

June 25, 1987

EVENING SITTING

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 proposed amendment thereto moved by Mr. Tchorzewski.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We adjourned for supper, and the member from Quill Lake will be pleased to know that I only have approximately 10 minutes left. However, I would only ask of him that perhaps he listen to some of it.

We had been talking about oil policies, Mr. Speaker, before we adjourned at 5 o'clock, and I had left off in explaining what a price-sensitive royalty system was.

And to simply go over it one more time, Mr. Speaker, it's a rather simple method of defining your royalties. And it simply is when the price of oil is low, your royalties are accordingly set; and when the price of oil goes up, so does your royalty level.

It's also interesting to note with the new fiscal regime, Mr. Speaker, that in fact, the regime that we've put into place when oil gets to a certain price, the royalty rate will be somewhat higher than it was previous to January 1 of 1987.

Mr. Speaker, our objectives, or our goals, on setting our oil policies were rather straightforward. We wanted to diversify the Saskatchewan economy by developing the natural resources of the province. And I really don't think that the opposition can disagree with that.

We also wanted to maximize the short- and the long-term benefits to the province from such development.

Mr. Speaker, thirdly, we wanted to minimize the environmental impacts associated with oil and gas development.

An Hon. Member: — Well you didn't succeed.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well the member says we didn't succeed, and we'll be able to take issue with that probably in estimates when we get into them.

Mr. Speaker, in attempting to achieve these goals, we have done some consulting, and we've indicated some co-operation, and we've searched for the best expertise that we could find.

We also understand that our province must compete for investment dollars, and if the opposition does not believe that that has to take place in order to get some

development going in the province, then they have their heads in the sand.

We also, Mr. Speaker, established a reasonable economic environment for the industry. We removed some administrative red tape, and we simplified some procedures. We also recognize, Mr. Speaker, that the benefits from such development extend far beyond government royalty and tax revenues. And I believe that the Leader of the Opposition would agree to that.

We also recognized it increases employment, jobs for our people, growth of service and support industries and businesses. It gives municipalities a broader and a greater municipal tax revenue base. And it gives us an expanded surface lease rental opportunities for farmers and for individuals. And those are some of the benefits that have to be considered outside of what government takes.

Mr. Speaker, by developing policies which take a long-term view of the industry and its potential . . . and the provinces passed Bill 42 and the federal national energy program, and I know that the NDP didn't like that — have provided some ample evidence of the result which can be expected from short-sighted policies. And I would like to think they are policies which view the industry simply as a cash cow, or more commonly, as people would say as they view the oil industry, the goose that laid the golden egg. It hasn't been effective on the short term, Mr. Speaker.

The Leader of the Opposition claims this budget did not tax the oil companies. His new members obviously agree with that. What he did not tell his members is, Saskatchewan still has the highest royalty rates in North America. What he did not tell them is, if the royalty rate is too high, the wells are shut in. And, Mr. Speaker, shut-in wells don't pay royalties and they don't pay the taxes and they don't keep the jobs.

Basic economics, basic economics for the member from Quill Lakes. What he did not tell him, Mr. Speaker, and nor did the member from Regina North East, who used to be a Finance minister, was that earlier the NDP had had an incentive program. That incentive program was in place, Mr. Speaker, until they left office. That incentive program paid 75 per cent of the actual cost of the wells. Now that's not bad, except that it also paid 75 per cent for a dry hole — no oil. Mr. Speaker, he did not tell them that when he left office in 1982 he left the province and the taxpayers with \$300 million liability owing on the NDP incentive program.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about that program because they say our incentive program shouldn't be in. That's what they say out of this side of the mouth; on the other side of the mouth they in fact had put one in.

Mr. Speaker, that program, as I said, covered 75 per cent of drilling and completion costs including dry holes. Mr. Speaker, it favoured the big oil companies. Why? Because it was based on production, and the big oil companies had the majority of the production in this office. It was also complex to administer. And, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately it resulted in part of the benefit

being transferred to the federal government through the then taxation system. However, that was maybe not their fault. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to think our program is based on success, because we don't pay for dry holes, and it's neutral in application to all companies.

Mr. Speaker, while the NDP leader was busy not telling the whole story, he told a much different story about a year ago. And I don't know if the new members are aware of that. Interestingly enough, his story was told to the newspaper with the now president of the NDP, Mr. Lingenfelter. If the new members across the way are not familiar with the NDP energy philosophies, then I think it deserves some attention in this House.

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, started off by saying, and I quote:

We'd like to see continued increases in production, sustain the drilling, and we would like to believe that exploration drilling will take place other than in established fields.

We agree, Mr. Speaker, we totally agree with the Leader of the Opposition on that point. Obviously he agrees with us because it's the same policy. The Leader of the Opposition went on to say, Mr. Speaker, and I quote:

We have no objection to tax holiday incentives for exploration.

An Hon. Member: — Who said that?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — The Leader of the Opposition said that. He also went on, Mr. Speaker, to say:

... that the NDP incentives program implemented during the 1970's did have holes, so to speak, in that it made it "fair game" in the business of buying and selling these credits.

He went to say:

We're not sure about incentives for dry holes.

That's where we differ, Mr. Speaker. We're sure; we're not going to pay for dry holes.

But he went on to say — and I ask the members to listen, the new members of the NDP, for this is what you believe in:

... we do believe in generous incentives and we have no objection to royalty tax holidays. Every government today has to realize that this is no longer the 1970's. It was a seller's market, therefore, there were strong royalties, and so we try to get what we could for the provincial treasury. Now there are compensation packages for explorers and for royalties. It is not the same realm as the 1970's because of the market. There are changed economics.

Mr. Speaker, if that's what the Leader of the Opposition says is the NDP energy philosophy, then I suggest that the next leader of the opposition, the member from

Saskatoon Riversdale, has a different view of the energy philosophies of the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, at the time the article was written, the leader went on to add a couple of other things. He did say that:

Now there is a little uncertainty creeping into the scene due to OPEC . . .

That was in January of 1986. But he said:

... we hope it's not too significant.

And I want to tell the members, it was very significant, very.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition debate on this budget has been far from reason and fact. We've all had choices to make, and we have chosen what we think is a realistic path in a transitional period of time. We have chosen to maintain a high level on the education and health programs. We have chosen to down-size government. At the same time we've done that, Mr. Speaker, we have chosen for some tax increases, but we also chose some tax reductions, namely for low-income families and single parents. We have chosen to pursue economic diversification through such policies as the energy policy, and we've chosen to acknowledge the difficulties in our farm sector and our resource sector.

Mr. Speaker, there are no assumptions built in for sky-high prices with this budget. We have chosen to take a realistic approach.

Mr. Speaker, while those are some of our choices, what may I ask are the choices opposite? Like the Manitoba counterparts, perhaps, for the member from Quill Lake. Is it a choice of bigger government, or have you got a broader vision than that? Perhaps it's a choice of bigger deficits. Then I ask, for how long and how much?

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it's back to nationalization — perhaps it's back to nationalization, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order, please. Please allow the minister to make her remarks without constantly interrupting her.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — I can only assume that perhaps I touched a soft spot. Mr. Speaker, the word "nationalization" . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please, order. I have just asked the members to not interrupt the minister, and already, as soon as she is on her feet, they are interrupting her. Please allow her to continue with her remarks.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the debate on how we do things in this province, there's obviously some differences between this side of the House and that side of the House. Nationalization has been one of them.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder how often that most of the members actually think about what nationalization is. They talk about wanting to own the resources, and yet the

nationalization is simply the act of taking tax money to buy what the people already own — nothing more and nothing less. The leader has chosen to simplify, I believe, for politically motivated reasons, by saying that we chose the oil companies over ordinary citizens. And I say, nonsense. The facts will speak for themselves. He's had the voice of rally, and I might add, so has the member from Saskatoon South, Regina North East, Moose Jaw North, Regina Rosemont, Prince Albert and Saskatoon Riversdale. The voice of rally, when all that Saskatchewan asks in dealing with this democratic institution are voices of reason.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I have not heard any reasonable arguments from across the floor as to why the budget should not be passed. I've heard rhetoric and a lot of allegations, but no solutions. And to be perfectly blunt about it, I believe their credibility has slipped several notches with their contradictory statements and the leader's stated positions on the energy policy.

But more significantly, Mr. Speaker, has been their strategy of instilling fear. That has been a choice made by the front benches across the way. That is the tactic, the tactic of fear. That's not ours, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we reject that, and we reject it, as I do, along with the amendment that the member from Regina North East has put forth. And I believe, actually, it's an amendment of fear, an amendment that lacks a whole lot of realism, and an amendment that lacks solutions with vision — there is none. We're back to the 1967s, as the member from Saskatoon Riversdale got into today in his early days in the House. Mr. Speaker, this is 1987.

For those reasons I will be supporting this budget and be voting against the amendment.

(1915)

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It is my privilege to rise this evening to participate in the debate on this, the first budget of the Tory administration since they were re-elected.

I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the Tories opened the legislature with their throne speech last fall, the members opposite were greatly reduced in numbers, sadly lacking in spirit, and they decided that the only way they could escape further retribution was to say nothing, to do nothing, and to promise nothing.

Unfortunately for them, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Finance minister couldn't leave well enough alone. He has given us the longest budget speech in Saskatchewan's history. It started last January and it finally concluded on June 17, maybe — maybe. Because yesterday he said he hadn't quite finished yet.

This budget speech was not only the longest, but it was the sorriest budge tin the history of Saskatchewan because it represents three things: a betrayal of the people of Saskatchewan; a fiscal disaster; and a triumph of ideology over common sense.

The Finance minister claims that this document will continue to build, to protect, and to diversify. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the lane to hell is paved with good intentions.

For what we have here in this budget is long-term pain with very little gain, unless you are an oil company or a bank or some foreign multinational corporation. The only things that the Conservatives are building are deficits. The only things they protect is their corporate friends from taxation. Mr. Speaker, they talk about diversifying our economy, but the only manufacturing that this government is currently accomplishing is manufacturing excuses.

To build, they say, to protect, to diversify — the slogans roll from the lips of the Finance minister. It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the Finance minister is a man of vast and varied misinformation, is secure in the belief that a little inaccuracy saves a world of explanation. George Orwell, in his novel *Nineteen Eight-Four*, told of a world in which we had a ministry of truth and a new language, Newspeak. Well, Mr. Speaker, Orwell's ideas are alive and well in Saskatchewan — to build, to protect, to diversify, they say.

And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, what does that really mean? It means, in fact, to cut, to slash, to destroy, to undermine the programs that we have here built in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, Newspeak is alive and well in Saskatchewan. And let me quote from the throne speech last fall. Let me speak in respect to what they said. You know what it indicated?

My Government intends to implement its programme in a spirit of co-operation and participation. Recent months (it goes one and says) have afforded my Ministers the opportunity to . . . make themselves aware of the public's ideas and aspirations.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what I would like to know: what rural and urban municipalities asked the government for a slash in revenue sharing? What hospital boards asked for a cut in their operating grants? I say you've betrayed their trust.

What school boards petitioned for a \$20 million cut in education grants? You betrayed their trust. What farmers asked for a \$24 million reduction in farm fuel rebate programs? I say that members opposite betrayed their trust.

I ask you, what drivers throughout Saskatchewan came to this government and asked for a 7 cent a litre increase in gasoline? What agricultural fairs and exhibition boards asked for the elimination of provincial grants and support? I say, what 4-H club members asked for the elimination of support to their programs? And I'll say there were none. In each instance they betrayed a trust of the people of this province.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, what students asked to have their courses cut, their future devastated, and destroy the quality of education in our institutions of higher

education? And I'll say there were no students that were consulted, Mr. Speaker.

I ask you, what battered women came to you to ask that their grant to their transitions houses, in fact, be slashed? And I say they betrayed their trust.

But the buzz words of the Minister of Finance are: to build, to protect, to diversify, Mr. Speaker. These are really hollow words. They're hollow words to the farmers, to our working people, to our young people, to our senior citizens across this province.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, you have made them, the government has made them unwilling participants in the most savage attack against the people and the programs that they have developed over our history. But, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you that the people here will not co-operate with the savage slashing of the programs.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — And I'll tell members opposite, you can tell them to clear out their desks, they're fired. You can shut down their dental chairs and say there will be no more dental care for our children. You can tell the seniors to pay for their drugs. You can tell them to pay more for their gas, and you can tell them to pay more taxes. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that they may participate, the people of Saskatchewan, but they will not in fact co-operate. They will participate, but I'll tell you that they will not forget.

I want to say to the government opposite, I remind you that you are the instruments of your own destruction. And I'll tell you that this budget has sown the seeds of despair and desolation across this province. And in doing so, that you have planted and will in fact reap the rich harvest when you pick up your courage to face the people of this province again.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan have a long memories. I say that the people of Saskatchewan will not forget what this budget has done to them. And I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, we will not let them forget either.

Every day is one day less for this government, and the people, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, are already counting. On every farm, in every hamlet, in our villages, and towns, and cities, they will be counting and they will be waiting. You have betrayed their trust, and I will tell you their retribution will be harsh and fast when given the opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the slogan of the people of Saskatchewan will be 62 in '90 or '91. The people, I'll tell you, of Saskatchewan are not that vindictive you know. You know what they're going to do? I predict they will leave them about two seats in this House — maybe. But that's only so they will never forget what these people have done to the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, their theme, to build, to protect, to diversify — such hypocrisy from the members opposite. For the past year we have heard that, Saskatchewan Builds. And I want to say that on lot after lot, empty lot after lot, you've

got the big blue signs saying, Saskatchewan Builds.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what are we building here in Saskatchewan under the present government? As I say, we're building deficits, tens of millions of dollars of deficit, hundreds of millions of dollars, billions of dollars of deficit — larger and larger deficits.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that we are the only province here in Canada where we're really building because the other thing, besides building this massive amount of deficit, we have built unemployment, massive unemployment in this province. And I'll tell you, there's skilled people unemployed, there's unskilled people unemployed, there are educated people unemployed, there are young people and there are old people unemployed in this province. And the regrettable fact, just as we had in the last administration, that right-wing administration under the late Ross Thatcher, people are again — young people — are leaving this province faster than ever before in the history of this province.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan Builds. I say to you that if we aren't building, then let's take a look at the second pledge — to protect people. I want them over there, the government, to tell the people faced with paying for expensive drugs that that's what they're doing, is to protect them. I want them to tell the young people that they disqualified or cut off of the dental program that they're protecting them. I want them to tell the battered women that they have cut off the grants for the transition homes that they are protecting them. I want them to tell the people who cannot obtain a hospital bed that they're protecting them. Tell that to the people who can't find a social worker that you're protecting them. Tell that to the people in Saskatchewan who can't find jobs that what you're doing is protecting them. I say, Mr. Speaker, this budget represents the greatest hypocrisy that this legislature has seen.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Speaker, what about their third theme, to diversify, they claim? Well let's look at what they're accomplishing here to diversify. This year there was a significant decline in the number of people employed in manufacturing and in finance, but still they're diversifying.

Saskatchewan *Trends Monitor* says last year, we said new housing starts would weaken further in 1986. They did. We anticipate another decline in 1987. And this is diversification. It really looks like an economy that's really on the move.

Vacancy rates in apartments and homes are rising. Bankruptcies are setting records in '86, exceeding the previous record of '82, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that at that time in '82 the operative slogan was, "open for business".

(1930)

Well, Mr. Speaker, to diversify. Manufacturers say that production will be lower in the next six months. Investment is down, and their theme goes on — to build,

to protect, to diversify, Mr. Speaker, when these difficult times call for leadership, a philosophy, a program, this government gives us slogans.

This budget, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, is a disaster looking for a place to happen. And unfortunately for the people of this province, it's happening here. The worst fears of the people of Saskatchewan have suddenly been realized. This government in this budget supplies no leadership, has no overall program, but has a philosophy based on political expediency and a discredited ideology of neo-conservatism. But then, Mr. Speaker, should we have expected anything more from the members opposite? Mr. Speaker, I can only say to you that we have a government here that has its wishbone where its backbone ought to be.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — You know, the other day I was talking to a constituent of mine, and he came up to me — he's a farmer and well-established farmer — and he came up and he told me, he said, do you realize, he said, Murray, he say, there's no fool like an old Conservative. And I say, why? He says, you just can't beat experience.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — No, Mr. Speaker, we couldn't expect more. Because to the members opposite, Conservative philosophy is sort of like a rocking chair — it provides a sense of motion, but it doesn't get you anywhere. And I say that because I think a Conservative is a person who doesn't think anything should be done for the first time. Yes, Mr. Speaker . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Tories, I suggest, and I suggest to the people of Saskatchewan, are a mean, callous, uncaring political party who worships at the altar of ideology that says that the only way to create prosperity is by taking it from those who have least and giving it to those who have most.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan are telling us — they're telling us in letters, by rallies, by phone calls, on the streets, in our stores, in the restaurants, on their farms — they're telling us that they have had enough. They have said to us that it is time to say, no more, to this government. No more to the members opposite, who believe that they should build a society based on greed and selfishness and handouts to their corporate friends.

Mr. Speaker, there is a better way than that demonstrated in this budget by the Minister of Finance, but it will not be found in the abstract market-place. It will not be found in the writings of the Fraser Institute, or their research which is being used by the members opposite. No, Mr. Speaker, the solutions to our problems will not be found in the budget delivered by the Minister of Finance. This budget does not solve problems, it causes problems.

This budget, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, is a sorry document. It breaks every major Tory commitment to the people of this province. It breaks the promise . . . It breaks, first of all, the

promise to cut income taxes, which was given in 1982, to cut income tax by 10 per cent. In fact they have reversed it and massively increased the income tax on the people of this province.

The promise to eliminate sales tax has not only been forgotten, it has gone the other way — an increase from 5 per cent to 7 per cent. The promise to reduce gas tax has suddenly been forgotten. In the last legislature, before the last election, I can remember the Premier indicating and scoffing at the New Democrats and saying to us: New Democrats, people should know, they will bring back a gas tax.

And here the very Premier, who deceived the people of the province and basically won an election on the removal of the gas tax, has forgotten that promise. The promise of open government has been forgotten. The promise of co-operation, forgotten. The promise of participation by the people of this province, forgotten. The promise of jobs to our young people, miserably forgotten. The only thing that this government has not forgotten is how to reward its friends and big business.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Speaker, their corporate friends continue to wallow in the public trough. For them, it's business as usual. For them, Tory times are good times. But I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, it's not for the poor, for the unemployed, for the sick, for our seniors, our young, our students. For ordinary people, I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, Tory times are hard times.

And I say to you that the people of Saskatchewan will never forget. Nothing will save the members opposite from the damage and the mistrust that they have placed in the minds of the people of this province. This budget will be the instrument of the destruction of that political party because it is an instrument which really maps out all of the deception that has gone on by that party with the people of this province.

I can say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the people have listened and the people have learned, and they know that they have been betrayed. And they say, never again will you have an opportunity to betray, to deceive, to hurt, to lie to the people of this province. I say, Mr. Speaker, that they will look to a return to a Saskatchewan tradition of people working together, not just for themselves, but for all members of society.

The people of Saskatchewan will be people working together, not just for their future, but for all our children. People working together, Mr. Speaker, not just for our children but for the children of the world, not just for ourselves but for a better world. People working together bound by common ideals, common objectives, working together in a common purpose and a common dedication to a great cause — that cause, the liberation of humankind.

People working together, Mr. Speaker, in the tradition of our great leaders: the J.S. Woodworth, the Tommy Douglas, the Woodrow Lloyd, and our current leader, Allan Blakeney; and all of those pioneers who worked to

build the Commonwealth Co-operative Federation here in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, this budget can destroy all what these pioneers have built here in Saskatchewan, but I'll tell you one thing, they cannot destroy memories.

We will remember the programs, as we remember those who built with their toil and their effort. They were people with a vision, people with a dream. And I'll tell you here tonight, members opposite in the government, that we're going to survive this nightmare, a nightmare of the exercise of power for power's sake. I say, Mr. Speaker, that our pioneers dreamt of how power could be used. They dreamt of using power for the benefit of ordinary people, for the good of all, and they dreamt of building a better world by building a better province. And I say they dreamt well, and they built well, and they gave us much to be proud of. They gave us their lives in our service.

In this budget, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite have indeed betrayed the people of this province's trust. The members opposite have forgotten, or perhaps they never knew, that the real measure of individual and national life is the quality of that life. And what we provide so that people can live useful and meaningful lives is the real measure of political worth.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we in the New Democratic Party look at this budget and see what I has done and see what it is doing and see what it will do, we can only call upon the people of Saskatchewan to respond to the oil scriptural call — be strong and of good courage, be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed.

But, Mr. Speaker, effort and courage are not enough. We must also have the purpose and direction today; there can be no status quo. Change is the law that binds society and those members together. And members opposite who look only to the past are certain to lose the future.

We need a budget that realizes that the risks are great, that the burdens are indeed heavy, and the problems are difficult. But I'll tell you, we need a budget that does not advocate its responsibilities by adopting simplistic solutions by promoting appealing slogans or by seeking out convenient scapegoats.

Mr. Speaker, we need a budget and government that not only seeks great ends but also the concrete means of achieving them. We need a government and a budget that is not afraid to act, that is prepared to exercise its full powers to assist its people. We need, Mr. Speaker, a budget and a government that is prepared to accept its full responsibilities to help all those in need and suffering. We needed a budget that recognizes that yesterday is not ours to recover but tomorrow is ours to win or lose. We need a budget that will pursue the right without self-righteousness. We need a budget that will pursue unity without conformity. We need a budget that will allow us to grow in strength with pride in ourselves. We needed a budget that will speak the truth and serve justice.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this budget does none of these things. Mr. Speaker, we must ask the people of

Saskatchewan to join with us. We ask the people of Saskatchewan to give us your hearts, and each day shall be a better world. We ask the people of Saskatchewan to give us your hearts and we will be the spades that dig the foundations for a new and better world. We ask you to give us your hearts so that we can change men and institutions for the better.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1945)

Mr. Koskie: — We ask the people of Saskatchewan to give us your hearts so that we can change our province, our nation, and our world.

Mr. Speaker, this budget has been the biggest betrayal that the people of Saskatchewan have ever had laid upon them. And I say to you that the people of Saskatchewan will never forget.

In 1967, Mr. Speaker, history has repeated itself. In 1967 the Thatcher government came into power and immediately afterwards heaped upon the people of this province all of the tax increases the like of which could hardly be believed.

And today we have history repeating itself. Here was a government, when it went out in October, telling the people of this province that we're going to build; that everything was fine. And I say that was hypocritical; that was misrepresenting the truth; that was deceiving the people of Saskatchewan. And I'll tell you, the people of Saskatchewan have long memories, and they will not forget.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by saying that this is a harsh, and mean, and an uncaring budget. But could we expect anything else?

All of us who sat here in the four and a half years prior to the election knew exactly what they were going to do. They were following the Fraser Institute blueprint for changing Saskatchewan as we know it. That's what they're doing.

And I'll tell you, during the first four and a half years they did pour money out — unlimited. And we knew deficits were growing. And the Minister of Finance: can you believe that he still sits in that chair as Minister of Finance? A man that came into this legislature before the last election, his final budget then, and said there would be \$389 million of deficit, and had the utter audacity to come forward and say, well I slipped a little — it's a \$1.2 billion, \$1.2 billion. And can you believe it, that they have so little talent over there that they can't even find a replacement for that incompetence?

It's a sad commentary that the best that they could have as a Minister of Finance is a retreat Liberal brought in for the purpose of power. So I say, Mr. Speaker, New Democrats are serious and New Democrats are angry. The people of Saskatchewan are angry, and I'll tell you, you boys across the way, you're going to have the roughest time, the

roughest time that you have ever seen. Because you have betrayed the people of Saskatchewan. And the people of -Saskatchewan are joining with us, and I'll tell you, we'll drive you out of office.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Speaker, I will be voting for the amendment and voting against this budget.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I rise tonight I think it's the fifth or sixth budget debate that I have taken part in since I was first elected to this legislature, and I must say that in preparing for this budget, it was one of the most difficult, arduous, and challenging processes that I'm sure any government has faced for some several decades, Mr. Speaker. But in the end, the right balance was found.

We said to the people of this province some several months ago that before we asked the family or the people of this province to tighten their belts, the government would tighten their belt first. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a budget that recognizes the priorities of the people — health, and education, and protection of families and individuals and seniors. It's a budget of understanding, it's a budget of fairness, and it's a budget of sensitivity. And there is no question, Mr. Speaker, that not all of the measures in this budget are popular nor did we expect them to be, Mr. Speaker.

But I can say, Mr. Speaker, without a doubt, that although this budget may not be entirely popular in terms of some of the tax increases that are necessary to get our economic house in order and some of the expenditure changes that had to be made, Mr. Speaker, we can say for absolute certainty that this is a responsible budget, Mr. Speaker, and it's the right budget. It's right because, Mr. Speaker, the public interest is put ahead of the special interest. And so I say congratulations to the Minister of Finance on a document that has fairness and responsibility and understanding and compassion.

Before I get into my further remarks tonight, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to pay tribute to some remarks made in the speech in this House in the budget debates earlier on this week, June 22 to be exact, by the member from Athabasca. And why a part of his remarks particularly stood out, Mr. Speaker, was for this reason: there was some thought had gone into it and some new thought, Mr. Speaker. And that was a rare commodity as we've listened to the opposition speeches over the past several days. This stood out, Mr. Speaker, like none other across there. The member from Athabasca made reference to a tragic hockey accident involving Brad Hornung, which I think we're all familiar with, Mr. Speaker. He raised a problem, but more importantly, he raised a solution that might prevent these accidents from happening in the future, Mr. Speaker.

And I commend that member because it's been a rare commodity that the NDP have taken a look at a subject and proposed a possible solution that's worthy of some study. And so I commend the hon. member from

Athabasca for taking that initiative, and a rare initiative it is over there.

I'd also, Mr. Speaker, like to say thank you to those who I have worked with over the past several months in the portfolio, the Education portfolio. I think of people like the Saskatchewan School Trustees, the LEADS (League of Educational Administrators, Directors and Superintendents) organization, the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, the university boards of governors, the presidents of universities, the faculties and staff of institutes, the teachers themselves, and certainly some of the students who have hosted me as I visited some of the schools in this province, Mr. Speaker.

And I must say, that although in some of these instances there has been some nose-to-nose debate, if you like, certainly I have found, for the most part, the attitude non-confrontational; but on the contrary, Mr. Speaker, rather constructive. And I want to thank them for that, and for their continued advice and guidance and input; I find them very genuine and sincere people.

And I also would like to acknowledge the work that the officials in the departments of . . . the new Department of Education, if you like: formerly made up of Saskatchewan Library; the Department of Education, K to 12 as you traditionally knew it; and the department of advanced education and manpower; as well, the staff at the Public Service Commission.

I particularly want to acknowledge the work that the Education department has done under the former minister in putting out the blueprint for the future, a booklet entitled *Directions* — the blueprint for the K to 12 system as we track towards the 21st century. And then more recently, Mr. Speaker, the document entitled *Preparing for the Year 2000*, done by those who work in post-secondary education. Excellent documents, Mr. Speaker, ones that we're very proud of and ones that the people of the province . . . It will serve the people of this province very well as we move towards the future.

I would like to spend a few minutes tonight, Mr. Speaker, talking in a few areas. First of all, talk about education and the exciting future that I think we have ahead of us. I want to talk a little bit as well about priorities and about making choices. Thirdly, I want to spend a few moments on my constituency and what this budget means for the constituents — my constituents of the Weyburn area, Mr. Speaker. And finally I'd like to end with a few remarks on the legislature in general.

I want to talk to the members here tonight about our plans for the future, the future of education. One could talk about the past, our record — the facts, Mr. Speaker, if you like, and certainly I think the facts do need to be told. Facts like, Mr. Speaker, in the last four years our government increased funding to post-secondary education by more than 50 per cent — a record not matched by any other province in this country. And that's a fact, Mr. Speaker,

Fact two, Mr. Speaker, that during the NDP administration, for some 11 years, university buildings went unrepaired. There were no replacements —

equipment went unreplaced, buildings were allowed to run down and depreciate because of fiscal neglect by the NDP government, Mr. Speaker. But what is the record under our administration, Mr. Speaker? Well, at the University of Regina, we will be providing more capital funding this year than the NDP did in its last six years of office, Mr. Speaker. And that's a fact.

As well, Mr. Speaker, the Devine government at the University of Saskatchewan will be building, along with the university and some of their corporate patrons, the new agriculture college, Mr. Speaker. The new agriculture college, which is pictured on the recent *College of Agriculture Highlights '86*, University of Saskatchewan, their annual report. A very, very fine facility, Mr. Speaker, and one that the farmers and the researchers at the university and the professors in agriculture of this province have waited something over one quarter of a century to happen, Mr. Speaker.

And under our Premier, it is now happening and it's happening because this is a man who understands the heart and soul of farming and agriculture in this province, Mr. Speaker. And it surprises me day after day that the NDP wonder why they have no constituency in the farm population across this province. It's no wonder when for 25 years, Mr. Speaker, this building that was sorely needed did not get built, and to look at the priorities and the choices that they made and put ahead of this project, Mr. Speaker.

Another fact, Mr. Speaker. The University of Regina, in conjunction with a company called University Microfilms International took \$1 million of their money, of the corporate sponsor's money, \$1 million from the Government of Saskatchewan and parleyed it into a 200 . . . in excess of \$200 million worth of library print material, Mr. Speaker, or library materials — but not in the conventional form as we know it, in the form of microfilm — \$2 million bought in excess of \$200 million of library material in this new technology. And I thought it was tremendously appropriate that on the pamphlet that they had that day, the headline or the top line was "The margin for excellence, the first step."

And that's what we're talking about, Mr. Speaker, in all of these initiatives, whether it's building anew agriculture college, microfilm acquisitions, new initiatives in computers. We're talking about providing quality education for our young people, Mr. Speaker.

And I congratulate Ernie Ingles and his fine staff over at the University of Regina Library for being innovative and being creative and taking \$2 million and turning it into \$200 million, Mr. Speaker — that's innovation. With these projects and initiatives, by making these resources available, Mr. Speaker, what we're talking about is quality.

And I now want to talk about the other very important issue when it comes to education, and that's accessibility. What are the facts on accessibility, Mr. Speaker? We've heard time and time again in this debate about how there are cut-backs, student enrolment is down, Mr. Speaker. At least that's what the opposition say.

But what are the facts, Mr. Speaker? The facts are these, Mr. Speaker, More than 5,000 additional students per year now have access to university because of the additional resources and facilities that are provided, Mr. Speaker. A 30 per cent increase in students has occurred at a time when the main population group aged 15 to 24 has shown virtually no increase. A 30 per cent enrolment when that age category has basically stayed static, Mr. Speaker — 5,000 additional students.

Fact, Mr. Speaker, technical institute funding up 72 per cent. The opposition would have us believe that somehow the technical institutes are falling apart because of cut-backs in funding. Mr. Speaker, it was this government, it was this Premier that built the new Prince Albert campus. Mr. Speaker, it was this government that has seen institute enrolments up 35 per cent. And the facts, Mr. Speaker, are the same for student aid. They're the same for training programs for those on welfare, and they're the same for institute extension programs in rural Saskatchewan — a very, very fine record when it comes to accessibility, Mr. Speaker.

Let me turn now to the K to 12 school system, for here the same contrast between the NDP neglect and our government's performance continues unabated. When we came to power in 1982 we found a school system running out of money, running out of time, and running out of patience. We ended up by having to increase funding by \$100 million a year before we finally met the need.

(2000)

In the five years from '77 to '82, when the NDP were in government, Mr. Speaker, municipalities had been forced to increase the school mill rate a total of 59 per cent to compensate for underfunding. In the five years under our Premier's leadership, '82 to '87, by comparison school mill rates have increased by only 14 per cent. Compare the record, Mr. Speaker — 14 per cent versus 59 per cent. But the news gets better, Mr. Speaker, because between '84 and '86 there was no increase at all in mill rates.

Now we have also made major investments in new construction and in new equipment for our schools, Mr. Speaker. Over the last five years we have undertaken 600 school construction projects totalling some \$350 million and construction related activity. And under the new \$150 million education development fund we have supported 1,800 projects, including the purchase of several hundreds of computers for schools and more than 20,000 school library acquisitions and countless other pieces of equipment, Mr. Speaker.

These then are the facts relating to education policy over the last five years. It is a record of accomplishment. It is a record of accomplishment, Mr. Speaker, that no other province in this country can match.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Now I can hear members opposite asking: if we have done so much why are people talking about cut-backs in education? I could give the

easy answer to this question, Mr. Speaker, and blame it on opposition scaremongering or media sensationalism. But the real answer, Mr. Speaker, is much deeper. Teachers, professors, and administrators in our schools and universities are feeling cut back because they sense they aren't keeping up with the rate of change in their environment.

As the figures show — as the numbers that I have just read into the record, Mr. Speaker — as the figures show, there have been a dramatic success in objective terms in increasing enrolment and accessibility. We have more of every form of service than we did just five short years ago — almost double in some cases. Yet the feeling of inadequacy persists, Mr. Speaker. To many it appeared as though we were on a treadmill where the objective keeps receding as we reach out to grasp, but never quite getting to it.

The solution to this dilemma is not simply more money, more borrowed money. The solution, Mr. Speaker, requires that we stand back and ask whether we have the right mechanisms to get the job done. So let's pause for a moment and consider how our world is changing.

As members on both sides of the House will agree, we see around us the forerunners of enormous change in Canada and around the world. Across a number of international fronts, economic forces are in play which will result in a major restructuring of the global economy. Socially and demographically, new pressures and new challenges are springing up to which governments and all of society must react. And at the same time as these forces for change are accumulating around us, we are beginning to experience a new generation of technology that will revolutionize the very processes we use to comprehend and manage the world around us.

It is as if, Mr. Speaker, we had jumped from a slow moving passenger car plodding along a sedate country road to a fast moving race car accelerating down a steep hill. In this new environment, Mr. Speaker, there is only one constant, and that is change. If we are to survive and prosper in this new world, we must come to grips with the reality of change.

This new information age will have an impact at least equal to the Industrial Revolution, perhaps greater even. But whereas the Industrial Revolution occurred over at least 100 years, the information age has hit full speed in a 10th of that time.

All economies are vulnerable to this new technology, but none as much as Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. Our whole economy since the Prairies were settled has been based on agriculture and resource extraction.

In the past, each new technology simply brought a more efficient means of production. We went from an era where the strong back on the farm was the symbol of success and prosperity, to an age when the farmer with several teams of good horses, that was the symbol of prosperity on the farm, Mr. Speaker.

In other words, we went from an age of manpower to an age where we had the sophistication of horses and the

horsepower. And then we went from the horsepower to the tractor, Mr. Speaker, and its mega-horsepower.

But for the first time in our history we face a new technology which has the potential to relegate natural resources to a secondary role. Diversification is the order of the day. The basis of this new technology is knowledge or information. And overnight our economic development strategy is cast in a new light. Suddenly brainpower and the human intellect — not horsepower, not manpower, but brainpower and the human intellect — become the primary resources or the primary considerations, Mr. Speaker. Education becomes the primary concern in our efforts to maintain our standard of living.

Now members opposite may say, well that's all well and fine, Mr. Speaker. Education, you say, is a priority; it's going to be our main concern. Just pour in the money and away we go.

But, Mr. Speaker, that's just like saying that horsepower could have competed with the internal combustion engine if we had just hitched a few more horses in front of the stone boat. That is the reality of the kind of change we're talking about, Mr. Speaker. We don't need more horses; we don't need more horses in front of the stone boat. We need the new and different technology that information and knowledge will bring us.

There comes a time, Mr. Speaker, when money is not enough. And the issue is simply this, Mr. Speaker, and I raise this particularly for the NDP. The issue is simply this: are you willing to face the need for change? That is the simple question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in the last 12 months, our government has begun the process of preparing for change in our education system. We decided to take a long, hard look at what we were doing; decide where we are strong and can build, and where we are weak and must change. Beginning with the K to 12 school system, that is precisely what we are doing with the *Directions* exercise.

We looked, we listened, and we saw where we must build. We set out to reinforce those basic learnings which go to the development of intellect, to the ability to communicate, and to the power to reason, Mr. Speaker. In co-operation with teachers and administrators, parents, and other interested groups right across this province, Mr. Speaker, we established and announced just some several short months ago, a new core curriculum, and identified essential learnings that all children must receive. And I am pleased today and tonight to advise the Assembly that curriculum advisory committees are being established for each of the required areas of study and will soon begin their work.

What this means, Mr. Speaker, what this new policy means is improved standards for our education system, quality in our education system, Mr. Speaker. Because I don't want to pick up the newspaper as I did some several weeks ago, several months ago now, as the *Star-Phoenix* — I don't have the date on it — and the headline was, "Academic standards dropping". That has no place in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. Or another headline from

November 20, 1986, the *Leader-Post*, the headline went, "Illiteracy rate in province set about 32 per cent." Mr. Speaker, that has no place in Saskatchewan.

What I want to see, Mr. Speaker, and this is what the headline was after we announced the new curriculum, "Revised curriculum boosts English," Mr. Speaker. Because people recognize that as much as we must have the new technologies and the new literacies, to be computer literate and technologically literate, at the end of the day people still must grasp and grasp fully the three R's of reading, writing, and arithmetic, Mr. Speaker. Basic literacy and basic numeracy, Mr. Speaker. That's the kind of headlines that we want for this new core curriculum, and that's what the people of this province wanted.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — I mentioned the accomplishments of the educational development fund since its inception two years ago. And I am pleased to say that nearly 14 more millions of dollars will be allocated this year for projects aimed at yet further improvements in quality in our educational system. That will bring the total to \$55 million allocated in the first three years, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to say a few words about our French education system, Mr. Speaker, and I will take time to read a brief statement in French to the legislature and then repeat my remarks in English, Mr. Speaker.

L'éducation française continue d'être une priorité de notre gouvernement. Depuis 1982, nous avons vu un progrès considérable. Pendant cette période, il y a eu une augmentation des inscriptions dans les programmes de les écoles désignées de 281 pour cent. Nous avons, 8,784 élèves dans les programmes de français de base.

Nous continuerons le soutien aux associations fransaskoises telles que l'Association culturelle franco-canadienne, le Collège Mathieu, la Commission culturelle fransaskoise, les Archives Provinciales, l'Eau Vive et l'Association jeunesse fransaskoise.

Enfin, je voudrais souligner la contribution de nos partenaires, les commissions scolaires et le gouvernement fédéral dans cette entreprise. Ensemble, nous réussirons à relever les défis en éducation française.

French education continues to be a priority of our government. Since 1982 we have seen considerable progress. During this period there has been a 56 per cent increase in enrolments in our core French programs and a 281 per cent increase in our designated programs. We have 8,784 students in designated programs and 72, 238 students in core French programs. We will continue to support French associations such as the Association culturelle franco-canadienne, the Collège Mathieu, la Commission culturelle fransaskoise, the Provincial Archives, l'Eau Vive and the Association jeunesse fransaskoise.

Finally, I would like to underscore the contribution of our

partners, the school boards and the federal government, in this enterprise. Together we will succeed in meeting the challenges of French education.

Mr. Speaker, now I would like to say a few words about the future of post-secondary education and training for the future.

The need for change here is all the greater because the proximity to the work place is so immediate. The technical institute system exists to train for employment, and yet it was being managed and operated in a manner that was 20 years out of date. Even the opposition realized that it was time for change, that change was long overdue, for in March of this year the member for Saskatoon University held a press conference to call for an autonomous board structure for the institutes. He said this would result in higher quality education in our institutes.

And, Mr. Speaker, the education critic, the member for Prince Albert — and I refer to a May 7 Prince Albert paper story headlined, "Autonomy for tech schools very popular says NDP survey." And I'll just quote a few paragraphs from this. It went on to say:

According to Kowalsky, respondents to the questionnaire indicated local control was important in trying to distance the technical schools from partisan politics. One person, he said, stated the issue succinctly: the institutes may become learning institutions instead of arenas for political games. Programs could be designed around the needs of the people in the province, not designed to buy votes for the least amount of money, he quoted.

And it further went on to say:

There should, however, be an umbrella organization with representation from all four boards to consult and co-ordinate the operation of the institutes.

A further paragraph was quoted:

In this way it is hoped that the problem of maintaining standardization in the curriculum will be eliminated, he stated. The improvements which could result from more autonomy, according to the questionnaire results, could also include increased speed in decision making and the ability to stretch budgets through entrepreneurial activity.

End of the quotation, Mr. Speaker. Well I am pleased to say, Mr. Speaker, that I agree entirely with what was said here, and what the hon. members have said about the need for autonomy. It's just too bad that those members changed their mind, Mr. Speaker, when we did change the governments. And now we do have a new form of autonomy — at least we will have as soon as that legislation is passed, Mr. Speaker. And I'm sure the hon. members will give their whole-hearted support to this legislation when it comes up in July or June or August, as they did in May, Mr. Speaker.

(2015)

And interestingly enough, Mr. Speaker, ever since we made this announcement about the new blueprint for our new technical institute in this province, the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology, the NDP appear to have gone underground with their survey, Mr. Speaker. It was not sent to me; there was no advice for me on it; there was no guidance on it; and if it hadn't been for the press conference that we happened to see and some of the press clippings, we would never have known they were in favour of a changed structure, Mr. Speaker. In any event, we have taken the decision to reorganize the community college and the institute, and I might say, along the lines, certainly, of what the members proposed — perhaps not exactly, but certainly the goals and the objectives are all the same and we can agree to disagree about the exact structure.

A few examples of new initiatives in the next year may be instructive, Mr. Speaker. Listen to this. Listen to this, Mr. Speaker. We will be more than tripling the amount of upgrading and retraining of journeymen in the trades area. We'll be implementing a new mining program in the P.A. area.

The hog producers who wanted managers and foremen and some of the technical people to help with increased hog processing in this province have been working together with officials from the department to develop a new curriculum that can be delivered across this entire province.

And we'll be putting together a program for parents concerned about alcohol and drug abuse.

And at the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, we will be providing 25 per cent more spaces — 25 per cent more spaces. Talk about accessibility, Mr. Speaker — 25 per cent more spaces than existed in 1982, Mr. Speaker. Now does that sound like cut-backs to you? Does that sound like declining enrolments?

I say no, Mr. Speaker, because more people than ever have more opportunities in this province than ever. Despite opposition forecasts of doom and gloom and cut-backs, that's 6,000 more young people who will receive institute training this year than when the previous government was in power.

But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, the training will be more relevant. It will be more up to date and it will be more marketable. The students themselves realize the importance of a relevant training program.

In the area of education outreach, Mr. Speaker, we have established a \$3.2 million fund to finance more education and training outside the cities — outside those cities, Mr. Speaker — where the universities and the technical institute campuses are located. And to help me put that distance education policy and the education outreach policy in place, I'll be establishing a distance education council.

We are pursuing a proposal to develop a common first-

and second-year arts and science curriculum for extension throughout this entire province. Talk about accessibility, Mr. Speaker. I'm talking about province-wide accessibility here.

Turning to the universities, I am pleased to say that the relationship between the government and the boards and the administrations of both universities are in good shape. We are working with Luther College at the University of Regina to establish a trade language centre. Members will hear more about this later, Mr. Speaker, and I'm extremely excited about this initiative.

And we are working with the University of Saskatchewan to establish an agriculture commodities research institute. And why are we doing that, Mr. Speaker? Because of stories like this one in the *Star-Phoenix* of May 15 of this year. And it went on to say, the headline did, "Education — a key grain marketing tool." This is exactly what we are talking about in the world of the future, Mr. Speaker — information. Knowledge is what's going to separate the winners from the losers.

Or another story here, Mr. Speaker, that talked about, education boosts sales. Mr. Speaker, education is going to be the key to the future of this province.

Let me mention one further initiative in the area of adult education. We will be announcing a major campaign against adult functional illiteracy. This silent enemy in our midst has reached unacceptable proportions. We must organize now to overcome it. I will be proposing this to the Canadian Ministers of Education Council when we go there this fall, Mr. Speaker, and I hope it will be the start of a national assault.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order, please. I believe the person telling somebody else to slow down should slow down. Just be quiet for a minute.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — If I'm going to make these new initiatives and to achieve this new sense of urgency and purpose, we have united the two education departments in the Saskatchewan library into one new and strong Department of Education, Mr. Speaker. In so doing, the amalgamation resulted in one-half millions of dollars of savings administratively. By coincidence, Mr. Speaker, that is one-half millions of dollars, Mr. Speaker, that no, we did not give back to the Minister of Finance, but instead, Mr. Speaker, have established a new and special fund for our regional libraries for their branches, Mr. Speaker, a fund to allow these branches to buy books, Mr. Speaker — the heart and soul of the library system. Books for our branches across this province, Mr. Speaker, and in fact we're going to make the rate available, the amount available double in northern Saskatchewan.

These are some of the new initiatives we'll be undertaking in the year ahead, Mr. Speaker, and despite what the opposition wants to have us believe, we are not doing less, but we have re-allocated resources to what we believe are higher and changed priorities.

Yes, yes, Mr. Speaker, this has been difficult and certainly yesterday — I was at the health sciences graduation at Kelsey — certainly a sense, by some of the

graduates there, that although the dental assistants' program will be continuing in Regina, certainly there's the sentimental attachments with having had that program delivered in Saskatoon.

But I think everyone agrees, Mr. Speaker, when they look at this objectively, as will the hon. member across the way, the advisory committee recommended that the dental auxiliaries all be delivered in one place. There is no argument, Mr. Speaker. It makes sense to have it all delivered in one place.

Now the argument then becomes Saskatoon versus Regina, Mr. Speaker. It's an age-old argument in a way, but my officials did their homework, Mr. Speaker, and have convinced me that the best technology . . . Two out of the three auxiliaries were in Regina already, and it made eminent good sense to have all three of them here, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, there has been difficulties, Mr. Speaker, and there has been some hardship involved. But in saying that we should not have done this, Mr. Speaker, the opposition is really saying it believes that we should, at all costs, hang on to yesterday. Well it is our belief on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, that we must grasp tomorrow. We believe we must grasp tomorrow as opposed to clinging to the policies of the past, the rhetoric of the past, the narrow ideology of the past.

And as I said earlier in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, of the one thing that has intrigued me as I have sat and listened to speech after speech, with the exception of some remarks, part of the remarks made by the member from Athabasca, there was not one new idea in their speeches, not one alternative, not one solution. Just as my colleague, the Minister of Health, said earlier some several days ago, mostly inflamed rhetoric, Mr. Speaker.

And as I listen to the Leader of the Opposition in his budget speech debate, I thought to myself that this could have been a speech he could have delivered, as I think maybe he did, in '83 and '84 and '85 and '86, because when he talked about alternatives, it was the same tired old three or four clichés and half-baked scenarios. They almost fall into those three or four categories, Mr. Speaker.

When it comes to alternatives, what's the first one that comes to the NDP's mind, the socialist mind? Tax the oil companies, Mr. Speaker. The oil companies are robber barons, Mr. Speaker.

Well I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, I'll take our government's oil policies any day over what the NDP were doing, because I'll tell you what it did in Weyburn, Saskatchewan. It boarded up half of downtown Weyburn, Mr. Speaker.

It boarded up places like the El Rancho Hotel, that until this government came along and changed those policies, it did not become unboarded. And today, Mr. Speaker, they have done renovations there that make it on a class that's comparable to anywhere in Canada. A very, very fine dining room.

So, Mr. Speaker, the city of Weyburn, the people of Weyburn, the people of the south-east oil patch, the several thousands that work there, they don't want nor do they believe, nor do they buy that old NDP bogymen dogma about oil companies are robber barons.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Okay. So what's the other target? Okay. After oil companies it's . . . (inaudible) . . . and the member for Regina Rosemont did a great job the other night. I think he referred to Hees International, North Canadian Oils, who by the way, Mr. Speaker, have a head office here in Saskatchewan in a beautiful tower in downtown Regina filled with lots of people working and paying taxes to this province.

And what is the thanks from the member from Regina? He kicks them around because they are an oil company and they're a multinational and they're vertically integrated.

Well I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan Wheat Pool just bought part ownership in Robin's Donuts. Now that probably makes them a big, bad multinational, and vertically integrated, and a bogymen, too.

That's the old category number two after, you know, sort of the old robber barons, Mr. Speaker.

Well what's the other category they fall back onto in terms of alternatives? Well the other one is, Mr. Speaker, more government. Big government is good government, Mr. Speaker. Or to put it another way, it's me and my family of Crown corporations, Mr. Speaker.

I'll tell you what, Mr. Speaker, in the past decade, in the past decade, when they were in administration here, Mr. Speaker, they made choices all right. They made choices, and they put land bank ahead of class-rooms, and they put potash mines ahead of computers, and they put uranium mines ahead of universities, Mr. Speaker. That's what they did. That's where the choices they made . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order. Carry on.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — And then this afternoon we heard the hon. member from Saskatoon Riversdale. Now this is the free trade critic. We heard him — that's the other bogymen for the NDP. They're against free trade. They're anti-U.S., and they're anti . . . just about anti-everything when it comes to the trade question, Mr. Speaker.

Here we are, Mr. Speaker, a trading province, an agricultural trading province, a resource trading province by every measure, fighting a siege of protectionism, and they don't want to look at ways to increase trade with (a) the United States, or for that matter the rest of the world, Mr. Speaker. They don't want to pursue a course of prosperity and a course of more jobs.

Quite simply, Mr. Speaker, with every one of these old bogymen, it's the same old lines.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, the opposition leader in his speech talked about not blindly adhering to a single ideology;

that we should look at choices. And it perked my interest for a while.

He went on to say things like this in the June 23, 1987, member for Regina Elphinstone, and I quote:

Members opposite may feel that everything in government is bad.

And he went on, Mr. Speaker, to talk about SGI. And I quote again:

I want to say this: if members opposite decide to get rid of parts of our common heritage because of narrow ideological reasons, I think a future government of Saskatchewan will feel free to counteract this narrow ideology.

He further went on to say, Mr. Speaker, and I quote again:

We think it's good for people to have a choice, and we don't think it should be barred because of the narrow ideology of members opposite.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I agree, we ought not be bound by narrow ideology, we ought not be bound by narrow ideology. I've said in this House time and time again that the issues that we face today in society are so complex, simplistic analysis will not do. Reducing every issue to a simple black/white, either/or, them/us, right/wrong, NDP/PC is *passé*. That's part of the '70s. That's the logic of the '70s, Mr. Speaker.

The issues that we face today are complex and every option deserves to be looked at. And I would tell you, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the course that this government has followed because . . . Find me a Tory who 10 years ago would've said that this government, with its Fraser institute mentality as they talk about, would've introduced debt moratorium legislation. Well I'll tell you we introduced it because the reality is our farmers needed protecting, and we protected them then, and we'll protect them into the future, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — And they say that Fraser institute mentality, Mr. Speaker would prevent us from pursuing and using the Crown corporation as a tool of public policy. Well, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, it was this government that set up the Saskatchewan Water Corporation to have a one-stop shopping centre when it came to water management in this province and drought-roofing and irrigation, Mr. Speaker. Does that sound like narrow ideology?

But on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, when it made sense to have the citizens of this province own the oil companies, their resource, we sold it back to them. And I'll tell you what, there are lots of moms and dads and grandpas that own those shares across this province today. Why? Not because of some narrow ideological view, Mr. Speaker, but the reality is we can get our fair share and then some, as the Minister of Energy outlined today, from the people's resource through taxation.

And, Mr. Speaker, these NDP across the road here would say that the Fraser institute mentality would never see a Tory subscribe to the economic theories of John Maynard Keynes, for example, Keynes, Mr. Speaker. Well, I'll tell you what, I believe there is a time and a place for the government to step in and stabilize the economy, to fuel the economy. It sure as heck was not in the '70s, Mr. Speaker, when inflation was going like this, the economy was run away with the inflation.

But I'll invite you in the '80s, Mr. Speaker, when our agricultural economy was hit and hard hit, we stimulated the economy with a \$1.2 billion production loan to our farmers because it made sense for the farmers. And we did not blind ourselves with ideology that said, no, we can't do that, that's Keynesian economics. We have done what is necessary to protect the people and to build this province, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — The only people . . . And I say, Mr. Speaker, whether you're talking about making change in education or making change in agriculture, Mr. Speaker, it's difficult going from the known to the unknown, but there has to come a time. The NDP as a party must realize this, Mr. Speaker. Even in Soviet Russia, the reform wing as this headline says, "Reform wing could be gaining ground in Soviet economy", *glasnost*, and all of that, Mr. Speaker. Tremendous change in the economies of Russia and China lately. Even they realize it.

(2030)

But of course I refer to the Leader of the Opposition. And as has been speculated, he may well not continue to be the Leader of the Opposition. So we're going to have a new saviour for the NDP Party across the way. And we heard for the most part, the one that's being acclaimed, albeit prematurely, the member for Saskatoon Riversdale today, wax eloquent. This is apparently, Mr. Speaker, the new saviour, the heir apparent. And as he pointed out, it was his first speech, his first real speech since he got elected last fall to this House. And so in a way, Mr. Speaker, I suspect that he used this opportunity to make a policy statement, to talk about the health education, which was noticeable by its absence, agriculture. But what did we hear, Mr. Speaker, when it came to agriculture policy, we heard virtually — or lack of agriculture policy — we heard nothing new other than the same old rhetoric, Mr. Speaker.

And I'll make this prediction, I'll make this prediction, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP, despite the fact that they themselves know they have to change, that they have to get the pulse of the rural farm community in this province, I'll bet you dollars to donuts that they'll be opposing and blocking for example, the federal legislation plant breeders' rights.

In a way, Mr. Speaker, that legislation typifies the view of those on the one hand who want to cling to the past, and those who recognize that new information and new technology are the secret to our success in the future. And I'll bet you they'll trot out the old rhetoric, they'll get the

NFU (National Farmers Union) policy manual, and they'll read "plant breeders' rights," we're against it, when everybody else, everybody else is saying, well maybe we ought to take a look at that option at least. And that's what I would say, Mr. Speaker.

And why do I say that, Mr. Speaker? Well I say that because of headlines like this, and it was in *The Globe and Mail*, June 24, just very recently. And the headline reads . . . it talks about "Hybrid potato plant packs its own insect repellent." Now by golly, Mr. Speaker, if we can get a wheat plant, if these genetic engineers can produce a wheat plant that would pack its own grasshopper repellent, now we've done something in this province. Because every farmer that I've talked to is sure as heck tired of using those sprays, paying for those sprays, getting sick using those sprays, contaminating the environment with those sprays. It costs him money; he doesn't want to do it; but he knows it's the only thing he's got at this point in time to counteract those grasshoppers.

And why do I say it, Mr. Speaker? Because *The Globe and Mail* earlier this spring: "Custom designed poultry near with lab success of gene transfer." Mr. Speaker, this is the heart of the issues. This is the heart of the issues, Mr. Speaker. This is the new technology of the future. We're going to have, not wire splicers out there mending the fence, Mr. Speaker, we're going to have gene splicers of the world of the future. Genetic engineers, bio-technologists, they're going to be developing the foods of the future, Mr. Speaker.

Well, that's what I believe, Mr. Speaker, because we saw not one thing today in Saskatoon in the opposition House leader's remarks, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that they have changed their views on agriculture one little bit. There was not one word on diversification, not one word on livestock processing, not one word on livestock feeding, not one word on inland grain cleaning, not one word on irrigation, not one word on special crops.

This guy still thinks that genes are what you wear. We're talking genetic engineering, Mr. Speaker. We're talking products of the future to decrease our fertilizer costs, to eliminate some of the insecticides we're using, and to have the seed and the cell of the future. We're talking about the star wars of agricultural science, Mr. Speaker.

And that is going to be the success for our farmers in the future. The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to farm policy in this province — when it comes to farm policy in this province — you ask any person out there in the country who would they trust on their combine, our Premier with the permit book or the labour lawyer from Saskatoon. And I'll tell you who they'll prefer every time, Mr. Speaker.

And I was so proud, Mr. Speaker, I was so proud when I read the accounts after President Mitterrand was here and visited with our Premier to sort out this bizarre global subsidy wars, Mr. Speaker. I'll tell you what, every farmer across this province felt good and they felt proud. They had a guy in charge of agriculture here in this province, who's the Premier, who understands this stuff, and the headline or the caption out of *The Globe and Mail* the day after President Mitterrand had been here — I don't

remember the exact words, Mr. Speaker — but it went something like this: that Saskatchewan would be the first to benefit when we put an end to this global protectionism.

And, Mr. Speaker, that's what our Premier was doing.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Speaker, I want to just close with a few remarks about my constituency.

I'd offer the Weyburn oil show, the second annual Saskatchewan Oil Show or biannual Saskatchewan oil show, another tremendous success, Mr. Speaker, given the downturn in the oil economy. Certainly everyone there is cautiously optimistic. And of course, it was buoyed that day when our own Minister of Energy announced that land sales are back up — back up, Mr. Speaker — where we all like to see them, most recent land sale yielding \$23.4 million. And I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, if there was one spot where there was lots of land bought, it was south-east Saskatchewan.

So I'll tell you what. Unless the NDP get back in, it'll be a long time before you see that El Rancho boarded up again because it's going to be hopping and popping down there again in the third and fourth quarter of this year. I really believe that.

Over at Canada Wire & Cable, the individual line service that SaskTel is putting in across the province, the lines are very busy there putting that in place. Sask Power continues to be a very good customer, and we've seen an expansion there in the work-force over the years. They're putting together cable now for Alberta and as well for the northern power line. We're very appreciative to SaskTel and Sask power and the confidence they've shown in Canada Wire & Cable, that plant in Weyburn. And it's a testimony to the people who work there, Mr. Speaker, and that they produce high quality cable and they've even been ahead of their allotment which speaks well for the people on the line.

Fillmore, the people there are excited. Their new hospital, nursing home, Mr. Speaker, is going to open in a matter of months.

Down the road at Stoughton, Mr. Speaker . . . You know, we had all these cut-backs in health, according to the opposition. Well we opened the new nursing home there. It's just a fantastic facility, Mr. Speaker. The people there are very, very proud, and as well there have been low-income housing units go up in Stoughton and, as well, in Weyburn, Mr. Speaker.

I want to close . . . As I said earlier in my opening remarks that I wanted to touch on four areas, and the fourth and final one is that I want to address a few comments to the legislature, Mr. Speaker. And this first came to mind, I suppose, when I sat here on the opening day of the legislature, Mr. Speaker, on budget day, and I sat here over the last couple of weeks, and we've all heard them — words, phrases, part sentences, some many — into the record, some from their seats. And I know, Mr. Speaker, you yourself made reference to some of these words and

phrases today, earlier in question period.

And what I'm talking about, Mr. Speaker, are things like this. When Regina member, Regina North East member on page 537 of *Hansard* referred to words like this: "a dishonest cabinet"; on that same page, and I pick a couple or three words out again: ". . . it lied. Plain and simple"; or Saskatoon Riversdale on page 640 when he used words like: "a blatant falsehood"; or the member from Regina Elphinstone, Mr. Speaker, page 645: "a more inaccurate and hypocritically inaccurate statement," "blatantly false" is another one. And another quote on that same page: "That was deception. And the government opposite continued its deception."; or the member from Moose Jaw North, Mr. Speaker, on page 586, referred to: "moment of honesty running through his veins" or another couple of words, Mr. Speaker, on that same page: "sadistic way"; or on page 588, the same member: "this plan of destruction and deceit"; or Saskatoon South said on page 597: "the deceit by the Premier and the cabinet opposite," another one, "liars."

Why I raise those, Mr. Speaker, and not to suggest that no members from all sides of this House at one time or another, including myself, may have been guilty of unparliamentary language. But the bottom line is, it became readily apparent on opening day here, with all the public here and those watching across Saskatchewan, this kind of thing does not dignify this legislature. It doesn't dignify our role as politicians and as individuals here. The people are not well served by it and, quite frankly, it just adds to the skin of cynicism and scepticism that exists in the public's mind.

And, Mr. Speaker, why that concerns me is if we continue to fuel cynicism and scepticism, what that does is it chips at the faith that the people have or must have in their political institutions. And if you start to chip away at their faith in political institutions, then you're starting to chip away at their faith in democracy. If you start to chip away at democracy, Mr. Speaker, you're starting to chip away at freedom.

And, Mr. Speaker, that is something that should concern us all, and I raise that because every time I have school students in here and I talk to them after they've seen question period, the thought that I always like to leave them with at the end of the day as they depart and we've had a visit, is that despite all the warts of democracy, Mr. Speaker, and the harangue sometimes, which I think we must look to control, is that this democratic system is the best there is.

And I have been fortunate enough to travel and to be in Africa and to be in the East Bloc countries and to be in Europe, and we forget, Mr. Speaker, what a wonderful, wonderful thing these freedoms are that we take for granted. There are no guns and check-points here; there is nobody asking us for our passport every time we turn around; there is no terrorism at our airports in Regina, Saskatchewan.

And we must, Mr. Speaker, we must preserve that and not take it for granted. And that is why I raise the question, Mr. Speaker. Not that I'm calling into question your judgement, Mr. Speaker, because I know you, yourself,

raised this same point earlier today. But the public, Mr. Speaker, do not deserve this nor does this institution.

The simplistic analysis must stop, the overstatement, Mr. Speaker, the fearmongering. It's not fair to the citizens of this province. Something is wrong. It is we who have the ability to put it right, and I believe we will, Mr. Speaker. And with that I just say in closing that I will not be supporting the amendment, and I will be heartily endorsing this budget because it is right, it's fair, and it's responsible. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Solomon: — Thanks, Mr. Speaker. I'm relieved to finally be given the opportunity to enter this debate that has been going on for the last five or six days.

The budget demonstrates, and my colleagues have clearly illustrated in numerous speeches to date, that the Progressive Conservatives are a party of double standards and hypocrisy. Dale Eisler, a noted reporter, even says that this party promotes and markets the big lie at every opportunity.

At the federal and provincial levels, the Conservatives whine and squeal during the election campaign to the voters, asking them to vote Progressive Conservative. They say, vote PC, elect a PC government because if you do, we will ensure there is less government, that there is less bureaucracy, that there is good government, that government will play a lesser role in your lives if it is a Progressive Conservative government.

Well, what do we have in Canada now? We have a government who has whined, who has coerced, and who has tricked people into believing that they should govern. This Progressive Conservative government in Saskatchewan, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is no different.

In this province they promised lower taxes, and of course we see in this budget, higher taxes — the biggest tax grab in the history of our province, over \$1,000 for a family of four.

They promised better health services. And what do we see? The abolishment of the dental program and the gutting of the prescription drug program. They promised fewer political hacks on numerous occasions, and what have they done? They've doubled the number of political hacks that these taxpayers in Saskatchewan are paying for, over \$7 million a year. They promised more efficient and less costly government — well, what a lark, what a laugh.

With this government in power, we have seen the most inefficient and bureaucratic government with the fastest growing deficit in North America, second to none. They've promised us a business-like approach, and what do you know? We have here in this province the most incompetent, the most grossly inefficient, mismanaged administration in our history.

The new vision people have of the Progressive Conservative is a vision of a lot of Progressive Conservatives and their friends salivating at the public

trough, PC no longer stands for Progressive Conservative, it stands for patronage Canada.

It's becoming more widely known that in October the PCs held a post-election caucus meeting with their defeated MLAs. They met to discuss ways to punish urban voters for having voted NDP. What we have experienced and witnessed over the past five months is the punishment the Progressive Conservative government has decided is appropriate for people who line in the urban areas.

This budget is the final beating administered to ordinary Saskatchewan people, at least until yesterday when Mr. Lane announced further tax increases.

(2045)

The unfortunate surprise for this PC government, which you will soon discover if you've ignored all the signs to date, is that the punishment that you've meted out, the punishment that you've handed out in massive doses in a prolonged stretch is hurting far more people in this province than you expected.

In fact, the people it will hurt most live in small communities and on farms. Your punishing programs will hurt both urban and rural families, be they NDP, PC or Liberal supporters. This punishment of people reminds me of a three-fingered salute that one Grant Devine, when he was running for the leader of this party . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order. Order. Members have been asked to refrain from using other members' names in their debate, and I would ask the member to not use other members' names. Use their seat or position when referring to them.

Mr. Solomon: — I recall vividly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when the Leader of the Conservative Party was running for leader and he administered this three-fingered salute to his convention delegates, he talked about God and the family and the PC Party, and he talked about the NDP under his thumbs — the NDP under the thumbs of the Conservative Party.

What he didn't realize, but now we see very clearly, is that people who voted NDP number hundreds of thousands in this province. More people voted NDP in this province in the last election than voted for those people opposite. And what we see now is the result of this dictatorial salute of people under the thumbs of government. I think it's disgusting. I think what is going to happen in the next election is that the people of this province are going to break his thumb off.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Solomon: — I listened with interest and somewhat disbelief at what the Premier said about Manitoba the other day, when he made a fool of himself in question period on the incompetent handling of a question put to him by the member from Saskatoon Riversdale.

He and other members opposite, the member from Shaunavon and the member from Rosthern and others, talked about the massive deficit in Manitoba and

compared it to the deficit in this province. Well I did a little research, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I find that again, here's another example of hypocrisy and double standards. What they say is what is not the truth.

I did a little research and what I found is that in the last five years the accumulated deficit in Manitoba was \$2.4 billion. In the last five years in this province we've had a deficit of not 2.4 billion, but \$3.4 billion. Saskatchewan's deficit in the last five years, on an accumulated basis, is 42 per cent greater than the one in Manitoba in the last five years. That's competent administration?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Solomon: — What I also found out, that in this fiscal year this government who is handing us a bunch of garbage about them being efficient and competent in terms of managing the economy and managing the budget and the deficit — our deficit is \$577 million projected for this fiscal year. Manitoba's is not 577, it's \$415 million, less by 39 per cent than this incompetent Conservative government that we have in our province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, these are critical times for the people of Saskatchewan. There's a deep sense of foreboding among our people with regard to the future. The actions taken against Saskatchewan people by this Conservative government have left our people frightened and bewildered. The final insult to them, in the form of this budget, has been devastating. An alarm must be sounded throughout our province. Saskatchewan and its people have been betrayed by this Conservative government — manipulated, swindled, and betrayed by as skilful a bunch of slickers and carpet-baggers as we have witnessed in recent history.

The budget is cause for alarm, Mr. Deputy Speaker. But when this budget is reviewed within the context of actions taken by the Conservatives against the people of our province, a frightening scenario of what Conservatives are attempting to do is revealed.

Seen in a historical context, the real intentions of this government can only be the result of the mental construct of a small group of people who have deliberately, with malice and forethought, conspired to undermine and destroy a way of life developed and enjoyed by Saskatchewan people — a way of life created and built over a long period of time, as has been suggested; a way of life that up until the reign of the Conservatives has been a beacon of hope for people in our province, in our country, and throughout the world; a way of life that up until the time of the conservative rule protected our people from the vagaries and cold, ruthless manipulations of the market-place.

Such is the government of the Conservatives — a new kingdom, administered from top to bottom on a leadership principle reminiscent of the harshest dictatorship of the past, having little of the efficiency it talks about as being part of the so-called free enterprise ethic, poisoned by greed, beset by constant confusion and cut-throat rivalries, augmented by muddling interference of party potentates, and often rendered impotent by the terror of the Conservative cabinet.

At the top of this swarming heap are a small group of fanatics in the Conservative government who destroy those who oppose them, who regiment the province's institutions, who suppress the freedoms of workers and the elderly, and place more and more wealth in the hands of fewer and fewer people.

Mr. Speaker, this government is a government with a purpose. This budget is the blueprint for the final victory of the Conservatives over common sense and decency in Saskatchewan.

As I visit people in my constituency and throughout this province, and speak to them about the issues that concern them, they no longer ask why is more and more control being placed on their lives by their provincial Conservative government. They don't ask that any more, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Now when I knock on almost any door or speak to anybody in my constituency or throughout this province, the resounding question is: how can this government be stopped? How can this out-of-control juggernaut of waste, mismanagement, and desecration be stopped? That is the question I hear from people from throughout this province and in my riding.

There are a number of issues of deep concern to Saskatchewan people raised by this budget. And while the contents of the budget have been published and discussed, it is the more sinister purpose of this Conservative government, of which this budget is only a reflection, which is rapidly becoming clear, and I want to say a few words about that.

There are a number of fundamental questions this budget raises, questions that reveal the hidden purpose, the real conspiracy being perpetrated by this government on its people. It has been said, and I quote:

When we refuse to see things as they are, there is nothing more mystifying than the obvious.

There are some obvious questions we must ask ourselves, and the answers, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are painfully obvious. The Conservatives say they must combat the deficit. They claim it has been caused by outside forces. The question is: how do you combat this deficit caused, as they say, by outside economic forces by handing over control of Saskatchewan's economy to those same outside forces like Peter Pocklington and Weyerhaeuser, the banks and the bond dealers?

The second question is: who really benefits from cuts to the civil service, from abolishing the dental plan, or gutting the drug plan, or the sale of oil leases? Who benefits from the fire sale of assets belonging to Saskatchewan people? Who really benefits?

And thirdly, why are there continuing attacks, direct attacks on the most powerless and vulnerable people in our society; the attacks on the abused and battered women and children; the attacks on the poor and the workers in the unions and the elderly and the handicapped; and in this budget, a massive attack on the middle-income salaried workers? Why does this PC government attack these people.

The answers to these questions are clear. And these answers are found, Mr. Speaker, I maintain, in the present context in some shocking parallels in history.

Well how about this Devine government's claim that it can only get rid of the deficit by cutting public services and raising the taxes of ordinary people. The words and actions of the Conservative government bear an eerie similarity to some other words spoken in history, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the words I quote are from Dr. Hans Frank, who was the commissioner of Justice and Reich law in 1936 in Nazi Germany. They are especially frightening when considered in the light of what has occurred in the Saskatchewan public service over the past few months in particular. Hitler, too, did not want any opposition. His lackey, Dr. Hans Frank, said the public servants, and I quote:

Say to yourselves, at every decision you make, how would the fuhrer decide in my place. In every decision ask yourself: is this decision compatible with the conscience of the people? Then you will have a firm foundation which, allied with the unity of the Nazi people's state and with your recognition of the eternal nature of the will of Adolf Hitler, will endow your own sphere of decisions with the authority of the Third Reich . . .

The following year, Mr. Speaker, the Nazi put in a new civil service law which called for the dismissal of all officials for, I quote, "political unreliability."

We're no longer far removed from that time, nor are we far removed from governments who seek to bend and break people to suit their purposes.

This Conservative government has similar ends in mind, make no mistake. They want public employees as lap-dogs, as yes-men, as servants who unquestionably carry out the mad economic schemes of their Conservative masters — a public service so gutted of objective criticism that it cannot be a balanced forum for reasoned decision making.

If anyone disbelieves what I say, they have only to speak with heads of government departments in this government and ask them how much actual input they've had into this budget.

The Saskatchewan public service, once paramount among its peers across this nation, has been reduced to a level of a publicity arm for the silly schemes of this government. And when they don't agree with their Conservative masters, they are fired or given so-called early retirements, paid off and shut up.

While the human suffering is of primary concern, we must again look at what this means. The Devine government said that it is costing money, yet all of us know the horrendous costs of so-called early retirement: huge pay-offs and pensions for people who have been cut out of the work place. Why? The answer is obvious again. These people have the knowledge and experience to know that by going along with the Conservatives they are helping to destroy the very network of protection set up to

assist them in being masters of their own destiny.

So the Conservatives are getting rid of the fathers and the mothers and the grandmothers and the grandfathers in the public service. That way the Conservatives can mould the government to fit their own image, the Tory image, for a new Tory Reich, a Tory kingdom in Saskatchewan.

Meanwhile, they leave the young, the new people, those who do not remember the past because they are caught up in the present. If early retirement is such a good thing, Mr. Speaker, I say that the people of Saskatchewan should give this government early retirement and as early as possible.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Solomon: — We need to liberate the people of this province from the corporate . . . Conservative axis before it's too late. We need to give all Saskatchewan people a role to play in shaping their destiny. This Devine government has, thus far, successfully divided the Saskatchewan family, pitting sister against sister, brother against brother, farmer against labourer, and children against parents, in the name of deficit reduction.

And the Conservatives talked about saying over the months and weeks leading up to the budget that they have no choice. We have no choice, they say. That, as most statements this government makes, is simply not true.

There are many ways for the provincial government to cut costs and raise revenues without savage cuts to services or record tax hikes or unmercifully punishing those who can't fight back.

Why not an employment strategy instead of an unemployment strategy? An employment strategy that provides jobs for all who want to work, that would stimulate the entire provincial economy, reduce unemployment insurance and social assistance costs, and increase general provincial government revenues.

Instead of spending \$300 million a year, Mr. Speaker, on oil companies such as the like of Shell and Texaco and Exxon outside this province, which provide zero multiplier effect or zero economic activity, if they spent that money in this province on job creation rather than spending \$300 million of tax dollars that leave the province with no benefits, we'd have a multiplier effect of another \$900 million, Mr. Speaker. And that in itself would be enough to sustain some of the hemorrhaging that is now going on in this province. It would also make a few people happier — maybe 20,000 people in terms of jobs, and business people will have some revenue walking in their door instead of walking out of their door.

(2100)

But Conservatives don't want everybody to be doing well. They just want some people to do well. The Conservative Devine policies have meant that over the past 12 months, according to Statistics Canada, that Saskatchewan was the only province to experience an actual decline in its labour force and an actual decline in the number of people employed. Last month Saskatchewan was also the

only province in Canada to experience an increase in the unemployment rate.

It's been said that this has been a wonderful government, Mr. Speaker. Well, it is a wonderful government. It's wonderful that they're able to stay in power with the record that they've got.

The fanatic ideology of Conservatives is no more evident than in their secret allegiance to the oil companies. The member from Weyburn talked about the secret allegiance and the way they embrace each other. Oil companies pay conservative election bills for a price.

In 1979 there were 9.4 million cubic metres of oil produced in this province. The value of that oil was about \$729 million. The province received a little over half of that in royalties under an NDP government.

The big oil companies weren't all that happy with that, but they didn't pull out. They wanted the oil and they were making a reasonable profit. Yet more importantly, this meant there was no flat tax, that there was no need to fire people helter-skelter from their jobs, and wholesale from their jobs. There was no need to increase nursing home costs by 15 per cent. There was no need to deny preventative dental care for our children, or need of drugs to the sick.

Then along came the Conservatives in 1982, the promise-a-day Conservatives. And they were richly funded in their push for power by the same big oil companies. The oil companies then called the tune. The Conservatives responded and danced with the oil companies. The Conservatives held those oil companies in a tight embrace, whispering promises of lower oil prices in their ears.

In 1985 Saskatchewan produced 11.9 million cubic metres of oil, with a value of, not \$729 million, Mr. Speaker, but a value of \$2.4 billion. And of course, that's three and a half times the value of the oil in '79. But what do you think the province received in revenues? Oh, about \$655 million. Now what that means is that we lost in that year, and the years leading up to that, over \$600 million in our treasury.

Even though the oil companies were making huge profits, the Devine Conservatives continued to dance to the oil companies' tune and make promise of royalty holidays again.

More than \$1.7 billion in tax revenue was lost in total in the last five years. And there weren't any more people working; in fact, Mr. Speaker, there were fewer people working in this province.

The infamous dictator, Adolf Hitler, got and maintained his early power by making some people scapegoats. He said the economic ruin following the first war in Germany was the fault of outsiders, then it was the fault of agitators, and then it was the fault of unions.

Finally in one of the most horrid periods in our history, the scapegoat became the Jews. It was a successful ploy by Hitler. Scapegoating seems to be a successful ploy so far,

Mr. Speaker, in this Conservative government.

Blame your problems on someone else, take the heat off yourself by abusing the innocent, and the vulnerable, and abusing the powerless. Smash the students, rip off the oil and the sick, deny the young, persecute the workers. Punish, punish, punish, especially those who vote against them. Find someone that's easy to kick around; that's the legacy of the Conservatives. That's the brave new world Conservatives are wet with joy over.

Conservatives have a purpose in mind. Let us continue to consider the budget deficit in a light of some other interesting factors. We know this conservative Premier and government are unabashed supporters of Prime Minister Mulroney. On every major federal issue the Premier has stood four-square with Brian Mulroney. He has never changed his filial devotion to the federal Conservative leader.

As we saw last fall, the Premier's devotion paid off for Saskatchewan farmers. What we didn't see — what we didn't see at that time was the same federal government cutting federal transfer payments for health care and post-secondary education.

And do you know how much that cost the taxpayers in this province? Well, I just happen to have the figures handy here for the Minister of Finance and for members that are present. It'll cost over \$300 million over the next five years. And the Premier of Saskatchewan was consistent. He kept his mouth shut.

But that's not all. In addition, Brian Mulroney's drug patent legislation will cost you and I \$75 million over the next five years. And the Premier of Saskatchewan agrees with that. He supports this clear, monopolistic piece of legislation, and he didn't say a darn thing against it.

In fact, those two federal changes alone will cost us \$75 million each year, or the equivalent of a full percentage point increase in the provincial sales tax.

What did our Premier do? What did our Premier do? He said. Go to it, Brian. Sock it to them. In fact, I'll even make it easier and gut the drug plan we have here. It'll help those big drug election companies — election contributor companies sell more drugs at higher prices in Saskatchewan. Three hundred and seventy-five million dollars in five years; a loss to our province because our gutless Premier is Brian's lap-dog.

Four hundred million dollars for the farmers; \$400 million from our health and education system. Give with one hand and take from the other; there's that Conservative double standard, Mr. Speaker.

We must, for our very survival, look at the obvious. Hitler's economic miracle came about because of rearmament — a philosophy of war. The Mulroney government, in parallel, now wants six submarines built that were supposed to cost \$8 billion — not million, but \$8 billion. Now estimates are that the cost will skyrocket to not nine, or ten, or \$11 billion, Mr. Speaker, but the price will skyrocket to somewhere in the tune of \$16 billion. Six boats at \$16 billion, to sail around under the

ice in the Arctic.

At the same time, he wants to cut back on health care and post-secondary education in Saskatchewan. And where's our Premier? The Premier of Saskatchewan stands four-square behind the simplistic, silly, tragic, prodigal waste of money.

Then the Finance minister, the member from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden, has the consummate gall to try and ram a fairy tale budget such as this down the throats of the people who live here. Such narrow presumption on his part, such an emptiness of conscience, such political pettiness. It's a real scam.

Health services have been cut. The Premier and his cabinet have a personal staff of 183 hacks costing \$7 million per year. Conservatives can't afford \$34,000 for The Voice of the Handicapped, but they can afford a personal staff of 183 political hacks for their cabinet ministers, costing Saskatchewan taxpayers \$7 million.

Conservatives can fire instructors at the technical institutes to save money. Yet they can spend \$66 million to buy an Alberta oil company, guaranteeing Alberta jobs — cutting Saskatchewan jobs but guaranteeing Alberta jobs.

What a wonderful government we have here, guaranteeing jobs in Manitoba, guaranteeing jobs in Alberta, guaranteeing jobs for their friends around the world, but firing people in this province wholesale — not providing any job creation, not providing any leadership in terms of the economy, totally vacuous.

And then Conservatives reduce police protection by firing 40 RCMP officers in the name of restraint. Still Conservatives are going ahead with spending \$120 million on the Rafferty dam project which all studies say is more of a political move than an economic move.

An Hon. Member: — Well, where would that be located?

Mr. Solomon: — The member asks where this dam is going to be located, and where the project is going to be located, and where the benefits will go? Everyone knows that the Minister of Education, the member from Weyburn will benefit, and his constituency will have some modest benefit. The Premier, the member from Estevan, who we can't really talk about because he's not around, his constituency will benefit.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order. Hon. members know that it is not the custom of this House to indicate whether members are present or absent. So I'd like to ask you not to do that.

Mr. Solomon: — I appreciate the information, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, an ominous shadow hangs over our province. Thoughtful people are making the comparisons and drawing the parallels between this Conservative government and their illegal move by not opening their actions to the scrutiny of the people. They're comparing that with Hitler's stifling of the Reichstag or the German

parliament — if people hear no opposition, there can be no opposition. That was Hitler's tactic, and that is the tactic of this Progressive Conservative government opposite, Mr. Speaker.

And now after the longest delay in the history of the province, where they have refused to provide this House with the *Public Accounts*, the first time in history that this province has ever received the *Public Accounts* at such a late date; as a matter of fact we haven't received them.

It is now four months later than scheduled, and the question we have to ask, Mr. Speaker, is: why are they not providing this House with *Public Accounts*? What are they hiding? Have they expended money that they can't find? Have they expended money on people that they want to try and hide in the next few months? We'd like to know exactly, Mr. Speaker, why that kind of delay is taking place?

But now we're presented with this budget. They're saying, take the budget, members of the opposition, have a go at it, and then, Mr. Speaker, that will placate us and get us off the mark. But it certainly won't.

This budget, Mr. Speaker, is a blueprint for future wickedness. Insatiable in their lust for power, and not content with having public servants under their heel or terrorized into various forms of abject submission. Conservatives through this budget carry their work of destruction among teachers, students, the elderly, the sick, and the handicapped. This terrible Conservative political machine, which we and the rest of Saskatchewan so foolishly allowed the Conservatives to build up year after year, feeds on the most destructive elements in our society — grinding up human lives and trampling down the homes of hundreds of Saskatchewan people.

Conservatives have pillaged the provincial treasury. Now we see the slippery sleight of hand of the Finance minister, the member for Qu'Appelle-Lumsden, selectively picking the pockets of ordinary people in this province.

Mr. Speaker. Last Saturday, last Saturday, 7,000 peaceful people came to this Assembly, to this legislature, to tell this Conservative government that what it is doing is simply not wrong — for if it was a mistake, Conservatives could be forgiven. No. Those 7,000 people came here, Mr. Speaker, to tell the Minister of Finance and the Premier and this government that they will not allow them to determine their future. And they say that they will not allow this government to determine, by their fanatical ideology, the future of the people and children in this province on the basis of their Conservative, corporate elite philosophy.

What fills me with even greater trepidation, Mr. Speaker, is the neutrality of the press, the neutrality of other professional groups of Saskatchewan to what this government is doing. Don't they realize that a government like this, so single-minded and narrow of purpose, will not ultimately turn its attention to them when they're finished with the rest of the people?

This is not idle speculation on my part, Mr. Speaker. It is the march of history. And if the press and teachers and lawyers and doctors and farmers think they are safe from Conservatives now, they're living in a dream world, a dream world that will soon be a nightmare for them when the Conservatives who are now at their feet will soon be at their throats.

(2115)

Mr. Speaker, I have a quote that I'd like to share with members in this House, and I quote:

Those who profess to favour freedom and yet depreciate agitation, are men who want crops without plowing up the ground. They want rain without thunder and lightning. They want the ocean without the awful roar of its waters. This struggle may be a moral one, or it may be a physical one; or it may be both moral and physical; but it must be a struggle. Power concedes nothing without a demand. It never did, and it never will. Find out just what people will submit to, and you have found out the exact amount of injustice and wrong which will be imposed upon them; and they will continue until they are resisted with either words or blows, or with both.

And I finish:

The limits of tyrants are prescribed by the endurance of those whom they oppress . . .

And that's by Frederick Douglass, 1857.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Solomon: — Said over 120 years ago and more relevant today, Mr. Speaker, than it's ever been, in particular, in this province. And it's relevant, Mr. Speaker, because of the government that we have in this province that is continuing to rule by dictatorship, continuing to rule without accountability. They refuse to call the Assembly. They refuse to call members to work. And we're paid — highly paid for some of us, some of us not so highly paid — to do the people's business; to hold government accountable; to look at what they've done in terms of their programs; and to look at what they've done in terms of their budget, and clarify and inform people in this province where the weaknesses are and what kind of problems they have. They have refused to call us to this Assembly until just recently to do that. They are not an accountable government, Mr. Speaker. We know that; it's very clear.

They have restricted our party and our opposition from providing alternatives to what they are putting forward. That is our role as we prepare to govern. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that what is going to happen is the people of this province . . . the people I speak to in my constituency are very upset, are very angry at what has happened.

I relay what has happened just recently, as of three days. I had two groups of students come in from my constituency

and they saw what was going on in question period. And I visited with them afterwards, had refreshments, and took our pictures together, grade 5 and 6 and 7 and 8 students from elementary schools in my constituency. And they were absolutely stunned, Mr. Speaker, they were absolutely stunned with the way that this government has destroyed and abolished the dental program. The dental program . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Solomon: — And the reason they were stunned is because these grade 4 and grade 5 and grade 6 and grade 7 students, who were always afraid of going to the dentists because of the machinery, because of the drills, and the pumps, and the big chairs, and the heavy equipment, and the fact that dentists don't have a lot of time to spend with them, advising them, and educating them, and consoling them, and making them more aware of preventative dentistry, and how they can prevent rotting teeth in their mouths, and how they can become more aware of how to live better lives because they've had this service.

They were stunned, Mr. Speaker, because they believed the dental program was one of the most important programs that they had in their education system. And if they were able to walk down the halls from their class, everybody was prepared to leave their classroom and take this service that was provided by the dental hygienists.

And what has this government done? Now these children — they can't walk down the hall and get their teeth checked out. They can't walk down the hall and be counselled and advised and educated and consoled in terms of what they should be doing with respect to dental hygiene.

Now what they have to do, Mr. Speaker, is through a hit and miss system. If their parents can get some time off work, if their parents can find a way to get to the dentist, if their parents can make an appointment with a dentist that's satisfactory to the child and the parent and the dentist, then perhaps they'll have some dental care that's decent.

But even if that happens, Mr. Speaker, what we're stuck with are the five and six and seven-year-olds who are going to dentists absolutely petrified.

My six-year-old came home from school and started — she was absolutely thrilled and tickled pink because she was able to go to this dental hygienist and say — she pointed to a filling in her tooth and she said, "Lookit dad, look what the dental hygienist did?"

And she did this with some thrill and some excitement because she realized that the dental hygienist was there to help her, help her learn about what was going on. And this government has destroyed that system.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Solomon: — And they destroyed the system that has helped children, not only in the cities, not only in the small towns, but in particular in the rural areas, for the

benefit, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit, Mr. Speaker, of those who have wealth and those who have power, because they will be the ones that will be benefiting from this new program.

Mr. Speaker, one other problem that I have seen with this budget that absolutely floors me — we didn't raise this with the school children because they obviously don't understand it — but what absolutely floors me is the continued delay in the release of the *Public Accounts*.

The Provincial Auditor, as well, floors me with his report in page after page he criticizes this government and points out with facts, and he backs them up with facts about this government's incompetence and how they've mishandled our money.

And, Mr. Speaker, I have a little article here about . . . a little title which says, "Mr. Lutz delivers annual report." He's the Province Auditor. "The financial date delay worries province's auditor general."

He's concerned over a lack of government spending accountability, and possible interference in his own independence. That's what he's concerned about.

He raises the accountability issue as we have raised the accountability issue in speech after speech. The member from Riversdale, the member from Quill Lakes, the member from Battlefords, every member that stood on this side of the House that has raised the question on the budget has in tandem said that this government is not accountable.

They are not accountable to this House; they have not been accountable to this House since they got elected. They have not been accountable to the taxpayers, and they are not accountable to anybody else in this province.

They have allegiances to the oil companies, they have allegiances to the banks and the bond dealers, and they have allegiances to their friends outside this province with power and wealth.

What really worries me as an elected official, Mr. Speaker, and what should worry members on that side of the House — and I think it's got them very worried right now — I ran for this office, Mr. Speaker not to get up here and make speeches about how bad the government is. I didn't run for that reason. I ran so that I could be a member of a government that could introduce new programs, that would benefit people. I ran, Mr. Speaker, so that I could be involved in a government that could improve services for its people.

What this government has done in its incompetence, in its disregard for accountability, in its disregard for the taxpayers' money, what this government has done, Mr. Speaker, it has shattered my objective; it has shattered the objective of members on this House; it is shattering the members' objectives on that side of the House, to be part of a government, to improve services, and to introduce new programs that will make Saskatchewan not number one in debt or not number one in unemployment, but number one in terms of a good province to live in. And that's what they have done.

We are not now legislators or people who bring in new Bills to improve services, or bring in new Bills to provide better programs for our people. We are now becoming debt managers; we're becoming debt managers of this province. So when the next election rolls around and the NDP win the government, rather than the member from North West being a part of a government that is involved in improving services and creating new programs, the legacy this party across the floor will be leaving me and others in the next NDP government is a legacy, not of new programs or services, but a legacy, Mr. Speaker, in being a debt manager, in being a tax collector, and thinking up new, innovative ways to collect taxes.

I think that's disgusting. I think this government should damn well resign.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Solomon: — The Auditor General or . . . Mr. Lutz, who is the Provincial Auditor, goes on to say in his annual report that he is concerned about the delay in releasing the government's public accounts. And I think the reason he's very concerned, Mr. Speaker, is because he smells something rotten. I think he and his accountants have concluded, after having dealt with this bunch across the way, that there is indeed something very wrong in the administration of our finances.

We have the member from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden who has been a Liberal, he's been a Conservative, and now he's a Liberal again as a Minister of Finance — the same budget that was brought in in 1967. This fellow here, this member from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden, this Minister of Finance, and this government opposite with their tactics in terms of lack of accountability, with their tactics in terms of frustrating democracy and centralizing power in the cabinet could teach — the person I refer to in my speech — a lot of tricks. They could have taught Adolf Hitler tricks that he never used in 1935 and '36 and '37.

And that's what worries me, Mr. Speaker, because I have young children, my constituents have a number of young children, and the last thing I want is a government like this in control of our finances and in control of our provinces so they can make laws that affect my family and the families of other Saskatchewan people.

When I was talking to these grade 6 and 7 and 8 students from my constituency, Mr. Speaker, what they couldn't understand in their astonishment was why a government who would totally desecrate the dental plan; who would do away with a program that has been a terrific program for all of our children who had the good fortune to participate in the program . . . what they were more astonished with was why the government would try and save 500,000 or \$600,000 in cutting that program and firing all their nurses — why they would do that when, in fact, the government spends money and gives taxpayers money to build Jacuzzis and whirlpools and swimming pools. What a government. They were just astonished. What a wonderful government. What a wonderful government!

I have an article here. The Minister of Urban Affairs, who's in charge of the Saskatchewan housing program,

talks about this very program that these young students are absolutely astonished with in view of the fact their dental program has been taken away. But the minister defends the use of taxpayers' dollars to build private swimming pools. And he quotes:

"Swimming pools are labour intensive," he argued during budget debate. People in my constituency of Regina South appreciate that program. It's one of the most successful job creation programs in Saskatchewan and is another form of diversification.

Diverting health money and education money, where it should be used, into Jacuzzis and swimming pools. What a program.

Mr. Speaker, it's not simply the case of whether or not to support this budget. The Conservative budget doesn't mean all that much to Conservatives. After all, they've never lived within a budget since they've been elected. The budget debate is simply an exercise to this government, an exercise that democracy forces upon them. Conservatives have already decided our fate in secret meetings, in covert actions, in under the table deals with outside corporate interests, in decisions made with their Conservative cousins in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot and I will not support this budget. It's a sham, a disguise, cloaking and hiding the very real intentions Conservatives have for Saskatchewan and its people. And when the debate is over, and when the vote is taken, and the people of this province see the member from Moosomin, the member from Rosthern, the member from Canora who's sitting back there, the member from Kinistino, and all the members — even the one that's waving back there, the member from Pelly; when they see all of these people stand up and vote for this disgusting budget, for the budget that is providing the highest tax increases of any budget, not only in Saskatchewan history, but . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order please. Order please. I'd like to draw hon. members' attention to rule 14(3) regarding the budget debate, which reads as follows:

On the fifth of the said days, at thirty minutes before the ordinary time of daily adjournment, unless the debate be previously concluded, Mr. Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings and, after allowing twenty minutes for the mover of the Budget motion to exercise his right to close the debate, shall forthwith put every question necessary to dispose of the main motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(2130)

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought for some time what approach one could take in winding up the budget speech, and I think that the remarks of the member from Regina North West probably epitomize what this whole budget debate has been about, from the opposition side.

And I want to put it in perspective. I want to put the following facts because political scientists, I think, will analyse some of the activities of the members opposite.

They wanted a budget for some six months, Mr. Speaker. They whined, they cried, they snivelled, they threatened court action, they were all the way to the Supreme Court, and oh, they wanted a budget! Mr. Speaker, for six months they called for one.

They're in the position of an opposition, with the government governing in some difficult times, a natural position and advantageous position for the opposition. And we can also keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that at one time the New Democratic Party had a history of being a reform party. So you have all of these facts coming together — this urge to get in and kill in debate, and a long ago history of reform and some difficult times, like I say, natural. And what did they come forward with after a week's debate? Zero.

Mr. Speaker, the only new idea that the New Democratic Party had through this whole budget debate was one member decided that the hockey rinks should be little longer than they normally are. And, Mr. Speaker, that is what the member from, one of the members from northern Saskatchewan suggested. The member from Athabasca said the skating rinks should be longer. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan deserve better from an opposition party than the disdain with which they showed the people of this province their lack of ability to come up with some positive ideas, some positive suggestions, to deal with some difficult economic times for the people of this province.

And what did they give the farmers? Absolutely nothing. Did we get one suggestion? The opposition critic, the NDP critic for agriculture, didn't even have the courage to stand up in the budget debate and speak on behalf of the farmers — at least the NDP farmers, few though they may be, Mr. Speaker. He should've at least stood up.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — And I believe that the farmers will continue to remember, Mr. Speaker, what the NDP think of them. The NDP treat the farmers with disrespect, and this budget debate proved it in spades. One of the most difficult times for agriculture in the history of our great province and the NDP opposition critic didn't even have the courage and the decency to stand up and talk about the plight of farmers and give some suggestions. And I find that a tragic day in the history, not only of this province, but in the history of the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker. And the farmers won't forget.

And what did we get on talks of agriculture? All we got was the leadership candidate, the member from Riversdale, talking about agriculture, and how he still doesn't want any change to the Crow rate, Mr. Speaker. That's what he talked about.

Still in the 1970s. He is still fighting the 1982 election, Mr. Speaker. We all remember the member from Riversdale in the last election standing up with his cowboy hat on, saying, anything for the farm vote, boys. And he forgot a

couple of things. First of all, he didn't have anything for the farm votes; secondly, much to the laughter of every farmer in Saskatchewan, he had the hat on backwards, Mr. Speaker. And they still laugh about . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — They still laugh, they still laugh at the labour union lawyer from Saskatoon Riversdale standing up with his stetson on backwards saying he is going to help farmers. And they wonder why they're in such serious trouble in rural Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

I mean, they did the farmers a favour they didn't put him on a tractor. He'd have hurt himself and probably anybody else within 50 feet. And they sure as to heck didn't put him on a horse, and with good reason, Mr. Speaker. They managed his agricultural statements and position, I thought, rather well, except for the hat. They couldn't quite get him to put the hat on correctly.

But what did we also get? And there was a common theme right through the NDP debate. Other than the venom and the hatred and the vindictiveness that we saw — and I think it was epitomized by the last speaker — there was a common theme, and they said, we want to go back to 1982.

The member from Moose Jaw North: take us back to 1982 in medicare. And you know what he is telling the people of this province? That they don't want the new nursing homes built by this government, Mr. Speaker. They are telling the people of this province they don't want a chiropody program brought in by this government primarily for our seniors; and they don't want a rural therapy program brought in; and they don't want the new cancer facilities; and they don't want a new Wascana Rehabilitation Centre being constructed in Regina; and they don't want a new hospital in Saskatoon St. Paul's; and they don't want the several CAT scanners purchased by this government, Mr. Speaker. They want to go back to 1982.

And I think it was emphasized again. Tonight the member from the Quill Lakes said, you can't destroy memories. You can't destroy memories, Mr. Speaker, and that's what they're living on. They're trying to live on memories and, Mr. Speaker, that's not enough for the people of our province.

They want to go back to 1982 and land bank, Mr. Speaker, where the biggest purchaser of farm land in the history of this province was the government competing with the farmers and taking their land from them. And they want to go back, Mr. Speaker, and they said it over and over and over again. They want to go back to 18 per cent interest rates, and with the government turning the back on the people of this province who are losing their homes and farms.

And they want to go back to 1982, Mr. Speaker, where they nationalized potash mines. For them, that was nirvana, Mr. Speaker, that was heaven. That was heaven: 18 per cent interest rates, land bank, and potash nationalization. That's New Democratic Party heaven and, Mr. Speaker, the surprising thing, and I think the

surprising thing to every objective voter, is that even the new members — even the new members in the New Democratic Party fell right into that trap of wanting to live in the past.

Mr. Speaker, that's one of the fundamental things that this budget is all about, is whether this province is going to look backwards and say that we can draw up a wall around Saskatchewan and everyone stay away; and we will just shrivel into a cocoon and die. Or whether we have the courage, not only as a government but as a people, to say we are going to make the changes necessary, Mr. Speaker, to protect our basic social institutions and to give our people a fair chance in a highly competitive, changing world.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, we've never seen such a collection of unrealistic politicians in our lives. Saskatchewan can't draw a wall around itself and say the world doesn't exist. And Saskatchewan can't say we refuse to compete with rapidly changing educational systems in virtually every other modern country in the world. And, Mr. Speaker, while most every other country in the free world is, people are wanting to take more responsibility for their own lives and actions, the New Democratic Party says that shouldn't happen in Saskatchewan, that it still has to be the government that does everything for the people. And that's been rejected. Mr. Speaker, in 1982; it was rejected again in 1986, and it will be rejected in 1990 and in 1994 and '98 and 2002 and 2006, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, they all want the programs of the 1970s. I hate to be the bearer of bad news to the New Democratic Party but the 1970s are over. The 1970s were over some time ago. And a wise political party, Mr. Speaker, says — and a wise government says — difficult as it may be, we must look ahead. And that's what this government and this budget does, Mr. Speaker, is it has the courage and the fortitude to look ahead — not into an easy world, Mr. Speaker, not necessarily into a fair world, and certainly a very difficult world, but at least it has the courage to make the changes so that our people will be able to compete with the rest of the world and that our basic institutions are protected and viable for the 1990s and into the next century.

We had some strange things develop. We had the member from the Battlefords. We saw some subliminal activities towards a leadership convention. I think one thing came abundantly clear during the debate is that they should stick with what they have, Mr. Speaker, because the member from The Battlefords twiggled something to the people of this province. And I know the rules, Mr. Speaker, about not using a member's name, but I'm going to quote exactly what the member from The Battlefords said — because he used the name, and I think the quote is quite important — when he said to the government, he said, you guys don't want Romanow for a leader. What's he know that we don't, Mr. Speaker? What's he know that we don't? And what does he know that the people of this province should know, that they

don't want Romanow for a leader either, Mr. Speaker? And what is he keeping from the people of this province?

We know lots; we know lots; we've got lots. But what does he know, that an active member of that party doesn't want the member from Riversdale to be leader of that party? And I think he should tell. I think he kind of, as the phrase goes, spilled his guts the other night about his problems in Prince Albert and how he had a confidential meeting . . . Or at North Battleford. That he really resented the fact that at this confidential meeting, the information got out. Not once did he deny, not once did he deny that he said that he threatened the chamber of commerce in North Battleford. Not once did he deny that he said he was going to be in the cabinet. And I think that we should have the member stand up and tell, not only his constituents, but this legislature and the people of the province, who offered him a cabinet post. Who made the deal? What was he promised for the support? And we'll watch; we'll watch very quickly, Mr. Speaker, who he supports in the leadership race as to how much his vote is worth.

Mr. Speaker, we also saw the rhetoric running ahead of the thought processes of some of the members. We had a diatribe by the member from Athabasca complaining about the changes to the dental program. What he said was that this government doesn't recognize the difficulties in northern Saskatchewan and that they needed the dental therapists. And he was condemning the change because we didn't recognize northern Saskatchewan. The fact that we didn't make a change to the dental program in northern Saskatchewan completely escaped him, Mr. Speaker — that we still have the dental therapists in northern Saskatchewan. We didn't make the change because we recognized the difficulties.

But you know what then he followed up and said — because I think it symbolizes the attitudes of members opposite — he said, we're afraid of dentists coming into northern Saskatchewan. He's afraid of dentists in northern Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, how backwards, how backwards can a party get, that they're afraid of dentists in northern Saskatchewan? Now I know people that are afraid of dentists, but I've never heard of a political party afraid of dentists before, Mr. Speaker. And now we see it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(2145)

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, the public of this province, I believe, are perhaps even more realistic than the politicians, and they know that governments must be realistic. And the people of this province . . . and notwithstanding that you don't want any change in your agricultural position. I don't think that there's a segment of Saskatchewan society that is more affected by change, more aware of tremendous change than our farmers.

And yet what we do get from the NDP? Silence from their agricultural critic, and no change from the so-called leading leadership candidate. And that, Mr. Speaker, I think epitomizes again the thrust of the New Democratic Party debate.

Mr. Speaker, it's common knowledge to every student of politics in Canada that a party that is afraid to change is doomed to defeat and destruction. And, Mr. Speaker, every single speech of the members opposite showed that they were afraid of change, afraid to tackle the future, afraid to make the necessary changes in education and agriculture and medicare, all for the good of the people of this province, Mr. Speaker. At one time they were a reform party, and now they're in a redundant political party, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — And it's a sad, sad legacy when that party hasn't had one new idea since potash nationalization in 1976. What kind of a legacy is that for our children? What kind of a legacy is that for the people of this province, Mr. Speaker? A party, a New Democratic Party, afraid of change.

Well this government isn't afraid of change, Mr. Speaker, and this budget is about change. And this budget, yes, has made some difficult changes, and the government has made some difficult decisions. But, Mr. Speaker, we are not like the members opposite; we don't have our head in the sand. We have our heads up, Mr. Speaker, because we believe that the people of this province deserve a government that is going to take them aggressively into the 1990s and into the next century, Mr. Speaker. And this budget, this Premier, and this government will do that, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — We stated, Mr. Speaker, that this budget will put the fiscal house of the government in order, and it has begun to do that aggressively.

We also indicated that we would protect the Saskatchewan people as much as possible, and we continue our senior citizens' heritage program, our mortgage protection programs, new education initiatives, more money for hospitals. Mr. Speaker, the seniors' heritage program and the farm protection program so condemned, Mr. Speaker, by the member from Riversdale, and silently his position acceded to by the silent agricultural critic from the members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, there is a changing world out there. The world no longer will have a consistent demand for Saskatchewan's natural resources. And those that want to deny that, Mr. Speaker, are condemned to backward thinking. And, Mr. Speaker, the farmers know better than the New Democratic Party that agriculture will be more competitive in the future, and we must adjust, and this government will adjust and change, Mr. Speaker. I support this budget and the people of Saskatchewan will . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

The question before the House now is the motion moved by the Minister of Finance, and seconded by the Deputy

Premier, that this Assembly do now resolve itself into the Committee of Finance, and the amendment to the motion, moved by the member for Regina North East, and seconded by the member for Saskatoon Riversdale, which reads as follows:

That all the words after the word "That" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

That this Assembly condemns and rejects the budget because . . .

Order, please. Order.

That this Assembly condemns and rejects the budget because it is a betrayal of the people of Saskatchewan, and a betrayal of the caring, sharing, and co-operative Saskatchewan way of life, and further, because:

(1) it betrays medicare in Saskatchewan by arbitrarily limiting insured medical services, destroying the children's dental plan and the prescription drug plan, and attacking many other health care services.

Order. Order, please. I've mentioned several times that when the Speaker is on his feet and reading a motion or making any other statement, there is to be absolute silence in the House, from all members. The member from Quill Lakes doesn't seem to understand that, and I ask him once more, I ask him once more to please refrain from interrupting.

An Hon. Member: — You're looking at somebody else.

Mr. Speaker: — Member from Quill Lakes, are you challenging what I'm saying? I am giving you the last warning. I'm giving you the last warning.

(2) it betrays the people of rural Saskatchewan by attacking a wide range of needed services;

(3) it betrays Saskatchewan young people by attacking the education system and by providing totally inadequate job creation measures;

(4) it betrays Saskatchewan senior citizens, the pioneers who co-operated to develop this province, by undermining services they need and their security;

(5) it continues this government's betrayal of Indian, Métis, and of northern people.

(6) it betrays the working men and women of Saskatchewan by eroding their rights, security, and opportunities;

(7) it 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.

Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the amendment?

(2155)

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 23

Blakeney	Romanow
Prebble	Tchorzewski
Brockelbank	Rolfes
Shillington	Mitchell
Koskie	

Berntson	McLaren
Lane	Hopfner
Taylor	Petersen
Smith	Swenson
Swan	Martens
Muirhead	Toth
Maxwell	Gleim
Schmidt	Neudorf
Hodgins	Gardner
Gerich	Kopelchuk
Hepworth	Saxinger
Hardy	Britton

Nays — 23

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order. Order. The Clerk is having difficulty hearing the voice vote.

Upshall	Lyons
Simard	Calvert
Solomon	Lautermilch
Kowalsky	Trew
Atkinson	Van Mulligen
Anguish	Koenker
Hagel	Goodale

Nays — 34

Blakeney	Kowalsky
Prebble	Atkinson
Brockelbank	Anguish
Shillington	Hagel
Koskie	Lyons
Romanow	Calvert
Tchorzewski	Lautermilch
Rolfes	Trew
Mitchell	Van Mulligen
Upshall	Koenker
Simard	Goodale
Solomon	

Devine	Schmidt
Muller	Hodgins
Duncan	Gerich
McLeod	Hepworth
Andrew	Hardy
Berntson	Klein
Lane	Meiklejohn
Taylor	Martin
Smith	Sauder
Swan	Johnson
Muirhead	McLaren
Maxwell	Hopfner

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

**Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure
Agriculture
Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 1**

Item 1

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:06 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order. Order, please. Order! I've asked the House to co-operate so that we can hear the votes clearly stated.

Petersen	Neudorf
Swenson	Gardner
Martens	Kopelchuk
Toth	Saxinger
Gleim	Britton

(2202)

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 34

Devine	Klein
Muller	Meiklejohn
Duncan	Martin
McLeod	Sauder
Andrew	Johnson