

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Solomon:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's with a great deal of pleasure this afternoon that I introduce to you, and through you to all members of this Assembly, 46 grade 5 and 6 students from Al Pickard School in my constituency on 7th Avenue North. With them are two teachers, Mrs. Verna Taylor and Mr. John Lukomski.

I ask all of you to take great interest in the question period, and I hope you enjoy your visit to the Legislative Assembly today. I look forward to meeting with you at 2:30 for pictures and refreshments and to answer any questions you may have about government or this Assembly. I please ask all members to welcome the students from Al Pickard School.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you, and to the members of the Assembly, some 17 students, grades 3 and 4 from the new Saar School in Kronau. I am very pleased they could join with us. They are accompanied by teacher, Shirley Drever; chaperon, Holly Matt; and bus driver, Mr. Fred Eberle.

I would ask all hon. members to join with me in welcoming the students to the Assembly. I wish them a very enjoyable afternoon and a very, very safe summer. I look forward to meeting with them after question period.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to at this time, with great pleasure, introduce to you and through you to the Assembly, a group of 32 students from the Osler School accompanied by their principal, Mr. Reg Peachey and teacher Glen Osmond. It gives me great pleasure at this time to welcome the students here. I hope you have an enjoyable visit and learn something about our democratic process. And I'll be meeting with you shortly after the question period, approximately 2:30. I would just like to indicate that these children seem to be carrying on the good tradition. Osler School happens to be the school that I spent about four years as a teacher myself. So welcome here, students.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce to you, and through you to the Assembly, 57 students from Judge Bryant School in grade 7 and 8, accompanied by their teacher Wayne Wilson; by their chaperons Al Chase and Mrs. Astrid Thom. I hope these students enjoy the question period. I look forward to meeting with them in about three-quarters of an hour for pictures, and we'll have a discussion about what you saw.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have a group of students from my constituency who are here today from Montgomery School. I believe they're in the gallery, your gallery, Mr. Speaker. There are 22 of them from grade 5. They're accompanied by teachers Lorne David and David Brown, and their bus driver is Mr. Ron Hawkins. I, like the other members, look forward to meeting the students and learning about all of the problems in Montgomery Place in Saskatoon Riversdale. Thank you, sir.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Public Protest at Legislative Building

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. Mr. Premier, on Saturday an estimated 7,000 people from across this province marched to the Legislative Building in the largest public protest this province has seen in 25 years. And my question to you, sir, is: in the light of the fact that we have had what is unquestionably the largest public protest in this province in 25 years, will you now listen, and will your government reconsider its unfair and uncaring policies introduced in the budget, and will you propose some changes before we are asked to vote finally on that budget later this week?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm not so sure that the people who gathered outside on Saturday knew that the Manitoba government was now sending cancer patients to Saskatchewan for treatment because they haven't got the facilities in Manitoba. And if you want to look at the demonstrations that were held against the members opposite when they were in government putting people back to work, you'd find that they were larger than those that were here on Saturday. And the hon. member knows that.

The combination of the fact that people in Manitoba, under the NDP government there, cannot have cancer treatment, and they have to wait up to six weeks, and medical people in Manitoba are requesting Regina hospitals to treat them here, seems to me as an indication of perhaps some of the talking about of both sides of the mouth that goes on in the policies and the programs of the members opposite. Maybe they should demonstrate in front of the legislature in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, where they do need some help in funding health care.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if I might recall the Premier to the province which he professes to be premier of, and to ask him whether or not he does not believe that a demonstration of that size which we saw on Saturday, including members of the clergy, and farmers, and wage earners, and women and children, and representatives of native people, and

people with disabilities and the like, do you not agree, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Premier, that that was an outpouring of feeling, an outpouring of concern about your policies, to which you should now respond and change the budget which we are now debating in this House?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, with our budget we're going to have to spend a good part of it treating people from Manitoba because they are going to be coming here. In the paper today it says they're asking the hospitals in Regina and for Saskatchewan taxpayers to pay for health care in Manitoba because they won't fund it.

Now, if we want to talk about Saskatchewan — the hon. member asked about Saskatchewan . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Yes, I did.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — We are going to have to spend it on Manitoba people. Plus we go back and look at the fact that under the NDP administration there was a stop in the funding for nursing homes; there was extra billing in Saskatchewan under the NDP; they wouldn't build enough new hospitals; no chiropractic programs; no new heritage program for seniors; long line-ups — and the former minister of Health would say line-ups were a sign of efficiency under the NDP. Health care funding was only \$742 million in 1982; 1.2 billion this year — up 63 per cent in the Saskatchewan . The NDP . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. Order, please. Order! The member from The Battlefords' outburst is completely unacceptable, and I ask him to please settle down.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — In the province of Saskatchewan, the people have looked at the NDP in the past and they say, where's the alternatives? Where's the solution? You didn't have a solution in '82; you didn't have a solution in '86; you haven't got a solution in Manitoba, because people have to come here to get health care.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we look at all the things they didn't do and all the things they didn't fund, it's pretty easy for them to say, well, call another election because we'd like another crack.

They just finished having a policy convention, Mr. Speaker, and they admitted they don't have any policies for farmers; they don't have any policies for health care; they don't have any policies for anybody.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. I was asking him about whether or not he felt the concerns expressed by the many thousands who marched on Saturday were worthy of his attention. Apparently his answer is no.

May I then focus the question, Mr. Premier, by saying this. I have a letter from a woman who writes as follows, and it's about the prescription drug plan:

I am 46 years of age with a 15-year-old daughter,

completing her grade 10. I have cancer and am currently living on two disability pensions which total \$1,053 per month. This is the total means of my support. I'm past medical treatment for cancer which means that I'm on morphine, sleeping pills, etc., to help cope with the pain and all the side effects until my time is up. The last straw is the elimination of the drug plan.

This letter is signed by a woman from the constituency of Arm River and, Mr. Premier, my question to you is this: are you prepared to say to that woman and thousands more like her that you feel that the cuts you have made in the drug plan are fair to the people of Saskatchewan and fair to a woman like that?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health in Manitoba has stood in his place many times and said this is a very fair program. The NDP talk about the program in Manitoba all over Canada. They say it's the best health care drug program you can find any place. Mr. Speaker, as I said on Friday — and as I said before — that if the hon. member wants to give me the specific information to the Minister of Health about some unique circumstance, we'll respond the same way the NDP do in Manitoba and that is, we'll look at that unique circumstance, we'll find out if there's some additional things that we should be doing.

**Ms. Atkinson:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The question is to the Premier. Hundreds of Saskatchewan dental therapists and other people involved in the dental plan marched to protest your government's unfair policies on Saturday. You've thrown more than 411 people out of work by privatizing the dental plan.

My question is this: how can you argue that the people of Saskatchewan support your privatization of the children's dental plan, particularly in view of the fact that a petition signed by more than 6,000 people from 253 different communities in this province was given to the Minister of Health? These signatures were collected within a 10-day period, even before you announced changes to the dental plan. Do you plan to ignore the views of these thousands of petitions, and do you plan to ignore the view of thousands and thousands of people who marched on Saturday?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, we are making the right changes to the dental program, the correct changes, so, Mr. Speaker, that we can provide excellent professional dental care for children from five years old to 13 years old — the best in the province and the best system in Canada.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, for the teenagers we've decided that there is something else that is more important in terms of priority. And the people of Saskatchewan believe that it's right. We've got the best health care treatment, the best dental program in the country for five-year-olds to 13-year-olds because the dentists are doing it.

And, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member didn't tell the whole story. She didn't say that the dentists are going to be increasing their staff; the dentists are going to be employing more people. And, Mr. Speaker, when we've helped train additional therapists to become hygienists, they're going to hire more of them. But I don't think that she mentioned that.

The people of Saskatchewan know this is the right thing to do for health care, the right thing to do for the dental program and, Mr. Speaker, the right thing for teenagers with respect to drug and alcohol abuse and other information that should be provided. Mr. Speaker, this is the right thing for health care.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### Service Cut-backs in Rural Saskatchewan

**Mr. Upshall:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Premier who is obviously living in a mythical world, because the people out there in rural Saskatchewan, farmers who I am in very close contact with, many of them participating in the march on Saturday, have expressed their concern that the government is cutting services to rural Saskatchewan. And the children's dental plan is just one example. Most of the 560 school dental clinics were located in rural Saskatchewan. Now those families will have to drive many, many miles to urban centres to get proper dental care for their children.

This is my question, Mr. Speaker: why are you adding to the burden of rural Saskatchewan, these rural families, facing . . . already facing hardship trying to keep their farms and their community? Why are you adding further burden to these people?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that with the NDP coming off their convention they'd have something else to offer, some additional new ideas for rural Saskatchewan. I read here from the president, the new elected president of the NDP:

If there was one place we were weak it was in policies for rural Saskatchewan.

With that question, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — I would just simply say this. Rural people want to see dentists and doctors in rural Saskatchewan, not all consolidated in the major cities. I know rural Saskatchewan as well as the member opposite. Rural people want to see the infrastructure go across rural Saskatchewan. That's why they like natural gas; that's why they like individual line service; that's why they like the new educational program and distance education. Mr. Speaker, we've done more for rural Saskatchewan than that government or those people did for the last 50 years — not only in Saskatchewan, but in this country.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — This month alone, Saskatchewan farmers will get \$675 million in cash in their pockets.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. Order.

**Mr. Upshall:** — Mr. Speaker, I again address the Premier with this question: I spend an awful lot of time in rural Saskatchewan, where a person in agriculture should spend his time. You couldn't convince a doctor in this province to move into rural Saskatchewan; what makes you think you're going to convince dentists to?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Upshall:** — I want to ask you about a letter which comes from the principal of the Rockglen School, and states clearly the kind of reaction that I have heard in rural Saskatchewan relating to the dental plan cuts, and he writes:

The changes to the plan will cause further disparity between urban and rural residents. To take their child to a dentist, for most urban residents, is at most a minor inconvenience to the regular daily routine.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. Order. Order, please. I will allow the member to make a brief quote from the letter, but it is a supplementary, so I don't think he should read the whole letter. Please make your point and put your question.

**Mr. Upshall:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I have one sentence left if I am permitted, in my quote.

For rural residents, it is a major disturbance which involves the loss of a day's work, a day's pay, and additional expenses involved travelling to the city.

Does the Premier deny that rural Saskatchewan is the hardest hit area, by the decision to privatize the children's dental plan?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, the NPD in Saskatchewan, when they were in government in Saskatchewan, were not successful in providing dentists and doctors to rural Saskatchewan. They're not successful in Manitoba. I don't know any place in the world, in fact, where they're successful at doing that.

I will say to the hon. member, if you want to see some dentists and doctors in rural Saskatchewan, you just watch this administration. There will be dentists and doctors in rural Saskatchewan, and you can count on it.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### Reduction in Chiropractic Services

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Premier, among the thousands who marched on Saturday, were those concerned about your plans to reduce coverage for certain kinds of medical care, such as chiropractic service. I have here a copy of a letter, the original addressed to yourself, of

which I got a copy. Since the Premier seems to have a difficulty concentrating these days, let me repeat for your benefit a couple of the key sentences. It's from a lady in Kamsack:

I am a patient who receives treatment twice a week. I suffer from severe headaches and lower back pain. If I miss a single treatment, the pain becomes, at times, unbearable. Belonging to a low-income family, it would be extremely difficult to afford treatments. Please reconsider your decision to cut chiropractic treatments.

Mr. Premier, have you not received thousands of letters like this, and how do you respond to the Saskatchewan people who say they're not going to be able to afford the way you're building Saskatchewan?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, I will let the Minister of Health respond in some detail. I will just say this. With respect to Saskatchewan people, senior citizens have more financial assistance than they've ever had in the history of Saskatchewan. The health care budget in this province is higher than it's ever been, 63 per cent higher than when you were in government — 63 per cent higher — and the highest ever in the history. When we're dealing with specific projects and specific programs. I'll ask ministers to respond to more detail. Minister of Health, please.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, as it relates to the question related to a letter that the member from Regina Centre received, I would ask the member from Regina Centre the following, and the public of Saskatchewan: have you seen any changes in chiropractic service in chiropractic service in Saskatchewan? — that question. Have you? Has anyone over there, with all of your inflamed rhetoric, seen any change in the chiropractic services in Saskatchewan? Answer that question if you ever can, to the public of Saskatchewan — to the public of Saskatchewan.

What we have said in our discussions with the chiropractors, Mr. Speaker, is the following. We have said this province is the only province in the Dominion of Canada that does not have a cap on the number of visits by people to chiropractors.

We've said that that's true, and we continue those discussions with the chiropractic profession, as we do continue discussions with the physiotherapy profession. Those discussions continue. There has not been a decision and there has not been a cut in either of those things, despite all of the rhetoric of the group opposite, despite all of the scare tactics of that group with the various people in this province, including some of the people involved in the demonstration referred to here earlier, Mr. Speaker. Those are the kinds of things that have been going on, and just in fairness to the public of Saskatchewan I think it's extremely important that that be put in perspective.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Shillington:** — The lady from Kamsack hasn't seen

anything. She has heard you announce that chiropractic visits will be limited to 10, and that's the source of her concern. Is the lady from Kamsack not to believe anything that this government says? Is that the correct approach?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — No one in this province has heard me announce that the chiropractic visits would be limited to 10. No one has heard me say that, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Supplementary. Is the right figure 12?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — No one in this province has heard me say that the chiropractic visits would be limited to any number — would be limited to any number. What I have said is: we are looking at a cap on the chiropractic services. We will look at that, and we will continue to discuss it with the chiropractic profession as is going on at the present time. And I might add to that as well, the physiotherapist profession has also entered into discussions with us, and those are ongoing.

So for the . . . What I just want to reiterate again, Mr. Speaker, and it's extremely important for the public of Saskatchewan, many of whom will write letters to the members opposite, to other members of this House . . . Many of my colleagues have received similar letters. We will all receive those letters, and all I say to the people of Saskatchewan is the following: when there is a decision and when the negotiations with those two professions are complete, there will be announcements. And I would suggest to all hon. members on both sides of this House, in fairness to the public out there who receive these services, don't inflame your rhetoric too hot.

### Opinions of Clergy on Government Policy

**Mr. Calvert:** — My question is to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. I was happy to be among the group of 7,000 admirers of the Premier who were here on Saturday. And frankly, Mr. Speaker, I haven't found so many clergy and church leaders in one place since the last clergy bonspiel.

Mr. Speaker, clergy and church leaders across the province have been eloquent in expressing their concern about this government. I can illustrate that with a quote from a letter from the Very Reverend Duncan Wallace, Dean of Qu'Appelle and rector of St. Paul's Anglican Cathedral, written to the Premier. He says in part in the letter:

The drug plan, the dental care plan, and similar programs, have been some of the attractive things about life in this province. It has appeared to me for some time now, and more so with these latest announcements, that your government is in the process of purposely destroying much of the social fabric so carefully and innovatively built up over the years in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Premier, my question is: do you propose to continue ignoring the advice of clergy and church leaders from across this province?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that I invited all the church groups from across the province to meet with me and my cabinet. And we discussed it with them all afternoon. And we had a great deal of support from church groups in that meeting, Mr. Speaker — a great deal of support. We didn't have unanimous support, but we had a great deal of support. And I would say over 60 to 70 per cent of the church groups represented there knew exactly what we were doing and said, you have to be responsible in this province, make improvements to the dental program, improvements to the health care program. And, Mr. Speaker, we said that's exactly what we're going to do. We're going to protect seniors, and we're going to provide that program so that we are protected into the future and not just let it hang out there in jeopardy like we see with the NDP in Manitoba.

Let me add, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is worried about the social fabric of any jurisdiction in Canada, he could take as many people as he likes . . . And look at what's going on in Manitoba where they have to send our patients into Saskatchewan so that we have to pay for their medicare, their social service programs. They have the lowest welfare programs, welfare assistance in western Canada, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, the Premier seems so enamoured by Tommy Douglas and the Manitoba government, perhaps we'll have a new member before long.

Mr. Premier, you see to have some difficulty answering our questions. Will you answer the question asked by Rev. Wallace in his letter to you on June 12? Rev. Wallace asks:

What will be the next step? Will your government next tamper with what is probably the best universal hospital and medical care system in North America? Will we soon hear of people refused admission to hospital because they have no money?

That's Rev. Wallace's question. Would you please answer it?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, in my response to the Reverend I will say very clearly and I'll give him the facts. So as I said to the church groups when they met with us, I believe that the church groups want the truth. Right? That's what they want.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. Order! Order, please. Order. Order.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, and the truth is: health care expenditures in '81-82 were \$742 million. And the truth is, Mr. Speaker, this year they're \$1.2 billion — a 63 per cent increase over the NDP administration — which is the largest in Canada. That's the truth! Now, I'll say to the . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. Order! Order, please. Order, please.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — They don't want to listen to the facts, Mr. Speaker. The truth will be in the letter that says that we have increased funding and we have the largest health care budget, not only in the history of Saskatchewan, but any place in Canada on a per capita basis, and we dwarf the expenditures that you will find in Manitoba where they have to send their cancer patients here. And I would send church leaders to Manitoba if they want to find out how you tax poor people, how you would tax them for food, and tax them on gasoline, and a payroll tax, and tax them on clothes. The poor in Manitoba under the NDP are taxed every day, Mr. Speaker, but not in the province of Saskatchewan where we have the best health care system any place in Canada. That's what will be in my letter.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### Spending under the Dental Plan

**Mr. Goodale:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier, and has to do with the arithmetic that the government is using in relation to the dental plan and the cuts that they've announced.

A newspaper report on Saturday indicated that the government's specific figure for the dental plan for children is \$8.5 million in the coming year; that last year, the actual expenditure under the dental plan was 11.4 million.

The newspaper quotes the Minister of Health as saying the cost per student is less for service supplied by dental therapists than by dentists. If that is the case, Mr. Premier, if that is the case, that the service is more cost efficient when provided by dental therapists which the Minister of Health has confirmed in this newspaper report, and last year the budget was 11.4, this year it's reduced to 8.5 millions, how in the world can you propose to provide the same kind of care to the children who need it when you're using a more expensive service and a less overall budget?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should know that when you take out the teenagers, you're going to save \$3 million — \$3 million. And when you're going to provide the service to young people going to professionals — the dentists themselves — that you're going to provide much better service. Now the combination of the two will save us, and I believe the minister will respond in some detail, over \$5.5 million. And it will be the best professional dental program that you'll find any place in Canada.

Now it's true, parents will have to take their children to the dentist. They'll have to do that. And for most parents I believe that that's quite reasonable that they do that. And they will be provided with completely paid for, best dental program you'll find any place in Canada.

With respect to additional detail, I'd ask the Minister of Health to respond.

## POINT OF ORDER

**Mr. Romanow:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before the orders of the day, I wish to rise on a point of order respecting one aspect of question period today which I would ask you to look into, sir, and then provide us a ruling. That has to do with unfortunate habit of the Premier giving an extensive reply to a question and then requesting a minister to yet even add extensively to the reply, in effect having two answers to one question.

I would submit, sir that that is out of order. If it is in order, then I suppose what we ought to do in opposition is to ask our questions in seriatim and in parts by the same token.

And therefore my submission to you, sir, on the point of order, is that the Premier has the choice of asking a minister to answer on his behalf or answering the question himself, but he does not have the choice of giving partial answer and then asking a minister to yet elucidate or elaborate upon that answer. That's my point of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I thank the hon. member for Saskatoon Riversdale for bringing this matter before the attention of the House, and I will defer my ruling until I have had an opportunity to study closely the transcript of today's question period.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### SPECIAL ORDER

### ADJOURNED DEBATES

#### MOTION FOR COMMITTEE OF FINANCE (BUDGET DEBATE)

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Lane that the Assembly resolve itself into the Committee of Finance, and the amendment thereto moved by Mr. Tchorzewski.

**Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of the amendment and to oppose the cruel and deceitful budget of betrayal proposed by the Minister of Finance last week.

It was clearly a budget of betrayal, Mr. Speaker, and I say that because it not only betrayed the election promises made by the members opposite and their party — and let us just take a quick review of that record of betrayal of promises made and promises broken.

We had an election promise by a government that inherited the best health care system in Canada and promised to make it number one, and on Wednesday of last week that was a promise broken, Mr. Speaker.

We had a promise made by a party sitting opposite to reduce income tax, and on Wednesday last again it was a promise broken, Mr. Speaker. There was a promise made by the members opposite prior to their election in 1982 to remove the gas tax, and on Wednesday of last week, again, another promise broken, Mr. Speaker.

We saw the evidence of that promise broken as we drove

through our constituencies since midnight, and as I drove down Albert Street into Regina this morning, I noticed over and over again the signs of promise broken on that one, Mr. Speaker. As I drove down Albert Street, I saw a Shell station that said, gasoline, 46.9 cents. And the subtle message there, Mr. Speaker, is that you can't trust a Tory. I drove a little further, and I came across a Petro Canada station that said, gasoline, 46.9. You can't trust a Tory. I came to another gas station, Mr. Speaker, an Esso station and it said, gasoline, 46.9, and you can't trust a Tory.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hagel:** — And I listened with interest, Mr. Speaker, to the member from Moosomin on Friday, who stood and began his debate in this legislature in response to the budget by saying — and I quote from the member from Moosomin. He said:

I want to begin my speech today by acknowledging the fact that these are not easy times for the individuals and the families of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, what the member from Moosomin was saying, these are tough times, and as people across Saskatchewan are saying over and over again, Tory times are tough times, and that's why we've got tough times today.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hagel:** — It was a budget of betrayal; not just betrayal of campaign promises, but a betrayal of the fabric and the culture of Saskatchewan people. We have in this province, Mr. Speaker, a culture that is unique in Canada. We have in Saskatchewan a people who believe and subscribe and live according to the principles of caring and sharing. We have in Saskatchewan a people who believe in neighbour helping neighbour. This budget was a betrayal of the very culture, of the very core, of the heart and the spirit of Saskatchewan people.

Is it any doubt that young people are leaving Saskatchewan today in hordes. Is it any doubt that people in Saskatchewan today are becoming angry — over 7,000 marching on the Legislative Assembly building on Saturday because of their anger with the fundamental dismantling of health care and social services and education in the province.

Let me give you just an example, Mr. Speaker of what I believe to have been a well-established trend that was exemplified by the Minister of Finance some months ago. When the members of the media said to the Minister of Finance, they said: My goodness gracious, you've discovered this new financial problem. Doom and gloom has hit Saskatchewan. Didn't you know that we had a financial mess before and during the election. And what did the Minister of Finance say in response, Mr. Speaker? What he said in response was: What do you expect? We're politicians.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, if just for a moment the Minister of Finance had a moment of honesty running through his veins, he would have said: What do you

expect? We're Tory politicians. That's what he would have said if he was being honest.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hagel:** — I detest, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the constituents of my riding, the sadistic way in which the Minister of Finance has marched out the cuts over the last couple of months, and the devastation and the pain and the anger that people in my constituency and across the province have felt as we had government by ambush. We all recognized the government by ambush that we saw, Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Finance would poke his head out from behind closed cabinet doors. He'd stick his head out in to the hallway and gather the media people and tell them who he was hammering today. And after having said that, he's sneak back in behind closed cabinet doors. Government by ambush. And the despair that people felt as they . . . there was literally a rush of despair in our constituency offices.

I heard people coming in expressing their concern and their fear as we heard the announcements about the increase in nursing homes rates of \$73 a month; as we heard about the home care rates being increased by 66 per cent for seniors who wanted to live out their time, in their failing years, living in their own home without having to move to a nursing home; the rush of despair as the transition houses for battered women and children to provide protection were cut.

And then we saw the government backtracking, with a bit of a public outrage. We saw in Moose Jaw the Wild Animal Park, which is the source of visits for families — 165,000 people a year, Mr. Speaker, come to the Wild Animal Park in Moose Jaw. We see this government threatening to — literally, literally threatening to — get rid of the animals and turn it into a picnic park. We saw in Moose Jaw the St. Anthony's Home, a nursing home, in which there were promises made with great enthusiasm, with all kinds of hyperbole for two consecutive years — key campaign planks of the two Tory candidates in the last election — that the St. Anthony's Home would be built. It would be built because the local people had raised the money — over \$1.1 million raised in the city of Moose Jaw and surrounding areas — needing to be matched by 1.3 million government dollars, and we saw that promise yanked away, Mr. Speaker.

We saw the Saskatchewan Technical Institute, after having lost 33 instructors through early retirement have 32 laid off callously, and six more at Coteau Range Community College.

We felt the frustration the people had with the delay of the call of the legislature, and their fear around the announcements, contrary to, I believe, the messages that the Minister of Health believes he may have been sending about chiropractic care and prescription care and dental care. Four hundred jobs lost at the supposed saving of \$500,000 - a half a million dollars.

And now we've seen the introduction of a flat tax in this term of office, and that being extended again in this budget. We've seen the sales tax and the gas tax. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, the gas tax, with a system that is built

to accommodate these seats, this is a plan that is tailor-made for people of the Tory way of thinking, who can manipulate the sales receipts and bring about a greater amount of destruction of the solidness of our resources in this province, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that one of the members wishes to introduce some students, and I'll stop for a moment to allow for that.

**Hon. Mr. Klein:** — Mr. Speaker, with leave — I hate to interrupt this eloquent delivery on the budget debate — but I would like to introduce some students, with leave.

Leave granted.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Hon. Mr. Klein:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to the entire Assembly, several young people from the constituency of Regina South that are sitting in the west gallery. And they are grade 4 and 5 students from W.C. How School.

I watched the school being built a long time ago as my children were growing up — they didn't attend W.C. How, but rather Deshayes, but a lot of their little friends went to W.C. How. I know a lot of the parents in the area. And they are accompanied by their teacher, Ms. Jill Ready, who is an annual visitor at the legislature with her students. And also with them are their chaperons, Pat Hartner, Barb Layton, and Randi Kennedy. I would ask all members to welcome them to this Assembly.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Speaker, members from this side of the House join with the members opposite as well in welcoming the students here, and we hope that their stay will be an enjoyable and educational one.

## SPECIAL ORDER

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### MOTION FOR COMMITTEE OF FINANCE (BUDGET DEBATE)

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Lane that the Assembly resolve itself into the Committee of Finance, and the amendment thereto moved by Mr. Tchorzewski.

**Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, it has been a long and agonizing process for the people of Saskatchewan, as the Minister of Finance well in advance of his budget trotted out the cuts and the hammering of Saskatchewan people. And I note with interest, and I note with sadness, Mr. Speaker, that as a result of the economic management of the members opposite and the Progressive Conservative government here in Saskatchewan, that we now officially, once again, become a "have not" province.

And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that all of this has happened, not because of circumstances that are purported to be

beyond our control. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this plan of destruction and deceit has occurred by plan. It has occurred according to the plan of the members opposite in an attempt to fundamentally dismantle Saskatchewan society and to change Saskatchewan society from being a caring and sharing people, people who say people come first, to people who are forced to consider that possibly profits have become before people. I think, Mr. Speaker, that that is the plan that we're merely seeing the symbols and the symptoms of now.

And I ask: if the members opposite were to ask themselves, how do you go about changing Saskatchewan people from a caring and sharing society, where neighbour helps neighbour with joy — how do you change that people? What you do is this — and this is the answer — you create such a financial mess in this province that no longer can a fiscally prudent people, like the people of Saskatchewan, like the responsible people of Saskatchewan, can no longer feel comfortable saying that people have to come first, and somehow you try to create a readiness for them to accept the argument that we have no choice. And that's the plan, Mr. Speaker, that's been carried out with far greater astuteness than many in this province are willing to subscribe to the members opposite.

And I ask the members opposite: do you ask us to believe, do you ask the people of Saskatchewan to believe, that you are so incompetent . . . you are so incompetent that you could take a \$139 million surplus and turn it into a \$3.4 billion deficit in less than six years. Do you ask us to really believe that you are that incompetent?

(1445)

Now I believe you've created a mess; no doubt about that. But I do not believe, Mr. Speaker . . . I say to the members opposite, I do not believe that you are as incompetent as you look. I do not believe you are as incompetent as the people of Saskatchewan say you are. I do believe that you have lied and you have intentionally acted with deceit to create a crisis. To create a crisis intentionally in the hopes that Saskatchewan people will put profits before people, and that's what's been done.

Let's just simply look at the track record of budget predictions, Mr. Speaker. And what do we find after inheriting \$139 million surplus? In the first year that this government opposite had to manage the economy and the budget of Saskatchewan, they forecast a \$220 million deficit. And at the end they say, whoops! We missed it by seven million; it was a little higher than we thought.

In their second year they said we're going to have a \$317 million deficit; somehow we're getting better control and at the end they say, whoops! We missed this one by 14 million. In the third year, Mr. Speaker, they said, we're going to tighten our belts, and we're all going to pull together, and we're only going to have a \$267 million deficit, and at the end of the year they said, whoops! Missed this one by 112 million. The fourth year they said, we've been seasoned in government, and we know the operations of government now, and in this fourth year we're going to have a \$291 million deficit. And in the end what did they say? They said, whoops! Missed it by \$293

million.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it came to the year before the election, and we were assured that they had control of the finances of the province of Saskatchewan. They say, now we're only going to have a \$389 million deficit. And what did they say at the end of that one that we heard last week, Mr. Speaker? The Minister of Finance stood up and he said, whoops! We missed it by \$846 million.

And then what did he tell us? He told us that in the interest of fiscal restraint, because this government has finally gained control of the finances of this province, we're only going to have the record predicted deficit since this government has come into office, and they're telling us this year we're only going to have a \$577 million deficit, Mr. Speaker. Can you believe what they say, when you see what they do? And why are people in Saskatchewan saying, you can't trust a Tory?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hagel:** — The members of government know, Mr. Speaker. They know that Saskatchewan people want good government. They want good government that provides high quality health care that everyone can have access to, and that you pay for according to your ability to pay, not based on how sick you are.

They know that Saskatchewan people want access to quality education where more than one out of every four students who applies to get into post-secondary education has a chance to get an education for their future.

They know that Saskatchewan people believe in a system of social services which ensure a right to security and dignity. But these concepts, these concepts, Mr. Speaker, are foreign to a government that is drunk with lust for power at any price and obsessed with the dynamics of an outdated notion of unfettered free enterprise. They know that Saskatchewan people will not accept that concept on their own.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hagel:** — What did they do? They made some choices . . . they made some choices. That's what public policy is all about. They made some choices. And what did they choose, Mr. Speaker? They chose over the past five years, to give more than \$1.5 billion, royalty holidays, to oil companies.

They've made other choices. They chose to give patronage jobs to defeated cabinet ministers and PC party presidents — they chose to do that. What else did they choose? They chose to give millions of dollars to Peter Pocklington, that free enterpriser from Alberta who sought to be the leader of the federal Progressive Conservative Party. They chose to give away a \$250 million pulp plan to Weyerhaeuser.

They made more choices for the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. They chose to give low interest loans to farmers across Saskatchewan, whether they needed it or not. They chose to give half-prices jacuzzis and hot tubs



and carpets to people in Saskatchewan without requiring that they create a single hour of work.

They chose . . . they chose more. They chose to hire fat political staffs for the Premier and the record number of cabinet ministers. They chose to send their cabinet ministers around the world. And I say, Mr. Speaker, because of their choices they are now saying, the government has made its bed, but the people of Saskatchewan have to lay in it.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hagel:** — And they've made those choices, Mr. Speaker, simply to try and force, to try and force a caring and sharing Saskatchewan people to accept a demented Tory view of the world, a view of the province that is causing people across the entire, beautiful province of Saskatchewan to need health care more and more, because quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, the government opposite is making them feel sick.

And I say, I say that the people of Saskatchewan will not buy it. The people of Saskatchewan care too much to buy it. And I say, as we saw on Saturday with over 7,000 people marching on this building, that the people of Saskatchewan are madder than hell, and they're not going to take it any more. And that is why literally thousands upon thousands of Saskatchewan people are saying to the Premier of this province: you don't have a mandate; you don't have a mandate to dismantle this province; you don't have a mandate to take it apart. And if you are going to do the responsible thing you will show the guts to call for that mandate by dissolving the legislature and calling for an election, so the people can decide.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hagel:** — Well the deceit goes further, Mr. Speaker. It goes into the Department of Social Services, and let me move my comments to that for just a moment, if I may.

You will be aware, Mr. Speaker, as will others, that over the past months as a result . . . partly as a result of the government having said in the Speech from the Throne that it intends to review the delivery of social services, so too the members on this side of the House said that the delivery of social services needs to be reviewed, and we felt that the people of Saskatchewan should have some say. And so we formed a task force, Mr. Speaker, and toured the province and listened to the real people of Saskatchewan.

And what did they tell us, Mr. Speaker? They told us several things. First, they said that as people come increasingly under stress, so too does the Department of Social Services. And let me give you just a small example of that, a small example that affects tens of thousands of people in this province. In this beautiful province, with all the resources that we have, there are 62,000 people living totally dependent on social assistance as a form of making ends meet, Mr. Speaker. And out of those 62,000, 29,000 of them are 19 years old or younger — they're young people.

We may say, well what about the children? We found, Mr. Speaker, that in Saskatchewan today, 14 years or younger, there are 23,000 young people — 23,000 children — living in the province of Saskatchewan in families dependent upon social assistance. And perhaps saddest of all, Mr. Speaker, perhaps saddest of all is the little tykes, the pre-schoolers, the little guffers. Did you know, Mr. Speaker, that in Saskatchewan today there are 10,000 little children, four years old or younger, who are living in families totally dependent upon social assistance? Ten thousand little tykes living in poverty, without a lot of optimism or hope for the future.

And that's why, Mr. Speaker, people told us that as they come under increasing stress, so too does the Department of Social Services.

They told us as well that in tough times — and goodness gracious, the first line out of the mouth of the member from Moosomin was that these are tough times — we've heard it over and over again, that in tough times the Department of Social Services should be expanding, not contracting. And he told us as well that there is a dangerous shortage of social workers in Saskatchewan, trained professionals, competent and sensitive to meet the needs of Saskatchewan people in need.

When I turned to the budget estimates, Mr. Speaker, and I turned to the Department of Social Services, what did I find? I found that for the planned — for the year to come as compared to last year, there will be 73 fewer staff in the Department of Social Services. And I found, when I started comparing apples to apples, Mr. Speaker — because the estimates don't do that — I found that when we eliminate the part in the budget that is described as payments to the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation, because it simply wasn't there last year, so we want to compare apples to apples, I found that when we subtracted the amount that appears to be allocated for severance payments for people who have been let go, that totals just about \$4 million. And then when I found, Mr. Speaker, when we compare all of that to the actual expenditures of the Department of Social Services last year, we don't have an increase in the Social Services budget, Mr. Speaker.

When we compare the plans of this government to the actual expenditures of last year, when we compare apples to apples, Mr. Speaker, what do we find? We find that there is allocated for Social Services this year a grand total of \$16.5 million less, and a drop, a drop of 4.4 per cent allocated for expenditures in Social Services.

And I looked at a couple of specifics, Mr. Speaker, that affect those who are most poor and most vulnerable in our society. And I looked at the family income plan. Members of this House will know that in 1974 there was introduced in this province a plan to give some support and security to low income families, in particular the working poor.

Did you know, Mr. Speaker, that last year, in 1986, there were 38,000 eligible to receive financial help, families with children, from this plan that provides, on a sliding scale, up to \$100 a month for each of the first three children, and up to \$90 a month for each child after that?

Very significant amounts, Mr. Speaker, for families with children. Did you know that in 1986 there were 38,000 families eligible to receive help through the family income plan? Eight thousand applied. And of those 8,000, 4,000 are receiving social assistance and had it deducted, dollar for dollar, from their assistance.

I look at that, Mr. Speaker, and I say my goodness, what a communication problem the Government of Saskatchewan has with its people. We have an excellent program that's been in place for 13 years, that provides support for low income families, and we can tell them about it without it costing us a penny. Because you see, Mr. Speaker, every year the Government of Saskatchewan sends a health card to every family in this province, and we can simply include in that some information about the family income plan and tell low income families about some security that's there for them., and all they have to do is ask.

And so what do we find in the budget plan for the family income plan, Mr. Speaker? At a time in which Saskatchewan people are hurting like many of them have never hurt before, we find that the plan is that the Government of Saskatchewan will reduce the amount budgeted for family income plan by \$444,000 — reduced.

I look at the social assistance, Mr. Speaker. The social assistance plan, which is there to provide security for the poorest of the poor, for the least fortunate, and for the most vulnerable in Saskatchewan today. And what do we find there, Mr. Speaker? What do we find there in the Saskatchewan income plan, in spite of the fact that many of the poorest of the poor have had to bear the brunt of so-called economic jurisprudence or fiscal prudence. The poorest of the poor on social assistance, Mr. Speaker, in their allotments for rent and food and clothing, have not had an increase since 1983. The poorest of the poor, Mr. Speaker, those receiving assistance, have not had an increase in their household allowances since 1977.

So what does the plan . . . What is the plan? Is the plan . . . we hear this word welfare reform used; I say abused. For those people who are on social assistance and not able to live without it, is the plan to improve their lot in life, Mr. Speaker? Well, let's look at the facts, because we find that when we compare the budgeted amount for social assistance for the poorest of the poor in Saskatchewan in the next year, as compared to the amount actually spent, as compared to the amount of dollars actually spent last year, Mr. Speaker, we find that the budget tells us that we're going to spend \$13.3 million less — \$13.3 million less budgeted to provide for the poorest of the poor in our province today.

(1500)

Well I say, Mr. Speaker, the government has to be held accountable for making choices, and I've outlined in number that they've made. I say that there are choices that can be made. We do not have to make the choices that they are offering to the people of Saskatchewan today. They're saying that you can't afford to provide quality health care. You can't afford to provide quality education. That you can't afford to provide quality social

services to the people of Saskatchewan, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that that's bunk. Because they can make choices. They can choose to implement policies which guarantee a fair return from the natural resources of this province, Mr. Speaker. They can choose to do that. They choose to cancel them and they can choose to put them back.

They can choose to act with faith in the future of this province and the people of Saskatchewan with a long-term recovery plan, not this knee-jerk kind of performance that we've seen from the Minister of Finance last week. They can choose to maintain Saskatchewan control over our natural resources and agriculture, and stop the move to out-of-province control of agriculture and natural resources in Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hagel:** — They can choose, Mr. Speaker, to cut the political hacks or staff; they can choose to cut them in half, Mr. Speaker, to reduce them to the level of political aides that existed prior to their taking administration.

They can choose to fire their patronage appointments and send their former PC party presidents out to look for an honest job. They can choose. They can choose to create employment, Mr. Speaker, and I have a suggestion for a mere half a million dollars. They can create over 400 jobs by returning the children's dental program to Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hagel:** — They can choose to get to work making work, Mr. Speaker, by building nursing homes and hospitals and public housing and repairing highways, with a commitment to get Saskatchewan and Saskatchewan people working again.

They can choose to press the federal government, Mr. Speaker, to honour its commitments for equalization payments in health and education. They can choose, Mr. Speaker, to press the federal government to carry out real tax reform and cover the loopholes that are causing us to lose between 5 and \$600 million a year through the loopholes in the federal tax legislation. And they can choose, finally, Mr. Speaker, they can choose to put back health and education and social services the way they found them.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hagel:** — And if it doesn't want to make these choices, Mr. Speaker, if the government doesn't want to make these choices, then can it do one honourable thing? Can it make one honourable choice? Can it choose to dissolve the legislature, to go to the people of Saskatchewan and ask for a mandate to dismantle and wreck the province the way they're proposing in the budget we have today? That's the final choice, Mr. Speaker, and that's the one that the people of Saskatchewan are calling for.

And so for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of the amendment. I stand in support of this amendment

of non-confidence, because I believe that it is appropriate for this Assembly to condemn and reject the budget as one which betrays medicare; as one which betrays the people of rural Saskatchewan; as the budget that betrays Saskatchewan's young people; as the budget that betrays Saskatchewan's senior citizens; as the budget that continues this government's betrayal of Indian, Métis, and northern people; as a budget that betrays all the people of Saskatchewan because it misrepresents the size of the deficit and fails to acknowledge that this deficit has been caused by the government's failure to collect corporate and resource revenues, and by patronage to the government's friends. Because it's a budget that betrays the working men and women of Saskatchewan, and because it betrays the government's election promises. For those reasons, I will be supporting the amendment and opposing this cruel and deceitful budget of betrayal.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's indeed a pleasure to join in the debate on the budget debate in this session of the legislature. I listened with interest to the former speaker, and I must say this: If, judging from the volume of his rhetoric, misguided as he may be, I do believe he believes in what he is saying. I feel sorry that the poor fellow isn't on the right track and could not come up with some positive alternatives.

I listened with great interest to the latter part of the speech, to the latter part of the speech where he was going to do all these things: to go out and build nursing homes, and to build highways, and to continue to spend in the public sector. And never once did I hear one alternative from whence he would diversify the economy to get in tune with the world we live in, to bring about the revenue, to generate the revenue to service the needs of the province. He is still in the old school in the old socialist mentality of the '50s and the '40s, to just take from the public purse without thinking ahead into the future as to how we would use the engines, the economic engines of this province, to build a new society, to build a new Saskatchewan, to build a Saskatchewan of the 21st century.

And that, my friend, and Mr. Speaker, is the reason that the people of Saskatchewan elected the government of Grant Devine in October. Because they saw a vision, they saw direction, they saw change in building different from the old model of just government take-over and government expenditure.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Mr. Speaker, it's for that reason that I want to congratulate my colleague and a long-time colleague and seat mate, the Minister of Finance of the province of Saskatchewan, for coming down with what I believe in making some of the most difficult decisions, some of the most difficult decisions that political people have had to face in the history of this province. And I want to say to you and all members of this Assembly that my cabinet colleagues and I sat with the Minister of Finance and the Premier of this province, and we deliberated hours and hours as to how we could best structure a budget to meet the needs of our province at this time and

in the future.

And, Mr. Speaker, I say with all sincerity, that was no easy task. There were no easy solutions. I refer you, Mr. Speaker, to the budget address and to page 2 and 3. And I always say a picture says more than a thousand words. And I think if one looked at that part of the budget address you see very vividly the situation that is facing this province today, where if we look at the one graph at the bottom it says total "Saskatchewan Resource Revenues." And you see a tremendous drop.

Mr. Speaker, those resource revenues have dropped in price globally — not just here in Saskatchewan, not just in Canada, but in many cases, around the world except in areas where there has been deliberate attempts in the agriculture sector to subsidize.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that economies around the world are facing a different situation than they did 10 years ago. This is a much different world economically than the world that was here when I first entered politics. And the solutions that were there in those days will not provide the solutions to the problems that are facing us today. And I say it is in this vein that my colleagues had to make some choices, and I want to say again, choices that were difficult.

The simplistic way is to say we won't change anything. We won't make some hard and difficult choices. We will leave it as it is and we will add on extra taxes. That was the solution that was made in Manitoba, the greatest tax increase of any government in the country of Canada. They did not, the NDP in Manitoba, have the courage to address some of the problems of expenditure in government in that province. The growth in their civil service of their last few years has been in the neighbourhood of 40-some per cent; growth in administrative costs, about 195 per cent. But what did they do? Did they decide to limit or to scale down any programs? No. Their decision, the NDP simplistic solution, is to just add on more taxes. And as you can see, the Manitoba people are becoming near the highest taxed people in the Dominion of Canada.

And the speaker before me spoke about social welfare rates. If he would check and do a little homework, he will see that the people in Manitoba are far worse off at the lower end of the scale on social welfare than they are in Saskatchewan.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of thought and a great deal of deliberation that we had to make some choices. Yes, we made some choices. We've made choices since we became government. I remember back in '82 we made choices. We made choices to protect the interest rates that were causing people in this province to lose their homes. We made choices to use the public purse to shore up agriculture and to come forward with programs so that people in Saskatchewan would not lose their farms. We made choices to support the senior citizens of this province. We made choices to bring in a flat tax. We made choices to bring in an educational development fund. We made choices to go on the most unprecedented building of special care homes that this province or this country has ever seen. Yes, we made

those choices from '82 to '85.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — We made those choices, Mr. Speaker, and I believe they were the right choices. And I think when the people spoke in October they said, right on the money. We will re-elect the Devine government because you do make choices and you make choices in the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — No I don't deny that there are people in this transitional phase that are having some confusion and some concern. And based on the rhetoric of the people opposite, I can understand why. I would like to refer back to *Hansard* of June 17 when the critic for Finance stood on his feet in this House and said:

Our health care programs with this budget are being ravaged, so that the people will once again, in this province, live in fear. They will live in fear of catastrophic health care costs if they happen to get sick. This budget begins to turn the clock back (over) 25 (or 30) years . . .

He says the people in this government "live in the past." Mr. Speaker, I say, who is living in the past? Which side of this House is living in the past?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. I would like to beg leave of the House to introduce somebody.

Leave granted.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Speaker:** — Hon. members, we have with us a guest in the galleries today, and it's just indicative of the keen interest that Saskatchewan people have in politics. We know that in Saskatchewan we have people of all ages who take a very, very keen and active interest in the politics, and the individual I wish to introduce to you today epitomizes one of those.

She's from my constituency. Her name is Mrs. Powells — Mrs. Theodore Powells, and she's 90 years young. She has come here today to watch the legislature, and I ask you all to greet her in the best way possible. Please welcome her.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

## SPECIAL ORDER

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### MOTION FOR COMMITTEE OF FINANCE (BUDGET DEBATE)

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Lane that the Assembly resolve itself into the Committee of Finance, and the amendment thereto moved by Mr. Tchorzewski.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think all on this side of the House join in wishing your constituent the best in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying previously, that one has to diversify and develop the economy of this province if we're going to provide the money for the programs that we need. And I was pointing out about the misleading that is going on from the Finance critic on the other side of the House, saying that the health care plans of this province are being ravaged. I've heard speakers on the other side of the House indicate that we have taken away the dental plan or that there is no drug plan. This is absolutely inconceivable, misleading, and an attempt to mislead the people.

Let me indicate to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the drug plan changes that have taken place in this province are no different than what was taking place in Manitoba under the NDP. And I've been to Virden and I haven't seen anybody falling dead on the streets in Virden because of lack of drugs. And I've studied the statistics, and I believe the people live as long in Manitoba as they do in Saskatchewan. But here is this opposition opposite us, trying to scare people, trying to intimidate the old, trying to intimidate the poor, that it's going to cost X amounts of dollars. I looked at one of the speeches from the critic for finance and saying possibly \$500 for drugs for people in this province of Saskatchewan. That is nothing but a deliberate attempt to try and mislead people.

I predict, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when the people of Saskatchewan see how the drug plan will operate, which is no different than Manitoba, in fact an improvement over Manitoba, I want to tell them that I think in another month or two they will say: those were the right decisions; they were difficult to understand at first, but you were right on the money again, Devine.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, those are the things that it takes courage to do. I know from which I speak because I spent four and a half years as the Minister of Health in this province. And I know, as my counterpart who is occupying the portfolio at this time can verify through everyone here, and the members opposite should know, that one of the highest escalating costs in government was the drug plan in the province of Saskatchewan. So we chose to change it. I make no apology. We chose to change it. And we debated and we deliberated and we looked at drug plans across the province. We changed it, and I can say today that we still have the best drug plan in the Dominion of Canada.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

(1515)

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — And, Mr. Speaker, there were other areas that we had to look at. We looked at the children's dental plan. We looked at if there was a way that we could deliver that plan that would be more efficient, at the same time safeguarding the dental health of those people from five to 13 years of age. And yes, there is a change, and unfortunately there is some disallocation of people

who were once employed in the drug plan. But there are contingency plans to try and have those people reallocated into dentists' offices, to give them training to go back to qualify for the needs again of the later '80s and '90s. And those are changes that governments from time to time have to take.

**An Hon. Member:** — Responsible government.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Responsible government. And I say they're taken, not easy, not flippantly, but with consideration and with a great deal of thought. Those were some of the changes we had to make.

Now what is the alternative, I ask you? If you are running a government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the revenues due to your resources, which are on a global basis, on a global pattern, are down; if your oil revenues are down; if your wheat revenues are down; if potash and if uranium are down, what are your choices? Sure, you can choose as our neighbours to the east did and put on massive tax increases. We chose not to do that. We chose to look at cutting some of our expenditures because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to me, in my way of looking at an economic picture, if it isn't coming in on one hand, then you've got to tighten down how it's going out on the other.

And that is as simple as one could put it, and those are the choices that we were to make. But if you listen to the people across the House, Mr. Speaker, they say no, you shouldn't have a deficit. The deficit is tremendous; the deficit is terrible. And then on the other hand they say: but don't you dare cut programs, or don't you raise the tax.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, any free-thinking, sensible person knows you cannot have it both ways, that you have to make some choices, and that you have to make choices that in some cases in the transition may be difficult. I don't deny that, but that you have to make choices, and that's what you're elected for, is to govern and to make those choices that are in the best line with the ideals and the hopes and the aspirations of the people of this province.

And although there may be those who will demonstrate — and I see it's growing every minute — it was 5,000 when I walked in here; the last speaker had it over 7,000; before we finish tonight I don't know what it will be. But there will be those who will demonstrate, and in a free society they have every right to demonstrate.

But let them have time to see that the significant changes are not what the prophets of doom on the other side of the House say it will be. To go out and try and scare people and go out and intimidate them and incite them into going out there and protesting about things that they thoroughly don't understand, and we'll see in some period of time that it is not near as bad as the prophets of doom across the House would lead them to believe.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I tell you Saskatchewan. An example of where these people are . . . I want to give an example of just the other day in question period. And if you'd like to just pay attention, I think you'll understand what it is, even the member from Saskatoon. And that was to show just where the opposition are coming from.

My colleague, the Minister of Education, was questioned in question period about some cut-backs and some lay-offs in the institutes, and he gave what I thought was a very good answer. He said that there were programs — and I remember one — he said that there'd only been one graduate get a job in that program over the last four years. It was some type of refrigeration engineering, or something of this nature. He said there was only one job. And he said, I believe that it is wrong to train young people for areas of work where the economy does not demand their skills. This is what he said. The member for Saskatoon University jumped to his feet, and his reply was: will you today reinstate these 149 positions? Not whether they meet the needs of this society today, not whether they build for the future, not whether they help us diversify the economy. But please, I feel comfortable with the status quo; I want to look backwards; that's where I felt safe; please take me back to the '50s. That's what he was saying — please take me back.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Because with my socialist mentality, I'm afraid to face the future. I'm afraid to move into the world, the world that the Margaret Thatchers and the people who are leading are going to be shaping the destiny of this next century.

The old type of system where the government was in the pockets of everybody, where the government was all-encompassing, where it was from womb to tomb, that safety network is no longer affordable. We are changing in our society. We are moving ahead. And you will see more activity and more action by individuals, the private sector. I know it's an awful word to them, but more of that is going to come about not only in Saskatchewan, not only in Canada, but across the free world. Because that's what it's all about. That's where we're living, and that's what we've got to be equipped to deal with. And the old solutions, the old solutions of government doing it all are not adequate to meet the demands of today.

So therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what are people saying to government?

**Mr. McLaren:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to ask for leave to introduce some students, please.

Leave granted.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. McLaren:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's my privilege to introduce to you, and through you to all members of the Assembly, grades 4 and 5 from two schools in Yorkton, St. Alphonsus and St. Paul. They number 48 students, and they're accompanied today by their teacher Violet Schneider and chaperon Irene Fahlman. I want to wish you well on your tour of the building and the Assembly this afternoon, and other facilities in Regina. We hope you find the Assembly interesting and educational. And I wish you all a very, very happy summer holiday. I would ask all members to please welcome these guests.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**SPECIAL ORDER**  
**ADJOURNED DEBATES**  
**MOTION FOR COMMITTEE OF FINANCE**  
**(BUDGET DEBATE)**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Lane that the Assembly resolve itself into the Committee of Finance, and the amendment thereto moved by Mr. Tchorzewski.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, it seems to me that when people in this day and age vote for a government, they vote for two or three major things. First of all, they vote for a vision. “And I think I’ve outlined to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how we on this side of the House feel that the present government has a vision, a vision that will diversify the economy of this province.

And I cite, for example when we’re often criticized. I heard the speaker before me indicate he was very concerned about Mr. Peter Pocklington coming to the province of Saskatchewan. I believe that producing bacon here in the province and selling it around the country is exactly what we should be doing. I don’t see any problem with that. And I think most farmers in Saskatchewan agree with that.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — And we go the Vanguard plant in North Battleford. We’ve got the member from there. I’d like to hear him stand up on his feet and say it’s a bad thing to come to North Battleford. I’m sure your colleagues and your supporters, be they few, would say it is a good thing and they support the Vanguard plant to be in there because they believe in diversification. And to be able to bring plants from British Columbia to Saskatchewan to manufacture mobile homes is exactly the thing that we should be doing.

We have these sorts of things. We’re producing intravenous solutions right here in Saskatchewan, right here in Saskatchewan, for the Saskatchewan market and for other areas.

I hear a lot of condemnation of the Weyerhaeuser deal. Well let me say, he who shouts too soon often shouts wrong. And I believe you will see that in the years to come, when we have a paper plant, I will challenge the members from Prince Albert when that paper plant is up and going and that pulp mill is running, to stand up and say, whoa! — Weyerhaeuser was a wrong thing; it was bad mistake. I want to see you stand in your seat in this House and say that in those days.

Let me tell you that it is that diversification, it is that building, it is that vision that is going to drive this province into the century ahead to be a leader in Canada. And it is not the old cocoon syndrome of leave me alone; leave it as it was; take me back to where I came from because I am safe and secure, even if I’m not going anywhere.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — The speaker from Moose Jaw who spoke just before me, he ended up, he ended up his speech . . . And as I say, I believe you believe what you’re saying, as misguided as you are, but you believe in it, and there’s some merit in that. But he says, please take it back to the way it was in ’82. Well I will challenge you to go across Saskatchewan, and you go across Saskatchewan and say, yes, we’ll go back to the way it was in ’82 with the moratorium on nursing home construction, and you’ll be run out of half of the towns in this province, my friend. That’s what’ll happen. Take it back to ’82, to the days of the moratorium. That’s exactly what they will say.

Now we’ll look further at diversification. I’m going to switch to one of the areas, Mr. Speaker, that I am proud to have responsibility for in this government. I am proud to have responsibility for that because I believe it is one of the economic engines that we can really get moving in this province— one that was neglected by our former colleagues, but something that is a priority with the Devine government and something that I believe can cause the cash registers of this province to ring and to help the economy and turn it around and bring us into this era, the 1890s, in the next century. And that is the topic of tourism.

I feel strongly that this province of Saskatchewan has a great potential in tourism. We have some of the nicest and friendliest people in this country. We have an ethnic origin that many do not have. We got the beauties of the North. I see the member from the North chuckling. I want him to stand up and indicate in this House that he does not think that there’s a great amount of potential in tourism in northern Saskatchewan. It could be, my friend, one of the things that helps bring about the whole economic recovery of that part of the country. And when I bring in some initiatives, I expect you to stand in support of those federal initiatives, and not use the rhetoric of some of your colleagues. Because I believe you’re the kind of man, if it’s right, you can stand up and say it’s right. And I will expect that of you.

But I can believe that with our tourism and with our hospitality institute that we’re going to start . . . because as I said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have some of the friendliest and kindest people in Saskatchewan. But we need to market that. We have to become a little more aggressive. And if I were to go to anyone’s home in this place, no matter which side of the House, or if they were to come to my place, we would be treated to the best. That’s what Saskatchewan is made of.

I say then, let’s market this spirit of Saskatchewan, so when our neighbours come in from the United States or from other parts of Canada or from offshore, that they get that true feeling of down-home Saskatchewan. Let’s market some of our legends and our stories. Let’s have those things that people come here and say, by gosh, it was a nice place to go; the people treated me fine. And they’ll go home and they’ll tell their friends and neighbours, and more people will come to this province.

Those are the things that we should be doing to help

diversify this economy — to help have people move in here, to visit us, to drive from location to location, to see many of the sights and many of the interesting things that we have to offer in Saskatchewan.

I believe strongly, and my members on this side of the House believe the same way, that we can market the tourism in this province so that people will be in Meadow Lake and they will be in Maple Creek and they will be in Kamsack and they will be in La Ronge, and they will be all around this province enjoying the wonderful gifts that we have and the hospitality that we can show to them. And we can do that without great expenditures of money. That can be done, and that is what we intend to do with building a hospitality institute in this province.

Another area that I am responsible for is the whole area of small business. And if we think the large smoke-stacks and all those things are what build the economy of Saskatchewan — they help. But really the majority of jobs come from the small shops, those under 10 employees. That is where a great deal of our economy is generated. And there is an awful lot we can do there.

If I sense anything across this province at this time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that there is a movement, not only here, but across North America, where young people are saying, hey, I want to try my hand at going into business. I want to start a program; I want to start a shop; I want to see if I can run a business, and that I can take part in the whole capitalist system, shall we say.

And they're coming in droves. And for that reason, we started a young entrepreneur's program in Sedco two years ago. We've doubled that program. And we believe, and my colleague, the Minister of Economic Development and Trade, believes as strongly as I do, that we should encourage the development of young entrepreneurs and that entrepreneurial spirit in this province.

(1530)

And to that extent, we're going to be developing an entrepreneurial institute which will show our people and our children in this province that there is a way that you can develop your talents and your abilities and add to the sum total of our society by going the route of the entrepreneur. And that's what we're going to do to develop those and to diversify this economy. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what I believe is the wave of the future. That's what I think the people voted for in October, was that vision.

You hear the name of Madsen Pirie kicked around a lot today. Madsen Pirie happens to be from the Adam Smith Institute. And he said this to the British people who have just gone through a very significant election. Madsen Pirie said as he spoke to the British people:

We always vote for the future. We vote for the government that offers the programs, not the government that looks back.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that that can be said true of the Saskatchewan people. And I believe that's what they did

on October of last year, voted for the government that showed a path to the future.

And I make no apologies to some of the adjustments that have to be made, in some of the programs that we have inherited will undergo change because after all, what is progress except change? And change sometimes is difficult to understand. And we all fear change and we all think it is maybe the worst. And then when you have people on the other side trying to frighten everyone and say that everything is going to hell in a hand basket, then change is frightening.

But I believe that we will see the people of Saskatchewan accept the changes that have taken place because we still have the best programs, we still have the best health program across this country, bar none. We still spend more per capita than any other jurisdiction on health, but we have made some changes.

When those changes are understood, and the impacts of those are understood and felt by the society. I believe, I believe strongly that the people of Saskatchewan will say, well, you made the changes, there was some confusion, and sure one's going to have to pay a little bit more, one's going to have to pay a little bit more, but we still have the best drug plan in Canada, we still have one of the few dental plans in Canada, and we have a government that is going to diversify and is going to lead and going to build on this economy, and that will not be by buying up more, more things that we already own.

You will not see this government buying up potash mines or creating huge Crown corporations as was the mode of the '70s. I notice in Manitoba today that Manitoba, and as the Premier said in question period, Manitoba cannot afford to treat the cancer patients. They're coming to Saskatchewan. But they've got \$185 million to buy a gas company. That's what Manitoba has, that's their method of diversification, and that is the same old socialist philosophy that has hung around for some time.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to you that I'm proud to be a part of this government. And I make no apologies that at this time we are undergoing some serious changes. And we will continue to make changes, but we will make changes that we believe in the ultimate outcome will be in the best interests of the Saskatchewan. That's what my colleagues and I are in politics for.

And we will not try and scare the people or misled the people. We will tell them the truth; we will bite the bullet; we will stand up and be counted, and we will move Saskatchewan forward so that in five years from today, or whenever the next election is called, the people of Saskatchewan will look back and say, it was maybe a rough time for a couple of months, or three months, but by golly you boys had that vision, that dedication, that determination to move this province ahead, as Grant Devine has since he became the leader of the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan.

So with that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm proud to support the budget; I could not support the amendment, and I'm proud to be a member of the party that is undergoing some difficult times but has the vision and a plan for

where we are going in the future.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is my first opportunity to participate in the House since my return in 1986, and I want to take this opportunity to thank the constituents of Saskatoon South who re-elected me for the fourth time. And I want to say to those constituents, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I will do my utmost to represent them the best to my ability. And I know, Mr. Speaker, with the introduction of this budget of this budget, that there will be a lot of people who will be looking for some assistance in the dental care, in the drugs, in the cut-backs in the hospitalization, and so on. And I want to assure them that at any time if they need my assistance, my constituency office will be available to them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in speaking to the budget debate I want to say to the people of Saskatchewan that indeed, as our critic of Finance has indicated, that last Wednesday probably was the blackest Wednesday that this province has ever experienced. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we find in this budget a government that is totally insensitive and totally uncaring to what happens to certain individuals in this province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I also want to, before I get into the budget, I also want to say a few words about the decorum in this House. I had hoped, Mr. Deputy Speaker, after an absence of four years in this House, that the decorum would have improved. In talking to elementary students and high school students, one of the things that they really were embarrassed about was the behaviour of members in the House.

I had determined last fall when I was re-elected to do my utmost to try and improve the decorum. I want to say to you, sir, in that regard I met with the Speaker last fall and indicated to him that I would give him my fullest co-operation in trying to improve the decorum. But I must admit, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am frustrated with the process. I am frustrated because the rules are not applied equally to all members of the House, and the House cannot function unless the Premier also abides by those rules. And if, Mr. Deputy Speaker, during question period the Premier is allowed to make his speeches in the House and not abide by the rules, this House will not function. It cannot function. And I ask for the Speaker to please make certain that rules are equally applied.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to indicate that it is my impression that the public out there have become very cynical and bitter about politicians. And let me say that I think that they have some grounds for this bitterness. They have some grounds for this bitterness because politicians nowadays, it seems to me, do not know really what the truth is. They don't know how to speak the truth, and when election time comes around we will say anything to get ourselves elected — just anything.

And I find that really unacceptable. And I want to give you some examples, Mr. Speaker, on this. I'll give you a good example of question period today. Question period today, the Premier got up and said that the Health budget, since 1982, had increased 66 per cent . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — 63 per cent.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — All right. I stand corrected, 63 per cent. But he forgot to tell the people of Saskatchewan that in 1982, and I have the *Estimates* here, subvote 29 which says, grants and allowances for ambulance services — it was not in the Department of Health at that time, it was in Rural Affairs — \$6 million. He forgot to tell the people of Saskatchewan that subvote 20, grants and allowances for home care, \$23 million, was not in Health, but in Social Services. He didn't tell the people of Saskatchewan that Subvote 21, grants and allowances for special care homes, \$190 million, was in the Department of Social Services, not in the Department of Health.

I think that the Premier intentionally, intentionally, Mr. Deputy Speaker, misled the people of Saskatchewan, like he has done since 1982. And I will give you examples of that, as to how he has gone around this province and misled the people of this province. And he's done it in the budget, and he's doing it every day in question period.

I note, Mr. Speaker, also one other thing that I didn't want to overlook. I note that the grant for MCIC (Medical Care Insurance Commission) has increased \$100 million over the last five years. For those of you who don't know what MCIC is for, they happen to pay the doctors of this province. They got an increase of \$100 million over the last five years.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I'm saying is when people say to me that they are bitter and cynical about politicians, I really don't blame them because I think we have lost a lot of credibility over the last five years. And I think it's about time that we change our attitudes and we speak truthfully as the facts bear out to the people of this province. And if that means that we have to bear some embarrassment, so be it.

But, Mr. Speaker, I also want to say that I think they've become cynical because of the dishonesty and the public scandals that have happened in Canada over the last little while. If you look at the scandals, you can't help but have some names come to your attention — names like Robert Coates, the former federal minister, Sinclair Stevens, Roch LaSalle, André Bissonnette, and today I hear there's another minister, McKinnon, I believe, or McInnes. Again, I say, Mr. Speaker, that we have an obligation in public life, not only to appear to be truthful but to be truthful and honest in our doings.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Mr. Speaker, I say that people have become bitter because of the patronage that takes place in public life today. And again I cannot help but think of such names like Dutchak, Schoenhals, Hill, Embury, Dirks, Ball, Birkbeck — all of these people come to mind, all former Tory supporters, all former supporters.

Mr. Speaker, in 1982 the members opposite made a lot of promises. Most of those promises they have broken.

They promised that they would do away with the gas tax. And I'm glad that the member for Arm River is here,



because the member from Arm River has told many individuals that if the Tory government ever, ever introduced a gas tax, that he would leave the Tory Party immediately. I see the hon. member still seated in his seat on the other side. Mr. Speaker, what I'm saying is that if you make a promise, you have to at least attempt to carry it out. These people make promises and don't carry them out.

Mr. Speaker, they said that they would eliminate the sales tax, the 5 per cent education and health tax. Instead of eliminating it, what have they done? They've increased it now to 7 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, they said that they would reduce the income tax. So what does the Minister of Finance do? He raises the income tax or the flat tax by one and one-half per cent. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that people are becoming frustrated and bitter about politicians? Is it any wonder?

Mr. Speaker, the Premier makes a lot of promises. And I was rather amazed this past winter when I attended the SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) convention, and the Premier was talking about debt in other provinces. And I heard him talk about the Manitoba debt. And he said, and I remember him saying, you know the debt in Manitoba is either 6 billion, 8 billion or \$10 billion, a difference of 4 billion. And he said it with a straight face. A \$4 billion difference and it doesn't make any difference to the Premier of this province? That's the kind of truthfulness or untruthfulness, Mr. Speaker, that we've come to expect of the Premier of this province. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, can we blame the people for being cynical about politicians?

Mr. Speaker, many people in Saskatchewan in the last three or four months were extremely concerned about the reluctance of this government in bringing forth a budget. And the government was saying well, we were overhauling the government and we just simply weren't able to put the budget together. That, Mr. Speaker, is simply not true. It is simply not true.

(1545)

Top civil servants tell me that the budget was ready by the end of February. All they would have had to do was to send it to the printers, have it printed, and we could have met much, much earlier. Then why did the government not present the budget? Well there were several reasons.

One, people said, and I don't know what truth there is to it, but that the Premier was having some trouble with some of his back-benchers, that they didn't want to accept the budget as it was, and he had to make some changes.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, some people were saying that the Premier didn't want to put the budget forward because he was afraid that in the months of April and May, when people are still watching TV, that opposition would get too much coverage on the budget that they had to present. So let's present it in the summertime when people are gone on holidays, no one is watching TV. And

I'm saying to the Premier, and I say to the members opposite, all right, you got away with it this time maybe, but I'll tell you, you are abusing the democratic process that the people of Saskatchewan and in this country have become accustomed to, and they will hold you responsible for that.

Mr. Speaker, these people have told me: we have to have some changes made so that this cannot happen again. We must not allow another government to be able to bring in the same kinds of abuses. A budget should be brought forward, it should be debated in the legislature, and then it should be ratified.

And the people have asked me: how can this government govern with warrants? and I explained to them that warrants are nothing new; we've done it before, but it was always ratified in the House. And it was. People come before the legislature, the Minister of Finance has run out of money, he asks for a warrant, and it's ratified.

But this government didn't do that, and there is a fair amount of legal opinion that what they were doing was illegal. So the people have suggested to me that there should be something in legislation. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to tell the members here today that during, not this session, but certainly during the term, that I am bringing forth a private member's Bill which will, in effect, say that government must bring forth a budget either by the end of the fiscal year or within two weeks of the fiscal year.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I think that politicians of all stripes, in my opinion, have abused the right of timing of elections. I said in 1971 that I was going to work for legislation which, and the Minister of Health said, but very successfully we did it. Yes, that's true. You did, very successfully. But I think we need legislation, Mr. Speaker, which again, the intent of it would be that elections must be held every four years, on a certain date, in a certain month. And I would certainly support that kind of legislation if it was brought forth by the government. But again, I would like to pursue that and see if a private member's Bill could be brought forward in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, let me now turn directly to some of the items in the budget. Last Wednesday I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Finance put the final nails in the coffins of many people in this province, and I don't think that's exaggerating it at all.

As I listened to the address, my heart and my sympathy went out to the many citizens who were so callously and so unfairly treated by the cabinet opposite — people who had placed so much trust in them just a few months ago. I found it inconceivable that the Premier and his colleagues could produce a document that manipulated so many facts and that contained so many outright lies.

But then, Mr. Speaker, the deceit by the Premier and the cabinet opposite didn't begin with the presentation of this budget. The deceit began way back in 1982, and the cabinet has simply continued it all along. I would suggest,

Mr. Speaker, that Sir Walter Scott had people like Premier Devine and the cabinet in mind when he wrote: "Oh what a tangled web we weave when first we practise to deceive."

And what a tangled mess. And what a tangled mess the Premier and his cabinet have brought onto this beautiful province.

Mr. Premier, you inherited a province in 1982 with a surplus of \$139 million. You had the fastest-growing economy in all of Canada. Outside investment was very buoyant; unemployment was at about 4.7 per cent; and we had first-rate health, social service, and education programs. In five short years, Mr. Premier, you have created over a \$3 billion deficit. Outside investment now is virtually to a halt; unemployment levels are extremely high, and in Saskatoon they're over 9 per cent, and you have emasculated our health and social service and education programs.

I want to say about health, Mr. Speaker, right now, to the Minister of Health, if he thinks that he's got a first-rate health care program, I would like him to come to Saskatoon and talk to the 10,000 people who are on the waiting list. People who need a hip operation — and I've written to him about one particular person who has to wait over a year to have her hip operated. For two or three months she lay in bed all day long taking pain-killers because she couldn't take the pain. All the Minister of Health could tell me was, well, I've increased the budget — a lot of compassion for a Minister of Health.

Mr. Speaker, the callous treatment of civil servants, and the manner in which you have dismissed them, is simply unforgivable. They say it's a voluntary retirement. Some of the voluntary people who have so voluntarily retired have told me they'd rather play Russian roulette than accept your voluntary treatment. Some of the civil servants told me that they were simply told, well, if you don't retire, your job is going to disappear next week. That's voluntary? I notice the Deputy Premier shaking his head, yes. That's the kind of voluntary retirement he wants.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier — and I want to say to the Premier — if you intended to create fear in the people of Saskatchewan, you've been very successful. You have created a lot of fear out there, and a lot of the people simply won't go public to tell you what they feel. But I can tell you one thing: even though they may not go public, they are telling us. And come the next election, they are going to speak loud and clearly just how they feel about you people.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Rolfes:** — I say to the Premier, as the member from Moose Jaw North indicated, you received no mandate last October to do the things that you are doing. The people took you at your word when, during the last election, you told them that we were building for the future; that the deficit was manageable; that we are taking great strides, and we were bringing our children back to this province. Our children, Mr. Premier, have no reason to come home. In fact, Mr. Premier, if you looked at the

facts, you'd know that we are losing people by the tens of thousands from this province.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Premier, that you were well aware during the last election that the deficit would be over a billion dollars. You knew that, and yet you went before the people, and I say you purposefully deceived them. You said that the deficit was manageable. I say that you continued with your deceit, and that you deliberately lied to the people of this province. You betrayed the people in '82; you did it again in '86, and I say to the Minister of Finance that you and the Premier are doing it in this budget. I say that you have cheapened, to the Premier, you have cheapened the office of Premier and you've disgraced that office. And if you've got any dignity at all, you'll resign from that position.

As I stated earlier, Mr. Premier, your problem started in 1982. You made some irresponsible promises which, if you had carried them out, would have totally ruined this province. Surely you knew that if you abolished the sales tax and reduced the income tax that you would destroy the financial viability of this province. Either you were incompetent when you made these promises, or you intentionally deceived the people of this province in order to form the government. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, he's both incompetent and deceitful.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to turn to the energy area for just a few moments. I want to tell the Premier that this major financial problem, his major financial mistake, came when he made decisions in this particular area. Because of your inane and unsound and senseless loyalty holidays from 1982 to 1985, when the prices of oil were relatively high and the profits to oil companies were also very high, the people of this province suffered revenue losses well over a billion and a half. No one will argue with you people that you had a flurry of activity in the oil fields. But I say to the Premier, and I say to the cabinet office, the price was too high and the revenue losses were simply too exhortative. Very little new oil was found in those years — very little new oil. Much of the drilling was done in known fields. The oil companies simply pumped out the oil at a faster rate. They took their profits, and when the price of oil went down, as you found out last year, the oil companies left this province and held you people up for further ransom.

The resources belong to the people of this province. You are the custodians, and you have the responsibility as the government to extract the best possible deal for the people of this province and to just for the chosen few. Because of your policies, you lost well, as I said, over a billion and a half. You blew it when the prices were high, and now you're asking the people of this province to make the sacrifices through your health cuts and your social services cuts and through higher taxes. That simply, Mr. Speaker, will be unacceptable, and I say to you that the people of this province will not forget that so easily. I say to you, Mr. Premier, you have gone too far in support of your friends. You've gone too far in support of the Pocklington. You've gone too far in support of the Hills and the Schoenhals and the Dutchaks and the Dirks. You've gone too far in support of the oil companies. You are extracting too big a toll from the citizens of this

province, and you're going to pay the ultimate price in due course.

Mr. Minister, you say you are building for the future. I assume you mean that you're building for our young people. What hope, what optimism is there for our young people in this province when you eliminate hundreds and hundreds of jobs for their parents? What opportunities are there for our young when scores of educational programs are obliterated in our community colleges and technical schools? What opportunities are there for our children to educate themselves in this province when you force our universities to eliminate programs, limit enrolments, and increase tuition fees? What hope? What hope do you give our young people to further their education when no jobs are available for summer employment, and little opportunity to receive bursaries to continue their education?

Where, Mr. Minister, in your budget, do you address the problems of our young people? Where are you going to give them any hope for optimism in this province? Are you telling them, like you've told the thousands who have left this province in the past five years, that their future is not here but somewhere else in Canada? Where, Mr. Minister, is your compassion? Where is your sense of dignity? And where is your responsibility to our young people?

During tough economic times, Mr. Minister, you don't need less government intervention; you need government to prime the economy. You need to provide more jobs by capital construction, more opportunity at our educational institutions, and you must assist those in need by providing more social and health services to help them through these most difficult times.

A caring and sensitive government would fill the gap vacated by the private sector during periods of economic slow-down. A caring and sensitive government would deal with the deficit by obtaining additional revenues from those who benefit the most when the deficit was created. You should have looked to the oil companies to start paying their fair share. Our financial institutions and larger corporations have done well in the past five years when you were creating that deficit. Certainly they could have been asked to pay more taxes during these difficult times.

You don't stimulate the economy by axing jobs of thousands of tax-paying individuals. You don't stimulate the economy by forcing local governments to increase property taxes, and you certainly don't increase revenues by forcing people to leave this province in search of jobs and educational opportunities.

(1600)

Mr. Minister, because of your deliberate policies of eliminating jobs, because you have driven more people into poverty, and now because you have further increased our hopelessness by the huge tax increase, this is not the time to decrease funding for many non-government organizations.

I will predict that because of your actions in this budget,

we will see an increase in crime, an increase in child abuse, an increase in women battering, an increase in family breakdowns, and an increase in the suicide rate in this province. People who do not have hope resort to extreme measures.

Now is not the time to eliminate 100 individuals from the mental health services branch, or 23 people from the community services area. Many individuals and families will need these services as they feel the adverse effects of your budget.

Now is the time to increase funding to transition houses, to family services, to the John Howard Society, and to increase the number of family and school counselors, as well as the number of social workers in this province. When the people begin to feel the effects of this budget, many will need the services of professionals in order to work through these most difficult times. A caring and sensitive government would have made that a high priority.

Mr. Speaker, I notice that my time is quickly running out, and I want to end by citing to the Minister of Health and to the cabinet opposite, about four or five cases of how this budget has affected individuals.

I have before me here a constituent who has suffered from MS (multiple sclerosis) for over 20 years. She just found out two weeks ago from the University Hospital, because of cut-backs that were asked by the Minister of Health of the university, that she no longer will get the required physiotherapy that she had been receiving over those years. And if she does not get the physiotherapy at least two or three times a week, and I say this to the Minister of Health, you will find that she will have to enter a hospital or she will have to enter a nursing home.

**An Hon. Member:** — It's untrue . . . (inaudible) . . .

**Mr. Rolfes:** — It is not untrue. Mr. Minister of Health says what I am saying is untrue, and I want to give him another example, or two or three examples of cut-backs at various hospitals. This lady writes to the minister:

Dear Mr. McLeod: I was very concerned to learn of the recent firings of physicians in the city of Regina, because of the serious deterioration of medical care and services that this represents for southern Saskatchewan. I am pregnant and have developed a condition known as gestational diabetes.

I can't read the whole letter because it's too long, but she goes on to say:

Dr. Bector is the only endocrinologist in the city. Since he is leaving, it is obvious that future medical care will be of poor quality. I pay my taxes and I've accepted frozen wages, but why, when I have a government need, is it suddenly not

important? How can supposed job creation, through home improvement grants, be more important than the health of southern Saskatchewan babies? Please evaluate your priorities. Health problems do not restrict themselves only to good economic times.

Mr. Minister, I want to read you another letter. This letter is addressed to the Hon. Grant Devine. And this letter, Mr. Minister, you also received a copy of it and I wrote you about these individuals. These individuals do not live in my constituency but wrote to me as a former minister of Health. And it says:

Dear Sir: (addressing it to Mr. Devine) It is with great concern that we view the forthcoming cuts in health and education service. The victims, and we use that word advisedly, are the old and infirm, the handicapped, especially the young, children and the intimidated, battered women and their families.

We are particularly concerned with the budget cuts to University Hospital. The result of this will be disastrous for our daughter. Stephanie was born prematurely and was saved by the care and devotion she received in the neo-natal intensive care in Saskatoon. She was subsequently diagnosed as having massive brain damage, which resulted in cortical blindness and cerebral palsy.

Now Stephanie's physiotherapy again has been cut back, Mr. Minister of Health, and that is because of instructions from your department that they must limit or restrict their budget.

Mr. Minister, I have two more letters that I wish to refer to, and this one again is written to:

Dear. Mr. McLeod: (And I wish the Minister of Health would stay and listen to this one.) In the past few weeks I have been increasingly upset about policies issued by the government. This note and attached letter is being sent as a result of much thought and much prayer.

I have used the health care system extensively since 1980. In fact, I was hospitalized for almost three months, three years ago in the General Hospital in Regina. The conditions in the orthopedic floor at that time were near critical. There were patients needing intensive care who were kept in this ward because of lack of beds in ICU (intensive care unit). The ward was understaffed, and the additional 24-hour care for these critically ill people added much stress to the existing staff.

There were many other situations which taxed the staff to the limit. As far as my own health is concerned, I have had to wait for six to eight months in order to receive health care. An accident seven years ago has left me unable to work outside our home.

Where is the hope, sir, when a government can just change policies and laws behind closed doors? Where is there hope when there is no thought regarding the hardship that is being done to the most needy? Do any of you know what long-term suffering and/or unemployment can do to people? Have any of you the slightest idea what would happen to those who will be burdened with the yoke of your slavery?

These are strong words, yes, and so are the emotions my family are and I am experiencing. We are at your mercy. Is this what democracy's supposed to be? We should have an opportunity to fight for our rights. Instead, we are reduced to helpless pawns in a game of autocratic power.

This is written by a woman who was involved in an accident and has been . . . can only now crawl on the floor in her home and she needs this extra help. She has written a long letter to the Premier, which is much, much too long to read, but which I will draw to the Premier's attention during his estimates.

I want to, Mr. Speaker, now read from what I feel is a letter of utter hopelessness. And this guy writes to me and he says:

Where and when is the Devine purge going to stop, or at least ease up a little?

And he goes on to say:

Even if this wholesale rape of health care in Saskatchewan was to stop today, I believe irreparable damage has been done, both emotional and physical, to many citizens of this province. Indeed, for one former acquaintance of mine, it literally would be too late. Recently the acquaintance was found dead from a drug overdose. Why? He was so depressed over the fact that he had no job, no foreseeable prospects of finding one, and the final straw, no money even to get out and go to a coffee shop and have a cup of coffee.

Prior to his death he had been a functional individual who had hopes for the future. His strong self-control, desire, and hard determination to succeed was slowly drained away, just as if he had had terminal cancer. It is truly a human waste and tragedy to see someone as I described slowly fall away in the manner he did.

Now, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Premier, these are actual cases of people who have been fundamentally affected by cut-backs that this government has put into effect, and these were cut-backs before the budget came into effect. You people can say all you want, that this is all stirred up by the opposition. These are actual cases, and I have many more in my office, in my constituency office, that I could relate to you, and will relate to many of you ministers during your estimates, of people that simply do not have hope.

I see the member from Biggar just simply sloughs it off.

And I say to him that you will also feel the ultimate effect in the next election.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Mr. Speaker, what we need is a compassionate and a sensitive government, a government that will look to the needs of individuals and to the needs of the people of this province and then come to grips with them. Mr. Speaker, because the budget does not meet the needs of individual people, does not come to grips with the problems that are facing this province, I have no choice but to support the amendment and vote against the main motion.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me to enter the budget debate at this time. I'm very pleased with this budget and would like to congratulate my colleague, the Minister of Finance, for a job very well done. He has delivered a fair and honest budget, a budget which tackles the economic difficulties of our province.

I'm proud of this budget because it has taken the fiscal responsibility of our province seriously, something which previous administrations have not had the courage to do. It clearly demonstrates that this government has the integrity and conviction to do what is right in planning for our province's future.

Mr. Speaker, on October 29, 1986, the people of Saskatchewan voted for a Premier and a party whose first priority is to provide the people of this province with a means to build a more prosperous future for themselves. The people of Saskatchewan wanted a government willing to look realistically at the challenges which face us today.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan is at the crossroads in its development as a province. The world economic situation has forced us to take a hard look at where we have been and where we are going. As your government, we have come to realize that we can no longer rely on our agricultural sector and our resource base to provide for an ever-increasing number of social programs and services that give rise to ever-increasing expectations.

Our current shortfall in revenues brought about by a serious drop in world prices for our resources and our commodities such as grain, oil, potash, and uranium, has left us vulnerable at our economic base. Traditionally resource revenues have supported essential services such as health and education. In the coming year all of our revenues from oil royalties, sales tax, and personal income taxes, would not be enough to cover health care expenses alone. Clearly Saskatchewan is in a battle to protect its future. Government alone can no longer be the single solution to every issue or difficulty that the people of Saskatchewan face. All of us need to pull together if we are to meet our challenges head on.

As we strive to protect our social institutions and the

ability of our people to take advantage of opportunity in these difficult transitional times, we have also remained continually aware of our responsibility to ensure that the services provided are needed, effective, and efficient.

In many instances this responsibility has necessitated the application of innovative changes and the constant questioning of old solutions and assumptions. We have had to question the structure and organization of government itself. This process has not been easy. We have taken the necessary time to ensure that our review has been thorough and that the solutions posed are not only sound today but will remain sound into the future. There is not only a desire, but a critical need for the government to get by with less. It is not a pleasant reality in a province that has, at times in the past, enjoyed a degree of prosperity comparable to anywhere in the western world. This reality is affecting all of us, and all of us are seeing things that we would rather not see.

(1615)

At the same time as we are undertaking this massive restructuring of our government and the services it provides, we must keep in mind a fundamental economic truth. If we are to be successful in our efforts to build a Saskatchewan that can not only survive, but prosper in the 1990s and beyond, we must concentrate our energies on diversifying our economic base. The world economy is undergoing drastic changes, and we must be prepared to keep pace.

Education, training, retraining, and technology are the keys to our success. We must stay abreast of new developments in these areas. We must be prepared to support areas of significant potential economic return, such as tourism and advanced technology.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to focus the attention of this Assembly on the work, the progress, and the government commitment to the future of science and technology. I support the budget address because during this challenging economic time, the strong performance of the advanced technology sector is welcome news.

Let me begin by emphasizing that more than ever before we need to maximize the opportunities and benefits generated by the advanced technology sector. This industry has demonstrated its strength by creating employment, generating revenue, and providing many social and economic benefits. It is working to diversify our economy by expanding our industrial base, and it is helping to make our traditional resource sector become more competitive and making business and the service industry more efficient.

Today the world is rapidly changing. Future wealth and job creation depend on the growth of knowledge in intensive industries, on the application of a technology to keep established industry competitive. It is within this context that our Saskatchewan government has recognized the need to move quickly and decisively to make science and technology a pillar in our strategy to ensure economic growth and employment in tomorrow's world economy.

The pioneering and innovative spirit which settled and developed our province some 100 years ago is now developing our science and technology frontier in Saskatchewan. Prior to 1982, there was little support for the development of advanced technology. Fortunately for the vision of our Premier and his government, a strategy for the development of this industry was developed. That decision has been an astounding success. As an example, the number of advanced technology firms has quadrupled, from 30 active companies to over 170 today.

In 1982, virtually the entire industry was based in Saskatoon. Today, although Saskatoon has experienced rapid growth, an advanced technology community is emerging in Regina, and the balance of the industry is widely distributed throughout other Saskatchewan communities. The annual sales figures, Mr. Speaker, have also increased dramatically from \$81 million in 1982 to over \$550 million today, with estimates of close to \$1 billion for the coming year.

This phenomenal growth in advanced technology has meant jobs for the people of Saskatchewan. Direct employment has almost doubled in the past five years to nearly 3,000 jobs, providing our young people with career alternatives and opportunities of a world-class nature.

Mr. Speaker, unlike past administrations, we have been able to deliver these results because we are committed to the development of advanced technology in this province. We have turned commitment into action.

Mr. Speaker, because of these results traditional Saskatchewan industries are benefiting through enhanced productivity and competitiveness, reduced costs, and by improved safety in agriculture, mining, and the manufacturing and service industries. Saskatchewan's advanced technology industry is working partnership with government, our universities, and research facilities to create new innovative products which strengthen and diversify our traditional industries.

There can be no mystery about what this means. Today's technology is transforming the world. It is creating a second industrial revolution. We are a resource rich trading nation in a race for technological survival. But where does Saskatchewan fit into this? Surprisingly, Saskatchewan is a leader among Canada's provinces in this technological revolution. Space technology, telecommunications and biotechnology are leaders, just to mention a few.

However, there is always much more to do, and for that reason I am especially proud of the announcement by the Minister of Finance to establish the \$22 million economic diversification and investment fund. This fund will combine the efforts of Tourism and Small Business, Economic Development and Trade, and Science and Technology. This fund will increase the efficiency and effectiveness of these three government departments by eliminating overlapping programs, and by multiplying their efforts on co-ordinated priorities in areas such as technology research and development, trade and tourism promotion, and entrepreneurial and industrial growth.

Mr. Speaker, the Finance minister also announced that an entrepreneur institute will be established, which I feel is welcome news for young people in this province, and especially in Saskatoon which had a record number of new business starts in 1986.

Mr. Speaker, our government's emphasis on the tourist industry has sparked phenomenal growth in my home town of Saskatoon, which attracted over 170 conventions with over 50,000 delegates in 1986. And it is this focus on tourism which has helped to bring Saskatoon's retail sales close to \$1 billion annually. Tourism promises to become one of the primary sources of revenue for the province of Saskatchewan, benefiting centres both large and small.

While we are committed to looking at new economic opportunities through diversification, containing our deficit and exploring more efficient ways of providing protection to individuals makes it necessary to examine some of the specifics of this budget.

Mr. Speaker, during the last while I have spoken to several constituents of mine. Concerns have been raised about certain programs such as the drug plan, the dental program, some social programs, and programs for seniors. But, Mr. Speaker, the greater issues are not proposed changes that might be taking place, but rather the scare tactics and circulation of misinformation by some members of that bunch opposite.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition members like to think they are the great defenders of the sick, the elderly, the handicapped, and the young, but they continually put them down and treat them like second-class citizens. There's nothing wrong with being advocates for certain groups of people, but why use scare tactics?

All one has to do is compare the record of this government to their administration and consider the accomplishments achieved during the last five years when the economy hasn't been nearly as rosy as it was during their 11 years in power. They're bankrupt of ideas and lack the sense of direction required for today.

I think Elwood Cowley, a former NDP cabinet minister, summed it up nicely in the book *Canada, What's Left?*, when he argued that the NDP's vision at present has somehow either narrowed or vanished.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments now about our record as it relates to health care, education, the handicapped, and senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, since 1982-83 we have increased real health spending by 15.7 per cent. During their last five years, they increased it by 7.2 per cent. Under the PCs, real growth in health expenditures, that's averaged 4 per cent per year over and above inflation. Saskatchewan has increased health spending more than any other western province — 15.7 per cent compared to 9.4 per cent.

Hospital and special care construction, \$180 million compared to \$160 million by that government — 14 per cent more. What about the replacement of special care beds? The NDP 192 new and 151 replacements; the PCs 1,357 — four times as many as they did. And they are the

defenders of our health program.

What about the area of acute care hospital beds? In 1986-87, 350 more than the NDP in 1981-82. Home care. The NDP spent \$13.6 million in 81-82; the PCs today, more than 23 million. What about ambulance services? We've increased those services by an average of 28 per cent per year in the last five years.

And we can consider a few other steps that this government has taken over the last five years, Mr. Speaker. A new cancer clinic in the city of Saskatoon, a new pediatric unit at the University Hospital, new hospitals built or planned — Nipawin, Lloydminster, Maidstone, Saskatoon, Hudson Bay, Watrous, and Watson. Expansion . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. Order. I would like the remarks to please slow down on this side of the House — my left side.

**Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn:** — Further expansion of facilities of the Pasqua Hospital in Regina, the University and St. Paul's Hospitals in Saskatoon, and at Melfort, and in Yorkton; a new Wascana Rehabilitation Centre in Regina.

Mr. Speaker, these are not the actions of a government that does not have the health needs of Saskatchewan citizens at heart. We have one of the best health care systems anywhere, but over the years it has been allowed to evolve with an number of inherent flaws. Over the past five years these flaws have become increasingly apparent as costs continued to escalate.

One such area is the Saskatchewan prescription drug plan. Over the past 11 years, the annual costs have risen from \$16 million to \$83 million — an increase of more than 400 per cent. At this present rate the cost of the program would rise to \$125 million by 1990. Clearly, we feel a responsibility to bring the costs of the drug plan under control.

In doing so, difficult choices were made. Safeguards have been built in for those special circumstances in protecting those most in need without placing them under undue financial stress. Senior citizens that I talk with feel an obligation to pay a small fee for this valuable program if it means ensuring protection for future years. They understand that the present rapidly escalating costs cannot be allowed to continue. Although the changes to the drug plan are fundamental ones, Saskatchewan will still have the best plan in Canada.

Another area of health care in serious need of revision was the Saskatchewan dental plan. This has been a good program, but an expensive one. It will still be provided for those children ages 5 through 13 — the critical years insofar as good dental habits and prevention are concerned. Because we are in a time when difficult choices are necessary, if we are to remain able to meet our most pressing youth health needs, our government chose to redirect resources to meet what has been described as the number one problem facing adolescents, today: the threat of alcohol and drug abuse. This program will still remain the best in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has been recognized for many years as having a top-quality education system. This government has been, and is, committed to ensuring that this long-standing tradition continues. However, changes were necessary to bring our education system up to date, to meet the needs of a rapidly changing society. Our educational system must be relevant today and tomorrow. The process of updating our education system began with a thorough review, involving consultation with all participants of the province's K to 12 system. In 1984 that review resulted in a visionary document called *Directions*, which lays out a 10-year plan to bring about necessary changes while maintaining a stability and previous growth and development of our system of elementary and secondary education. The establishment of the education development fund provides for the financial resources to carry out this strategy. This was one of the most positive steps to be taken in education for many years. It makes a lot of sense, Mr. Speaker. But because of tough economic times, these moneys be spread out over a longer period of time — \$14.5 million is still allotted to the education development fund for the 1987-88. This funding is over and above the \$330 million in operating grants, and the \$31 million to capital assistance for the construction and renovation of schools.

Mr. Speaker, we just heard one of the members opposite talking about cuts in education. We find that the only cuts to education this year in the budgets were a 1 per cent cut in operating grants. That, surely to goodness, is not too severe when we consider the times that we're in today.

Mr. Speaker, this government is also equally committed to quality post-secondary educational programs. Changes have been made to the structure of technical institutes and community colleges, again to bring them up to date so that the challenges of today and tomorrow can be more adequately met. What about this government's record in post-secondary education, Mr. Speaker? Well, let me tell you about it. Since 1982-83, the number of spaces in technical schools have been increased dramatically, by 1,700 spaces. Financial assistance for students has been increased and made more accessible. Between 1982-83 and '86-87, Saskatchewan increased total government funding to universities by a greater percentage — 38 per cent — than any other province in Canada. The current level of capital funding provided to the universities is more than three times what it was when our government took office in 1982. As a result of these increases, total government funding per student in '86-87 in Saskatchewan was the second highest in Canada.

(1630)

Mr. Speaker, these are not the actions of a government that does not place a high priority on the education of Saskatchewan young people. We will continue to make every effort possible to see that our education system retains the high standard that people of Saskatchewan have come to expect.

Mr. Speaker, members opposite often make reference to our treatment of handicapped or disabled. Our record over the past five years speaks for itself. In regard to

special education programs in our school systems, funding for programs has increased substantially each year. At the school for the deaf in Saskatoon during our administration, a deaf-blind program has been implemented. Transportation allowances have been vastly improved to allow greater opportunities for handicapped children. More handicapped children are receiving service today than ever before. The number of spaces in group homes and workshops has been increased. General funding has been increased in these areas. The trend today is for greater integration into the community. The closure of the North Park Centre in Prince Albert is in response to this feeling and was the recommendation of the Saskatchewan Association for the Mentally Retarded. Mr. Speaker, this government has also taken steps to bring in legislation that will provide greater accessibility for handicapped individuals — something members opposite were requested to do on several occasions, but failed to act.

Mr. Speaker, we will continue to meet the needs of those who are less fortunate than others, by providing services through the above, plus direct funding to organizations such as the Saskatchewan Association of Rehabilitation Centres, Canadian Paraplegic Association, Saskatchewan Association for the Mentally Retarded, the Canadian National Institute for the Blind, and services for hearing-impaired persons. And we often have a lot of criticism from members opposite today, Mr. Speaker, about cut-backs to the Voice of the Handicapped. From what I've just said, it's very obvious that we're very committed to those groups that provide service to the handicapped. And they all are spokesmen for any of those in different individuals.

As well, the move to have the Saskatchewan Abilities Council administer the aids to independent living program will increase the number of outlets in the province. They'll provide quality service, and they'll also provide the council with additional funds and an enhanced role in the province.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment briefly on this government's record with regard to seniors. Over the past five years, Saskatchewan's seniors have enjoyed a significantly improved standard of living due to the government initiatives in health care, housing, income supplements, and tax concessions. Apart from foregone taxes and universal programs, the government spent an average of \$2,300 per senior in 1986-87.

The following new initiatives have been introduced by our government since 1982. A chiropody program, rural community therapy program, seniors' heritage grants, non-profit housing grants, Saskatchewan Pension Plan, plus expansions in other areas such as 600 new special care home beds, 135 per cent increase in total special care funding, a 73 per cent increase in home care funding, increased non-taxable seniors' income plan payments of 160 per cent for single seniors and 133 per cent for couples, and 71 per cent increase in aid to independent living. Further protection is being provided through changes in provincial income tax rates for low income tax seniors.

Mr. Speaker, our seniors understand tough economic

times because of their own experiences in the Great Depression. They realize more than most that governments can only do as much as finances permit. They recognize that increased deficits are no longer acceptable. They also want to be part of the solution and not part of the problem. Because of this belief they are supportive of what our government is doing to provide fiscal responsibility as well as protection for Saskatchewan families. They understand how this province and this country were built on the basic principles of individual initiative; of hard work by people with a vision for a better future. This government shares that vision and is committed to moving our province forward in spite of tough economic times.

Mr. Speaker, in this budget debate what we are really discussing is how Saskatchewan will prepare for the future. I realize that the opposition were, and still are, unable to grasp this fact. When we consider that during 11 years in power, government expenditure increased on an average of 17.9 per cent per year, they never once looked at reducing their own spending, but rather they always forced the Saskatchewan people to pay for this socialist ideology of bigger and bigger government.

Mr. Speaker, the world is entering a new era. We must be ready to meet this challenge and protect our province's future. All governments have a responsibility to protect their citizens with a basic standard of services in areas of health care, education, and social services. However, our government also believes that strong social institutions must provide the basis upon which the people of Saskatchewan can take advantage of economic opportunities to diversify our economy and create new wealth.

Government also has a responsibility to be frugal with taxpayers' dollars. That is why a review of all government expenditures was conducted and new priorities set that are in step with the times. This is never an easy task. But only a very cynical and foolish government would pretend that it didn't have to happen.

Mr. Speaker, our government has the courage and conviction to do what is right for the sake of the province and our children's future. Mr. Speaker, I will be voting against the opposition amendment, but am proud and pleased to support this budget.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lyons:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure once again to raise in this Assembly to be able to direct my comments to yourself and to the members on the other side regarding actions which have brought disrepute to their party, to their caucus, and to this province . . . to this province in terms of its history and tradition of, as my colleague, the member from Moose Jaw North says, sharing and caring.

I want, before I begin addressing the subject of the budget, Mr. Speaker, I want to pay a vote of thanks to the Progressive Conservative party which I understand recently featured myself in an issue of their Tory rag called *The Saskatchewan Viewpoint*. And I want to say right now how much I appreciate the publicity given to



me by *Saskatchewan Viewpoint*, although I must say, Mr. Speaker, I'm disappointed in the member from Weyburn. When I rose in this House to speak in addressing the Speech from the Throne, he promised to distribute 1,000 of my speeches to his constituents. Now I understand constituents in Weyburn have called his office asking for copies of that speech. They tell me, because they've called my office, and I understand he hasn't done that; he hasn't distributed the speech. Mr. Speaker, just another broken promise — just another broken Tory promise.

Mr. Speaker, it's been interesting listening to the debates. It's been interesting listen to the debates put forward by members of the other side in regards to the kind of statistics they're putting forward. I walk in from visiting the great town of Weyburn today just in time hear, I believe it was the Premier, talking about how they'd increased health spending by 66 per cent — I think it was 66 or 67 per cent — talking about what a great increase it was. And yet, when I just stay one or two hours later, I hear the member from Saskatoon Mayfair talking about an increase in health spending of 15 per cent. Mr. Speaker, they can't even get their statistics right. They can't even get their statistics right, because there's one thing in common that all liars have, Mr. Speaker, in that they are not able to . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! Order, order, order. I think the hon. member should be reminded that the term "lie," "liars," any such thing, is not permitted in this House. It is one of the most provocative statements and accusatory statements that any member can make and is always deemed as unparliamentary. So I remind him now to not to use that term any more.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm talking about in the general sense of one common thing that people who do not tell the truth have in common, is that when they tell an untruth at one time, they're not able to remember what that untruth was a little later on. And in the case of the members opposite they're not even able to remember one untruth from one hour to the next.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to begin, because when I listen to the members opposite we hear a great number of statistics that they're deriving from this budget. And as Benjamin Disraeli says, and I want you to pay attention, Mr. Speaker, to this closely, because I'm quoting Benjamin Disraeli. Benjamin Disraeli says: "There are three kinds of lies: lies, damned lies, and statistics."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add another category to that — Tories. Tory budget: lies, damned lies, statistics, and Tory budget. I think Mr. Disraeli, after listening to the budget speech, would certainly include that category in his book.

There's another quotation, Mr. Speaker, it says: "Statistical thinking will one day be as necessary for efficient citizenship as the ability to read and write" — H.G. Wells. I'm quoting, Mr. Speaker, from Bruce Johnstone's article in the *Leader-Post* of June 3, 1987. Mr. Johnstone says: "(There are) two little pearls of wisdom are contained in the foreword to a little book full of similar gems, entitled *How to Lie With Statistics*."

And I realize, Mr. Speaker, that we have a book here *How to Lie With Statistics*, and it's called the -Saskatchewan budget. It's called the Saskatchewan budget, because the Saskatchewan budget, as presented by the Minister of Finance, doesn't deal with the economic reality of this province in one fashion or another.

The budget introduced by the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, is, I would submit, nothing more than a political document. It is nothing more than a political manifesto of the Conservative Party. It is a political manifesto of the Conservative Party. It is a political manifesto which says . . . And if you don't believe me, if you were listening very carefully to the former minister of health, now the Minister for Tourism — if you were listening to him closely, it's the political manifesto of Thatcherism brought to Saskatchewan. The political manifesto of Margaret Thatcher brought to Saskatchewan. He said it, he said it himself. He said, we've got to follow great leaders like Margaret Thatcher. We've got to go forward into the future with great leaders like Margaret Thatcher and, by implication, Ronald Reagan and all the other members of the Conservative international — all of the other members of the Conservative international.

It's a political document because it changes the fundamental direction of the province of Saskatchewan. It says, we are going to move. We are going to move from a province in which the government plays a leading role in providing services to the people. We are going to move from a government constructed in which the governments that we elect, or that the people elect and are responsible to us, will play a leading role in providing us goods and services that we want. We're going to move from that kind of province to a province which is open for business and which is there, up for sale as a playing field for the rich, the wealthy, the corporate citizens, the international capitalists. I believe the word the Minister of Tourism used, the international capitalism, that that's what this province has become. It's a playpen.

And it's a political document, this budget, because it is built on two untruths. Didn't use lies, I said untruths — two fundamental untruths. And the first of these fundamental untruths, Mr. Speaker, is that everything in Saskatchewan is going down the tubes, that the economy is totally in ruins, that we've got grasshoppers, and we've got plagues, and we've got lotuses, and we've got low prices for this and high costs for that, and so on and so forth and so on and so on.

That's the message that this Conservative government has been trying to put forward for the last while — that everything in Saskatchewan is going down the tubes and that we, together, we all must suffer it; that we all must tighten our belts; that we all must endure the slings and outrageous fortune of the international . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Thank you very much, thank you very much. I'd like to thank the member from Turtleford — the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune. In this case, the slings and arrows of the international market place. But that we're all suffering, without exception. That's the kind of picture that this document tries to paint, and that's the kind of message that this government is trying to put forward.

But you know it's not true, Mr. Speaker. It's not true.

We're not all going down the tubes. Certainly senior citizens are getting squashed under their heel when they raise the rents at the special care homes.

(1645)

Certainly senior citizens are getting hurt, and everybody else in Saskatchewan is being hurt when they hit us with the drug plan. Certainly the children of this province are being hurt when they go after and rip away the dental plan. And one can go on and on.

And we're all getting hurt because of their taxes. We're all getting hurt because of their taxes. We're all getting hurt because they've taken away things like the property improvement grant. Saskatchewan people are being hurt, real Saskatchewan people. But we're not all suffering. Not all of Saskatchewan is suffering by any means.

There are those in this province who are doing very well, thank you, in this times of slings and arrows of outrageous international fortune. The oil companies in this province are doing very well, Mr. Speaker, I happened the other day to pick up a copy of the financial report for North Canadian Oils. North Canadian Oils, as you know, is a subsidiary of Hees International. Hees International is a multinational — they call it washing operation. They try to clean the cash up in companies that they feel have potential, and do a financial laundering operation, I believe is the technical term that they tried to use.

Heess International is the owner of North Canadian Oils, and we all see the North Canadian Oils building down on Victoria Avenue. Now the members opposite have tried to paint a picture of the oil industry as being suffering, of being at the mercy of the slings and arrows of outrageous international fortune and oil prices, that they're all hurting, that they all are just crushed, crushed by the international situation.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, when you look at a company like North Canadian Oils, not the major player in oil operations in this province or this country, but one of them — when you look at the balance book, you will see, among other things, that they made a profit last year; an after-tax, after-dividend profit of \$17 million — \$17 million, Mr. Speaker. Here is one ... the 12th-ranked oil company in this province makes an after-tax profit of \$17 million — not hurting.

In fact, they make an interesting statement in their financial report, Mr. Speaker, in terms of how they view what's happening in the province. I want to read what they say about land position, their land position. That's the acquiring of Saskatchewan land. That's land that belongs to the province — Crown land — belongs to every citizen in this province. Let's see what North Canadian Oils says how badly they're hurting in this international recession when they acquire land. They say:

During 1986 North Canadian Oil acquired 226,097 gross acres, 137,550 net acres, the majority of which was purchased at Crown land sales at a cost of \$5.3 million. Average prices paid were \$38 per acre in Alberta and \$36 per acre in

Saskatchewan, down from 74 and 67 per acre respectively, for land acquired in 1985. Much of this acreage was purchased in prime exploration (get this) ... prime exploration and development areas backed by seismic information. The depressed economic environment in 1986 provided the company with an opportunity to build a quality land portfolio at a relatively low cost.

Here we have a subsidiary of Hees International, a multinational financial conglomerate, who's acquiring Saskatchewan land, quality prime land. And why? Because we've got the world economic downturn. Seventeen millions in prime Saskatchewan land at half the cost of what they paid in 1985. Really hurting, Mr. Speaker. The oil companies in this province are real hurting.

And let me tell you, let me tell you right now, let me tell the people of Saskatchewan one of the reasons why they're hurting in the way that they're hurting. They're able to pull over the \$17 million, the 17 million or 20 million or whatever, whatever company happened to be looking at profits out of this province because that government over there made a choice — made a choice after the 1986 election. They made a choice to make a cut, and the first cut that they made were cuts to oil royalties — cuts to the oil companies. Money which could've gone to fund the dental plan in this province, they gave away to their friends in Hees International and the oil companies.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lyons:** — Mr. Speaker, they made that choice. Right? The oil companies are not hurting. Sure, there's trouble out there in the oil patch, but you just ask the oil companies, take a look at their financial statement, and you'll see what kind of trouble they have. Their trouble, Mr. Speaker, is they haven't got the armoured cars big enough to take our money to the banks of New York and Toronto. That's the kind of trouble that they're suffering from.

And you think, Mr. Speaker, that well, maybe that's just an anomaly; that's just the oil companies; that they're not hurting. Well, the Premier and the other members of the party like to picture themselves as the champions of the agricultural sector, the champions of farmers, the champions of rural Saskatchewan and of rural life in Saskatchewan. And what they try to do and what they have tried to make as a justification for this budget is that things are totally bad in rural Saskatchewan, things have gone down the tubes for Saskatchewan agriculture, things are being wiped out for the rural way of life.

And in many cases, it's true. If one looks at their record of trying to save family farms in this province, they will see that they have lost 1,000 permit-book holders a year, who have left Saskatchewan, have gone off the land — 1,000 a year, 1,000 farmers down the tubes a year.

And the farmers are hurting, and the rural communities in this province are hurting, but somebody isn't hurting. Now let me tell you who's not hurting, because I don't

think you have to guess very much. While ordinary people who live in rural Saskatchewan, who live on the farm are hurting, people like Cargill — Cargill, the giant, integrated agri-business corporation which sucks money out of Saskatchewan like a vacuum cleaner picks the dirt up off some people's floor, Cargill reports 66 per cent increase in 1986 profit — 66 per cent increase in 1986 profit. Very, very nice. We have a giant multinational agri-business firm which for years has been in the Saskatchewan market-place reporting a 66 per cent increase in the profit — 66 per cent increase.

Now that's a totally different picture of what's going on in certain segments of the agricultural community than what's going on for most people. So things aren't all bad if you're an oil company, or if you're a giant, multinational agri-business firm, or if you're Federated Co-operatives.

Federated Co-operatives last year enjoyed the highest record of profits in its history. Federated Co-operatives, which is based in rural western Canada, which derives most of its income from operations in western Canada, enjoyed the highest level of profits it's ever had. Things aren't going badly for Federated Co-operatives Ltd.

And, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the things like the financial page of the *Globe and Mail*, or if you read the *Financial Post* and the *Financial Times*, you will see that these are not isolated examples. You will see that in fact that company after company, whether it's in Saskatchewan or across Canada, aren't hurting. They're not hurting. They're in fact enjoying record profits while we are suffering, and we're suffering at the hands of a Conservative — a mean-spirited, narrow, Conservative government. And that's the lie, that is the untruth, that this budget is based on. And that is why that they have the political, that it's a political document, cause it doesn't tell the truth in what's happening in the economy. In fact it tries to picture exactly opposite, a mirror image of what's happening.

Mr. Speaker, this is a document that's built on untruths of reinforce a government of untruth tellers. It doesn't quite ring right, does it? I think Benjamin Disraeli term would suit the members opposite much more.

**An Hon. Member:** — What's Benjamin Disraeli's term?

**Mr. Lyons:** — Well Benjamin Disraeli talked about lies, damn lies and statistics and statisticians; and then I guess there's the Tory — the Tory, that's right; it was just the face we forgot.

Mr. Speaker, besides being an illegitimate document that's being presented to this House, we're dealing with a government which is an illegitimate government. It's a government which doesn't have a mandate from the people of this province to do what they're doing. It's a government which was elected because it kept its agenda hidden in the closet, did not bring it out, did not dare bring it out because they knew that they would never in a thousand years get elected in Saskatchewan on their political program. They didn't have the guts, quite frankly, they didn't have the guts. They didn't have the courage of their convictions. They wouldn't put their convictions up front. They're political cowards and each

and every one of them will pay for that political cowardice, because they'll be rooted out like the malignant lilies of the political field which they are, and they're going to be rooted out by the people of this province, Mr. Speaker. Let me tell you that right now.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lyons:** — Mr. Speaker, when I talked in the throne speech — I had the opportunity to speak during the throne speech debate — I said that the people were silent now, and this was back in the winter, but come the spring the legislature of the streets would be speaking. And on Saturday we saw that legislature, we saw the vanguard of tens of thousands of Saskatchewan people gathering here in front of the legislature, saying, you have done us injustice and we demand redress. You know, Mr. Speaker, the major, major chant, the major slogan that was raised by those demonstrators from across the province — you know what it was? It was: dump Devine; down with the Tories; call a new election; get rid of them. Get rid of them. That was what the protesters were saying. They were hurt. They were feeling that hurt. But most of all, they were feeling the hurt of having been lied to. That's what they were saying, Mr. Speaker: we've been lied to and we don't like it very much and we're not going to take it.

The member from Moose Jaw North talked about people being as mad as hell. Well, I was at the demonstration on Saturday, and I think that's an understatement. I think that's an understatement, Mr. Speaker. They were more than made as hell. They want one thing and that's just this: that's just to get rid of that government. They don't want these people in here because they were lied to. These people are illegitimate. They have no moral right. They have absolutely no moral right to govern this province. Oh, sure, they have the legal right because they had Brian Mulroney buy the election for them with his \$1 billion campaign promise. But they've got no moral right to sit there and govern this province because, as political cowards, they kept their hidden agenda in the closet and wouldn't bring it out until well after the election, because they knew the people of Saskatchewan wouldn't elect them. That's why they're an illegitimate government.

Mr. Speaker, there's one question, though, that we haven't addressed yet. I notice the time, so before I get into this, I was wondering should we maybe adjourn the debate until this evening, given the . . . I notice the time. Or call it 5 o'clock?

No. Okay. Fine, Mr. Speaker. I guess there's one question that hasn't been answered in this. They haven't been answered in this, and I . . . and that's the question: why are they doing it? I mean, why are they doing it? They say that they've got fiscal problems. They say that there's a deficit problem. And we have time and time again — and the member for Regina North East in his excellent reply to the budget address — pointed out that, in fact, the document doesn't speak the truth in telling the people of Saskatchewan that there are alternative sources of revenue; that in fact they can tax the oil companies, they can put back the oil royalties structure and be able to deal with the deficit in a fair way that affects all Saskatchewan, instead of the kind of mean-spirited way that they're

attacking people.

Some people say to me that they think these people are bad or evil. Well, some may be. I don't happen to think that. Some people say that they're incompetent; and some are. We've seen the Minister of Finance for this government, time after time, bring in budgets which are totally out of line with reality, and that's nothing more than political or fiscal incompetence.

Some people say that these people over on the opposite side are fools. Well I'll tell you what, they all are. They're all fools if they end up voting for this budget because what they're doing is voting for the end of their political future in this province. They're all fools if they think that the people of Saskatchewan are going to forget what they've done. They're all fools if they think that the people of Saskatchewan will forgive them. For while the people of Saskatchewan are caring and sharing, they won't countenance one thing, and that's being . . . having the truth, they won't countenance the deceit. They won't countenance the deceit that the members on the opposite side practice. So those people are fools . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** —. Order, order. Order. It being 5 o'clock, this House does not stand recessed until 7 o'clock.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.