

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Petersen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I would like to introduce to you, and through you, a group of 49 students from the Wadena Elementary School. They are accompanied by teachers, Reg Glennie, Mair MacDonald; chaperons, Diane Gradin, Dorothy Wickstrom, Gail Norberg, Jeannie Elphinstone, Cathy Gradin; and their bus driver is Doug Griller.

I hope that you have an interesting stay here today. I know you will enjoy question period. I'll be joining you later for pictures and refreshments in room 218. I'd ask all members to welcome them to the Assembly today.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Currie: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure at this time to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, 27 grade 7 and grade 8 students from St. John's Elementary School. They're presently sitting in the Speaker's gallery, and they're accompanied by their teacher, Penny Sibbald.

I'm sure that you people will find your visit to the Legislative Buildings very interesting, very educational. I will be meeting with you at 3 p.m. for pictures and drinks, and I would ask the members at this time to join with me in extending a welcome to these students.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Operation of All-Terrain Vehicles

Mr. Lusney: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Highways. Mr. Minister, more than two years ago your government introduced a white paper on the need to control the operation of all-terrain vehicles, I guess more commonly known as ATVs, Mr. Minister.

More than a year ago, in March of '85, your government made public a white . . . or you made public draft legislation which you promised to act on within months. That was in 1985, Mr. Minister. Fourteen months later we continue to see fatal accidents involving young people and all-terrain vehicles, and there's no sign of legislation coming forth from your government.

Can the minister assure this legislature that the use of all-terrain vehicles — that you will have legislation in this legislature on the use of all-terrain vehicles later this week, and if not, Mr. Minister, why not?

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can assure the hon. member and the public of Saskatchewan that this government is very, very concerned with the use of all-terrain vehicles, and you are quite accurate in your history of what this government has done regarding a consultative process with the public of Saskatchewan.

We are still, today, consulting with numerous groups — be they women's groups, manufacturers groups, user groups — we are still consulting with them today. Now I find it very, very strange, Mr. Speaker, that the member of the opposition would stand here at a time of bereavement of many families in Saskatchewan and all of a sudden — all of a sudden become very, very sanctimonious about this particular issue.

Not once has the member opposite come to my office and ask for a copy of that draft legislation. Not once has any member opposite come to my office and inquired about the specifics of it. And I would ask the member opposite, if he is genuinely concerned — if he is genuinely concerned — to please come down and sit down; let's co-operate; let's talk about this proposed legislation, and I would welcome your input to it, sir.

Mr. Lusney: — A question to the minister, Mr. Minister, you brought forward, or at least proposed, some legislation, draft legislation. Bring it into the House so we can deal with it. That's where we should be dealing with it.

When the former minister introduced your government's white paper on ATVs (all-terrain vehicles) in 1984 — in 1984, Mr. Minister — he noted at that time that there were 14 young people under the age of 16 that had died while operating ATVs in this province between '81 and '84. And the former minister also said at that time, and I'll quote, Mr. Minister:

I think it's time that we consider the need for legislation before additional young lives are lost.

That was the former minister.

Mr. Minister, since your government began studying this issue in March of 1984, many more young people have lost their lives operating ATVs, including a four-year-old here just last week near Hanley. Mr. Minister, how many more deaths of young people in this province will it take before your government will act?

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of today getting into the specifics of some of these very, very unfortunate accidents that have occurred. And I think it's fair to understand that when accidents of any type occur there are various reasons for those accidents, and I don't think it right that we go into the specifics of any of those types of accidents. I don't think that would be fair nor reasonable.

I can say that this particular issue is a very, very sensitive one that requires a great deal of thought, and no matter what type of legislation we were to introduce, I can assure the member opposite and the people of Saskatchewan that simply by legislating certain procedures will not alleviate and stop all accidents.

Now we will be considering all relevant details, and I assure the member opposite that we will indeed be introducing legislation. I will not at this time say exactly when that may be, but I could perhaps mention this; that

if the member opposite would discontinue his practice of standing here in the legislature and having me run around all the province looking for bus number 749 and serial numbers and such, and on and on, if you'd get down to the basic issues of today, at that time we will get to some of the legislation.

Mr. Koskie: — A question to the Minister of Highways. Mr. Minister, a lot of people can't understand why you're delaying important legislation. In 1985 your government released the results of a questionnaire which you showed 93 per cent support in the province for legislation to control ATVs, and 75 per cent support for legislation which would restrict the operation of ATVs on public property to those 16 years of age and over. I ask you, Mr. Minister, with that kind of apparent support and continuing list of fatal accidents occurring to young people across the province, I ask you: — when will you finally act on this important legislation and introduce legislation to the session here?

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — I think I fairly clearly stated that we will be introducing legislation. I'm not prepared at this time to state exactly when, and I hope that the member opposite appreciates the very, very difficult job that we have in coming to grips with the type of legislation that is to be introduced.

Now members opposite may say, okay, all-terrain vehicles are causing some deaths, perhaps we should ban all all-terrain vehicles. I don't think that that is a proper response. There are other groups who say, no, we should just leave it wide open and have no legislation whatsoever.

We are trying to come to grips with a reasonable, common sense approach to this problem. And it will be dealt with in the very near future, but I am not prepared to say today that we are going to introduce legislation next week or the week after. But it will be dealt with at the appropriate time.

Mr. Koskie: — A further question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. I ask the minister, what are you precisely saying? You indicate . . . are you saying that by introducing the legislation you won't, in fact, make it safer for the control of these vehicles? Are you, in fact, saying that we shouldn't have laws for drinking and driving because we still have traffic accidents? Is that your perverted logic? Is he saying that we shouldn't have any restriction on the operation and trucks because people over the age of 16 get into traffic accidents? That's the perverted logic that you're using.

No one is saying that it will eliminate all accidents. But, Mr. Minister, you have been derelict in your duty — and your government. For two years you have studied it. What we're asking you here, and the people want to know, is: — what is your timetable, or do you have one, or are you waiting till after the election and disregarding the safety of young people across this province?

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite has absolutely no right to stand in this legislature and for one moment infer that this government has not been very, very concerned about safety in this province.

I can go on at great length — at great length about the many safety programs that this government has initiated, including the safety school bus stop-arm program and numerous other safety programs. There has been no government in the history of this province that has had a better record of safety, and our traffic accident statistics will support that.

As it respects, specifically, all-terrain vehicle legislation, I can assure the member that it is going to be a very, very high priority with me, and I would ask for the co-operation of the members opposite. And I would ask not that the members simply stand up at a time of bereavement of a number of families and try and make a political statement just to gain political points.

Legislation will be introduced here. And I'm not prepared to tell you exactly when it will be, but it will be good common sense type legislation and it will be introduced in due course.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Minister, you have . . . Supplement, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, you've had over two years to work on this important matter. I ask you: — if it is in fact a high priority with you, what are you waiting for? You have consulted with the public; you have put out a white paper; what are you waiting for now? Why aren't you concerned about the safety of young people across this province? Have you not got the political nerve to move forward prior to the election? Is that what you're waiting for? Opportunism, that's what governs this government.

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Mr. Speaker, once again I'll say how very, very strange I find it that the members opposite all of a sudden find this is a burning, pressing issue.

An Hon. Member: — After two years . . .

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — You're certainly right that we have, over the last two years, engaged in a very, very strong consultative process with a number of different interest groups, be they manufacturers, users, or women's groups, and we have done a considerable amount of consultation with these people. And that consultation process is still ongoing, and we are on the verge of introducing legislation. But don't you stand up here today and all of a sudden, just because there are some very, very recent deaths, all of a sudden it becomes a burning, political issue with you people.

And I ask: — how many of you people in the opposition benches have come to my office and asked for a draft copy of this legislation? I dare say there's not a member opposite that has taken the time to come even and review it and to give our government a little bit of co-operation and a little bit of assistance with the very, very difficult legislation that is going to be addressed.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, I'd like to differ with your interpretation of the fact. I want to say that when there are deaths, when there are deaths of young people, I say to you it's incumbent upon us to raise the dereliction of your duties in bringing in legislation. I ask you: — if it's a high priority, why haven't you brought it in?

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Mr. Speaker, I think I fairly clearly laid that out. We are still engaged in a consultative process. And there has been people from all over the province of Saskatchewan that I am still corresponding with, that I'm still having meetings with. People from every corner of this province have wanted to have input into this legislation because there is a divergence of opinion as to how much the state should become involved in legislating these types of vehicles. And we have taken a very reasonable approach to it, consulting with many, many people across this province.

I might add that the only people that we have not consulted with has been the members of the opposition because they have not had the fortitude to come ahead and make their input known to my office.

Mr. Sveinsson: — Once again, Mr. Speaker, we have an example of the pot calling the kettle black. I will suggest though that, as a member of the transportation committee of 1983, this discussion was ongoing and at that time it looked like it may be resolved. And I will ask the minister if, in fact, as a result of the consultation that's gone on since 1983, is he not prepared to table legislation in this House in this session?

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — I have already stated, Mr. Speaker, that we are very, very close to having legislation prepared and brought into this legislature. I don't think it would be responsible for me to say, yes, we're going to introduce it next week or the week after. But we are very, very close to introducing that legislation. And I'll admit that it has taken some time, and perhaps it is unfortunate that we did not move a little bit quicker.

But there are alternative methods of going about introducing legislation, and that is the methods that the opposition used for many, many years in that province, and that is standing up and invoking upon the people of Saskatchewan legislation, whether they were in agreement with it or not, whether they had consulted the people or not— simply invoking legislation that may or may not have been popular.

It has been this government's attitude throughout its history that we will consult with the people of Saskatchewan on many, many issues, this one included. And I ask for the members' patience — to wait for just a short while, and we will have legislation introduced into this legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Promised Arbitration Hearing

Mr. Sveinsson: — Mr. Speaker, on May 11th . . . I'm sorry, May 15th, and the question is to the Premier. He suggested that he did solve problems for Saskatchewan people — Father Larré, Les Hainstock, the Bryces.

I would just like to remind the Premier, it's been 12 days since that statement was made in the House, and Mr. Hainstock's problem has still not been solved. In fact, he's been told that it likely will not be solved, simply because of your arbitrary decision and your interpretation of the Act. In fact, it covers the solution to his problem

Mr. Premier, you stated in the House that you are willing to solve his problem. Is any action going to be taken in that direction? And will you commit another meeting to Mr. Hainstock and deal with the problem in a forthright manner that you suggest you deal with all problems that come to your office?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, as I said before, we have continued to work with Mr. Hainstock. We have . . . I said categorically that we are going to charge a royalty on trees that are cut, and that's the policy. And that's not going to change.

With respect to how much we're going to charge rent on land, I'm quite prepared, and I believe that the process is under way to have it privately appraised to find out what it will carry in terms of livestock. If we get an independent person appraise it, then that will be what we'll go with.

So with respect to the royalty or the stumpage, or whatever you want to call it, on trees for agriculture, I'm going to stay the course and it's not going to change. With respect to charging him rent for his livestock, I'm quite prepared to look at a private appraisal.

Mr. Sveinsson: — You suggest here, Mr. Premier, that you had solved Mr. Hainstock's problem. Are you misleading the public of Saskatchewan with a statement like that? In fact, his problem hasn't been solved. And when are you prepared to solve his problem?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, if an individual wants me to stop charging rent on land that the government owns, I won't do that; I'm going to charge rent. If they want me to stop charging rent on land that the government owns, I won't do that; I'm going to charge rent. If they want me to stop charging a royalty for the trees they cut and sell, I'm not going to do that. I am going to maintain the programs that charge rent for land and I'm going to charge royalty or stumpage fees for trees. That's the way it is, and that's not going to change.

With respect to how much rent they should pay for livestock land and if there's some question how productive it is, let's have a private appraisal. I'm quite prepared to do that. But I'm also going to charge them some rent on public land with respect to how many livestock they can carry on it. Maybe it's more or less livestock that can be carried, and therefore more or less rent, and that's up for discussion and I'm prepared to look at that.

Teachers' Superannuation Fund

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Acting Minister of Education. Mr. Minister, in 1980 legislation was passed to begin to cover the unfunded liability of the teachers' superannuation plan which, over the last 50 years, had been underfunded.

One major step was to retain all of the excess earnings in the fund to help write down the unfunded liability, but this year for the first time, Mr. Minister, your government has changed that policy. Now you are taking all of the earnings, all of the excess earnings out of the teachers' superannuation fund and you're using it to help cover your government's massive deficit.

Can the minister confirm that \$30 million will be lost to the Saskatchewan teachers' superannuation fund this year alone, under this change, and can you justify this kind of irresponsible action?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the Minister of Education will have more to say on this in more detail. But I would remind the hon. member, and I will remind you, Mr. Speaker, and all members of the House — that member who just took his seat was the minister of Finance in the former NDP government; that former NDP government ran the unfunded liability of the teachers' superannuation to \$1.2 billion. And yet that former minister of finance under that former government would have the gall to stand here and accuse this government or any one else of a problem in the teachers' superannuation. I would say that that is hypocritical in the first degree.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, now that the minister has not answered the question, let me ask him again. Mr. Minister, you know very well that it was in 1980, under the New Democratic government, that steps were taken to do something about the unfunded liability which had been in existence for 50 years in this province, Mr. Minister. You are now turning the clock back to what existed before 1980 by taking earnings from the superannuation fund and putting them in to cover your deficit into the regular budget.

Now my question, Mr. Minister. A new question. The minister knows that the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation — because they have met with the Minister of Finance — has gone on record as being totally opposed to your government's attempts to skim off excess earnings of the fund to pay for your deficit. Your party and your members have screamed long and you've screamed loud for years about unfunded liabilities in pension funds, and yet you have taken a step in this budget to worsen the situation with respect to one of the biggest pension plans in our province. How, Mr. Minister, do you justify this action in light of your party's opposition to unfunded liabilities in any pension plan, and will you commit your government to the goal of a fully funded superannuation plan with the first step being the allocation of all of the excess interest earnings to the teachers' superannuation fund?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, Mr. Speaker, there was a good deal of detail, and for some of that detail I will take notice on behalf of my colleague, the Minister of Education. But, Mr. Speaker, a reminder once again, that former minister of Finance, that former minister of Education, former minister responsible for the Teachers' Superannuation Commission in that other government — \$1.2 billion, I remind you, Mr. Speaker, of unfunded liability in that commission under their government — and now he stands and says that. As I've said before, that is absolutely hypocritical. And then he would stand there and suggest that in a short four years this government should solve a \$1.2 billion problem . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . He says we should solve a \$1.2 billion problem in four years. An absolute hypocrisy, Mr.

Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the minister how he proposes that his government will solve the unfunded liability of the teachers' superannuation fund by taking \$30 million out of the fund to help to pay for the deficits. Will you answer that question?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, Mr. Speaker, what the member suggests is absolutely false. And I would just remind you further, Mr. Speaker, and all members; it's not only in the teachers' superannuation commission where there's a problem with unfunded liability — something in the order of \$3 billion unfunded liability in the public sector pension area. And for anybody from that former government who was in power during the days of heady revenues in this province to let it go to the stage that they did, and then even have the gall to raise the question, I cannot believe it, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister deny that money was taken out of the teachers' superannuation fund this year, excess interest earnings, and put into government revenue in a way which was not true in, let us say, last year, or not true in 1981? Have you not made a change in policy which takes out of the teachers' superannuation fund excess interest earnings?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, Mr. Speaker, as I have done, and I'm not sure of the details of what happened, but I will say: — not only has the former minister of education and the former minister of finance — now we have the former premier, who was ultimately responsible for the \$3 billion that I mentioned in public sector unfunded liability, standing here and suggesting that there's something in disarray in the teachers' superannuation fund.

I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, there is not. Nothing is in disarray. The only disarray in that whole area of the public sector pension unfunded liability is what was created by you, sir, and what was created by your cohorts who were speaking before you.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The opinions of the minister are not what we're asking for. We're asking for simple statements of fact. I ask you, sir: — is it not true, is it not true that your government took out of the teachers' superannuation fund \$30 million — \$30 million — by a change of policy, a policy which was not pursued by your government prior to this year, or was not pursued by our government following 1980?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, as I've said, the unfunded liability and public sector pensions, including the teachers' superannuation fund, was a problem that was created over a long period of time. That very gentleman who raises the question, that gentleman who started to work in this building when I was in grade 8 — or was it grade 2? — something about that stage, and then he stands here now to a new government that's been in power for about four years and suggests that the problems

of the unfunded liability of public sector pensions are somehow on our heads. It's an absolute fallacy, Mr. Speaker.

I first of all couldn't believe that that member would raise the question, and now that the former premier would raise the question, it's even more hypocritical, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — May I take it then, Mr. Minister, that you're not denying that the \$30 million was purloined from the teachers' superannuation fund and transferred to the Department of Finance in order to finance your deficit? Are you denying that? It's a fairly simple question, Mr. Minister. We don't need a little speech on what the shortcomings of the Anderson government or the Thatcher government or any preceding government . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right, or any preceding government.

I am asking you, sir, whether or not the policy you followed last year would not have resulted in that \$30 million staying in the fund, and the policy you pursued this year means you're taking out the \$30 million. Is that not true, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, the member says, don't give me a little speech about the Anderson government, the Thatcher government, any of those things, Mr. Speaker. I would suggest to you the most apt name to the unfunded liability in the public sector pension area would be Blakeney's liability, and there's no other name to put on it, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, I rise to seek leave of the Assembly to move down the order paper directly second readings under public Bills and orders. We seek leave in order that the Assembly may debate our three private member Bills, which would reduce the tax burden on the people of Saskatchewan. Therefore I seek leave of the Assembly . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Do I have the floor, Mr. Speaker, or does the member of the WCC from North West continue to yap.

Mr. Speaker, do I have the floor. Mr. Speaker, or do I have to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well can I have some order in the House?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order. The member has the floor. If he has something to say, I would like him to get on with it.

Mr. Koskie: — Well I have something to say, Mr. Speaker, and I said it and you couldn't hear me. So I'm asking for order, and I wonder if the members across the way would come to order.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. I would ask the member, if he has something to say, to get on with it, or we'll take the next item of business.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day I rise to seek leave of the Assembly to move down the order paper directly to second readings under the public Bills and orders. And we seek leave in order that the Assembly may debate our three private member Bills, which would reduce the tax burden on the people of Saskatchewan. I therefore seek leave of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker.

Leave not granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure to introduce some guests from the Clayoquot Indian Band in Vancouver Island, British Columbia. They are guests of the Piapot Indian School.

There are 22 students visiting with us this afternoon. They are, as I say, in the Speaker's gallery. They were accompanied by four supervisors from Piapot Indian School: — Stan Mustatia, Agnes and Brenda Tom, and, I believe, Tim Davies.

I would ask all Hon. Members to join with me in welcoming the students to the Assembly. I hope their afternoon is enjoyable. I look forward to meeting with them for refreshments and questions a little later this afternoon, so please join with me in welcoming them to the Assembly.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTIONS

Resolution No. 9 — Refund and Removal of Sales and Flat Taxes

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us, in which I will formally move at the end of my remarks, is in the following terms:

That this Assembly urge the Saskatchewan Government to take steps immediately to refund the 5 per cent sales tax collected from purchasers of used cars, trucks and other used vehicles, and to remove the unfair flat tax which it has imposed upon Saskatchewan taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, members will know that we, on this side of the House, feel very strongly with respect to the subjects continued in this resolution. The resolution addresses a central issue facing this legislature, and facing the people of Saskatchewan, and that issue is the issue of fair taxation and this government's unfair tax increases on ordinary Saskatchewan people.

We all remember the political promises of 1982, and I will recount a couple of them. They promised to eliminate the provincial sales tax in the first term of office, and the promise to cut income taxes by 10 per cent; that these promises were made, cannot be denied. We have many, many examples of it.

I have here an ad put in The Kindersley Clarion on behalf of the member for Kindersley, and it reads in part as follows; it says that:

This measure (meaning the elimination of the sales tax on utility bills) will be the first phase of a new PC government's commitment to the complete elimination of the sales tax in its first term of office.

The complete elimination of the sales tax in its first term of office. That's what the member for Kindersley promised to his electors.

I have here one that was inserted by the now member — in each case I will simply refer to the member — the current member for Shellbrook. And he says:

We're going to phase out the provincial sales tax, and there's going to be a 10 per cent reduction in personal income tax.

Ten per cent reduction in personal income tax. Now that is the comment of the member for Shellbrook. I have one here for the member for Maple Creek:

. . . a 10 per cent across the board cut in personal income tax.

A 10 per cent across the board cut in personal income tax. The member for . . . I've dealt with the member for Shellbrook. I don't want anyone to feel neglected. I've dealt with the member for Maple Creek. I have here the member for Last Mountain-Touchwood, and again talking about eliminating the 5 per cent sales tax:

This measure will be the first phase of a new PC government's commitment to the complete elimination of the sales tax in its first term of office.

It's a very familiar phrase — appeared many, many times. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take the time of the House by reading all of the advertisements which contain those particular promises. There are very, very few members opposite who did not sponsor advertisements that contained those particular commitments.

So we have these promises, the promises to eliminate the provincial sales tax in the first term of office, and the promise to cut income tax by 10 per cent. Those were pervasive in the election campaign of the members opposite. These were the promises. They were made; they have been broken.

Just compare, Mr. Speaker, the promise with the performance — the promise of what was to happen with taxes compared with what has happened with taxes. Let's take for a moment this sales tax. The promise to eliminate the sales tax has been followed in the budget of last year by an extension of the sales tax to used cars and trucks. And this was very, very vigorously defended in this House by the former member for Regina South.

The debate was long, and the debate was protracted. And it was over and over again insisted by the former member for Regina South that this tax was a good tax and fair tax, and any suggestion that it was contrary to the promises

made in the election campaign was rejected.

Now with respect to the promise to cut income tax, we have not seen the cut in income tax; we have seen instead the addition of a new and unfair income tax — the flat tax — all of this introduced in the budget of the member for Kindersley last year.

And we all remember that budget, the manner in which members opposite proudly defended that budget as . . . One of their phrases was "the most intelligent budget in Canada." And one that talked, Mr. Speaker, a great deal about tax reform. We heard over and over again that these were measures to make our tax system fairer, that they were elements of tax reform.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the public didn't think they were very intelligent, and they didn't think that they were reforms, or not reforms in the right direction. And we hear no longer any talk by members opposite about tax reform. They have understandably and wisely, from a political point of view, stopped trying to represent — I might even say misrepresent, but certainly wrongly represent — these measures as any form of tax reform. They are reform only in the sense that they're changes, and every single change was a retrograde step making the tax system less fair, rather than more fair.

We note that the PC government will not even agree to debate the private members' Bills that have been on the order paper for a good period of time, and we have made many efforts in order to bring them forward for debate.

With this background, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to the words of the resolution, and you will note that it deals specifically with the sales tax collected on used cars and trucks and other used vehicles, and it deals with the flat tax.

Mr. Speaker, turning first to the tax on used vehicles. It was defended by members opposite on the grounds that it was somehow fairer. I was totally unable to understand their arguments and still am unable to understand the arguments that they mounted last year in this Chamber. And I am still convinced by the arguments which we mounted which said that, on the average, people who buy used cars are less able to pay taxes than people who buy new cars.

Everybody can come up with their own exception to that general rule, but I think there can be no doubt that people who buy new cars have, on the average, higher incomes than people who buy used cars. And that accordingly, if you shift a tax from new cars to used cars, you're shifting a tax from people who have higher incomes to people who have lower incomes. That strikes me as very, very obvious, and I wondered why members opposite were unwilling to accept that argument last year when we put it forward time and time again. None the less, Mr. Speaker, they declined to accept that argument, and they imposed this tax, a tax which we believed was unfair and we continue to believe is unfair.

Mr. Speaker, in due course, when it was very, very clear that the public also agreed that the tax was unfair, the government relented, after having collected something

between four and \$5 million from 60,000 purchasers of used cars and trucks. And they have not so far been willing to make any refund to these people. So far they have been unwilling to acknowledge that the tax was unfair; they have been unwilling to acknowledge that a mistake was made and that a refund ought to be made. And I want to say that we think the position of the government on this is wrong, and that the government ought to refund the tax which they collected from a tax which we said was unfair, and which I can only conclude they now believe is unfair.

The whole tax system of this province has been characterized during the last several years as one which was rife with unfairness. We've seen a tax system based upon double standards, double standards of the grossest kind. We've seen huge tax breaks for oil companies, tax breaks of the order of \$300 million a year for oil companies, and at the same time, the imposition of new taxes, new in the history of this province, on used cars and trucks.

(1445)

Now surely, Mr. Speaker, that is a perverse — a perverse application of tax laws. It makes taxes far less fair than they would be if we applied some just ordinary standards of fairness. We have seen special benefits and tax breaks to people like the Peter Pocklington and the Manalta Coals; and we have seen taxes imposed on people with modest incomes, many of them young people who buy used cars.

This has been a defining feature of the tax régime of members opposite that they have sought ways to reduce the taxes of the wealthy, and they have sought ways to impose new taxes on ordinary people.

I'm free to admit that every tax change has not moved in that direction, but overwhelmingly the tax system has moved in that direction. And, Mr. Speaker, that is a direction with which I do not agree and our party does not agree. And I want to say very, very clearly that a New Democratic government, when it is elected, will restore the property tax relief removed by this government opposite; we'll refund the used vehicle tax; and we'll repeal the unfair flat tax. Those are our commitments, Mr. Speaker, and those will be acted upon just as soon as a New Democratic Party government is elected and just as soon as this government has the courage to call an election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Well, Mr. Speaker, we are all anticipating that we may well have an election call today, and we are very hopeful that that comes about so that we may have some opportunity to test the people, the judgement of the people of Saskatchewan, on some of the issues which I have raised.

I want to turn now to the matter of the flat tax. We have, as I indicated on the order paper, a Bill which would be designed to repeal the provincial government's unfair flat tax. I am not now debating the Bill; I am debating the idea that the flat tax should be repealed. It was introduced last

year as part of the biggest and most unfair increase in taxes in Saskatchewan history. There is no question that a budget which withdraws property tax rebates to the tune of \$100 million or thereabouts from a great number of ordinary people across this province; which imposes a flat tax, a flat tax which compared with other income taxes is very regressive — it hits poorest people hardest — an which imposes a sales tax on used cars and trucks and takes it off new cars, at least in part, is a perverse budget, a budget which is aimed in the wrong direction, and which is unfair, and properly is described as the most unfair budget introduced in the history of Saskatchewan.

This year we have had a new budget with new Minister of Finance in an attempt to recoup some of the losses sustained by the last budget, and we have the flat tax being doubled. The flat tax for 1986 is double what it was for 1985, and I think that those many, many taxpayers who were surprised and dismayed when they calculated their income tax last month and found that they had this substantial flat tax to pay will be surprised and dismayed still more when they find that next year that flat tax is doubled.

Now the flat tax, Mr. Speaker, is going to take more than \$100 million a year from working people and working families. This from a government which had \$300 million a year to give to the big oil companies at a time when oil prices were record high and when oil companies' profits were at record highs. And there's no doubt on either of those counts — oil prices were at record high, oil companies' profits were at record high, and that's the time this government chose to give to these oil companies a break of \$300 million a year and slap a flat tax on ordinary citizens of this province in order to recoup \$100 million of that back.

Now that's what was done. And I don't think anyone will deny it. I doubt very much whether anybody will stand up and give a reasoned argument against that analysis because that's what happened. That's what happened. The amount of money collected from oil companies as a percentage of the total value of production went down and down and down and down. And if, Mr. Speaker, this government opposite had collected the same percentage in taxes in last year as it did in its first year of office — if it had just followed its own rules, not the rules of any previous government, but its own rules — if it had done that, Mr. Speaker, we would have collected, not 300, but approximately \$450 million more.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some members opposite may say, ah well, there might not have been as much oil produced. and they may well be right. There may have been some. So I think any calculation which says that it's only \$300 million a year that these people gave to the oil companies is a cautious calculation and a conservative break for the oil companies.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Now, Mr. Speaker, let me talk a little bit about the flat tax, a flat tax which is unfair, unfair for two reasons, unfair because it is a flat tax. There is nothing progressive about the rate. A person with an income of \$25,000 a year pays that tax at the same rate as

someone with an income of \$250,000 a year.

An Hon. Member: — The same amount?

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — No. The member opposite asks if it's the same amount. No, not at all. They pay the same percentage, the same rate. The rate is not a progressive tax rate.

The theory of the government opposite is that the person with an income of \$25,000 a year can part with the same percentage of his income without any more pain as the person with an income of \$250,000 a year. That's the theory of a flat tax, and I don't share that theory.

I believe that people with an income of \$250,000 a year can afford to pay a higher percentage of that income in order to support our common services than the person with the income of \$25,000. Now this is . . . Our view is totally rejected by the government opposite, other wise they wouldn't have applied a flat tax. They would have applied a tax that had some measure of a progressive aspect. They did not do so. They selected a flat tax.

I would venture to think . . . I know, for example, that this is the only income tax in Canada which on its rates is not progressive. Even the most conservative government in Canada, when applying an income tax, has always adopted the idea that the rich could pay a higher percentage of their income than the poor. That has been the universal rules until these people opposite decide they were going to break new ground, they were going to introduce tax reform, and as an element of their tax reform, they say, Mr. Speaker, that a person with an income of \$250,000 a year should be called upon to pay only the same percentage of his income in tax as the person with the income of 25,000. Now that is the essence of a flat tax, and that is why it is unfair — that is why it is unfair, Mr. Speaker, that is one reason why the flat tax is unfair.

The second reason why the flat tax is unfair is because it is applied on a tax system which is itself unfair, and they have selected as their tax base a calculation on the tax form which ensures — which ensures — Mr. Speaker, that the tax will be as unfair as possible. They have applied the tax to net income — not to taxable income, but to net income. And I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, why I think that is an unfair way to apply an income tax.

I want to review for this House those things which can be deducted when calculating flat tax and those things which cannot be deducted while calculating flat tax. And you will note, Mr. Speaker, that in many cases — not all cases but many cases — the deductions which can be made in calculating flat tax are deductions which are characteristically available to the wealthy but not available to people of ordinary means. And the deductions which cannot be deducted for the calculation of flat tax, but can for the calculation of ordinary income tax, are deductions which are characteristically available to everybody — rich or poor.

So we have, once again, this government deciding, in order to make sure that the wealthy get the breaks, we are going to levy this tax on net income so that the following

things may be deducted. You may be able to deduct contributions to the Canada pension Plan or the Saskatchewan pension plan. And you can deduct registered home ownership contributions, and union dues, and professional fees, and the like; and you can deduct some child care expenses. Note, Mr. Speaker, what you also can deduct: — registered retirement savings plan premiums, which are used by many people but characteristically by the wealthy, and this all-encompassing one, practically, allowable business investment losses — allowable business investment losses — they are deductible; index security investment plan, money which you have invested in an index security investment plan; allowable capital losses, they are deductible. And I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how many of the ordinary voters in the constituencies of members opposite are using the index security investment plan. I think not many; I think that one is available primarily to the wealthy.

And then other deductions — and that one is one where you can deduct such things as film and video tax breaks, and other exotic tax breaks — you can put those under line 222. Some of the others you can put as deductions from income on page 1. Those, Mr. Speaker, are the deductions available when calculating the flat tax.

Now let me tell you what deductions are not available — what deductions are not available — and I'll ask you whether or not these are characteristically used by people of ordinary means and not by people who are ordinarily using the index security investment plan. Well, there's the age exemption if you were over 65. Now a lot of people are over 65, and you don't have to be wealthy to be over 65. But this one is not available for the calculation. You cannot deduct that when you calculate your provincial flat tax. Mr. Speaker, that one is not going to be available because, for some reason, members think that that would be unfair to give a break to people over 65.

The married exemption, for having a dependent spouse; that is not available. That cannot be deducted for the flat tax.

I want to make clear, Mr. Speaker, these are all deductions available for ordinary income tax, such as we have in this province and we have in all other provinces, but not available for this very special flat tax which has been imposed by the government opposite as the only such tax in Canada.

(1500)

Nor, Mr. Speaker, is the exemption for dependent children available. In this special tax, as an element of tax reform introduced by members opposite, the exemption for dependent children is not available.

Mr. Speaker, the special exemption for medical expenses, for higher than normal medical expenses — available with respect to income tax everywhere else in Canada — not available for deduction when calculating your flat tax.

Charitable donations — here is another exemption, Mr. Speaker, which is available under every single income

tax system in Canada, in every province, except the Saskatchewan flat tax which does not allow you to deduct charitable donations.

Here's a deduction for blind persons or persons confined to a bed or a wheelchair. Now this one is another exemption available, or deduction available, in all other income tax systems in Canada, but not available under the Saskatchewan flat tax. An education deduction, an assistance with tuition fees for people going to university — this one also is not available for deduction under the Saskatchewan flat tax.

There are a number of other fairly technical ones here — capital gains exemptions and the like — they also are not available for calculation of the flat tax. And I want, Mr. Speaker, to digress for a moment and deal with that little item. Because members opposite are perhaps not aware of the fact that while they say that you can sell a farm in this province, and if you realize a capital gain, it will not be taxable, they are not saying the truth. It is subject to the flat tax — it is subject to the flat tax — and members opposite have been unwilling at times to acknowledge that.

Mr. Speaker, it words rather simply. If you make a capital gain on the sale of, let us say, a farm, half of it is included in your income and you enter it on page 1 of your return, and then you were entitled to claim an exemption if it is a farm, which effectively removes the tax for the purposes of ordinary income tax. But of course our flat tax is calculated well up the form from this, and it works to tax all capital gains.

Well, Mr. Speaker, those are a few of the reasons why I am of the view that the flat tax is an unfair tax. A nurse or a teacher or an elevator agent or a truck driver, virtually all of their income will show up on the tax form as net income. And they'll have to pay this year virtually 1 per cent of their gross income with relatively minor deductions.

But the business person, he has the opportunity to lower his taxable income very substantially by the use of, as I say, film and video tax breaks or exotic tax breaks. Well, I am not quarrelling with people who use those tax breaks. People who use those tax breaks are merely using what the law permits them to use. We ought not to lay the blame on the taxpayers. We ought to lay the blame on the lawmaker. And that's what I am proposing to do and seeking to do.

The lawmakers opposite made the laws with respect to the flat tax. If the business man takes advantage of the exemptions available to him, I do not quarrel with him; that's the way the tax laws work. I do quarrel with the people who permitted him to take those deductions. And certainly you can hardly find a tax where the deductions available are more unfair, as compared to people with high incomes and people with low incomes, than the Saskatchewan flat tax.

The flat tax, as I say, permits you to deduct film and video tax breaks, but not any deduction you may have because you're a blind person or confined to bed or a wheelchair or because you make substantial charitable donations.

No one that I know denies any of these assertions that I am making. They simply say that, ah, well, that's how we made it; it was tax reform; it isn't very good but, ah, well that's what we did. That, Mr. Speaker, is a very, very unfair tax system — a very unfair tax system — and one, Mr. Speaker, which it doesn't much matter what members opposite propose to do about it.

It doesn't much matter whether members opposite recognize that this is an unfair tax system. It doesn't much matter whether they are convinced by my arguments, because I am saying to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the ordinary people of Saskatchewan, just as soon as the government opposite, the government which is overcome by cold feet, screws up its courage and calls an election, we'll have a New Democratic Party government in this province; a New Democratic Party government committed to the repeal of the unfair flat tax, and committed to fair taxes for ordinary people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Yes, no longer — no longer will Saskatchewan be the only province which has two provincial income taxes of this measure of unfairness. The time for tax fairness has arrived in this province, and it will in fact come to pass just as soon as the election is called.

Members opposite, who undoubtedly will be joining in the debate, will be attempting, I trust, to put up a defence of the flat tax. I have tried on many occasions to get members opposite to stand up and say it is a fair tax; it is a reasonable tax; and I'll tell you why. But I have not found anyone opposite to put up a reasoned argument based upon the tax, based upon who pays it, based upon whether it hits wealthy people as hard as it hits not wealthy people.

We just will not get them to stand up and say why they think it is a fair tax. They just . . . Occasionally you can get someone to stand up and say: — I think it's a fair tax. But what they will not do is go through the application of the tax, see what is exempt and what is not exempt, and say that list of exemptions compared with this list of non-exemptions is fair and reasonable, and they don't do that because it isn't. It isn't fair; it isn't reasonable. It's unfair, and it's unreasonable.

Now, Mr. Speaker, from what I have said you will know that we believe that the 5 per cent sales tax collected on used cars should not have been collected. And I say again, Mr. Speaker, a New Democratic government will refund the money wrongly collected by the PC government under the used car and truck tax . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes we will.

Members opposite are yet again talking about a death tax.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I hear from time to time people talking about a tax, which was once collected, which had a threshold of \$500,000. You didn't pay any unless you collected \$500,000; \$500,000 in the

mid-70s, by today's standards, would be well over a million dollars in current dollars.

It is they who are saying we ought to be refunding money to people who had tax free . . . tax free what would amount to \$1 million by current tax dollars. And they compare that with a 19-year-old kid who buys a used car and you've taken \$180 from him. That is Tory philosophy over and over again. They say, well, if we refund it, that sales tax to a 19-year-old young man who paid \$180 in tax on a used car that he bought, we would then surely have to refund taxes to people who paid taxes after an exemption, after an exemption. Yes, Mr. Speaker, after an exemption of what would now be \$1 million.

And they are concerned about people who would have in today's dollars, a million dollars. And it is because of their touching concern for these people, the belief that they would have to refund money to these people who got a million dollars exemption, that they won't give back the \$180 to the 19-year-old young person. That is their argument. I've heard them make it over and over again and the member for Eastview just raised it again. He says it's the same principle. The same principle, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. If any members would like to get into the debate, there will be plenty of opportunity this afternoon, and until that time when you stand, I would ask you to contain yourselves.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — In principle, Mr. Speaker, the same principle they say applies to giving back \$180 to a 19-year-old lad who has bought himself a car, a used car, and to someone who paid a succession duty 15 years ago after an exemption of what would be in today's dollars, a million dollars. Now that, Mr. Speaker, is an interesting and very clear statement of PC philosophy . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right.

And it is because these people believe that their job is to protect millionaires and not to the same extent to protect ordinary people who buy \$3,000 on used cars and therefore pay \$150 in tax; it is because these people have willingly given \$300 million to the oil companies year after year after year, and because they are now imposing a flat tax on a bus driver and allowing him not to deduct any exemptions for dependent wife or dependent children or because he has extra medical expenses; because of all of those things, I believe that this government has lost touch with what ordinary people expect of a tax system. I believe they are no longer interested in a fair tax system, fairness as seen by ordinary people.

They have just talked to too many special pleaders in the tax area — too many special pleaders in the tax area who are looking for yet another tax credit, yet another tax break. Some of them had proved in the past to be spectacularly, spectacularly generous to the wealthy. And again I don't complain that the wealthy use the breaks. You cannot fault a person for using a tax break. You can most assuredly fault the people who made it possible.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, it is time that this legislature stop building into our tax system more tax breaks for the

wealthy and stop applying more taxes on ordinary people.

And because of that, Mr. Speaker, I am going to move:

That this Assembly urge the Saskatchewan government to take steps immediately to refund the 5 per cent sales tax collected from purchasers of used cars, trucks, and other used vehicles, and to remove the unfair flat tax which it has imposed upon Saskatchewan taxpayers.

My colleague, the member for Regina North East, is seconding this, and, Mr. Speaker, I am so moving.

(1515)

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to have the opportunity to second the resolution moved by the member from Elphinstone, the Leader of the Opposition, and say a few words in support of the resolution.

I want to do that, Mr. Speaker, because I think we have here before us a resolution that has got considerably more substance to it than all of the legislation which this government has introduced in this House in this session up until this present time. It's a resolution that could affect, Mr. Speaker, if the government would recognize the importance of it, could affect a lot of people who are working very hard out there and struggling under some difficulty to provide all of the needs that their families have in this period of time; people who are struggling to try to raise children so that they can have a future that is promising, a future which they can look forward to.

They have had some difficulty doing that under the policies of this government. And the introduction of the flat tax, the putting on of the sales tax on used cars, and other taxation measures, have contributed to that difficulty which those people have had in the last four years, now going on to five years, under this Conservative government.

By now, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the fiscal mismanagement of this government is almost legendary. Wrong priorities, wrong policies, extravagant and wasteful spending, poor planning, or perhaps a total absence of planning — and there's some people who I submit would suggest that there has been a total absence of planning — together with the kind of tax increases which Saskatchewan citizens have had to suffer because of this government, it adds up to four years, now going on to five years, which have left this province with a very heavy tax burden — a very heavy tax burden. And on top of that you would think that with this ever increasing increase in taxation on ordinary people, that it would have contributed to lessening the amount of the deficit that this government has accumulated. But indeed it has not.

In spite of all this taxation on ordinary people, the deficit in Saskatchewan continues to grow at an astronomical extent and rate. This deficit now is over \$2 billion. And all of this gouging of the taxpayer by this Conservative government has not done anything about reducing that

deficit, which supports the argument which I have made, Mr. Speaker, that we have had the kind of mismanagement which has never been heard of in this province before.

And the government members, if they think that I'm mistaken, well I would invite them — or the Minister of Finance, if he chooses to speak in this debate on this resolution at some time today — I would like them to enter the debate, and give us a current estimate of that deficit and explain why it is there in spite of the kind of taxes that this government has imposed.

The resolution before us, Mr. Speaker, urges that the government — and I will read it — that the government:

take steps immediately to refund the 5 per cent sales tax collected from purchasers of used cars, trucks, and other used vehicles, and to remove the unfair flat tax which it has imposed upon Saskatchewan taxpayers.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that that is a reasonable and responsible resolution and any reasonable and responsible government would take some action on it. The policies, as it applies to taxation and what tax money has been used to pay for, have been wrong. They've been wrong-headed from the start. They've been wrong-headed from the beginning of this government in 1982, and they have failed.

They collect a new double tax, the flat tax. People go and pay their income tax on income that they earn. And after they have calculated their income tax, they have a double tax put on top of it, on their net income, which this government has called a flat tax and then pretended that it was tax reform. That has contributed to the provincial treasury many millions of dollars. They brought in a sales tax on used cars. That too has contributed, not quite as many millions, but millions of dollars — I suggest, somewhere in the area of \$6 million.

And what did this government use that taxpayers' money to do? Well they paid \$300 million a year to the oil companies by not collecting reasonable taxes from them. They took it from the flat tax and the sales tax and taxes on working people so that they could pay the oil companies \$300 million a year.

Ah, the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake says, ah! But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that that's not fair, this kind of policy. He may think it is, and members opposite may think it is, because they take the advice of the treasury benches. I do not think that it's a fair policy when you tax working people, ordinary citizens who have to raise a family, more and more and more every year while you say to the oil companies, you can have \$300 million a year. That is not my definition of fairness, and that's why I am pleased to support this resolution.

What else, Mr. Speaker, has this flat tax, this increase in taxation through the flat tax and the sales tax on used cars, paid for? Well it's paid for \$390 million in loan guarantees to Husky Oil of Alberta — of Alberta, Mr. Speaker.

A \$140 million in loan guarantees to Manalta Coal in Alberta. What did Manalta Coal do? They came into Saskatchewan, these friends of this Conservative government and this Conservative party, and they said look, we got a deal for you. They said, we have a deal for you. You now own the coal fields of Saskatchewan Power Corporation does. They use the coal to generate electricity for Saskatchewan people. Manalta came and said to their friends opposite in the government benches, we got a deal for you. We will buy this coal off your hands but you guarantee the money, the loan that we are going to use in order to buy this.

Well that seems to be, Mr. Speaker, not a very fair comparison. It's a fair comparison but not a very fair policy. Tax people more; tax people who are struggling to make a living; tax people who are struggling to raise their families and provide them with an education and an adequate roof over their head; and then use some of that money to guarantee a \$140 million loan to Manalta Coal of Alberta to buy their coal. Only a Conservative government in Saskatchewan could dream up that kind of unfairness and that kind of illogical business decision.

They pride themselves about their business acumen. Well, Mr. Speaker, they have shown time and time again that their knowledge of how business really effectively works has a great deal of shortcoming. What have been the results? If there had been some results which would have raised revenues for the treasury so that Saskatchewan people could then have better services and maybe ultimately have their taxes reduced, if there had been those results, maybe some people could have been convinced that there was some logic in what the government was doing.

But what were the results? Well here's what some of them were. Investment in Saskatchewan declined over the past four years; the real, the constant dollar of investment, Mr. Speaker, has declined. In spite of the advertising and the boastings of this government opposite about what a great job they're doing economically, investment in constant and real dollars in Saskatchewan declined.

Retail sales are flat. The small-business sector has been ignored by the open for big business policy of this government . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . and the member from Maple Creek asks, why don't I say something about jobs.

Well I would like to accommodate the member from Maple Creek and I want to tell her that the jobless rate in Saskatchewan — the unemployment rate — has tripled since this government . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. We're on a fairly narrow resolution dealing with two taxes, and I would ask the member to stay on the subject that's before us today.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I will do that, Mr. Speaker. I want to say that members opposite, when they ask me to make comments, I am tempted. But as long as you will keep them under control, I will continue with the subject at hand.

The point I was making, Mr. Speaker — and I shall not

repeat it — was simply that the government's taxation policies and the form of new taxes which this government has imposed on Saskatchewan people, when compared to what the people have received for those taxes, have been extremely unfair. And I can say that, Mr. Speaker, from firsthand experience. I have met literally thousands of people in the last several months, five to six months, in fact a year, and I have talked to them in their homes and at public meetings about what their concerns are. And you know what they say? They say a number of things, but leading the list, leading the list of concerns are jobs, the flat tax on income, and the refusal of this government to rebate the sales tax that was collected on used vehicles.

Those are the leading issues that Saskatchewan people are talking about today. And I suspect maybe that's one of the reasons why the Premier and the government opposite have been reluctant to call the election. Because they don't want to deal with those issues; they don't want to deal with this resolution.

I'm sure that members opposite will stand up and they will make speeches about what a great reduction in taxation there has been. Well before they do that I want to show to them, in the remarks that I am going to yet make, that indeed there has not been a reduction in taxation on Saskatchewan citizens; there has been a substantial increase.

My colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, spoke about the promises which the Conservative candidates made in the last election, and there were many of them. There was a list of promises, Mr. Speaker, that could have filled a Mack truck. And most of them, Mr. Speaker, have yet to be implemented. Most of them have yet to be implemented. And those dealing with taxation are among that list.

The promise to eliminate totally the sales tax — where is that promise? Well it's on a lot of advertisements that are around. It's on a lot of pamphlets that every one of those members opposite distributed to their constituencies in the hope that it would make people vote for them.

But yet we have not seen any sign by this government that it's willing, in fact, to move on that promise. In fact, we saw a sign that it was going to do the complete opposite when it put in a sales tax on used vehicles. Now they have an amendment in the House to eliminate the sales tax on used clothing.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the taxation gamesmanship, and this is the government gamesmanship that the people of Saskatchewan object to. They want a government that's going to be honest. They don't want a government that's going to say, one day, we're going to eliminate all the sales tax, two or three years later come in and actually put more sales tax on, like it did with the used vehicle tax, then find that it's got some political problems, and then come in and say we're going to remove the sales tax on clothing, still ignoring the initial promise.

The kind of politicking that this government has done, Mr. Speaker, has turned the public of Saskatchewan against them, simply because the public of Saskatchewan believes that they can no longer trust them for another

four years. They can no longer trust this government for another four years. And maybe that's why the government has decided that they want to take five years, instead of the normal four, of their government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me indicate to the House what this change in taxation has done. It hasn't done anything to improve the fiscal situation of the province of Saskatchewan. It has done nothing to do that. As a matter of fact, I have here an article on which it is reported that — this is from the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* of very recent date, I think last week. And the article reports on some comments made . . . the article refers to some comments made by the investment rating agencies.

(1530)

And here's what the investment rating agencies say:

Moody's Investors Service expect to send analysts to Saskatchewan within the next month.

It's concerned with the deficit. They continue to say:

"We're looking at the most recent budget, which seems to have a high deficit position," said Moody's vice-president Tis Crowell. "We've been concerned in the past with Saskatchewan, in the growth of the debt. They're starting at a low base, but there has been a growth in debt to meet operating and other expenses over time, and we see a continuation of this over 1986 and 1987."

No measure of taxation by this government has done anything about reducing or doing away with the serious problem that's about to face the people of Saskatchewan.

It goes on to say:

Both firms lowered the province's international credit rating in the last year. In July 1985, Moody's reduced it to AA from AA-1, referring to the province's mounting deficit and "static economy." Saskatchewan had held the higher rating since 1981.

And I don't need to remind the House who was the government of the day in 1981.

In January, Standard and Poor's lowered the rating from an AA plus to a AA, citing "deteriorating trends in the province's budgetary position and its debt burden." The two firms set credit ratings for all Canadian provinces based on deficits, economic performance and outlook.

I prefaced my remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by highlighting or by pointing to the gross mismanagement of this government. I don't think that anyone needs any greater evidence than that which is presented by the rating agencies of North America. Those that do the credit rating for all of the provinces in Canada, they are concerned about what's happening to the provincial fiscal situation because of the mismanagement of this government. And I submit to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the taxation policies of this government and their

mismanagement has contributed to the kind of reports that we are getting from the credit rating agencies.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan no longer believe what this government has to say, whether it's on policies dealing with social issues or whether it's on policies dealing with taxation. They no longer trust it, because the people of Saskatchewan want a government that's committed to fairness. That has always been the case in this province; that is the historical tradition of the people of Saskatchewan, who knew generations ago that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I will pause while the members opposite have what they want to say from their chairs.

An Hon. Member: — Why did you lose? Answer the question. Answer that simple question.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, are you going to call the member from Moosomin to order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, or do you just call certain people to order?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I say that the people of Saskatchewan no longer believe this government, and when I say that, I seem to hit a very sensitive note over there. They all erupt in their seats. They all erupt in their seats and they scream and they holler — particularly right now the member for Moosomin who's not running again so I guess he doesn't care — and that only happens, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when members on the opposition obviously strike home. And he is certainly showing that we have struck home here this afternoon. The reason, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the people no longer trust this government is because they know it's not committed to fair taxation. The member from Elphinstone, the Leader of the Opposition, explained that very well.

The members opposite are quite prepared to say people who make a great deal of money should be allowed to use all kinds of exemptions in order that they can reduce the amount of income tax that they pay. One of the members opposite, from Saskatoon, talked about what he calls a death tax. Well I think that that . . . He now knows it was a very unfortunate question to ask from his seat, because it was then pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition that in today's terms people could deduct \$1 million before they had to pay any taxes. But on the other hand, under the used car sales tax, a teenager of 19-years-old, or someone who is on his first job — making a living — who bought a second-hand car and paid \$200 or \$150 in sales tax, cannot get the same kind of treatment.

And that's what we're objecting to here today, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We're objecting to that kind of unfair taxation policy which has grown and developed in this country over the years. And it continues to grow even more unfair under the present government of this tripe, both here in Saskatchewan and in Ottawa. And so the resolution, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is one that I think is worthy of support by all members of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this motion is about a central issue facing the people of Saskatchewan today, and as I said it's about the unfair tax increases that this government has imposed. All across Saskatchewan — in cities, towns, and

rural communities right across the province — we're hearing more and more people say that they are deeply disappointed in this government because it promised to cut taxes for working families and for farm families, but it broke that promise by imposing the biggest and the most unfair tax increases in Saskatchewan history.

Now here in the legislature, even with its huge majority, this government refuses to even debate the three Bills which have been on the order paper for many, many weeks since the beginning of this session. Each time that those Bills can be brought forward dealing with the flat tax, dealing with the rebate on sales tax on used vehicles, this government does not allow them to be debated in the legislature.

Mr. Speaker, that tells you something about the attitude of this government. And the Saskatchewan people are particularly disappointed about what they see as this PC government's double standard — one set of rules for the rich and the powerful and the political friends of the PC government opposite, and another set of rules for ordinary people.

And I know that the members opposite, because they don't like us to talk about this subject, they shout from their seats. They don't want to hear how much more and more Saskatchewan people have become disappointed by this double standard which they have imposed. But there have been too many examples, too many instances where this government shows it had one set of rules for ordinary Saskatchewan people and a very different set of rules for its political friends.

And Saskatchewan small-business people have some first-hand experience of this double standard when it comes to taxation and other policies. Just ask an architect, or just ask a consulting engineer or a contractor, Mr. Deputy Speaker; just ask them about open competitive tendering and political friends of the government. They understand the PC policy of patronage only all too well, for they have been its victims. Or just ask some small-business operators about the \$10 million give-away to millionaire Peter Pocklington.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order. The member is straying considerably from the motion under debate, and I would ask him to come to order and stick onto the topic.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I will abide by your ruling. I think I have made my point about the double standard and the unfair taxation policies of this government, and the used vehicle sales tax which this government refuses to abolish legally, which collected more taxes from the people who could least afford to pay the, people who buy second-hand cars — not people who buy new cars like cabinet ministers over there — but people who buy second-hand cars because that's what they can afford. Those people were having to pay a new and an increased tax. But people who came in to set up some friends of the government, like Peter Pocklington, who came in, was able to get \$10 million handed to him because he's a friend of the government.

Now I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that that is an example of unfair taxation. Those 18- and 19- and 20- and

21-year-olds — those people who have families and bought a car that was second hand because that's what they could afford — did not expect that that tax that they paid should go to pay off a Conservative buddy from Alberta by the name of Peter Pocklington. That's the double standard.

Those people do not think it's fair or correct that they should have to pay a tax, and they can use that money very badly and very dearly. They do not expect that they should have to pay that tax while oil companies, some of which haven't paid any taxes to the federal treasury for years and years because of tax deferrals, should get \$300 million a year.

There is nothing fair about that kind of tax policy, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and that's why this resolution is here today, because it's an opportunity to have it debated. And if the members opposite had any concern or had any desire to be re-elected in the next election, whenever they have the courage to call one, they would seriously consider supporting this resolution here this afternoon and then doing something about it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, tax increases in Saskatchewan, which include the sales tax on used cars, vehicles, and which include the flat tax, have had a significant impact on people who live here. Let me give you an example of the impact that these tax increases have had on two categories of people, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Let us take the person who is earning \$20,000 a year, and I will use the figures that are provided very kindly by the Minister of Finance, so they're not my figures, but the Minister of Finance in his budget speech, which I have here, has provided what kind of taxes and services a person who makes \$20,000 a year, who has a spouse and two children, has to pay. Well you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in 1986 under the new budget, that person earning \$20,000 a year because of these tax increases and others, is going to pay \$761 more in taxes and charges than that same income level paid in 1982.

And all I'm doing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is taking the numbers from the charts in the 1982 budget, and the numbers from the charts in the 1986 budget. And you can do your calculations, and the members opposite who may desire to stand up and speak in this debate can do their calculations, and they will find that because of the conservative unfair tax policies, that person who's earning \$20,000 a year with two children and a spouse — not a very high income in this day and age — that person in this year is going to pay \$761 more in taxes and charges than he did in 1982. That seems to me to be a very unfair tax system.

Now let's look at another comparison. Let's look at the same kind of family who has an income of \$30,000 a year. Once again you can take the budget documents from 1982, and you can take the budget documents from 1986, and you can make the comparison. The charts, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are identical. The same taxes and charges, and when I say taxes — just so the members do not think that I'm trying to confuse anybody — I'm talking about charges that the government makes on Saskatchewan citizens. And they include the following:

provincial income tax, tax credits and rebates, health premiums — we don't have health premiums in Saskatchewan yet under this government — retail sales tax, gasoline tax . . .

An Hon. Member: — Gasoline tax.

(1545)

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I'm even including, yes, gasoline tax. The members opposite say, gasoline tax. For the sake of fairness, I'm including the gasoline tax in 1982, which doesn't exist in 1986. Keep that in mind. It also includes the car insurance which is a government charge; telephone, which is a government charge; home heating, which is a government charge; and electricity, which is a government charge. Those are the items.

Considering those items, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I remind you again that a family of four with an income of \$20,000 a year in this year, under this election budget, is going to pay \$761 more than it did in 1982. Now when you consider what inflation has done to the purchasing value of the dollar that those people earn, the kind of price increases that they have seen in the food that they must have to buy, that is a very high increase in taxation.

Now before I gave the outline of the items, I said I would give you the statistics for a person earning \$30,000 a year, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Let's have a little order in the Assembly so we can get on with the debate.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm glad you called order because I really want the members opposite to hear this next one. And I'm going to talk about the person from a family of four with an income of \$30,000. Do you know how much taxes that individual is going to have to pay more this year than they did in 1982? Seven hundred and sixty-six dollars — \$766 more. Why? Because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government chose to put on a new flat tax, which is a double taxation; they chose to remove the property improvement grant, which is an increase in property; and in return, they chose to mismanage the province, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which has created a debt of \$8.7 billion that these same taxpayers over the next generations are going to have to pay back. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is not what I consider a fair form of taxation.

Now it's particularly ironic when one goes back and considers what certain members of the opposition who are now the government had to say about deficits and taxes in years past. Here we are with an \$8.7 billion debt and a fiscal budgetary deficit of over \$2 billion. And what did the Premier have to say about that at one time? He said in 1982 in December, "Deficits are just a deferred tax that must be paid by future generations."

Well, boy, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he couldn't have been more right because future generations are going to have to pay for the mismanagement of this government. And people who have children in this province, and people who are young and just starting to make a living in the work-place are looking at this and they're saying they are

not prepared to take a chance for another four years.

What else did the Premier have to say? Well he said, "Deficit budgeting in Canada has to end if the country is to be competitive in world markets." The Premier, July 14, 1982. And do you know what it was called, this document that he was quoted from? The Evils of Deficits, Part II, by Grant Devine in the Regina Leader-Post. What a contradiction. What a contradiction!

And finally I want to give you one more quote.

I believe the kinds of things that we've initiated in this budget will be talked about for decades to come.

And this is in reference to the 1985-1986 budget, that most intelligent budget, which removed the former minister of finance from his former position to his new position. That was also stated by Grant Devine, the Premier of Saskatchewan, with regard to that deficit.

Well I want to say, Mr. Speaker, this resolution about doing away with the flat tax and rebating of the sales tax on used vehicles is proof that once again, in this case, April 17, 1985, the Premier was right. This issue will be debated. It's being debated today. It will be debated during the next election campaign because the people of Saskatchewan are asking that it be debated. The people of Saskatchewan are asking that it be debated, and they are saying that the flat tax, which is a tax on top of the income tax, has to go. And I want to put on the record, as has my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, done, that when a New Democratic Party is elected, the flat tax will be abolished.

And I want to say also, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan are saying that with regard to the sales tax on used cars, those people who had to pay it for six months shouldn't have to pay the price of a mistake which this government made. Why should a few people — not a few; many people — why should many people be punished because they bought a car within a six-month period that this government had the sales tax on used cars? Why should they have to pay that tax in the period of one fiscal year while the people who happened to buy a car in the other six-month period of that fiscal year don't have to pay that tax?

That's what's so basically unfair. And I know that members opposite really, deep down, agree with me on that, but they're tied, the private members are tied by the dictates of their cabinet and caucus solidarity and all those kinds of fine things that happen to apply in our parliamentary process.

I want to say very clearly, Mr. Speaker — welcome back — I want to say very clearly that when a New Democratic government is elected, if the people so choose, those people who paid a sales tax on used vehicles will have that tax rebated, because it's unfair. That's the commitment of the New Democrats. That's a commitment which we have put on the record in this resolution, and that's a commitment which we have put on the record in this debate. It's a commitment that reinforces our desire and our commitment to a fair tax

system. Not like the members opposite who talk about a tax reform and then do the complete opposite, but a commitment which I know the people of Saskatchewan believe will be delivered under a New Democratic government, as have all commitments made by the New Democratic party been delivered after that party was elected as a government.

Between 1971 and 1982, promises were made and promises were kept. Between 1982 and 1986, promises were made and promises were kept. And the highlight of this debate is the one that deals with, one, the promise to reduce income tax by 10 per cent, and instead we have a flat tax; the promise to eliminate the sales tax, and instead we had a sales tax on used vehicles, which some people should have rebated and have not. And because of this commitment of my party, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this resolution, and I invite other members to support it as well.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Myers: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me pleasure to speak on this motion put forward by the member from Regina Elphinstone. To say what I've heard in a few simple words would be putting it bluntly to say that those two members have blatantly mislead the legislature — blatantly! — because I hold up here in my hand the 1981 General Tax Guide for residents of Saskatchewan. And I went through it, and I want to make it this clear to the public, I went through it. Here it is. In 1981, what is the Saskatchewan tax on income taxable at 5,000? it was \$385.90. That was 1981. In 1985, which is the last tax year, and we've just finished filing for it, what was the Saskatchewan taxable tax that year? Three hundred and fifty-one dollars and thirty cents. If you added the flat tax to that amount, it is \$9.60 lower that you're paying taxes last year than you paid in 1981 — \$9.60 less, not more, not the \$400 they're claiming on the radio.

We've heard all their radio ads about the double taxation — \$400. Do you know that you would have to make \$80,000 a year to pay a \$400 tax? It was one-half of 1 per cent, but those members mislead the public. They went around saying 0.5 per cent tax. Well the senior citizens in my constituency mistakenly took it to mean 5 per cent — 5 per cent. And they were misleading the public, the senior citizens. Typical misleading, blatant lies — blatant lies. Totally blatant.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. I'm going to ask the member to withdraw that term. We don't allow that kind of language in this legislature.

Mr. Myers: — I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for saying that. I guess what I meant was that the members opposite have been misleading the public, and by reference to the material that I've read out, that is a clear indication that . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. I ask the member to withdraw those words.

Mr. Myers: — I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw those words, and I will continue.

For incomes of \$10,000 taxable in 1981, it was \$876.10. That's 1981, Saskatchewan tax payable. In 1985, same category, \$815.90 plus the flat tax, which brings it up to \$865.90, comes to \$10.20 less in tax payable this year than it was in 1981 under their government.

Again, the facts — the facts are here. The facts are here in the 1981 tax guide; the facts are here in the 1985 tax guide. And if the members knew anything about reading or going to the income tax payable, instead of reading out of their own propaganda, they would have gone to these two books and calculated the tax difference. And it shows clearly that we're paying less tax today, less income tax today, Saskatchewan side of it, than we were paying in 1981.

And I will continue, Mr. Speaker. For the tax payable category of \$15,000: — in 1981, \$1,433.90 — do you hear that? — in 1985, \$1,306.40, plus the flat tax brings it up to \$1,381.40. That's \$52.50 less, and it's here in black and white.

It's here in the federal tax books which are sent to every resident in the province. If anyone disputes what I'm saying, all they have to do is go back and check their records. They will find out they are paying less tax under this government than they were under the opposition when they were in power.

Here's another one, \$20,000 — because the member from North East mentioned the figure — \$20,000 tax payable: — in 1981, \$2,054.30; 1985, same category, \$1,839.80, plus the flat tax brings it up to \$1,939.18, \$114.50 less. Not the figures he quoted out of his own propaganda book which they published in the spring of '82; it's right here.

I would remind the member from Regina North East that these are taken out of federal publications that are sent to every resident in this province, and it's right here in black and white. And you have been misleading the public.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. When the hon. member was on his feet, he asked for orders that he could speak. And now I would ask him to give that decency to others.

Mr. Myers: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to also quote from the tax category of \$25,000 tax payable because he was alluding to that tax category as well. In 1981 the Saskatchewan portion of the income tax was \$2,753.80. Black and white — I'll table it for the member if he would like to go through it. Obviously he doesn't like reading the truth. Same category in 1985, \$25,000 tax payable category: — \$2,437.50, plus the flat tax — half a per cent, not the 5 per cent they were misleading the public with, half a per cent — \$2,562.50, \$191.30 less. Not more — less — less tax.

(1600)

And I invite anybody who's watching this on TV to write me, and I will provide them with a copy of the 1985 and the 1981 General Tax Guide for Saskatchewan residents, and they can make up their own minds as to who is telling the truth, who is misleading the public, and who is doing

this out of purely political reasoning. Our tax record: — we promised to take taxes off, and we did. In the last budget, not more than two months ago, we eliminated the 5 per cent sales tax on clothing up to \$300 — right across. Something they never did.

I'll ask them: — when did they ever eliminate a 5 per cent sales tax in the 11 years under their government? Not once, not once did they eliminate it. Not once because they never passed it. A bunch of promises in that book which never became law. It was purely propaganda on behalf of your part. But we took off the clothing tax, or the 5 per cent tax on clothing up to \$300, and that generally benefits the average person; that benefits everyone in the province, and particularly the lower income people. That's a general benefit to everyone — 5 per cent off clothing. They never did it. They had 11 years to take the tax off, but not once did they remove any tax.

We took the tax off power bills three years ago; took the tax off power bills, a tax that under their former predecessor, who was the CCF, had put on. They put on; we took it off. We'll make that clear that they put taxes on; we take taxes off.

We took the tax off gasoline less than 10 minutes after the cabinet was sworn in. That was a general saving of \$135 per man, woman and child in this province — the tax off gasoline. Why, when we were one of the two major producing oil provinces in the country, that we had to pay tax an our neighbours to the west, Alberta, did not?

And now when the Leader of the Opposition is questioned about the gasoline tax, he's telling no, we won't put it back on. Possibly they would come up with an idea of taxation on salaries — the one and one-half per cent taxation on salaries like they do in Manitoba. And who does that benefit? No one, no one. And that's a party and a government of the same political persuasion as they are.

We've also introduced a tax credit for union investment. But if we really want to get back to it, when the member from Regina North East, he mentioned all the other things about being fair, being fair — was nine and five-eighths per cent interest rates to the Cornwall Centre, and some eastern developers, was that fair to the general public? Not fair.

And he's sitting there. He was a minister of Finance; he's the one who signed this deal. Money to eastern Canada, money to his friends like Bob White; Bob White, the next leader of the NDP party in Canada. His friend, Bob White, centred around Ontario, and does not want to see any portion of the country grow except Ontario.

I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I will get back onto the issue of taxation, taxation indirectly into their government. They took \$270 million out of our pockets to put \$540 million into potash without creating one single . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order please. The member is speaking on a very narrow resolution. he's ranging much beyond it, and I would ask the member to come back to the subject.

Mr. Myers: — Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry if I'm ranging, but I'm just replying to topics that the member from Regina North East had brought up in his speech while you were absent from the Chair, Mr. Speaker.

Taxation happens to be one of the games they play very well. They convince the general public, and they put advertisements on radio and TV, and they mislead it in ads and newspapers about taxation, about taxation. About the flat tax, they misled the public. I have had numerous complaints and questions from constituents of mine regarding the advertisement they ran on the flat tax and how they misled.

I was talking to a constituent of mine not more than two weeks ago, and I asked him if he had any concerns. And he wondered why he was paying \$1,500 in flat tax. And I said, sir, you must be wrong, you must be wrong; it was one-half of 1 per cent. And when I sat down with him, I showed him that it wasn't \$1,500, it was \$150 for the salary category in which he paid taxes in. And that was the 1985 tax form which he had in front of him.

People who . . .

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

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I just wonder whether the member would entertain a question. Would he?

Mr. Speaker: — Would the member entertain a question?

Mr. Myers: — Mr. Speaker, the member had more than 30 minutes to lay out his case when he spoke in the House, and if he wants to entertain any questions, I will do that outside the doors of this Chamber any time. So if the member would like to entertain any questions, I'd be willing to take them outside.

But general taxation . . . They talk about the flat tax, the flat tax. It's the wicked, wicked tax. Well I'd like to remind the member from Regina North East that under their government over 600 people who paid taxes — I shouldn't say paid taxes because they never did — over 600 people, when they were in government, never paid taxes — people who made over \$50,000. And they call out for fair taxation when there's 600 people earning over \$50,000 and not paying taxes. It was their government that allowed it to happen, their government that didn't allow for fair taxation. The flat tax is to capture that portion of the market.

And they talk about fair taxation. The people on low income talk about fair taxation. And the flat tax is one point in fair taxation where you capture everyone in the province; no one is exempt. Under their government, when he was minister of Finance, that was allowed to happen. Six hundred people didn't pay taxes, and that's a real shame.

Mr. Speaker, since there are many more people who would like to speak on this topic, I will conclude my remarks by saying that if people want the real story about taxation, I would invite their calls; I will send them the material; they can see for themselves. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weiman: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My full intentions this afternoon in the House was to listen to the debate, and try to listen to it as calmly and coolly as possible; however, some of the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition and the member from Regina North East have impelled me and compelled me to stand and refute some of those statements which are completely and directly misleading, as the member from Saskatoon South has already proven in his case.

I do apologize in advance if I do sound a bit disjointed, and that is because the comments that came across the House this afternoon were disjointed. And I apologize for that in advance, Mr. Speaker. I may be ranging afield a bit, but that would be in terms of refuting what they had said. And I will not apologize for that, of course, because I believe some of the statements that they made demand a comment back and in terms of refuting what the statements they have brought up.

You know my first impression this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, when I was sitting and listening to the debate by the Leader of the Opposition, was something that we're all familiar with in terms of a television show. And I don't intend to give a plus to any particular network, but here are many people who watch the Johnny Carson show. And by and large what will happen on the Johnny Carson show about once a month when he doesn't have any appropriate guests, he'll bring on some old hoofer from the 1940s or an old singer from the '40s and get them up on stage and say, give it one for show business.

And he'll get up there and he'll sing the old songs and dance the old dances, himself never having remembered that he's not 20 years old any more and he's not 30 years old any more. He's carrying a couple of extra pounds around the waist. The voice is going off key. But he still gets out there and gives it the old song and the old dance. And the first impression we have when we see that, and we say, gee isn't that fantastic; you know, I can remember that guy from the '40s in the movies, and it was just great movies this guy was in.

But then, you know, a little later as we're watching that performance, we start to get embarrassed sitting at home in our own little rooms watching that television show. And we're not even near California and we start getting embarrassed — we get embarrassed for this old hoofer.

And then eventually what happens is, the respect that you had for the hoofer of the '40s who you admired in the movies, after awhile it doesn't become embarrassment any more; it becomes pathetic. It becomes absolutely pathetic, because here is a person living in the '80s still believing in the songs and the dances of the 40s, and it just doesn't wash — and it just doesn't wash.

You know, the Leader of the Opposition started his comments by quoting from a lot of campaign literature. And I remember very clearly, and I believe *Hansard* will show me to be correct on this, he stated that the member of Shellbrook's literature said that they would phase out the E & H tax — the Progressive Conservative Party, once

in government, would phase out the E & H tax. And I agree with that; that is exactly what the literature said.

However, he went on to say over and over again — and again brought back by the member from Regina North East — that we'd eliminate it. Now what is the story? Even that song and dance that we're getting from across the floor does not have the right words to the song. First they start out by saying we'd phase it out and then flip-flop real quick and say, eliminate it. And I would hope that they would get that straight so that they would be able to present a common and logical argument to the populace of Saskatchewan.

I am amazed in talking about taxes, and particularly the E & H tax, Mr. Speaker. I do again want to quote the member from Elphinstone of a couple of days past when we were talking about just one component of E & H, not the total package. And of course a segment is part of the whole, so I want to continue on in this. And I will quote him verbatim. he said:

The measures to remove the 5 per cent E & H tax on clothing up to \$300 (and I will quote, says) it's relatively small.

Relatively small. The Leader of the Opposition, the bastion of the ordinary people, states, it was relatively small. You know, when the housewife goes shopping for clothes for herself or clothes for her children over 14 years old and doesn't have to pay that E & H, I guess she probably thinks it's relatively small, especially when they are on pinched budgets, as the members opposite are alluding to. I suppose in her mind she says, well that's okay; it's just relatively small; the Leader of the Opposition said it's relatively small.

The trade worker — again the champion of the tradesman, who has to buy coveralls, who has to buy work apparel — I'm sure when he goes into his store . . . And the Leader of the Opposition would have us believe that he's not going into Dorn's or Caswell's. No, because that's too expensive for them. He's going into Woolco. I'm sure that when this tradesman goes into Woolco to buy his coveralls, and he goes and pays his money at the till and the lady says, no, there's no more E & H on this and hands it back, I'm sure he says and he appreciates when he goes home to talk to his wife that afternoon: — gee, isn't that great; that was relatively small. That's what the Leader of the Opposition said; it was relatively small.

The champion of the "ordinary person," to be able to stand in this House and say that — I would hope that some day, on a Sunday or a Friday, that you would go to a shopping mall. And if you would stand in front of one of those stores as every member comes out of that store with a purchase, and say to them, straight in the face; you ordinary person, I fought hard for you and I will continue fighting hard for you; and that 5 per cent E & H tax that you just had off of your clothes, don't worry about it; it's relatively small.

That is ludicrous. It is embarrassing, as I stated earlier; it is pathetic.

I could go on more about this E & H on clothing. But as I

said, Mr. Speaker, it is a segment, being a segment of the whole. But I just wanted to get that point through, because it epitomizes the type of logic, and a lot of times disjointed and fractured logic, that I've heard in my four years in this House.

(1615)

The member from Elphinstone, the Leader of the Opposition, also went on to state this afternoon that a person who takes advantage — and that's not really the correct word, advantage — a person who, within his rights as a citizen of this province and therefore of this country, who can read a tax form correctly and can find ways of saving themselves some tax money which is theirs, that there is nothing wrong with that. Well, one of the rare times in this House, I will concur with that. I agree with you, Leader of the Opposition, on that.

Then he went on to state that if there was anyone to blame for that, it should be — and I will quote again and *Hansard* will bear me out on that because I listened with great enthusiasm and attentiveness when the Leader of the Opposition, because I have to explain to my constituents what he really meant because many times they don't believe what they're hearing. So I'll quote: — if there is anyone to blame, "lay the blame on the lawmakers."

Again I agree 100 per cent with him. That is part and parcel of the responsibility that I take as a legislator. When I, along with my colleagues in this Assembly, pass laws, I have to be willing to take the responsibility for laws that are unpopular, laws that may at one time seem just and a little later on may be unjust. So I agree 100 per cent with the Leader of the Opposition. Well I would like to quote: — "lay some blame on the lawmaker." And I will even underline that. I would like to lay some blame on "the" lawmaker, the past premier of this province.

What type of blame should we lay on a government that increases personal income tax from 34 per cent to 51 per cent? We have the member from Elphinstone stand in this House and berate a half a per cent flat tax, berate 5 per cent E & H tax on used cars — which is his right — but do it with such an angelic face, almost a saintly demeanour, and forget in all honesty and integrity to remind the people what lawmaker should be blamed for the 34 to 51 per cent increase in personal income taxes while they were government.

We've heard the expression "crocodile tears." I've made the allusion to the "wolf in sheep's clothing." I far prefer that television show I was telling you about earlier.

But you know, a lot of times when you're talking to the public, per cents are sometimes difficult to be understood. And then the Leader of the Opposition alluded to that. He said, you know, the tax forms are hard to understand. Sometimes they're difficult to fill out correctly, to come out to the best advantage of the taxpayers. So instead of just talking about that 17 per cent, I would like to put it in a little bit clearer perspective.

The first year of office of the members opposite, personal income tax revenue in this province that was brought into the coffers was \$63 million. When they left — and, I might add, not through their own volition — in 1982, personal income tax brought into the province of Saskatchewan under their increases was \$511 million. Sixty-three million dollars to \$511 million. Over 800 per cent increase in actual dollars — 800 per cent! and to stand there, with that angelic countenance, and tell us that we are the lawmakers that should have the hands of blame laid upon, well, we'll let the public make their judgement on that.

The Leader of the Opposition also went on to state that the taxes that have been imposed by this government are totally unfair — totally unfair. And again, it is his right to state that. Again, when we look at something we see it from two different perspectives. But what about E & H tax on utility bills — is that fair? No. Who put them on? Who took them off? What about phenomenal increases in utilities to the users — was that fair? No.

But I think I have to be more specific on that, more specific on that. They made this allusion to the oil companies and the gas, and how much it costs and all that. Let's talk a little bit about that. We are all familiar in this province with the huge profits from SaskTel when you were in government. And your members have stood up, the member for Shaunavon stood up in this House many times and states, we couldn't help but make money in those days; things were just great. A farmer couldn't go poor in those days; the crops were great and the prices were high. But you made sure and ensured that in those great days, that you brought utility rates, not so much commensurate with that, but above that profit margin. And here is a party, a party that does not believe in profit.

I'll tell you what your party believes in. Your party believes in capitalizing on profits, but socialize every loss you can find. That's what your party believes in. But anyways, the natural gas to heat our homes — and I'm only picking a few years. If I took the whole 11 years I think even the member from Athabasca would leave this Chamber in shame. I'll just pick a few, just a few: — 27 per cent in crease in 1975; 17 per cent in '77; 15 per cent in '81 — over 60 per cent.

Natural gas rates: — over 120 per cent in that same time frame — 120 per cent. But with the illogical kind of thinking, that's fair: — the same kind of comment and the same kind of logic that would suggest, as I mentioned earlier, when that person comes out from the supermarket and you touch the hand of that ordinary person and say, don't worry; when there's a 5 per cent tax taken off of your clothing, that's relatively small — that's relatively small.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition also went on to state that of course we're going to defend the oil companies. We're giving all this money away to the oil companies instead of their proper taxation rate for them. The member from Elphinstone, the Leader of the Opposition, full well knows as past premier of this province, as past Finance minister of this province, that the highest royalties in oil and gas in this country are in

Saskatchewan.

Now who's gouging who? Who's taking advantage of who? He also full well knows — in terms of moneys that come to the coffers in which the governments can use to spend on programs for the people of this province — he full well knows that over 25 per cent of the revenue that's generated in this province comes from the oil sector. But he won't state that. He will make them look like corporate criminals — corporate criminals — instead of stating the truth.

You know, I don't mind as a member, after four years in this House of having people say, look, you did give tax breaks to the oil companies for drilling. I don't mind that; it's truthful. And when I do see my constituents, I can tell them that. You don't have to be embarrassed or hide from the truth. I don't mind that.

But for Heaven's sake, Mr. Speaker, you would think that all honour — and we do have that appellation as Hon. Members in this House — that in all honour that you would be able to give the full story of the truth, and tell the people that those big, mean oil people out there give us over 25 per cent of our revenues to build hospitals, to build nursing homes. But no.

Now it's amazing, *Beauchesne's*, the book that we go by, the referee's guidebook in this House, states that there are certain words that cannot be used in this House because they are unparliamentary. Mr. Speaker, if I had an opportunity to edit that book, there would be words in there that may be non-parliamentary, but at least they would be honest, that could be used in this House. Because there are certain words that should be used to describe those members opposite, which I can't in this House without having to sit down.

Now the Leader of the Opposition also states, and takes the time to politicize a bit — and I don't really have any difficulty with politicizing, whether it's out on the streets or in the Assembly. I mean, that's the business we're in. We're in the business of politics. We are not here to exchange recipes, but we're here to talk politics. So the member from Elphinstone stands up and says, but we're here to talk politics. So the member from Elphinstone stands up and says, but if we are government. You know, a nice little campaign speech from the Assembly. We'll beat this; we'll do that; we'll do this; we'll do that.

Well my mother always told me that I would be judged by the character of the company that I keep. So let's just look at the company that is kept by the members opposite. The only — the only — comparison that I can make, because there are no other NDP governments in Canada, the only comparison I can make is the Government of Manitoba. Now let's just judge the character of the companions that we keep.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. I would ask the member to come back to the subject of the debate.

Mr. Weiman: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can appreciate your ruling. It's always precise and it's always correct. I apologize for straying from that field. However, I did want to talk about tax. It has to do with E & H tax. And if you should rule me out of order again, I will dam well

accept your ruling.

The E & H tax of Manitoba, up 5 per cent . . . 6 per cent. Talking about taxing ordinary people, they tax ordinary people to go to work. They have an employment tax in Manitoba — ordinary people, ordinary people.

You know, another comment made regard in taxation in this province. There's been a lot of comments made about taxation in this province in so far as whom should we tax. Let's go out and tax all those rich people. Let's get all those rich people taxed. Let's get at it. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what income members opposite are, but I want to tell you I don't know very many rich people in this province. There aren't very many rich people in this province. To quote the Leader of the Opposition, there are a lot of ordinary people in this province, but there aren't very many rich people in this province.

But let's pretend that there are a lot of rich people in this province. Well let's just keep taxing them, and eventually with that type of mentality what happens is we've got a lot of poor people in this province because you can only go to the wells so often. And you full well know it from your years of experience, as soon as you went out with the gaff to get those rich people by the gills, those people left this province. And when they left this province, jobs went down with it. But no, you would bleed them of every cent you could to equalize the so-called "socialization" of this province, in terms of fairness and equality. There aren't that many rich people here.

(1630)

You know, I do not for a moment apologize or am embarrassed by my stand on my type of philosophy, my type of thinking. I've been lambasted, and I've been castigated for being a free-enterpriser for thinking that way. At least the members of the opposition would have me believe that there's something wrong with entrepreneurship. Well first of all, I don't make apology for it because I do believe, and I do believe the majority of the people in this province, in terms of their heritage, in terms of the trials and tribulations they went through to open up this province, firmly believe that by putting effort and hard work into any enterprise — whether it's a farm, whether it's your teaching job, or whether it's a business — you will get ahead. And the majority of the public out there do believe that.

But let's talk about that. If I was of a different philosophy, this great equality of tax reduction, this great equality of tax payment by the taxpayers, as the NDP would have me believe . . . Well if I really believed in this socialization — which some call socialism, which some call the NDP party — but if I really believed that, and I was a member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, I'd want to sell half my farm and give it to the ordinary people. If I was drilling wells in Shaunavon, I might want to share some of that money . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. I would ask the member to stay on the subject. You've been drifting several times now, and I would ask you to get back to the subject of the debate.

Mr. Weiman: — Okay, Mr. Speaker, I apologize. You're absolutely correct; I have to agree with you. Mr. Speaker, I know I'm not supposed to question the Speaker, but are the terms . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please.

Mr. Weiman: — I'll probably be called for unparliamentary language on this, but I would say to the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg: — grow up, will you.

In terms of taxation of the rich — and that was brought forward by the member from Elphinstone, the Leader of the Opposition: — let's tax the rich. Well I don't think it's ever been stated publicly, because I don't know if politicians want to take statements like that. But, you know, it is the rich that help keep this province going, and I will say that publicly.

The person who has the million dollars does not run off to Dairy Queen to buy snow cones; he takes that million dollars and he reinvests it right back in this province if the climate is appropriate. And when he reinvests it back into this province, he creates jobs, and those people who have jobs can pay taxes.

An Hon. Member: — You're in fantasy land.

Mr. Weiman: — It is not fantasy land, the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please.

Mr. Weiman: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will not continue with that type of topic because the members opposite consider that fantasy land; when you create jobs, that's fantasy. You see that goes along with their thinking about tax breaks being relatively small and not amounting to anything. That's fantasy also. So I will not continue on. I just want it to be on the record that the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg considers job creation fantasy, and it is not important.

The Leader of the Opposition also went on to state that there should be some reform to the taxes and to the tax schedules. And then he also went on to state that the average person does not understand it or can take full advantage of it, and I agree with that part, with that part. Unfortunately, not all of us in this province are Nova Scotia lawyers who can look at a tax form and figure it out sufficiently to our benefit.

But you know, the public, I am convinced — and I am willing to take the retribution for any comments I am about to make regarding that public right now — the public, I am convinced, is not so much concerned about what can be written off, what can be used as a tax dodge. what they are more concerned with — and the member from North East who was so in touch with that mass out there of ordinary people should well agree with me — what the majority of the public are concerned with in terms of their tax dollars is how judiciously is it spent. Because if they believe that it's fairly spent and correctly spent, then they are willing, as good citizens in this province, they are willing to pay their

fair share of taxes. It is only when they think it is not fairly spent do they get angry, and justifiably so — and justifiably so. And I will be talking about the fairness — the fairness to answer that concern of the taxpayer of where it is judiciously spent. I have a few more . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. I've called for order several times now, and I'm going to ask the members to contain themselves. I've given this side of the House the opportunity to speak. Now give this side the opportunity.

Mr. Weiman: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again very precise and correct . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member from Regina North east — and I usually do not allow myself to be entrapped in catcalls from the opposition — but the member from Regina North East has suggested that I should check the galleries because I guess the implication is that that is the stage and that's who I should be speaking to.

That's not important. What is important is that I speak through this Chamber, not to the press gallery, not to visitors in the gallery, but to members of my constituents and tell the truth. There are more comments I would like to make in refuting the Leader of the Opposition, but my fellow colleagues have more than enough on their plate.

However, I do want to turn my attention to the member from Regina North East. He made reference that money spent by this government through our taxation policy, " . . . has been wasteful spending. Wrong priorities."

He talked about deficit and fails to remember — fails to recall - the dictate of his own leader. Again we have this flip-flop and again we have this schizophrenic type of logic. One day it's Dr. Jekyll; the next time it's Mr. Hyde. He fails to recall the Leader of the Opposition has stated publicly that . . . And I will quote as close as I can: — " . . . that in tough times there are necessities for deficits." But no, that doesn't matter, you see, because that's not the comment at the time. He was trying to prove his own political point.

But anyway, coming back to the wrong priorities, wasteful spending. Spending is wrong. "Gouge the taxpayer." Well let's talk about gouge the taxpayer. Let's talk about gouging the taxpayers. Rural gasification for farmers so that their heat costs go down, which comes from taxpayers' dollars — is that gouging the taxpayer? Is that money well spent? Lower the interest rates for farmers — is that gouging the taxpayer? Is that money well spent? Stabilization programs for the farmer, flood assistance, aid in time of grasshopper pestilence — is that gouging the taxpayers? Is that money well spent?

Go out to the rural areas occasionally — and I appreciate that you and I are both city boys — but go out into the rural areas occasionally and ask farmers if they were gouged by our tax increases. You ask farmers whether our taxes and our taxation policy has been fair to them in terms of the expenditures that we spent on them. Go out to the rural areas and ask them that.

And I'll tell you what the farmers will say to you. You would not dare go ask a farmer that because the farmer is very well aware and has a strong memory of Russian

thistles. And the last thing they want to see you get is another Russian thistle.

Let's talk about the old folks and our taxation policy. Let's talk about the old . . . because you brought up senior citizens. And the taxes that we generate, whether it's through income tax or whether it's through E & H tax, and then we spent on programs for the citizenry of this province. Go ask a senior whether a \$1,000 program to upgrade their house — which would not only upgrade their house but enable them to stay in a home environment as opposed to a senior citizens' home — ask them if that was an unfair tax. Ask him if he was gouged.

Go to a senior citizen in my city, because obviously you're not talking to the senior citizens in your city. Go to the senior citizens in my city and ask them whether our taxation policy — which allowed for the building of a 238-bed nursing home in my constituency which I'm very much proud of, which allowed them some hope of getting into adequate nursing home facilities which were not available to '75 with your moratorium — ask them if that's gouging; ask them if that's unfair spending of the tax dollar.

You mentioned now . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member from Regina North East is now crying because I am bringing this up, and begging upon the Speaker to sit me down because I'm straying afield. You brought up unfair tax policies; you brought up the topic of spending unwisely, and I will quote you: — "not only spending unwisely, wasteful spending; wrong priorities; gouging the taxpayers."

Putting up two new high schools in the city of Saskatoon after 15 years of no high school was like putting blinkers on and stating there were no increases in high school students in the city of Saskatoon for 15 years, and you're telling me that was wasteful spending? The opening of multiple schools throughout the city of Saskatoon is wasteful spending?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. I know that both sides of the House have strayed at times from the subject of the Bill but I would ask the member now to stay on the subject of the Bill for the remainder of his topic. He has had plenty of latitude, and stay on the subject herein.

Mr. Weiman: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: — You've run out.

Mr. Weiman: — Oh no, I'm not run out. I'm not run out. the stories that could be told in this Assembly and told to the public would be more in length than the Thousand and One (Arabian) Nights stories. I could keep the stories going for a thousand and one nights.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going . . . I have things to say, yes, definitely. It's just that I am trying to say them in such a way that allows me to continue on in terms of talking about E & H tax.

An Hon. Member: — . . . (inaudible) . . . the Speaker.

Mr. Weiman: — I would never disagree with the Speaker,

you know that full well, because there have been occasions when I've had to sit as the Deputy Speaker and I would never disagree with that Chair, unlike certain members in this House who will try to bait.

As I stated, I want to discuss topics in terms of the 5 per cent, the flat tax, taxation policy, and how moneys are spent — how moneys are spent.

We have heard references to the types of taxations that we have, and we've had references of taxations that the opposition members have had. Now the opposite members would not want us to bring up the succession duties because they said in terms of . . . well it was \$1 million before any taxes went on — \$1 million before any taxes went on.

You know, it wouldn't matter - it wouldn't matter whether that money was 100,000 or 50,000 or 25,000. When a person goes out and through their lifetime's toil generates an income and savings, and have that eroded and taken away from them at a time when the whole family is most susceptible — and that time is the time of death — and then turn around and ask for interest upon this money if that money wasn't made available immediately, I think that is why the farming community has this great mistrust for the members opposite, and why the members opposite would be unwilling to go to the farm community to talk about programs that were initiated these last four years — \$28 million — 28 million.

(1645)

Mr. Speaker, we have seen many taxes collected in this province — and I have in my short lifetime — that were totally unfair. And again I'm being very careful because of only responding to what they termed unfair tax increases — unfair tax increases.

If I purchase something and I have to borrow the money in order to do it, and then I have to increase taxes to pay for the borrowed money that I borrowed plus its interest, I think there is a direct correlation there in terms of taxation. And I would think that the whole Assembly would agree with me on that.

Now if I go out and borrow . . . Well I won't turn it around a different way. The greatest tax increase in this province came to a billion dollars, a billion dollar tax increase of which the members opposite will not shout too proudly about. That billion dollars was made up of over \$600 million borrowed on the open market in New York, and \$400 million borrowed in that same market to buy potash mines, to buy uranium mines, but did not create one extra job. I know it's . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order.

Mr. Weiman: — Mr. Speaker, yes, the member has lots to say, Mr. Speaker, the members of the opposition do not want to hear about their taxation. Fair. That's fair? There may be at times when I have strayed afar and I've already apologized to you for that, but I had to try to make a point. Because you see there isn't much difference in the spectrum of past, present and future; and the game of politics goes exactly that route. Because as you've done

in the past, your tendency is to do in the future. I can only talk about my present administration and the good things that we have done. But yet, if the members opposite are willing to use scare tactics on that public, I have to talk about the past and the present.

However, I will not go any further on it, Mr. Speaker. All I would remind the Assembly and this House is that I am proud of the policies that we've brought forward. I'm proud of the programs that we've brought forward. My colleague from Saskatoon South has indicated the fallacy, the hypocrisy — if not the outright misleading of the Assembly — in terms of the taxes paid in '81 versus '85, with the flat tax included, I think we have done exceptionally well.

And we have done exceptionally well in times that were not this flush rich times of the '70s that you were in power, but times in which there were downturns in the economy — times in which segments of our society not only needed tax relief, but help. And no matter how sophisticated and smug we get sometimes, when we think in terms of the great diversity of this province, of oil, potash, gas, uranium, there is a . . . It's coming together.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. When I'm on my feet, I'm going to ask the members to be quiet. If the member has anything further to say on the topic, I'll hear it. Otherwise we'll move on to the next member.

Mr. Weiman: — I'm still here. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I first of all . . . First of all, I abjectly apologize, and I will specifically go to the taxes.

All I was wanting to state is the farm community is very important to us, no matter how sophisticated we get, to think that we're just city. However, in conclusion, in conclusion, I think the message that has to go out to the public of this province regarding taxation, in so far as the costs with the flat tax included, require a review.

And so I just want to state one last time . . . in fact, the first time for myself, Mr. Speaker. In 1981 a person making \$5,000, their income tax load under the past administration, for the provincial side of the tax, was \$385.90. In 1985, under the Progressive conservative government, that same person, at \$5,000, would have paid \$351.30, which is a decrease, and which the members opposite are stating isn't much. It's that relatively small thing that the Leader of the Opposition had indicated regarding the E & H tax — relatively small. And I can appreciate that 85 take away 51 looks like \$34. But it was a \$34 decrease. But in terms of the inflation rate, in terms of 1981 up to 1985, that \$34 is more than the \$34. A person having to pay tax on \$10,000 in 1981 — \$876.10.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not asking for order; that's not my role. But, Mr. Speaker, I think they were very much taken by the Johnny Carson story, because they're asking me to repeat that again. And I don't think you will allow me to because I've already stated about the old duffer, so I would ask them and invite them to read *Hansard* tomorrow for the conclusion of the Johnny Carson story. I think you'll find it enlightening.

At any rate, 1981, somebody paying taxes on \$10,000 — \$876.10. In 1985 it was \$815.90, which again is a decrease; it looks like a decrease of \$61. And again they would call that a decrease, relatively small — \$61 that is in your pocket to spend. And again, taking into account the inflationary spiral from '81 to '85, that \$61 would be more than the \$61.

In 1981 on \$15,000, Mr. Speaker, it was \$1,4330.90, again taken from the tax supplement that comes in your taxes in 1981, the Saskatchewan portion of it. In 1985 it was \$1,306.40, which is over a \$100 reduction. With the flat tax, with the half a per cent flat tax included, it's still a \$100 reduction. And again in terms of the spiral of inflation from '81 to '85, it is worth well more than the \$100. In 1981 the . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please.

Mr. Weiman: — In 1981 a person paying on \$20,000 is \$2,054.30; in 1985 . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I would caution the member from Regina North East that this is about the fifth time that I have asked for order and you continue to shout, along with others, but I want you to maintain order.

Mr. Weiman: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That is over a \$200 decrease at \$20,000. Now I know that in this province there are a lot of people not making \$20,000, but there are a lot who do.

Again, taking into account the inflation spiral from 1981 to 1985, that would be worth more than actual \$200 decrease; it would be far larger than that. And that's only if we took the percentage increase in the economy year by year, '81, '82, '83, '84, and '85.

In 1981, for a person having to pay tax on \$25,000, would have paid \$2,758.80; 1985 it would be — and it was, rather, not would be, it was, on that \$25,000, \$2,437.50, which by my reckoning is over \$300 decrease, which again is more than the \$300 if you take into account the inflationary spiral.

Mr. Speaker, I think this proves very well that the taxpayer of Saskatchewan, in whatever category they wish to quote or spout, is paying less in 1985 than they were in 1981 under their term of administration, and yet they would have the public believe otherwise. As the member for Saskatoon South has indicated, he would make readily available to any person in this province these statistics — so would I — to show and prove the point, I would hope that constituents of the members opposite, their constituencies would ask them for a copy, and as well-meaning and good MLAs they would present that and show it fairly and truthfully.

Mr. Speaker, there is so much more, there's so much more I would like to continue on. I would love to talk more on tax reform. I would love to talk more on E & H . I would love to talk more about future plans, and I would just leave the House with this last question: — what would you really do? I mean, tell the folks, what would you really do? Now don't just keep harping on what we did, which we have already reviewed and shown, and you have misled

the House, but what would you do?

Mr. Speaker, there's so much more I wish to say. However, with the time approaching 5 o'clock, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:57 p.m.