or constructive for a future in this province that we thought that it was absolutely incumbent upon us, Mr. Speaker, to put in an amendment so that it would at least have enough substance to bother wasting our time voting on it.

So in addressing this amendment and my support for the amendment, I want to take a little different direction than I did when I spoke earlier to the throne speech itself. Although I had given some thought to taking it apart clause by clause and working through it and pointing out to the people of Saskatchewan exactly what is lacking in the Speech from the Throne, and what will be lacking in our budget and where we're going to be going. But the reality is that that would probably not serve as much purpose as to maybe make a few comments directly on some of the speeches that we heard.

I can only say, Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity, that a few weeks back we thought there wasn't going to be any hockey games in this part of the season to be watching on television. And I thought at first, well that's good; we've probably seen enough hockey on television this winter anyway. But then last night as I realized that the speeches being delivered here were the entertainment for the

evening in alternative to the hockey game, I was pretty happy for the folks out in the country that they had something worthwhile to listen to because it certainly wouldn't have paid to bother listening to some of the speeches we heard here.

And I just want to refer to some of the things that were brought up, Mr. Speaker, in those speeches, and give you a little bit of direction as to the reality of where some of these things should be going to, because there's always two sides to every story. And of course the dust storm that we had last week was foremost in a lot of folks' minds. And it certainly had people thinking about what would happen out in the country over the next year.

And obviously, as the dust blew out in the country . . . and I want to tell you that I was in Maple Creek on Saturday, and I discussed with the agrologist out there the wind storm that had occurred. He told me that he'd been out to the Fox Valley area and had actually witnessed some of the fields after the big blow and that they had been blown down to the hard pan.

That of course, for those folks that may not know what I'm referring to, means that all of the soil that was tilled last year blew away from the top right down to the depth of the final working. So every bit of ground that had been loosened up by an implement over the past year had blown away. And that was a very serious situation.

But out in the country we have a unique kind of people — people that can sometimes laugh at themselves. And one of the farmers pointed out to me that he'd looked out the window during the wind storm and he said it was so windy. And I said, how windy was it? And he said, it was so windy that there was a gopher out there 15 feet in the air and he was still digging.

Well only farmers can show that kind of spirit and make jokes about the disaster that they're living through. And it's that kind of spirit that keeps them going through all of these difficult times. Because when you consider all of those kind of problems and the things that are happening with the GRIP program . . . And I note with my tongue in my cheek that last year that GRIP was referred to as the reason to gripe, and this year the GRIP is not the reason to gripe; it's the reason to grope, because all the farmers are groping around to figure out what they griped about last year and what to do next to try and save themselves this year.

The NDP have said to us all through last summer and all through the fall and through the campaign and all winter that they could do better and they would do better. Well, Mr. Speaker, they took a trip down to Ottawa. They spent, I think somebody says, \$400,000 and they were going to do better. They were going to get more.

And I want to tell you and tell the rest of the folks that I'm a farmer — farmer first still, and a politician second. And my hand is out. I am waiting for this money that the Minister of Agriculture promised that he was going to get us. I'm standing here waiting.

I'm waiting for him to explain to me also why he continues to say that the federal government is the only

one that has any responsibility. Certainly the federal government does have responsibility — there is no question about that — but at the same time I will point out to this Assembly and to the rest of the folks that last week I received, as a farmer, a cheque in the mail. And when I opened it up, I found that I had received money from the federal government. That money was itemized as being an acreage payment from the federal government.

Now the people in the government tell us that the federal government owes us a third line of defence. Well I say to you, what is a third line of defence? Is that not money from the federal government? Now maybe it wasn't enough, and I guess in farming the point can be made that no matter how much you get it's never enough. Money's like that for everybody in society.

Now we have to be a little bit thankful for what we get because if we step on the very toes of the people that are helping us, how long are they going to continue to help us? Why don't we say thank you, go with our hat in hand to Ottawa and say, we appreciate the help that you've been giving us, we do need some more, but we appreciate what you're doing, instead of stabbing them in the back and trying to make them look bad every time we turn around?

Now we understand that the Minister of Agriculture is trying to push everybody to go into a market-price crop insurance. Why is . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I have to remind the member that he has already spoken in this debate and he must speak strictly to the amendment. And reading the amendment, there is absolutely no reference whatsoever to the changes to the GRIP program in the amendment. So I will ask the member to keep his remarks to the amendment that has been made.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will no longer refer to the GRIP program because after all we have sort of bludgeoned it to death. And I will continue on to the other parts of the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — One of the other members, Mr. Speaker . . . and I'm sure that you won't mind if I refer to the speeches that were made to the amendment by the other members if I don't point out directly which ones spoke on them but just generalize. And what I will generalize on is that, first of all, I made some little notes as you will see here as each one of the speakers was up. And that of course should point out that I . . .

The Speaker: — Order. I want to again remind the member that it's your duty, not mine, to make sure that your remarks are in keeping with the amendment. And if you're referring to speeches that other members have made and does not pertain to the amendment, I'm going to rule you out of order.

An Hon. Member: — He said it was on the amendment.

The Speaker: — He did not. He said general terms. He would speak in general terms and if it did not refer

specifically to the amendment he would hope that the Speaker would take that into consideration. His remarks must pertain to the amendment.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I most certainly will concentrate my discussion on the exact amendment and the words of the amendment. And I also will specifically talk about those things that those members have talked about in their speeches to this Assembly on that specific issue.

Now one of the members brought up the fact that they were going to bring in the old dental program and we wondered why, as we were writing up our amendment, why that wasn't in the throne speech. That promise was thrown out many times through the election, and we thought that if a government is going to put together a throne speech with their first intention of approaching a new budget, that they would in fact start to deliver on some of their promises. And the fact is that they are not mentioning this particular project.

They talk about closing our schools. And we just heard the past speaker talk in fact about the fact that he supports a lot of the Scharfe/Langlois report being restudied, and just after a time when we saw 600 people assembling in the school over in Swift Current and very upset with the prospect that the government would bring in this particular document and use any of its recommendations.

The Minister of Education has sent letters to us indicating that that report would not be used. And now we hear the member opposite saying in fact that they are going to. What a contradiction. And it makes me very, very upset to hear that there might be a contradiction of that kind, Mr. Speaker.

We also heard people alluding to things like the Rafferty-Alameda dam in just the second-last address. And they alluded to some of the figures. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that it's only fair and proper that we make sure that the people of the province of Saskatchewan know exactly what those figures were and what was happening. The member across the way alluded to the fact that the Rafferty-Alameda dam had been started at \$42 million and had ended up at \$50 million. Well the figures that that member used were accurate but they were not portrayed in a proper explanation of how the process really worked. The \$42 million that the member alluded to was the cost only of the face of the dam — the dirt that you put between the two hills. And I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that it takes a lot more to build a dam than just putting dirt between two hills.

In fact, the reality is that the project was supposed to cost \$120 million to begin with. That was the starting figure, not \$42 million, because there's a lot of things that have to be done. Then the American government kicked in 40-some million dollars American which comes to about \$50 million Canadian, and the reality of life is that the Americans would not be kicking in more money than the entire project would have cost. So that refutes the argument that \$42 million was the projected original cost, because they simply were not going to pay for more than the cost of the whole project.

The reality is that there was a cost overrun and that cost overrun went from 120 to \$150 million, and there's a logical explanation for that that the people of this province will remember if they just think back to the days of the construction and all of the problems that resulted while that construction was on. And those problems, of course, resulted from litigations that forced the government of the day to go into the building of extra facilities for wildlife and those kinds of things. So if you have to go out and build some extra things as a result of litigation, you can't really call them cost overruns; you can only call them legitimate costs of the project forced by the public.

So then one of the other members gets up and alludes to the fact that it is terrible and almost sinful in this province that somebody was building a golf course beside it. Well I always thought that when you build a dam to save water, the recreation project . . .

(1530)

The Speaker: — Order, order. I must remind the member that he has spoken in this debate and he must limit himself to the amendment that has been made. And he is not doing that. I would ask him to . . .

An Hon. Member: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker?

The Speaker: — Yes, what's your point of order?

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Speaker, I am raising this point of order because the amendment that he is speaking to very precisely points out that what we want to talk about on this amendment is that "... and further regrets . . .", Mr. Speaker, if I may just quote the amendment itself as we have proposed it, "... and further regrets that the government has failed to provide any economic leadership or positive solutions . . ."

Now the economic leadership that we're talking in part and parcel, beyond the economics as diversification and so on, is the agricultural aspect which we feel is very important. Now the economic or positive solutions is GRIP, we would contend, as being one of those positive solutions that we are looking for this government to institute. And that's why it's in this amendment as we're proposing and that's why our members, who feel very strongly about it, are bringing this up, Mr. Speaker. I draw that to your attention.

The Speaker: — I think the words of the member are well taken if they are then applied to the amendment. But I fail to understand how criticism of the overrun of the dam that was built by the previous government and the criticism of a golf course that is being built there has anything to do with providing leadership, positive economic leadership, of the present government.

If the member can relate that to the amendment that is made, I will let him continue. But so far he has not related it at all as to how that relates to lack of positive leadership by this government. If he can do that he can continue.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that it shows a lack of economic

leadership when members of the government themselves condemn projects that the previous administration were working on. It's a lack of economic leadership when you plant in the minds of people a fever of doom and gloom about all of the good things that we have. When you start putting people down who in fact do golf, that is a lack of economic leadership because you're saying to people that they shouldn't have recreation in their lives in our province. And that cannot possibly be. You have to have a sense of well-being, a sense of wanting to live, and a sense to want to have a reason to get up in the morning. And you can't just do that if you're always surrounded with doom and gloom.

And that was the point I was trying to make, Mr. Speaker — that we have to have positive solutions to the problems we have, positive solutions of economic leadership.

Now in the area of economic leadership, we could ask where in the budget have we failed to talk about things like our parks. And we wanted to talk a minute about recreation and I'd like to mention the Cypress Hills Provincial Park. It's in my constituency. And economic leadership would have been, Mr. Speaker, if they would have put into this throne speech some direction that the Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources would in fact do something to make our parks more attractive to the tourists of the country and perhaps from across the United States.

Last year we were disappointed to find out that a lot of folks weren't coming to Saskatchewan for their holidays. And if we don't show some initiative, some kind of future planning to get the tourists to come back to our parks, to get people, even in Saskatchewan, to start taking some time out to go and use our facilities, then those facilities are going to end up having to be closed, and we're not going to have them any more.

I've had people, for example, say that the very simplest thing like planting some extra trout in the lake there would be economic leadership because it would bring in more tourists if the people could actually catch a fish once in a while. If there's only enough there to feed the birds that live on fish and the old fellas that are retired that go out there to spend a few hours and take their grandsons, never get a bite, they're going to go. I mean they're not going to come here. They'll leave. They'll go somewhere else. So we've got to have that kind of economic leadership, Mr. Speaker, that provides for some recreational facilities to be expanded, and putting one at the Rafferty dam would be an excellent idea.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — The sound of one hand clapping.

Mr. Goohsen: — I guess I shouldn't stop to listen to the commentaries. But one thing I have to note, Mr. Speaker, is that whenever I get up to talk, at least I get some hecklers, and it makes me feel that at least I'm doing some good because somebody's paying attention. And I did notice that some people spoke without even so much as a comment from the gallery. So it makes my day actually, and I enjoy it.

We had, Mr. Speaker, wondered why in this speech, as I wind up my remarks about the amendment, why in this Speech from the Throne there wasn't more emphasis put on the plebiscites that were held, and showing the people which direction the future is going to take us in that area of a positive solution to the problems that people feel we have in our political system. And that problem, Mr. Speaker, is that people feel that politicians aren't listening, and many of the other members have alluded to that. And the reality is that they think we don't come back to them.

Well in our plebiscites — we had three plebiscites, you all remember them — we feel that these things should have been in this document. That there should have been positive direction outlined of where we're going on those three important issues. And I'm not going to go through them, each individual one, because all of you know what they were about.

But the government has been ducking those plebiscites and the concept of it. And I want very much to remind the government that if we're going to have a positive solution to the problems of this province, we've got to look at what the people want and have indicated in the plebiscites where they voted so very dynamically in numbers in one direction or the other.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the members opposite will consider that economic leadership is important in a throne speech, and it's important in a budget, and it's important that we have sustenance and substance into this throne speech. And I would encourage the members opposite to forget their partisanship and to forget about the role they have to play of naturally opposing everything that we say, because we're not really saying that a lot of the things they're doing is so terrible. We're saying, we just have to do a little more. And we would ask them to join us and support this amendment.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cline: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me to join in this debate on the Speech from the Throne. As I indicated last time I had the opportunity to speak, it's a real honour for me to represent the people of Saskatoon Idylwyld in this legislature.

And I'd like to join with some others in this House, Mr. Speaker, in complimenting the member from Meadow Lake on his speech in support and moving the Speech from the Throne and also the member from Regina Wascana Plains. Both of those individuals did a very commendable job and I was proud to be associated with them, Mr. Speaker.

And I'm also proud to associate myself with this government and with this Speech from the Throne. It is a very positive new direction for our province, Mr. Speaker, and I've had the opportunity since the speech was read by Her Honour, the Lieutenant Governor . . . and the speech has certainly received a very positive and favourable reaction from people in my constituency who have been waiting for a new direction from the Government of Saskatchewan for a long time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cline: — And I want to touch on some of the positive aspects contained in the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, although not all of them, because other members have most ably addressed some of the other aspects in the Speech from the Throne.

But one aspect of it that has not been addressed is what Her Honour said concerning The Occupational Health and Safety Act and the fact that amendments will be introduced to that Act to better protect people in the work place and to address the recommendations of the Occupational Health and Safety Council.

Mr. Speaker, no one, to state the obvious, should die on the job. But from 1986 to 1990, Saskatchewan averaged 29 fatalities in the work place and also 16 occupational farm fatalities. In 1991, I'm sorry to say, as the minister announced in the legislature last week, 40 individuals died in the work place. And accidents should be prevented in the work place, Mr. Speaker, but in 1990, 13,715 workers were injured on the job.

We have to remember, Mr. Speaker, that these numbers sound somewhat sterile, but they represent people, people with families and the same aspirations for a productive and healthy life-style that all people have. They are spouses, parents, sons and daughters, co-workers, sisters and brothers and friends. And I'm sure we've all had the experience, Mr. Speaker, of seeing someone we know either killed on the job or injured on the job.

These numbers not only represent a staggering human cost but also, Mr. Speaker, they represent a great loss in economic terms. We suffer from income loss, productivity loss, loss of experienced workers, social service costs, health care costs, workers' compensation costs. And all of these costs are unacceptable in our province.

Unfortunately in the 1980s we saw from the Government of Saskatchewan, the previous government, not only a lack of commitment to enforcement of occupational health and safety standards but also, very sadly, an insensitive and unresponsive workers' compensation system. And in light of that, Mr. Speaker, I was very happy to see what Her Honour said concerning this issue in the Speech from the Throne.

And I'm particularly pleased that the extremely difficult financial situation that the government finds itself in will not prevent the government from improving occupational health and safety laws and regulations. Because it is one thing to have occupational safety laws and regulations, Mr. Speaker, but it is another thing to be committed to enforcing them. And I believe that enforcement of them is indeed the key to improving our province's safety record. And I hope that none of us, whether governments, unions, or workers, are content as long as there is a single, preventable work-place accident occurring.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cline: — So I thought that that was a very positive initiative in the Speech from the Throne. Another positive initiative, Mr. Speaker, was what Her Honour said about this government moving forward in the area of prevention and wellness in health care, including life-style education, assistance towards independent living by the elderly, emphasis on community-based programs and services, home care, and hospital integration and co-operation.

I was particularly pleased as well that the government intends to consult with consumers, health-care providers, and community leaders through the creation of a provincial health council to address some of these issues. This to my mind, Mr. Speaker — and many, many people in my community have reacted positively to it — is a very visionary approach.

Much has been said of late, Mr. Speaker, by some of the members opposite about health care and what this government may or may not do with respect to health care, and in particular medicare. And I pause to reflect upon the history of medicare in our province and our country since this is the 30th anniversary of medicare in Saskatchewan, which of course was the precursor to a national medicare plan.

This, Mr. Speaker, involved a great deal of courage, determination, and vision on the part of the then government of the day, the government of T.C. Douglas and later, Woodrow Lloyd.

History tells us some very interesting things about the role of the party with which I am associated in the health care field and also the role played by the other parties represented in this legislature. The government of T.C. Douglas of course first brought in hospitalization, a first in Canada and North America, on January 1, 1947, which later led to national hospitalization.

(1545)

I was interested to hear from the member for Arm River yesterday that it was in fact John Diefenbaker who pioneered medicare in our country. I thought I might point out to the member from Arm River that actually, if we want to go back in history, it was the Liberal Party at its national convention in 1919 which first proposed a national, comprehensive health insurance system.

The problem was, Mr. Speaker, as the member from Moose Jaw says, this was all talk and empty promises. The Conservatives took no action, the Liberals took no action, and in fact eventually when the CCF/NDP (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation/New Democratic Party) started to bring in medicare, it was a long and bitter fight, opposed at every step of the way by the Liberals and their political cousins, the Conservatives.

But despite their lack of enthusiasm, Mr. Speaker, on December 16, 1959, then Premier Douglas announced to the legislature his government's intention to enact medicare, which was a first in Canada and in North America — very impressive, Mr. Speaker, from a small province with limited resources. Of course on July 1, 1962, medicare was enacted into law.

Today, Mr. Speaker, to listen to the Liberals and Conservatives, one would think that they were enthusiastic supporters of the plan at that time. But the facts show they were not.

In the 1960 provincial election campaign, the Liberal and Conservative parties campaigned in opposition to medicare and attempted to unseat Mr. Douglas and his party with respect to that plan. They were aided and assisted by the College of Physicians and Surgeons, which at that time spent tens of thousands of dollars in an effort to defeat the CCF.

The government did not waiver from its objective and the government was re-elected in 1960. As I said, the law came into place July 1, 1962 when The Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act became law.

But this too came only after a fight between the time of the 1960 election and 1962. Firstly, the Liberal Party did everything it could to obstruct and prevent the passage of the legislation in this Chamber. The College of Physicians and Surgeons, once the legislation was passed, demanded its repeal. The various right-wing thinkers in our province formed the Keep Our Doctors committees, which launched a vicious, fearmongering smear campaign against medicare. The Liberals resorted to all sorts of tactics and theatrics, including an attempt by the then opposition leader to kick the door to this Chamber down.

Municipal councils passed resolutions against medicare. Hospital boards denied medical privileges to physicians sympathetic to medicare. The College of Physicians and Surgeons denied licences to physicians from elsewhere. Rallies were held on the legislative grounds against medicare. And of course the doctors went on strike July 1, 1962 to back their demands that medicare be withdrawn.

And as I said, Mr. Speaker, the representatives of the Conservative and Liberal parties were together as one on this particular issue. But the then premier, Mr. Speaker, Woodrow Lloyd, and his government did not back down. With considerable courage and the conviction that all Saskatchewan people should enjoy equal access to medical care, the party I'm associated with enshrined medicare into the social fabric of this province and this country.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cline: — So that is the history of the issue, Mr. Speaker, and those are the facts. And my point is this: I and the members of this government do not need to be lectured to or taught any lessons by the members of the Liberal and Conservative parties about medicare. The record speaks for itself, Mr. Speaker.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we have the opposition complaining about the province's financial situation. And I must confess that this has struck me as passing strange, Mr. Speaker, because taking over the Government of Saskatchewan from the previous administration is a little bit like coming back into your house after a group of drunken yahoos have been having a wild party over a

long weekend.

In short, the finances of the province are in a bit of a mess to say the least and I would predict, Mr. Speaker, that it will be a very, very long time indeed before the people of this province entrust the members opposite with the financial purse strings of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cline: — Whatever the members opposite may say in this regard, Mr. Speaker, people in Saskatchewan know that no Saskatchewan family could have run a household like the member from Estevan ran this province. The revelation recently, Mr. Speaker, that some \$15,000 worth of liquor was delivered from the Saskatchewan Liquor Board warehouse to the legislative office of the PC (Progressive Conservative) minister responsible for the Liquor Board was very disconcerting, Mr. Speaker, especially when one considers that they got the booze but we got the hangover.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cline: — Then we have 168 passes worth almost \$10,000, Mr. Speaker, to the Big Valley Jamboree, purchased by the Liquor Board for distribution by the minister to his friends and colleagues.

Then we have 23 employees seconded to Executive Council from departments for political work, total wages paid by the affected departments being almost \$1 million. Then we have 42.5 million estimate for the province's share of the Rafferty-Alameda dam, but the figure of 155 million was spent up until the time of the 1991 election.

Not to mention, Mr. Speaker, fiascos like GigaText, Supercart, Joytec, High R Door, Austrak Machinery Corporation, Pro-Star Mills, Nardei Fabricators Ltd., and Canapharm Inc., all of which were projects of very little thought — other than the immediate political agenda of the day — were put into and all of which cost us millions of dollars, Mr. Speaker.

And recently the Provincial Auditor has reported in his special report to the Public Accounts Committee that some 130 employees, Mr. Speaker, were paid over \$5 million by government organizations which did not have them doing anything. And I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that that is extremely disappointing and disconcerting to me, and it's extremely distressing to the people I represent.

Also we have the auditor reporting that nine organizations of the government made payments for advertising totalling \$439,000 over a two-year period, but the advertising was never received.

We also have five government organizations reporting goods and services of a value of \$42,000 provided to cabinet ministers and other officials of the previous government without charge. We also have goods and services totalling \$1.7 million given by eight government organizations to other government organizations, Mr. Speaker.

And I think the question that many people are asking is,

what sort of accountability you can have in government if this kind of misspending and misappropriation can occur without these members being taken to task. And I realize that the members opposite were taken to task, or their parties at least, in the last provincial election, Mr. Speaker.

But it seems to me that a lot more needs to be done in terms of asking the question as to how this could have occurred and what role present and past members of the Conservative caucus may have played in these developments.

And I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I agree with statements made by Mr. Eisler in the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* of May 2, 1992 where Mr. Eisler says, and I'm quoting:

It is deeply offensive to hear the Opposition Tories attempt to deflect attention from the scandalous way they treated the public purse during almost a decade in power.

They seem not the slightest bit contrite over the fiscal mess the province now finds itself in. It's as if they have nothing to be ashamed about or repentant for.

The facts are that while the Devine Tories were in power, people in government engaged in practices with public funds that at times were despicable, in some cases perhaps criminal.

What more do the Tories need to be shown before they will atone for their behavior or at least admit they have much to answer for?

And I think that's a very good question, Mr. Speaker. There are a lot of unanswered questions concerning the role of Conservative politicians both elected and unelected, and Conservative government officials concerning the public, the finances of our province, Mr. Speaker. And I hope the Conservatives will, as Mr. Eisler says, eventually come clean and assist the government in explaining to the people of Saskatchewan exactly where all of this money has gone.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cline: — I'm very pleased, Mr. Speaker, in view of what I've said about the lack of accountability in the previous administration, with the actions today taken by this government including the appointment of the Gass Commission, which has recommended ways in which we will ensure that what happened under the previous administration never happens again.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have every confidence in our Premier and the members of our cabinet and the members of . . . my colleagues in the New Democratic caucus. I sincerely believe that we now have a government which consists of honest and competent people.

I believe in the future of our province. I want to end on a positive note, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the province of Saskatchewan, with its resources and most importantly

with its people and with its history of being able to solve problems together, has a great future. And I believe that the 1990s can be Saskatchewan's decade. With good management and community co-operation and even moderate improvements in the price of some of our goods sold on the world market, we will pay the bills that have been run up, and we will provide new opportunities. We have every reason, Mr. Speaker, for hope and optimism, and we will indeed make the 1990s our decade.

So I'm very pleased and proud, Mr. Speaker, to support the Speech from the Throne, and I will be voting accordingly upon the division. Thank you very much.

(1600)

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Renaud: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank you also, Mr. Speaker, for your leadership in the first sitting of the twenty-second legislature for the province of Saskatchewan. And my constituents, Mr. Speaker, from Kelsey-Tisdale, convey their support to you, through me, in this second sitting.

I'd like to thank my colleagues, the hon. member from Meadow Lake and the hon. member from Regina Wascana Plains, for moving and seconding the throne speech.

I rise in support of the throne speech, Mr. Speaker. But before I get into that, I want to make one comment. The hon. member from Maple Creek mentioned tourism in his response to the amendment, and encouraged us to look at economic development and tourism. And I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we are interested in economic development and tourism. And the reason, Mr. Speaker, that tourism dropped last year was not because of that; it was because the government of the day had a 7 per cent PST tax. That's the reason tourism fell.

Our government, Mr. Speaker, abolished that tax on October 21, and I'm proud of that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Renaud: — On October 21, Mr. Speaker, the province of Saskatchewan gave the new government a mandate, a mandate to change. They elected a new government in 55 seats — 55 constituencies across this province. Rural areas, cities, farmers, labourers, professionals, business men — they voted for change, Mr. Speaker. And they would have elected 66 members, all 66 seats, if the campaign had lasted another few weeks.

You ask yourself why. Well, Mr. Speaker, the reason is the members across, whose management ability was quite simply not satisfactory to the people of this province. In fact, to use a favourite word of some of the members next, their manageability was a liability.

The people in Kelsey-Tisdale and across the province, Mr. Speaker, stated by their vote that we cannot have a debt of this magnitude in the province of Saskatchewan — a debt that will destroy our ability to govern, that will destroy our ability to control our own destiny.

The former premier said deficits are only deferred taxes. And then they left us with a debt, Mr. Speaker, a debt on a per capita basis that is the second largest among all the provinces in Canada — nearly \$14 billion. A debt of nearly \$14,000 for every man, woman, and child in the province of Saskatchewan. A debt, Mr. Speaker, that if it is not turned around in a very short time will gobble up government services like health care, education, agricultural policies.

And, Mr. Speaker, to speak on the Crown corporations for a moment, a government that drained the retained earnings from those Crown corporations, put them into general revenue to hide the deficit, weakening not only the government's operating side but also the Crown corporations which are so important, a vital aspect to the Saskatchewan economy.

The people on October 21, Mr. Speaker, elected a party that they trusted, a party who when in office before showed surplus after surplus. In 1982 the Consolidated Fund was some \$139 million to the good, in the black. And the debts in the Crown corporations was merely \$3.3 billion, and it was a self-liquidating debt, Mr. Speaker.

On April 27, Mr. Speaker, of this year, our government stated emphatically that in the throne speech we will begin to face the challenge of putting our financial house in order. This was the first of our election promises, Mr. Speaker, and it was one of the reasons for our resounding victory.

Saskatchewan people realize, Mr. Speaker, that it is not an easy challenge, but they know that together we can meet the challenge. People in every sector will join with us to begin our mandate for change. They know that this debt was not created by them or their children, and their children must not be left with that great burden.

Interest on our debt, Mr. Speaker, is money that could be spent to help create employment, health care, education — over \$700 million this year alone. This of course cannot continue. If it was allowed to continue, Mr. Speaker, that interest bill could reach \$1.5 billion in the next few years. That's the old show and the old title, *Gone with the Wind*.

You know, Mr. Speaker, in the past few weeks there has been talk of health care premiums. In a 1971 throne speech, the New Democratic government of the day eliminated the deterrent fees put in by the Liberal government and the medical fees to the elderly.

And you yourself, Mr. Speaker, why are we talking about them now? Well, Mr. Speaker, I look at the members across and I look at how they managed this province. And I say to them, why? There are thousands of reasons why, and they all say Tory mismanagement.

I look at the special auditor's report, Mr. Speaker, and I note \$16,000 for cabinet ministers to attend the Big Valley Jamboree, for food, administration, trailer rentals, alcohol. Yes, indeed. They've got the alcohol, and as a member just said moments ago, the people of Saskatchewan got the hangover.

And I note over \$5 million in payments to some 130 employees, for extended periods did not work for the organizations that were paying their salary. And I see \$439,000 paid to nine advertising agencies for advertising or communications, for goods and services that were never received by the government. And I look at \$705,816 spent by the Crown Management Board to pay a company for general advice on privatization. And I look at \$5 million for GigaText. And I look at \$1.1 million spent by SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) to prepare for privatization. And the list goes on.

If there are premiums, Mr. Speaker, and if taxes are raised, the people of Saskatchewan know why. They know who's responsible, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there is a change in the wind. I look at the Gass Commission report — another election promise kept by this government, Mr. Speaker, a promise to open the books. And what do you see, Mr. Speaker? We see recommendations because of Tory mismanagement. They say there is a need for greater public accountability. The government must have a solid plan for deficit reduction and recognized accounting practices must be implemented. Why? I know why.

Since taking office, Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of my Premier and his cabinet. We have taken a leadership role in cutting excesses. SaskPower-SaskEnergy bills in one envelope — savings, \$750,000; the repeal of the high severance deals like George Hill, \$1.34 million; total, \$12 million savings; closing of the trade offices in Hong Kong, Zürich, and Minneapolis — welcome home, Mr. Taylor and Mr. Andrew — saving us \$2 million; spending cuts in government advertising and travel, another \$28 million. So if there's a will, there's a way.

Smallest cabinet but most efficient cabinet in 20 years — and the cabinet, Mr. Speaker, that took a 5 per cent cut in salaries. And again the list goes on. Responsible government has finally arrived in this province.

The mismanagement and the waste demonstrated by the past Tory government, Mr. Speaker, has led to the perception that politicians are not to be trusted. This feeling, Mr. Speaker, in a province that traditionally regards its politics in the very highest of regards, is not right.

I will take this opportunity to read from an editorial from the *Leader-Post* dated May 2, from the pen of the same writer that the hon. member from Wilkie quoted yesterday, to emphasize the mismanagement and waste of the previous administration. And I will read from this article:

One small example of the mess is the nine government departments or agencies that paid \$439,000 to advertising agencies for services they never received.

As well, 130 government employees did not work for the department, agency or Crown corporation that paid their salaries.

It goes on to say:

The biggest abuse of this was in the premier's realm of Executive Council. Of the 130 (employees), 49 were actually working directly for Devine, thereby appearing to reduce his budget by \$1.8 million.

All of this adds up to an abuse of the public trust that comes with being in government. There can be no defending it, which perhaps explains why the Tories really don't even bother trying.

Another election promise, Mr. Speaker, by this new government has been addressed in this throne speech — to correct that feeling about the political people that govern our province; amendments to The Provincial Auditor Act and to The Financial Administration Act, a code of ethical conduct for elected officials, Conflict of Interests Act, and amendments to the Saskatchewan Human Rights Code. This will demonstrate, Mr. Speaker, to the people of Saskatchewan that our government is very serious about changing this attitude by action.

Certainly our financial situation is so very serious, Mr. Speaker, and still the throne speech delivers a positive plan for Saskatchewan people. The plan is simple. It's straightforward, Mr. Speaker — a plan unlike anything this Assembly has seen in the past 10 years. It is not a plan of **ad hoc** this here and megaproject there. And to illustrate that, I just want to talk a minute about the previous administration in this **ad hoc** type of policy or plan that they had. The previous administration, Mr. Speaker, would have had us put up what may have been another of their white elephants — a CANDU 3 reactor — with no idea of need or benefit, without any actual cost/benefit analysis.

I am proud, Mr. Speaker, that our government's right direction in the appointment, Mr. Speaker, of the Saskatchewan Energy Conservation and Development Institute, recently appointed by our Premier. It will look at all forms of energy with the good of Saskatchewan people at the forefront — nuclear energy, wind energy, co-generation — because this is economically the best way to address our future energy needs. And it's likely the reason the members across are not in favour, because anything to do with economics may not be that high on their priority list, Mr. Speaker. It is no wonder the member across cannot understand our plan.

Firstly, of course, we must get our financial house in order. It is a plan that speaks of jobs and economic development. Mr. Speaker, it talks of the Premier's Economic Action Committee representing all players: business, labour, agriculture, local governments.

(1615)

I suppose that sounds a little strange to the members across. They may not be able to understand that people working together is the only way to address the concerns of the Saskatchewan people.

It speaks of agricultural industry in this province, Mr. Speaker, and recognizes agriculture as our number one industry. Our government has recognized that over the

many years we have governed this fine province that we are totally committed to agriculture. On April 27, we addressed the agricultural sector of our province — more improvements to the income stabilization plan for 1993, an action on severe debt problems faced by our farm community today. The lack of persuading or the lack of desire to persuade their federal counterparts, Mr. Speaker, is why the agriculture in this country . . . or why that agriculture in this country is an equal responsibility of every Canadian, has had a very detrimental effect on agricultural programs across this country and especially in our province.

I am very proud, Mr. Speaker, that I am part of a government that will continue to attempt to convince the federal government of their responsibilities to this very important industry — agriculture

It speaks of protecting our environment with some clear cut direction — the environment charter of rights and responsibilities Act, an Environmental Assessment Commission, amendments to The Parks Act, The Critical Wildlife Habitat Protection Act. And, Mr. Speaker, we also speak of health care.

Speaking of health care, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that it was a priority of this government since the very beginning. I want to read from the 1944 throne speech, Tuesday, February 8:

Legislation will be submitted to you authorizing my Government to enter into such an agreement to provide Health Insurance for all people in Saskatchewan.

You will be asked to consider a measure respecting a National Physical Fitness Programme which is being undertaken by the Province in co-operation with the Government of Canada.

From the 1944 throne speech, Mr. Speaker, that's our commitment to health care.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Renaud: — Another article in the provincial election of 1960, the Saskatchewan CCF promised to introduce a province-wide medical insurance plan, construing the election victory as a mandate to implement this scheme. Douglas summoned a special session of the legislature in October 1961. Mr. Speaker, this is our commitment to health care.

Thirty years ago Tommy Douglas took a new direction in health care after defeating one administration that had no desire to change. Today our Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker, again after an administration that had no desire to see change — too busy cooking the books or whatever . . . Tommy Douglas, if here today, would be as proud as I am of the direction that we are taking in health care, the wellness, preventative care, new structures, better service, less waste. I would like to commend our Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Renaud: — The throne speech speaks of child hunger, Mr. Speaker, something that should not exist in the western world. I believe, Mr. Speaker, the mismanagement of this province's financial affairs by the members across contributed to this very, very serious situation.

It speaks about the plight of our Indian and Metis brothers and sisters and the need to promote the right of self-determination and self-reliance. It speaks about workers, Mr. Speaker, about their health, about their safety. It speaks about the importance of a strong Canada in this its 125th birthday.

Mr. Speaker, the story is straightforward and I am excited as my colleagues about this new session, about attacking our deficit and its interest costs, about democratic reform, about jobs, about employment, about agricultural direction, about social justice, and the environment, about a sharing, a coming together, a new will, a new understanding of all our peoples — urban, rural, rich and poor, young, old, black or white — toward our future and the future of the next generation.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I ask the members across for their co-operation — I notice the member from Thunder Creek recently stated that people want the partisan stuff to be put aside — and I ask them to join with us in supporting the throne speech. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for your time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the short time left available to me, I'm pleased to have this opportunity to make a few comments, particularly to the amendment that was put forward by the members of the opposition on this throne speech.

A lot of people in Saskatchewan, I think, Mr. Speaker, were expecting the new government of the day, a government elected with a very large majority, to come into this legislature — after great delay because they said they needed the time to put their house in order — and lay down a statement that people in this province would finally have some sound leadership; if one believed the statements of the member from Riversdale when he was in opposition and after he became Premier, that this sound leadership would lead Saskatchewan in a new direction.

Well unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, as I've listened to members of the government talk about this particular throne speech, I thought they might come up with some reasons that obviously the members of the public missed. Because I haven't noticed a lot of platitudes for this particular throne speech coming from the public at large.

I haven't noticed in the newspapers, I haven't seen it on TV, I haven't seen any of the special interest groups in this province that traditionally are involved in the debate from the throne, make any remarks at all on this particular throne speech. And I think it says something about what this legislature was presented with, Mr. Speaker — this vast deafness that we see across the province of Saskatchewan.

Because when one looks at this particular document, the only economic initiatives that I see are initiatives taken on by the former government. I mean how ludicrous to stand in this legislature and claim that Harvest Meats and Spar industries are this new vision that this government is bringing to Saskatchewan. How ludicrous.

We have a lot of platitudes in this throne speech about how people in Saskatchewan are going to change their views of things, how the community is going to become more involved, how we're all going to sort of redirect our thinking. That's fine and dandy, Mr. Speaker, but people need leadership in order to do that.

As one of my colleagues said in speaking to this amendment the other day, there are politicians and then there are leaders. There are politicians and then there are premiers. Premiers are expected to provide leadership to give people the self-will because ultimately, Mr. Speaker, it still comes down to individuals in this province collectively or by themselves changing the direction in which we do things.

And I saw nothing in this throne speech, Mr. Speaker, that would motivate individuals, either by themselves or collectively, to go out and know that their government is setting a new positive agenda for the province.

And that is why the opposition found it reasonable to bring in an amendment to this throne speech, because the government basically is presenting nothing new other than rhetoric to the people of Saskatchewan.

They didn't talk about the campaign promises that were broken. They didn't tell us about reducing taxes in the province of Saskatchewan. They didn't tell us that the medicare system wouldn't have user fees attached to it. They didn't tell us how freedom of speech in this province is being taken away from people. They didn't tell us about the patronage that they promised they wouldn't do, but appears to be rife in our province.

I found it rather amazing, Mr. Speaker, that in a throne speech from a government, from a political party that said political patronage has to be something of the past in our province, would brag about appointing 500-and-some individuals to boards and commissions already over and above all of their political appointments which they don't tell us about and which members of the media have to ferret out.

They didn't brag in that throne speech about making a past president of the NDP Party one of our newest provincial court judges, particularly given the comments of members opposite, particularly given the comments of members opposite on appointments made by the former government.

And they talk in here about how they set this new direction of helping communities work together, and yet members in this legislature stand and condemn community bonds. Because community bonds, Mr. Speaker, by opinion of everyone in this province — by everyone in this province — are a way that communities can work together.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — The member says, and I find this interesting. Mr. Speaker, the member says, what about Fair Share? And I remember full well when members of the public, members of the government's own unions came to this legislature and said that they didn't agree with the program. And yet the government of the day didn't threaten to fire those people because they expressed an opinion that was counter to the government's policy directives of the day.

And yet we have a minister of the Crown stand in this legislature, stand in this legislature and say that it is quite right and proper for the government of the day to place a gag order on its own employees because they might — they might explain the differences between '91 GRIP and '92 GRIP to one of their clients. They might explain to an angry farmer who stands up at a meeting or walks into his agent's office as his fields are blowing away, they might explain the fundamental economic differences. And the minister responsible says that he is going to sick the government's police on them because they might say something contrary to government policy.

And after members of that party, the NDP Party, stood in this legislature and chastised the government of the day for even introducing a program that the employees didn't agree with, I find it absolutely reprehensible, Mr. Speaker, that these people can talk about building communities and getting people to work together in a throne speech, and then do diametrically opposite to what they talked about.

Mr. Speaker, the other day in this legislature I spoke at great length — at great length — on some economic issues that face the people of this province, and during that speech, Mr. Speaker, laid on the Table of this legislature the documents that I spoke from and quoted from, and outlined my arguments based on documents not developed by this opposition, not developed by anyone associated with this opposition, and at least presented the evidence to this legislature that that party and that government is simply trying to pull the wool over the taxpayers of this province, because they knew, they knew exactly where the finances of this province were.

They went out and promised the moon. They went out and got the taxpayers' votes in this province by total deception. And now, Mr. Speaker, they're running and hiding behind the fact that the former government didn't do everything perfectly.

(1630)

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I say to the members of the government, take a look at the *Star-Phoenix* today, take a look at most of the media around the province and know full well that the folks are beginning to catch up with you. And after your budget on the 7th, I think every member in this legislature would stand and vote for the amendment as put forward by the member from Wilkie.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The division bells rang from 4:32 p.m. until 4:44 p.m.

Amendment negated on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 9

Muirhead	Britton
Neudorf	Toth
Swenson	Goohsen
Boyd	D'Autremont
Martens	

Nays — 41

Van Mulligen	Hamilton
Wiens	Johnson
Simard	Trew
Tchorzewski	Draper
Shillington	Whitmore
Koskie	Sonntag
Anguish	Flavel
Goulet	Cline
Solomon	McPherson
Atkinson	Wormsbecker
Kowalsky	Crofford
Carson	Stanger
MacKinnon	Knezacek
Penner	Harper
Cunningham	Keeping
Upshall	Kluz
Hagel	Carlson
Bradley	Renaud
Lorje	Langford
Lautermilch	Jess
Calvert	

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me to again address this House on the throne speech. I feel honoured by the people of my constituency who have supported me through the past 10 years. Actually it's almost 10 years . . . it's a little past 10 years that they have supported the Tory government and me as a member of the legislature. And I want to say that I appreciate their support.

I want to also indicate some of the things that I think are of interest to the people of the Assembly. I had a situation in my constituency that went back for some 30, 40 years where it was represented by Liberals and NDP MLAs, and some of them had significant influence in this province. And yet what we had in my constituency is an overriding principle that said that we don't want to build anything.

And subsequent to that we have had some very significant building going on in my constituency. I want to point out that we have had quite a number of schools built in our constituency. We've had a hospital built. We've had renovations to other hospitals.

And I want to thank the people of Saskatchewan for providing that support to the constituency that I live in. The school that my father went to was built in 1912. A new school was built this year, and that's in the town of

Herbert. And they took the old bell tower and put it in front of the new school, and that was a significant day in the life of the people in the Herbert community. And I think that they want to say to the people of Saskatchewan that they appreciate very much the willingness to participate in their tax dollars to provide that to the people of Herbert.

Addressing the needs and the concerns of the province go far broader than just my constituency, although I think it's an example of the things that are around the province.

I have economic development in my constituency; I have agriculture in my constituency; I have people who live in the rural and work in urban, and I have a lot of those people and they're very avid supporters of mine. And I appreciate that a lot in relating the kinds of things that they're prepared to do, not only on my behalf in getting me elected, but also in providing an economic direction to the people of Saskatchewan and showing how they can work together to make that happen.

The oil industry is a very intricate part of my constituency. Some of the very earliest discoveries of oil were discovered in my constituency. They deal with the kinds of things that I believe that people of Saskatchewan are familiar with, being on the frontier, being on the cutting edge of development. And I would say that as I go through my speech, I want to point out some of the things that I believe not only the government in the throne speech have done wrong, but I think that they provided a backdrop of things that really haven't been good for the province of Saskatchewan.

And I have sat here diligently listening to members talk about the throne speech. I've listened to that carefully. And I've gathered some very important information and I've deducted a few things.

One of the things that I've deducted is that there was nothing in the throne speech, so they had to go back to 1944 to dig up Tommy Douglas and talk about Tommy Douglas in relation to the things that he did. And I'll point out to the members of this government that Tommy Douglas was important to the people of Saskatchewan, and I'll tell you why.

It was because he was a builder. He did believe in building. Why is Diefenbaker Lake the centre of attention for Gardiner dam and Tommy Douglas — the three people who built in this province who are recognized as builders in this province have their names attached to that reservoir, that development there. And Tommy Douglas and John Diefenbaker and Jimmy Gardiner were people who were prepared to build.

And I say to you that maybe you should go back and look at the dynamics of the Tommy Douglas days and what made him the initiator of those things to build, things to do, things to work with — the things that you need to think about in terms of the kinds of things that you've spoken about, going back to those fundamental days when you think that your party began.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is what I've heard a lot about. I think that these people have lost touch with knowing how

to build. They'll study it. They'll study it again and they'll study it again and they'll study it again. And when they get done studying it, they'll cut down more trees to study it again. And that, Mr. Speaker, is the way this government has operated through their history. And I think that the kinds of things that we see in this throne speech deal with the kinds of things that I think are kind of mundane.

But if you go back and look at what their speech brags about, you'll see Spar Group as one of the things that is mentioned there. Now who brought Spar Group into the province of Saskatchewan? Well I'll say to the people here, it was Spar Group themselves that brought Spar Group into the province of Saskatchewan.

And why? I'll tell you why. Because they wanted to get out of British Columbia. Do you know why? Because of labour laws. With an NDP government in British Columbia and the labour laws that they were confronted with, they decided that they were going to move to Saskatchewan. That was one of the main reasons why they moved in the first place.

And, Mr. Speaker, as I see in this discussion on the throne speech, I see that there's going to be a whole lot more that are going to be dealing with the same kinds of labour legislation that we anticipate coming before this Assembly that are going to just as much stifle them in Saskatchewan as it probably did in British Columbia.

That, Mr. Speaker, is one of the reasons why they moved, and that, Mr. Speaker, I think is reason to believe that we've got a sense of lack of direction when all we can do is make a law that says that we've got to restrict, we've got to withdraw services and all of those kinds of things. We have to look for opportunities; we have to look for economic development.

I want to touch a little bit on another area of economic development that I think this government totally missed the mark, and that's the atomic energy opportunity that we had in the province of Saskatchewan. I really fundamentally believe that every person who represents any seat in Saskatoon ought to be totally ashamed of what their position was.

They did not look at economic development in dealing with this. They did not look and research. They did not look in any kind of scientific expansion in the university. They never looked at that at all. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the members from Saskatoon should hang their heads for not telling the cabinet that they needed that economic development to enhance the opportunities in the province of Saskatchewan.

What was it going to do? It was going to study the opportunities that nuclear medicine, nuclear physics, nuclear energy could provide in the province of Saskatchewan. And I think, to the people of this Assembly, that that should be something that even now you should begin to consider because of the opportunities that are available.

What would 70, 80, 160, 170 jobs do in Saskatoon, of high profile, scientific jobs and giving an opportunity for our young scientists coming out of the university right

now? It would give an excellent opportunity for those people to not only consider but also that they could become a part of this community. And what have we got that we can export more of, is knowledge and information, and put that energy to use in driving the opportunities for the people of Saskatchewan.

We have produced some of the brightest people in Saskatchewan that are telling the world what to do. And why can't they do it from Saskatchewan? It's because of the kinds of attitudes that are demonstrated in the memorandum of understanding in the energy agreement that the people of this province turned down. And I think that the people of Saskatoon should hang their heads.

Mr. Speaker, I have a lot more to say on this subject, and therefore I would ask to adjourn debate today.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:58 p.m.