

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

ORAL QUESTIONS

Martensville Trial

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker, my question today is to the Minister of Justice. Mr. Minister, as you are aware, the Martensville sexual abuse cases have been forefront in the newspapers for some time. All of the details surrounding this serious issue have yet to be explained. Some have said that the technique used by police in interviewing the children was wrong. Others have questioned why the Justice department did not hold preliminary hearings instead of using direct indictment.

Mr. Minister, the parents feel the justice system has failed them, and has failed them completely. Mr. Minister, the questions are numerous but the only answer you have given them to date is the Justice department did what it believed was right.

Mr. Minister, are you going to look into this matter? Will you indeed hold an inquiry?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for his question on this very important subject, and one that is of great concern to all of us.

The Martensville trial was the longest criminal trial ever held in the province of Saskatchewan. It's my understanding that a great deal of the time in that trial was taken up by an examination of the techniques that had been used in developing the evidence of the children, in interviewing them, and in trying to ascertain exactly what their evidence was.

A preliminary inquiry was not held in the case for a couple of reasons, which I consider to be very valid. It was a decision made, of course, by the prosecutions — it's their decision to make — the prosecutions unit. They felt that to put the children through the additional procedure would be just too hard on them.

And secondly, it would have consumed another approximately one year of time, which would have yet delayed the trial and made the recall of events even more difficult for these children. So I think that that was the right decision. In those circumstances, considering all of the circumstances, I don't think a public inquiry is appropriate and I have said so publicly.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Minister, the problem that we are facing today, and as you have alluded to, is the fact that a lot of people, people right across this province, and in my riding I run into it . . . I know that other members have run into the same question. I think what's basically cropping up is a fact

that people in general are beginning to really question the whole judicial system. And it's not just a matter of the Martensville cases that has spurred this question, Mr. Minister. I think that people need to know that this justice system is working and working on their behalf.

Mr. Minister, do you not think that a public inquiry would be the best way to restore confidence in our judicial system, the best way to — once and for all — put an end to the accusations?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, the first thing that you would have to ask yourself is what is it that you would inquire into? And I'm just a little short of understanding what it is that ought to be the subject of the inquiry.

Certainly the evidence of the children has been inquired into at great lengths. The files are full of transcripts of interviews of those children by various police officers: first of all the Martensville police and the officer that they had assisting them from Saskatoon and then re-interviews as the case was developed after the Department of Justice got involved. And then they spent weeks and weeks on the stands. From an evidentiary point of view, I think that the case provided that kind of an inquiry.

And if it is the way in which the police conducted the interviews, I think that subject was examined at great length during the trial. The conduct of the prosecution, I think, is not being questioned by anyone. So I'm not sure what it is that we would inquire into. And I think we would have to know that very clearly before we could seriously think about holding an inquiry.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would direct my questions to the same minister on the same topic.

Mr. Minister, by agreement with the mayor of Martensville, we both agreed that we would keep strictly out of it, as I think all politicians should have stayed out of this issue until it has been resolved. And I guess from your answer so far we are about as far along as we're going to get in the resolution of this.

But I would say to you, Mr. Minister, from the perspective of the people of Martensville and surrounding areas where I have my office and so on, it is still an extremely contentious issue, and it's a very personal issue with those folks. And there are a lot of questions out there.

What went wrong with the system? I have yet to speak to anyone in that area, Mr. Minister, who is satisfied with the judicial process. No one is satisfied. They all have questions. What went wrong with the system?

And, Mr. Minister, I don't think that you can simply duck behind the procedures that have been followed and say that's all we can do. I am asking you, let us

have a judicial public inquiry as to what went wrong with the system. I don't advocate getting the kids up or anything like that to give more pressure on them. That's not what I'm asking.

I'm asking let's draw back, and have from a provincial perspective . . . to see what went wrong, to assure, sir, that something like this can never happen again. That's why I would lend my support to our critic of Justice and say, let's have a look at this.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the intervention of the member. There is no question that in a situation like this people are troubled and people ask the difficult questions which includes the question: what went wrong?

We are, of course, in the Department of Justice, reviewing this as we would review any other major case, to try and do that. And I know that the RCMP (Royal Canadian Mounted Police) are doing the same, going through the same process. Now the member indicates that something more than that is required and I have not accepted that suggestion, because frankly I don't know what it is that we would inquire into. I don't know what it is that we would inquire into. The machinery of the state is set up to deal with alleged crimes and evidence is placed before a jury of ordinary people who determine whether or not a crime has been committed. And it has been determined by a jury, in this case, that in the case of Mr. and Mrs. Sterling Sr., no crime has been committed.

Beyond that the state doesn't have any machinery to find out what happened. That's not the function of the criminal law system. Now as to what went wrong, the interviewing techniques have undergone great examination during the trial, which was a public process although it couldn't be reported. But that part of the case was reported in great detail so we know a great deal about how the investigation was conducted. The fact that the jury found the Sterlings not guilty, that of course can't be the subject of inquiry. That is the end of that matter. And so far as the conduct of the Crown is concerned, the prosecutors, I don't think that has been the subject of any criticism. So I don't know what it is that we would inquire about.

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Minister, what we would inquire about is what went wrong with the system. Where was the Crown prosecutor; where was the Department of Justice involved? Where did they go wrong? Mr. Minister, one of the bigger concerns, a big concern that I have as well in this issue, is that we have three — and I'm sure for you as well — and that is that we have three police forces that are being tainted right now and the people are asking themselves: do we have confidence in our police forces?

We have the Martensville police force, we have the Saskatoon city police force, we have the RCMP involved. That cloud is still hanging over their heads. That has not been resolved. And simply by staying it

and saying we are going to wait for a year and see how this whole thing develops, without a clarification of the process, in the public's mind . . . You can have all the reviews that you want in the Department of Justice. That is not going to allay the concerns that the public has and I think this should be a public inquiry so everything can come out in the wash, and that's why I'm asking you that, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, that's what I tried to answer directly to the member before. I don't think anyone is suggesting that the case was improperly prosecuted. I think that there is no criticism of the way in which the department or the prosecutors functioned. So far as the way in which the matter was investigated by the police, I just say again, Mr. Speaker, that that question was examined in great detail in the trial. Indeed it was the theory of the defence that it was the investigation that was wrong and that that led to all of the difficulty that led to the charges. So that has been examined at great length. And we will all have to review that situation to determine what we learn from it. But I don't see what it is that would be gained by going through some kind of public inquiry to rehash what was already heard at the trial.

But I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, because I think this is a very important line of questioning. We must learn what we can from the whole experience surrounding this trial, and we must all work very hard and very diligently to learn what we can and to take whatever steps are available to us to ensure that if there were mistakes made — and I think there were — not to repeat those mistakes, not to have to go through that again because little children have to be protected.

Casino Gambling Expansion

Ms. Haverstock: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister responsible for gaming. Mr. Minister, on Friday last I asked questions of you with respect to the proposed profit sharing for the two \$25 million casinos to be built in Regina and Saskatoon. Mr. Minister, have you received a proposal from any American investors to finance the casino construction?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question from the member from Greystone, we have met with people involved in the gaming industry from the United States, people who have requested a meeting with the Gaming Authority and with myself. We have met with them. They have put forth, in general terms, the kind of operations that they run in the United States and how their gaming operations work in the areas where they're doing business. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I think that's a responsible approach to take.

We have had proposals put forth by the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations, by community groups from one end of this province to the other. Some of these proposals dealt with revenue sharing; some dealt with involvement of community groups; some dealt with the size that they propose for their casinos

and the locations.

We put all of these into the mix, Mr. Speaker, and based on the information that we were able to gather from people who have done studies with us and for us, we put together a proposal for casino expansion that the member is well aware of. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, to the member from Greystone, that I think we have done a very diligent job in taking a go-slow approach to this. And I want to say, in quoting from the federal Minister of Indian Affairs from the *Leader-Post* . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Next question.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can you tell us, Mr. Minister, as the result of the meeting held at the Hotel Saskatchewan between representatives of the American Promus Corporation, the meeting with the Premier, the ministers of Finance, Justice, and yourself, can you tell us what agreement was proposed, who will put up the capital to build the casinos, and what percentage of profits is expected in return?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the member from Greystone, we've met with a number of different companies and different people who have been associated and involved with casino development in other areas. And I'll be tabling today a list of the meetings that we've had over the past months. One of the meetings, I would say to the member from Greystone, was with Promus Corporation who operate casino operations in the United States.

They brought to us, in general terms, the types of casinos that they're operating, how they work, and I want to say they showed us a video that we found very enlightening in terms of the development of the venues that they have in the United States. There were no details discussed. It was a straight presentation in terms of what they're doing, what their corporate enterprise is doing in the United States. There was no discussion of revenue sharing or any of the things of that nature.

But let me say to the member, as I read the quotes that she is attributed to in the *Leader-Post* of February 12 . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Next question.

Ms. Haverstock: — Mr. Minister, when will you table the anticipated revenue projections for the proposed casino operations so that we can investigate the impact that this is going to have on our society in Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Well let me say to the member that we have developed the principles of a casino expansion policy which include the exhibition associations, aboriginal people, and the Government of Saskatchewan. In terms of the details, I want to say that none of the details in terms of revenue sharing have been negotiated. That's a process that we're

putting in place. I want to say that there has been a lot of speculation, and the member from Greystone has clearly been quite part of it.

As I look at the quotes from the *Leader-Post* of February 12, and I find with interest that she has a revenue breakdown of some \$60 million: 40 million to an American investor, 12 million to the FSIN (Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations), and the remaining 8 million split between exhibitions and Metis.

I notice in her proposed breakdown that there's no revenue from the Government of Saskatchewan, so let me say to the member from Greystone, fine to speculate, but I say to you today that no discussions have taken place in the details of revenue sharing. That's a process that we're putting in place and will be discussing with the Metis, with the federation of Saskatchewan Indian and other Indian bands, with the exhibitions associations. And I'm hopeful that we will come before the people of Saskatchewan with a proposal that the federal Minister of Indian Affairs indicates we probably will, and it'll be acceptable to all, Indian and non-Indian.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Are you saying, Mr. Minister, that you have met with American investors, you have met with exhibition boards and the FSIN, but you have not yet estimated the revenues, the profits, or the betting volume the American investors and your casino partners expect? Or are you telling us that the public has no business knowing this information?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, let me say to the member, and I want to quote from the federal Minister of Indian Affairs who says:

I'm quite satisfied that there are excellent discussions going on between the FSIN and Saskatchewan and I think what comes out the other end is probably going to be satisfactory to the native community and the non-native community (alike).

And I want to say to the member from Greystone that I agree with her Liberal colleague from Ottawa in that we will come up with a proposal that will satisfy Indian and non-Indian alike.

I want to say that this government supports job opportunities for aboriginal people. We support a capital pool for economic development that can create some jobs in communities like Fond-du-Lac and Stony Rapids where unemployment rages — 90, 95 per cent. And I ask the member for Greystone if she supports that process.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I could not help but pick up on the exchange that has been going on over the last few moments and I would like to direct some questions to the same minister, Mr. Speaker, and at the outset would like to acknowledge and thank the minister for sending over to me five minutes ago the Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority Social

Impacts of Gaming. And I will be looking through that document with a great deal of interest, Mr. Minister.

However, you have yet failed to deliver upon your promise to give us the economic studies that you have based your gambling strategy on. Mr. Speaker, last sitting the Leader of the Third Party claimed that an increase of \$350 million in betting would have to be placed in order to meet a \$50 million profit projection. Mr. Speaker, as well she claimed that the American investor in the casinos would claim 80 per cent of that profit. And my question to the minister of gaming is this. Have you had an opportunity, Mr. Minister, to review the claims of the third party leader, and specifically, what kind of projections of your own you would have to counter what appears to be a very, very significant number?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the member's question, let me say that I haven't had an opportunity to analyse, in any detail, the numbers put forth by the member from Greystone. As a matter of fact, I'm not quite sure where she may have gotten her information. I understand that her party has talked to a number of gaming experts and she's confident that the government's new partnership will include American investors, Federation of Saskatchewan Indians, and various associations including the Metis Society.

I want to say this. No final decision has been made with respect to whether, whether or not, we would involve outside management. If in fact we do, I would want to say to the member from Rosthern and to the member from Greystone that it would be our priority to see what kind of expertise we have firstly within this province. I think secondly we would look to see what kind of expertise there is in our country. And the third option, and the last option, if we were to include outside management, would be management from outside of this country.

Now having said that, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that it's become quite clear that the federal government has taken an interest in what we're doing in Saskatchewan in terms of involving aboriginal people, first nations people. And they agree that in fact we're on the right track. So I ask the member of the opposition, and I ask the member from Greystone, do you support the economic initiatives that we're taking? Do you support the jobs for first nations people? You can't have it both ways. On which side are . . .

The Speaker: — Next question.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, I don't think it's very significant of what . . . whether we support or not. What is important is what do the people think. And quite frankly, Mr. Minister, the people don't know what to think because they've got nothing to base their opinions on. That's why it's of such paramount importance to get this study out, Mr. Minister.

I have a copy, Mr. Minister, of a study done in 1993 for the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations, and by . . . done by Harrah's Casino Hotels. And that study suggests that the member from the third party must have been picking some figures out of thin air, because this study suggests that in order to generate that \$50 million in profit, gaming revenue in this province would have to be \$150 million, which is about some \$200 million less than the third party leader has indicated. And furthermore, Mr. Minister, it suggests that the cut for the American investor would be 33 per cent rather than the 80 per cent of profits as suggested earlier. Mr. Minister, the point is very simply this: we cannot have a meaningful debate on this issue unless you are willing to divulge all of the information regarding your decision on operating casino gambling.

And so therefore, Mr. Minister, I ask you again: will you table all of your studies as you have done with this study, and I recognize that. But will you table all of your economic studies that have been done in association with expanding gambling in Saskatchewan? Will you do that now, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, let me say to the member from Rosthern and to the member from Greystone that it's not my intention to get in between them into a dispute as to how much money would go to who today. I don't think that it's my place to get involved in a family feud that they might be having over there.

So let me say, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to be entering into negotiations with aboriginal people in this province, with the exhibition associations, to determine the most fair and equitable way of revenue splitting on the expanded casinos. And I want to say as well, Mr. Speaker, that of the thousand people that we contacted through the study that I passed on to the member from Greystone and to the opposition, that it became quite clear that 86 per cent of Saskatchewan residents gamble. It also became clear that 12 per cent of Saskatchewan people leave this province every year to spend gaming dollars in other areas of the world.

So I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that it's our position we're going to sit down and negotiate with the people who I have mentioned to come up with a partnership arrangement that's going to keep money in Saskatchewan, that's going to create aboriginal jobs in this province, and that's going to stem the outflow of dollars from Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Availability of Taxol

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Associate Minister of Health. Mr. Minister, it's not often that the official opposition compliments the government in question period, but

I'd like to take the opportunity to thank you on behalf of the Hartsook family for your efforts on Friday.

The Hartsooks and many other Saskatchewan families who have a family member suffering from cancer are waiting for a decision on the drug, Taxol. And I'd like to commend the Associate Minister of Finance for immediately meeting with the Hartsooks to discuss this important issue on Friday. For the families requesting information, I would request today that you give us a brief update on Friday's meeting and to tell us what the families could expect. Could you do that for us, Mr. Minister.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, while we're in the mood of complimenting each other, I want to compliment the member of the opposition for the fashion in which he raised the question on Friday, giving us a few minutes advance notice of the questions that he was going to raise and indicating that we would like to deal with this in a non-partisan kind of approach. I appreciate that, and I hope we may continue to do that.

We did meet, as the member indicates, the Hartsooks and I, following the House on Friday. We had a good meeting. We had with us at that time an official from the Department of Health who clarified the exact process of approval.

In this case, the drug, Taxol, has received federal approval for use for cancers associated with breast cancer and cancers resulting from breast cancer. To date it has only been approved for ovarian cancers. With that new approval, the process then is that the Canadian cancer foundation and its own committee here in the province looks at the use of that drug, setting up of the protocols and so on.

As a result of the meeting on Friday, we have been in touch with the foundation, and they give us their assurance that at the earliest possible opportunity the committee will be drawn together to review the protocols for this drug.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have leave to introduce guests.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and members of the Assembly a former member of the Prince Albert Council, Grethyll Adams, as well as Dr. Teo, who are with us here today in the government gallery. They are here, as I understand, Grethyll, not as now a person working with the city of Prince Albert but working with the Canadian Polytechnic College. Their job is to work with residents of Saskatchewan in teaching languages that will go towards helping our business

people and residents of Saskatchewan work in international trade and other areas.

And at meetings this morning with staff of our department, I think we had a good, solid exchange. I want to welcome you here to the Assembly and look forward to meeting with you in the future.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Boyd: — Before orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, with leave, for a brief statement on the Saskatchewan Winter Games now being held in Kindersley.

Leave granted.

(1430)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Saskatchewan Winter Games

Mr. Boyd: — Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to speak about the Saskatchewan Winter Games that officially opened yesterday in Kindersley.

Mr. Speaker, there will be some 1,700 athletes from all over Saskatchewan competing in these games, which I understand is more than are competing in Lillehammer, Norway currently, Mr. Speaker. There are also 1,400 volunteers working hard to ensure the games will be a success. I think this is a tremendous testimony to the volunteer spirit that Kindersley is famous for. Kindersley is also the smallest community in Saskatchewan to ever hold the Saskatchewan Winter Games, again showing the community pride that Kindersley exhibits.

Last night's official opening was a tremendous combination of entertainment, enthusiasm, and good sportsmanship. The evening was coordinated by Susan Spier of Brock, Saskatchewan, a small community neighbouring Kindersley. I'd like to commend Susan and all her support volunteers for a job well done.

Entertainment came from across the province, including the Saskatchewan Express, a cheer-leading group from the Luther College of Regina, diverse local talent including the Hansen School of Dance, the Cathy Mylrea School of Dance of Kindersley and the K.C.S. Band of Kindersley. To all those involved — athletes, coaches, families and volunteers — hats off to you, and may you enjoy a week of fine sportsmanship and competition.

Mr. Speaker, it is with tremendous pride and honour that I am entrusted to represent the fine people of Kindersley and report to you and all members of the legislature about the Saskatchewan Winter Games that are ongoing in Kindersley this week.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add my

comments to those of the member opposite.

Leave granted.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Mr. Speaker, I also would like to compliment the town of Kindersley and the people of that community on the wonderful opening ceremonies that were organized last night.

The Saskatchewan games, both the winter and summer games, serve to showcase the amateur sport in Saskatchewan and serve also as a training background for Canada Winter Games to be held in Alberta in 1996. These games build characters, build healthy bodies, and they build communities. Over 1,700 athletes participating in 15 venues will be competing in Kindersley, as the member opposite said. The facilities for these events are located mainly in Kindersley through municipal facilities that were upgraded with tremendous local support and as well through an agreement with local school boards and churches.

A unique feature of these games is also the intercommunity cooperation that Kindersley has with Rosetown and Stranraer for their use in the gymnasium and ski facilities. I want to add my words of congratulations to these communities and to the organizing committee and chairs of Mr. and Mrs. Berard and to the Mayor Dorsett and to her town council for the wonderful enthusiasm and dedication that they have shown in staging these games.

As I said last night, these 1994 winter games are the largest ever held in Saskatchewan in the smallest community ever to host them. If it were possible, the people of the town of Kindersley should receive the first gold medal for this wonderful achievement. These games are a marvellous success because of the spirit and the dedication of the people of Saskatchewan. It exemplifies the tremendous pride the Saskatchewan people have in our young people and in our communities. I want to recognize also the significant support of these games from the Saskatchewan Lotteries, the Saskatchewan Games Council and Saskatchewan Sport. Congratulations to all those involved.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add my congratulations to one of the facilities in our community.

Leave granted.

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, I want to add my congratulations with the members who have already expressed them to the town of Kindersley and the district for the tremendous effort they've made in organizing yet one more games event. They've been a host of a number of successful sports events in the past and they've done an excellent job.

One of the very special efforts that was made to work with Kindersley was made by the very small

community of Stranraer who have . . . where I had the privilege of opening their renovated ski facility which they've been working on for the last 20 years. There has been a major community effort between Stranraer and the municipalities around them to establish a ski facility, not quite like the one in Lillehammer but as close as you're going to get in Saskatchewan. And I want to add my congratulations to Stranraer and all those who have worked to establish this wonderful facility that's going to be a treat for everyone to ski on for a long time to come. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, leave to make a statement concerning Teacher/Staff Appreciation Week.

Leave granted.

Teacher/Staff Appreciation Week

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to rise in recognition of Teacher/Staff Appreciation Week in Saskatchewan which I understand coincides with the national Teacher/Staff Appreciation Week.

Teachers' roles have changed throughout the years. They have gone from the one-room classroom teaching grades 1 to 10, to state-of-the-art institutions using modern technologies. However not all teachers and students are fortunate enough to have the most modern of benefits. Teachers in some jurisdictions of our province are struggling with fewer resources, a shortage of staff, and at times, deteriorating facilities. All told, in some cases, a crumbling infrastructure.

Although many teachers, school boards, and administrators are facing such challenges, our children continue to receive an excellent education. Saskatchewan residents have risen to great heights over the years. Former prime ministers, the current Governor General, and our very own Lieutenant Governor, all born, raised, and educated in this province. Accomplished individuals whose success can, in part, be attributed to Saskatchewan's top-notch educational system.

It is important to recognize the talents of our teachers and to thank them for their efforts. On behalf of the opposition caucus I thank all teachers and other staff members for their commitment to our children's education and future. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Hamilton: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, with leave, to also add our appreciation to the teachers and staff in Saskatchewan.

Leave granted.

Ms. Hamilton: — Mr. Speaker, I rise to also ask the House to give appreciation to the teachers and staff in Saskatchewan with the significance of a week that's

set aside for them from February 13 to 19. This week has been designated provincially at the request of the Saskatchewan Federation of Home and School Associations in appreciation of the work that teachers and staff do, day in and day out, in the education of kindergarten to post-secondary students.

As we all know, the role of the school system and those who work in it is more demanding and critical than ever before. Teachers and school staff are challenged each day in preparing students for future careers. In addition to providing students with the modern-day scientific and technological knowledge and skills they need, they also have to respond to factors such as family instability and violence, hunger, poverty, teen pregnancy, substance abuse, and behaviour problems.

Mr. Speaker, by highlighting this week it is one way to give recognition and thanks to teachers and school staff for their professional and personal contribution to the future and well-being of their students. During this week, it is an opportunity for all of us to acknowledge their contribution to our children, our schools, and our communities.

I would ask at this time that all members join me in expressing a heartfelt thank you to all the teachers and school staff in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Lorje: — . . . Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, to make a brief statement on Ramadan.

Leave granted.

Ramadan

Ms. Lorje: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I noticed the puzzled looks that passed on the faces of many members. I would like to point out that this past weekend, Mr. Speaker, the Muslims of the world started the lunar month of Ramadan — a month of fasting between dawn and dusk.

Fasting is the second of the Five Pillars of Islam. It is a time of spiritual renewal and contemplation. It is a time of self-reflection and personal growth, learning and sacrifice. It is a time to achieve empathy with those less fortunate, to recognize those suffering from hunger, disease, and oppression. Ramadan is a time to transcend differences, difficulties and diversity.

Over one billion Muslims in the world observe this month of fasting, over half a million Muslims in Canada and over 1,000 Muslims in Saskatchewan. In fact, Mr. Speaker, Muslims have been in Saskatchewan since the early 1900s. These celebrants in Saskatchewan aren't just Muslims, Mr. Speaker; they are Canadians — originally from Pakistan and Egypt, from East Asia to the Caribbean, from the European and the north and west African regions of the world. These people are involved in various professions and occupations: retail, farming and civil service, public and private sectors, university

teaching, and research.

Ramadan is an important time for Muslims in Saskatchewan and elsewhere. It is particularly important in Bosnia-Herzegovina, where over half the population are Muslims. Bosnia-Herzegovina is a war-torn country, locked in desperate strife, indeed, some would say genocide. How ironic at the start of the Olympics in Lillehammer that the people in Sarajevo, the sight of the '84 Olympics, face the tragedy of war. And yet, Mr. Speaker, the beleaguered Muslims there take the time to observe a month-long fast, to recognize others less fortunate. This is the point of Ramadan — the spirit of self-sacrifice, caring and renewal.

Mr. Speaker, I know that all members of this House join me in wishing the Muslim people of the world a joyous Ramadan leading to peace in the world. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Haverstock: — Yes, with leave to make comments on Teacher and Staff Week.

Leave granted.

Teacher and Staff Appreciation Week

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, just a few short words on behalf of the Liberal Party and the Liberal caucus to give support to the teachers and staff throughout the province of Saskatchewan. There is nothing more important than the well-being of our children. And I've spoken with many many teachers as of late. Indeed we'll be meeting with two more groups of them this morning, because they are feeling under a great — tomorrow morning — under a great deal of stress. Why? Because they are dealing with increased multigrades; they are dealing with increased enrolments; they are dealing with increased numbers of children with special needs; and increased demands of all kinds, many of which have little to do with education. While they are doing this, of course, they are dealing with decreased levels of respect and support from the public.

So we, on behalf of our party, would like them to know that they receive our support and our good wishes in this time of recognition for them this week.

The Speaker: — May I at this time inform the House that the Speaker was so eager to get into orders of the day that he forgot a few items on the routine proceedings. Could we revert back to ministerial statements?

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Consultation with Youth Concerning Health Issues

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the Assembly today of a planned new initiative of interest to all Saskatchewan youth and their parents, families, and communities.

In keeping with the spirit of health reform, later this month we will begin an extensive process of consultation with Saskatchewan's young people to seek out their views on public health issues. Their opinions will be sought to help us find solutions to problems such as smoking, tobacco use, drinking and driving. We also hope to discuss a number of options that would reduce the accident rate among new drivers.

We know that Saskatchewan young people have a great deal to share on matters such as these and we intend to give them that opportunity. Although consultation has already taken place on these issues over the past two years, this is the first time that the process will focus specifically on youth.

At least 500 young people between the ages of 12 and 19 will be contacted by way of school meetings and questionnaires. It will be a fully representative sample that includes urban, rural, northern, and aboriginal young people. There will be an educational component as well, providing youth with the kind of information they need to make responsible choices.

This will be a joint undertaking involving not just Saskatchewan Health but also the Department of Justice, along with SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance). Saskatchewan Education, Training and Employment will also be involved in helping to coordinate the school meetings. The final results will be presented to the ministers of Health this spring.

Mr. Speaker, once the results have been reviewed there will be proposed changes to The Highway Traffic Act, The Vehicle Administration Act, The Driver Licensing Regulations, and The Minors Tobacco Act. We expect that legislation will be ready for tabling during the current session, but I should emphasize that no changes to legislation will be made until we've heard the views of young people and taken them into account.

Mr. Speaker, it's been said many times that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, and nowhere is this more true than in the field of health care. Mr. Speaker, as we speak to Saskatchewan young people we know that these are formative years. Habits and tendencies acquired in youth often endure through adulthood and so we want to do everything we can to help Saskatchewan youth make responsible choices. And, Mr. Speaker, we want to hear what they have to say on these and other issues so that we're working with them as partners.

(1445)

Mr. Speaker, this initiative will play a valuable role in helping us to define and address health issues for Saskatchewan's young people. And for this reason I am sure it will be of interest to all members and we'll enjoy their support.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, again setting an unusual precedent for myself, I'd like to join with the minister in congratulating him about the process and undertaking that his department and other departments are embarking on. We all agree that healthy lifestyles are the key, Mr. Minister. The education process of promoting responsible use of alcohol and the health risks associated with smoking are initiatives that the official opposition can support. The consultation process with young people across the province is good and we look forward to the discussion and the good suggestions that I'm sure will come out of the consultation process.

We all know of families, Mr. Speaker, that have suffered tragedies with young people across our province, so we recognize the importance of the initiative, of joining with the youth throughout Saskatchewan to hear what their views are on these important issues. We look forward to good legislation to help protect our young people in Saskatchewan. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We too in the Liberal Party applaud any efforts to promote the participation of our citizens in the democratic process. And this proposed involvement of youth is of even greater significance, primarily because what we would like to see is young people having some understanding, not only that their views count, but that they can be included in whatever takes place in the democratic process.

Several organizations in our province, even some citizens, have expressed some frustration when they have discovered that government publications are already in print when consultations with them are taking place. I do hope that this is not the case in this particular circumstance, that you already have in mind what the legislation will read, but that you will meet with them with a very open mind.

This is an extraordinary opportunity to give young people direct input into issues of concern to them, and I hope that this undertaking proves most worthwhile and that their comments and points of view are truly heard.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 4 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act (Four Year Term)

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move a Bill to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act (Four Year Term) 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 establish The Tourism Authority

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill to establish a Tourism Authority be now introduced and read for 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 questions 22 and 23, I table the following answers.

The Speaker: — Answers have been tabled for questions 22 and 23.

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to respond today to the Speech from the Throne even though we feel, Mr. Speaker, that this throne speech was lacking in some cases.

I'd like to also take this opportunity to congratulate the member from Regina North West on her election. I understand that it was a very difficult by-election, temperature-wise, in Saskatchewan.

I too participated in knocking on doors, and I can attest to the fact that when it's 30-below out, not many people want you standing on their doorstep. But there was one good point about it, Mr. Speaker, is that the people did invite you in to speak to them in their homes rather than on the doorstep.

I'll keep my remarks brief, Mr. Speaker, because we feel that a throne speech debate should have some meaning. And in some throne speeches there are new initiatives that are worthy of debate, Mr. Speaker. But this particular throne speech is lacking in anything substantial to be worthy of debate.

And what this is doing, Mr. Speaker, is costing us \$35,000 a day for really no purpose. This is simply an unnecessary expense, Mr. Speaker, and we should be getting down to the business of the House. We should be dealing with the Bills that have been presented to this House.

Being the opposition member responsible for Education, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on some of the matters that the Speech from the Throne did raise dealing with education.

One of the items that was mentioned in there was the electronic highway. Now, Mr. Speaker, when you

make this kind of a statement you're talking in buzz-words. Most people do not really understand what is meant by the term electronic highway. Now it can be a worthwhile effort when the speech talks about Canadian network for the advancement of research, industry and education. Well that sounds very good, Mr. Speaker, but again what does it really mean? When you talk about the electronic highway what are you talking about? You're talking about the transfer of information from point A to point B. But what forms does that information take? Mr. Speaker, it can be video. It can be documents or data, any of those types of information that you would transmit electronically.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have a system already in Saskatchewan that performs some of those duties, some of that capability. It's called SCN (Saskatchewan Communications Network Corporation), so why would the government not include SCN into this electronic highway rather than looking at cutting funding for this.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem that the only reason the government is looking at cutting funding to SCN is because it was a Tory initiative. Mr. Speaker, SCN provides for video conferencing between universities and SIAST (Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology) programs throughout this province in the regional college system. It's an excellent method for educating people away from the centres, away from Regina and Saskatoon.

A professor in university in Regina can be teaching a class and somebody in Redvers can be receiving that class. That is what the electronic highway can do, Mr. Speaker, and we already have that capability here. Now the term electronic highway would expand on that but we should at least keep that portions that we already have and build on that, Mr. Speaker. If the government does not maintain this, university courses and SIAST courses would not be accessible to a good many communities in this province, and in particular, in my own area under the Southeast Regional College.

Mr. Speaker, there would only be two communities that could reasonably sustain university courses in them and that would be Estevan and Weyburn in the Southeast Regional College area. The other communities such as Glen Ewen, Redvers, Carlyle, Assiniboia, would not have that capability. But with SCN in place and maintained, Mr. Speaker, they would be able to do so.

And when you look at the Southeast Regional College, Estevan and Weyburn comprise only 20 per cent of that geographic area. Mr. Speaker, without SCN in place, a second year of university courses and a good many of the Southeast Regional College facilities would not be possible. And a second year of university classes in those communities benefits the community. It benefits the students because they can remain within their communities. They can continue to live at home. They can live, perhaps even can carry on working in their communities to enhance their education and maintain some income.

Consider the ramifications. In 1991 universities delivered 140 first class and second class year courses in the regional colleges. There were 76 traditional face-to-face courses provided for an enrolment of 895, and 64 SCN courses with an enrolment of 713. This is for a total of more than 1,600 people, Mr. Speaker, and SCN played a major part in that.

One of the other areas that the Speech from the Throne talked about was the social environment in our schools for the students. Now that's a very important component, Mr. Speaker, that children must have the proper social settings within the schools to be able to be educated. If a child is hungry when they come to school their learning capabilities are decreased.

But there are other things within the school system, Mr. Speaker, that we also need, that must be addressed, and that is teachers. Without teachers in the school system we don't have much of a school system, Mr. Speaker.

We need the proper resource materials within the school. We need proper school facilities for children to attend. And throughout the province, Mr. Speaker, there are a good many of the school facilities which are deteriorating and which need immediate attention.

When we look at the social problems within our schools, Mr. Speaker, it's my belief that those remedies that we can provide through the education system should not be funded directly through Education but rather they should be funded in conjunction with Social Services. We should not be taking funds away from the education of children to provide for the social context; that should come from another department. It can be funnelled in through the Department of Education, but it should have separate funding.

I mentioned the schools, Mr. Speaker, the school facilities are deteriorating because of the lack of capital funding. Now schools are not just physical buildings, but we do need some physical structures across this province to provide that education. And when schools are receiving cuts year after year — 1992, 2 per cent; in 1993 a 2 per cent cut; in 1994 the government is projecting a 4 per cent cut — when you add that all together you're looking at almost a 10 per cent cut over the last three years. And that is a very significant drop, Mr. Speaker, because not only has the money decreased but costs continue to increase. In a lot of school boards it amounts to a lot more, Mr. Speaker, than 10 per cent.

I have a projected preliminary estimate of the cuts to the school boards and they range anywhere from a cut of 91 per cent to increases in some cases because of increased enrolments. But most school boards across this province are facing serious cuts, Mr. Speaker, and it will have a detrimental effect on the education available for our children.

There are many other educational and environmental issues, Mr. Speaker, which need to be discussed. However they can be better discussed with the budget speech and with estimates. Mr. Speaker, we in the official opposition believe that time and the use of talents of members and of staff could be more efficiently used in dealing with the real needs and the wishes of the people of this province.

Because we feel that the taxpayer should be getting a better value for their dollars, for that \$35,000 a day, the PCs (Progressive Conservative) voted in support of a motion to move from debating the Speech from the Throne to debating one of the Bills. Now, I know that the Government House Leader and the Premier were suggesting that was closure, Mr. Speaker. Closure is a move by government to limit the debating opportunities of the opposition.

In this particular case, Mr. Speaker, there is no closure. The official opposition is volunteering to no longer debate the Speech from the Throne and to move on to the Bills of the House. Mr. Speaker, every member of the NDP (New Democratic Party) voted against it. All the members of the PCs voted for it and, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals were not here to vote. If members do not want to work on the Bills that we have submitted to the House, we are prepared to deal with government orders.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the member from Moosomin:

That the House do now proceed to Bill No. 2, An Act to amend The Department of Economic Development Act, 1993.

Motion negated on division.

(1500)

Mrs. Bergman: — Before I begin my comments, I'd like to welcome another guest today. In the gallery there is the president of Regina North West constituency, Mr. Doug Deegan. I'd ask the Assembly to join me in welcoming him.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mrs. Bergman: — Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to address this Assembly in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I would first like to say how proud I am to represent the people of Regina North West who recently elected me to this Chamber in a campaign in which the weather alone was a formidable foe, not to mention the plethora of viruses and other debilitating infections which laid low not only campaign workers but a large number of people I found at home in pyjamas and mustard plasters.

In the past year and a half I have come to know my constituents and their concerns in some depth. The people of Regina North West are part of the growing edge of north Regina. More than a thousand of my constituents are health care workers. A larger number are employees of the Crown corporations, in various

government departments. My constituents are police officers, teachers, clerks, mechanics, carpenters, students, caretakers, sales people, labourers, technicians, fire-fighters, small-business people, steelworkers, mail carriers. Among my constituents are many aboriginal families, both treaty Indians and many Metis, a growing Sikh community, and many other immigrants whose hard work and commitment to community are contributing to the growth of the Regina North West.

Many of my constituents are home-makers because this is a constituency with many children. The concerns of the people of Regina North West are focused on their children. I am very committed to protecting the interests of their children and of the families of the North West through my work to influence public policy in this Assembly. The family is the source of good citizens, and we must make sure that we provide the best possible environment for families to flourish.

In the time that I have spent getting to know my constituents, they have had a lot to say about how they are governed. The people of the North West agree that the deficit has to be addressed. They agree that the Conservatives have lost all credibility on this and most other matters. They look to the government to cut the deficit, but they look for fairness. They look for accountability. They look for the government to consult with the people of Saskatchewan. But they also look for compassion from their government in its decision making.

The people of Regina North West know that deficit reduction has to be balanced with economic development. They are still waiting for the government to create a climate conducive to economic activity and growth. When this government was elected, it was based on a promise of no new taxes and assurances that job creation and economic development would be priorities. All they heard from this government is a listing of goals, but where's the meat?

Many Regina North West voters are students who don't know if there will be a job for them when they graduate. Some have already graduated and returned for further classes because there are no jobs, and their student loan debt keeps growing.

Hope is the one thing many of our young people are losing. As a result, we see many of them leaving the province in search of something better. They take with them not only the knowledge they have gained through our educational system, but they also take with them the promise that each of them show in different fields of study.

The future of our province depends on these young people. Where is the economic plan that will keep them here? Saskatchewan may have the lowest unemployment rate, but that statistic excludes not only those who have stopped looking for a job, but also those who are looking for the first time.

Mr. Speaker, when I was a student and looked forward to starting my first job, it was with a sense of anticipation. Students today are more often racked with a sense of trepidation or despair. Will the government act to realize its responsibility to build an economic climate which will keep our young people in the province?

The future of the province is also very much contingent on the future of aboriginal families, the only part of our population which is steadily growing. The throne speech barely mentions the word aboriginal, much less addresses any of their concerns. When will the government respond with a plan made in true consultation with the aboriginal peoples?

Small-business people in Regina North West have been decimated by high taxation policies. When taxes are too high, people are unable to dine out or buy locally and keep their local establishments open. When local North West businesses are forced to cut back, it means that young people lose their part-time jobs. When will the government respond with a plan to encourage small business?

During the Regina North West by-election, a common issue was raised in almost all of my visits to people's homes or during telephone conversations. At issue was jobs. Unfortunately, many of my constituents are unemployed, and many of those that are working are concerned about how safe their jobs are.

On one block alone, one-third of the people are unemployed. Where is the economic plan to get these people back to work? Where is a vision that will provide these people with some hope that there is light at the end of the tunnel? These people only want the dignity of being able to collect a pay cheque for a job well done.

As I stated earlier, Regina North West is home to many health care workers who have told me that the wellness plan, as declared unilaterally by this government, has resulted in more nurses than there are construction workers on compensation as a result of stress-related illness. Surely the wellness model, which has not yet been defined, cannot be achieved at the cost of the health of health care workers. Nurses have told me they cannot provide adequate, much less good care, because of increased patient loads.

What health care workers say is that no one in government is listening to them. They need to know that if changes are being proposed to the system that they will be involved in the decision-making process.

What these people do not need is to find out — after the fact — that changes have been made, changes which make their jobs much more difficult to carry out effectively. These are the people that know the health care system best, Mr. Speaker; they deal with it every day. They must be involved.

Mr. Speaker, when I listened to the people of Regina North West as I campaigned, I found some people who were disappointed — profoundly disappointed

— and some who were angry. Both felt betrayed by a government which refused to listen to the democratically expressed will of the people, whether expressed through the 1991 plebiscite votes or through government-initiated consultations. Some were so angry they refused to be enumerated.

Mr. Speaker, the people want to be heard. While the government says it is committed to the power of community and cooperation, it appears to many of my constituents that they are excluded from that community. The member for Regina Wascana Plains points out that the government has a plan for the people of Saskatchewan. The government takes great pride in its plan. The only problem is that this government has also demonstrated that if people have concerns about that plan, these concerns are not listened to, much less considered.

When the Premier said at the outset of the recent by-election that whether his party won or lost the seat it would be business as usual for the government, many people of Regina North West were deeply offended. To them it was another sign that the government doesn't care what they think and is in no way accountable to them.

Mr. Speaker, I can only speak for myself, and on behalf of the people of Regina North West, on the issue of pay raises to ministerial and Executive Council staff. What the people of Regina North West are upset about is not the number of political appointees who received their raises — 2 of them, or 10 of them, or 18 of them — to them it is only a matter of degree.

Mr. Speaker, what the people of Regina North West are upset about is not that this government hid the actual figures about the media . . . from the media and from the people of Saskatchewan. What the people of Regina North West are upset about is not the size or the percentage of the raises — whether they were 4 per cent, 8 per cent, twelve and a half per cent, or 35 per cent.

The member for Regina Albert North has said the government couldn't pay its political appointees what it felt they deserved in 1991 because the province was on the verge of bankruptcy. The member for Regina Albert North continued: in 1993 the province has barely stepped back from the precipice of bankruptcy. And yet the very first thing they did was to make sure their political employees were given raises. Is this an example of a government with its priorities in place?

What the people are upset about is that this government is totally insensitive to the plight of Saskatchewan people. Many people have lost their jobs, had their work hours reduced, or have had their pay frozen. These people can't understand how a government would tend to the needs of its political employees when so many ordinary people without political connections are hurting. The people are upset by the government's double standard at a time when its members say the province is still close to the precipice of bankruptcy.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Regina North West are hurting because the Federated Co-op's warehouse has left town. They are hurting because of lay-offs at IPSCO and the Royal Bank, because Dominion Bridge, Massey Ferguson, Westank, Coca-Cola and Pepsi-Cola, and many others, have shut down. It seems to the people of Regina North West that the government can't fathom their anxieties. It seems that the government lives in another world.

In order for a government to govern well, it must work in consultation with the people and have the consent of the people. Regina North West residents have asked the government to roll back the pay raises as an example to the people of Saskatchewan. I expect the government would get a lot more cooperation in this belt-tightening time if they set an example with their political staff.

In the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, the government states the case well. In restoring sound financial management to the province, the government attaches even more importance to the way in which it is being accomplished by sharing the burden equably.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Regina North West and the people of Saskatchewan are calling on the government to live up to its own words. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am surprised by the constant partisan attacks which appear to be looking for someone to blame rather than working together on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan to find solutions to the problems of indebtedness, joblessness, and lack of hope.

Mr. Speaker, I came to this Assembly with certain expectations. I had expectations that the members of this Assembly would demonstrate through their actions a devotion to making Saskatchewan a better place for the people who elect us. Barely two days into this experience, I have been thoroughly disappointed at what seems to be a propensity on the part of the NDP back-benchers to waste what little opportunity they have to participate, a penchant to level personal attacks on other members of the Assembly and even private citizens

I have to ask myself, Mr. Speaker, where is the vision of these individuals? Surely they have a message to convey to the rest of us in this Assembly — a message that would increase our understanding of the viewpoints of their constituents, a message that would deepen our sensitivity to the concerns of Saskatchewan people.

(1515)

But what I have seen is the darker side of politics — a side which is responsible for the cynicism and bitterness held by ordinary people towards this place. Mr. Speaker, I have seen elected members make accusations against guests in your gallery. Those guests, some of whom I know, are appalled that any member of this Assembly should have the right to attack a member of the public without that individual

having the opportunity to defend him or herself.

Mr. Speaker, it is these kinds of vindictive attacks that have made people afraid to be identified within the political process in our province. Afraid, Mr. Speaker, to be affiliated with any other than the governing party in power. And, Mr. Speaker, any person in public office who must rely on tactics of fear and intimidation to secure their power, to enhance their sense of control over the people they are elected to serve, any person who stoops to such tactics, should be fully ashamed of using valuable time in this Assembly to engage in such behaviour.

Mr. Speaker, we have received many calls from people around the province who are appalled by the actions of government back-benchers. And I want to be certain that those members are aware of that reaction to their performances.

If we hope to attract quality people to serve in this Assembly we must raise the standards of debate, elevate the level of dialogue that goes on here, or we risk the continual erosion of respect for this institution. Mr. Speaker, it is not up to the public to become more trusting of us as politicians; it is up to us as politicians to become more worthy of trust and respect.

I am deeply concerned about the attempts by members of government to mix apples and oranges for purposes of political gain. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the continual challenges by the government members with respect to grants to the Liberal caucus. It is not the Liberal Party who set the structure of grants available. When our leader was elected she petitioned the legislature for financial assistance to enable her to do the research that would allow her to fulfil her responsibilities as leader of a provincial party. She did not ask for personal remuneration, although she was obligated to perform the duties for which other party leaders were provided an additional remuneration.

It was made clear to the member from Saskatoon Greystone on numerous occasions in this Assembly that two sitting members was the criterion for any party to attain party status. I am certain the New Democrats are now well acquainted with what is required to qualify for party status as they've had to deal with this on a national level. My point, Mr. Speaker, is that the Liberal caucus has not accepted one dime more than the rules permit. In fact the Liberal leader, as Leader of the Third Party, has waived the salary increments to which she would have been entitled should she have chosen to accept them.

Furthermore, the chair of the Liberal caucus has waived remuneration for his duties as party whip. I would also like to underline for those members of the Assembly representing Regina constituencies, that I am the only Regina MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly) who has waived claim to per diem expenses until such time as an independent commission recommends what is fair compensation in terms of salary and expenses.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I find it unacceptable for the members opposite to attempt to defend what is an indefensible action on the part of their government by taking the third party to task for accepting what are the standard grants available through the budget of the Legislative Assembly, voted on by the Board of Internal Economy, to the third party to fulfil its obligations in this legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if members opposite have concerns with the size and disbursement of caucus grants in general, then they should take initiative to deal with those concerns across the board in a fair and dignified manner befitting of elected representatives. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is no place in this Assembly for personal attacks and the undermining of the reputations of our colleagues without serious cause and justification.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite are part of a government which condones hiring political staff without open competition, creating positions without job descriptions, reclassifying those positions without public scrutiny, and then unilaterally raising the pay of some of those people within those positions. From all aspects — budgetary process and fiscal responsibility — from all aspects, Mr. Speaker, the actions of this government with respect to the recent pay raises and reclassifications were wrong.

The government should not hide behind attacks on the legitimate disbursements and remunerations of the third party in order to deflect criticism for its own indefensible actions in raising the pay of ministerial assistants while other workers in both private and public sectors hold the line. Mr. Speaker, I can only hope that the personal attacks I have witnessed during my brief initiation to this Assembly are not an accurate picture of what I can expect from the days and months to come.

As the Liberal caucus, we are working to better represent not only our own constituencies but all the people of Saskatchewan. At this point of its mandate the people of Regina North West and all the people of our province are not convinced that the government truly listens to their concerns but continues with business as usual. For that reason I will not be supporting the motion.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Carlson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am proud, on behalf of my constituency, to respond to the Speech from the Throne. I would like to congratulate my colleagues from Regina Lake Centre and Biggar who both moved and seconded the Speech from the Throne and did, what I might add, a very good job.

I would also like to take the opportunity to congratulate the new MLA, the new member for Regina North West, in her success in winning the by-election and taking her seat in the House, and I'm quite confident she'll do a good job. I just want to

make one comment on her first speech in the House when she talked about executive assistants or ministerial assistant salary increases. I know that the member knows that that's not accurate and I just want to know what the new Liberal politics is. Are we going to have honesty or are we not going to have honesty?

I'm going to talk about a few comments, a few subjects that were talked about in the Speech from the Throne and also some activities and some events that have been going on and are going on in the Melville constituency.

With respect to the throne speech, as you know, 50 years ago Tommy Douglas took power and for the first time there was a government of the people and for the people. Like my colleague from Moose Jaw Palliser mentioned about getting rid of a government of cats, or according to Douglas's parable of Mouseland, the mice finally saw through the charade of electing either white cats or black cats and elected their own instead. And we realized at that point in time that cats are cats.

But this did not mean that the cats were out of the picture. Once banished from government the cats retrenched in other areas of power. From there they renewed their assault against the mice. Mouseland was under siege.

Over time these cats have become bigger and bigger and better organized than ever before. We have cats who think it is their God-given right to move across borders to wherever they want so as they can be better able to steal and live off the natural resources and labour of the mice living there. They negotiate agreements such as GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade), NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement) which open up local markets so that they can sell their ill-gotten goods.

We have tom-cats who specialize in pitting working mice against farming mice. We have fat cats who don't pay their taxes, run up huge bills and deficits and then expect the mice to pay for their excesses by forfeiting their social institutions and safety nets.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the cat metaphor was useful in Tommy Douglas's day and it is still useful today. We see these cats operating on a daily basis in our society and interfering with our ability to govern ourselves and to determine our future. For instance, the throne speech talked about an agri-food equity fund to establish and encourage new value added agricultural businesses in Saskatchewan. The potential here could be far-reaching and it's something that we in this province of Saskatchewan have to take seriously, is value adding as many products as we can to the fullest extent that we can.

However, agreements such as the Canada-U.S. (United States) Free Trade Agreement, NAFTA, and the GATT will very likely interfere with the success of this initiative. But we must try and try hard and be careful. They create a climate where these businesses have to deal with international market conditions over which they have no control. The bottom line is that

these agreements remove government's capacity to implement policies in the best interests of their constituents. But with new ideas and new ways I know we can.

Another example, Mr. Speaker, is the beef industry development fund, also announced in the Speech from the Throne. The beef industry requested that such a fund be established to improve products and enhance markets for the beef industry. Although the grain industry in Saskatchewan has long been the largest component in the farm sector, cattle has also been a very important part of our agricultural base.

The world cattle population has been on the decline over the last few years, so it would seem that there would be room for cattle expansion and products related to the beef industry. However the beef sector — as with the value added sector — I believe that with NAFTA, CUSTA (Canada-U.S. Trade Agreement) and the GATT, it'll jeopardize our government's capacity to encourage and protect and enhance the beef industry when it comes under attack from the cats wanting to sell into our markets. I think we can still do it. We've got to be dedicated, got to be careful, but it can be done; but it won't be easy.

Mr. Speaker, also mentioned in the throne speech was a new transportation policy council. The council is developing a comprehensive transportation policy which is to ensure competitive market access for Saskatchewan exports and to provide links to move products in and out of Saskatchewan. Our province has always been vulnerable when it comes to transportation. We are the farthest from the east and the west coast ports; however we are relatively close to Churchill. Churchill has always been under-utilized. All kinds of excuses has existed as to why it can't be used to a greater extent.

I believe that to expand and enhance the use of Churchill would be in our best interest, but once again — because of NAFTA, the Canada-U.S. Trade Agreement — we are going to find it very difficult to enhance the Port of Churchill, since the national flow is developing in a north-south stream instead of east-west. If more and more products flow out of this province north-south, it will put an economic hit on this province that we have never seen before. It would be like a family farm or business having the staff to do all the work but choosing to contract out to another business to do a portion of their work.

We have a transportation network in this country that could be enhanced, and have our products moved, and provide employment to our own people. I believe that at the time of the Canada-U.S. Trade Agreement talks — that if implemented — our transportation system would eventually shift from east to west . . . shift from east to west and north to south. I did not expect it to happen so quickly though. CUSTA and NAFTA again have tied us into a system where more and more products will move south, causing loss of jobs and high unemployment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's consider how we got these

three agreements. It was the federal Tories that gave us Canada-U.S. Trade Agreement — signed, sealed and delivered. With NAFTA and GATT it was the Liberal government that delivered it. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it has been mentioned before — the black cats and the white cats. They've been at it again and the bottom line is, cats are cats.

Another area heavily affected by the cats has been taxation. As we all know, the taxation landscape has changed in the last 20 years so that individuals, farmers, workers, small businesses — in short you and I — make up 80 per cent of the federal government's income. While this goes on the fat cats and large corporations and banks are having a heyday. I might add that banks have been showing record profits in the last few years, as individuals are finding it harder and harder to survive. The rules by which the shift took place were set in place by the Liberal and Tory governments. You see, Mr. Speaker, the cats were at it again. Black and white. There's no doubt about it, cats are cats.

(1530)

Last fall we saw a federal government elected. Shortly after, the federal Minister of Finance announced that the deficit for '93-94 would be \$45 billion, \$10 billion higher than previously thought.

The Saskatchewan government faced the same problem in the fall of 1991. Lower credit ratings, higher interest payments, and limited borrowing capacity forced us to make drastic changes. This is nothing new. In Saskatchewan Tommy Douglas had to do the same thing in 1944.

However, up until now no federal government has ever made an attempt to address the federal deficit. I believe it would be totally irresponsible if the federal government does not take measures and come out with a plan that would have a balanced budget in the foreseeable future. To have a sound economic plan is the base for success; however, the very economic plan that the government might implement must not attack the basis of our society. But not to address the financial situation would jeopardize our health care system, our social programs, and our education system. And within the health care system I look at the drug patent legislation and I think, Mr. Speaker, that the new federal government could do something in that area that would alleviate a fair bit of hardship to individuals who are using drugs to a high extent. And I think that it's a tremendous economic drain of our communities, what the drug companies have a stranglehold on in their patent protection.

I think for the federal government to do nothing would probably drive up interest rates and in turn inflation, which in turn would add the cost to our daily existence as individuals. So I call on this federal government to come out with a plan whereby sectors that are not now contributing be asked to pay their fair share and not simply ask those who are contributing to pay more and more.

So now that we know who are the cats and how they operate, what do we do? Today, just as years ago when Tommy Douglas formed government in Saskatchewan, we must understand and remain vigilant against the cats — the cat that is ever ready to pounce on its prey in order to satisfy its voracious appetite. As mice, we must build the structures that will protect us from the onslaught of the cats. All that we envision for ourselves and for our natural resources will be for naught if we do not protect ourselves from the cats.

While we speak of economic growth in this province, without defences we will be at risk. I believe that the protection of and the respect for the working men and women of this province will be the foundation on which we will grow in Saskatchewan.

In this session of the legislature we will introduce amendments to The Trade Union Act and The Labour Standards Act. These amendments will clearly indicate the standards by which we operate in Saskatchewan. We encourage and we even welcome economic growth in Saskatchewan but we will set the standard by which economic activity will operate.

The former administration led by the member from Estevan indicated to the world that Saskatchewan was "open for business," that Saskatchewan was a province of cheap land and cheap labour.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Saskatchewan can function in today's economy in a strong and vibrant manner. We can offer our strengths to the world without selling ourselves short. Our labour legislation will tell the world that business with Saskatchewan will be conducted using the highest standards that we can achieve, just as last year we renegotiated a deal with Federated Co-operatives to send a message to the world that business in Saskatchewan is to be conducted in a fair and equitable manner. No more give-aways, no more sweetheart deals.

The labour amendments that we will legislate this session will clearly define the high expectations that we hold for ourselves and demand for others when they come to do business. I believe that our labour legislation needs to respect the integrity of the workforce and create a climate for fairness. We have just witnessed a labour dispute at the west coast between grain handlers and terminal managers where a localized strike escalated into a full-scale walk-out initiated by management where the workers were prepared to load our grain and load perishable goods. The essence of this dispute was that the labour standards were to be driven down in order to weaken the union and strengthen management.

In Saskatchewan, we expect that all participants in the workforce are valued and protected. Amendments to our labour legislation are the foundations of which we will build our economic renewal.

Mr. Speaker, I want to spend just a few minutes now talking about some of the things that are happening and been going on in the Melville constituency. I think

that these examples of activities in the constituency show the kind of energy and strength that exists in our rural communities.

Last year a group of people started a welfare rights group in Melville. The group's stated purpose is support and advocacy and education with and for low income people. There has been a tremendous number of people participating in these activities which brings them together.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the Star Blanket Band, an Indian band within my constituency, reached an agreement with the town of Fort Qu'Appelle regarding an urban reserve. This agreement is an historic one for the people of Saskatchewan and a new milestone in regards to aboriginal self-government.

Also the North Valley Health District was formed. The health care district encompasses the major centres of Esterhazy, Melville, and Ituna, and the surrounding rural areas. The Board has hired a chief executive officer and together with the Board and CEO (chief executive officer) are conducting needs assessments for the district.

I want to say a few words about education, and in particular the unique governance that we have in the Melville area. For over 20 years the Deer Park School Division, which is the rural area around Melville including Ituna, Hubbard, Fenwood, Goodeve, Killaly, and Grayson; and the Melville Public School Division 108 which is the public school system within the city of Melville; and St. Henry's, which is the separate school division within the city of Melville, have shared services.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, for over 20 years the three school divisions have shared a director of education, one secretary-treasurer, and sort of one whole school board office. In addition to the cost saving and the sharing of services, there has been no unnecessary duplication of services and I believe a better sort of handle on the education needs of the community.

The Lebreton Eagles hockey team has become the newest member of the Saskatchewan Junior Hockey League and commenced play this past fall. So along with the Melville Millionaires, the Yorkton Terriers, the Weyburn Redwings, and the Estevan Bruins, we have our own little regional hockey rivalry. And I have, I believe, the honour — and probably the only one, only MLA — to have two SJHL (Saskatchewan Junior Hockey League) franchises in my constituency, the Melville Millionaires and the Lebreton Eagles.

Mr. Speaker, organized labour is a vibrant force in Melville constituency. The regional labour committee has been gaining strength since its inception about five years ago. The committee has representation from unions in the private and public sector and from unions affected by federal and provincial jurisdictions. The diversity of the representation gives rise to issues such as transportation — there's people working on the railroad involved in the committee — retail/wholesale trade, insurance,

telecommunication. There's also farmers on it through the workplace and some representatives from the local National Farmers Union, library services, public services, health care, and social justice.

Mr. Speaker, many members of the farming community in my area have indicated their support for the Canadian Wheat Board and the orderly marketing system as it presently exists. The ravages of the open market are so apparent that farmers acknowledge the benefits of this marketing system. The Canadian Wheat Board is known to have an incredibly competent staff and board working on behalf of the farming community. I mention these activities and accomplishments as they demonstrate the motivation and drive of people committed to their communities. All of these achievements were the result of hard work, dedication, and determination. These are the qualities that have stood us in good stead in the past and I believe they are qualities that move us towards our stated vision.

I want to close with a quote, and it's a quote of Tommy Douglas:

What our ancestors began, we will continue. Because times change and people change. We need new ideas to meet new situations. But the principles of organizing society for the benefit of all people, not for the privileged few . . . that is still there. And that is the principle to which we adhere.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will be supporting the motion and not the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Langford: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure to stand up today on behalf of my constituents, the Shellbrook-Torch River constituency, and bring some of their concerns to the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the member from Regina Lake Centre for moving the Speech from the Throne, and the member from Biggar for seconding. They both brought very important issues. The Shellbrook-Torch River constituency is basically made up of forestry, tourism, and agriculture. There are a number of tree nurseries in my constituency. The Prince Albert tree nursery is located near Spruce Home. There are also a number of private nurseries as well. The tree nurseries have had some tough growing seasons, Mr. Speaker, because of the weather conditions.

Mr. Speaker, the environment and resource committee toured the forest area. We toured some of the reforestation area north of Smeaton, also the East Trout and Candle Lake area. One thing that has become a real concern in the forest is dwarf mistletoe. It's a fungus that stunts the growth of jack pine. The only way you can solve this problem is to harvest the wood and burn the part of the tree that is not salvageable. Then they could go back in and reforest

these areas. North of Prince Albert this is being done now.

Mr. Speaker, we have a number of small contractors that are harvesting the wood in this forest. These people employ two- and three-man jobs. These contractors are made up of post-treatment plants, saw mills, shakes and shingles. Those operators too are having problems with wood allocation, Mr. Speaker. Hopefully a co-management program will help to overcome this problem.

Mr. Speaker, there is a partnership agreement between P.A. (Prince Albert) pulp and paper and the government for \$128 million — environment performance enhancement program. The mill will be in full compliance with the government environment legislation by the year 2003, maybe even sooner.

Tourism has also become a big industry in Shellbrook-Torch River. We have fishing, big game, and game birds. The national park is in my constituency. People not only from Saskatchewan and across Canada but also from different countries around the world come to share beautiful Waskesiu. At Waskesiu there is fishing in a number of lakes, also big game animals, plus natural scenery, Mr. Speaker. There is three provincial parks, lower fishing lakes, Emma Lake, Candle Lake as well. There's much to enjoy in our parks.

There is also outfitting. There has been an ongoing increase in outfitting. From the 1990s, the number of outfitting has increased to approximately 1,800. There are some concerns facing outfitters, but these are problems that we are dealing with through a co-management agreement.

(1545)

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about agriculture. I would like to refer to the Ag 2000 strategy, paving the road to recovery. Changes don't happen overnight, but I can see the changes already in my area. Mr. Speaker, a farmer a couple of miles to the west of me feeds approximately 2,000 head of feeders. A farmer to the right has a cow-calf operation of 200 to 300 animals.

There are also a number of big game farmers in my constituency. They raise elk, buffalo, ostriches, and llamas. Farmers are diversifying, Mr. Speaker, also specialty crops such as canola, canary seed, peas, hay. Agriculture is changing in the '90s. Where they seeded wheat and barley, they are now seeding speciality crops.

Mr. Speaker, we have to help educate farmers and organizations about the options facing them, sharing information, looking for alternatives to the challenges facing us in the global market, looking for other alternatives at home to create local provincial marketing strategy that would allow us to compete on the world market. Mr. Speaker, agriculture is a major resource in my constituency. The farmers have done a lot in diversifying. A lot more has to be done.

Mr. Speaker, at the GATT, the federal Liberals was the one that agreed in principle a number of what I call give-aways. Agriculture is the main industry in Saskatchewan that will be affected. Marketing boards for domestic eggs, poultry products, will not be allowed. Extensive grain subsidies will be phased out. Tariffs on pulp and wood have been eliminated.

Health and safety regulations cannot be used to interfere with trade. Services are now included as part of the trade agreement. Financial services, legal services, telecommunication services, tourism, and transportation, that is just to name a few of the services that will be affected.

The agreement has the potential to include provincial governments. Governments are required to protect property rights like Bill C-91, drug and chemical patent protection.

Mr. Speaker, I could remember when I was out holding meetings around the province for Focus on Inputs because the chemicals were so costly to the farmers. At that time glyphosate or Roundup was \$24 a litre. The company, Focus on Inputs, said we could manufacture the chemical for \$6 a litre and still make a profit. That is a saving of approximately \$15 a litre.

The Bill C-91 protects the chemical companies and the drug companies. The Liberals are protecting the multinational companies just like the previous administration. They're cats. We must wait for the specifics of the deal but at first chance, however, it is clear that the decisions were very one-sided with large corporations coming out as the biggest, maybe the only winners.

Nowhere is there any priorities given to employment issues or human rights, labour standards, or to patent, or to protection of quality of life. Our national government has not only denied local communities a say, but they have given up some of our ability to make economic and social policy decisions.

Mr. Speaker, there are many challenges facing people and politicians after the last administration.

We have a school in Paddockwood area, Mr. Speaker, that was built for political reasons. Now it's closed. The people in the area are hoping to see this building in use because this is a new facility. The people are working hard in the area to see if there isn't some solutions or alternatives for the use of this building, and I am working closely with them.

The REDA (regional economic development authorities) initiative launched on June 29, 1993 encouraged coordination of community economic development, an organization within trading regions for the purpose of insuring long-term and effective community based economic development and services.

The Prince Albert area was the first to form a REDA. The announcement was made December 16, and

another seven REDAs are expected to form by March 31, 1994, with seventeen more anticipated by March 31, 1995.

Health services. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak about health services in my constituency. The P.A. Health District has been formed. The Prince Albert Health District is in part of my constituency — like Waskesiu to the north, Birch Hills to the south, Weirdale to the east, Spruce Home or Sturgeon Lake to the west. There is a first respond team in this district. This is Christopher Lake, Emma Lake and Anglin Lake areas.

Mr. Speaker, this area for the two months of the summer has the same population as Prince Albert. Of course, Mr. Speaker, they use all the resources in that area that is available to them. The first respond team is made up of doctors, nurses, people with first aid. Fire respond team in the area as well. Most of these people have cabins there or live there year round, Mr. Speaker.

The North-East Health District also has been formed. I share that with my colleague from Nipawin. The area in that north-east district is Choiceland and Smeaton. Mr. Speaker, the Smeaton hospital has been fire condemned for over two years now. The district health board is working very close with the Smeaton district to come up with the needs assessment in that area. Changes to the funding of acute care and long-term care were not taken very lightly by the Smeaton district. But, Mr. Speaker, working with the health district they are starting to feel the changes in the health services. These changes are starting to provide better services but more needs to be done.

Parkland district board is also up and running. I shared that too, Mr. Speaker, with the member from Redberry and the member from Turtleford. The Parkland district area that is in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, is Canwood and Shellbrook. Mr. Speaker, Canwood has a community clinic which they are very proud of. This community clinic has been there for a number of years.

Mr. Speaker, home care's administrated in the Parkland district out of Canwood. There are a number of hard workers in Canwood that need to be congratulated for their hard work. Mr. Speaker, there is also a home, a seniors' home in Canwood which I had the opportunity to visit last year. The town and area should be congratulated for the hard work they have done over the years to maintain the level of service they have in Canwood.

Mr. Speaker, Shellbrook and the Parkland Health District Board are doing their needs assessment for Shellbrook. There is a hospital in Shellbrook and also a seniors' home.

In wrapping up, Mr. Speaker, our natural resources are working. We must build on our natural resources, which we are. Added value food processing, tourism, mining, forestry — we don't have to depend on outsiders.

Mr. Speaker, we don't need the megaprojects. We need to develop our own resources with common sense. That is using our resources wisely. We must leave something for our children to build on.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased with the throne speech and am pleased to hear the budget will come down on February 17. This gives local governments a chance to budget for the year.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, a lot has been done by my government, but a lot has to be done.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's enjoyable for me, Mr. Speaker, to rise today to discuss the Speech from the Throne which was so beautifully delivered the other day in this very Assembly. As always, the Lieutenant Governor has done a remarkably good job and we commend her for that, and we hope that she has a long and prosperous life.

We want to speak, Mr. Speaker, about this address, mostly because it has become a tradition to do so. And that tradition, of course, is based upon the premise that this Assembly is an Assembly of words, and the use of a lot of words is always necessary. And yet there are times when the reality of why we use a lot of words is sort of lost.

We use a lot of words, Mr. Speaker, because we debate issues. And the process of democracy has evolved that we debate issues quite frankly because we need to get both pro and con of all of the concepts that go with whatever the debate is going to be about, expressed fully and completely and sometimes over and over, in order to make sure that nothing is missed so that the government of the day can serve the democratic needs of the people in a much better fashion. But there comes a time, Mr. Speaker, when too many words simply become a waste of time as well. And there needs to be some balance.

So in keeping with the official opposition's decision to cut the throne speech debate short and getting through it as quickly as possible so that we can spend time on more pressing issues, I'm going to make my remarks rather brief today. And some might question what brief might mean in my case, but I'll definitely work on it as I go.

As far as I'm concerned the throne speech, in most cases, Mr. Speaker, is important. The process, I think, is important. But we are at the present time in the middle of a government's tenure of office, a time when most people are looking for the government to take some action. And this is not a time for a lot of pomp and ceremony, and we need to get down to business.

The people of Saskatchewan feel that we've got far too many dollars being spent with far too few results coming to the people. We've got people who say that we're spending \$280,000 of taxpayers' money in the

course of a week to debate issues that are very vague to say the least. And I believe, sir, that most people in the present mood that our electorate is in would say that that's too much money to spend on a week when we have so many pressing issues that need to be addressed.

(1600)

The member from Rosthern mentioned the other day that in Alberta the Speech from the Throne was replaced with a Premier's address. And while I'm sure that they will have speeches from the throne there in the future in order to serve the needs of the political process and the democratic process, this year, because economics are very difficult throughout our nation and surely throughout the world, they have seen this as a solution in part to beginning to solve the problems of a necessary roll-back of costs.

It costs us, they tell me, \$35,000 a day to debate the throne speech. I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, if that figure is exactly correct or if it's a few dollars up or a few dollars down. But irregardless, if it's anywhere in the ballpark, it's a lot of money. And most likely a lot of taxpayers would say today that sure, \$35,000 isn't a lot of money in the scheme of things when you're spending 5 billion. But you have to start some place, and I think that's what the electorate is telling us.

They're telling us we should deal with issues like taxation. They want us to talk about the union-only contracting. Folks have been coming into our offices, and I'm sure into the offices of members of the government, to tell them that these kinds of directions are too extreme and too one-sided to allow for a uniform development of our province in the future.

They want us to talk about utility rates and the need for legislative committees to oversee them so that they are fair and equitable rather than becoming tools of taxation to serve the needs of a very hungry government.

We have increasing welfare cases in our province. This is an extremely distressing area of concern, Mr. Speaker, for all of us. Because what it means is that our system is failing our people. We have people first on unemployment insurance and then as a last resort, it becomes a welfare thing. And this is the point in life where many of our citizens find themselves today.

And there is only one solution, Mr. Speaker, and that has to be the creation of more work for people to be able to do, more realistic jobs for people to work at. The solution has to be a broadening of the base of opportunities. And we need to reform all of this Legislative Assembly and the way it works, Mr. Speaker, because we are getting out of tune with the times. We have been living in the past far too long, and a good indication of that has been the very substance of the speeches that we have listened to over the past days.

I have no objection to honouring the memory of a very great statesman and a very great Saskatchewan person

in the name of Tommy Douglas. Certainly he did a lot for our province. But we have listened to the black cat, white cat story more than a few times. And while I enjoy listening to the story — and it probably has some truth to it — it is always shortened by not completing the fact that in reality if there are these metaphorical black cats and white cats, there most certainly is at least 55 hungry cats in this very Assembly.

My tour through the constituency before I was elected, Mr. Speaker, related to discussing the waste and mismanagement of government and who in fact is the beneficiary of many of the dollars that are spent in places where people seriously wonder whether or not those dollars should go there.

One of my constituents made an observation, not so much to cats but the same theory, the same principle. And what he said was that what you do when you change governments is that you put a bunch of fat cats out of the pen and put a bunch of hungry cats into the pen. And he says all they do is spend all of their time trying to get back up to the trough.

I think that's an over-cynical way to put things, Mr. Speaker; however my constituent made the point that if we change governments, we simply would be costing ourselves many millions of dollars fattening up a new bunch of cats. And I suspect, by the way things are going, he may be right.

So let's get to work. Let's talk about the problems of our province. Let's talk about agriculture, the biggest industry still in our province. Those of us who are involved in it like to think it's the most important, but I'm sure that those who are not involved in agriculture will say that they have just as great of an importance to society. And in reality they will be right, because all of our industries are important.

The world is a big circle, and we go around in that circle whether we like it or not. And everybody's job is an intricate part of making that circle work. And so we need to work on all of the problems collectively throughout our society, our economic situation, and the many, many other pressing issues of our Saskatchewan families and the struggles that are going on within our society.

We don't need, Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, to have the members opposite telling our electorate that the train has left the station, or that we're on the right track. We don't need to do that for another three days, Mr. Speaker, because quite frankly the people of Saskatchewan are tired of being dictated to. They want somebody that will sit down and listen to them, to confer with them. I know for a fact that there are at least a few stock growers in this province that are ready to tear up part of that track, and derail that train.

I think we've heard enough of the drivel, as it was portrayed to being here the other day — enough of that to last us for a lifetime perhaps, but at least enough to last us for this week.

So I would like to join with my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, in asking the government that we would bring forward the concerns of our constituents through the important Bills and the important issues that we have outlined through the beginnings of this week, while we have presented the Bills to restructure the province and to rebuild and reconstruct the workings of this very Assembly.

My constituency, Mr. Speaker, has rural hospitals that are reeling from the government's funding cuts — absolute horror and disgust in the minds of people at what has happened. And it appears that rural health facilities will face even further reductions. And those, Mr. Speaker, are the kind of things that we need to address fully and squarely here in this Assembly, because the health of our people is the most dear and near things to their hearts always, even ahead of their own personal economies, their own personal jobs, and the things that they do in their lives. Because no one can live if they're sick without some fear and a lot of needs to be taken care of.

We have other issues in our area, Mr. Speaker. We have the 9-1-1 issue of emergency dispatch service. We have problems with not being able to get that service into place, although we've heard some positive signs in the last few days, and I'm hopeful that we can get this project under way now. Certainly it's been waiting far, far too long; far, far too much quibbling between a Crown corporation and the people that it serves.

We have seniors being shipped all over this province, from one care centre to another, simply because the government has an arbitrary rule that you can only stay in a facility for so many weeks.

This is the kind of thing, Mr. Speaker, that has to be talked about, has to be worked on through legislation, and has to be taken care of very quickly. It's all well and good to say that we have to work for a period of time to allow a new system to get started. But if we're the individual, the one person who has to suffer as a result of this process, then it doesn't look like such a wise thing to be taking time over. If it were your mother or your father that's being shipped all around the province and you have to phone all over the province to try to find out which facility they're in this week, then it becomes very real and very personal and certainly cannot be tolerated.

I believe with some planning and some intelligent thought here, Mr. Speaker, that we can make life much easier and much better for many of our senior people. I know that we can do it. We have the ability in this province to do a better job than we're doing, and I think we ought to do it.

We have a government, Mr. Speaker, in this province that is willing to squeeze small businesses that are not unionized in favour of unions. And then these people claim that they have the concerns of the people foremost in their hearts and in their minds while they drive business out of the province, run our seniors from home to home, ignore the needs and the wishes

as basic things as interprovincial trade being ignored, simple things like they need to have cattle brands allowed to be done in Alberta that would qualify for Saskatchewan. Those kinds of things not being allowed to happen because our Minister of Agriculture doesn't have the time to go to Alberta to negotiate an interprovincial agreement. There are a lot of little things that could make life so much easier that are simply not being done, Mr. Speaker.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I say to you, and I say to the members of this Assembly through you, that we must get on with business. There are many pressing matters that need to be taken care of. And for me to talk about them all day today won't help. We need to get into the legislation that needs to be changed in order for things to be done right.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I would say that it is time for me to follow my colleagues and move:

That this Assembly now proceed to Bill No. 2, An Act to amend The Department of Economic Development Act, 1993.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Seconded by the member from Wilkie.

The Speaker: — Let me just ask the member. I believe I heard him correctly, say that the House do now proceed to Bill No. 2. Your motion reads Bill No. 1 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well if the member meant Bill No. 1, then the motion is in order. But if he meant Bill No. 2, it's out of order . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Okay just so we . . .

It's moved by the member from Maple Creek, seconded by the member from Wilkie:

That the House do now proceed to Bill No. 1, An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act (Legislative Utilities Review Committee).

Motion negated on division.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, unlike the previous speaker I intend to take a little time today. The throne speech and the tradition of the throne speech, as the member well knows, is to put forward the position of the members of the legislature, to discuss the accomplishments or lack thereof of the government, and to deal with the issues that their constituents have raised with them over the past while. Mr. Speaker, I intend to try to deal with some of those topics today in dealing with that.

Unlike the members of the Conservative caucus, I don't believe that it's a waste of time or a waste of taxpayers' money to raise concerns that taxpayers have raised with me as their representative in the legislature. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be able to stand here and raise the concerns of the people of Regina Rosemont, the people who want me to speak out and to speak out forcefully, to put forward the case that they are making to the government and to all

members of the legislature.

(1615)

That, Mr. Speaker, is not a waste of taxpayers' money. That, Mr. Speaker, is the essence of the democratic process, something that the members of the Conservative caucus have in fact deigned to look with some disapproval upon since the time that they came to power in 1982. And again it shows in fact, Mr. Speaker, their lack of respect for the ability of people to speak out and put forward their position. And I say shame on the members of the Conservatives.

I say . . . not only me say that, Mr. Speaker. I say that in the last provincial by-election held in the constituency of Regina North West, the people of Regina North West said shame on them as well, honouring their candidate, Mr. Schmidt, with 138 votes. And if that isn't shame, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what is. I don't know what is. The people of . . . in fact, people of that constituency have passed judgement on the Conservative caucus as have the people of this province in the last provincial election.

Mr. Speaker, I want to, before I begin to talk about more substantive issues, congratulate the newly elected member from Regina North West. I listened with some careful attention to her speech and while I want to say that I agree with some of the things she said, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I found that what she said for the most part wasn't totally true — that what she said was in fact less than honest. And what she said, in fact, was carefully crafted by her speech writers to leave an impression which is not in fact the case, Mr. Speaker. I want to refer to a couple of passages from her speech and how she carefully crafted it.

First of all one of the things she raised, Mr. Speaker, was the fact — or tried to leave the impression — that the Leader of the Third Party did not accept any additional remuneration upon becoming Leader of the Third Party. Mr. Speaker, I want to challenge the newly elected member from Regina North West at this point in time to find out whether in fact that is the fact. Because it's my information that the day after she became the Leader of the Third Party and it gained official status, that she went up and took that \$17,000 in additional pay that she was entitled to as a member of the third party, as Leader of the Third Party.

Yet the newly elected member from Regina North West attempts to leave us with the impression that she did not do that. Now if that's the new kind of politics, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me it's a lot like that old kind of Lib-Lab Tory politics that we've had for too long in this Assembly. And one other example, Mr. Speaker, of the white cats talking with the black cats' tongue. Or, Mr. Speaker, I listen to the member saying I'm going to not take my \$94 per day per diem until the report of the independent commission that was set up to look into MLAs remuneration and benefits reports.

An Hon. Member: — Isn't that thoughtful?

Mr. Lyons: — Now that's very thoughtful and very carefully crafted, Mr. Speaker. She didn't say that she was going to turn it down; or turn over the \$94 a day to the food bank; or she didn't say that she was going to give it to charity; she didn't say that she was going to return it down . . . turn it down in perpetuity. No, what she said was I'm going to turn it down until the commission comes back to report, Mr. Speaker.

I'd like to find out now, from some point in the future on, whether in fact the member means that she's not going to take it, or means that she's not going to take it for this little while so that she can grandstand to the public. She can take the same position as that Tory who got 138 votes in the constituency of Regina North West.

You know, Mr. Speaker, knowing Liberals, and knowing Tories, and knowing how they craft the truth, and how they twist and turn in the wind, that in fact I bet you that that member from Regina North West does indeed take that \$94 when the commission reports back, and she can claim to her constituents: well I didn't take it right away. I didn't take it right away, Mr. Speaker.

And there's another issue. There's another issue in that, that the member from Regina North West raised in her speech — and I don't want to be overly critical because it's the member's maiden speech and I thought in fact she did a very good job in delivering. I thought she did a very good job in delivering that speech but there are a certain lack of truthfulness in that speech.

And the third item was when she talked about ministerial salaries and the whole kerfuffle around the raises given to ministerial assistants and the implementation of the new grid. Well what the member didn't . . . what the new member didn't say, Mr. Speaker, or tell the House was that her colleague — the member from Shaunavon — when this issue was raised in the caucus of the New Democratic Party when he sat there, that he in fact voted in favour and he did not object to the implementation of that new grid and salary. She didn't happen to mention that, Mr. Speaker, to this House and probably a convenient lapse of memory. Who knows, right?

She also — she also failed — she also failed to mention that during the election campaign, when she tried to claim in her election literature that there was a 12 per cent across the board raise for ministerial assistants, and when she was challenged on that in public, she has yet to say, gee I was wrong. Gee it wasn't 12 per cent across the board. Gee I must have been mistaken or maybe my researchers in the Liberal party were mistaken. Gee I didn't know. No, Mr. Speaker, she didn't admit that that in fact was not the case, and when she was challenged, and proven to be wrong, she didn't back down. No she didn't do that. She still tried to leave the impression for her narrow partisan political purposes that the 12 per cent increase was across the board and applied to everybody and the fact is, Mr. Speaker, she knew better. She knew better, but tried to leave an opposite

interpretation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I raise those three minor little discrepancies in the impression that the hon. member wants to leave to this House because she tries to, as does her leader of her party masquerade, that somehow there's a new politics, that somehow that they represent a new breed, and a new openness, and a new honesty right in the province. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I've presented three little incidences — three little incidences to show that, in fact, that what seems to be said is not necessarily, Mr. Speaker, the facts of the matter. Now I'm not accusing the hon. member of dissimulating directly, but I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that what we see is what we get and it's not what they say; it's what they have done, Mr. Speaker.

And speaking of which, if I can refer to today's edition of the Regina *Leader-Post*, Saturday, February . . . pardon me, the Saturday, February 12 — Goodale and look at the headline: "Goodale rents from friend. Office space rented from his campaign manager."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Third Party and the hon. member from Regina Wascana, the member of parliament, the Minister of Agriculture, right? Our bosom buddy so to speak, politically speaking each have supported the other, right? Each of them have tried to claim that they represent the new politics. Each of them tries to say that, gee, we're different from the rest of those grubby old politicians rolling around out there in the real world. And then I look and see the *Leader-Post* headline, "Goodale rents from friend. Office space rented from his campaign manager." Five thousand square feet of prime downtown Regina office space taken from Bob Peterson, well-known bagman of the Liberal Party, head of Denro Holdings.

Mr. Speaker, members of this Assembly, we know there is no difference between the Liberals and the Conservatives. We know that historically one right-wing party, when out of power, tries to pretend that it's somehow different from its kissing cousin — the other right-wing party. But the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, have well been politicized enough to know that when you scratch one, you're scratching the other and they both bleed together. And, Mr. Speaker, not only Tweedledee and Tweedledum, right, twins, kissing cousins — the Siamese twins of Saskatchewan politics.

Now the member and it's nice to see her here, Mr. Speaker; she won the election fair and square. But I'd like to respond to the member from Regina North West, I'd like to perhaps caution her on not getting too comfortable in her seat in this legislature. After all, Mr. Speaker, she won by a vote total which was less than that received by the Liberal Party in the 1991 general election.

In fact she won, Mr. Speaker, by a sum which was less than that received by other members of this Assembly in terms of plurality, majorities over the Liberals, so I wouldn't want to get too carried away and read too much into the Liberal victory. In fact, I think it's pretty small solace for the Liberal Party. I think it's pretty

small solace for the Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker, when they're only able to eke out a small victory, only able to eke out a small electoral victory in an election in which we have seen the smallest turnout in at least 25 years, and probably more, in this province.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is basically where I want to lead my remarks today. I want to talk a little bit today about the context of politics in Saskatchewan, or the politics in Saskatchewan, the performance of the government in the context of the by-election results and what it represented. And I say, Mr. Speaker, it's not coming like Mark Antony to either praise nor bury the government, it's more like Cassandra to perhaps give a few words of advice to the government and a few words of caution because the by-election . . . Mr. Speaker, the by-election was a very interesting and very informative process that we've just gone through. I think it was characterized, Mr. Speaker, first of all by its incredibly low turnout, as I've said before. Some people will try to say that the low turnout was because of the cold or the low turnout was because of voter disinterest. That may well be the case, and I want to deal with that in a few minutes.

However, Mr. Speaker, I think that there was another message to be read in that voter turnout, and that is the message — and the Premier has alluded to that in his previous remarks, remarks made previously in this House and outside this House — is that the people of Saskatchewan have suffered in the last two years. They have sacrificed, they have tightened their belts until they can tighten no more, right. They've dug down, hunkered down, tried to get through a situation which, quite frankly, was not of their making but in fact was the making of the former Conservative government. But now, Mr. Speaker, they're saying, enough is enough; we're not going to sacrifice any more; we don't feel that it was our fault or a situation of our doing and we therefore are not willing to go much further in granting the government patience.

I think the low turnout . . . in fact, Mr. Speaker, I know the low turnout . . . because I happen to live in that constituency, in the poll 33, the southernmost poll of the Regina North West constituency, and my friends and neighbours who explained to me why they didn't vote in the election said they want to send everybody a message. And the message they wanted to send was this — and the member from Saskatoon University has previously alluded to it — that there has got to be a new air of hope developed in this province, and that the Government of Saskatchewan has got to be the agent of, the carrier of, that hope. The Government of Saskatchewan has got to put forward an alternative to the present situation and then to the present system which is leading to despair, some anguish, and hurt among the citizens of this province.

That's the fundamental, underlying message, and they did it two ways. One — the member from Regina North West pointed it out — they didn't vote; they didn't register, and they expressed their anger at what was happening to the province. But they did not blame the government for all the ills. The fact that they stayed home and did not vote against the government

is prima facie evidence, Mr. Speaker, is prima facie evidence that in fact they, while dissatisfied, were not going to go back to the Liberals and Tories to look for solutions. That record low turnout should not give any consolation to the Leader of the Third Party, and it certainly doesn't give any consolation to whoever is going to be the Leader of the Official Opposition.

(1630)

Mr. Speaker, when I talked to my friends and neighbours in the area — and they talk politics — there's three themes that they seem to bring forward, that they want the government to respond to. And I call them the three i's. There's imagination, innovation, and involvement. Mr. Speaker, they want to see a greater imagination by the government, and some of that I must say, Mr. Speaker, was reflected in the throne speech, but they want to see the government use the imaginations not only of the members of the legislature but all of its citizens in responding to the problems that we all recognize and that we all know that we face here in Saskatchewan.

They feel that the system does not provide for an outlet for their creativity and imagination. Whether they're a teacher that is stifled by the present school structure at the school level as well as at the board level; whether they're a health worker that feel that they don't have the input necessary in delivering health care reform which they support, Mr. Speaker, which they support — and the member from Regina North West knows that to be true — that they support health care reform but they want to see more imagination so that their creativity can be used; whether in fact that they are the steelworker or the policeman or the person who is a domestic worker, they want to feel that their creativity can somehow find an outlet as we go from a period of austerity and belt tightening to turning the corner towards a new dawn in this province.

Let me give you an example, Mr. Speaker, of something that's come up recently in that regard. I want to talk . . . The teachers of the city of Regina, through the Regina Public School Teachers' Association, have unanimously passed a concept called the deferred salary plan. Now it's a plan, Mr. Speaker, which is in existence in every other province in Canada except Saskatchewan. In fact it was introduced in 1983 in Nova Scotia as a response to budgetary cut-backs and to tightening of the belt in that province.

And basically the plan says, look, I am willing to defer part of my salary for two years or three years or four years or five years based on a percentage. And I'll take a year off three or four or five years down the road, right, using that part of the deferred salary. And you can hire a young teacher which will save the board money, which will allow me to overcome teacher burn-out — and we all very well know that in the teaching profession burn-out is becoming a more and more critical problem particularly in times of financial restraint — that we will go ahead and do this provided the government does certain things.

It doesn't necessarily cost any money. That is, that basically the government's got to change the superannuation Act, The Teachers' Superannuation Act, to allow for contributions in that year of sabbatical to be deferred and to be paid out so that superannuation benefits as well as disability and health care and dental benefits are applicable in that year. And that requires a change in The Education Act and the superannuation Act, right. Now that does not take, that does not take a great change. But it's the kind of thing that the teachers themselves are looking for.

And surprisingly enough, it's not just the teachers themselves who are looking for it. For example, I'm told that the Prince Albert Rural Board now wishes to be able to enter into the negotiations over a deferred salary plan. They're waiting for an initiative by the STF (Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation). They're waiting for initiative by the teachers. But they themselves, they themselves realize the value of that kind of plan.

Now it may not seem as a great big thing, Mr. Speaker. It may not seem as a major reform. But it's already in place in the provincial civil service. The public service agreement provides for that deferred salary plan. The teachers themselves are asking for it.

And it seems to me that the government, it's incumbent upon the government to respond as quickly as possible to that kind of thing, where they can deal with redundancies, that boards can deal with the question of redundancies, the question of teacher burn-out, and develop a different way of looking at the working world. So, Mr. Speaker, I raise that because it seems to me it's one aspect of imagination put forward by the people of this province that the government can very well respond to.

Mr. Speaker, the second aspect of that is innovation, of how we do things. You know in society and particularly in the government and the government bureaucracy there is, Mr. Speaker, there is an inertia, a built-in inertia which, it's the big "i", that in fact acts as the block in imagination, innovation and involvement. And it's called inertia.

Because things were done that way time after time after time in the past, there is a built-in response that, gee, that wasn't the way we've done things before; are you sure we should do things different in the future?

Well we've seen some inertia overcome in health care reform, Mr. Speaker. We've seen resistance put forward, a lot of it organized by the members from the Progressive Conservative caucus, some organized by the members of the Liberal caucus. We've seen that kind of inertia overcome, in fact, by people of this province who understand that there was a need for change.

And there was a mobilization and there is a mobilization going on around health care reform. And sure there's problems with it. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, there are problems with it and some of those problems, I'm glad to say, were identified recently by

the Health Services Utilization Commission. But inertia is endemic to society because it's much easier to do things the way they were in the past than to look into the future and try to become innovative on how we do things.

Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to see that the government recognizes that there is a need for change in at least some areas of our daily life, some areas of life which affects everybody in the province. That is in The Trade Union Act and The Labour Standards Act, and the government's promised to upgrade and to bring into the '90s, legislation in those two areas.

I say, Mr. Speaker, one should not dare to be bold in those areas because between the 1944 Trade Union Act and the working world of today there's a great gulf. Or between the last revision of The Labour Standards Act and the working world of today there has been a tremendous change.

Now the buzz-words of globalization or competitiveness, or all the buzz-words of the right wing, are not the kind of change I'm referring to. I'm referring to a change in attitude towards work and towards the way in which one spends their working lives, by the great majority of people.

No longer, no longer, Mr. Speaker, are individual workers in this province content to remain on the same job, year after year after year. No longer are people content to be stuck in a rut, to look solely for security in a single job as their *raison d'être* for existence, hoping to work until they get to 65 to be able to retire, right, and then to die.

And part of that is just the changing nature of the ability to communicate. People see the world; the world is brought into their living room. They're able to see different lifestyles, different ways of living, different ways of being, and they have developed different ways of seeing what life constitutes, what life is all about.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is incredibly important understanding to have when dealing with changes to The Labour Standards Act. Because what has got to be built into The Labour Standards Act changes is a recognition that, on the one hand, there is the need for security in terms of living standards. At the same time there is a need for flexibility in terms of the ability to change jobs. And what that implies of course, it means the ability to portability of pension, portability of dental, portability of health care plans. That means the development of an infrastructure of security, a safety net that people can in fact move from job to job.

But equally as important, equally important is the notion that individuals who want to work in this society have a right to a job and that their right to a job and the notion of what constitutes a job must be extended beyond that which has been traditional, a traditional employer/employee relationship.

Community service has to be recognized, I would submit, as a valid form of work that may not produce

profit for an employer or may not produce surplus value for some large corporation but produces good for a community, produces something tangible, produces something real for the community.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make, for example, I want to make a reference to initiative from the Minister of Municipal Government and the Minister of Education who got together and who responded to a request by people in the community in Regina for the development of a inner-city youth sports project.

People came to the ministers, said, look we've got an idea. We want to implement this at least as a pilot project. We think that it's better to have young people in the inner cities of Regina playing basketball in the gyms than it is to be out knocking old ladies over the head, right, breaking and entering. We think that it's better to have those people, to have the young people involved in an activity in which social skills, notions of responsibility and a future and a vision of the future can be at least dealt with them, than it is to have them out on the street sniffing glue and developing . . . running into B and E's (break and enter).

Mr. Speaker, and I'm proud to say, I'm proud to say that in terms of innovation, right, that those two ministers have responded well to that. And quite frankly, the program as it now stands is growing like Topsy and in fact has probably reached the capacity of growth at the present moment. But the uptake, to use the bureaucratic term, but the uptake in that program has been overwhelming because it meets the needs of the community, and there was a flexibility and a willingness to innovate on behalf of those ministers that in fact has developed what we think will probably end up to be a model program not only for Saskatchewan, but in Canada, for helping inner-city youth, keeping them off the street and getting them in to a school context and in to a socialization context that will provide nothing but benefits for them and for the society down the long run.

And that leaves me, Mr. Speaker, to my third "i", which is the "i" involving involvement. There is a sense, Mr. Speaker, of frustration at the system that's not directed towards any government *per se*, or any political party *per se*, but there is a sense of frustration out there that says the system has got to change to allow us to be involved in making decisions which affect our lives. There is a sense of frustration out there that says, all this change which is going on around us has not benefited us, has only benefit very few — the rich, the powerful, those who run large corporations, those who are the major financial backers of the Liberal and Tory parties; that what change that has occurred has not been directed from us for our benefit but has been imposed on us by those who have no accountability to the process whatsoever.

And you can see that, Mr. Speaker, when IPSCO for example says, well we are going to open up a rolling mill down in Iowa somewhere and it may or may not result in the loss of jobs in Regina. The people who were the steel workers in the constituency of Regina Rosemont as well as those in the constituency of

Regina North West, have no input as to the decision which affects their lives. And more and more as the people are educated, and more and more as people understand the nature of the global realities around them, the frustration level arises.

The frustration level continues to grow because the gap between the rhetoric of democracy on the one hand, and the reality of the lack of democratic involvement on the other, grates more and more on people in such a manner that they are grumpier than heck.

We saw a couple of examples of that. We saw it in the general election of 1991 in which the Tory Party was decimated, reduced to nothing. We saw it around the Charlottetown accord when, despite the best efforts of the political and economic and cultural elites of this country to say, this is what is good for you folks out there, those folks out there says, it may well be but you're not imposing it because we didn't design it and we didn't come to grips with it and we don't think it's in our best interest.

Now without taking a position one way or the other on that, Mr. Speaker, let me just say that it was pretty clear that the vote for the Reform Party . . . and I heard some pretty, pretty nutty explanations of why people are voting for the Reform Party. Well let me say this, right. That protest vote out there is an example of the kind of frustration that people are feeling, that there is a breeding ground of despair out there. And, Mr. Speaker, we've seen that emerge in a violent manner in the state of Chiapas, right, in response to the Free Trade Agreement imposed on the people of Mexico without their consent.

(1645)

Well let me say this, Mr. Speaker, that Chiapas is not too far away. One only has to go to the communities of La Loche and to other northern communities to see the level of despair, to see the level of hopelessness, to see the level of unemployment, to look at the level of lack of progress in trying to meet some basic, basic needs to realize that that kind of frustration can very quickly burst out here in Saskatchewan.

I make a special plea, Mr. Speaker, because I have a sense that the government in changing direction in beginning to develop its broader horizons in this new agenda. I want to make a special plea for the people of northern Saskatchewan, that they be included in that development, in that involvement. I think it's incumbent upon us in southern Saskatchewan to recognize that there are special needs and that there are special responses need to be designed for the people of northern Saskatchewan.

So I want to make that despite the fact, Mr. Speaker, that La Loche is a long way removed from the constituency of Regina Rosemont, that we're all brothers and sisters here in this province trying to struggle through, and that the government of this province . . . and I know it will, because there's a compassionate nature, there's a compassionate

nature in the hearts of people sitting on this side of the House, and yes over on that side of the House, that that compassion will show through in the kind of innovative, imaginative, and involving responses.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to end off talking about the question raised by the member from Regina North West about where's the vision and where is the plan. I think those are two of the rhetorical question that she asks.

Well, the vision, Mr. Speaker, is not contained here. The vision is not contained within these four walls. As bright and as lively and as imaginative — as bright and lively and imaginative and as nice as we all are as individuals, the vision of what this province can become is contained out there.

It's contained in the minds and in the hearts of those people who worked the land; those people who work in the cities and the towns; those people who have built this province; those people who continue to build this province; and those people who know that there's an alternative, there is an alternative to the present system.

We don't often talk about that, Mr. Speaker, about that the vision has got to be a vision not of this minor reform or that minor reform, but that the vision has got to be a different world — a different reality, a different global system, a different way in which we relate to one another not only as individuals in a social context, but the way in which we relate to one another whether it be through trade, through commerce, through the production of goods and services, through the entertainment and culture, but that what we have now is not good enough.

And when you scratch and when you talk to and when you listen to the people of this province, they provide you with that vision. And sometimes it takes a little extra listening and sometimes it takes a little prodding and sometimes it takes clarification, and sometimes it takes more than consulting — it actually takes involvement. But that when that process is gone through, there is a recognition that first of all, the present system is not working. People know that.

They can see it in Bosnia and Herzegovina; they can see it in Latin America; they can see it in Asia. They can see it when three-quarters of the world's kids go to, you know, go to sleep hungry; when 30,000 of them a day — 30,000 kids a day die because there's a lack of proper medicine and a lack of proper water and a lack of proper eating facilities.

And they look around and they see that those very few who control so very much aren't worrying about that, that they're living out the fantasy lives of the lifestyles of the rich and famous. But that the reality which is brought into their living-room every day is the real reality. It's the faces of the kids, whether it's World Vision Canada or CARE (Co-operative for American Relief Everywhere, Inc.) or Plan International or whatever charity is trying to get through to the consciousness of people, that in fact there is a reality

out there that has to be changed.

And the people of this province, because they are political people and because they have a tradition and a history of change, understand that the system itself must be changed, Mr. Speaker, because they know the system is not producing for human need; it is only producing for human greed — the greed of the very few; the greed of the lifestyles of the rich and of the famous. Mr. Speaker, people know that and they know it intuitively and it is well lodged in their consciousness.

Now you will find — and I guess this comes back full circle to where I started off — you will find that there are different responses to that understanding. And those responses are political responses and those responses are the program of the various groups and classes in society which says, this is our answer; this is how we think the system has got to be changed or done away with so that we can build a better world.

The Liberals, the Conservatives — there's no difference. They'll both tell you that the answer is through increased competitiveness, the increased creation of a competitive climate. That it's through globalization; that it's through getting everything free enterprise; that it's through the kind of capital investment and foreign investment, and open for business and open for dog-eat-dog kind of world. They'll both tell you that, Mr. Speaker. And when you scratch them, you'll find there's no difference between the member from Kindersley and the member from Saskatoon Greystone.

There they are. Ask them what their vision is, and what do they say? Let's build a nuclear reactor on every street corner; let's have a nuclear reactor here and we'll put Saskatchewan on the map. It may glow, Mr. Speaker, it may glow, but it will be on the map. Right. Both of them acting as mouthpieces of Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd.; both working hand in glove and wanting to . . . that's their vision. That's their vision — open for business. Let them come in, let them take, let them rob, let them pillage, let them despoil.

That's their vision of how you change the system. More of what we've got. Let's have more of what we've got to change what we have. That's the logic of what they're trying to say, Mr. Speaker. Let's have more free enterprise.

I mean, free enterprise has done such a wonderful job of creating this planet. Free enterprise has done such a wonderful job of feeding the children of the Third World, of feeding the children of La Loche, of feeding the hungry kids of Regina. Free enterprise does such a good job of maintaining the environment. Free enterprise has done such a wonderful job, wonderful job of making sure that the education and the health care system and all those kinds of social safety nets are kept in place.

If free enterprise has done such a wonderful job of creating such a wonderful world, let's have more of it. That's the logic. Let's have more greed so that we can

fulfil human need. And it goes back to a basic philosophical difference between this side of the House and that side of the House — a basic philosophical difference.

Their side says — and it doesn't matter whether it's a Liberal or a Tory — they say, you go out, enrich yourself, and let everybody enrich themselves and that will solve all the problems. That's the philosophy of Adam Smith. That's the philosophy of the member from Kindersley. That's the philosophy of the member from Greystone. That's the philosophy of the old-line capitalist party sitting over there. Gee, that sounds like an old, kind of out of place expression, old-line capitalist parties.

But there's no difference. There was no difference when Tommy Douglas talked about the black cats and the white cats and the spotted cats. They were cats, Mr. Speaker. And let me tell you, cats today were cats yesterday, and they're going to be cats tomorrow unless there's some kind of genetic mutation provided by the atomic fallout from the member's from Greystone's reactor on every street corner.

Mr. Speaker, that's the difference. It's in the political response. And the member from Regina North West can pretend. The member from Regina can pretend that she's not political and that the member from Greystone isn't political and that the member from Shaunavon isn't political.

But of course, Mr. Speaker, we in this House know it's precisely the kind of know-nothing politics, the know-nothing politics of the Liberals and the Tories which have resulted in this kind of mess that we have here in Saskatchewan today — the \$16 billion debt, the loss of hope, the loss of confidence, the shaking of confidence that we can in fact build a better world starting here in Saskatchewan and extending beyond our borders throughout our nation, throughout our continent, in fact around the globe.

You know, Mr. Speaker, that's what it comes down to. Now the member from Greystone may laugh at it. She may try to say, well we're all pragmatists here together. The fact of the matter is she's right. Some of us are pragmatists all here together — right? — but there is a zeal. There is an idealism, and there is a vision which is contained on the members of this side of the House that will be utterly foreign to you, has been foreign to you, and will for ever be foreign to you, sealed with the "Book of Seven Seals," locked away, locked away because it's based on the book of compassion, something that is not based on greed, saying that there is a world that we can build out there that doesn't revolve around the almighty dollar, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity today to listen to one of my favourite singers, a guy called Billy Bragg, and he's a singer from Britain. And he was singing an old song, and I don't know if the members opposite are familiar with the words, but I'm going to acquaint them with it if they're not. And it starts off:

And did those feet in ancient times walk upon these green
and pleasant hills,
And did those Holy Lamb of God walk among this dark
satanic mills?
Bring me my bow of burning gold;
Bring me my arrows of desire;
Bring to me oh clouds unfold;
Bring to me my chariots of fire,
For I shall not cease from mental fight nor shall this sword
rest in my hand
Till we have built Jerusalem upon this planet's green and
pleasant land.

I've abridged it; I've changed the word England to planet.

Mr. Speaker, that kind of vision, that's the kind of vision which
has motivated the people of this province, the people of this
province and the representatives of this party since the early
1930s, for 50 years, Mr. Speaker.

That's why we're going to be celebrating the 50-year election of
the Douglas government, and that's why, Mr. Speaker, that's why
the torch, the zeal, and the fire of a new society still burns in our
hearts.

Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.