

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Ms. Lorje: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's nice to be recognized by you. I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Legislative Assembly, 49 grade 8 pupils from Wildwood School in Saskatoon — a wonderful school and a wonderful group of pupils.

They are accompanied by Donna Hrytzak, the vice-principal, and their teachers, Corinne Morton and Joel Nostbakken. And I ask the members of the Assembly to join me in welcoming them.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce a group of civil servants who are touring the legislature today — and they're sitting in your gallery — from Social Services, Justice, Highways, and Community Services. I understand they're here to visit the legislature and to sit in on question period this afternoon. And I ask you to welcome them.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, a group of eight SIAST (Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology) students. This group of students are enrolled in the English as a second language program here in Regina. I know that they will enjoy question period and the proceedings in the Assembly.

I know that all members will join with me in welcoming them here to the Assembly.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too would like to make some introductions this afternoon. I notice that in the east gallery there's an old teaching partner of mine, Loretta Bell. Welcome here, Loretta, and also 62 students who have accompanied her or she's accompanying them — I'm not quite sure which is which — from the town of Martensville, my home town where I have my constituency office, and I'm looking forward to meeting with them later on in the course of the afternoon. I ask all members to please help me welcome the students and teachers and bus driver from Martensville.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Hamilton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise to join with my colleague from Regina Elphinstone in greeting the eight adult students from SIAST, and I'll be meeting with them at 2:30 for pictures and then join with them in the members' dining lounge to have discussion and any questions they might have of me about the Assembly and their tour.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Budget Provisions

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today in the media we see more of Saskatchewan's best kept secret splashed in the media. Mr. Speaker, it was only a few short months ago that the NDP (New Democratic Party), the now government of the province, was very vociferous in its opposition to the former government saying that they would have to lay off people in the public service in order to be reasonable in their deficit reduction plan.

Now I am informed, Mr. Speaker, that certain departments are even seconding extra secretarial work in order to issue pink slips to government employees, some of which have already received them.

Mr. Speaker, my question is: do either the real Minister of Finance or the toy minister of Finance . . . whichever one would like to take the responsibility for resigning should any of these leaks, Mr. Speaker, show up in tomorrow's budget? Which one?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the budget will be presented. I will be honoured to rise in this place and present the first budget of the New Democratic Party government. At that time the House and the public of Saskatchewan will know that we have charted the right direction to put this province back on the financial path that it needs to be on.

And we'll be beginning the correction of the waste and the mismanagement and the patronage and all of those things that were brought about by the former government, many of the members of which are seated over there, so that we can begin to get the province's finances back into a position of integrity and start rebuilding Saskatchewan for the future.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Revitalization of Rural Saskatchewan

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Rural Development, a position, I suppose, will become extinct after tomorrow's budget, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Minister, you and your NDP colleagues have promised that assistance for agriculture in rural Saskatchewan is the number one priority of your new government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — Even in the throne speech, the Premier from Saskatoon said that he wants to rekindle the Saskatchewan spirit of community and co-operation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — Can the minister explain to this Assembly and to thousands of people who count on the program's counselling and assistance and extension services provided by the Department of Rural Development how this government intends on achieving this lofty goal?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member opposite for the concern for my position here at the cabinet table. We indeed do intend to revitalize rural Saskatchewan. I think you will see the seeds of that in the budget that's presented here tomorrow. And we will revitalize rural Saskatchewan. We will lead rural Saskatchewan into a new future. We will not go back to the past, but we will revitalize and rebuild rural Saskatchewan as we will rebuild all of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, already the ground is becoming very dry and the GRIP (gross revenue insurance program) program has been gutted and forced upon farmers and you have failed in your promise to deliver more agricultural assistance. You have increased input costs or utility rates; you've increased all kinds of rates and cancelled the rural gasification program. You've decreased the funding to the RMs (rural municipality); just to name a few of the programs of your kind of help for rural Saskatchewan. Can you articulate to this Assembly your vision for the future of rural Saskatchewan given the already dismal record?

Can you, Mr. Minister, how you will accomplish your goals to promote and preserve our rural way of life through your department, the Department of Rural Development.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, clearly we have made some tough decisions which were forced upon us by the legacy which we were left.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Programs in rural Saskatchewan are going to have to be done as programs in all of Saskatchewan are going to have to be done, to spend our money smarter and to get more bang for our buck and not to spend money wastefully as we have in the past. And that is part of the plan.

And we will call on the people of rural Saskatchewan to rebuild themselves and they well know that government alone cannot rebuild rural Saskatchewan. And we refer to the member's sentiment of co-operation, and that's how we will rebuild rural Saskatchewan — with the co-operation of rural people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — Mr. Minister, it is quite apparent that

your government is bent on abandoning the residents of rural Saskatchewan, and you refuse to do your job and defend them as the minister. It is your job as the Minister of Rural Development to defend the people of rural Saskatchewan even against your own colleagues. It is your job to do that.

I have a new question for the same minister, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, two months ago your government announced that there would be 7.4 per cent cut-backs to RMs in revenue sharing and other programs for this year and some more for next year. Now the RMs swallowed your bitter medicine and budgeted for the decrease, using the same criteria and formula as was used last year. However the RMs are now receiving cheques from your government that have been cut, for example, 30 per cent to the RM of Carmichael and 44 per cent to the RM of Star City. Every RM I have talked to seems to have a different figure.

Mr. Minister, could you explain to the RMs and to this Assembly how your new cut-back formula works?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, I'll be glad to explain how the formula works. I don't know if I have time to do the whole formula here today. There's a very complicated formula which involves 27 . . . 24, I think, different factors which is used to calculate RM grants. And so while there was a 7.4 per cent cut in total, that does not mean exactly that amount to each RM. And therefore there will be some variation between RMs.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — It had, Mr. Speaker, a nice start there. I almost thought we were going to find out what was going on. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the minister could in fact provide this information for the municipalities. In fact, Mr. Speaker, my own municipality has an administrator that phoned in and asked for the information. She was told it was too complicated to explain on the telephone and that she would receive a letter sometime later. I have not seen that letter and neither has she.

So I ask the minister again: will you, Mr. Minister, within this next week, provide for the people of Saskatchewan this kind of information so that we know what you're trying to do to us out in the country?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, I repeat, the formula is one that was used in the past. It is also . . . was one that was developed with the consultation with the SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) and it is a complicated formula and certainly it is not a secret and can be released to anybody that wants to know it. It's public knowledge and certainly you can have it.

Government Appointments

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker, the people of this province

know that the NDP won the provincial election based on many promises, promises that quickly became transparent as glass. And allow me to be a little more specific, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the member from Riversdale, the Premier. The member from Riversdale stated the following on October 3, 1991. On that date he stated, and I quote: No more business of getting into the civil service because you pack a political card or access to government because you lack a particular political card, and I am absolutely firm on that at my stage in my political career.

How, Mr. Premier, can you justify appointing Ted Boyle, a former NDP employee, as the new manager of corporate relations for Saskatchewan Government Insurance; Terry Bekolay, former president of the NDP party, as a provincial court judge; Terry Stevens, former premier of the NDP executive, as the new acting executive director of occupational health and safety? Mr. Premier, how can you justify these blatant political patronage appointments after you promised to eliminate that very thing?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — I'm not familiar with some of the appointments that my friend opposite asked about, but I want to speak particularly to the one concerning Terry Bekolay who was sworn in as a judge of the Provincial Court last Friday. I was present at the ceremony as were senior members of the Prince Albert bar — none of which I could identify as NDP supporters — who all were enthusiastic about the support . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — . . . enthusiastic about the appointment of Judge Bekolay because he is a highly qualified person. Provincial Court judges are only appointed if they receive the approval of the Judicial Council of Saskatchewan. The Judicial Council of Saskatchewan is made up of the three chief justices of the three Saskatchewan courts, plus the president of the law society plus Mr. John Archer plus, at the time of Mr. Bekolay's application, Mr. Gary Semenchuck — who will be known to members opposite. They approved his appointment and gave him an exceptionally high rating. And we were pleased to follow their recommendation in the appointment of Judge Bekolay.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Minister, you are now the government of this province. And I ask you if you can give that answer with an honest expression on your face. And, Mr. Minister, your Premier during the election campaign promised to do away with political patronage.

In fact, Mr. Minister, your Premier made the same promise that I just quoted from in regard to government boards and agencies. And I quote the Premier, Mr. Minister: My general proposition is that partisan political people, party people, and defeated MLAs (Member of the Legislative Assembly) and candidates ought not to serve on boards. They ought not to serve because they give the board the wrong perception. That's the objective. If we

don't succeed in it and continue to appoint party hacks, even fewer, then I've gotten nowhere.

In light of these comments by your leader, Mr. Minister, can you explain the appointment of Debbie Packet, the current NDP constituency president from Estevan, to the Saskatchewan energy board, and the appointment of Lorne Johnston — Lorne Johnston, a defeated NDP candidate — to the STC (Saskatchewan Transportation Company) board of directors? And will you admit that possibly your Premier has failed miserably to carry out his promise to eliminate patronage and that you have indeed gotten nowhere?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Well, Mr. Speaker, when you get 53 per cent of the votes cast in an election, it's a little hard to avoid appointing NDP supporters.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — What we have tried to do throughout, in the case of Judge Bekolay and everyone else, is to appoint people who are competent to the position to which they're appointed. We do not inquire what their political affiliations are. We look for qualified people. We look for people who are able to do the job.

Now may I say with all respect that that stands in stark contrast to the appointing policies in this government over the last nine and a half years. We are trying in every case to appoint people to boards and to positions who can do the job and who are qualified to do the job and have the experience to do the job.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Minister, isn't it possible that you received 53 per cent of the votes on October 21 simply because the Premier made these promises prior to election day?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — And isn't it even true, Mr. Minister, that maybe you don't have the 53 per cent of the votes you had on election day today? We'll find out tomorrow and following tomorrow's budget where your percentage stands.

Mr. Minister, how can you justify the millions of dollars wasted every year on patronage? You said that . . . the Premier said that back in 1990. And in 1991 during the election campaign he stuck to his guns and promised to eliminate this very thing.

Mr. Minister, in February your government fired Ray Fieber, a long-time SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation) employee. You fired Mr. Fieber, a non-political, long-term serving individual, and replaced him with Mr. Wawryk, a one-time aide to NDP cabinet minister. Mr. Minister, how can you justify firing a non-political, long-term civil servant and replacing him with a blatant patronage appointment?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of the circumstances surrounding the particular case cited by the hon. member. But, Mr. Speaker, it takes a lot of nerve for somebody from that side of the House to be lecturing us about patronage appointments.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — I repeat, we are . . . we have committed our . . .

The Speaker: — Order. I believe that the member for Moosomin had absolutely no interruption when he asked his question, and I wish the members would do exactly the same thing and let the minister answer the question. Let him answer.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, we have committed ourselves to the appointment of qualified people and we have committed ourselves to the principle that we will not be making patronage appointments, and we have not. In all of the appointments to all of our boards and commissions, we have tried to appoint qualified people. We have tried to maintain a gender balance whenever that was possible. We have tried to ensure that a reasonable percentage of aboriginal people are appointed on these boards. If some of them happen to be NDP supporters, we can't help that. Fifty-three per cent of the people of this province passed judgement on your government.

One of the reasons they passed judgement on your government in the way they did was because of your record with respect to patronage. Another reason why they voted against your government was the fact that you've left the province in the kind of financial mess that it's in with a \$15 billion debt hanging around our neck.

But on the question of patronage, it is passing strange that somebody from that side of the House would have enough nerve to lecture us on the subject of patronage.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the minister: Mr. Minister, I find it interesting that as a minister of the Crown that you would continue to look back at a former government's record and continue to put all your emphasis on a former government's record. I find it interesting that you would also find it difficult to know of the appointments, whether they've been made or not, when they've been splashed across our local newspapers for the past number of months.

Mr. Speaker, the question here is not the fact of what happened prior to or regardless of what government. The question is the promises made by this government, the fact that they were elected on October 21 based on a promise to eliminate patronage, to be open and honest. And, Mr. Speaker, to the minister, we see every day in the *Leader-Post* government advertisements for senior political executives — each and every day. These advertisements don't come cheap, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Minister, why are you wasting the taxpayers' money on advertising these positions when the positions are being filled by individuals like the Jack Messers, like the Carole Bryants, like the Donald Chings, the former law partner? Why are you wasting money on advertising government positions when they have already been filled or you've planned to fill them with NDP partisans?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, that's utter nonsense, and the member knows it. That's utter nonsense, and the member knows it. And I can certainly understand, Mr. Speaker, that the member opposite, the members opposite, don't want us to be looking backwards. If I were them I wouldn't want to be looking backwards either.

Their record, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the question of patronage appointment and political hirings are well known to everybody in this province. And we will not be lectured to by the likes of them. They have no moral standing to be making these charges in this legislature.

I repeat, this government is committed to a process of hiring and a process of appointment that is not political. We will be making our appointments as we have so far, as we will continue to do in the future, on the basis of appointing qualified people who can do the job and do it in the best interests of all of the people of Saskatchewan, not in the best interests of their political friends.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to reiterate again that the question that is being raised today is the fact that the people of this province spoke on October 21 based on promises made by that government. The people spoke out on the fact that they believed, honestly believed that the government opposite would not enter into political patronage.

Mr. Speaker, you can't hide behind the fact that many of the appointments made were well known activists in the NDP Party. In fact, Mr. Speaker, today we also see the headline in the *Leader-Post*: "Walters sues crop board." Today we see that Melville mayor Jim Walters has launched a legal action against you for firing him for political reasons.

Mr. Minister, don't embarrass yourself by saying it wasn't political. The people in Melville don't believe it wasn't political. They believe in fact that there was politics involved.

After all, Mr. Minister, we look at the firing of Mr. Walters, and just two days prior to his firing, who was appointed to the chairman of the board of Saskatchewan Crop Insurance? — none other than the NDP constituency president, Mike Halyk. Melville doesn't believe you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Minister, how many more legal suits like this one are going to be filed against you and your government for wrongful dismissal and how much will this cost the taxpayers of the province of Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Now, Mr. Speaker, what does the hon. member expect me to say with respect to the situation in Melville? The member himself says that an action has been started. And he knows when he puts that question that we're not able to answer it because we're not able to discuss a matter that's before the court. So that is not a fair question to be asking at this stage. That's something that we'll answer for in court and we're not the least bit shy about doing that.

Now you mention the case of Jack Messer and let's just talk about Jack Messer. Sure everybody knows that Jack Messer was politically active, but does anybody in this province doubt Jack Messer's competence to run the Saskatchewan Power Corporation? No way. No way. No way.

And a very significant selection committee selected the name of Jack Messer from a national competition — a national competition. And if he's sitting there in his place calling the members of that selection committee dishonest, then he better walk outside the door of this House and make that allegation.

In the meantime, we say that Jack Messer was the most qualified, most competent person for that job, and the fact that he had NDP connections does not disentitle him to that job. Nor are we prepared to disentitle the 53 per cent of the Saskatchewan population that supported the NDP in the last election from being appointed to government boards or to government jobs. They are entitled.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker, a final question to the minister. I find it interesting that he would stand here defending Mr. Messer. In fact I'm not a little bit unsure that he isn't just a little embarrassed by some of the things that have happened recently.

First of all, taking \$27,000 of taxpayers' money to renovate a bathroom. Secondly, driving around with Lexus vehicles . . . A person wonders whether or not they maybe were building a ramp and they'd be building a garage up on the third floor for that vehicle.

Mr. Minister, the question before you today is the fact are you indeed going to honour the promises and the commitments you made to the people of this province prior to the election, promises which the Premier said that he would never enter into; that indeed, this province would be open; that people regardless of politics would be able to apply for jobs fairly?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Now let's just talk, let's just talk about the car, shall we? Let's just talk about Mr. Messer's car. Mr. Messer's car was arranged for under policies which had been established under the previous government and continued in force at that time. It was your policy. It was your policies. His arrangement with respect to that car was the same kind of arrangements that were allowed under the guidelines that the former government established. Now we . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I wonder if the member from Wilkie has a question that he wants to put before the House? If you have I will recognize him when he stands. I've asked him once before not to interrupt, and I ask him again to please quit interrupting when the minister is trying to answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — And I would remind the member opposite, Mr. Speaker, that anything that may have happened as he has related, relating to Jack Messer, absolutely pales, absolutely vanishes in the face of \$1.3 million trust fund established by Mr. Messer's predecessor — absolutely pales.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the minister who appears to be in charge of patronage, the Minister of Justice. Mr. Minister, will you give this House the assurance today that the hundreds of pink slips being issued by your Minister of Finance, not one single one will be back-filled by NDP partisans in the months to come. Will you give that assurance today?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Yes, I give the member that assurance.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Telephone Rate Increases

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister responsible for telephones. Madam Minister, in January you announced in a news release rate increases for telephones and you said they were 4 per cent. Mr. Speaker, as it turns out this was not the accurate figure. I have a telephone bill here from a rural medical practitioner and his telephone rates went up in three different categories by 47 per cent, 25 per cent, and 22 per cent.

Madam Minister, will you admit that you misled the people of Saskatchewan about the true magnitude of these rate increases? The evidence is already in the people of Saskatchewan's pockets.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to answer the hon. member's question by referring to the rate action that was taken on January 31, or announced on January 31, effective March 1. It was a large range of changes in telephone charges necessitated by the competitive aspect of the CRTC (Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission) in competition in long distance rates. So long distance rates interprovincially went down substantially. In-province rates, that is calls of over 100 miles, went down substantially.

In attempting to communicate the rate action to the subscribers of Saskatchewan, we took what would be a typical profile of an average mix on an average telephone bill. And this is a very difficult thing to do because of the

nature of our subscribers, where some may use no long distance whatsoever; some may use a great deal. And the typical profile produced an average increase of between 3 and 5 per cent. And that's what was communicated to the people of Saskatchewan.

At no time did we represent it as being an overall increase. In fact we pointed out that many people would experience a drop in their rates if they were a substantial long-distance user.

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

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. Ms. Simard: — I beg leave of the Assembly to make a brief statement respecting Battered Women's Awareness Week.

Leave granted.

STATEMENT

Battered Women's Awareness Week

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to speak on a matter of grave importance to the people of this province. My colleague, the Minister of Social Services, has declared May 3 to 9 as Battered Women's Awareness Week. I wish to add my voice to those from the Provincial Association of Transition Houses and its member agencies who are using this week to raise public awareness about wife abuse, and to encourage strategies to work toward the eradication of violence in our society.

According to Linda McLeod, a leading authority on wife battering, wife battering results in the loss of dignity, control, and safety. It is accompanied by feelings of powerlessness and entrapment. It is experienced by women who are the direct victims of ongoing or repeated physical, psychological, economic, sexual, and/or verbal violence, or who are subjected to persistent threats or the witnessing of such violence against their children, other relatives, friends, and so on, Mr. Speaker.

Those who have researched the historical role of women in society tell us that wife battering or wife assault has been a common practice for many centuries. In fact it has only been in the last hundred years that laws permitting wife battering have been repealed.

None the less the practice of wife battering would seem to be as common today as it ever was. Indeed the statistics would suggest that it is even more prevalent. One in ten women, for example, is the victim of violence. This means that 36,000 Saskatchewan women are abused by their husbands or male partners.

Almost one in five Canadian men admits to using violence against his wife, and on average during 1990 in Canada two women were killed by their partners every week. Almost half of wife assaults result in physical injuries to the woman. In one out of four cases of wife assault, the children of the assaulted women are also hurt

or threatened, Mr. Speaker.

It is estimated by the first time a police report on wife assault is made, a woman has already experienced on average assault on 35 occasions.

Despite the facts, Mr. Speaker, wife battering is still not taken seriously by everyone. The nature of wife battering runs the full spectrum of violent, degrading, and abusive actions and words. The long-term psychological effects are often destructive of a woman's self-esteem. The repeated violence often fosters feelings of self-hatred leading to withdrawal or the overuse of alcohol and drugs. Forty per cent of battered women report using drugs to sleep and 74 per cent of battered women report using drugs to alleviate anxiety.

There are short-term effects as well, Mr. Speaker — bruises, cuts, burns, and broken bones. Indeed, wife battering can even lead to death. About 40 per cent of homicides in Canada involve a domestic relationship. Most commonly men kill their legal or common-law wives. Statistics Canada reports that 79 per cent of spousal homicide victims are women. The picture is not pretty and the violence must stop.

This week those who work with battered women in transition houses and other programs will be undertaking a public education campaign. Their goal is to give the public a greater awareness of this significant societal problem. I wish to add my voice to theirs in saying that, as minister responsible for the Status of Women, I am committed to achieving equity for women in all aspects of life.

I believe that as a society, we must value the inherent worth of every individual in society and expect each person to treat every other person with respect. Until that day we will all pay the costs of society's tolerance of violence. We pay in health care costs and social services, in court system costs and an increased use of the penal system, not to mention the human tragedy involved.

Let us all join together this week, Mr. Speaker, in working to eliminate violence from our society. It will take a concerted effort by both men and women, by our teachers, our judges, police officers, churches, social workers, mental health workers, governments and many others in society acting together to eliminate wife battering.

Let me assure the people of the province that this government recognizes that it has a role to play in eliminating this form of violence. We look forward to the report of the Canadian panel on violence against women. And I want to personally thank each and every person who shared their experiences, expertise, and recommendations with that panel.

On behalf of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I wish to close by once again recognizing the many organizations and individuals who are working to eliminate violence in our society and to help all of those who are affected by it. Working together we can achieve the goal of zero tolerance of violence in our society. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of the official opposition I would like to add a few words of my own and our own to the suggestions that the Hon. Minister of Health has just made. And I would like to start off by commending the minister and commending the government in pursuing this avenue, and also commending the many women and the many workers in PATHS and so on, Provincial Association of Transition Houses Saskatchewan, that are involved in this kind of thing.

And having been the minister of Social Services for the last couple of years, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, and members opposite, and indeed the viewing public, that violence is part of our society, unfortunately. And I feel that the only way in which we as a society can come to grasp with this everyday violence is to do away with the cyclical nature of it. Because, Mr. Speaker, violence is cyclical in nature.

If you're going to have abuse in a home, invariably it is those kids, it is those children that are going to grow up and actually seek a violent partner because that is what they are familiar with. That's actually what they are comfortable with, in a crude sense.

So, Mr. Speaker, what we must do is break the cyclical nature of this transmission of violence from one generation to another. And so in order to do that we must reach out as a society. We must reach out. And I would suggest to the hon. minister that we reach out not only to battered women, but we must expand and we must seek out the abused, yes, but the abuser as well. We must also have programs in place to treat the abuser.

Children are being abused as well as battered women, Mr. Speaker. And another not very often mentioned people in our society that are suffering abuse is the elderly as well. We must reach out to the elderly in so doing.

And, Mr. Speaker, what I hope is going to come out as a result of what we're doing here today is that we will be sending out a message to society that violence is wrong. Society must get up on its hind feet and say, violence is wrong.

I agree with you, Madam Minister, zero tolerance is what we must strive for. And the only way we can do that is by making society aware of it and society saying, we will grapple this situation to the ground and that it's all right for people to stand up, it's okay for them to say, I have been abused. They must not hide; they must not feel ashamed of coming forward and saying, I have been abused. And when we can start doing this, I think together we will be able to fight this enemy of societies.

Madam Minister, I say this in the most non-partisan way possible. You don't have enough money in your government — neither did we when we were in government — to be reactive all the time to solve this problem. We must be proactive, as you're suggesting today, if we're going to be able to solve this problem. Madam Minister, I support very much your initiative this time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to add my words to those so articulately expressed by the minister responsible for the Status of Women.

On Battered Women's Awareness Week, we must reflect upon the increase of violence in our society at every level, and be determined to work together toward creating a healthier, more caring environment for our children. And by teaching our young children to honour and respect each other, by ensuring that individuals are empowered at every stage of their lives, we're going to reach a time, I truly hope, when weeks such as this are no longer going to be required.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS PUT BY MEMBERS

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, as it relates to questions put by members, item no. 10, I would ask that this question be converted into a motion for return (debatable).

The Speaker: — Motion for return debate.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, the answer to questions put by members 11, 12 and 13, are hereby tabled.

The Speaker: — Questions 11, 12 and 13 tabled by the minister.

(1445)

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

Mr. Martens: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I began yesterday to speak to the throne speech and the blueprint for change by the Government of Saskatchewan. And I pointed out a number of things that I think are necessary to analyse what it is they're trying to say in the throne speech and the things that they are leaving out and the things that they are putting in.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that as I said yesterday, there are opportunities that are available in this province because of some of the things that we have and some of the things that we are.

I want to point out to the Assembly that the provincial government made the decision — and I hope that they would reverse it — that the province would not endorse the memorandum of understanding on energy. And I want to point out to the people of Saskatchewan again that what we have by not doing this is a clear put-down of the opportunity for young people in this province to do

the things that they are very, very capable of doing.

We have, Mr. Speaker, a very honourable lady, a woman in this province who has achieved excellence on the basis of her capacity to provide research in nuclear medicine. She, Mr. Speaker, is the Lieutenant Governor of the province of Saskatchewan. She has received the Saskatchewan Order of Merit. She has received the Canadian order of merit, and on the basis of achievement. Mr. Speaker, she is a person from Saskatchewan. She has received recognition for her services across this province and across Canada and internationally for the things that she has done in medical research in nuclear medicine.

Mr. Speaker, we have young people today who are just as capable as she is — young men and women who understand nuclear medicine better than any political person opposite, and we have them where we could have medical research in nuclear medicine. We could have nuclear physicists coming out of this province where we could market the opportunity to develop the kinds of things that the future holds for the province of Saskatchewan. We have nuclear chemistry that we could put together with individuals from the province of Saskatchewan that we could be the centre in Canada for nuclear research.

But what have we done? We have turned down an opportunity to study the opportunity. We have turned that . . . or they have turned it down, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that is an indictment against the government for ever for taking this opportunity and giving it to someone else. Someone else in Canada is going to do that. They're going to take our uranium and take it into their provinces and study it. Our children will have to go to New Brunswick or Alberta or British Columbia to deal with that, Mr. Speaker, and I find that appalling.

I find that . . . the opportunity available to young people only happens as the windows or the door swings open once in a while. And this was an opportunity for our young people to be career scientists in the province of Saskatchewan with an energy option available to them that would be able to be used by young people in learning how to be an example throughout the world. And I believe that, Mr. Speaker, we have lost that opportunity.

We have a science centre in Saskatoon in agriculture. Why? Because Saskatchewan is an agriculture province.

We have a science centre there that is a science centre of excellence. It is going to produce people who are excellent. We have people who have been very prominent in agriculture in this province. We have people, Mr. Speaker, who are prominent in Canada for the financial institutions that we have. We've trained people to be able to deliver in financial institutions across Canada and across the United States, in financing fiscal management across Canada. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we had . . . the Bank of Canada vice-president was from Saskatchewan.

We had people all over the world who can hold their heads up. But why would we neglect an opportunity such as this, as we have in the nuclear side, to study it and give ourselves an opportunity to develop. And I think, Mr.

Speaker, that is wrong. I believe it's wrong, and I think that the government will for ever regret it.

And as I look it, it stands in the face of public opinion. The public opinion said — from SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association), yes, do it; we need that opportunity. SARM — yes, Mr. Speaker, we want to do it. Do it for us. Why not do it? It didn't have anything to do with a CANDU reactor. It was a part of a study to look at it.

And the Minister of Energy laughs. He could have had that along the Diefenbaker Lake just north of his constituency. What kind of opportunity would he have had to make that kind of an opportunity available to the people in the south-west part of Saskatchewan? That is exactly what he could have done.

And he is avoiding the question. He is avoiding the opportunity, and I think it's wrong. And from an academic to think that that was the only function that was available is also to think that an opportunity would not have been available for our young people.

What will our young people do? Mr. Speaker, they will go to Alberta, or they might go to work on a reactor in Ontario. Or they might go to France to work on a reactor — all the uranium coming from Saskatchewan. Seventy-five per cent of our uranium goes into the nuclear reactors in France, 50 per cent in Sweden. All of this is an opportunity for our young people to become a part for growth, and I don't understand why this opportunity would have been missed.

"A Mandate for Change" was one of the titles that they headed off the throne speech with, Mr. Speaker. And I think that that mandate for change should be some mandate in the mentality of the individuals opposite to adjust and get a grasp of what can happen with young people in our province and with the ability to learn and the ability to excel. And I think they've missed a great opportunity.

I want to point out a number of other things that the mandate for change said and what it was supposed to be. And I find it really striking.

The quote is that the people want my government to be open, honest, and fully accountable. Well, Mr. Speaker, in the last few days in question period and throughout the past week and a half we have come to realize that there are a whole lot of things that aren't open and they aren't honest as it relates to how they're going to deal with the public and the rural people of Saskatchewan.

And I want to say, I want to say to the members opposite, that when this government brings forward a Bill that will deem to have had information provided, when farmers don't want to have it, and that will be deemed to have been provided, Mr. Speaker, is not open and it's not honest. And in fact, Mr. Speaker, I would say it's dishonest. It's morally wrong, it's ethically wrong, and it's legally wrong.

And I think, Mr. Speaker, that is fundamental to what is going on over there. If it doesn't suit me, then we'll make it a change. If it doesn't suit me, even though the law says

one way, we'll make a change. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that that is wrong. It's absolutely wrong. Is that open, honest, and accountable? No, Mr. Speaker, it is not.

People want my government to be fair and compassionate. Is that being fair and compassionate when we have the farmers of Saskatchewan having to go to court to protect themselves in an action against the Crop Insurance Corporation and the government? No, Mr. Speaker, it is not.

They want a spirit of co-operation and community — very fine objectives. But, Mr. Speaker, in reality is it happening? No, Mr. Speaker, I don't think so.

Going on to the second page, Mr. Speaker, they want to deal in a way to amend The Provincial Auditor Act — very, very commendable. We want to see what it's going to do for the Provincial Auditor in reviewing the books, and I'm very interested in seeing it. And in the bottom line it says: "... to improve the Provincial Auditor's access to the books of all Crown agencies."

Well, Mr. Speaker, when you have a verbal agreement with the president of Sask Power Corporation, what is a verbal agreement? Will the auditor be able to say, on the basis of a verbal agreement, you have completed the contractual arrangement with the president of Sask Power Corporation? Will you? I ask the question: will the auditor be able to say to this Assembly that Mr. Messer with a verbal contract got paid what he was supposed to be paid?

A verbal contract, Mr. Speaker. What does the verbal contract mean? Does that mean he drives a Lexus this week, and next week he doesn't? This week he has a bathroom and next week he doesn't? Is that the way that works?

Access to the Crown corporations, Mr. Speaker — is that the way the verbal agreements are going to be? Or are they embarrassed with the fact of what they're paying him? Would they be prepared to provide that information to us on a verbal agreement, because what is it? What really is it?

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that in the news it said that his bathroom was going to cost \$27,000. Well in this verbal agreement, how many months pay is that? One month for Mr. Messer, or two months? How much is it? And how many people in this province don't earn \$27,000 a year, Mr. Speaker. And here, Mr. Speaker, is the president of this corporation spending \$27,000 to renovate his bathroom.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to this Assembly that in the throne speech they had some discussion for the members of the Assembly and it's a code of ethics for public civil servants. Now that is an interesting one.

Today we stand on the threshold of the budget. And we had some questions earlier about pink slips being handed out tomorrow. Are those pink slips going to be filled and back-filled with people who have identified themselves as supporters of the NDP party? It's a question that we seriously want to have the government consider.

And we will be asking, Mr. Speaker, in the budget, in reviewing the budget, whether in fact this has really happened. And that's a question we have to ask the members opposite and we will be asking the ministers opposite to do that.

I notice here, Mr. Speaker, that the government is going to introduce a Bill on the Saskatchewan Human Rights Code. Now I would think that this would be an ideal opportunity and an ideal place to give the unborn child some rights. And I think that as we take a look at this we will probably be looking at how this can be done to amend the Bills that will be placed before this Assembly.

But, Mr. Speaker, that will be a primary function and a focus of what we are going to initiate from this side of the House. And I want to make that clear to the people of Saskatchewan and also to this Assembly that that's one of the things that we will be doing.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of the responsibility that I had with a minister of the Crown, we had many things in agriculture that we dealt with to provide opportunities for initiating economic development.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out, some of them were opportunities that we had with processing our agricultural raw product. Mr. Speaker, we had some very, very important successes in this province, and one was Harvest Meats. And wouldn't you know, for an example, an example of a business that would be open and moving forward with initiative and proactive in its sales and marketing opportunities, they would put into their budget or their throne speech a recognition of one of the functions that we assisted in.

And, Mr. Speaker, it's a credit to the people who are in Harvest Meats for what they have done. It's a credit to them for their skills and marketing, their skills and management, that they have succeeded as well as they have. And, Mr. Speaker, they are an excellent asset to this province.

It goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, that the government is going to use Crown corporations to stimulate the economy. Now as I understand it, there was 10 per cent of the province left to deal with as it related to natural gas distribution in the province. And, Mr. Speaker, what an excellent opportunity to reduce costs, increase the income of SaskEnergy, and allow that as an opportunity to develop the province of Saskatchewan.

(1500)

And, Mr. Speaker, these weren't places that were in outlying areas of the province. No, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it they were along the lake here just north of Regina. Some of those places were told last year that they were going to get natural gas into their homes, and now they won't be able to.

And why, Mr. Speaker, why would you put an opportunity like this for stimulating the economy, giving an excellent opportunity for, number one, SaskEnergy to make more money . . . and for the province to be able to

sell gas to the people of Saskatchewan.

It is beyond me, Mr. Speaker, why the people of this kind of government have always been against developing the natural gas industry. They have been against it. It's a history. It's a tradition. And they've been against it all the time. And I find it very difficult to understand.

Mr. Speaker, Sask Power Corporation has been used as a tool of opportunity to develop the economy across this province in many, many ways and in many, many places. We have the northern electrical development, we have the grid increased from the west side — from Alberta moving into Saskatchewan — we have Shand, we have Alameda and Rafferty as parts of those developments, an opportunity as a part of that infrastructure. And, Mr. Speaker, I know that members opposite have a passion for those two reservoirs. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if they will ever go fishing in those lakes, or if they will ever go water-skiing on those lakes because of that passion that they have as a resistance to the development of those two projects.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the members who sit in the back and especially to the member from Indian Head-Wolseley, that member was consistent in his adamant disregard for the truth as it relates to Rafferty and Alameda. He consistently was against it — consistently.

Now I want to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that I have lived in the driest part of Saskatchewan for all of my life. And I had a very highly regarded hydrologist born at Maple Creek, who teaches at the university, told me one day, he said: you know the PFRA (Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration) built a dam on the north slope of the Cypress Hills. It took three years for that to fill. And you know something, he said: it's never been empty since.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is a part of what we are here to do. There are times when, Mr. Speaker, that lake valley has been wall-to-wall water, washing down for ever into United States and then back up into Canada destroying ... raising havoc everywhere it went. And that, Mr. Speaker, is the reason why that dam was built there.

And, Mr. Speaker, representation was made here by the member from Bengough-Milestone saying that the total cost was \$42 million. Mr. Speaker, that representation is incorrect. And I believe that the people should be discussing among themselves what it actually cost.

An Hon. Member: — A hundred and ninety-five million.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, the member from Indian Head-Wolseley says \$195 million. But what did he say and what did he do as a part of that interaction with all of the legal costs and all of the implications of the extra environmental studies, extra litigation and all of the things that are involved with it.

What did he say? How did he provide the benefit to the people of Saskatchewan? Well sir, he probably lost the province of Saskatchewan between 50 and \$60 million personally because of his vendetta against that. And that, Mr. Speaker, is not a good thing to have.

So Sask Power Corporation has developed lots of reservoirs in this province, and I believe that they should still be doing that, and they should continue to do that.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, that the throne speech talks about is the involvement of Saskatchewan in the Free Trade discussions with the United States and Mexico. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is very important that we seriously consider that. I think we need to seriously investigate the opportunities that we have to make North America a community that can survive because we have the freedom to trade across the border going north and south. I believe in that, Mr. Speaker. Every time we close a door, we build a wall.

Mr. Speaker, it was a privilege for me to be in the Soviet Union the beginning of February. And I have had people come back and say to me: how did you find the economy? Well I said, if you went back there, you'll find the economic balance is somewhere about 1930-35. That's where the economics of the Soviet Union are today. And what did they do? For every time the world economy went up, they would build the wall a little higher. And every time that the world economy went higher again, they would build the bricks a little higher. And then two years ago, what happened, Mr. Speaker?

I had a colonel, who was a member of the city council of Moscow, tell me this, and he said: communism has killed the soul of the Russian people. He said, I said to the military leaders that the enemy was not the western world, the enemy is inside. And you know what, Mr. Speaker? He told me that he was right. I didn't say that to him. He said he was right, because the economy could not resist the international pressure on those walls always going higher, because the people themselves were not willing to participate in that kind of an economy.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is what we have to think about when we want to isolate ourselves, or if we think we can isolate ourselves from our neighbours and the communities around us. And, Mr. Speaker, the more opportunities we have to trade with other countries — whether they're Mexican, whether they're South American or whether they're Canadian, interprovincially, or United States — the better off we are. And, Mr. Speaker, that is a very, very important part of the function.

And I would encourage the government opposite to be as open-minded as they possibly can. Don't throw away the mandate. Don't throw away the opportunity like you did in the energy agreement. Don't throw it away because our children are going to have to take that opportunity and use it to build this province. You can't build it without it. And, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to point that out.

One of the things that is in this throne speech — and I want to focus on that a bit — is the area of agriculture. And they make special references to the programs that farmers are finding a great deal of difficulty with today and that's the GRIP program. They say in here that the changes that they've made are moderate and they're slight, and that they will have some sense of wanting to fix it and make it better. Well I'll go along with making it

better, Mr. Speaker, but I don't think what they've done today is making it better.

I want to point out that as I went around this province, and ministers in 1991 went around this province, we probably spoke to 30,000 people — individuals who were interested in the program. If you take and expand that to people who really attended the meetings, there would be pretty close to 50,000. And, Mr. Speaker, that opportunity said more than one thing to me. It said, number one, Mr. Speaker, that people wanted in this province an opportunity to insure their farms on an individual basis.

Mr. Speaker, in order for us to understand that, I want to draw a parallel. A farmer is being asked today to insure on an average — an average of the commodities, an average of the farmers around him. And you know what, Mr. Speaker? If you took the block that you lived in, or any of these people here who live in a city block, and would take the insurance on that city block and say: your house is worth \$50,000, we'll insure you for 50; yours is worth 75, we'll insure you for 75; and his is worth 100, and we'll say that we're going to average the whole thing out. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what the government is asking the farmers to do today. They're asking not only to average the insurance, they're asking them to average the contents of those houses — average it all out so that everybody is the same. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what's wrong with it.

Individuals have come to me from across this province and said, we want individual coverage for individual crops. The rural members have heard this in their own constituencies and I don't know why they haven't said it to their minister. Mr. Speaker, that is a point I want to make.

Mr. Speaker, my question and my question in the budget and the question in this throne speech is: why don't they make it available? Why don't they let the farmers choose? If their idea is so good, it should be able to sell itself. Give them the opportunity to decide -- '91 or '92. Give them the opportunity to decide. Are you prepared to do that? I'm prepared to live with that.

And then let's go through the summer, Mr. Speaker, and go through the summer and make some adjustments to what they choose as their option. And, Mr. Speaker, they will probably as the summer progresses be more in line with '91 than they have ever been with '92.

Mr. Speaker, this province needs to have a stable economy in agriculture. And, Mr. Speaker, members opposite in rural Saskatchewan went around promising cost of production. Now that's a good one. They're not even prepared to fund 70 per cent of an index moving average price, and they want cost of production. They're not prepared to spend 70 per cent of the index moving average price, and they want the cost of production put on this yet on top of that.

Mr. Speaker, that wouldn't be 70 per cent of the index moving average price; that would be 100 per cent. They're not prepared to pay 70 per cent because they've got to reduce the program. They're not even prepared to pay 100 per cent on the yield, Mr. Speaker, and they want

cost of production over on the other side. And in fact their committee members who met on it from the National Farmers Union said, we'll make our own report. SARM said, we're going to make our own report. Did we ever hear the minister talking about that? No, Mr. Speaker, we did not.

As a matter of fact, in February the Minister of Agriculture received a letter indicating that SARM was not in agreement with their proposals as it related to the new GRIP. They weren't in agreement with it. Did he tell anybody? Oh no, Mr. Speaker, he wouldn't tell anybody because he had a commitment to the taxpayers that he was not going to spend more than \$140 million. That's what he was told, that's what he told his committee, and that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what they had to deal with.

And, Mr. Speaker, they really had to wrestle with that one. They couldn't give, Mr. Speaker, the opportunity for the farmers in the province to have any kind of a guarantee. No, Mr. Speaker, they'll guarantee all of the teachers in this province a fixed return. They'll guarantee all of the nurses in this province a fixed return, and I have no problem with that. But will they give the farmers one? No.

Mr. Speaker, on the basis of a cultivated acre which these farmers are getting their money for, it's likely \$4 a cultivated acre — \$4 a cultivated acre to bolster the economy of 60,000 producers and thousands of other small-business men across this province. And, Mr. Speaker, they weren't prepared to put \$4 up.

And yet we have members opposite who are teaching professionals. We have people opposite who are medical professionals. And they have a guarantee. They know how much they're going to earn. They know what they're going to get. But will they give the producers in the province of Saskatchewan even 70 per cent of their cost of production? Oh no, they promised 100 per cent of cost of production. Going around the province, they had meetings about it, and the Premier said it in Harris; he said it in many other places — cost of production. It says it in here, cost of production.

But you know what, Mr. Speaker? That is only to highlight it so that the people who are against what they're doing as it relates to GRIP, that they will be satisfied. But, Mr. Speaker, they're not going to be satisfied. I don't think that they should be.

I'm going to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that this throne speech probably, in my view, demonstrates the weakest — no, Mr. Speaker, the second-weakest throne speech that I've ever heard in this Assembly. The second weakest. The first one was in December.

(1515)

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — And, Mr. Speaker, the second-weakest one is this one we have here today. Half of it — half of it, Mr. Speaker — is filled with platitudes; the other half is filled with things that the Tory government did in the last 10 years. And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what this throne speech represents. They're going to make changes

here and there and try and smooth it all over.

But, Mr. Speaker, what they really are saying to the people of Saskatchewan: you can handle it on your own; do it yourself; we're not here to help you. And yet in their campaign slogans across this province what they did is they typically said, we're here to help you, we're big brother, we'll look after it, we'll defend you, we'll uphold all of the things, we'll eliminate poverty, Mr. Speaker, create jobs, balance the budget, do all of those things. But, Mr. Speaker, the mandate of this government isn't big enough to do that.

And in this throne speech they said that . . . it's all full of platitudes and Tory commitments from other years. Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting the throne speech on the basis of the platitudes that have been given to us today. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Carlson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me a great deal of pride to participate in the debate from the Speech from the Throne. I'd like to also congratulate my colleagues from Meadow Lake and Regina Wascana Plains for moving and in seconding this Speech from the Throne. They did a fantastic job and I congratulate them on that.

Mr. Speaker, this is the third time in history that the people of the province of Saskatchewan has turned to the New Democratic Party, or to the CCF (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation) prior, to get the financial shape of the province in order.

My dad used to talk about the dilemma that the Clarence Fines administration — he was the Finance minister of the Tommy Douglas government — faced in 1944. The economic crunch that the province found themselves in at that time was as bad as it is today if not worse. But even with that financial crunch at that time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the government of Tommy Douglas and the Finance minister, Mr. Fines, were able to turn the road around and we did some very unique things in the '40s and '50s, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And I'm sure we're going to be able to do that again as we set a new direction in Saskatchewan.

In 1992, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we find ourselves in the province of Saskatchewan with a deficit of almost \$9 billion. And in 1982, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we had an operating surplus of 139 million. How did we get there? How did we get there?

For 10 years, for 10 long years the Tories' expenditures rose at double the rate of the revenues. The economic factors of the time with agricultural prices being low, low resource prices, high interest rates, increased unemployment, and out-migration were all factors. Also the reduction in the federal transfer payments which total \$550 million this year were also factors.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the former government didn't have any plans to address these issues and concerns — no long-term employment strategies, no long-term small-business plan. Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's where

job creation lies — in small business, in small-business development.

I'd like to spend a few minutes talking about our Crowns. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Crown corporations historically paid dividends, based on their earnings, to the province of Saskatchewan. What we see in the last nine and one-half to ten years was a raiding of the Crown corporations, and an example is with SaskTel.

In 1988, Mr. Deputy Speaker, SaskTel was forced to pay \$238 million into the operating budget to the province of Saskatchewan, and more like 18 or \$20 million had been the norm over the years based on their earnings.

In 1990, Crown Management Board was forced to contribute \$310 million into the operating budget of the province, and I might add, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that was against the recommendation of the board.

This display of mismanagement showed the unethical way that the previous government operated. Not only racked up a record deficit on the operating side in the last nine and a half years, but they all but bankrupt the Crown corporations as well.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the PC (Progressive Conservative) economic plan, or failure, which I would like to call it, is highlighted in a few of the examples that we see have transpired over the years, and I would like to talk about a few of them.

The tractor plant in Weyburn with a \$700 million loan with the perception or the wish of getting approximately a hundred jobs — that fiasco started in June of 1989 with a loan, and by August of 1990 it was shut down. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we've heard of comments in this Assembly about GigaText; there was over \$3 million blown there. Pro-Star Mills, in March of 1983 a loan, \$490 million from SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation); January 1985, shut down. And we all know about Joytec. And we all know about the Supercart fiasco. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a record that the former government members should be ashamed of.

I'd like to talk a bit about wasted tax dollars. Nine hundred million dollars from Sask Property Management on an option to purchase the Regina YMCA (Young Men's Christian Association) in 1988, only to be written off the books two years later.

Nine hundred and eighty million dollar salary spent by departments and Crowns to provide political staff to the premier's office. I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, unforgivable. Three hundred twenty-two million dollars spent by Crown management to pay salaries and severance to the former president of the Crown Management Board. Seven hundred and five thousand dollars spent by Crown Management to the Rothschilds, a British firm, for "general advice" on privatization, on something that the people of the province had absolutely no interest in, privatization of our Crowns, and spent almost a billion dollars.

I'd like to talk a bit about agriculture now, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Our Premier and Minister of Agriculture, along

with a hundred-and-some farmers last fall went to Ottawa, trying to put the case forward to the federal government that Saskatchewan agriculture, the farmers in Saskatchewan, need and must receive \$500 million payments in a third line of defence. And I'd like to know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the opposition voted against that measure the other day when we were debating emergency resolution.

We're also going to be talking about, in agriculture, protecting the Canadian Wheat Board and other agricultural programs that have been or are going to be under attack as a result of the Free Trade Agreement with the United States, and as possibly a free trade agreement . . . North American Free Trade Agreement.

We supported the method of payment to be retained to the railways, and our Premier has called for provincial representation — the bargaining table — during the North American free trade agreements to ensure sure that we . . . that farmers in Saskatchewan have a voice on what's going to happen in the North American Free Trade Agreement. Because in the last round of talks with the Canada-U.S. (United States) Agreement, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the only agriculture representative on the Canadian side advising the government on agriculture was individuals representing big business, in particular Cargill Grain. That's not necessarily what the farmers of Saskatchewan . . . is in their best interest.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Carlson: — Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne talks about a mandate for change, talks about an open and honest and accountable government, talks about jobs and job creation and stimulating economic growth. Also talking about protection of our environment.

What this means, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the beginning of getting our debt under control. And it also talks about more importantly, I believe, is restoring hope for the people of the province of Saskatchewan and to renew the spirit of co-operation and community back into the values of the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Carlson: — These are the reasons, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I do support the Speech from the Throne, and I will be voting accordingly. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Lorje: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It is a great honour and privilege for me to be able to reply to the Speech from the Throne on behalf of the people from Saskatoon Wildwood. And it is an especial privilege because I have just for the last one-half hour been talking with students from the Wildwood School in the constituency of Saskatoon Wildwood.

I must say they had a great many creative and interesting questions to ask of me, ranging all the way from why does the Speaker take his hat off when he comes into the House to what is the value of the mace and would you sell it to pay off the deficit?

What I said to the students was no, I would not sell the mace to pay off the deficit despite the fact that the deficit is almost overwhelming in this province. There are certain things that are priceless. Certain things that we will not bargain away. One of them is democracy.

Unfortunately we saw the members opposite prepared to give away anything to their friends in big business, prepared to bargain away our future and our children's future. They are now paying the price for that profligate spending, that waste and mismanagement. Because, Mr. Speaker, on October 21 the people of Saskatchewan gave us a mandate for change.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Lorje: — And six months later the people of Saskatchewan know that we still have that mandate for change and they know that we will introduce change.

Earlier this week I came down to Regina and I arrived here at about 8 in the morning. Since I didn't have a meeting over at the legislature until 9, I decided to take advantage of the brief time I had free, and take my dog for a walk.

I was walking along the Wascana Creek bank, not to be compared of course to the beautiful Saskatoon river bank, but still a nice asset for the city of Regina, and I met a gentleman who said to me, what are you doing here in Regina? And I allowed as how I was a member of the Legislative Assembly. And he said, for whom? And I said, well I'm a New Democrat and proud of it.

This gentleman then went on to say, you know, I've been in business for several years and I've had a lot of employees. I've always fought against unions, even though I realize sometimes they're good, sometimes they're bad. And I've never voted for your party. I've always voted Conservative all my life. But I want to tell you, he said to me, this time in October I voted for the New Democratic Party.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Lorje: — And I looked at him rather surprised, because quite frankly he didn't look to me like your typical New Democratic supporter. And I said, well why in Heaven's name would you vote NDP? And he said, because quite frankly I'm sick of the mess and we trust you guys to clean it up.

And guess what? That's what 53 per cent of the voters in this province said. They trust us to clean up the mess. They want our financial house in order in this province so that we can have a future in this province.

What we're seeing now is that ideologies are shifting. People are changing and they're moving beyond traditional politics. Because what they see — with record high bankruptcies, record high unemployment, record high statistics in terms of violence against women — what they see is a Saskatchewan that is unravelling at the human seams, and people do not want to see that. They are sickened by it. They are sickened by the deficit, they're sickened by the waste, and they're sickened by

the unemployment and an economy that's out of control. And that sickening was caused by nine years of Tory waste, mismanagement, and poor government.

(1530)

People now are banding together, moving beyond traditional ideologies and looking at the party that they know will give them common-sense management, will help them to put the financial house in order in this province and will help to save the value and uniqueness of this province. We don't want to be a province where the last person has to turn out the lights. We want once again to grow, to prosper, and to flourish.

We know that there is a value and a uniqueness to living in Saskatchewan. We know that we have values that are above and beyond partisan politics. There's a uniqueness to the Saskatchewan people. We're real tough. We live in a relatively isolated, land-locked area and yet at the same time we still reach out a neighbourly hand to help people.

We see the uniqueness in the person who's willing to walk through a snowstorm to help his or her neighbour. We see the value and uniqueness of this province when we go to the Saskatchewan Indian and Metis friendship centre and we join together in an Indian round dance, or when we go to one of the local theatres — Globe Theatre in Regina or Twenty-fifth Street Theatre in Saskatoon — and we see the talent and skill and creativity of our artists. What we see all around us is people who are willing to help other people — people who are willing to tough it out in the short term so that in the long run our children and our grandchildren can have a future.

Right now our province is crippled in debt. It's not a debt that the majority of people in this province asked for. It's a debt that's been imposed upon us. It's an unprecedented debt and it's the highest per capita debt in the whole Dominion of Canada. Just this Sunday the Premier of this province went on province-wide TV to give a frank and full disclosure of the level of the debt in this province. He talked about the fact that every man, woman, and child in this province now is indebted to the tune of \$13,000.

And what kind of a response did we get from the opposition members to this disclosure? We saw one Tory member say, it's time to stop the partisanship. Of course he would say something like that. He wants to hide the fact that it was his party that created this massive, overwhelming debt that our party will now have to clean up.

And then we saw the Leader of the Liberal Party say, well it was a waste of a half hour of hockey. I don't know why she would say something so shallow as that unless she was simply trying to get media attention. But quite frankly I say to her and I say to the members opposite, it's time to move beyond political fashion statements. Simply because they have no responsibility for cleaning up the mess is no justification for making shallow statements about the level and the depth of the mess.

We have the responsibility as members of the government to clean it up. We were elected to make tough decisions. We will make those tough decisions,

and we will clean up this province. And the reason we'll do it is because Saskatchewan, unfortunately, is almost on the verge of bankruptcy. We must get our financial house in order in this province.

We know it's going to be a difficult balancing act. We know we have to maintain our credit rating. We know as well that we have to maintain Saskatchewan's ability to manage Saskatchewan programs — programs like medicare, like our education programs, like the programs that we will be implementing to finally deal properly and respectfully with outstanding aboriginal land claims.

Our task will be difficult. And unfortunately we've just discovered it's going to be even more difficult because the previous government plundered our Crown corporations. We commissioned, after we had the Financial Management Review Commission, we commissioned the firm of Ernst & Young to do a report on Crown corporations. We knew the news would be bad but, quite frankly, how bad the news is I think shocked and dismayed almost every one of us.

What we found out when the Ernst & Young report was tabled was that the Tories, those great financial wizards, had borrowed money to pay the borrowings on the borrowings of the operating debt. I mean what kind of financial management is this? I call that not free enterprise but Houdini economics, and we've got to stop it. Because our goal, quite frankly, is a Saskatchewan that is free from debt, a Saskatchewan that's free to live on the good, basic Saskatchewan values of compassion, co-operation, and community.

We've been in government now for six months, and it's been an interesting and exciting and occasionally rocky six months. Up in Saskatoon people will often ask me: well, Pat, you've left city council and now you're in the legislature. What do you think of it and do you enjoy it? Now enjoyment, I have to say, is not an adjective that I would use to describe what we're doing here. But I do have to say that I think it is tremendously important, it's a great privilege and, quite frankly, I am frankly glad I left municipal politics and now have the opportunity to serve at a provincial level.

I'm glad because we have major difficulties facing us and I am convinced that this government will face them in an appropriate, respectful, and humane manner. We've had several successes just in the last six months. We've demonstrated — as we said during the campaign — that we would be accountable. We had the Financial Management Review Commission, the Gass Commission, we've demonstrated openness, and most particularly we've demonstrated restraint.

We just this week announced that we've done away with many of the perks for senior Crown management executives. We have a very small cabinet and our cabinet has taken a salary cut. We've set a moral tone for this province that unfortunately the members opposite are both unable and unwilling to follow. We've also partially reorganized the civil service. And I know that we will continue to do that so that we get an effective, lean, and efficient service-driven civil service, rather than a patronage-ridden civil service.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Lorje: — We've set up an energy institute and we've developed a new vision of health, the wellness model. I'm very proud of these things. Those are successes that I think we can look back on with some pride over the last six months.

Some people would say, well maybe everything hasn't been entirely roses and sunshine, and indeed there's been a few little political skirmishes and battles that we've had to deal with, some perceived problems. I don't think they're real problems, I think they're perceived problems.

The members opposite a moment ago were heckling me, as a member from Saskatoon, that I should feel ashamed that this government did not sign the AECL (Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd.) memorandum of understanding. I say to you now, I am not ashamed of that. I am proud that this government did not get snookered into the AECL memorandum of understanding. That memorandum of understanding, if you would take the time to read it, you will see that quite clearly what we were going to get for a payment of \$1 billion — in a province that is \$13 billion in debt, I don't know where we would find the \$1 billion — we were going to get 170 jobs. That's very expensive job creation.

And SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation) would have been forced, if we had followed through on the \$25 million initial investment, SPC would have been forced to build a prototype nuclear generator, a CANDU 3. And most importantly and most reprehensibly from my point of view, SPC and the province of Saskatchewan would have been forced to develop this province into the nuclear waste dump site of the world. And that is wrong. Saskatchewan is far more important and far more precious than that, to be a dumping ground for the waste of the world.

Now some people say, oh no, the memorandum of understanding didn't really say that. There were separate clauses, and you could deal with them individually. And you weren't committed to building a CANDU 3, and you weren't committed to a dump site. If that is so, why did the Hon. Jake Epp then say, I'm sorry Saskatchewan you can't have the research jobs if you don't take the prototype CANDU and if you don't take the disposal site. Jake Epp said, no cherry picking for Saskatchewan. It's all or nothing.

Well quite frankly, I don't want that kind of a great deal. I don't want Saskatchewan to be a nuclear waste dump site for the world. And I don't want us to follow what Bernard Michel of Cameco keeps promoting, that our rock formation is supposedly so stable that we should take the waste of the world. That's wrong.

And then we see it's not just the members of the Progressive Conservative Party and their cohorts, their few cohorts who are pushing that. We see that the hon. member from Saskatoon Greystone is also promoting that, but promoting it, I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, in a most inconsistent fashion. In her reply to the Speech from the Throne on April 30 she said:

... the NDP have given no indications ... how they will create an environment which will encourage growth and wealth creation. There is talk about the concept of creating jobs through the Crown corporations — the old NDP stand by (she says) — government job creation through government jobs.

The member from Saskatoon Greystone says:

All this does is to re-route some of the profits from the Crowns, which would normally come to the treasury as tax revenues or dividends to government, in order to put a few people to work.

Now you would hear that and you would think that means that she believes that Crown corporation jobs are no good, and we shouldn't have Crown corporation jobs. But one paragraph later she goes on to say:

The most disappointing and crucial evidence of this is the completely ill-advised decision to cancel the memorandum of understanding with AECL. Twenty-five million dollars in federal money which would have been spent largely on jobs for the next five years has virtually evaporated before our eyes.

That \$25 million would have created Crown corporation jobs. Now what does the member opposite want? She says Crown corporation jobs aren't any good, but AECL Crown corporations are wonderful.

It seems to me that what she's basically doing is paraphrasing George Orwell: all Crown corporation jobs are equal, but some are more equal than others. I don't think there's logic in that kind of argument and I categorically reject it.

We've seen lately a few problems and partisan furore over the GRIP program. The problem, I think, is that a few farmers, the 5 per cent factor I would say, want simply to take advantage of the guarantee. Farmers that I have talked to say that they want to farm the land. That's what they want — an opportunity to get out and farm the land.

(1545)

They're also asking that they be able to farm the land, not the program. And they want us to work and clean up Tory patronage. Many people that I talk to are angry that we haven't fired a whole bunch of people. They keep bringing me lists and say, this person is a Tory, this person is a Tory, and this person does nothing at his job — let's get rid of him. And I say, no, what we have to do is do a review and people will stay in their jobs if they're competent and if they're doing the job that they were hired to do and if it is a necessary job in this province.

Because what we have to do basically is to clean up the mess. We've got to lay the foundation for new initiatives. We've got to focus on the deficit. It is extremely important over the next few years that we continue focusing on the deficit so that eventually we will be able to build on the solid principles and key programs of New Democrats —

programs of health, education and social assistance.

Tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance, the Deputy Premier, will be tabling his budget in this House. I expect that it will be a tough budget. But quite frankly, the future of this province, the future of our children, is at stake. We must get our finances under control.

This means that all of us, all sectors, all income groups, will probably have to contribute to cleaning up the Tory mess. But we will do it because otherwise, unless we finally wrestle to the ground the atrocious, unacceptable level of interest on public debt that we're paying, this province will indeed be bankrupt.

I think, though, what we will see, even though I expect fully that this will be a tough budget, it will still be a New Democratic budget with compassion at its basis and with a good, solid foundation for laying the brickwork for our new vision in this province. Together we're going to rebuild this province for our future.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Lorje: — I said earlier that the politics in this province are changing, and I think they are. As we enter the 21st century, we're seeing that people want direct empowerment; they want a more direct response. They're tired of the bafflelegab that they have occasionally received from politicians.

People recognize the seriousness of the economic situation in this province and they're willing to shoulder their share of it. They know who got us into this mess and they've entrusted us to lead us out. And we will do it by specific initiatives.

We're going to, for instance, focus on the wellness model. We're going to change the whole piece of action around health around. We're not going to be focusing on illness any longer. Instead, what we're going to be focusing on is making sure that we can improve the quality of life for people, that we can, all of us, own responsibility for our own life-style decisions, and that we can work in partnership with the professionals in the health care field so that together we can all make a difference and maintain a state of wellness.

Wellness isn't just about saving money, even though that is a part of it. Wellness, I believe, is the responsible and effective, empowering use of our health care resources for everyone. Wellness isn't just a unitary focus; it isn't a one thing; it's many, many programs all combined together.

Wellness to me means resources to poor people; it means an emphasis on literacy; it means stamping out the "isms" of sexism and racism and elitism. It means adequate housing for people, it means jobs for people, and it means working directly on all those factors that affect the physical and mental health of all of us.

Wellness to me means dealing directly with the issues of the forgotten minorities — the refugees who come to this country, people who have been forgotten in the programs, the women who are working double days, the

racialized people, the working poor.

We will, I believe, working in partnership, actually move beyond the concept of health as an absence of illness and move instead to the concept of wellness. So we'll be doing that as a specific initiative over the next few years.

We will also, at the same time as focussing on wellness, focus on the illness system because that is part and parcel of wellness. There are unfortunately some people who still continue to get ill.

We'll move into the next generation of medicare in terms of our health care provisions. We see that in the throne speech where we're moving to create health boards in Regina and Saskatoon, and we will see them eventually in other parts of the province.

We will be moving to having a health services utilization and research commission so that we can look at why people are going to doctors, what the diagnoses are; we can look at what kinds of education people may want so that they know when it is appropriate and responsible to go to a doctor and when, quite frankly, it isn't.

We'll be moving to have a provincial health council that will consist not solely of professionals, but the other people who are gatekeepers in the system: the consumers, the community leaders, and also, the health care providers.

There are other specific initiatives that we will be undertaking that are briefly outlined in the throne speech that I think will be laying a foundation for a new vision in this province, a new vision of compassion and caring. We will be making changes to the human rights legislation. Quite frankly, I am very proud of that and very excited about it, that we will be recognizing that all groups in this society will have and must have the opportunity to live and to work in dignity without fear of discrimination.

We'll be making changes where we'll be putting people first, especially aboriginal people. It is time that we recognized that we have several unique cultures in this province, and most particularly, peoples of the first nations and Metis people are extremely important in this province.

We're recognizing the inherent right to self-determination and self-reliance. We are recognizing aboriginal peoples' right to define and practise their own culture, their own customs, and their own values. We'll be doing that in very specific ways as they are outlined in the Speech from the Throne.

We'll also be doing it in attitudinal change ways as we work — all of us, I hope, everyone in this province — to clean up, for instance, our racist language. It is time that we recognized in this province that when we talk about our pioneers and when we talk about our agriculture base in this province, that there is more to this province than simply people who came here in 1870 or 1880 and started farming the land. It is time that we recognized that this province originally started as a territory based on the fur trade and that it is aboriginal people who are our pioneers, not people from Europe.

It is time that we recognized too that aboriginal people are not our aboriginal people, just like white people are not aboriginals' white people. We've got to stop using the phrase, our native people.

And I think we will clean up our language. We will start to develop both attitudinally and in programs an approach of respect and dignity. This is extremely important, because what we've seen in the last week or so is that there is a very thin veneer to this civilization. I look with dismay and with extreme sadness at what happened in Los Angeles where we see well over 55 people dead, several hundred injured, and thousands in jail for rioting and looting.

And that's not confined to Los Angeles. It's not a unique United States phenomena. We saw it as well in the last couple of days in Toronto with people rioting. That to me, Mr. Speaker, is extremely sad. We have to recognize that the roots of racism are alive all throughout this society and we have to actively, as a government, do something to stop that.

So that's another specific initiative that's outlined in the throne speech — an initiative of which I'm extremely proud.

We have as well in the throne speech outlined initiatives dealing with the special and unique concerns of women. We have to, I know and I am convinced, deal with gender parity and we will eventually have to bring in pay equity. Those are simply issues that will not go away and that we must deal with.

At the same time, we have to deal with other issues that are of unique concern to women. Earlier today the minister responsible for the Status of Women, the Hon. Louise Simard, stood up and talked to us about the problems of battered women — the fact that one in ten women is battered in this province.

We also know the shocking statistics for poverty for women, the problems of discrimination. We have to deal with these things, these core issues, in a caring and compassionate manner so that we can then go on and address the other issues like pay equity and employment equity. We can work on those things now; we can begin in a non-legislated way through our civil service to gather the data on compression and job ghetto-ization, to do the research on the job classifications so that when this province's finances are in order we can move very quickly and immediately into pay equity.

And I'm convinced that we will do this because what we see now in this Speech from the Throne, this New Democratic Speech from the Throne, is a start, the foundation for a new vision in society. We're going to see, both through the initiatives outlined in the throne speech and through the budget speech tomorrow, the foundation for compassion, for caring, and community. I'm proud of the throne speech. I'm proud to speak affirmatively for it. I'm proud to be a New Democratic MLA, and I'm proud to be a representative in this House. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Draper: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure to have the opportunity to speak in support of this, the second throne speech of the twenty-second legislature of the province of Saskatchewan. My congratulations are extended to Her Honour, the Lieutenant Governor, and for the mover and seconder of her address, but also to all the other capable speakers who have preceded me.

More particularly I would like to applaud the author whose thoughts were expressed so nobly in that speech, a person with not only a deep and perceptive mind, but one who sees clearly, not only to the horizon, but beyond it. Oh nameless prophet, I salute thee.

You will, I hope, sir, excuse me if I do not recapitulate those lists of things done and projects yet to be completed. These are of course very important, but they're laid out very eloquently in the throne speech and by the speakers, much more capable than myself, who've spoken already. What I would like to do is to give you some ideas that this speech and its responses have inspired in me.

Sir, we have only formed the government for six months, and rebuilding a province is rather like rebuilding a house, a house that has fallen to pieces as the result of neglect of an incompetent and bankrupt previous owner.

The first throne speech in December, sir, was in fact a declaration of intent to clear the site. During the short session that followed, we rolled our sleeves up. We spit on our hands and got our working tools in order. We got rid of the broken bottles, the old bricks, pieces of barbed wire, and the plastic bags that are everywhere. And we levelled the ground.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1600)

Mr. Draper: — In the second throne speech, this is where we start the real work, our own work. This throne speech in effect digs the trenches in which the footings and foundations will be laid. And trenches is a very evocative word. It implies warfare and preparation of defences for what is expected to be a prolonged battle. A fixed and secure position from which we can sally forth to engage the enemy. And that enemy, sir, is not the opposition. They're already the prisoners of their own stupidities and multiple mistakes.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Draper: — They lost their war last October. The enemy, sir, is a disastrous economy they left behind like the four horsemen of the apocalypse.

But to get back to my original analogy, sir. Tomorrow, Thursday, we will have the budget speech which will be the foundation on which we build a solid edifice of fiscal policy and laws over the next four years. And from that solid fortress we will fight the next election, secure in the knowledge that we have prepared the province well.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Draper: — The member for Estevan gave us the catch phrase, there is so much more we could be. So true, but so sad that that is as much as his mind could encompass. Catch phrases, sir. We say, there is so much more that we shall be. And under our new Premier and with our new NDP government, we will be, we shall be.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Draper: — And that, sir, is the difference between this side of the House and that.

Actually I'm very disappointed that the hon. member for Estevan is not in the House today.

The Speaker: — Order. If the member doesn't know, he is not to refer to whether members are present or not present in the legislature . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well you know now.

Mr. Draper: — It's just that rumour had it that he dug himself a hole to China to hide from my speech.

The Speaker: — The member is out of order again by referring indirectly that the member is not in the House. I ask him to get back to his speech or I'll call upon another member.

Mr. Draper: — I apologize. As a neophyte I am ignorant of so many of the rules and regulations.

Mr. Speaker, sir, I've been listening with great interest to the debates that have been going on in this House. And I was particularly interested in the — what shall we call it? — the altercation that occurred on Friday morning between the member of Thunder Creek and the Premier.

The logic of the member opposite appeared to have been that, one, the Finance minister of the previous administration cooked the books; two, the member of Saskatoon Riversdale knew that and said so; and, three, the Leader of the NDP said that he could govern without raising taxes after corruption and accounting fraud had been eliminated. Therefore his argument went that if the present Premier increased taxes, he is guilty of misleading the electorate in the election of last October and ought to resign.

Sir, this is the strangest logic I've heard since, as a medical student, I removed a pencil from the bladder of a young man who swore me blind that he'd swallowed it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Draper: — And I remember as a young child hearing an old vaudeville song which went: How could you believe me when I said I loved you when you know I've been a liar all my life.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Draper: — There were no apologies for having run the province into such a terrible amount of debt. There were no apologies for hiding expenses in inappropriate places. Strange.

I also remember the election campaign of 1982 when the leader of the Progressive Conservatives at that time promised to remove the 5 per cent health and education tax, sir. He promised to reduce the income tax by 10 per cent. And do you know what happened to those promises, sir? Does anybody here or there remember the member from Thunder Creek demanding the resignation of the premier for breaking those promises?

On Friday, sir, what we got was a double dose of hypocrisy. And I suggest that in future we get less thunder from the party opposite and maybe more creak.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Draper: — A hundred years ago or so, sir, in another House, a certain Benjamin Disraeli, himself a very well-known Conservative premier, is reported to have said a Conservative government is an organized hypocrisy. I suggest that it still is. And the member's support of this amendment to the motion is so much horse feathers.

The member for Saskatoon Greystone seems to have fallen for the 50 cent coupon trick. You know the old con, sir. A catalogue comes through the mail with a 50 cent coupon. You can either put the coupon in the bank — you get 50 cents; or you can buy \$50 worth of knick-knacks and your coupon's worth 10 bucks. Great saving. Don't kid yourself, sir, you're still out 40 bucks.

But the federal Tories and the AECL believe in megacoupons. For our \$25 million coupon we get a down payment on what? — a \$5 billion nuclear reactor? Quite a bargain, don't you think? And by the time it's built it'll cost us \$15 billion, just like the one in Ontario. I believe it started at 3 billion, ended up at 14. Oh, peanuts. Just like Rafferty-Alameda — 45 million to start with, up to 150 million, and still going strong. In fact, I got information . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No water? What's water got to do with a dam?

Yesterday I got information, sir, that the Alameda dam is moving. It's going downstream, and it's going down towards the centre of the earth apparently, too. And it needs repair, the repair which will be a touch of \$4 million.

No, by now we've got used to the idea of first building a dam and then studying environmental aspects, the problems. Now we're going to get used to the idea of first building a dam and then designing it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Draper: — This really is a devine folly. I too have had letters from constituents regarding a nuclear power reactor, and everyone has been against it, sir. I've had a letter from a builders' association and from a group of professional engineers, and they are for it, but that's to be expected. They are hoping to make a killing out of it. My fear is that we'll get a killing as a result of it. One of the most important matters discussed in the throne speech, sir, is health care, and is a . . .

The Speaker: — Order. I'd like to ask the member from Pelly and the member from Kindersley if you want to carry on at that volume, to go behind the bar or outside the chambers.

Mr. Draper: — As a physician with over 30 years of practice behind me and experience in hospitalization in four continents, you can imagine that I'm very interested in the subject of health. All physicians, myself included, are anxious to keep people well. We spend much of each day counselling patients about what is euphemistically called life-style. But in my day it was always called bad habits. The name has changed, but the game is still the same.

Doctors don't wish to spend their time dishing out expensive pills. Take one pill three times a day, granny, and we'll see you in a month and check your blood pressure and be fine. That's not what we were taught or brought up to . . . (inaudible) . . . was medicine, and we don't want to do useless operations either.

We would much sooner persuade people to eat less and better. But we find ourselves overwhelmed just as much and just as dangerously by adverts for junk foods and deep fried kittens and other such abominations. And I think that these are far more dangerous, or at least equally dangerous to our health as cigarettes and liquor.

I hope, sir, that with my qualifications and experience in this field I shall get the opportunity in the near future to contribute to this program.

Education, sir, costs the province more than anything else except health care. I believe it's \$1 billion a year. And I think that education is probably more important than health care in that our students see their teachers five hours a day, whereas they see the doctors once or twice a year if they get bashed in the nose by a hockey puck.

Obviously the primary responsibility for nipping bad habits in the bud and promoting good life-styles and good habits lies with the parents. But if the parents are incapable of doing this alone, then the back-up presumably should be in the schools when all's said and done — 5 hours a day, 5 days a week, 35, 40 weeks in the year, for a period of a minimum of 12 years.

We only wish that as physicians we had the opportunity to guide our patients every day, every week, every year.

One of our problems is of course that so many teachers go into teaching as a last resort. An educator interviewed on CBC (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation) radio last Saturday morning, May 2, stated that two-thirds of all Canadian teachers reported that teaching had not been their first choice of career — a very significant number. And if you combine this with a lack of enthusiasm of so many students to be taught, and my own children were no better — I wasn't much better myself, to tell you the truth — we have a problem that money alone can never solve. And the arson at Delisle school is an indication of the frustration of students with the education process.

And the teen-age suicides in Moose Jaw that have been in the news so much lately, surely they've got to be taken

into consideration. They must be involved in this context.

Motivation, sir, cannot be bought at any price. And add to this, sir, the incredible rate of burn-out amongst teachers and we have an enormous problem. Do you know, sir, that the average length of time for a teacher in Britain to collect his pension is two years — two years. And I doubt if it's much better here, although I don't have the figures for Canada.

My own father, sir, was a teacher and, following that, a senior lecturer at a college. He retired at 34 . . . at 64, I beg your pardon, 64, and died at age 68. He was very lucky, he considered, because he collected his pension for twice as long as the average. But that's not much compensation for a lifetime's work.

I would like to see some sort of sabbatical leave introduced — a year off with full pay maybe after 15 years. It could be worked by taking deductions from the teacher's salary and maybe an equal amount from the Education department. It would give them an opportunity to recharge their batteries, conduct research, maybe tour the world before they're too darned old to be able to do it and appreciate it. What's the use of perfect software if the hardware is worn out?

It has come down to us from classical times — I believe it was Lucian around about AD 100 who said, *mens sana in corpore sano* — a healthy mind in a healthy body. And for the best of everything, we need the best of everything — the best of food, the best teachers, the best schools, the best educational system, and the best of health. Without that you're wasting your time.

(1615)

I'm also very pleased, sir, to see in the throne speech reference to that much neglected natural resource, and I refer here to the aboriginal people.

Shortly after coming to Canada, my wife and I adopted two young children, one a Chipewyan boy from the North and the second a very beautiful girl of Cree extract from the Fort Qu'Appelle area. And unless you have direct experience, sir, you just cannot understand the problems such children have in growing up in an alien society.

Both of them ran away from school, sir. Both of them ran away, separately, from home. Both of them ended up with alcohol problems. One of them ended up a guest, should we say, of Her Majesty on more than one occasion. You know what I'm referring to. Neither of them are bad. Neither of them are evil or wicked. They're just confused and very lonely. Both of them have passed through the fire and both have survived. Both have subsequently taken training and are now established in what looks like stable careers.

But there are too many like them languishing in our correctional centres, not only in Saskatchewan but throughout Canada and in the United States as well, sir. Totally wasted. Not criminals, just ignorant and largely illiterate. They're unwanted on the reserves; they're unhappy in our cities. They have no jobs, no hope, no

future.

But our government has pledged itself in this throne speech to do something about it, and I congratulate them from the bottom of my heart.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Draper: — It is not only the just thing to do, sir, it is humane, and it is good economics to boot to get these young people — and for the most part they are young people — out of jail where it costs \$20,000 a year to keep each one. Get them producing. Maybe they can produce \$20,000 a year when they're training, and we're not just saving 20,000, we're saving 40,000.

I hope I haven't bored you, sir. I know that all this will take time and be costly. But we really don't have a choice. It has to be done and we have to start it today. And I thank you for listening to me.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It certainly also gives me a great deal of pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to engage in the debate on the Speech from the Throne. And I have been listening very carefully as speaker after speaker gets up, and I am encouraged by the sincerity that all of these ladies and gentlemen are showing, from both sides actually, Mr. Speaker, in letting their views be known. And I congratulate all of them for doing a job particularly well.

Mr. Speaker, before I continue on into the meat of my speech, which is obviously going to have to be very abbreviated in terms of what I had planned, I would like to thank the constituents of Rosthern very sincerely for once more returning me to this legislature and to be able to speak on their behalf.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Actually, Mr. Speaker, it was one of my constituents that said to me, any fool can get elected the first time; it's getting elected the second time that really counts. And I take that I'm sure in the spirit in which it was given, that I am here once again, the second time, representing my constituents. And it's difficult for all of us and any of us to be an MLA and to do a good job. I know that I speak for I think every member here that very often at the end of the day we say: what was all this about?

A lot of people came with problems — problems that we could not solve. And we feel dejected about that, but then comes that moment when we were able to help someone in need, point them in the right direction, and certainly that makes us feel good.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a lot has happened in my constituency with the seniors' housing complexes, the nursing homes, sports complexes, the decentralization that took place, as far as North Park, and for the handicapped and less privileged people were concerned. And we have group homes now in Rosthern — which the opening will take place in about 10 days time, very proud of that — group homes in Waldheim, group homes in Hepburn. And

certainly it was very comforting to me to have been indeed part and parcel of that process.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not zero in on particular concerns that I have in this Speech from the Throne, the Speech from the Throne that indicates at the beginning that there is a mandate for change, a mandate for change initiated with the results of the election. And I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that yes, I will agree that there was a mandate for change, but a very narrow, restricted mandate for change. And that mandate for change does not, Mr. Speaker, that mandate for change does not entail the ripping off of the people of this province by saying one thing and then doing exactly the opposite once these good folks across the way were elected. This mandate for change does not include utility increases, tax increases, and attack on our health structure.

This mandate for change, I will concede, does include such things as the elimination of patronage, for example. And, Mr. Speaker, I was very enheartened today when the Minister of Justice stood in his place and made a solemn commitment to the people of Saskatchewan and to this legislature that the people who are getting the pink slips as a result of what that Minister of Finance is going to be doing tomorrow, that those individuals who get those pink slips even today, even as I speak, that none of them will be back-hired and that none of them would be NDP supporters. And I congratulate the minister for taking that firm and honest stand.

And I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that we as an opposition intend to hold him and his Premier to that promise because that was a solemn promise made in this House, and we all know the consequences of a member standing in his place, making a commitment, and breaking that commitment.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn my attention for just a few moments, if I might, to the *Star-Phoenix*, the latest *Star-Phoenix* that I've been able to get hold of, and I notice on the front page of the *Star-Phoenix*, Mr. Speaker, the headline says: "Crop insurance agents gagged: PCs." Crop insurance agents gagged.

And then I notice also on the throne speech here that it talks about openness of government and it talks about the ability for people to freely and safely being able to express themselves. Yet we have the crop insurance agents being gagged.

And I can attest to that personally because at the first few crop insurance meetings that I was at, the first thing that those agents had to tell us: folks we are not allowed to talk about the '91 GRIP program — we're not allowed to talk about that. That's openness.

Now furthermore of course, and I don't want to go through the whole litany, but the farmers — we saw them on the steps here — they objected to the GRIP program changes to which they were not party. These programs have been changed, gutted to the point where they're not bankable.

I asked the bank manager in . . . I won't name the bank in

Saskatoon, his major portfolio is agriculture — he says: no, we're not loaning out any money now; the only farmer that we will give money to in a loan right now is the farmer that is so well-heeled that he doesn't need the loan.

That's the extent to which this government has created concern and pessimism in the farming community. It's not bankable; it's not predictable. The only thing that is predictable is that the premiums are higher and the coverage is lower.

And then when farmers say: well you've broken the contract, you didn't give us the information by March 15, what is the Minister of Agriculture's response? Oh well, we will have deemed it to be; we will pass an Act retroactively.

And ladies and gentlemen in the public, and ladies and gentlemen in this House, what this House is going to be asked to do is to vote on something that we all know that did not take place.

No farmer, not one farmer, got a notice in the mail saying, we're going to be making those changes. Heads up, do you want to stay in or do you want to get out? Not one farmer got that letter.

But the Minister of Agriculture is saying, oh that doesn't matter. That doesn't matter, he's saying to you. And he says, we're going to vote it in anyway, and we'll pretend that something happened when we didn't. Well what do we call that, Mr. Speaker? What do we call that? I can't say what we call that. But that's what members in this House are going to be asked to underwrite. And I don't think that there are members on that other side . . . they may tow the party line on it, Mr. Speaker, but they are going to have second thoughts. And they will not feel good about doing that.

Well, Mr. Speaker, like I said, I wanted to spend a little bit of time on the *Star-Phoenix*. And normally I don't read the *Star-Phoenix* or like talking about it too much because in my opinion it's not a paper that's usually being accused of being balanced or anything like that, but we'll let that go.

Turn to page 2. "Continuing exodus likely result of . . ." And I'm quoting, Mr. Speaker: "Continuing exodus likely result of Honest Roy's budget".

Now what I'm going to do in the next few minutes is just give you a brief idea of what people are thinking and people are saying and people are dreading about this government and what it's got in store for us. "Continuing exodus likely result of Honest Roy's budget," I quote again. And he continues, Les MacPherson, and I have my own personal opinions there too of better left unsaid.

I missed the premier's speech on T.V. the other evening . . . There are but 10 such people in Saskatchewan (that watched it), and they're all in Romanow's cabinet.

All right? But then he goes on to say:

It was Honest Roy, you may recall, who not so

long ago was denouncing high taxes. We're going to change all that.

And that's what we've been saying. That's what you folks across the road were elected on, the promise that there would be no taxes. They were not necessary.

Four point five billion dollars is a large enough budget for any government to operate under. We do not need more taxes, he says.

It was Honest Roy (and I quote again) who said over and over again that, \$4.5 billion in provincial revenues was enough. He does not say this any more (he says).

He does not say this any more.

It was Honest Roy who, during the election campaign, warned us of the deficit, that it would be hundreds of millions of dollars higher than the devious Devine administration let on. Now he feigns surprise at the dimensions of (the) deficit.

What I'm telling you good folks across the way is that it's not washing. It's not washing with the people out there. The people are telling us, you knew. You knew the state of the finances of this province, and yet you went ahead, and yet you said you would do more with less. That is what you said. And I hear the toy minister chirping in the background.

Well what else did you say, Mr. Minister? I'll quote what you said. It's in the paper. And this time I happen to choose the *Leader-Post*. I try to be balanced. And the *Leader-Post* says, and I quote, Shillington — and there's a nice beaming countenance of his is in here — and it says: The NDP won't raise any personal taxes for four years.

These are not our ads, it's a total third party, totally divorced from any political affiliation. And I am quoting what the former critic for Finance said: the NDP won't raise any personal taxes for four years. That comforts me. That comforts me, Mr. Speaker, knowing that I can rely on the words and the promises of our government; that I can relax, that I'll be able to sit back in my seat tomorrow while the Minister of Finance reads his budget, and not have to worry about being taxed more.

Because, Mr. Speaker, that's precisely why the members opposite were elected. We had our economic plan and we gave it to the province. We gave it to the people. They looked, they judged, and they said: we don't like it because the NDP are saying this, and we like that better, we like that better because he says no taxes, more services for less. That's what he said.

That's why you were elected, ladies and gentlemen, and that . . .

(1630)

The Speaker: — Order. Order. I must inform the Assembly that under Rule 13(4), it is my duty at this time to interrupt debate and put all questions necessary to dispose of the main motion.

Before we — could I have your attention, please? — before we call in the members, I would just like to draw to the attention, especially of the new members but I noticed also some of the more experienced members, you should all have been aware that the motion was going to be taken at 4:30 and therefore you should have been in your seats or close to your seats and not cross in front of the Speaker when he's reading the motion. You either then stay behind the bar, but you don't cross in front while the Speaker is on his feet. That is a standing rule, and it has been a tradition in this House for a long time. So I ask members to please be aware of that in the future.

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

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 42

| | |
|--------------|-------------|
| Van Mulligen | Lautermilch |
| Thompson | Calvert |
| Wiens | Hamilton |
| Simard | Johnson |
| Tchorzewski | Draper |
| Lingenfelter | Sonntag |
| Teichrob | Flavel |
| Shillington | Roy |
| Koskie | Cline |
| Anguish | Scott |
| Goulet | McPherson |
| Atkinson | Wormsbecker |
| Kowalsky | Kujawa |
| Carson | Stanger |
| MacKinnon | Knezacek |
| Penner | Harper |
| Cunningham | Keeping |
| Upshall | Kluz |
| Hagel | Carlson |
| Bradley | Renaud |
| Lorje | Langford |

Nays — 9

| | |
|----------|-------------|
| Muirhead | Britton |
| Neudorf | Toth |
| Swenson | Goohsen |
| Boyd | D'Autremont |
| Martens | |

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

MOTIONS

Address be Engrossed and Presented to Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Saskatoon River Heights:

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

Motion agreed to.

Ways and Means

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Regina Dewdney:

That this Assembly pursuant to Rule 87 hereby appoint a Committee of Finance to consider the supply to be granted to Her Majesty and consider ways and means of raising the supply.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:45 p.m.