

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Monday next ask the government the following question:

Regarding SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) and the Department of Highway's recent increase to insurance premium rates and vehicle registration charges: (1) why are vehicle owners whose insurance expires in March of 1993 being charged an additional 4.75 per cent on renewal despite renewing before April 1 when the increase is to take effect; (2) why are vehicle owners whose registration expires in March of 1993 being charged an additional 7.6 per cent on renewal despite renewing before April 1 when the increase is to take effect; and (3) what have the ministers responsible done to determine the extent of the above practice?

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Monday next give first reading to a Bill to protect municipal property taxpayers in the province of Saskatchewan through the repeal of The Hospital Revenue Act.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly, Bert Brown of Alberta. Bert will be known to many members of this Assembly as the father of the concept of the Triple E Senate. Stand up, Bert, so they can have a look at you.

We worked closely with Bert and his group and other similarly minded governments during the last constitutional negotiations and supported quite a strong version of Triple E right through to the end. I think that I'd like to have members welcome Bert to our House today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also would like to extend a warm welcome to Mr. Brown to the Assembly today. Bert was into my office and had the opportunity to meet members of the opposition caucus just after lunch. Bert and I were trying to remember if it was 1987 or 1988 when he sold me my first Triple E pin. But it was a ways back, and I've been happy to renew ever since. And I just applaud Mr. Brown and the efforts that he's done on behalf of western Canadians.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too would like to join with the government and the official opposition in welcoming Mr. Brown. We've had interesting discussions on numerous occasions. The last

of course was at Sask Place when 12,700 other individuals were present. And we really, I think, benefited not only from your work in Triple E Senate, but your ideas on agriculture as well. So welcome.

Mr. Carlson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you and through you to the rest of the Assembly, some students from the Melville Comprehensive School in Melville. They're accompanied today by Len Ernst, their teacher, and Al Shotz, the bus driver.

They're a group of Christian ethics students. Len is a Christian ethics teacher at the comprehensive school in Melville. I'd like all the Assembly to welcome them here today and I'll be meeting with them after question period.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, a famous son of Saskatchewan, Eric Mallings, who is in the press gallery with us today. Many of you will know Eric from his many programs, W5, and also to say to him welcome home. And we look forward to pleasant comments from you as a result of your experience here in question period.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The area around Swift Current has been a party to many well-known news media people and Eric Mallings is one of the people that have been associated with the area around the south-west. Some of the very first people in the CBC (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation) were involved in Swift Current — Mr. Minifie. And I think others will know that it has been a significant contribution by the people of the south-west to the whole of the Canadian broadcasting industry. And I want to welcome him here on behalf of the opposition.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Lorje: — I would like to join with others in welcoming Mr. Mallings to this Chamber. Eric and I . . . actually he may not remember me but we served on the University of Saskatchewan student union council many, many years ago. And we have both gone on in totally different directions in terms of public service. I'm not sure who's taken the best direction, but I do want to welcome you and wish you all the best in the future.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would be remiss in not extending a warm welcome to Eric Mallings, whom I have known since early childhood. His mother was my . . .

An Hon. Member: — He is that old.

Ms. Haverstock: — Yes, he is indeed. His mother was my Sunday school teacher. He is named after his uncle who was my father's very best friend. And I've had the

privilege of knowing Eric for many, many years, and I'm not going to tell anything more than that. So welcome.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Penner: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd also like to recognize an old friend and a schoolmate of mine, Eric Mallings. Eric and I went to high school together. I was the teacher and he was one of the students. But, Eric, it's nice to see you today and we hope to see you after the question period.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Are there any others up there?

ORAL QUESTIONS

District Health Boards

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I confess I don't know Mr. Mallings at all. I'm just a local boy that needs a lot of help.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for recognizing me. Mr. Speaker, my first question today is to the Minister of Health. Madam Minister, yesterday you not only delivered a health Bill to the members of this Legislative Assembly, but you put out notice that you are delivering a health bill to every property tax owner in the province of Saskatchewan.

Madam Minister, your Premier, your Premier declared before the full convention of SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association), that your assault on the health care system would not have any impact on property taxes. Will you today admit that the structure that you have proposed will lead directly to higher property taxes as you offload your health care funding onto municipalities? Will you admit that, Madam Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, the Bill very clearly deals with issues such as taxation, and district boards do not have power to tax on the property tax base. So district boards do not have that power. What the Premier stated at SUMA is that district boards would not have the power to tax on the property tax base and that the status quo on an interim basis would remain in place, until we had an opportunity to work out alternative mechanisms and solutions to deal with the \$23 million that is now raised on the property tax base.

Those discussions are in the process of taking place, and the Department of Health along with Community Services and Rural Development and with input from stakeholders, we'll be looking at how we deal with contributions at the local level and how we deal with the 23 million that is presently raised through taxation by union hospital districts.

Mr. Speaker, we should note here that union hospital districts have the power to tax. New district boards will not have the power to tax and therefore there's complete

illogic in the member's suggestion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Madam Minister, during your lengthy speech there, what you're doing is basically fudging the issue. I would suggest to you, Madam Minister, that come out of the shadows, come into the sunlight so that the people and the taxpayers of this province can have a clear look at you.

Madam Minister, your Bill specifically provides that municipalities can either use general property taxation or special health taxes, health levies on property. Are you saying now that that was all a mistake and that you will remove the possibility of jacking up property taxes before the law?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Under the present system \$23 million a year is raised through union hospital districts levying taxes and through the municipal property tax levy — 23 million. There is no intention on the part of government to remove the need for local contribution to capital construction; therefore district boards will have the right to go to municipalities and to ask them whether or not they could impose a special levy, for example, to deal with the issue of capital construction, which happens now, incidentally.

Municipalities, for the first time, will have the right to say no. Under the former legislation under union hospital districts, the union hospital district board made the decision as to whether or not they levied — the union hospital. Now municipalities will be . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. Next question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Speaker, another new question to the minister. Madam Minister, you say they will have the right to say no; I suggest to you and the taxpayers of this province say to you, they will not have that option. What you're doing to them is forcing them into a corner. You've already announced that they are going to be taxed . . . cuts in funding for hospitals, in funding for health. You've already announced that. They will not have that luxury, Madam Minister, of saying no because you're forcing them into a corner. You are saying that it's a voluntary contribution and that is where the nonsense is, Madam Minister.

Madam Minister, what is your advice to the RMs (rural municipality) and municipalities of this province when the centralized health board approaches them and says, put on a special levy or we will close your hospital? What is your advice to the reeves, to the town councillors of the province, when your blackmail tactics come to fruition? Tell us that, Madam Minister.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order, order. I would just ask members not to use words that become inflammatory in the

question period.

Hon. Ms. Simard: — There has been an enormous amount of consultation that has taken place with respect to health reform. The members opposite know that I have travelled the province at least three times this fall and winter talking to the people of Saskatchewan, the health care stakeholders, and municipal representatives. They know obviously better than you do that what the status quo is and the fact that this legislation improves the situation, from their point of view. They realize that, Mr. Speaker.

The members opposite talk in terms of cost cutting. Yes, there will be budget reductions in the health care budget this year as there were last year. There is no question that is true, Mr. Speaker. But what they fail to realize is that these reductions are taking place as a result of their ineptness, their mismanagement of . . .

The Speaker: — Next question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Madam Minister. You were getting almost into that inflammatory rhetoric again, and that is always a signal to us that you are getting uncomfortable.

Madam Minister, not only do you have provisions in your new Bill for offloading, you already . . . you already have a legal back door. There is no sense of volunteerism there.

The Hospital Revenue Act gives the provincial government the explicit power to order municipalities to impose property taxes for health funding. Do you deny that you already have the power to force municipalities to collect property taxes to fund the health system your new Bill is establishing? Do you deny that?

Hon. Ms. Simard: — The hospital revenue tax has been there for years, years. It's there. There's no change in that. The status quo remains. It's the same as it was before. Even when you were in power the hospital revenue tax was there.

The members opposite are a way off on a red herring here. What they should be talking about, what they should be talking about is the improvements to the health care system that are going to be delivered in the long term as a result of coordination and integration of our health care services. But instead they want to focus on a red herring for political purposes. And they refuse to acknowledge the fact that the budgetary reductions we're going through are as a result of their mismanagement and . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Next question. Next question.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps, Madam Minister, you are trying to tell us what to talk about. I'm telling you what I'm talking about is what the people of this province want me to talk about. They have a concern. The organizations within this province have a concern, Madam Minister, that you are basically going to use a back-door tactic to cover up what your Premier promised the people of this province — maybe not

directly. Maybe the Premier did say that the health boards will not have the power to tax.

But, Madam Minister, we full well know the offloading that you are intending to do through the back door, and one of those back doors that the organizations in Saskatchewan have a great deal of concern about is The Hospital Revenue Act.

Now, Madam Minister, will you agree, will you agree to do away with The Hospital Revenue Act as such, to remove the possibility of the Minister of Finance and your Premier to grab deeper into the taxpayers' pockets.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Simard: — I will say once again, Mr. Speaker, the status quo does not change. And the red herring the members are raising is exactly that — it's a red herring and it's political scare tactics on their part.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that there are thousands of people across this province who are very pleased that we are coming forward with district legislation and moving with some coordination and integration of health care services. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that this is going to lead in the end in the long term to much better quality health care services, particularly for rural communities, the communities that some of these members over here represent.

For at least 10 to 20 years we've had a serious problem with distribution of doctors in rural Saskatchewan. And while those members were in power they chose to ignore it. They chose to ignore the duplications in service, the gaps in service, and they raised the provincial debt in this province by billions of dollars.

The Speaker: — Next question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Madam Minister is getting into more and more political rhetoric. Madam Minister, you are clearly offloading funding onto the property tax base. Clearly. Clearly without a doubt, that's your bent. But worse, Madam Minister, you are now also offloading the province's debt onto the centralized boards. The centralized boards, not the province, will now borrow the money for capital projects. The boards are going to have to do that, according to your own document.

Madam Minister, given the recommendations of the Gass Commission, and given your government's write-off of almost a billion dollars in hospitals and schools, can you explain to us how the debts these boards will incur on your behalf will be any different than SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation) incurring the debt.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, under the status quo, union hospital districts have the right to borrow. This doesn't change the status quo. The members here are off on red herrings trying to create political issues that don't

exist. As opposed to being part of the solution, they are continuing to be part of the problem.

The Speaker: — Order, order. There's just too much interruption. There's too much interruption when the minister is trying to answer her question. I ask the members, please — there's no interruption when you ask your question, no interruption when the minister answers her question.

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, after years of neglect, years of neglect in this province by the members opposite, after total irresponsibility with respect to the finances of this province, when a government finally attempts to do something about the problems that are out there, instead of being part of the solution they want to continue to be part of the problem.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Madam Minister, I don't think I have to remind the public that is watching how you are evading every question. You're not answering it forthrightly and completely. You're getting into political rhetoric every time you don't understand a situation. Now, Madam Minister, you can't have it both ways. You first of all blow up the debt on the back of the previous administration and then you cook the health care system to hide debt under your own administration. The principle that your Premier used in writing-off all the hospitals in the province that . . . was that hospitals do not generate their own income and therefore the debt could only be paid for by grants through government.

Since you are saying these centralized boards will incur debt and you say that they will have no independent revenue capacity of their own, is it not simply true that all hospital care, all hospital capital costs and debts must be written off against the provincial debt each time that it is incurred? Is that not true, Madam Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, district boards will have an obligation to provide the provincial government with an annual budget. And the legislation protects the public from deficit budgeting and indicates in effect that there will not be deficit budgeting.

Now obviously if there's a situation where somebody has an overrun, the provincial government will be monitoring that and looking into it very carefully. But the legislation is designed to protect the public from deficit budgeting by the district boards.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The minister just said now that they can borrow but they are not allowed to have debt. Madam Minister, you are offloading funding onto property tax and you are offloading the provincial debt onto the centralized health boards. That is clear, Madam Minister.

To cap it all off, you are not going to allow the boards to fully elect their own people. Instead, you will allow some

to be elected and half as many again to be appointed by you personally.

Madam Minister, is the fact of ensuring these political appointments not a clear admission by you that you do not trust the people to elect health board members who will do your bidding?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Simard: — I have a hard time not laughing at some of your questions. They're absolutely ridiculous. If you understood and just took the time to try and understand what is taking place as opposed to trying to make political rhetoric out of what is occurring in Saskatchewan, you might understand why there is need for appointments.

This morning in Saskatoon, for example, someone stood up from the College of Medicine, the Faculty of Medicine and wanted to know if it was possible for one of them to be appointed to the board. Mr. Cliff Wright said yes, they should be involved.

The point is is that there will be situations where appointments should be made to the board. For example, if a person from outside should be appointed to another district board so that we get that coordination between two districts, that freedom is there. If we have an aboriginal community that was unable to elect a member to the board but still should have input into that process, there will be room for appointments.

So the reason for appointments to boards is to make sure that certain interests and certain specialties and the process of coordination between districts can continue to take place.

So if the members . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Next question.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's interesting, Madam Minister, how you so sanctimoniously answer that question when you were the first one to condemn that very same recommendation by the Murray Commission. What a change of heart when it's convenient. And that, Madam Minister, is why we suspect your motives. That's why we suspect motives — exactly for the example in the previous answer that you gave; exactly because of that.

The fact is, Madam Minister, the fact is you take care of your politics and not the needs of the communities, and the people have full power to elect their boards. If they have that full power your politics will suffer, Madam Minister. That's what our concern is.

The government is right in thinking it can no longer trust the people to blindly follow along. They're not going to do that. You rigged it so that you only have to win two wards to have full control over those boards. That's what you've done. I doubt that if you can win even the two wards, but that's easier than doing it the other way.

Given that you are playing along to rig the boards themselves, why do you find it necessary then, Madam Minister, to set election rules in the secrecy of cabinet, in cabinet meetings, rather than debate them in the Assembly? Madam Minister, by regulation in the secrecy of your compatriots in the cabinet, you are going to set regulations, not that they can be debated in this Assembly. Why is that, Madam Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Regulations can always be debated in this Assembly. You can ask questions about them; there's nothing stopping you from making . . . from asking questions. There is nothing being done in secret here.

The fact of the matter is I travelled the province and officials from the Department of Health travelled the province for several months and people clearly felt that an election process where there were elected boards, partially elected, partially appointed, was appropriate. There was a feeling throughout this province that that was appropriate, and we listened to the people. The people also told us they did not want district boards to have taxation powers on the property tax base, and we listened to the people. The people also told us that they wanted to have district board legislation as soon as possible and we listened to the people because it's the second Bill that's been tabled here in the House.

The results of this legislation is a result of massive consultation and that consultation process with respect to the election process and how wards are established will continue. What you see . . .

The Speaker: — Next question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Madam Minister, you talk about open consultation and travelling around the province. You travel around the province in picked audiences where you determine who's going to be there. The buffer of your officials are there. That is the type of open and free consultation.

I ask you, please go out and have public hearings on this. You have refused to do that, Madam Minister. Why? Why don't you call public meetings throughout Saskatchewan so all people will have their say? You refuse to do that. So don't sanctimoniously get up and say what a wonderful consultative process that you have had, Madam Minister.

Madam Minister, in summary you are offloading funds. You are offloading debt. And you are fixing the electoral process. Those are the three accusations that I'm making to you today, Madam Minister.

Is it not clear that your policy is not about wellness; it's not about sound finances; it's not about communities having control, Madam Minister; but instead it is about you controlling communities. Is that not the real agenda, Madam Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know what these guys have been smoking but this is ridiculous.

An Hon. Member: — I don't think it's healthy, whatever it is.

Hon. Ms. Simard: — It's certainly not wellness, Mr. Speaker.

The fact . . . This morning I had a meeting with some 800 people. I had a meeting this morning of some 800 people, and the press was there and it was open to the public. It was not a closed meeting. I've had meetings throughout this province, Mr. Speaker, with many thousands of people. Some people were invited. The doors weren't closed to others. We wanted to make sure our planning group people came out.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, there have been thousands of people — thousands of people at these meetings, and none of them have been closed. And then again this morning some 800 people.

The members opposite have never engaged in this kind of community developmental process where we are asking communities and local people at the grass roots level to be a part of reform. They have never engaged in a process of that nature.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Business Investment in Saskatchewan

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, there's no question that the NDP government opposite is painting the worst economic picture possible in order to hide their ongoing betrayal of promises.

Last week we saw an example of what doom-and-gloom strategy has done to businesses looking to locate in Saskatchewan. A major hotel chain decided to cancel plans rather than move to Saskatchewan, because of the efforts of the Premier and the member for Melfort.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we have an example of the kind of confidence your government is inspiring in the local business community. *Sask Trends Monitor* has recently released information that shows that the investment intentions are down 9 per cent from the 1992 level, with virtually all of the decline in the new capital category — 9 per cent, Mr. Speaker.

Very simply, my question is to the Premier: will your government acknowledge that the ongoing political strategy is getting in the way of economic development to the tune of 9 per cent drop in investment strategy? Will you admit, Mr. Premier, that your strategy has been a failure?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the question. I point out to the hon. member that the Regina Chamber of Commerce in a statement just issued recently, having surveyed its members, said that 82 per cent of the member firms felt that the volume

would be up, 20 per cent expected to employ more, 22 per cent said they were going to invest more, and 37 per cent said that they were going to look forward to better economic times. That's the reality.

I also say the following to the member, I say this, Mr. Speaker: we have a responsibility to deliver government services to the people in the most efficient manner possible. This province is on the verge of bankruptcy and we cannot afford to do otherwise. Have the economic and social benefits been fairly weighed against the costs? I'm not so sure.

What I'm reading to the hon. member are the words of one Mr. Grant Hodgins, a member of your cabinet table, who described the true finances from the inside. He was telling the truth; it's about time that you started telling the truth.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, thank you. What we just heard, Mr. Speaker, is the NDP (New Democratic Party) lighting up their blame thrower once again, lighting it up for everyone to see. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Premier, the reality is investment may be up in Regina, but the rest of the province investment is going down 9 per cent — down, Mr. Premier. That's the reality. *Sask Trends Monitor* believes investment in this province is going down.

Will the minister . . . will the Premier admit that his economic strategy for this province has been a dismal failure, particularly in light of the information we see today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously the hon. member does not wish to be confused by the facts. I have in front of me here the Conference Board of Canada — have you heard of it? The Conference Board of Canada in its latest report predicts for the province of Saskatchewan a growth of 3.2 per cent. Not the greatest, but I tell you it's going to be higher than Manitoba, it's going to be higher than Ontario, and it's going to be as good as most of the provinces in this country.

And I want to tell you something, sir. The fact that that prediction is being made by the Conference Board in the face of a \$15.5 billion debt that you and your colleagues saddled, is a miracle and a credit to this government's policies.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

POINT OF ORDER

The Speaker: — Order. Why is the member on his feet?

Mr. Neudorf: — Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — What's your point of order?

Mr. Neudorf: — I want an explanation or a ruling on why the opposition is being called to order for

unparliamentary language and the Minister of Health was totally ignored. I'd like to have a ruling from you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — I'll take your comment under advisement and bring a ruling back to the House.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 4 — An Act respecting Local Improvements in Urban and Northern Municipalities and to Effect Certain Consequential Changes

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Mr. Speaker, I move that The Local Improvement Act be now introduced and read the first time.

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

Bill No. 5 — An Act to amend The Planning and Development Act, 1983

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Mr. Speaker, I move that An Act to amend The Planning and Development Act be now introduced and read the first time.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, as it relates to question no. 75 put by the member for Greystone, I would request it be converted for motion for return (debatable).

The Speaker: — For return debate.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — As it relates to the question put by the member from Moosomin, I would hereby table the response.

The Speaker: — Answer tabled.

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

Mr. Kluz: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It is definitely an honour to reply to the Speech from the Throne. Before the House was in session my family was watching television news one night and the reporter said that all of Saskatchewan's eyes would be on the Speech from the Throne because they were looking at the budget and they were looking for clues. My young boy said, dad, why are they looking for you?

I want to take a moment to thank some special people in

my life. It's my wife and my three children who make a lot of sacrifices for me to do this job. I want to thank them for making those sacrifices.

I want to welcome you back in the Chair, Mr. Speaker. It's nice to see that the decorum is going to be restored in this House.

I think back when I was first elected, I talked to some of my high school principals that told me that I don't know why we even went to the legislature; the conduct there was unbearable. I don't think we will go back. I suggested to them, they go back once again and they will find that the decorum is restored and it is once again a respectable institution.

Our government is going to restore sound financial management. We're going to have a better future for our children. And what that means is that there's going to be no more vote-buying and no more pork-barrelling. Those days are over, Mr. Speaker. We're returning to open, honest, and accountable government.

When the member from Arm River talks about there was a debt of 3.5 billion in this province prior to '82, well that may be true. They should look and see where that debt was. That debt was in the Crown corporations. We had a fine province; Crown corporations who carried a debt that was self-liquidating.

We saw those Crown corporations disappear; they were privatized. Sask Minerals, Potash Corporation, for example. We also saw our highways equipment sold off. For the tune of something like 40 cents on the dollar it was auctioned off. Most of the machinery left this province, and the RMs and the towns didn't even get a chance to bid on it — 40 cents on the dollar, it's gone.

For every year that the past government was in power, they added \$1 billion to the deficit — \$1 billion a year. That amounts to \$2.8 million a day, \$2.8 million for every day they were in power, they added to the deficit. I can't even imagine that amount of money. And for each year that 1 billion they added totals 15 billion now because the Crown corporations are gone. We're paying interest charges of \$760 million a year-plus, or \$2.1 million a day or \$24 a second — \$24 for every second of every day — interest on the public debt here in Saskatchewan. And you wonder why our hands are tied.

I'm asked many times by my constituents, what would the Conservatives have done if they were re-elected; how would they have run this province. Well there's no doubt in my mind, no doubt in my mind whatsoever that they would have privatized the rest of the Crown corporations: SGI, SaskPower, SaskTel, and SaskEnergy would have been privatized. They would have sold everything and we would have probably been 20 billion or God only knows how much in debt with no public utilities or Crowns at all. And at the same time they would have lined their pockets.

And, Mr. Speaker, when you wonder why I'm saying they would have lined their pockets, I've got an article here in my hands, *Toronto Globe and Mail*, Saturday, February 6, 1993. It's entitled: "How the gravy train went off the

rails."

Saskatchewan. The '80s were the province's time for expansive deal-making. Indeed, it sometimes seemed as though everyone was striking it rich. But today, with the province \$15-billion in debt, it's time to pay the piper.

I'm going to quote some articles from this paper because I think it has to go on the record and the people of this province have to know what went on here in the last 10 years. It says:

A number of well connected developers grew fat from long-term government leases on their buildings . . . "The developers had 14-year mortgages and 15-year leases." What this means is that they would use the security of these government leases to borrow money to finance their buildings, then enjoy ownership of the building even before the government lease ended.

And I've got in my hands here the annual report from Sask Property Management Corporation, and if you look at the schedule of payments, it's full of these contracts. And I'm not going to list them or disclose any of the individuals that took on some of these contracts. If you want to look, contact any member of the government or get a copy of the Sask Property Management Corporation annual report and take a look for yourselves.

(1445)

And all of these leases at the same time, Mr. Speaker, all of these leases are much higher than comparable leases in adjoining areas, and sometimes 75 per cent higher. And we wonder, we wonder why our province is broke.

Some more quotes, Mr. Speaker.

In 1991 directors of Roberts & Poole and Dome worked together as directors of Blue Wave, which put together the Tories' advertising campaign for the provincial election. A provincial commission found that Dome was paid thousands of dollars by the government for no apparent reason. Dome also funnelled \$500,000 over two years into a third unrelated agency, Strategy West, run by a close Devine friend, Cy Macdonald. There was no mention of contracts to him in the public-account books.

No mention. Where did this money go? Was it used for an election? — I have no idea. But there is no record of it whatsoever.

And another quote:

GigaText. In 1988 Tory party pollster Ken Waschuk introduced Guy Montpetit, owner of Montreal's GigaMos Systems Inc., to the Saskatchewan cabinet. With help from Montreal Senator Michel Cogger (who comes to trial . . . on charges of influence-peddling in relation to GigaMos), Mr. Montpetit sold Saskatchewan on a new computer system for translating government

statutes into French. Deputy premier Eric Berntson arranged a \$5-million grant to set up GigaText. Mr. Montpetit loaned \$150,000 of it to Mr. Waschuk, who put it in a new Bermuda holding company. Mr. Montpetit also spent \$2.9-million on \$39,000 worth of second-hand computers he already owned; they were unable to translate more than a few words.

He went and took 2.9 million from the province and bought \$39,000 worth of useless equipment he already owned. It's a shame, Mr. Speaker.

Another one:

Rafferty-Alameda dams. Built in Grant Devine's riding (and I'm quoting, Mr. Speaker), these two dams were supported with 155 million . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. If the member is quoting, he must do the exact quoting. He can't say, I refer to the member's riding, then name the member and now I'm going to quote. It has to be in the quote. And I just want to direct that to the member's attention.

Mr. Kluz: — Okay, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will start again. I'm making a direct quote here:

Rafferty-Alameda dams. Built in Grant Devine's riding, these two dams were supported with \$155-million in provincial money, but government investigators say they will never generate enough revenue to cover their cost. Two new worries: There is not enough runoff and the Alameda dam seems to be shifting, suggesting a possible structural deficiency.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a national paper, the *Toronto Globe and Mail*. It's a non-biased report and I urge everyone to read this. Get a copy of it and read it. It lets you know what happened to this province the last 10 years.

Also on this front page there's some cost-cutting tips that were implemented by our government. It says:

The Premier's office stopped serving free booze to cabinet ministers. Savings last year: \$19,285.

In talking to one of my colleagues, they have said that, you know on a \$4.5 billion budget, \$20,000 is not a lot of money, but I tell you it sure is a lot of booze. And it kind of wonders, the way they ran this province, were they consuming that stuff while they're making some of these decisions? One sure has to think about that. Sure question it.

One more quote, Mr. Speaker:

SaskTel gave up its season's tickets to Roughrider games. Savings per year: \$6,172.

I'm going to shift now to talk a little bit about agriculture. You have to realize that this province has roughly 50 per cent of the agriculture land, 3.7 per cent to this nation's population, and roughly 2 per cent to the nation's taxpayers. That is why, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan

should not stand alone in this ag crisis. The crisis demands a national solution.

I have many of my constituents and neighbours near foreclosure. Their loans are being called. And it's not of immediate happenings. It's what has been happening to agriculture over the last 10 years. And now the projection of net farm income per family farm is someplace around \$3,000 of annual income.

The member from Arm River yesterday was talking about land bank and how so proudly he stood up in this House and said in 1983, I believe it was, they got rid of the land bank. Well I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, those same farmers that maybe were happy at that time, during the last couple of years I had talked to them and told me they certainly wished that land bank was around and maybe they could have continued farming instead of losing their farm. I want the members of the opposition to know that.

So we're talking that this is a federal responsibility. We only have 2 per cent of the nation's taxpayers. We need some money from the feds. They say there's no money. But somehow they find money for buying helicopters — billions of dollars.

And Minister McKnight when he was minister of Agriculture kept telling us there's no money, no money for agriculture, but four days after he changed portfolios, found 6.7 billion for Hibernia. I'm not saying that they don't need economic development there. I'm happy that Hibernia is getting some money and we'll see some economic development in this country. But if they have money for one area of this country they should have money for every area.

We talked about some of the farm support programs. It's interesting to note that Manitoba has a sunset clause on their safety net and it states, if they do nothing different, January '95 they'll be out of the program.

And I'm going to read some of the Alberta press release. And you keep in mind one thing about Alberta. They have half as many farmers as we have and they have more than twice the population. Yet Alberta is saying they can't afford these programs.

Some of the excerpts from this press release:

A two-year-old farm subsidy program, that governments claimed would be self-funded, has already piled up a \$400-million deficit in Alberta.

. . . I don't think it (GRIP) will ever be sound, said Isley.

Probably is saying that because of the sliding prices.

Mr. Isley also said,

There will have to be increases in premiums . . .

Increases in premiums.

Manitoba Agriculture Minister Glen Findlay told a farm group last month that the plan was designed

as an interim measure that would not be necessary after 1995.

When you think about how the program was set up, Mr. Speaker, back in 1991, Saskatchewan was the first one out of the chute under a Tory administration to sign this safety net proposal. And then when you think about it, when they signed it so fast, I don't think there was any consulting with any farmers or any farm groups.

And all governments of the day, all governments of the day, had said it has to be actuarially sound. And after two years the prices are going to go up, we won't have to be paying out to the farmers any more. They'll be paying premiums, and they'll pay back all the money that we gave them.

What it turns out to be is it's like another loan, another loan for the farmers because they've got to pay back the deficit through higher premiums. It's like the ACS (Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan) production loan or the spring seeding loan that many of my constituents are still paying back.

When I explain this to many of my rural councils — the last one, by the way, does not view things the same way I do politically — but when I explain this to them, they said they would never, ever vote Conservative again. They also said there won't be a Conservative government in Saskatchewan for 30 years.

An Hon. Member: — Fifty.

Mr. Kluz: — Some of my colleagues are saying 50. I agree — 30 years is much too soon.

We need a national program. Think about why we need this national program.

Before 1988 this province funded the administration of Crop Insurance in relation to farm support programs. That's all this province funded. Today we're paying around 43 per cent all farm support — 43 per cent and we have 2 per cent of the nation's taxpayers. How can that be, Mr. Speaker? How could a government of the day set something like that up?

They also promised 500 million when the safety nets were first signed. They promised 500 million. We haven't seen it yet.

We also had a two-price wheat system, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — Order, order. Could I ask the two members — the member from Shellbrook-Torch River and the member from Wilkie — if they have a conversation, to go behind the rails and not interfere with the member who is trying to speak.

Mr. Kluz: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. At least I can see that we are restoring decorum and some of the members must be paying attention to the speech.

When they promised this 500 million, we haven't seen it. We lost our two-price wheat system. A cheque was promised equal to one year's lost revenue. None of my

farmers have seen that cheque that was promised.

We've lost oats off the Canadian Wheat Board. And what have we seen? Lower oats prices. And one of the new commissioners from Alberta that's appointed to the Canadian Wheat Board is totally against barley being on the Canadian Wheat Board. So obviously the government in Ottawa, and I think the members opposite feel the same way, that they don't want to see the Canadian Wheat Board there at all.

The Crow benefits were changed. And now we're going to lose another \$80 million over the next two years on the Crow benefit.

Just look at all the comments I made about the money lost from federal farm support programs over the years, that happened while the previous administration just sat by and let every one happen because their Tory cousins were in Ottawa. Let it happen, indeed they did. And maybe they did support it. No doubt in my mind they did. That is why again, Mr. Speaker, that we need a national program to benefit this country as a whole.

I'll move off now into some of our new national goals. And one of them, Mr. Speaker, is a new national government — little excerpt from the throne speech — new national government. We know there will be a federal election sometime this year, and let's hope that we have a government that listens to the needs of this nation as well as western Canada.

And if you think back, if you think back when Mr. Mulroney was first elected, he had a choice at that time. There was a huge deficit racked up by the Trudeau administration over the years. The Auditor General had said that Trudeau's spending was out of control. And when Mr. Mulroney came on the scene he had a choice, and that choice was to take the hard line and pay off that accumulated debt, which at that time would have been a lot easier than it is today.

(1500)

But instead of making that choice he piled up the deficit, which is out of control. Look at the situation Canada is in today. If he would have taken the hard line, paid off that deficit, think of how things would look in this nation today.

And, Mr. Speaker, we're facing the same thing here in this province. We have a huge debt of \$15 billion. We have no choice and we do have the courage, Mr. Speaker, to turn this thing around and make this once again the best province in this nation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — Are you done?

Mr. Kluz: — No, I'm not done yet, hon. member. We talk about renewing health care. It's a milestone in this province, something that Tommy Douglas recognized as a second phase in medicare, the phase he also recognized is going to be the more difficult part to do. We're going to empower communities to make decisions

that serve them best.

And when I go to health care meetings I talk to the delegates and I address them, and I go back to some of my roots when I was a reeve of the municipality. And I tell them when the government of the day would come up with a decision and tell us this is the way we have to do it, we would yell back and say: no, we know what's right for us, let us make that choice ourselves. The next time around when they would let us make that choice, we would say: well you have the bureaucracy that's on salary, why don't you make that choice for us so we don't have to let our volunteers do that? So what I tell them is no matter which way, no matter which way the government goes or which direction we go, it's not going to be viewed as the right decision by local governments.

But in this decision, Mr. Speaker, there's no doubt in my mind it is the right decision because the communities will have a choice to make the right decisions for themselves which serves their area the best. And at the end of the day we will have a revised system which will have much better health care.

And, Mr. Speaker, that goes along with our wellness model. And when you talk about the wellness model, I believe I am living proof that that system does work. As many of you will recall, the last legislative session, towards the end I took ill, I developed pleurisy. I was excused from the House for some time. And I realized that I had to change some of the things I do. I've changed my lifestyle, I've changed my diet, I do some exercises now, I've lost 30 pounds. I feel fit as a fiddle. And there is something to that wellness model, Mr. Speaker. I feel great and I'm sure I'll be here for this whole session and I'm looking forward to it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kluz: — When we talk about some of our boundaries, this session we're going to introduce The Constituency Boundaries Act, and it's going to eliminate political influence. And being a rural member who has seen his population decline, I would hope that we do have provisions in there to look at cases of large area and low population to make sure that some of our numbers are equal, and I have a couple boundary commissions that come to my mind. And one was back in 1991 where there was countless money spent on a boundary commission that was supposed to be in place for the 1991 election, but it never happened. And I don't know why it didn't happen.

Maybe it had a lot to do, that it didn't have a chance to get passed in this Assembly, and maybe that is why, because it didn't have time because the House was prorogued for some strange reason. I don't know what that reason was. I don't know if it was because Grant Hodgins had resigned and walked across the floor, or if it was because the government of the day was running before they passed the budget. I'm not sure what it was, but there was a boundaries commission that money was spent on and didn't see the light of day.

There's another one that comes to my mind back in 1969, 1971 — I believe it will be 1971. In the election prior to

'71 in the constituency of Kelvington-Wadena, many of you will recall that Brian Bjarnason, the Liberal member, won by a slight majority. But due to some circumstances that the ballots weren't counted in the hospital polls — they disappeared — and it was that close that it was ruled there would have to be a by-election. I don't know why the ballots weren't counted — if they were lost or what happened — but there was a by-election ruled in 1969.

And at that time the New Democrats campaigned on the new deal for people, the new vision for Saskatchewan, and in '69 Neil Byers won that by-election. And they always said at that time, if we win Kelvington-Wadena we're going to win the province. So 1971 come along, the general election. There were some boundaries changes and I remembered very explicitly what happened in Kelvington-Wadena. There was 22 corners around the polls of Kelvington. They would take and draw a line . . . they would pick out a Liberal farm family and if there was a New Democrat they would go around a few corners so that they could vote in another constituency, just for the fact they wanted to win Kelvington-Wadena. There was 22 corners around the polls in Kelvington.

And sometime back when Walter Smishek was one of our honourable ministers, I was at a meeting with him in Saskatoon. And when we were in the hotel in the evening, we had run across Senator Steuart. He invited us up to his hotel room. And through some conversations of old times and reminiscing, Mr. Steuart had said, we may have done a lot of things when we were the Liberal government, but we did them all by the book.

I said, Senator Steuart, I disagree with you because I was working the Kelvington-Wadena election in 1971 and we had 22 corners around Kelvington. That was a gerrymander. You guys gerrymandered those boundaries.

And he looked at me and he said, that wasn't a gerrymander; that was a daveymander.

So I'm glad to see, Mr. Speaker, that we're going to take the political influence out of the new boundaries commission. We're also going to restore faith to the electorate with our new initiatives. We're going to let the people know that that light at the end of the tunnel is not no longer a freight train like it was under the previous administration. There is light at the end of the tunnel.

We're going to do what's right. We're going to restore open, honest, and accountable government, and once again, Mr. Speaker, restore the faith the people have in their elected representatives and this Legislative Assembly.

Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I'd like to say that I'm proud to be able to represent the constituency of Kindersley. I thank the good people of Kindersley for having the confidence in the Progressive Conservative Party and in myself, Mr. Speaker.

In preparing my response to the Speech from the Throne, I took a moment to peruse the last session's speech — NDP back-bench cheerleaders saying how wonderful they have done; farmers going bankrupt; health care boards fighting amongst themselves. Your government's incompetence is becoming legendary.

Members of this Assembly may recall that speech and its commitments to the people of Saskatchewan. We are dealing with some of those promises this session, Mr. Speaker. The same promises made in 1992, and again they're being made in 1993.

The NDP have a problem fulfilling promises no matter where they were made, on the election trail or in the Speech from the Throne. Of course some of the promises made in the 1992 Speech from the Throne were controversial, so they were shelved.

Before I go too far, Mr. Speaker, about the government's broken promises, I'd like to just briefly touch on some other broken promises, promises made by the member for Saskatoon Greystone.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal leader, the member from Saskatoon Greystone, is more interested in her media profile or media-appointed superstar status, than governing this province. She presents a reform package that consists of vague notions, and trendy and lofty goals, but no substance.

Beyond the proclamation that "I'm different," I think she should present a little more to that. She says that she represents a party that's committed to reforming this institution, and yet we see her federal counterpart, Mr. Chretien, not allowing people to run in nominations, appointing people in nominations. Some commitment to reform, Mr. Speaker. That's the kind of party she represents.

Her record in this House, if anyone cares to take the time, just take the time to have a look at her record. How has she voted in this House on the various occasions?

Let's talk about her record with respect to the referendum question of abortion funding. Does anyone remember how she voted on that? Does anyone remember that, Mr. Speaker? I'm sure the people of Saskatchewan would be interested in knowing how she voted on that important question.

Let's talk about how she will vote on the changes, the upcoming changes that we're anticipating in the Human Rights Code. We're all interested to know how she's going to vote on that, Mr. Speaker.

Let's talk about her proud pronouncement that she sits on more standing committees than anyone else, and how hard she works. But then let's examine, but then let's examine her attendance record at those standing committees.

Let's talk about her plans to close rural hospitals. I wonder which ones she had in mind, Mr. Speaker — the one in Eatonia? Dodsland? Eastend? Beechy? Macklin? Perhaps Gull Lake? Let's talk about her ideas to cut down on the

number of rural seats and the real reason that she suggests that.

Let's talk about bringing in the Liberal leader . . . Let's talk about her bringing in the Liberal leader from British Columbia in the last election campaign, in the dying days of that campaign, and where he is today.

Let's talk about the Liberal Party that solely consists of bitter infighting between the likes of Tony Merchant and the former Liberal leader, Ralph Goodale, and the bitter infighting between the member from Saskatoon Greystone and anyone in that party that disagrees with her.

As the NDP House Leader has correctly pointed out, correctly pointed out, she made the promise in this legislature that she was going to present one new economic development project per week. That was her promise — one per week. And now, Mr. Speaker, we see her large deficit in ideas piling up in front of us all.

(1515)

Her term of office has been some 68 weeks now and she has brought forward I don't think any. I stand corrected on that. She may have brought forward one or two new economic development projects. If her promise of newness can be believed, it's time to get started, to address that economic development deficit she has run up.

And now, Mr. Speaker, thank God she's never had the opportunity in this province to govern because of those kinds of things. If for once, if for once the media and general public could turn their magnifying glass and attention her way, everyone would see vote after vote falling by the wayside; promise after promise falling by the wayside; lofty principle after lofty principle falling by the wayside; vote after vote with the NDP; important question after important question left unanswered.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, she may aspire to superstardom but until each and every one of these questions is answered, she is exactly where she is today — an independent, insignificant member of this legislature who receives far more attention than she deserves, far more attention than she deserves. And only one thing I can . . . It's time someone in the media took the time to check her record on a number of these issues. And I'd eventually hope that one of the media gurus of this institution will do that, take the time to check her record.

The Liberal leader has consistently complained about other parties stealing her ideas. Well, Mr. Speaker. We now see the Liberal leader proclaiming for all to hear that Saskatchewan should have an ethanol standard.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I remind the Liberal leader that the ethanol standard in Saskatchewan was part of the former Progressive Conservatives' commitments to this province in the last election campaign, and that the member for Thunder Creek last session presented a draft Bill with respect to an ethanol standard. Who's stealing whose ideas in this House?

I can, though, have sympathy for her in one area, in one area. The NDP did pick up on one of her promises, that's to close rural hospitals. That's the one idea that the NDP have taken from her. That was originally her idea.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we'll move our attention a little bit more back to the throne speech and what was in there and what wasn't in there. Mr. Speaker, I refer to one thing that I noticed in the throne speech debate — the commitment of the government to amend the Human Rights Code, amendments which are very, very controversial, as I'm sure everyone in this House knows, and many residents of this province strongly disagree with.

We have been getting letters on a daily basis; in my office in Kindersley, three to five letters a day, Mr. Speaker, on this one issue. On this one issue. I can only imagine what the government members must be getting on that issue, Mr. Speaker. Our province's residents are not only opposed to this, they vehemently are opposed to any changes in that code.

I understand that you're . . . I understand, Mr. Speaker, that our neighbours to the west of us in Alberta are putting this question to the people; asking in a referendum if the people of Alberta agree with changes in that area.

Homosexuals are protected under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. It's not necessary to change or amend the Human Rights Code provincially. We have more pressing things on the agenda of Saskatchewan than that, Mr. Speaker.

One clear example of that is economic development. Last session, your government told us in the Speech from the Throne that there was 700 companies that were expressing,

. . . an interest in either relocating in Saskatchewan or expanding their operations here. If these businesses proceed with their plans they will have the potential to create or maintain more than 16,000 jobs.

Being the opposition member for Economic Development, this statement was of particular interest to me. I'm sure that the unemployed of Saskatchewan are also very interested in this. We in the opposition attempted to find out a bit more about these companies, Mr. Speaker — for example, identifying them, Mr. Speaker. Regrettably, we still have no idea who those 700 companies are or where they're going to be relocating in Saskatchewan.

I asked, Mr. Speaker, for a list of these companies in question period. I asked in estimates, Mr. Speaker. We asked and asked and asked. The media asked as well, Mr. Speaker, and they too were refused that information. I don't think the NDP have 700 companies who want to relocate in Saskatchewan. I think it's just another example of the NDP misleading the public of Saskatchewan.

Just last Friday, if everyone will recall, in question period I asked the minister responsible for Economic

Development in this Chamber to give me a copy of his long-touted list of these companies. And he referred to a few of them; he went on a couple of them. And if you'd care to check the record on that, Mr. Speaker, it clearly shows each and every one of the ones he talked about were initiatives brought to the province of Saskatchewan by the former administration, not his.

And, Mr. Speaker, when asked about that list, the Economic Development minister said we could have the list; call his office up and he'd give us a copy of it. So, Mr. Speaker, last week — or earlier this week, sorry — earlier this week I called his office and asked for it. He promised it; I asked for it. I was refused.

The Economic Development minister promises it. His staff says no, can't have it; there is no such thing; we haven't made up any kind of lists like that. But yet a promise again broken by the Minister of Economic Development.

I don't think there's 700 companies wanting to relocate in Saskatchewan. I think there's a whole bunch of companies that are looking at Saskatchewan, but the moment they hear the kind of stuff that comes out of the Premier of this province or the member from Melfort saying that the province is on the verge of bankruptcy, that sure creates a lot of business confidence in this province. Seven hundred probably want to leave is more like it; that's for sure.

The hotel chain in Melfort is just a clear example of that, Mr. Speaker, wanting to come to Saskatchewan, hearing the doom-and-gloom message, and then backing away as fast as they possibly can, relocating into either Alberta or Manitoba — good Conservative provinces.

And the members there opposite are still saying that there's that many companies that are interested in relocating it. How can you believe that kind of stuff that comes from these people?

I think it's a lot like the Piper deal. Do any of you remember Piper? Your minister standing up, your minister standing up in a news conference and saying: she's signed, sealed, and delivered; Piper Aircraft will be building aircrafts in Saskatchewan within a few weeks. That was his statement. A few weeks, Mr. Speaker. Haven't seen it. Haven't seen it. No one has seen it yet.

I don't think that it's going to happen, Mr. Speaker, and neither do any of the other members of this legislature. That's why we never hear anything about Piper Aircraft any more. It was a clear bust. That's what it was, an absolute, clear bust, the Piper deal, as far as Saskatchewan residents are concerned. Piper hasn't relocated anywhere. It's doubtful they will relocate anywhere, no matter what the Minister of Economic Development has to say.

The only thing that seems to be relocating in the province of Saskatchewan is the population base — relocating to other provinces. That's what's happening in Saskatchewan today.

The only two areas, the only two areas, Mr. Speaker, in

the throne speech that were positive were with respect to the AECL (Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd.) agreement and community bonds. When the NDP had their convention I was pleased to see our agenda being advanced; pleased to see that. The Tory agenda, they finally realized, in those two areas was right on the money, right on the money. The AECL agreement — and I'm glad to see that they're endorsing it roundly, member after member endorsing it at their convention.

We're just proud to see that that was something that you people agree with. Members like the member for Regina Rosemont, happy to see that he's onside with AECL, Mr. Speaker. The member from Saskatoon Broadway, we're happy to see she's onside with AECL agreement; proud to see that. The member from Regina Albert North, happy to see that he is onside with the AECL agreement. The member from Regina Lake Centre, very nice to see she endorses AECL now.

An Hon. Member: — What about the rest of us?

Mr. Boyd: — The rest of you, yes, absolutely. We in the opposition give you high regard in this question alone, the AECL agreement. We're very pleased to see that our agenda has been advanced by the NDP Party. Nice to see, Mr. Speaker, that finally they are coming around and endorsing our agenda.

AECL and community bonds. I commend these former anti-nukes for putting behind their unfounded opposition to nuclear development and trying to do something finally to help this province. Congratulations to them.

Our labour force however, Mr. Speaker, has decreased by some 2,000 persons in Saskatchewan from 472,000 in 1993 . . . from 474,000 in 1992, Mr. Speaker. There were 47,000 people unemployed in Saskatchewan during January of 1993. An increase of 4,000 from December of 1992 — 8,000 more than the number employed in January 1992. These figures were extracted from the Saskatchewan Bureau of Statistics labour force statistics, February 5, 1993.

Even more shocking statistics come from the government's statistical review, February 1993. For example on page 2, Mr. Speaker, the total unemployed labour force in Saskatchewan is now 425,000 . . . was 425,000 in 1991. Now it is 435,000, Mr. Speaker. A shocking increase — 10 thousand more unemployed people.

In agriculture alone 2,000 jobs have disappeared. The statistics read as follows: In 1993, 70,000 people were employed in the agriculture industry in Saskatchewan; in 1991 there were 72,000. Two thousand jobs evaporated in that sector alone.

I ask the member from Regina Elphinstone, where are these 16,000 jobs you promised last April? Where are they? They sure aren't in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. The evidence is clear. We need those jobs in Saskatchewan. It's time he came up with the 26,000 jobs that he has promised — 16,000 that are gone and the additional 10,000 that he promised . . . that were lost in Saskatchewan.

The only unemployment . . . or the only area of employment that is increasing in Saskatchewan is his cabinet. And if you recall, Mr. Speaker, when he was elected as Premier of this province he made the commitment to the people of Saskatchewan that he would have a cabinet that was very small; 10 cabinet ministers until the province could afford to have more.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think the province, after one year of NDP government rule, is in any better economic shape. In fact we're in a whole lot worse of a mess. And yet another promise, another promise broken, Mr. Speaker.

Remember the statement, and I quote: my government will use Crown corporations to stimulate economic development.

What happened to that promise, Mr. Speaker? The throne speech that contained some . . . also contained some harsh words about not only the North American Free Trade but the FTA (Free Trade Agreement) and the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) as well.

Consider the following, extracted from that throne speech, and I quote:

. . . the (promised) North American free trade agreement, with the United States and Mexico, offers Saskatchewan few benefits and much cause for concern.

Now I want to emphasize, it specified "offers Saskatchewan few benefits", Mr. Speaker. Compare that statement with the following, and I quote:

"Western Canada and agriculture probably have much more to gain from (the) . . . North American Free Trade Agreement than any other part of Canada."

That quote was made by the Minister of Economic Development in the *Star-Phoenix*, February 9, 1993.

How do those two statements come together, Mr. Speaker? How can they reconcile those two kinds of things? On one hand, in the their Speech from the Throne they say it offers few benefits. The Economic Development minister says it's great; it provides all kinds of opportunities in Saskatchewan. I think perhaps the minister from Elphinstone forgot Saskatchewan is part of western Canada.

(1530)

Few benefits or more benefits — which one is it? The Speech from the Throne says few; he says, lot of benefits. I'm sure the people of Saskatchewan would be interested in him making up his mind on this issue. Is it good for Saskatchewan, in his opinion, or is it not good for Saskatchewan in his opinion?

The member from Elphinstone's ears are probably still ringing, Mr. Speaker, from the phone call I bet he received from the federal Leader of the NDP. I'll bet she

straightened him out in no uncertain terms about her contentions about the North American Free Trade Agreement.

And then the machinery of government was sure put into gear in a hurry to try and correct his misquote, as he calls it — his misquote. What a joke, Mr. Speaker. Everyone knows he said it. Everyone knows what he was meaning when he said it. But now he said, oh I didn't say that; they took me out of context, Mr. Speaker.

I don't think so. I think he's back-peddalling as fast as he can to get out of jam that he has with his federal counterparts. That's what the people of Saskatchewan believe. No one was surprised about their flip-flop on that. No one at all.

The NDP hasn't changed its tune since they formed government. Do the members opposite recall the outrage each and every time a government minister would go on a trade mission of the former government? Every time one of the former ministers would go on a trade mission these people got up and just spoke in volumes about how terrible it was that these people were flying all over the ... flying throughout the world trying to bring jobs and opportunities and investment into Saskatchewan.

And now what do we see, Mr. Speaker? Now what do we see? This world traveller, Dwain's world is not too small any more. He travels the world, thinks nothing of it. What are the destinations? It would be interesting to see what the destinations he has gone to over the last year and a half, Mr. Speaker — all over the world, all over the world. And we wonder why was it bad when the Conservative government was trying to attract jobs and opportunity and investment into Saskatchewan, and now it's okay.

Why is that, Mr. Speaker? Well, Mr. Speaker, it's because when in government they say one thing; when in opposition they say another thing. It's clear. These people cannot be trusted. They will say one thing and do another every single time, Mr. Speaker. The member from Elphinstone went on a European vacation just before Christmas and a winter holiday in January. It's clear. Check the record yourself.

Nice little cosy vacations that he took at taxpayers' expense under the auspices of creating jobs and economic development in Saskatchewan. Perhaps someone should send him on an economic development mission to his own constituency, own government's constituency of Canora, to open their eyes with regard to the GRIP program and the plight of Saskatchewan farmers, Mr. Speaker.

One of your government's election promises was to improve the GRIP program. They're going to improve it, Mr. Speaker. That was their promise: going to get more money; we're going to get the cost of production; we're going to do everything we can for farmers. You've done nothing for farmers. If we could turn back the clock, Mr. Speaker, to 1991, the best thing that could ever happen is if this government was never elected as far as farmers are concerned.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order, order. Why is the

member on his feet?

Mr. Renaud: — To ask leave to introduce guests, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Renaud: — Thank you. In the west gallery, Mr. Speaker ... or the east gallery, I guess, Mr. Derek Wichorek, University of Regina student and a fellow from the Weekes district in my constituency is visiting. He's very interested in politics as his parents Stan and Justina, and I would like the House to join with me in welcoming Derek to the House this afternoon.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY (continued)

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We would also extend a welcome to the guests in the gallery.

Now let's get back to agriculture for a little while, shall we, Mr. Speaker. Something that they don't like to hear about but unfortunately whether you realize it or not it's kind of an important area of our economy in Saskatchewan. Fairly important. But what's happened to it? What's happened to it, Mr. Speaker? Three rallies later and your GRIP (gross revenue insurance program) program is still a disaster, a disaster that can be directly, directly attributed to your government and the member from Rosetown-Elrose and all of the support that he had.

And, Mr. Speaker, I could not believe it — could not believe it — when the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg stood in this legislature in this debate and said that GRIP '92 was the right thing to do. That's what he said, Mr. Speaker. Go back and check the record. It was the right thing to do.

This Rolls-Royce socialist up in the corner over there obviously didn't pay too much attention to what his Premier was saying. Can you believe it, Mr. Speaker? The member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg still believes '92 GRIP was better. Oh my God! In a constituency like Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, one of the hardest impacted constituencies probably in this whole province with the possible exception of Shaunavon over there, and he still believes ... Where has he been over the last year, Mr. Speaker? Can you believe it?

And not only that, Mr. Speaker. We absolutely couldn't believe our good fortune on the very first day that we thought there was going to be a debate, throne speech debate, that the member from Humboldt rises in his place and said, we want to debate agriculture. We couldn't believe our good fortune, absolutely couldn't believe it, just absolutely ... And then not only that. He proposes it but he wasn't prepared to speak to it. Could you believe

that? He got up and had a few little comments about it, and then the member from Shaunavon chimed in afterwards.

They weren't even prepared to speak on agriculture and they proposed on the very first day, the very first day, an emergency debate on agriculture. These two lightweights in agriculture, the member from Humboldt and the member from Shaunavon — the Mickey Mouse and Daffy Duck of agriculture in Saskatchewan — standing up and telling farmers that they're the spokespeople for agriculture. Could you believe it? Could you believe it? You two, along with the member for Rosetown-Elrose and the member for Canora, have done more to destroy agriculture in this province than anyone in the history of this province, done more to destroy it than anyone in the history.

And what does the Premier have to say on this topic? What does the Premier have to say on this topic, Mr. Speaker? He says it was a mistake; that's what he says. Doc up in the corner believes it was the right thing to do, but the Premier says it was a mistake. You ought to pay attention, Mr. Member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, to what your Premier is saying. Do you even realize that he thinks it's a mistake now? I don't think he does, Mr. Speaker.

The Premier wishes he never touched it, he said. You people are a deceitful, arrogant, unrepentant bunch of laughing stocks that the farmers of Saskatchewan will never forget — absolutely never forget you. I predict, Mr. Speaker, in the next election you won't win one rural seat — not one rural seat. The farmers of Saskatchewan will kick you out of office.

The farmers of this province would like to storm this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, and give you people a collective kick in the butt like you've never got before. And probably on top of that they'd hang the member from Rosetown-Elrose if they ever had the opportunity.

Almost 13,000 farmers rallied in Sask Place in Saskatoon — 13,000 farmers, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: — And what did they say?

Mr. Boyd: — Because they were suffering from the NDP's government to change GRIP. That's what they said, Mr. Speaker — that's what they said.

An Hon. Member: — Standing ovation.

Mr. Boyd: — Standing ovation, can you . . . Swift Current, we hear from Swift Current now. He says they gave him a standing ovation. I recall the place practically coming down in boos for your Premier. That's what they were doing. They roundly booed him from start to finish, his comments. When they talked about . . . when he brought up his GRIP program, what did they do? They booed him like no Premier in this province has ever been booed before. And the paper recorded it, and the media scribes were all there and they recorded it for history.

I wonder what the Premier of this province thought when that happened to him. I wonder what was going through

his head at that moment. It was absolutely incredible to see him just booed roundly by probably as partisan a group as you people could collectively put together that day.

Here's what the Premier said, and I quote, Mr. Speaker. This is up at P.A. (Prince Albert) not too long ago, January 13, a quote CKBI Prince Albert, radio station in Prince Albert: The changes we made to GRIP '91 and GRIP '92 were not . . . Sorry. I'll start again on that, Mr. Speaker: The changes we made to GRIP '91 and GRIP '92 were not the answer, that's for sure. They added to the problem in some ways. I think that if I had to do it all over again, I wouldn't have touched it.

That's what he said — I wouldn't have touched it. I can imagine that's . . . There's never been a more truer statement than that one. Along with the former minister of Agriculture, the one that he turfed out . . . We all realize he had to do that. I'm surprised he still is in the cabinet. And the farmers of Saskatchewan are surprised too.

One farmer at the rally stated, the first step is admitting the mistake; the second step is fixing it. Where's the fix? Where is any kind of help for agriculture from this administration? Where are these two lightweights, Mickey Mouse and Daffy Duck, when it comes to speaking up for agriculture in caucus, in the NDP caucus? I wonder what they say. Not a word.

The member from Humboldt probably stands up and says, why don't we debate agriculture on the first day? Gee, there's a brilliant idea. And they all look around and say hey, let's all click in on this great idea to debate agriculture. And they . . . Sure. Okay. What the heck. Got nothing to lose. We're so screwed up in agriculture now, maybe we could talk about it a little bit and it will get better.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it isn't getting any better. No help from this government. None whatsoever. Not a red cent for farmers. You've been in their pockets since the day you became government, sucking more and more dollars out of their hands every time we turn around, Mr. Speaker.

And the member from Humboldt stands up and says, I'm a spokesman for agriculture. Shaunavon the same way. Oh, man. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker? If it wasn't for the salary they collect as an MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly), their farm would be broke — long gone, broke, dust, out of here. That's what would happen to their farms.

And it's not surprising. It's not surprising, Mr. Speaker. Because every farmer in this province took a collective hit of about 10 to 20,000 bucks because of their changes in '91 GRIP. That's what they took.

Hey, I mean, look it up yourselves, guys. Figure it out on your own farm, if any of you have the capacity to do that. Take it to an accountant maybe. They can tell you. Take it to your accountant, Mr. Member from Humboldt. Find out what the hit cost you. Find out what the hit cost you back there, Mr. Member from Shaunavon, and Mr. Member . . . Oh, no, it didn't cost the Rolls Royce socialist anything; he doesn't farm. Forgot about that. The Rolls

Royce socialist up there in the corner, it didn't cost him a nickel. It must have been easy, it must have been easy for him to put his hand up in caucus and say, let's get rid of this.

Must have been easy for that member, the member from Biggar over there. Same thing. Your farm would be dust, broke flat, if you didn't have your MLA's salary to prop it up. You know it and I know it too. I know very well what would happen to the farms of these members had they not had a salary to help prop it up.

You people promised farmers all over this province that you would provide more help for agriculture, more help in every way. You would go down to Ottawa and you would extract some money from the Prime Minister down there. And what did you get? Not one red penny; not one red penny you didn't get. And it's clear why, Mr. Speaker, it's clear why. The farmers in this province know why. You don't deserve a cent.

You made changes in a program that farmers believed had some very, very strong potential. You absolutely gutted it, absolutely gutted it, and then . . . Doc up in the corner says, it was the right thing to do. Can you imagine? You've kicked, absolutely kicked agriculture at every turn, every turn, Mr. Member from Swift Current, every single turn.

(1545)

Utility rates. Are you aware that out on the farm, out on the farms of Saskatchewan they use the odd little bit of gas, they use the odd bit of electricity, they use the odd bit of insurance for their vehicles. Telephones, they use that. Every single opportunity your government has had you've increased the taxes on everybody, increased the taxes on agriculture. And then you stand up and say, we're the spokespeople for agriculture. Can you believe it?

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . that's for sure. That kind of spokesmanship we don't need in this province.

Who broke the contract, Mr. Member from Swift Current? Who broke the contract? Retroactively came in and ripped off agriculture like it's never been ripped off before. Came in to this legislature . . . You had to ram it down the throats of the opposition and every farmer in this province. It's no wonder you're in court, it's no wonder you're in court. If you weren't the government, you guys would be in jail over those kinds of changes. That's where you'd find yourselves. Contract law would put you folks away for good.

In the province of Saskatchewan, the farmers would like nothing more. For what you did to the program, for what you did to the changes in that program, you deserve to be behind bars. That's where you deserve to be.

Mr. Speaker, the speech from the throne also mentioned recent events at Eston, my home town, with respect to farm ownership. Mr. Speaker, I predict that the government will move to restrict farm ownership and will have the final say when a farmer decides to sell his or her farm — government heavy-handedness at its worst.

You can't sell your farm. No you can't buy that farm. No you can't sell this farm. We decide from now on who's going to buy and who's going to sell in this province. Is that what we're expecting to see? Is that what we're expecting to see? We've got an ageing farm population, and we're going to have a government that stands up and says, we don't think you should be able to sell your farm. That's what we're expecting.

Not only do the farmers of this province contend that the problems associated with '92 . . . have to contend with the problems associated with '92 GRIP, they also have to contend with all your tax increases. And it's just becoming unbearable on agriculture, absolutely unbearable.

I'll quote from another farmer at that rally in Saskatoon: you can't continue to milk the cow without feeding her. Maybe you should be aware of that.

The member from Rosetown-Elrose, he knows all about feeding hogs, or lack thereof, lack thereof, lack thereof of feeding them.

I ask the members across the floor, particularly the member from Canora, please, please consider the federal government's offer of assistance. Absolutely look at it. The farmers of Saskatchewan are counting on you people to take a look at that offer. It's been on the table for something in the order of seven or eight months, I believe now, Mr. Speaker.

Bill McKnight, former minister of Agriculture, made the commitment last Thursday in Hazlet that the offer is still on the table. Still there. I ask you people to support farmers and quit blaming others for your incompetence. Absolutely quit that.

The farmers of this province need some help. There's an offer on the table and you say no, we're not going to do it, not going to touch it. Can't touch that.

What makes more sense than for the provincial government to put up their money and the federal government to put up money and actively cooperate and share the financial responsibility, Mr. Speaker? For every tax dollar Saskatchewan raises, 17 cents goes towards servicing the provincial debt. For every dollar the federal government takes in, over 40 cents goes towards servicing the federal debt.

We're all in the same boat here, Mr. Minister. We're all in the same boat. Who pays the taxes? We all are in the same boat here.

Our farmers need some help and they need it before spring seeding. And these folks opposite . . . there's an offer on the table and they won't even talk about it. Won't even talk about it.

It's no wonder the Premier was roundly booed in Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker. No wonder. There's an offer on the table for help from the federal government and they say no.

An Hon. Member: — Since December.

Mr. Boyd: — Some time now, that's for sure. And yet he won't look at it.

There was a survey, if any of you recall, there was a survey going around at that rally in Saskatoon and it clearly showed . . . did you see the results of it, any of you? We could send you a copy if you like. The results clearly showed farmers wanted to return to a 1991-style GRIP program. That's what it showed. That's what it showed.

An Hon. Member: — Ask Alberta.

Mr. Boyd: — Ask Alberta. Can you imagine that, Mr. Speaker? The member from Swift Current says from his seat, ask Alberta. Ask Alberta. Ask the Alberta farmers what they think of '91 GRIP in Alberta and '92 GRIP in Alberta. Ask the farmers of Alberta what they think. They like it. They're happy with their program out there.

You don't give a . . . you couldn't care less about agriculture. And it's clear evidence when the member from Swift Current says from his seat, ask the Alberta people. Ask the Alberta people. The farmers of Alberta believe in their program because it's working for them.

An Hon. Member: — 400 million.

Mr. Boyd: — Yes, 400 million. Right. That's quite a shame, isn't it, Mr. Member — \$400 million right straight into the pocket of agriculture. What a shame. What a shame, \$400 million goes into the pocket of farmers in Alberta and the member from Swift Current says it's bad.

Every business and every store and every farm implement dealership and everybody associated with agriculture in Alberta. It's booming out there if you ever took the time to drive out and have a look. Do you know what's happening in agriculture in Alberta? You don't, do you? They don't. They look at it and they say, it's costing \$400 million in Alberta. That's right. We recognize that — \$400 million it costs there.

But where did the \$400 million go, Mr. Member from Swift Current? It went straight into the hip-national of every farm family in Alberta. That's where it went.

And the member from Swift Current, I can't believe he would chirp up from his seat: it's bad; it's bad. Doc up in the corner thinks it's bad too. Daffy Duck and Mickey Mouse think it's bad. The member from Shaunavon and the member from Humboldt, they think it's bad. Four hundred million dollars goes into the pockets of agriculture and these two spokesmen for agriculture say, can't have that; can't have that; that's bad. Can't have that; it's bad.

But the member over here in the corner from God knows where, he says it's bad too, bad too. Farmers all over the province of Saskatchewan are going broke and this member over here says that's fine. Didn't cost anybody any money though.

An Hon. Member: — No there won't be anybody to make anything too.

Mr. Boyd: — That's right. The tax base in this province is evaporating before our eyes and these people say we can't give anything to agriculture; can't help in agriculture. What's happening in Alberta's bad.

Well it's no wonder. It's no wonder your Premier was booed in Saskatoon about agriculture. It's little wonder to me. The survey showed at that rally in Saskatoon farmers wanted to return to '91-style GRIP. That's what it said. Take the time to check the record on that. It said they want to return to a '91-style GRIP. But everyone recognizes and we've said time and time and time again in this legislature '91 GRIP wasn't perfect, but it's a whole heck of a lot better than what you guys come up with.

You get a good crop, you get a good crop, you get high-grade wheat, you get the best payment. You get a poor crop, low-grade wheat; when you need the help the worst, you get the least payment. Ho! That's insurance at its best — NDP-style insurance, NDP-style insurance. When the house burns down you don't pay them. When the house burns down you don't pay them. When you're building the house up and you add another room onto the house, you get a payment. There's a . . . what a program! What a program. Can you believe it? The farmers of Saskatchewan are just absolutely laughing at you folks about that.

An Hon. Member: — Where is the member from Rosetown?

Mr. Boyd: — Yes, that's a good question. The farmers of Saskatchewan would like to have a little visit with that member, the member from Rosetown-Elrose. It'd be interesting to know the kind of telephone calls and letters he gets. Oh, can you imagine? He's probably under police guard, Mr. Speaker. He's probably under police guard. And if the member from Swift Current and a few of the rest of you continue to say in Saskatchewan that '92 GRIP was better, you'll need police guard too.

You couldn't go into a rally in Saskatchewan . . . It would've been interesting if the Premier would've stood up in Saskatoon and said, we did the right thing. He wouldn't have got out of there. That's what would have happened to him. Everyone knows that. You make a promise on one hand to improve a program and then you absolutely destroy it.

And the frost that hit Saskatchewan in the latter days of August last year just absolutely confirmed it in everybody's mind. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, what would have happened to the farmers of this province had we had a 1988-style drought? Can you imagine what would've happened? Farmers would have harvested five bushels to the acre. In my constituency that was a pretty normal yield in 1988. Absolute crop failure, disaster. That's what it was.

They got five bushels to the acre, \$2, 2.50, maybe even three bucks a bushel. Who knows, you might get \$15 an acre. You might've got another 45 or 50 from Crop Insurance, and you'd have got zero, you'd have got zero from a '92-style GRIP program. And yet Doc up in the corner says it's good. Your Premier says it's bad. No

willingness whatsoever to change the program though. Hard to imagine.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to talk a little bit about the NDP's plans to reintroduce harmonization. Or at least what we will see in the upcoming budget, I predict, we will see a reintroduction of harmonization only it'll be selective harmonization. That's what it'll be: selective harmonization. Selective harmonization, that's what it'll be called.

An Hon. Member: — Selective pain.

Mr. Boyd: — Selective pain, there's a good term for it, selective pain. Somebody will have to pay the tax; another group won't have to pay the tax. The input tax credit thing, I predict, won't be part of it, won't be part of it. Business and the chamber of commerce, Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce, business groups all over this province are saying, for God's sake if you do it, bring in the input tax credit side to it, and for God's sake broad-base it on everything right across the board.

But no way, can't do that, can you, Mr. Associate Finance Minister from Swift Current? Can't do that. Because we've broken too many promises already. Holy . . . You wouldn't want to break any more just lately anyway. You've broken so many promises that this one would be a little too hard to swallow for the people of Saskatchewan, the ones that you haven't already kicked in the butt.

Well, explain to us . . . It will be interesting, Mr. Speaker, what the explanation will be of selective harmonization when they get the opportunity. It will be interesting to hear what the Finance minister and associate Finance minister have to say when it comes to selective harmonization. How will you justify it? I'll bet the speech writers in your office are working overtime trying to figure out some clever little phrases to disguise what you're doing.

An Hon. Member: — Just like we've seen in Health.

Mr. Boyd: — Yes, absolutely. Just what we've seen in Health. Why is selective harmonization better? Simple question. Maybe the member from Swift Current will put his mind to that for a little while. You guys are the most blatant hypocrites in the history of this province.

(1600)

The Deputy Speaker: — I've listened with great interest to the member's remarks. And I'm concerned with the words that the members is using, the last being the word "hypocrites." The member uses language that . . . Well I would refer the member to Beauchesne's citation 491 and read in part:

. . . that language used in the House should be temperate and worthy of the place in which it is spoken.

And although I don't want to go through all of the member's speech, I want to just advise him of that, that he should search for words that are temperate, worthy of the place, and in particular invite him in this case to retract

the word "hypocrites."

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize for that inflammatory comment.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to refer people in Saskatchewan to a couple of things that happened over the course of the last year in this province. They say they listen, they're open and accountable, willing to listen to the people of Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, last session . . . In the last election there was a plebiscite. One of the plebiscite questions was with respect to funding of abortions in this province, Mr. Speaker. And the Health minister stood up and said we couldn't do it. It would be contravening the Canada Health Act.

You could have referred it to the Court of Appeal for a decision. Everyone knows that. Everyone in the province of Saskatchewan recognizes you could have done that. But you didn't; you refused to do that. And the people of Saskatchewan are asking now, why? Why when you can deny chiropractic and optometric services in Saskatchewan, why won't you look at de-insuring another area? The people wanted it. The people of Saskatchewan overwhelmingly endorsed it. And yet you won't look at it.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's an absolutely grave error that the government has made in that area, another area like that. The people of Saskatchewan want it; they said they wanted it. The Premier of this province stands up and says, we are an open and accountable government, that we will do the things in this province that the people want. And yet they wouldn't touch it. Every one of their members, when we presented the amendment to the Act last session, every one of their members stand up and voted no to that question, Mr. Speaker.

And now people of the province of Saskatchewan realize that this government will not listen to them. They're going to boldly go about doing their plans in every area. They have no regard whatsoever for what . . . the wishes of the people of this province. No regard whatsoever.

Rural people are living in complete fear of losing health care — absolutely complete fear of losing their health care facilities. The people in my constituency, the good folks at Eatonia and Dodsland, absolutely are living in fear that their hospitals are going to close. And we'll do everything we can, Mr. Speaker, to fight in this province to see that those hospitals are maintained.

At the SUMA convention I had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to talk to the mayor of Macklin, Saskatchewan. Any of you familiar with it? It's not far from Cut Knife-Lloyd constituency. Anyway, he said they had \$1.2 million in the bank and they want to build a hospital.

He also pointed out that Macklin, whether you believe it or not, is the fastest growing community in Saskatchewan. It had the most housing starts on a per capita basis of any place in this province, more than Regina, more than Saskatoon, more than any other community in Saskatchewan. Macklin, Saskatchewan, is

the fastest growing town in our province. And yet he believes this government will deny them the opportunity to build a hospital.

Well you know what he told me? He said, I don't care what that government says. We're going to build a hospital in Macklin and we'll fund it ourselves if we have to. That's what he said. He doesn't care what this government says. He said they don't listen to the people of Saskatchewan. We need a new hospital here in Macklin, and we're going to build it.

These health care changes are not fair. That's what it comes down to. They're not fair. Everyone knows that. It's clear. You've got community against community fighting out there right now, big communities fighting against small communities because they're all afraid that they may lose their hospital.

The bigger communities realize that there's an opportunity for them, and of course they would realize that. And the smaller communities realize that they're going to take it right on the chin. They're going to lose their hospital, and it'll all be done under this clever, little, veiled way that they're working towards right now. The promise that the Premier of this province made at the SUMA convention — it wouldn't be thrown on the tax base of property — now we see the Health Act, it isn't going to deal with it in that way. It's clear, Mr. Speaker, that they are indeed going to do it that way, that it will fall onto the backs of the taxpayers of property in this province. It's clear.

Mr. Speaker, I think Tommy Douglas would be rolling over in his grave if he knew what was happening today in this province. I think he'd expel each and every one of you from the party for what you're doing to health care. I think he would. I think he'd expel each and every one of you.

Saskatchewan's residents are being treated differently, depending on the kind of illness they have and where they live. If you live in rural Saskatchewan, can't have a hospital. That's what you're telling them. Or you're a diabetic, too bad. The member from Regina Lake Centre stood up here the other day, Mr. Speaker, and told us all about diabetic strips. Well, Mr. Speaker, those used to be covered, those used to be covered. And now they de-insured them. The diabetics of this province realize that they've been betrayed. The people who require chiropractic services in this province realize that they've been betrayed. The people who require optometric services in this province realize they've been betrayed.

How many groups haven't you betrayed? Is there any? Let's just go down the short little list. You betrayed farmers. That's clear. Everybody knows that. Betrayed health care workers. You betrayed the support that you have in the SGEU (Saskatchewan Government Employees Union), or used to have. You betrayed people who require health care services. Even talked about, for a while, about tearing up the highway network and betraying every motorist in Saskatchewan. You've betrayed everybody that has electricity in their home or a telephone or natural gas.

You've betrayed everyone. Every single person in this province has been impacted by your betrayals.

Hospital administrators have publicly denounced your most recent attack on health care in rural Saskatchewan. It's no wonder, Mr. Speaker, it's no wonder. They see clearly now what is happening in health care. One only has to wonder how many jobs will be lost as well. How many rural hospitals will be closed, and the people that work in those hospitals will be thrown out of work? They'll be bounced.

What will happen, Mr. Speaker, as I say, it's fairly clear in my constituency. The people have already figured it out. If the hospital in Eatonville closes, there are some people, nurses there, that have worked a long time so they'll be moving over to Estevan . . . they'll be driving over to Estevan, I should say, about 35 miles, and taking the jobs of the people that are at Estevan. And the people that are Estevan, if they don't have enough seniority, will be going somewhere else. We'll have health care workers driving all over this province trying to seek a job. That's what's going to happen.

And what happens in the interim? Other issues that are of specific interest, Mr. Speaker, to my constituency are — and all of Saskatchewan — the Saskatchewan Pension Plan. In the last session, absolutely destroyed that program. They were going to cut it off completely — absolutely close it, shut her down, done like dinner. That was what was going to happen to it.

But now after a considerable amount of pressure from the people of Saskatchewan and the opposition, you restored it in a skeletal form, Mr. Speaker. That's what they did. And now, the people of Saskatchewan . . . We get calls on a daily basis about this as well. They're saying to us: what do you think we should do? Should we leave our money in the pension plan or should we take it out?

We can't trust this government, it's clear. Farm families look at it and they say, well they changed my GRIP program. They took money out of my pocket there, so could they . . . do you think, do you think as our elected representative, do you think that they might, might just touch a little of that money too? Maybe I should get it out of there before . . . while the getting's good.

That's what they're saying. They look at it and they say: they've betrayed us in every single area in this province. I'm worried. I'm worried sick that you'll perhaps confiscate that money. That's what they're saying to us and I'm sure that's what they're saying to you, too. Do you have any designs on that money? Is the Finance minister and associate Finance minister . . . have they any designs on taking that money?

Well I sure hope not. But the residents of Saskatchewan, the ones that have money in that Saskatchewan Pension Plan, believe that that's a very real possibility. And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, we are counselling those people to stay in the program. We are saying to them: at some point in time, in about two years from now, after this one-term government is thoroughly trashed in the next election, maybe the plan would be reinstated by a Conservative administration. And we're saying to them, we're saying to

them, Mr. Speaker, stay in the program.

I'm not sure, we'll see. The deadline date for withdrawals isn't all that far away. I believe it's March 29; I think it is. It's not that far away, Mr. Speaker. We're hoping that the plan will still be able to be kept in place. The people are worried about that.

If you close the pension plan in my constituency, 15 good jobs will be lost. That's the direct impact in Kindersley. Saskatchewan residents will lose an opportunity to contribute to a pension.

Everyone realizes the importance of pensions. As MLAs we have pensions. We all realize the importance of that. We all realize the importance of school teachers having pensions. We also realize the importance of nurses having pensions. We all realize how very important it is for providing for yourself and your family when it comes to your retirement years, Mr. Speaker. But yet the government won't reinstate the program as it was.

Home-owners, home-makers, people with small businesses around this province had, for one time, they had an opportunity to contribute to a pension plan and they liked it. It was clear. Thousands and thousands of residents of this province contributed into that plan and they thought it was good; they thought it was safe. But now they're worried about the safety of it. I don't think this government even would go that far, but who knows? Who knows, Mr. Speaker?

I want a commitment from the Minister of Finance that the people of Kindersley and all plan participants can rest easy that she will not force a quick demise of the Saskatchewan Pension Plan. A simple commitment to this House, Mr. Speaker, that's all we're asking. Keep the plan in place; keep the jobs in Kindersley in place; keep the opportunity for people to contribute to a plan.

Another fear, Mr. Speaker, in my constituency, is what your plans are for the oil industry. What are your plans? It won't be long, we'll find out. Sometime mid-March we're anticipating the budget. What are you going to do? What are you going to do to the oil industry? Are we going to see oil revenue taxes increase? That's what they're asking me. What do you think, Mr. Member? Are we going to see that? Are we going to see a well-head tax?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to tell you a little bit about our oil patch in the Kindersley area. It's a very marginal field — low production. Four to six barrels a day is average. They can't stand any increases in cost right now, absolutely can't stand it. The oil industry out there right now is going through a relatively good time. And the reason is quite simple. All of the major oil companies have pulled out and the smaller companies are buying them up. The people who have a direct stake in local jobs and employment, the local independents, are the ones that are doing it. They want the jobs and investment to stay there.

And, Mr. Speaker, they have lower costs. That's why they're able to make a few dollars out there right now in the oil patch. That's why they're able to do that. But, Mr. Speaker, we are very, very concerned that in the

Kindersley constituency and other relatively marginal oilfields around this province, that we'll see an oil well-head tax.

(1615)

And if you look at the industry, just take the blinders off for a minute and look at the industry, you'll realize that the industry can pull up stakes and be out of here in 24 hours. And that's what they tell me they'll do. You just walk in, turn the valve, shut down the pump jack, and we're out of here — goodbye, *adios*, I'm into Alberta. That's what they're going to say and that's what they're going to do. She's only a short little hop from Kindersley, Saskatchewan, to Red Deer. It's only a short little hop and they'll be moving, rest assured of that, if you jack the taxes too high on that. Mr. Speaker, they can slam the oil industry into neutral so fast that Kindersley will virtually be devastated — absolutely devastated — and other oil communities around this province, the same way.

Hopefully the member from Battlefords realizes that — the new Minister of Energy and Mines. Hopefully he's taken the time to consult with the industry. Hopefully he's done that. But I'm not so sure, Mr. Speaker, whether he has. But it's our hope in the Kindersley constituency that he will, before the budget, take the time to call up some of the people in the industry and find out what the impact would be.

Mr. Speaker, when we measure this government, on every account it's been an abysmal failure. Agriculture, taxation, health care, highways, Crown corporations, taxes are all up right across the board. It doesn't matter what it is, it's up.

Mr. Speaker, I can only conclude by saying I hope the people of Saskatchewan can hold on for a couple more years so the people of this province can boot this bunch of socialists out of office. And it's clear, Mr. Speaker, they are indeed a one-term government. You're the biggest bust of a government in the history of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment to the motion presented by the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster. And the motion reads as follows:

That the following words have been added to the motion:

but regret that the government continues to engage in a policy of betrayal, exemplified by such things as: increased SaskTel rates; increased SaskPower rates; increased SaskEnergy rates; increased vehicle registration insurance and motorists' licence fees; increased E&H tax; a new 10 per cent surtax on personal income tax; increased fuel tax; user fees for chiropractic services; user fees for optometric services; triple deductible for prescription drug plan; de-insurance of insulin; increased air ambulance fees; increased resident income charges for seniors in special day care homes; de-insurance of oxygen; cancelled rural natural gas distribution program; attacks on municipal autonomy; offloading of funding and debt to the local

governments; increased breeder fees; increased pasture rental fees; increased farm fuel taxes; reintroduction of purple gas; destruction of GRIP; ignoring all plebiscite results; cancellation of senior citizens' heritage program; increased unemployment; sustained out-migration; crippling the Saskatchewan Pension Plan; failure to deliver a workable economic strategy; and a general unwillingness to accept responsibility for real public policy in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I move this motion, seconded by the member from Moosomin. Mr. Speaker, I so move.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I have received the amendment by the member for Kindersley, seconded by the member for Moosomin. I find the amendment in order. And as is the practice for the debates on the motion on the Speech from the Throne, the debate will be concurrent on the amendment and the main motion.

Hon. Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments today in regards to the throne speech. And also a bit of introductory reference points to the amendment. And more particularly to some comments, you know, implied in the amendment by the member.

And in my comments I will be covering topics relating to economic development and jobs, as well as health care reform, education, social justice, our special action in relation to Indian and Metis people in the province of Saskatchewan. And then I will make some concluding remarks.

First of all, in response to the member's comments and a lot of the members from opposite, I was indeed thoroughly disappointed. I was thoroughly disappointed because ever since I was elected in 1986 when I was a member of the opposition and now a member of the government, I was thoroughly disappointed because I heard the same old story. And the same old story is this, that the government . . . the members opposite are always talking about the politics of division. Whenever they raise something in the legislature, it's always things having to do . . . rural versus urban. When they first came in office, they didn't even know the North existed. So I could hardly even say whether they were against the North in the very first time, you know, when I was in office. So there was this politics of division.

And then I heard the member talk about community against community. Not very different from what I heard, you know, from '86 onwards when I was in opposition. And now they're even talking about community against region and region against province. They're always talking in the negative of the politics of division in this province.

What we're trying to do in this throne speech is provide some hope and opportunity for people. And here we're stuck with the politics of division by the members opposite. When you look at the politics of division, one of the other aspects that is very, very important in regards to their comments is this: never, ever do they accept

anything, any wrongdoing in the past since 1982, since they were in office.

When you look at the \$15 billion that we're in debt in this province, not once will they take responsibility for it. Not once will they say: yes, it was because of massive give-aways or because there was massive increases of dollars that were either given to the GigaTexts, you know, across Canada or to a few of their friends, you know, at the community level.

They will never, never really talk about that. They will never talk about the massive incompetence, the likes of which we had never seen in the province's history. You will see them squirming around on a daily basis at question period or in response to the throne speech and blaming absolutely everything on what has taken place in the past one and a half years.

And what this one and a half years has presented was a new hope for Saskatchewan people. And we are seeing for the first time that the essence of any organization when a lot of people present the government through various forms, you know, their incomes so that we can run good government, you will never see those Tories admit for once that it was also their mistake. They will never admit any wrongdoing on all those years.

And a lot of people are out there, having a certain degree of apathy in regards to politics and governing, one of the reasons is the great instability in the world, but the other thing is that that great instability that has been caused by PC (Progressive Conservative) government action since 1982. They can absolutely come to the legislature on a daily basis and have no remorse at all, no compassion for what the people have had to face in the past nine years, and also today.

And wherever we look in this day and age, and we're trying to look for signs of hope, all we see are these two things: the politics of division and the refusal to take any responsibility. And they keep on playing off people one against the other.

I think that enough is enough. I think that the people of Saskatchewan need to join together, whether it is business, whether it is labour, whether it is the unemployed, people that work in the farms, people that work on the trapline, people that work in the mines, people that work at the universities — people from all over this province need to get together to create a new sense of hope and direction which this throne speech provides.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Goulet: — When you look at this throne speech, there are many challenging items that are out there. We have produced a document that will be a very important part for our development in the next year. And what we have done is an important item — we have built on what took place in even one year in office. We are continuing what we said we would continue during this period in time, even when we were in opposition. We said we would open the books and we would deal with our finances in this province. And a lot of the people

presented that challenge to us, and we are proceeding with that challenge.

When you look at the situation in 1982, we were looking at a situation where this province was \$139 million to the good. Eleven straight years of balanced budgets. Eleven straight years of balanced budgets by the NDP government. And when you look at the record of the Tories, every year the budget increased. Now when you look at it, the budget increased and the deficit increased all through those years. We kept seeing the expenditures go up and there was absolutely no way that they were looking at any form of reality in regards to their predictions.

When I was running for the first time in 1986 and I was going through those years prior to then, I was trying to deal with this issue and we were raising this question at that point in time in history. We said, the Conservatives at that point in time in history were stating that we were going to be in a hole by approximately \$375 million. When the facts came out, when they tried to buy the political vote of the province of Saskatchewan at that time, the record showed very clearly it was \$1.2 billion. That was \$800 million in the hole in one year — \$800 million.

The minister from Lumsden area who got knocked off in the last election kept on telling us that indeed we were close to target at approximately \$400 million, but they were \$800 million out. And a lot of the people, when you look at this record, still find it in disbelief.

When they were accidentally elected again with a \$1 billion promise by a person who knows when to resign — you know, the Prime Minister — a lot of the people thought that things were going to change in '86. But things didn't change. We kept on going in the hole and further and further in debt.

(1630)

And there was the continuation of this thing until we pretty well, by the time we're taking office, we're over \$14 billion in debt. Last year when we looked at the budget, it was in enormous proportion in comparison to what people were capable of earning in this province. And a lot of people have been asking me: how big is this deficit and this long-term debt? Well the debt is about \$15 billion now and last year we were looking at about \$760 million just to pay for the interest payments — \$760 million.

When you look at \$760 million, we could do a lot in the many areas, of whether it's in the health field, in paying for the many services that we have out there in need, and also in educational change items that we are talking about — whether it's in curriculum and instruction — and in many areas. And we can pay for a lot of those things if indeed we didn't spend that money on the Conservative deficit and debt.

So, Mr. Speaker, when I listened to the members from opposite, we saw them talking about their politics of division. We heard them talk about trying to blame the people and not taking, you know, their share of what has

happened.

But the people have been very happy in relation to the new government because we have taken responsibility for what we ran on. We ran on the fact that we would be moving towards balancing our budget. But because of the situation we're in, it'll take us a long time. It took them nine years to destroy this province, and it will take us, you know, probably a shorter period of time to bring it back up. But I'll tell you, it is a real mess.

One of the things I would like to talk about in regards to the throne speech is this. We look at the throne speech and most of the most important questions people raise is this issue of economic development and jobs.

I look at the budget in relation to my own area, my constituency, Cumberland constituency in the North. And I look at the developments that we've had, you know, prior to 1982 and what happened between 1982 to '91 and what we're trying to do now. And even in relation to a specific sector like mining, our record shows that we were proceeding on the road to success till this government came in. We were employing people on the new mining developments in the early '80s at about 50 per cent rate of employment.

When the Conservatives took over, of course, they brought out their new strategy which did not even consider the North. And I still remember this. I was utterly amazed, but maybe after knowing this government I am no longer amazed because they absolutely said that the North didn't exist, even in their highways map.

You know, I've been saying this for a few years now that in their highways map they said that the North was populated with full of beautiful lakes and rivers, but no people. And they said in their highway map, that '93 highway map, it said the North was populated with full of beautiful lakes and rivers, but no people. And a lot of the people were very, very disappointed at that time in northern Saskatchewan when the Conservatives were really following up with their strategy and treating the North as purely a resource exploitation area, and that they did not have any people.

When we looked at that situation, Mr. Speaker, the members showed a great devastation in regards to the North.

Sometimes when I look at it in historical terms, some of the members from across will wonder what am I talking about in regards to the concrete public accounts reality in regards to my comments. I would like to put forth these figures — and I'm taking it in broader strokes in regards to the historical terms — and I go back to the previous government prior to us in 1971, the Thatcher Liberal government.

And when we look at the Thatcher Liberal government, Mr. Speaker, they did a lot of positive changes for that time in history in regards to having an Indian/Metis department. They did some changes, but when I looked at it in comparative historical terms although there was a little bit of an improvement in regard to establishing a bureaucracy in the province, that the amount that really

actually got down to the level of expenditure at the public accounts level was to the tune of 2 per cent for all of the North and also for Indian/Metis people in the province. The amount of money that was there in the budget was \$8 million.

When we were in office in 1982 the amount of money that we spent in northern Saskatchewan and for Indian/Metis people, and the programs from economic development to social development dealing with the whole area of political structures as well as in cultural development, we were spending at that time in 1982, \$128 million for Indian/Metis people in the North. And that accounted for over 4 per cent of the budget.

When the Conservatives were around, by the time they had not only devastated this province, they also devastated the North. From \$128 million and over 4 per cent of the budget, the Conservative government by 1989 was spending \$58 million and approximately 1 per cent of the budget. To be precise, this was about 1.2 per cent of the budget.

In other words, they had devastated not only this province, but they had devastated the North. The North had been cut back a place where there was the highest unemployment rates. The province had cut back by \$70 million. Over half of the money had been cut in the North by 1989.

They were not fooling people when they said that there was only lakes and rivers in the North and no people. They lived up to that basic premise.

So when we look at the record, Mr. Speaker, we are looking at a record now and trying to fight back with people in the North and trying to get people in the areas of employment. Because the basics of any development is being able to put food on the table, you know, for your own children and have a sense of responsibility to feel proud of what you are doing. And in many cases, you know, this very basics of a person's existence was taken away through nine years of Tory rule.

So when I look at the situation, Mr. Speaker, and when I hear the people over there talking about the politics of division and having absolutely no remorse — having absolutely no feeling, no compassion — when I look at my own area in northern Saskatchewan and the devastation that they have caused, and now that they have put us in debt, and when I want to stand up and fight for jobs, I know I can only do it in sectoral strategies even in the area of mining.

When they were in government, on mining alone, Mr. Speaker, the record in employment shows that there was a 50 per cent employment rate when we were in power. It dropped to about 12, 15 per cent by 1983.

They did away with everything in the North back in '82-'83 period. They did away with the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, they did away with the monitoring committee. Absolutely no involvement of people. They completely disregarded the people in the North and they proceeded to implement their own plans and strategies. The employment rate dropped from 50 to

about 12, 15 per cent during that period.

When we were in government in a short period of time and when we were in opposition, we kept on bringing up this issue and it slowly started improving. And I must say right now, Mr. Speaker, we are now at a percentage point of 42 per cent of Northerners being employed in the mines.

There's 42 per cent now, Mr. Speaker, being employed in these mines. Out of that a lot of people ask me, well how many Indian/Metis people are employed in this new strategic effort by the provincial NDP government. And a lot of people are starting to realize that it's very important to look at this question in this fashion.

And I must be very proud to report, Mr. Speaker, that the record now in the mining industry and in our cooperative, you know, approach with mining, is that there's now 37 per cent of Indian/Metis people working in the mines in northern Saskatchewan.

This is very important, Mr. Speaker, because now the people can put food on the table for their children at good paying jobs.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, when we were looking at it, the Conservatives put a lot of people into welfare. We are trying to fight back to get people into the job capacity. We are trying to put people in good paying jobs. The paying jobs on most of the people in my constituency on those mines is from \$15 an hour to \$24 an hour. With the high costs of living in northern Saskatchewan, there was a recognition in the mining industry that those salaries had to be properly paid at the same level as any place in northern Canada.

And we have recognized that fact, Mr. Speaker, and we have produced where a lot of Indian/Metis people worked besides their other brothers and sisters, you know, from across southern Saskatchewan and across Canada, and they're being paid at the same good wages that they're earning in those mines.

So when I look at this, Mr. Speaker, we're looking at a new hope, you know, for the people in the North. We're improving and working along with the mining companies to produce a new phase in the history of mining development in the North.

You know, many times when I look at the longer history, we used to be employed at a 2 to 5 per cent level. We are now approaching at a 40 per cent level. And the mining companies, as I said, they will be with us in moving toward a 50 per cent hiring level by 1995.

And this is the type of strategy that people want to hear and listen to, rather than the politics of division that the other members always talked about. And this is the type of strategy that we are pursuing.

Mr. Speaker, alongside the development, of course, we are proceeding to work with the federal government as well as the people of northern Saskatchewan in making

sure that the development is on a sustainable level. A lot of people talked about sustainable economic development and now sustainable environment. And we are trying to proceed along that path. And many of the members, many of the communities that I've talked to, you know, have raised this issue, not only in mining but in forestry.

And we are proceeding, you know, with cooperation of course at the two levels of government as well as the local communities to try and come out with a new phase of development wherein we can combine economic development with sustainable environmental development.

And I think that's very important in looking at our new developmental record, Mr. Speaker, because we have to update ourselves from time to time in history. We know that we were the best in the world when it come down to the 1970s and the strategies at that time. But now as a government we're saying, we still even have to improve that; we're moving along and progressing along in that fashion. And I'm very pleased, you know, to see the direction that we're moving.

Many times on this strategy I recognize the strong positions taken by people in the environmental field, whether in regards to uranium or whether in regards to forestry operations or whether even in trapping. I know that as a person who was raised in trapping, we always used to have a tough time in regards to the animal rights people. Every time that we tried to do certain things . . . I know that when I was raised on a trapline I didn't have to rely on welfare.

(1645)

We lived off the land and we went out, and that's how we survived. Sometimes we took our . . . when I was a child growing up we took our books out and kept up with our math assignments and so on during the time that we were out on the trapline, and we made a good living. We didn't have to survive on welfare. We went and worked and lived in harmony with nature, and took what was necessary from there and left some for the following year. We practised, you know, proper sustainable environmental procedures before the word came into vogue as we now know it today.

So there was many things that I learned through the process of being born and raised on the trapline, and learning to deal with the issue. But at the same time we recognized the problems of price fluctuations. In many instances I recognize and I can empathize with the issue related to many people in farming and when I see a lot of people in trapping because in many cases we both live off the land. And in many cases the weather would hit us bad in some years and it was a devastating thing for us, but we kept on standing up and fighting for our ground and fighting for our jobs, and we kept on going.

And that's the type of spirit, you know, that I'm talking about, which I have seen talked about in farming which I've seen discussed in the trapline. And this is the type of spirit that we are talking about in the context of this new government and this new throne speech, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Goulet: — I want to talk about this thing on the environmental question, Mr. Speaker, because it is very important. On the trapline . . . I'll give you a little bit of history on what it's like to be on receiving, and we knew that we had to improve. We tried to on the trap line . . . on the level traps we tried to change to what we call stop-loss traps with strings in them. And then we later on changed to different types and also to what they call the cony bear traps.

We tried to move step by step in history towards what people now call humane trapping methods. And we have progressed. And last time I went to the trappers' convention just a couple weeks ago, they were mentioning that to me and they were bringing brand-new ideas on new ways of establishing more humane trapping.

And of course there is still a big resistance out there and I understand, you know, the importance of the concern for animals because I myself was raised in being concerned with animals. It's very interesting how the belief system was. And I would like to share a little bit of the belief system in that regard, as a person having been raised in that section.

We had a belief where if you left an animal that was injured, to die, it was wrong. The belief was whatever sickness that that animal would befall, whatever that sickness that animal would get, they said . . . the belief in our community was that you would get that sickness. And that was the belief that we had. So there was a very strong belief that you don't injure animals unnecessarily, that you had to be able to live in harmony with nature and to be able to partake in the animals and partake in the taking of animals; and being able to clothe yourself from it and also to put food on the table, you know, for your own children.

So it was a controversial thing, you know, when I was being raised in the '50s and also later on in the '60s. It's still a controversial issue today. And so it continues and we try and keep making improvements in that area. And I see some of the animal rights people have changed their position and have recognized the fact that trapping as a way of life is important for people, that it's important.

And some of them have backed off and said yes, we agree with you. We know how hard it is to try and be put on a dependent position of welfare and the destruction, you know, that it causes in the long run; and the fact that a lot of the alcoholism and so on comes through a form of dependency and that we have to fight this dependency. And trapping in many ways is a person standing up for themselves and learning to survive and make a good living.

So when I looked at it, there was many other items in the budget which I thought that were very good . . .

An Hon. Member: — In the Speech from the Throne.

Hon. Mr. Goulet: — On the Speech from the Throne.

There was the importance of the health care budget and the formation of the health care districts which we saw come to pass here yesterday.

One of the things that was important in the development of northern Saskatchewan was involvement of people in decision making that affected their lives. It was a very important principle, a very important, democratic principle, Mr. Speaker. Because when we were doing a lot of the development in the North, we saw the initial stages of elected municipalities in northern Saskatchewan. We did that in the '70s. We saw . . . (inaudible) . . . development for the first time where we had elected school boards.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to announce today that in our throne speech we would proceed with health care districts, and we passed that legislation on first reading the other day. And we are progressing forward to give a new voice to the people, not only in the municipalities area or the areas in relation to education, but now in health.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Goulet: — So, Mr. Speaker, when I hear the people talking about it, all I hear is community against community, community against region. All this plays divisional politics.

And here what we are trying to do is give greater power to the people that affect their lives. We are giving them power into the health districts. And we are doing it in the fashion that is a true representative aspect of Saskatchewan history, and that is in the cooperative forum — communities joining communities, communities working together. And that is the basis of the context on the formation of this new health districts that the members from across fail to realize.

So when we look at this, Mr. Speaker, all we heard from the Tory government of the past was studies. I mean in northern Saskatchewan we had study this and study that. They even had a study in the health care field that said the North was third-world medicine. But when it comes down to the facts, Mr. Speaker, they didn't do anything about it. They kept cutting back the North in regards to health.

When we look at the record last year, we made some improvements in health, Mr. Speaker. And we are proceeding to work with people in developing a more improved health system for the North. So I'm proud of the throne speech in that regard.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Goulet: — When I look, Mr. Speaker, at the concept of education, we had done many improvements when we were in government. We had done a lot of improvements in northern education and in Metis education, the development of the community college system in this province. We saw the development, you know, later on on different levels of curriculum, you know, the *Directions* report, and then later on the . . . a lot of the developments that were . . . now we're starting to

see being talked about and raised on quality of education. These are the things that we worked on, you know, when we were in power before, and will continue to work on, you know, at this time.

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that we have done a quick review in this year, and this year we will be finished with the reviews because we feel you always have to have a continuous process of consultation with the people. You have to keep up to date with the people to know exactly where you're going. And that is exactly what we are doing in the processes of review in the questions of education and the quality of education improvement.

Mr. Speaker, when I look at the question of social justice, I see this issue as an important question. Many times when I looked at the Conservative government in the nine years they were in power, complete disregard, you know, for the area of social justice.

I was pleased to report, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to go ahead with an action plan for children. When they were around, children were forgotten. We are not scared to mention children in regards to our development and our approach. We are approaching this in a new direction and trying to find new ways, especially on dealing with, you know, working parents, and especially, you know, the ones that cannot get welfare but, you know, are in low levels of salaries and so on. So we are trying to proceed to a new direction in that sense.

Also, I was very pleased in regards to the area of the workforce that we are going to deal with the question of Workers' Compensation Act and there will be changes on The Workers' Compensation Act as well as The Occupational Health and Safety Act.

In many cases, you know, when we look at working together with workers of the province of Saskatchewan, we had to do it not only on a daily working basis, but in regards to the legislation that are required from time to time. So I'm pleased to report, you know, that development in that sense.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to report in the area of aboriginal peoples. Indian/Metis peoples in this province have become, you know, not only . . . have become very important in the modern day likes with our constitutional practices, but in relation also to the mining development in the North and being part of the workforce. But also being, you know, part of the new entrepreneurial activities that are taking place in this province.

Many of the bands, many of the Metis communities, have become entrepreneurs in their own right. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that from straightforward historical terms, that the first entrepreneurs in Canada, you know, were related to the fur trade, and those would have been Indian and Metis people.

And you know, the basis of the fur trade, you know, was an important part of our Canadian history. And I'm very proud to say that, you know, as a person of aboriginal ancestry, that indeed we have made this recognition known in our action in just a year and a half. I'm pleased to report this year that we will be moving ahead with the

treaty land entitlement legislation.

In many years when you look at the history of land in this province and the fact that a lot of farm lands are being lost, you know, to the financial institutions, and we look at the whole history of land, a lot of people don't know the development of land history. And I might say that the Indian people in regards to the outstanding land entitlement were very pleased when we finally get . . . when we finally resolve it.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this land entitlement issue was matched in regards to other moves in regards to the Metis people of the province. The tripartite agreement a few days ago with the federal government and the province shows our dedication also to the Metis people, and recognizing the strengths that they have from the past and that we're also building in the future and that we will be working with them in this regard.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to say that I support the throne speech. I know that it presents many challenges, but I think it also presents a hope. It presents a hope for all the people in the province to work together, presents a new vision for the province of Saskatchewan against the division, the politics of division and fear, that we have seen in the past.

We want to move forward and say, here is a new direction for not only the people in the rural areas but in the urban areas and in the North. Let's move forward and say yes to the throne speech and no to the amendment that was done.

And, Mr. Speaker, seeing that it is close to 5, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:59 p.m.