

## EVENING SITTING

## COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

## Motions for Interim Supply (continued)

**Mr. Goulet:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that the former minister of northern Saskatchewan wanted me to give him more of the same. So I think I'll direct my reports on the North now in regards to this interim Bill, interim resolution.

Mr. Chairman, the central issue for people this spring while we were waiting for the budget was the issue of jobs. The high unemployment situation, we don't have to repeat — I think everybody knows what it is in the North. I might comment, Mr. Chairperson, that research in the '60s and '80s has shown very clearly that unemployment is indeed not only one of the most stressful aspects of a person's life, but actually really not only tears apart his individual being but also his family and community.

It is important to recognize that the research report states that for every 1 per cent rise in unemployment, there is a 4 per cent rise in suicide rates. I would like to mention a particular instance that has occurred in relation to that, Mr. Chairperson. In one community in northern Saskatchewan since the housing crisis fell on us in '82 and since this government come in, and in particular to the people who had raised hopes on this particular budget of this spring, there was a suicide rate of approximately 1 per cent in a particular community. And that 1 per cent, when you look at it in, let's say, a situation like Regina, that would equal 2,000 people — 1 per cent of the city of Regina would be about 2,000 people — in the North, in one particular community between 1982 and '82, there was 1 per cent of the people that committed suicide.

While it hardly raises any eyebrows for any of the members from across, it was a devastating experience for the people at the community level and also for the families who had to endure the pain and the suffering of particularly the effects of unemployment.

As I mentioned in relation to the jobs aspect, one of the key hopes that people had in this budget was hopefully to come out with something on jobs in relation to mining and forestry. As usual there was nothing in the budget in relation to the monitoring committee of Key Lake. The monitoring committee was to make sure that people from the North and Indian/Métis people were hired into the Key Lake mine. We were also to make sure that the environmental and also the safety and positive benefits to the business people in northern Saskatchewan were there. But again, the very device that was used in the Key Lake agreement to improve the hiring of Northerners and Indian and Métis people was knocked off by this government. It's no longer there. It has disappeared.

Again, Mr. Chairperson, it shows that this government simply not only punishes people from the North; it destroys their means of livelihood.

A lot of people were wondering whether this budget

which would, as provided through the mechanism of this interim resolution we are raising, there may be something on the development of the highways in the North. We know that 19 people have died on the road. Highway 102 alone, north of La Ronge, between 1979 and '85 — 19 people. And we thought that this interim mechanism would provide, you know, for some money so that we could start working on building the roads in the North that were accessible right down to the community level, and also bridges — for example, the bridge in Cumberland House; the roads up to Sandy Bay; the roads up to Wollaston.

But what this province, what this PC government has done, is simply neglected the needs of people in northern Saskatchewan. They would just allow the people in the North to continually go on a road that is highly hazardous. And at a time also when we are pushing a lot more dangerous chemicals to be transported on those roads, they need improvement.

In relation to this interim mechanism, a lot of the citizens from Wollaston were very hopeful that they would be treated in the same way that the citizens of southern Saskatchewan are treated. They wanted sewer and water. They wanted housing. They said three families are living in one house. This is occurring in many of the communities, but they . . . I will have to report to them, Mr. Chairperson, that indeed this is not the case.

The other point that I wanted to mention in relation to the fact that a lot of people were interested in the tourism aspect. There will be . . . interesting to know that Tourism and Small Business has cut back \$500,000. Also, too, the camp rates were increased without proper notice to the tourists that were visiting the North. A lot of them, of course, have raised their concerns already to the minister.

When we followed up, a lot of people talked about the need also in the area of forestry. A lot of people were wondering whether this spring the Weyerhaeuser agreement would work hard to hire Indian/Métis people and Northerners at a higher extent than before. There was a clause in the Weyerhaeuser agreement that said it would encourage Indian/Métis people to be employed in the forestry industry. What we have found out, Mr. Chairperson, is this: as I talked to many of the contractors and workers in the North, they said, it is discouraging. It's not encouraging. One particular case was such where a person actually went to Weyerhaeuser quite a few times, the person brought their skidders two times to the work site to get a job, and he was told to move his equipment out. Two times the person wanted to find a job and couldn't find it. The contract stipulates that they would encourage people to be hired but that simply wasn't the case.

In relation to the forestry industry, and this again pertains to this spring, there was a lot of forest fires this spring — one of the largest forest fires in our history. We looked at our budget in relation to forest fires, and what we find is that it has been cut back. A lot of people reflected back in regards to that forest fire, and they said that it was even tough to get a job on the way they are now handling the forest fire arrangements.

But the main thing that people wanted to relate to me in regards to the forest fire this spring was this: they said, it is sad to say that when we fight for jobs in the North – and we have been fighting hard for these jobs in the past five years – it is sad to say that in one fire alone, there were more jobs created in that one fire than in the past five years of the operation of this government. The person went on to say that it is surprising that lightning can create more jobs in northern Saskatchewan with one strike than the PC government in five years.

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

**Mr. Goulet:** — When you look at the aspect of those people who are fighting for jobs in the forestry and mining areas, one also has to look at the traditional resource use area – and I'm glad that the minister in charge is waiting for what I am going to say in this regard.

I recognize that while we still have subsidies this spring for booze, that there is still a cut-back in the subsidies to fish. Transportation . . . The fish transportation subsidy has been cut back by 50 to 60 per cent. The cut-back has attacked the fishermen. The fishermen, Mr. Speaker, are also worried . . . That's not a cut-back only on generally all the fish but it is cut back on the most productive fish. Pickerel and sturgeon will not get a fish transportation subsidy.

When I look back at that fish transportation subsidy this spring, Mr. Chairperson, I talked with one of the fishermen and he told me that the department that spent a lot of time trying to catch him for using illegal nets. He said that they used planes, they used helicopters – probably spending about \$10,000 a day to try and catch him on what he was using. He said that they even had video cameras after him – all over the place.

(1915)

Now they found him guilty of using one illegal net and of course, he said, I will gladly pay for that and he did. But that wasn't enough. He got a letter from the deputy minister later on saying that since he had caught all of his fish with this supposedly illegal net, which was never proven in court, he said they would take away his transportation subsidy. Of course, a person came to see me later on. He said, nothing really is getting done here, and of course nothing was being done because everybody else got cut by that transportation subsidy – not only him, but everybody.

In summary, I would say that in relation to the Indian/Métis people, I will quote a person that I met a little while ago in my travels. And he said, in the past, we had owned this land and all the resources that were there. In our goodness we shared these resources with everybody that has come up to the northern areas. After our land was taken, they said that they would give us jobs and that we would work our way from the bottom.

He said, 40, 50 years later we are still working our way from the bottom. But not only are we working our way from the bottom; these people, this present government, now is trying to do away with the few jobs that we have

left. First they took away our land, now they want to take away all our jobs.

In relation to the North the people are saying, why doesn't this government change? Why doesn't it want to work with the real builders of northern Saskatchewan? They say, we are the builders; everything in the community is everything that is here. The government says they build, but they destroy most of the things that we have fought so hard for all these years.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would say that this interim resolution assists one small mechanism in the large plan to continue to punish and keep down people from the North and people of Indian and Métis ancestry; that this interim measurement is not simply an ordinary measurement but is part and parcel of a plan which in Saskatchewan history we will look back and say that it was the error where there was a great rise in ageism and handicapism and sexism and racism.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support this measure, basically, because we want to get on with the business of this House with a greatest reluctance and, hopefully, that the members from across start listening and not trying to keep the people quiet whether they're from the North or whether they are Indian and Métis people.

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

**Ms. Smart:** — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to address this interim supply Bill on behalf of the constituents of Saskatoon Centre. I want to make some general comments related to this Bill, particularly because time ran out and I didn't have time to respond to the budget speech. I would like the constituents of Saskatoon Centre to understand clearly my concern about approving this Bill, although I feel that I will have to do it.

This Bill is a Saskatchewan first. We're being asked to approve expenditures for April, May, June, and July before we've had a chance to debate the estimates and debate the budget that's being presented to this House. This is a precedent that's never been set before, and I find it a very great concern.

First of all there's the question of the illegality of spending money by special warrants as has been done over the last few months, especially as many of these special warrants were all signed by Bob Andrew, as Acting Minister of Highways, and . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order. Order. Order! Order. Order! Order. I've asked members not to refer to members by name, but by their seat or their position as a minister or a member of the House.

**Ms. Smart:** — I was referring the former Finance minister who was fired from his job.

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

**Ms. Smart:** — It's important to me to explain to the constituents of Saskatoon Centre what this issue is about, because being new to the House I am learning a lot about the procedures of the legislature, and I'm having some

very grave concerns about what I'm learning here.

I was really concerned to discover, for example, that the public accounts have been very late in coming. Just today we received the public accounts for the province of Saskatchewan for 1985 to 1986. And we're already debating the estimates for '87 to '88. There's a huge gap in there of public accounts that have been spent, money that's been spent that we still don't know where it's been spent or what it's been spent on. And I'm being asked to support this interim supply Bill to spend more money when I still haven't had a chance to discuss what the money's being spent on.

And I know for many of the small-business men in Saskatoon Centre constituency that this is very unbusiness-like behaviour on the part of the government. It's totally unacceptable business practices and it really amazes me to think that we are being asked to buy basically a pig in a poke by supporting the funding of programs, and we don't know what the money's going to be spent on.

I also want to tell the constituents of Saskatoon Centre my very grave concern about what I witnessed, particularly in the House today, when the Premier, in question period, was asked over and over again to explain to the people of Saskatchewan how he could approve a budget deficit of \$500 million at one point and then a few months later say, whoops, it's gone to 1.2 billion. He was asked over and over again by many people in the opposition to answer that very simple question, and that question was not answered. And I find I have a very grave concern about supporting an interim supply Bill to spend more money when I can't even get a direct answer from the Premier of this province as to what the deficit actually is and where he gets these ideas from; that he's saying one thing one month and something else another.

And I find it even more concerning because the Premier has been, of all people, a booster of the information age, telling us over and over again that this is the information age. We are entering the new technology; we're enter in the new age of information; this is a wonderful new change that we've got. And yet he has denied us the basic information that we need to make wise decisions here in the House.

I find it very difficult to make reasonable decisions in approving this supply Bill, and I find it of very grave concern that we have to be told over and over again how important information is – and yet it's withheld.

And it's that kind of doublespeak that I'm finding myself really opposing in this House, and I want people in Saskatoon Centre constituency particularly to know that I find it very hard when information is withheld — not only withheld; when what we say isn't what we really mean.

There've been two examples in the budget that I find of particularly concern. There's been much made of the 63 per cent increase in health care costs and yet there's been no acknowledgement that many programs have been put into the health care budget that were not in there before. We're just told over and over again there's been this large increase, but we don't know what it's been spent on.

**An Hon. Member:** — They don't either.

**Ms. Smart:** — Maybe they don't know. But I want to know. Before I start approving any more expenditures, I want to know what you're proposing that we spend the money on.

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

**Ms. Smart:** — You tell me that Saskatchewan government resource revenues have fallen by 50 per cent since 1985, declining from roughly one-third of the government revenues in 1981 to only 13 per cent today – and that was in the budget speech. And yet, there was never any acknowledgement that the reason that the resource revenues have fallen is because this government is not collecting them. So there's more being said than what's actually being admitted. And I find in that kind of doublespeak, it's very difficult to make wise decisions.

I want to know, when I approve an interim supply Bill, how much of these funds under this Bill is intended for the large, expensive, partisan politics support staff which now exists in this government. We know that, at the very least, the government has doubled partisan political support staff at the ministerial level.

I understand that cabinet minister have 99 political staff members and that the Premier has about 60, and that the total cost of this is about \$10 million. That's a tremendous amount of money.

I want to know how much of this money that I'm being asked to approve in this interim supply Bill is being spent for extravagant political advertising. I can see by the estimates that the total cost of advertising by the government is phenomenal, and I say that this cost reflects its deceit. The advertising that they've been paying for reflects the deceit that the government has been perpetrating on the people of Saskatchewan, and I protest on behalf of the constituents of Saskatoon Centre.

I was deeply offended by the ad that came out in the *Star-Phoenix* and other newspaper right after the gas tax was announced, with big headings saying, "Important savings for Saskatchewan drivers." That gas tax is no saving for Saskatchewan drivers. This is deception. This is the kind of propaganda that is absolutely unacceptable to people in Saskatoon Centre constituency, and I protest.

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

**Ms. Smart:** — You're expending a large amount of resources on advertising your programs, and there's a basic inconsistency, also, in the advertising priorities. Those departments providing essential services to a great many people, for example, Social Services and Health, are not receiving the advertising support and assistance that befits their importance to people in this province. Instead, the availability of such service tends to be sporadic and selective.

I was just really interested to find out that, for example, in advertising, the Highways budget, the Highways department, has spent \$1,080,402 on advertising; Parks,

\$1,016,533; and Social Services only \$563,728.

The budget for Social Services only represents .17 per cent of the total spending on advertising by this government, and the budget for Health on advertising only .09 per cent. And just to tell you how serious this is for people, particularly the people in Saskatoon Centre constituency – many of whom are on very low incomes—is that advertising dollars for the Saskatchewan assistance plan, the family income plan and the Saskatchewan income plan within Social Services does not exist or there's an absence of it.

We discovered when we went around Saskatchewan talking to people about social services that many, many people on low incomes didn't even know about the family income plan that was available to them to bring their earnings up to a minimum amount. These are families that are working on minimum wage.

(1930)

I don't know if any of the members opposite have any idea what it's like to work on minimum wage and support a family, but on \$4.50 an hour, a person is only making about \$9,000 a year. I have in my constituency men who are supporting their wives and children on that amount, and they're entitled to get some assistance from the government to bring their income up a bit.

And yet we find when we look at 1986, that only 8,084 families were enrolled in the family income plan, and 38,480 were eligible. A lot of people don't know about that family income plan. Probably one of the reason they don't know about it is you're sitting on it because you don't want to pay for it.

**An Hon. Member:** — Gordon Dirks and Paul Schoenhals know about it. They've got a little bigger plan though, with hundreds of thousands . .

**Ms. Smart:** — One of my colleagues has pointed out that there are many people getting money from this government who are already getting quite a lot. People like Paul Schoenhals and Gordon Dirks have got contracts from the government for very good incomes. And yet in Saskatoon Centre, and in other constituencies in this province, there are many people living on very little. I'm not sure that this interim supply budget is going to give them anything. I'm very concerned about how much they will see.

I want to speak about this because it reflects to me a fact that this government, I don't think, values where the money that they are proposing to spend comes from. It comes from the people who are earning a little bit. It comes for all the people in Saskatchewan who give in to the tax plan, who pay their extra taxes so that the government can have money to spend.

I believe, that in deciding how that money should be spent, that we should think about it carefully and respect the work that's involved in providing that money to the government – the work that many, many working people do in Saskatchewan to pay their taxes and to have their money, that's collected by the government, treated

with the respect that it deserves.

I want particularly to know how much of the funds that are being approved now for April, May, June, and July, without me seeing anything except a recommendation that I approve an interim supply Bill. I have no documentation as to what's going to be spent; I have no details on it. How much of these funds is going to be used already to move us closer to the super-technical institute that's being proposed by this government? It's being set up now. I want to know how much of this supply money is going to work towards getting that set up. It hasn't yet been debated in this House. We need legislation to set up that super institute, yet you're moving very quickly to set it up without that debate in the House.

It's just one more example to me of the fact that the government does not seem to respect the legislative process one bit. You've been so late in calling the legislature that now you have us in here over the summer to give you money to spend on things that have already been spent, and on things that we don't know anything about, before we can get around to debating the budget. I find it, really, the most incredible process to be going through.

I want particularly to refer to that super institute because I was surprised to hear the member for Saskatoon Mayfair say that the Minister of Finance has delivered a fair and honest budget and that this government has the integrity and conviction to do what is right in planning for our province's future. I wonder how he can say that in connection with something like the proposals in education, when he's been involved in education and he knows, for example, that not only will the super institutes be set up, but the move to privatized education is going to cost the people in the province a lot of extra money. And I want to speak on behalf of the people, particularly the women in Saskatoon Centre constituency that I have talked to, who have enrolled in Compucollege in Saskatoon Centre. Compucollege is a franchise operating at a profit, and the cost of the course there is astronomical.

You're closing down course at Kelsey, for example, in office administration – a course that was mostly women, and taught by women – and now the fee at Kelsey is just over \$500, and now that the fee has gone up. It was \$471 for a whole year's tuition. And people going to Compucollege, many of those women, have been paying \$3,495 for a six-month diploma course in business administration. That is a terrific fee for people to be paying. Accounting and computer courses at Compucollege cost 4,700-and-some dollars for a six-month course when they could have had the same thing at Kelsey, but the program at Kelsey has been destroyed.

The courses at Kelsey that have been destroyed have been courses that have been particularly important to women – dental assistants, nursing assistants, office management, cosmetology, barbering and hair-styling – to mention five out of six that were closed down and eliminated completely, not to mention the teachers that were thrown out of work.

I protest on behalf of the constituents in Saskatoon Centre, that they have this kind of decision being made in education to cut the programs and at the same time being forced to pay these high rates at the private colleges.

And then I notice with interest that the government is now proposing that students will have to take out \$6,000 in student loans before any portion of that loan is forgivable, and it's only going to be forgivable if you finish the course that you're taking.

Now when you look at the courses in the private institutes and you look at the cost — 3,000, \$5,000 for a six-month course — you see that somebody could take out a loan for \$6,000, pay for that course, finish it in six months, get the money back, and the government has paid that money to the private college. The loan is forgivable to the student, but the college has got that money.

I want to know just what the plans are for the government in spending money on education. I don't see that this is a progressive step, one bit. I see it a step backwards. I see it hurting women particularly — particularly the women in Saskatoon Centre from age 50 to 65 who have had to stop working in their particular work place because their health is broken down or because they have been put out of work by new technology, and they are looking for retraining. Many of them are going to classes at Compucollege, taking their whole life savings and putting it into courses. Many of them are not accredited. When they finish the course, they can't get work.

The travel agency business in one good example: they can take the course and have nothing to show for it at the end, and I suggest that the money in privatizing education is going in the pockets of people who already have it and don't need it. It should be in public sphere, and I want to know more about this before I start approving budget estimates and interim supply Bills.

Something else I wanted to talk about is the senior citizens. The Premier says, "Senior citizens have more financial assistance (and I'm quoting from *Hansard*) than they have ever had in the history of Saskatchewan." Now many of the senior citizens — and I represent a constituency with over 30 per cent senior citizens — have told me that, yes, they do have a better life now than they've had in the past, and they appreciate what they have in terms of the government's support. But they are very frightened now, and I'm getting a lot of phone calls from senior citizens, saying they have had good assistance in the past and now they are losing it.

They are very worried. The good assistance has been built up over the years; it's not something that just happened last year. It's been worked up over the years in a very solid program of support for seniors, and now they are very fearful of what is happening with the loss of the drug plan and with the loss of health care services.

Much has been made of the fact that the NDP government for some time decided not to go forward with the building of nursing homes. That's because, and the constituents in Saskatoon Centre know very well, that that's because home care was developed in 1979 — a very important phenomenon for the people who are senior citizens in

this province. Home care cut down on the need for nursing homes. Home care gave people support in their own homes. There are many people in Saskatoon Centre living in their own homes who really appreciated that kind of support, so that they would not have to go into an institution. And it seems to me only logical and sensible that a government would, when they introduce a program like home care, cut back on nursing homes until they could see the need to go forward. It was very sensible planning, in my estimation, a lot more sensible than the conservative government now.

In Saskatoon constituencies there was a very nice service going called Evergreen Neighbourly Services. Evergreen neighbourly Services cost the government \$78,000 a year. It was just the ideal program for support from a Conservative government because Evergreen Neighbourly Services extended home care on a volunteer basis to over 300 people in their homes in Saskatoon. It provided crisis service; it provided friendly visits; it provided meals on wheels on weekends; it was a program with three and a half staff people employed and 75 volunteers organized. And this is the government that talks about valuing volunteer work, valuing the work of seniors. That's all rhetoric. It doesn't mean anything when you take away the \$78,000 that were supporting a really good program of volunteer work in Saskatoon, support for home care. And you've taken it away.

And you talk about how you've been putting in nursing homes. The people don't want to go into nursing homes; they want the home care service. They want that volunteer service. They appreciated the seniors going out to talk to each other. It was a program where strong seniors were supporting frail seniors — and you took the money away. And I don't know, when I support this interim supply Bill, what kinds of money I am supporting for who. But I do know that the \$78,000 for Evergreen Neighbourly Services has been cut, and I'm sure that lots of other good programs are being cut, too.

There's another point that I want to speak to when I speak about his interim supply Bill, because it directly affects so many people I've talked with when I've been able to get back into the constituency. And that is the accusation that the opposition is trying to scare people and intimidate them, and inciting them into going out there and protesting things that they thoroughly don't understand. And those are the words of the Acting Minister of Health the other day when he was speaking about the demonstration. And I find those words really insulting to the people of Saskatoon.

They understand very well what they're protesting. They know very well what's inciting them to go out and to stand in line and to come out and to show their displeasure. They understand it very well. It's a put-down to say that they don't understand it. They know that change is not necessarily progress, that much of what they've built up in Saskatchewan can easily be destroyed and is being destroyed. They are concerned for themselves, the senior citizens. They are concerned for older people who are not yet 65 and believe me, it breaks my heart when I see people — particularly women, because so many women live in poverty — telling me that they can't wait until they turn 65 so that they can get the

old age pension.

And the people who are protesting the drug plan and the people who are protesting the possibility of being charged for physiotherapy and chiropractors care are protesting on behalf of older people who are not senior citizens yet, who haven't got that kind of fixed income. Their fixed income is very low. And many of the older people in my constituency are protesting not just for themselves, but for the younger people. They're protesting because the programs that they've put so much energy into building up in Saskatchewan are for the future, not just for the pats. They want them for the younger people and they're very concerned about the destruction that's going on right now.

The people that I've been talking to have a deep understanding of what's going on. They have a deep love for the province, and they have deep interest in political action, and very much want to see people telling this government just how unacceptable these so-called changes are.

When we had the budget speech, that day when the protesters were here at the legislature, I had the opportunity to stand in the Legislative Library with a constituent from Saskatoon Centre, a man in his 80s, who had taken the bus to come down that morning. And he was resting in the library before he went out to join the demonstrators on the steps of the legislature, and he was telling me with tears in his eyes of his great fear that they were ruining the province, and that everything that he'd fought for when he went to fight in the Second World War was being lost.

(1945)

And he said, Anne, you've got to do something, you and your colleagues on your side of the House, to stop the government from its destructive ways.

He was afraid, and I had not instilled that fear in him. Believe me, I have not got that power to incite people. People know perfectly well why they're protesting in the streets. And I say to all of you, to the chairperson, that the thousands of people who marched on the legislature are only the tip of the iceberg of protest in this province.

The Premier may think that they march because they are pawns in the hands of the opposition, but as I say, he deeply insults the people of this province by saying this. The people who marched and the many thousands more who cheered them on – and there was cheering all the way along the streets of Regina, and horns honking in support, and in protest against the government – these are people who come from a wide variety of backgrounds.

I know from the people I've talked to in Saskatoon that they're people who care about their neighbours and about what's happening to this province. They're people from the most vulnerable groups in our society and they are people who are their supporters and their friends, and I know from talking to people in Saskatoon Centre that there are many, many kind-hearted people in this province who are very deeply concerned. They are

people who are proud of what they have built up over the years in Saskatchewan and they're not afraid of building for a future as long as it's a future which is fair and just to all.

On their behalf, I really want to express my grave concerns about approving this interim supply Bill. I feel almost as if I'm betraying people when I do because I want to see the estimates. I want to see what the money's being spent on. I want a chance for all of us as critics in this side of House to have a chance to have our questions answered, and hope that they will be answered, because the people of Saskatchewan deserve answers. They don't deserve the kind of treatment they had today in question period.

They've put their sweat and their blood into the money that you're now spending. It's very important to them to know that it's being spent wisely. They believe in the future of this province.

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

**Ms. Smart:** — They've been building the future of this province and we're building it with them and we will in the future, and I will be very reluctantly approving this interim supply Bill because I know that it means that money has to go out for social assistance. But on behalf of the . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order. Order! I'd like the members on both sides of the House to give the . . Order! I'd like members on both sides of the House to give the member from Saskatoon Centre . . to make her comments.

**Ms. Smart:** — Just a conclusion and a pledge to the people of this province, and particularly the constituents of Saskatoon Centre, that I will certainly do all I can to try to get some answers out of this government as to how their money is being spent.

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

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to address the Assembly for a few minutes – a few minutes probably would be about 20 minutes to one-half an hour. I know the members opposite would like to hear a few intelligent words from me, especially the former minister of Health, and I will accommodate him.

Mr. Chairman, today we've heard many people from this side of the Assembly give ample reason as to why this interim motion should be debated today. In question period today, Mr. Chairman, we had the worst performance that I have ever seen of a premier in this Assembly. When asked upon by the Leader of the Opposition to answer questions in regards to this budget and the deficit, he simply refused to answer. He was asked, Mr. Chairman, if he knew last fall when he spoke to the people of this province in the election if the deficit would be \$1.2 billion dollars, while he was telling the people that it would be only \$500 million. He refused to rise in his chair and answer to the people of this province.

Mr. Chairman, I think that that is ample evidence that the Premier simply did not tell the truth last October. He

deceived the people of this province as to the actual financial situation of this province. And I therefore say that we cannot believe the figures that are presented to us in the estimates, and I certainly do not believe the figures that we have before us in the interim supply motion.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the deficit for this year was \$1.2 billion. The SGEU says that the budget is fudged. Many other people say that the actual deficit may well be more than that. Others say that it is less than that. But I do know one thing, Mr. Chairman: that the figures of \$577 million is a fictitious figure. You simply cannot believe that figure. This Minister of Finance and the former minister of Finance were so far out in their estimates that one would be very naïve to believe the figures that they have presented to us today.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, there is a credibility gap in the present Minister of Finance and certainly the Premier. Mr. Chairman, a week before the budget was presented to this province, on June 12, the Premier, the Premier of this province spoke to the Canadian Club in Saskatoon, and when one of the members there asked him about his budget and about the cut-backs – I believe by a farmer by the name of Mr. McFarlane; it said McFarlane's remarks drew a round of applause from the audience, but Devine defended the government's record.

Now I want to go on a little bit further. The Premier said this:

The province could borrow more money, Devine said, but the deficit for the coming year (and I want the people to note this was five days before the Minister of Finance presented the budget – the deficit for this year) will likely be \$1 billion . .

And I say to you, Mr. Chairman, how can the Premier of this province, five days before his Minister of Finance presents the budget in this House, tell the people of this province that the deficit would be \$1 billion? Is he incompetent? Does he not know what the truth is? I don't think he does; I don't think he knows what the truth is.

Mr. Chairman, as I said the other day in this House, Sir Walter Scott, I'm sure, had the Premier in mind when he wrote:

Oh, what a tangled web we weave,  
When first we practice to deceive!

This Premier, Mr. Chairman, started to deceive in 1982; he can't get himself off the hook; he has to continue to deceive in order to cover up, and I'm saying that this budget is as untruthful as any statement that I have read that hasn't contained any truth whatsoever. You simply cannot believe the figures that are there.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, it is so ironic that we have to approve this interim supply motion. Because there are people out in Saskatchewan who need that money, and if we don't approve it, those are the people that are going to suffer. It's not the Premier that is going to suffer; it is not the Minister of Finance that is going to suffer. They'll take care of themselves. As my colleague from Saskatoon Centre has indicated, 150 hacks, political hacks – 60 of

them in the Premier's office, another 90 distributed around the other ministers —they'll take care of their own. We know what they've done to their other colleagues who were turfed out by the people — \$100,000 to Schoenhals; \$500,000 consulting fees to Embury and company; and it goes on and on and on, Mr. Chairman. They'll take care of their own but the opposition has a duty to defend the ordinary person out there. And, Mr. Chairman, I tell you that this budget has the wrong priorities. This interim supply therefore has the wrong priorities and that's why this interim supply motion must be debated now.

Mr. Chairman, for months on end we asked the government to call the legislature. Their reasoning was, well, we haven't got the budget ready. And yet I am told – and yet I am told, Minister of Health, by people in the government, that the budget was ready two months ahead of time, two months ahead of time, but they simply didn't want to present it to the people when everybody was watching TV. So they choose a nice time during the summer; nobody seems to be listening, nobody seems to care – they're on holidays. That's when they present the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say to this government that you can't get away with that kind of haphazard playing with democracy. There are some traditions in this province that the people out there hold fairly sacred, and I say to you that you are going to, in due course, pay for that decision. You're going to pay the ultimate and that is a defeat in the next election.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the members opposite, and to the Premier and to the Finance minister, that this budget simply has the wrong priorities. It has the wrong priorities. You created a deficit over \$3.4 billion in five short years. You were left with a province that was envied by many right across Canada. We had the fastest growing economy, the lowest unemployment; we had a diversified economy; and we gave you a surplus to work with. What have you done in that short time? You have created the largest deficit that this province has ever seen.

And not only that, Mr. Chairman. What they have done is, in this budget, they have the audacity to give all the breaks and all the benefits to the big oil companies, to their friends, through patronage. So what did they do in this budget? They turn around and tax the ordinary person to the tune of almost \$300 million — \$300 million.

And by the way, I want to say to the Minister of Parks that Roy Norris gives you his welcome. I heard Roy Norris on the open line show this morning, saying . . And where is the Minister of Parks? Where is he? I want to thank him for an increase of \$138 per week — \$138 per week increase – at Pike Lake for Roy Norris and his family.

**An Hon. Member:** — He finally sees the light.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — I think Roy Norris has finally seen the light.

One hundred and thirty-eight dollar increase for one family per week to stay in our parks – in our parks, Mr. Chairman. That's why I say this budget has the wrong priorities; this interim supply motion has the wrong priorities.

This interim supply motion and this budget, Mr. Chairman, does not come to grips; it does not address the problems that exist in this province. I want to tell the Minister of Health – I want to tell him there with all his arrogance, with all his arrogance, that the people in Saskatoon . . . We have almost 10,000 people on the waiting list. And when you have people who need a hip operation have to wait for over one year – for over one year – to get into a hospital, don't tell me that you are giving high priority to health.

When I was the minister of Health, we had a total of 3,000 people on the waiting list in Saskatoon; now we have close to 10,000. And I want to say to the member from Eastview: I've known him for a long time; I know that his office has been flooded with complaints by people of Saskatoon who simply are not getting the service that they should be getting.

In tough economic times, gentlemen, ladies and gentlemen, you do not fight the economic situation on the backs of the poor. You don't fight it on the backs of our senior citizens. You don't fight it on the disadvantaged. These are not the people that caused this deficit. These are not the people that should suffer now because of your mismanagement, because of decisions that you made to cut the royalty rates to the oil companies. Don't fight it on the backs of the poor.

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

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Mr. Chairman, I tell you, with all the reasons I have already given you, the member from Cumberland House, I think, gave us probably the best reason why we should not approve this budget or should not approve this interim supply – and that is what you have done to the aboriginal people of this province. That is what you've done to them, the people that founded this country, the people that you should try and protect the rights of, and not do what you people have done; not cut their core funding just because Jim Sinclair told the Premier exactly what he should hear. Don't take it off out of those people. Now don't cut the native court workers. Don't cut the native court workers in time of economic restraint. What you are doing . . .

(2000)

Mr. Chairman, what I want to say is that in tough economic times, you do not place the burden on the poor, the disadvantaged, or the senior citizens. This is the time . . . In tough economic times, Mr. Chairman, that is when you're going to get more family breakdowns; that is when we're going to get more women battering; that is when we're going to have more child abuse; that is the time when these people, these groups, these non-government groups, need the money. The voluntary groups need that money to work with these people. It's not the time to cut their grants.

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

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Mr. Chairman, this budget, in my opinion, does not address the problem out there in agriculture either. Very little . . . In fact, the budget cuts, I believe, 23 per cent of the Agriculture budget. Where does this budget – I ask the former minister of Agriculture – where does this budget come to grips with the debts that the farmers have right now? Where does it come to grips with the commodity prices, the low commodity prices that the farmers are getting right now? Where does it come to grips with the high input costs that farmers have? Nothing in here in this budget. No, but you've cut the Agriculture budget dramatically.

It wasn't the farmers that caused your problem; it was your decisions, your priorities, your mismanagement.

Mr. Chairman, I want to simply conclude by saying that this budget is a betrayal. It is a fudged budget. Mr. Chairman, I want to conclude by simply reading from a number of clippings that I have here as to what other people feel about this budget – why, for example, the budget should not be approved.

Here's one: "Cuts hurt crisis unit"; "Interval House faces \$27,000 cut in budget"; "Childfind Saskatchewan out of money." The budget doesn't come to grips with any of these. "Disabled protest cut-backs." Why fight it on the disabled?

"Provincial cut-backs have seniors fired up"; "Human rights commission alarmed by 25 per cent cuts"; "Leaner justice system left chasing criminals" "Cuts stun John Howard Society"; "Voice of the Handicapped cries out"; "Handicapped official blasts government cuts"; "Deficit cutting affects children"; "Cut-backs hit women's dream of a new life"; "Funding cut-backs shock library board"; "Funding cuts hit harder in rural area"; "Provincial cuts anger P.A. mayor." Who's the mayor of P.A.! P.A. mayor. Oh, that's Dick Spencer, isn't it? Oh yes, Dick Spencer. Sure, oh yes, I remember now. "P.A. must borrow for capital works."

I'd like to end up by saying, "Klein says, municipalities lucky cuts weren't higher." Thank you very much, thank you very much! You're a very . . . Now I'll tell you, there is a kind and sensitive individual. You're just lucky I didn't cut you off entirely.

Mr. Chairman, I think from what I have said, this budget does not address the problems that exist in rural Saskatchewan or in urban Saskatchewan. We all know there had to be restraints. What I'm saying is the government simply chose the wrong priorities. They are fighting their restraint on the poor, the disadvantaged, and the senior citizens, when they should be looking at other areas. And I suggested, for example, the multinational corporations, the oil companies – these are the people who did well from 1982 to 1985 when oil prices were the highest they ever were. These people did well.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, I very reluctantly have to support the interim supply motion because the people out there need the money, but I do it very reluctantly. Thank you.



**Mr. Koenker:** — This interim supply Bill was an insult to Saskatchewan people. It's an insult to Saskatchewan people. For the government to come now and want approval for its spending plans is an insult, laughable if it weren't so insulting — a request to supply one quarter of the year's funding to a johnny-come-late government.

The question is: where was the government earlier this spring when it was spending the people's money? Hiding from the people, hiding from public accountability, hiding from this legislature and the process that takes place here.

When it comes to this interim supply Bill, we have a government and a Premier who believes that the legislature isn't necessary, that we really don't have to be here, that we really don't have to follow due process, that the cabinet can do things sequestered in its own hiding.

It's a sort of government by living in a hole, a government by executive decree or dictatorship. It's a government that has disregard for parliamentary principles and for the will of the public, that the people be represented, that the people's money and expenditure of that money be scrutinized by the representatives.

During the months that we're asked to cover by this interim supply Bill, the months this spring, February, March, April, May, the first half of June, there was no legislature in session. If it had been in session, there wouldn't be any need for us to address this problem tonight.

This was the single latest budget in Saskatchewan history, and Saskatchewan people aren't likely going to forget that for a long time. Saskatchewan people, this spring, lived with a government acting by executive decree, and they resented it. Across the province people came to New Democrats and were saying, what can we do? What can we do to get this government accountable for its actions, to stop the cuts, the wild and reckless cuts that are hurting us and our children, our senior citizens? How can we put an end to these cuts? The answer was public pressure, in part. The people of the province brought to bear pressure on the government which resulted in this legislature being recalled.

But also it was the threat of legal action that intimidated them to get back in here and deal with the public's business. When the legislature wasn't in session, there was no recourse for technical institute instructors, for students, for senior citizens, for low income families and seniors, to deal with the cut-backs that they were experiencing — no place where they could put their case, no place where they could have people plead their case, no place where the government would be forced to justify their actions.

This government loves to practice deception, and loves to hide from the public — decisions in closed cabinet sessions and not on the floor of this Legislative Assembly. And so the question is, where was their public accountability? Where was their public accessibility earlier this spring when public funds were being spent? It wasn't on the floor of this legislature, that's for sure. What

was the government doing when it wasn't here? Well, it was cutting; cutting health programs.

I have a constituent who sent a letter to the Premier's office just within the last week and a half, who talks about the cut-backs to the chiropractic services. She explains the fact that she had been seeing a medical doctor regarding headache problems this spring, hadn't been able to achieve any satisfaction, and finally ends up going to a chiropractor after exhausting all medical possibilities with physicians. And lo and behold, in seeing the chiropractor, her medical problems are solved. But now she writes irate to the Premier because the possibility of her receiving these services from the chiropractors are reduced by her inability to afford them. And she writes:

If I had to pay for all or for part of these services, my financial situation would not have allowed the medical help which was very necessary to me. I cannot understand how or why your government would consider removing essential services such as this from our medical plan.

It's not just medical services that were cut. One hundred and forty-two technical instructors were cut while the government was in hiding, while public funds were being spent. One hundred and forty-two technical instructors: 39 at Wascana Institute; 32 at Moose Jaw Institute; 67 at Kelsey Institute; and even four at the P.A. Northern Institute of Technology, the showcase of the government's progressive policies. So to speak. Over 533 student positions at Kelsey have been abolished by this government at a time when unemployment is at record high for young people between the ages of 16 and 21.

Now it means that of five young people applying to Kelsey, only one has a chance of getting into the program for this fall.

The certified dental assistants program had 50 positions available for this fall, with as many as 237 people applying for admission to this program for September of '87. This program had an employment rate of some 85 per cent for the previous year, 1986. But this program was cut, and it's history now. And we are being asked to pass this interim supply Bill to countenance the irresponsible actions of this government, this record of mismanagement and ineptitude.

But there were certain areas where there weren't cut-backs. There weren't cut-backs to patronage appointments out in the public service, or patronage appointments right in the Premier's office. We've already heard tonight about the \$10 million worth of patronage appointments to cabinet ministers and the Premier. A real double standard.

And the issue here then with this interim supply Bill really comes down to the issue of credibility. We're being asked now to approve government spending plans, when they should have been approved far, far earlier. A government that disregards the public and denigrates the parliamentary process now, tonight, wants approval for its interim financing and funding, after it's delayed the legislature, fudged on budget estimates, and delayed in releasing public documentation and records.

And one wonders what we can expect in the future, for next year, or a year or two in the future. A repeat performance, perhaps. This government, yes, is johnny-come-late to the legislature. It doesn't want to be accountable. It wants public business to be postponed, to be covered up and delayed so there is no public accounting.

And that's because they are fundamentally incompetent; because they can't manage the store. And this interim supply Bill that we have here tonight is symptomatic of that very incompetence.

It will supply money – lo and behold, the taxpayers can probably scarcely believe this – they will supply money to build some \$8 million worth of roads and bridges for Weyerhaeuser corporation in northern Saskatchewan this year. Some appropriate management of public funds.

And that's what we're being asked to countenance in passing this interim supply Bill on June 29. That we should be presented with such a Bill – it's an insult; an insult to the people of Saskatchewan.

(2015)

In order for the government expenditures to continue, I think the opposition has no option but to go ahead and approve this interim financing in order not to add injury to the injurious and insulting policies that the government has practised so far. I plan to vote for this supply Bill, but I very much resent it, and I fundamentally regard it as an insult to Saskatchewan people and their political process.

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

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

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Chairman, I hesitated to rise in this particular debate on this resolution because the members opposite have had no opportunity to speak to this particular resolution.

Now there have been some members across the way taking advantage of their opportunities to speak in this debate: the member for Weyburn, the member that leaps large cities at a single bound from Regina South, been saying a few comments in this debate, but unfortunately they're . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . There he is again, trying to speak from his seat and not from his feet. Because unfortunately their comments cannot be recorded in the legislative documents here, and the member from Souris-Cannington as well. And it's important that the members across the way be given an opportunity to have their feelings about his resolution placed on the record of this House.

We have the feelings of the member for . . . the Minister of Finance, who put his comments on the record, sufficient to get the resolution before the House, and then he left.

Now in the number of years that I've been in this House, Mr. Chairman, I've been able to gaze across the House from both sides and occasionally see a rascal across the way. But never, in my parliamentary experience, have I

been able to gaze across the House and see so many rascals in this legislature. And these rascals in this legislature are all in this together. There's a conspiracy of rascals here. There's the ones from Eastview, the member from Eastview – he's part of this conspiracy with these other rascals here; the member for Nipawin; the member for Wascana who's had a couple of comments in this debate, unfortunately again not on the record; the member from Morse; the member from Yorkton; the member from Thunder Creek. They're all part of this conspiracy which is before the people of Saskatchewan.

And it's unfortunate that they're not taking part in this debate because we'd like to have their thoughts on the record. Perhaps they wish to speak on the Bill when it's before the House. However, I'd like to hear their comments at some time in this debate because it's important that when they should be silent, they are vocal, and when they should be vocal, they're silent. And they're very vocal before the election, and they tend to be silent after the election, except for a minimum amount of defence which is put forward by the Minister of Finance.

Now this conspiracy practised by the Government of Saskatchewan is led by the attitude of the Premier of Saskatchewan. And the attitude of the Premier of Saskatchewan is most adequately summed up by this article that appeared in the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* on January 19, 1983, "Devine woos U.S. investors." And in this article, quoting in part from the *Star-Phoenix*:

Devine extolled the province's riches and said Saskatchewan has so much going for it that you can afford to mismanage it and still break even.

And he also reiterated – and this is something else that our Premier has undertaken on behalf of the conservative Party – he also reiterated his free trader stance. This article goes on to list a number of places the Premier is visiting in the United States to take the message to them that Saskatchewan has so much going for it that you can afford to mismanage it and still break even. And even the Premier of Saskatchewan has exceeded his wildest dreams about being able to mismanage Saskatchewan and still break even, unfortunately for the people of Saskatchewan.

Now, the first Finance minister we had was an interesting study in the decline of Finance ministers. And this particular finance minister started with the Tory cook book back in '83. And it's interesting to note that the first, the beginning of this conspiracy, started with the first Finance minister in league with the premier and all of the members that sat on that side of the House and, for that matter, many that sat over on this side of the House at that time who are no longer with us today.

Now, how did they start this off, Mr. Chairman? Well, the way they started it off was discovered, not only by the New Democratic Party, but by the auditor of Saskatchewan. And it's reported in the *Star-Phoenix* of March 25, 1983. "Provincial auditor report backs windfall claim." And it reads on:

A recent report from the provincial auditor supports the NDP's contention that late delivery of

a . . cheque saved the provincial government from a \$300-million-plus deficit this year.

This is the auditor's report.

The report, tabled in the legislature Thursday, questions the Progressive Conservatives' decision to credit part of a \$273 million cheque from the federal government to the 1982-83 fiscal year, thus holding their deficit (to about) \$220 million.

Now the consequence of crediting part of that cheque to the deficit of 1982-83 was that the debt, had they not done that, would have been in the neighbourhood of \$330 million, rather than \$220 million. And if it had been credited where it was earned, as the auditor states in his report, the surplus left by the New Democratic government in 1982 would have been closer to \$250 million rather than \$139 million. And here began the fiction of the cook book of the Conservative Party, and this conspiracy which they continue on today, and will attempt to carry on when the next election occurs in Saskatchewan, if the people of Saskatchewan do not become more acquainted with the action of the Conservative Party and their conspiracy.

In order to perpetuate the conspiracy, it's necessary to limit the amount of information that is made available or at least delay the information being made available to the public and to the members of this Assembly. We saw one of the steps last December when the government brought in Bill 5 which would permit them to do in the cabinet room that which was formerly done in the Legislative Assembly with regard to reorganizing the government.

And that was followed later, Mr. Chairman, by the release of the reports of the government departments. And I have some of them here. I have a stack of them here, Mr. Chairman. And it's interesting to note what the dates on these reports were. Here's a Saskoil report, tabled June 18. The auditors' statement was March 3, 1986, but it was not tabled in this Assembly until June 18, '87. Saskatchewan Cancer Foundation, tabled June 18; the auditor's statement date was July 25, 1986. The Advanced Technology Training Centre, tabled June 18, 1987; the auditor's statement was dated May 9, 1986 – over a year before it got to the members and to the public. Western Development Museum, tabled June 18 in this Assembly; but the auditor's statement date was June 27, '86. The Consumer and Commercial Affairs annual report, tabled June 18; the auditor's statement was dated December 3, 1986. The Saskatchewan Research Council annual report was tabled June 18, but the other dates in the statement are August 15, 1986. Canada . . Saskatchewan Crop Insurance report, tabled June 22, 1987; the auditor's statement is dated August 15, 1986. The Saskatchewan Beef and Stabilization Board, tabled June 22; the auditors' statement was July 31, '86 – almost a year. The Saskatchewan Farm Ownership Board, tabled June 22; the statement has other dates in it which indicate it was ready thereabouts December 22, '86. The Saskatchewan Arts Board, tabled June 18, 1987; the auditor's statement has a date on it June 6, 1986 – over a year this report's been waiting around, hasn't been presented to this legislature or to the public of Saskatchewan.

Here's one interesting – my MLA – June 18, the Saskatchewan Science and Technology report; the duty minister's statement has a date on it, November 27, '86 – months and months ago, and this is my own MLA, I'm ashamed to say, June 18, the Saskatchewan Culture and Recreation report, the letter of transmittal is October 1, 1986 – it was a long time in transit. Saskatchewan Health Research Board, June 18, '87, it was tabled in this Assembly, the auditors' statement date is July 24, 1986. Saskatchewan Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission . . and I realize this is painful for the member from Souris-Cannington because he was holding these reports as one of the key people in the cabinet, and I'm sure there's only two or three key people in the cabinet and he is one of them. I've always regarded him as being a key person. He obviously was one of the ones who would have knowledge about these reports being held back from the public and from this legislature.

Saskatchewan Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission, now here's one that the Premier makes a lot of thunder on, and the reason he's making a lot of thunder on it is that when you got an empty drum, you can make a lot of noise on it. It was tabled in this legislature June 18, '87; the auditor's statement is May 26, '86. This report's been lying around the member from Souris-Cannington's office, or somebody's office, for an awful long time now. Saskatchewan Rent Appeal Commission, tabled June 18, '87, transmittal letter is June 25, '86 – pretty close to a year. Saskatchewan Advanced Education and Manpower, a very important department, student aid fund, June 18, '87 it was tabled in this Assembly; the transmittal letter is September 8, '86 – been around for months and months and months.

**An Hon. Member:** — Have you read them all?

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Oh, there are many more. I want to assure the member from Souris-Cannington that there are many more of these reports that have been around for months, around for months, been held back – held back by this government to prevent information from getting in the hands of the public, to prevent information being presented to the opposition so they could begin studying this reports. Instead, all of these reports were dumped in the House within a few days of the opening of this session.

Saskatchewan Teachers' Superannuation Commission tabled June 18, '87; the auditor's statement has a date on it, December 19, 1986. Saskatchewan Public and Private Rights Board, June 24, 1987; the letter of transmission was January 30, '87 – it's been around for close to six months.

(2030)

Here's an important one, the Saskatchewan economic development and trade market development fund, June 25, '87 is when it was tabled; the auditor's statement made is May 13, '86. Saskatchewan Heritage Fund annual report, tabled . . whoops! . . tabled very recently – probably today – and the letter of transmittal has a date on it, October 19, '86, and the auditor's statement has a date on it, September 24, 1985.

So you see here, Mr. Chairman, what this government has been doing is to do things in secret outside of this Chamber — not within view of this Chamber — to hold back as many reports as they can — and there are many more reports — and keep information away from the public of Saskatchewan.

The budget dates, of course, are well known hereabouts. Only two times since 1945 has the government gone beyond the end of the previous fiscal year before it could get its budget into the legislature.

Now the tabling of reports in this legislature . . . It's important that all members of the Assembly be informed, but the delay in tabling reports in this legislature was capped today with the tabling of the public accounts. And other members have spoken about the tabling of the public accounts, so it's unnecessary for me to comment much further on it. But the auditor's statement is October 10, 1986 on this particular one, and it was tabled today, and it's the public accounts for 1985-86.

Now, the Government of Saskatchewan says it couldn't get its budget before the Legislative Assembly because of serious financial problems. Well, the province of Alberta, right next door to us, our sister province, managed to get its budget before the legislature before the end of the fiscal year — the previous fiscal year. They were able to do it.

The Government of Canada, which has two problems — it has a Conservative government and it has serious financial problems, similar to Saskatchewan — it was able to get its budget before the Parliament of Canada before the end of the previous fiscal year.

Let me give you one more example. The Premier and some of his key conspirators over there quite often refer to the province of Manitoba. Now one thing they do not refer to in the province of Manitoba — they're silent on — is the fact that the province of Manitoba, which is having serious financial problems as well, was able to get its budget before its legislature before the end of the previous fiscal year.

Now it seems like everyone in Canada is able to get their budget before their respective parliamentary bodies before the end of the previous fiscal year except the province of Saskatchewan. Now I wouldn't want to blame that on the public service of Saskatchewan because for many, many years the public service of Saskatchewan got the budgets in, and you only have to examine the record, got the budgets in in March, February, March, February, March, March, March. And the only time it ever went beyond March was April 10, 1985, and June 17, 1987 — both under a Conservative government, and that's since 1945, when I was just a little boy. I know you wouldn't believe that. But here you have a government which is hiding the budget, following the same path that they are following on public documents, the same path they're following on public accounts, the same path with the budget. Keep the information away from the public as long as possible — not because they can't get it there; it's because they're hiding it and it's a conspiracy. And as I mentioned, all of those members in the back row are part of that conspiracy.

Now what are the consequences of this? Well a number of news items which appeared in the *Star-Phoenix*, for example, indicate some of the consequences of the actions of this government to municipal government. This headline appearing on May 19, long after the fiscal year was started: "Council stymied by delay in budget." This is a report on Saskatoon city council meeting, and it talks about the cuts and the suspected cuts, and so forth.

Another one here, "City bus fares may increase." This is May 7, well after the start of the fiscal year. Well, city bus fares did increase. Then the budget came down and now the city is going to have to make a decision whether it increases those again, because even the city was not able to guess how much of an increase the province of Saskatchewan was going to put on sales tax or that they were going to institute . . . what level they were going to institute the gasoline tax at, a tax which they vowed never to put on in Saskatchewan again.

"Funding cut-back shocks library board." This is April 13, well into the new fiscal year, where the city of Saskatoon public library finds out from the drip-by-drip budget that this government has brought in that they're going to lose 30 per cent of their provincial funding.

"Province's indecision skews city budget plans," another item. This one is back in February when the city was well into their budgetary process. And I know this because I've had some experience with their budgetary process there.

"School board . . ." There's another one, back in February, "School board fears revenue loss if provincial budget delayed," and members across the way, some of them, may recognize the name of the chairman of the board's management and finance committee.

**An Hon. Member:** — Who's that?

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — It's Dr. Lowell Loewen. I believe he was recently at one of your meetings. And what does Dr. Loewen say? He talks about a possible loss of close to \$7,000 of revenue a day because of the delay of this province's budget. And here's quote from Dr. Loewen, which you can maybe ask him about next time you see him at one of your meetings:

"That's money we can't afford to lose," says trustee Lowell Loewen, chairman of the board's management and finance committee.

Some of the effects of this government's actions by bringing in their budget later than it's ever been brought in before.

And it was thought, it was thought in the beginning, and this is some of the city's estimate back in May 5, that the average home owner to pay \$62.31 more because of the provincial government's budget. Well, I suspect that that will be on the light side. And I, interestingly enough, was looking up my own tax bill for the city of Saskatoon and it's up \$79.60 because of this government's actions.

Not only do you have these municipal bodies that are suffering and are going to have to pass on the extra costs

of this government's actions to their ratepayers, either this year or next year, or they're going to delay projects again – some of which have been delayed before under this government's budgeting restrictions and lack of finance to municipal government.

A member, my MLA, will remember the 51st Street overpass which is being built there. There's a pile of dirt and it's got weeds on it now for four years – been delayed by the city government because they cannot proceed with it. And my MLA will also know that the city put off repairs to major bridges in the city of Saskatoon because of cuts in finance – municipal financing – in the city of Saskatoon. And this is happening all over the province.

That's why we view this interim supply as a serious question. Not only do we believe that the interim supply was used improperly, there tends to be an opinion around that it was illegal as well. I think the members across the way, in assessing the situation, decided that here may be some validity to the suggestion that it was illegal. The consequence of that was that they called the legislative in, session into effect on June 17, and I suspect that the calling of the legislature would've been put off even farther had the government of Saskatchewan felt they could get away with it.

But there was a public pressure building up; the legality of their moves was being called into question. And they hurriedly made an announcement the day of the meeting of the New Democratic caucus to consider this matter and announced that, three weeks in advance, the legislative session would be called into session.

These are all serious questions which I unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the members on the government side refuse to comment on. We would like to be able to accept the words of the Minister of Finance; however, we have learned not to trust the words of the Minister of Finance. We prefer to hear some of the words from the members that sit on the back benches so we can get them on the record on this particular matter. And I would implore them to take an opportunity now – you've got lots of time – take an opportunity now and speak to the Assembly on this particular matter. Do you feel that this government has lived up to the letter of the law and the spirit of the law with regard to budgets, tabling documents, holding back information?

And I want to hear the members from across the way. This is a routine matter, approving interim supply. It would be a routine matter were it routine in nature, because in the past I have had the opportunity approve interim supply a number of times. Nothing out of the ordinary in the past. But there is certainly something out of the ordinary at the present time with regard to interim supply, and I would encourage the members across the way to put their views on the record so that we will all know what they are.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

**Mr. Hagel:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I am saddened this evening that we stand in this Legislative Assembly to debate this motion calling for an interim supply to approve spending which has already occurred or will be shortly spent – the amount that hasn't already occurred – the amount of \$1,197,269,100.

And I recall having walked away from this Assembly at 1:30 in the morning on December 24, and going back home to my home constituency and people saying, why in the world was it that the government chose to call a session three weeks before Christmas while everyone is preoccupied, getting ready for Christmas, and not paying a great deal of attention to the Legislative Assembly? Could it have something to do with that ominous Bill 5 that they introduced to allow the government to create government departments and wipe out government departments, and mix and match, and change budgets and staff and mandates of government departments, and do all of that behind closed cabinet doors? Could it have something to do with that? Could it be a symptom of this Progressive Conservative government which tells us that they have a new mandate, despite the fact that they did not get the majority of the votes in Saskatchewan? Could it have something to do with a new fashion of government in Saskatchewan, government which would take place behind closed cabinet doors and away from the open assembly of the Legislative Assembly?

And people of my constituency said, when are you going to be going back? When are you going to return to the Legislative Assembly to do the business of this province, to consider the budget for the next year and the Bills that were promised in the Speech from the Throne?

And over and over again I told constituents in my riding, we'll be back in February. For years and years the session has been called in February – we'll be back in February doing the business of the people.

And so January came by and I anxiously looked in my mail for my notice for the call of the session in February, and there was no letter. Through February I looked through my mail box every day looking for the letter to announce the call of the session of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, and there was no letter.

(2045)

In March I surveyed my postal box every day looking for this long-awaited letter to call the legislative members back to the session to do business for the people of Saskatchewan, and there was no letter. Well I thought surely now that the fiscal year has expired, now that we're into the new fiscal year, we're into April, surely this long awaited letter will arrive and checked my mail box throughout the month of April and there was no letter.

Well I thought this is virtually impossible, that we couldn't have gone this far, and we found ourselves moving into the month of May. For the first half of the month of May there was no letter, and then finally, finally the New Democrat caucus decided that enough is enough, and we will have to sit down, and if it is the only way to force the government to govern, to take action in the courts, that we will have to do that, and we gathered – four weeks prior to the call – four weeks prior to the

Legislative Assembly beginning, in the morning and at noon.

At noon of the morning that the New Democrat caucus decided that we would have to take legal action to force the government of Saskatchewan to govern, the Premier wandered out and said, with four weeks notice, when the norm is two – 10 or 14 days is normal – but with four weeks notice the Premier said, we're going to finally get to the business of Saskatchewan and you can expect your letter in June; and finally I got my letter. Finally I got my letter that said on June 17, on June 17 we're going to begin to do the work of the people of Saskatchewan.

So here we find ourselves tonight, Mr. Chairman. We find ourselves here this evening on June 29, debating a Bill to provide for interim funds in the amount \$1.2 billion which has already been spent. And I ask myself: why are we doing this? Why are we doing this? Why do the members on this side have the concerns that we've expressed over and over again? And I say to myself, these are the symptoms we are seeing this in this debate tonight, a symptom. And I'm not sure what it's a symptom of, because it's hard to decide.

It's hard to decide if this is a symptom that we are debating tonight because the government has a plan to deceive the people of Saskatchewan – option number one. Or is it a symptom that we are debating this interim supply Bill tonight because the Government of Saskatchewan is plagued with incompetence – reason number two. Or is it reason number three, that we are debating this Bill tonight because we have a government in Saskatchewan which operates by a partisan political agenda and a partisan political agenda only, and this government, for the same reason that it's felt that it was in order to call the session three weeks prior to Christmas to introduce Bill 5 to conduct government behind closed cabinet doors . . . Is it the same reason that we are then called in the middle of June to debate the government's business while through the months of July and August the people of Saskatchewan go on holidays? Could that have something to do with why we're sitting here tonight? And I am astounded . . . I am astounded, Mr. Chairman, that after this Bill was introduced, member after member from the New Democrat opposition caucus, ten in number, have risen to debate this Bill, and not one single member on that side has had the courage to stand . . . has had the courage to stand and say why it is important to debate this Bill tonight – not one.

Oh, we've heard the catcalls; we've heard the member from Souris-Cannington; we've heard the member from Regina South; we've heard the member from Weyburn catcalling across the Assembly as to why it's so important that we are debating this now. But not one, not one has had the courage. And I say to you, Mr. Deputy Premier, will you stand and have the courage to tell the people of Saskatchewan why we are debating this interim Bill tonight? And you did not have the courage to introduce the budget prior to the end of the fiscal year. Will you have the courage to do that?

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

**Mr. Hagel:** — Well, let us look, Mr. Chairman, to the

track record because this government is fond of claiming its firsts – and believe me, it's had some doozies. Let's take a look at the track record of the conduct of the business of the Government of Saskatchewan. Let's take a look, Mr. Chairman, in modern history.

Let me start with the year 1945 and take a look at the dates, the dates upon which the public accounts were made available to the members of the opposition and to the people of Saskatchewan – the public accounts which outline the expenditures that were actually made by government departments on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan. Let me read, Mr. Chairman, to you and to the people of Saskatchewan, the track record of the good conduct of business of the Government of Saskatchewan since 1945. Let me present to you the dates at which public accounts were made available following the completion of the fiscal year prior. If you listen carefully, Mr. Chairman, you'll see that there is a pattern.

On February 19, 1945, the public accounts were tabled for the year 1943-44, approximately 10 and a half months following the completion of the fiscal year. Now without making reference to the years . . . Let me just refer to the calendar dates by month, from the years 1945 until we get to more current, and then we can look specifically at the track record of this Conservative government.

We saw the public accounts tabled in the Legislative Assembly on February 19, 1945, then February 22, then February 11, then February 17, February 21, February 21, February 12, February 12, February 18, February 15, February 14, February 10, February 15, February 17 – this may sound a bit monotonous to the member from Regina Wascana, but if you listen carefully, even you will be able to understand that there is a trend here – I say to you.

They were tabled then in 1959 on February 13, February 15, February 14, February 23, February 15, February 7, February 15, February 14, February 9, February 19, February 5, February 27, March 3, March 6, February 6. And then we began to see the beginning of a new trend, a new trend to deliver these reports to the people of Saskatchewan earlier, that started in 1973. In December 19, 1973, December 17, '74, January 28, March 7, March 28, March 15, and then the beginning . . . In the final three years of the New Democratic government, the public accounts were reported on December 14, December 12, and December 10. In each of those cases, Mr. Chairman, the public accounts were presented less than nine months after the conclusion of the year in which those expenditures were made.

And then we come, then we come, after 38 consecutive years of modern history in which the public accounts were delivered by March at the very latest, we then come to the beginning of the term, of the first term, of the Progressive Conservative government.

And what did we see? Well we saw, we saw the first time that this government produced those public accounts, they came in in February 24, 1983 – a little later. Perhaps they could be excused because they were rookies as they told us and they weren't sure what they were doing.

Well after having a year's experience in 1984, they came in on March 23, the second latest date in modern history. The following year, in 1985, we had a new record, another PC government first, and we had the latest date in modern history in which the public accounts were presented – April 12, 1985. Then in 1986, then in 1986, they got their act together, and they came in four days before the end of the year, March 27, the third latest date in modern history.

And now we have, now we have, Mr. Chairman, another first – another first for this track record of this inglorious government opposite – the latest date, the reports for 1985-86 being presented to us here on June 29, 1987, a full 15 months later, Mr. Chairman, a full 15 months following the completion of the fiscal year that we had to wait, until today we received the public accounts for 1985-86.

And I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that that is a sign the conduct of this government in producing the reports of its financial transactions is the betrayal of good business practice. It is a betrayal of the principle of open government in making information available to Saskatchewan people. And most of all, it is a betrayal of the trust of Saskatchewan people. Well, Mr. Chairman, that's how they've done in producing the reports in the context of Saskatchewan history.

How do they fare on the other end? How do they fare in producing the plans for the expenditure of budgets? And let's take a quick review again, Mr. Chairman, and take a look at the track record for modern history in the governments of Saskatchewan over the years beginning in 1945, what were the dates in which the governments of Saskatchewan presented their plans to the people? These were the plans that the government had put together to state what their priorities were in the programs that they were going to deliver for the people of Saskatchewan.

And listen carefully again, Mr. Chairman, because there's a trend. There's a trend that takes place, not over years, but it takes place over decades. And so when were the budgets presented? In 1945, the budget was presented on March 15, that was by the Tommy Douglas government, after having one office in June of 1944. And let me go through the months and the dates after that. In consecutive years, Mr. Chairman, we had budgets presented on March 14, March 6, February 26, March 2, March 8, February 21, February 27, March 4, March 3, March 2, March 5, March 6, February 28, February 27, February 26, February 27. There is a trend again, Mr. Chairman. March 9, March 1, February 21, February 19, February 25, February 17, March 1, February 18, March 2, February 26, March 10, February 9, March 8, March 14, March 24, March 10, March 7, March 8, March 13, March 5. And then March 18 was the budget presented by the member from Regina North East in 1982.

And so you will see, Mr. Chairman, over that period there were 38 consecutive years in which the budget's plan for the people of Saskatchewan was presented in either the month of February or March – for 38 consecutive years.

Well, along came 1983. Along came 1983 and a new administration which does things in new and different

and sometimes mind-boggling kinds of ways. So what do they say? In 1983, the first budget – they made it, Mr. Chairman. They got the budget in before the end of March. In fact, they got it in two days before the end of March. They came to the people of Saskatchewan and said, here's our plan for the year to come.

In 1984 they got it in a week before the end of March – March 21. And then we come to 1985 and another first, another first for the PC government of Saskatchewan, and the first time in modern history in which the government delivered its plan for the people of Saskatchewan after the fiscal year had actually begun.

In 1985 we didn't see the budget until April 10, and that was a new record. That was the latest budget presented in modern history in the province of Saskatchewan.

In 1986, they say they got their act together and they delivered it five days before the end of the year, on March 26.

And so here we are, 1987, after 82 years of history in the province of Saskatchewan, having had only one budget presented after the beginning of the fiscal year and that being presented by the members opposite. In 1987 was the budget presented in April? No. Was it presented in May? No. The budget was presented, finally, on June 17, 1987.

What a statement of either incompetence, deceit, or betrayal – and it's hard to make up your mind which it is.

So that's the track record, Mr. Chairman. That's the track record in producing the reports of the expenditures; that's the track record in producing the plans for the expenditures of this government sitting opposite. Well should we expect that having done things in this new and phenomenal kind of way, having pulled together the best business minds of the PC caucus, that they have managed our affairs better than they have ever been managed before? They like to tell us how business-like they conduct government.

(2100)

So what's the record? Here is the government that inherited a \$139 million surplus – a \$139 million surplus they inherited. And in their first year, and their first year said, well, we're a little wild and reckless and we're not too sure just what we're doing here. Son of a gun, we haven't quite figured these things out as well as we should have. We know that.

And they told us in the fall of 1982 that we're going to have a record deficit in Saskatchewan. They said we're going to have a deficit of \$220 million. We know what to do with surpluses; we wipe them out. We're going to have a deficit of \$220 million. And at the end of the year along came the Minister of Finance, along with his prediction for the next year's expenditure, and he said, whoa. We were a little off. We said we were going to run a deficit. We ran a deficit; we kept our promise; we ran a deficit, but we missed it just a little bit. And he said, whoops! We were \$7 million off. It was a little bigger than we thought – not too bad.

But he said, you know, we got things under control. We know how to run government. Now we've been here for a year. We've found the keys to the washrooms. We know how to balance the books and so he said, in our second year, we've got things in order, and this year we're only going to have a \$317 million deficit. And along came the end of the year and the Minister of Finance stood up again and what did he say? Whoops! He said we missed it by \$14 million this year. Not too bad for the best business minds in the PC caucus.

But you know, we've got the problem in hand now, we've got the problem in hand now, and look out, people of Saskatchewan, 'cause things are getting better. Next year you're only going to have a \$267 million deficit. And along came the Minister of Finance at the end of the year, and he stood up in this House, and what did he say? He said, whoops! Missed her by \$112 million this year. It was a little bit bigger than we thought. But then he told us, we've had 3 years to figure things out and we have finally got things under control. Next year you're only going to have a \$291 million deficit, people of Saskatchewan. And oh, we were all so encouraged that finally, finally they were going to manage our affairs with good business acumen.

And along came the Minister of Finance at the end of the year. He said, we were going to have a \$291 million deficit, but whoops, we missed her again. How much did we miss her by? Just a little bit, just missed her by \$293 million. You know some times things change — a little tough to predict.

**An Hon. Member:** — That's \$1,200 a family.

**Mr. Hagel:** — Twelve hundred dollars a family my colleague says — and he's right — in increased debt for every man, woman, and child in the province of Saskatchewan.

But along came 1986-87 when the Minister of Finance said, you know, folks, this is an election year. We've been at this business of governing for four long, lean years, and we have finally, we have finally got our act together, and this year just, to show you we've got our act together, we're going to have the biggest deficit that we've ever forecast in the province of Saskatchewan. He said, as a symptom of our good business management this year we're only going to have a \$389 million deficit. And then he stood up, he stood up in this room across the way on June 17 and he gave us the biggest whoops of all. He said to the people of Saskatchewan, the big whoops this year folks is that we made a slight miscalculation and we only missed the deficit by \$846 million.

But we were reassured on June 17 — and this may sound a shade familiar — we were reassured on June 17 that as a sign of the good business management of the members opposite with the best business minds of the PC caucus and the PC Party, that we are only going to have, once again, the biggest deficit projection in the history of Saskatchewan. And he said, this year folks just to show you that we've got our act together, we're only going to run a \$577 million deficit.

Well I dread the day when we get the next report because I'll tell you, Mr. Chairman, those whoops are getting painful. They're getting painful for the people of Saskatchewan, and the people of Saskatchewan are beginning to wonder — they're beginning to wonder about the business acumen of the members opposite, led by a Premier who told the financiers in New York in 1983 that Saskatchewan has so much going for it you can afford to mismanage it and still break even. Can you believe that? The Premier of Saskatchewan. That was prior to the whoopsies.

Well, Mr. Chairman, is there any doubt why the people of Saskatchewan are saying and are asking, can you believe what they say when you see what they do, and why the people of Saskatchewan are saying every day when they drive by a gasoline station up and down Albert Street in Regina and all across the province, gasoline 46.9 cents, a reminder that you can't trust a Tory?

And so we find ourselves here tonight. We find ourselves here tonight debating this Bill, asking for approval, approval to spend money that's already been spent — \$1.2 billion, nearly \$1.2 billion that's already been spent, and we're asked to give approval to that Bill and the money is already gone.

And I say, Mr. Chairman, I say in conclusion, that I despise the fact. I despise the fact that we are gathered here tonight to debate this Bill — whether it's a symptom of mismanagement, whether it's a symptom of incompetence, whether it's a symptom of deceit, or whether it's a symptom of partisan politics on the part of the government. Whatever the reason, whichever one they choose to tell us as the explanation for this exercise tonight, I despise the fact that we're here.

And I point out in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that I am the tenth consecutive member of the opposition to rise and express our concerns and our reservations simply about the fact that we have to debate this Bill. I invite just a single member opposite — I invite the Deputy Premier of Saskatchewan to have the courage to stand up and tell the people of Saskatchewan why it's good for them, and why they've done such a wonderful job, and why we have to be debating this Bill, and what that has to do with their best interest. I invite the members opposite, Mr. Chairman, to stand up and explain to us what they're doing because, quite frankly, I don't understand, and I don't think that the people of Saskatchewan understand or accept that we're doing what we're doing here tonight.

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

**Mr. Upshall:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**An Hon. Member:** — Bringing in your heavy hitters to wrap it up?

**Mr. Upshall:** — You betcha. Always save the best to last, and I will give you now a few thousand of my well-chosen words as to why this interim supply Bill makes me very nervous I'd just like to talk about a bit about the money you didn't spend. We have a situation in agriculture where your budget cut 26 per cent out of the agriculture sector — 26 per cent, a quarter of it — more than a quarter.



Money was spent by this government on a number of things, but one thing they didn't spend money on, Mr. Chairman, were a few things at the University of Saskatchewan. Soil testing is one of them. Cut the soil testing out. So now the farmers, when they go get their soil tested so they know what fertilizers to put on, what nutrients they need, where does the money come from? Out of their own pocket. This government spent money, but it didn't spend it on the farmers in that respect.

It didn't spend money on the farmers with respect to feed testing lab — \$200,000 a year for feed testing. Beef producers in this province looked forward to sending in their samples to know exactly what nutrients they have — a Cadillac system cut out from under the beef producers of this province. This government says it's supporting — I say it's knocking the knees out from the people, the farmers of this province, because the money comes directly out of their pocket. And later I'll tell you where they are spending the money.

Something else that happened to the University of Saskatchewan was the extension division in poultry. The supply and management business in poultry has taken the industry to its greatest heights ever seen in this province. We have a situation where 25 per cent of the poultry farms were monitored as far as egg production, as far as health of stock. They had two staff, a veterinarian and another researcher, telling farmer show they could improve their production and they brought the quality of production up to its highest degree. What does this government do? It didn't spend any of this money supporting their farmers who are producing eggs and poultry in this province.

What else didn't it spend its money on? It didn't spend its money on some important social things in this province. It's reducing, in the next four years, its support for agricultural and horticultural societies, something the rural people in this province could go to, could work together, and have a fair or an agriculture, horticultural show to get away from their frustrations, to get away from the mental turmoil they're going through. And how does this government respond? No. You guys out there — take the money out of your own pocket if you want to have any social benefits for rural Saskatchewan.

They didn't stop there, Mr. Chairman, they went a little further and they went and grabbed a hold of the 4-H. The children of this province who enjoy learning, and combine that learning with fun. And they didn't spend any of this money on that. They went even further, a whole \$10,000.

But the Premier time and time again tells the Women's Institute that they are the very most important people in rural Saskatchewan because they tell their peers and their children the benefits and the education aspects of women in rural life. A whole \$10,000, and what do you do? Knock the knees out from under them. Rhetoric, idle rhetoric.

I think some of the money could be spent making a couple of trips to Ottawa telling the Prime Minister about why there shouldn't be variable rates, and telling the

Premier why there shouldn't be free trade. But do they spend money on that, Mr. Chairman? No, because they do not support the rural fibre of this province, the farmers and rural Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Upshall:** — And I think, Mr. Chairman, with a record like that, the only thing that should accompany a record like that is a mug shot and fingerprints. Because I believe that it's criminal, the things they are doing to this province in that respect.

Other things that's happening, Mr. Speaker, with regards to where this interim supply of money went. At the same time, at the same time that one minister was on the phone to a client, to a person from rural Saskatchewan, saying, why can't I get into the hospital; why can't I get my cancer treated? At the same time that person is on the phone to one minister, down the hall a little further, what's happening? Another minister is on the phone to George Hill saying, George, have you got enough money? Is 200,000 bucks a year enough for you, George?

At the same time that the dental therapists of this province found out that they had the knees kicked out from under them, at the same time that they wiped out their entire livelihood, and one of them was on the phone to one minister, down the hall what's happening? Another minister says, Tim, is 500,000 bucks enough for you and your buddies to study how we down-size this government? That's where the money went.

At the same time that the drug prescription plan was being eviscerated, at the same time that minister was on the phone saying, how much do you need? You know the people of Saskatchewan have got lots of money. At the same time that was happening, what are they telling to the hospitals? We're closing down your wards.

This is the type of hypocrisy that we have seen, and that's why it's very, very difficult for me to vote for this interim supply Bill, although we on this side have the compassion to know that there are people out there who need their money. And although we know the hypocrisy is there, the idle rhetoric is there, and the mismanagement is there; although we know that they are sitting here on the other side of this House talking about issues that affect us provincially, talking to their federal counterparts in Ottawa — I like to call it saying harmony with Brian and the brain dead — the same time that's happening, the people, the rural fibre of this province, is being literally wiped out.

(2115)

Where is the money? Where is the money? How much of this money was spent in rural Saskatchewan to sustain rural life as we needed, to sustain the populations of the farm, to sustain the populations in our rural towns? Where's the money? Was that money spent? I say no, it was not spent, and it should have been.

We see the people in the nursing homes paying more money. We see home care, rural Saskatchewan, which is a program that has greatly taken the emphasis off the need

for building more nursing homes, we see their fees increase 67 per cent for those on full subsidy – 67 per cent increase. That's the type of hypocrisy that this government dictates.

So, Mr. Chairman, I will not go on any further, but I thought I must rise to say . . . to tell you and the members opposite, and I would like just one of them, even if you come from the back benches, to get up and justify to what you've done – justify to the people.

And I didn't mind not speaking in the budget debate. I didn't mind not speaking in this budget debate because I know you over there need all the time in the world to try to justify this decrepit budget.

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

**Mr. Upshall:** — And one more thing, I don't think you'll ever have enough time in your lifetime to justify this budget. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I spoke at some length earlier in this debate on this committee. I would like to take some time now and address some questions to the Minister of Finance dealing with this resolution.

This resolution that's before us asks this Assembly to approve, with interim supply, the expenditure of \$1.197 billion. Most of that money has already been spent by special warrant. I ask the minister the following question: in this resolution that is provided before us here today, what amount covers the special warrant expenditure which you have made already, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — As I indicated at the outset, it was for the special warrants plus the month of July, so you can take one-twelfth of the proposed budget, and except for, I think it's \$300,000 . . . Provincial Auditor will give you the figure.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Just while we're waiting for your officials, I just repeat my question. The question is this: what amount of this \$1.197 billion is retroactively to pay for the special warrants which your government approved in cabinet and spent without authorization of the legislature?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — I've indicated how we could quickly calculate it if we wanted to take a minute. We take one-twelfth for the month of July of the budgetary expenditures less, I believe, about \$300,000, if I recall, on the Provincial Auditor. We'll get it.

If you go to your supplementary estimates, you'll have your special warrants.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Will you introduce your assistant? Is it your deputy?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Yes, the acting deputy of Finance is Jack Vicq.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you. I just wondered whether you can ask your acting deputy who has been very instrumental in putting together this interim supply Bill, if he can inform through you, this House, how much of this interim supply Bill consists of the special warrants which we have to pay for, or you have to pay for retroactively?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Again, you know, I mean it's just a matter of getting someone to add up the various subvotes, but they're all set out in the supplementary estimates that were tabled, and they are done in the traditional manner. Again, if you wanted to simply add up the information that you have, we will get it done, but it's obviously going to take a few minutes.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — I'm really quite shocked. Mr. Chairman, I'm really quite shocked. Here we have . . . the minister comes to this House; he introduces a resolution; he asks that this House pass on this resolution to spend \$1.197 billion. That's not loose change. That is hard-earned taxpayers' money that the minister asks us to spend. He has with him the deputy minister who does, I'm sure, an adequate job. Surely he can turn and ask his deputy, who must have written this Bill, how much of this Bill will be to cover the money spent by special warrant through cabinet order without ever coming to this legislature. Is it \$928 million? Is it \$700 million? Is it \$600 million? Very simple question, and I would like a very simple answer.

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — You know, one of the real difficulties, Mr. Chairman, is giving these guys too much information, giving the opposition too much information, because they don't know what to do with it. We've given this information to the hon. member, the supplementary estimates. He didn't even take the time to add up the information. Now we can go through all the subvotes, all the information and add it up and . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order, order.

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — . . . taking the time of the House all day long to ask for information, and then the hon. member has nerve to stand up before the people of the province and say he didn't read the information that he was given by the opposition. Now, we'll go through and we'll get it all added up for the hon. member, as I've simply indicated to you that the number that's in the Bill, and I believe you have that number; I gave the number to the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon, of \$1,197,269,100. What I indicated is that we'll go back and we'll break it down – one-twelfth of that is for July. Approximately 300,000 is for the Provincial Auditor, as I explained to the Leader of the Opposition today. We'll do one-twelfth and take it back down. Or we can go through the process and add up all the information that you have been trying for, for I don't know how long, all day today.

And then you have it, and you don't know what to do with it. You don't know what to do with it. You stand up all day long, Mr. Chairman, and you've asked for information after information. And you know, Mr. Speaker, we heard some rather funny statements today. We had some rather funny statements today. I think the accusation was made by several members that the Minister of Finance was doing things outside the legislature.

I'm going to remind the hon. members of a famous Finance minister, who pre-dates the Finance critic . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order. I would ask the member from The Battledowns to allow the Minister of Finance to make his . .

**An Hon. Member:** — He's not giving an answer.

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order. Are you challenging the Chair? Allow the Minister of Finance to make his comments.

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There was a famous Finance minister who was well known across Canada for his cries of economic "chouse" in the world. We went through a budget, hearing about economic "chouse" until everybody found out he meant chaos. Didn't know what the word was himself, and yet he was entrusted with the public moneys opposite.

Here's what the member for Finance, the former member for Regina North East by the name of Mr. Smishek . . Do you know what he did? He left the legislature; the legislature adjourned in December 1, 1976. Do you know what he went out and did December 8, 1976? He was afraid to do it in the House. He announced a 3 per cent income tax hike, the largest single income tax hike, and he was afraid to do it in the legislature. Mr. Speaker, all I suggest to the hon. members is that it's all right to get into the political debate, but please, for heaven sakes, let's be a little more accurate than you were today.

And I take a look at some of the other budget debates. I look at some of the other budget debates, Mr. Chairman. I know the hon. members don't want to hear this, but the Ontario budget has not been brought in within its fiscal year since 1979.

Now I find it interesting, Mr. Speaker, that it's not all right for a Progressive Conservative government, but it is all right for a Liberal government propped up by agreement by the New Democratic Party. And I think the public in Saskatchewan are quite interested to recognize that all the rhetoric we've heard for some time, and all the inflamed rhetoric turns out, Mr. Speaker, to be less than accurate, to say the least. And I think I'm putting the best face on that when I say that.

So, Mr. Speaker, we've had a lot of rhetoric today; we've had numerous members; we've had members who wouldn't participate in the budget debate, screwed up their courage over the weekend to come. And I refer in particular to the member from Humboldt who is two and a half weeks late, afraid to talk about agriculture. And today he gave the new agricultural policy for the NDP today, and we appreciate that. It was one big zero.

And, Mr. Speaker, that was the sum total of the debate. So I just bring everything back into perspective tonight, Mr. Speaker — that one New Democratic Party assisting Liberals elsewhere have had late budgets for a long period of time, and secondly, Mr. Speaker, that the argument that things are not done in the legislature. I think there has been an excellent tradition and practice set by the predecessor of the member opposite.

Now we have now taken the time, Mr. Speaker, because the hon. Finance critic was not prepared to do it himself from the information he had, that about \$882,209,100 approximately, were very close . . (inaudible interjection) . . Well, do you want . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Did you add it up?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — No, no, that's give or take a couple of hundred . . But again, that's a quick calculation by the acting deputy. Again, I'll give you the information, but, you know, give us the time to go through and get the figures for you. We've given you the information; you didn't sue it. We'll go through and calculate it. I mean, we can debate that for a long time, and we'll simply get the calculations.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Well isn't this fascinating, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, you had the time. Mr. Minister, you had since October of 1986 to get your act together. Mr. Minister, you refused, your Premier refused to call this legislature into the session because you said you needed the time.

Municipalities had to wait, and school boards had to wait, and hospitals had to wait, and all kinds of local government bodies had to wait because you wanted the time. Instead of being able to use that time and get your act together and know what you're doing, you come in here and give the greatest display of arrogance that we have seen in this House yet, in your speech.

The people don't trust you; you know they don't trust you. You're just like your Premier. Somebody gets up and asks a question and he refuses to answer it — that's providing he bothers to get up and try to answer it. And then after your speech, which was not only irrelevant but verges on the stupidity, if I may use that word —after that, you then provide this House with information which is wrong.

(2130)

Mr. Minister, I didn't write these supplementary estimates; you wrote them; your officials wrote them. The buck stops with you. And even I know that if you look on page 24, you can see under Consolidated Fund, loans, advances and investments, \$907,037,090. And then if you turn, Mr. Minister, to page 26, you can find under summary, budget expenditures, \$21 million. And if you add just those two lines, you find that the amount of money that is in this interim supply that you bring before us today, which is going to go toward the special awards, was \$928 million — \$928 million, Mr. Minister. Not only do you make a 208 per cent mistake in the estimation of your deficit, and your back-benchers should be listening to that, you haven't learned from that.

Today you get up in this House, on this very important resolution, and you either mistake by merely \$100 million — merely \$100 million, and it's, in your opinion, give or take. It's not give or take, Mr. Minister. It's important. It is important to the people who pay the taxes. It is important to the children who don't have dental care. It is important to the 10,000 people waiting in hospital waiting lists in the city of Saskatoon, and thousands more

in Regina. And you say: give or take a million here or 100 million there. What nonsense!

Now that is the kind of mismanagement, and that is the kind of irresponsibility that has brought us to an accumulated deficit of \$3.4 billion.

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

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — And who knows, who knows? Is it \$3.4 billion? Anybody who would make that kind of casual castaway of an error might say anything he wants.

Now, Mr. Minister, finally we have the figure. And I want to say in conclusion on this item that it's my job, and the job of my colleagues over here, to ask the questions, and it's your job to provide the answers. That's why you get the pay of a cabinet minister. I'm beginning to wonder, like a lot of people in Saskatchewan are beginning to wonder, whether you earn that pay. But that's why you're in the position you are. The buck stops with you.

Now, Mr. Minister, may I ask you another question? There has been a lot said in the pre-days of your budget on June 17, in fact some very notable opinions have been provided by constitutional experts and by lawyers, that you were acting illegally — that you were acting illegally. Have you, Mr. Minister, bothered to take a look at the legal opinion provided by the Legislative Counsel on the legality of the special warrants which you and your government was passing which then became the process of . . . (inaudible) . . . ? Have you seen that legal opinion, Mr. Minister, and what is your opinion of it?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member says that his job is to ask questions and ours is to give answers. I suggest that part of his job is to be somewhat accurate in his statements.

And we've had, for example, numerous statements of the hon. member dealing on various factors, one regarding the budget. I think he's had a diatribe in the last little while about oil revenues and oil companies that even the *Leader-Post* saw fit to not only refute his statement, but in effect challenge every aspect of the hon. member's premises; and secondly, challenge the whole argument that he made about oil royalties, the effect of the royalty position of the respective political parties. And like the past history of the hon. member, he's been out by some several hundreds of millions of dollars.

And so if you . . . Certainly obviously it's your right to say that people don't believe me. Obviously they don't believe you. Obviously they don't believe the members opposite. Obviously they haven't believed you on numerous occasions. So that's a debate that we can continue for some considerable period of time. You ask me if I saw the . . . and read the opinion of the Legislative Counsel. The answer is no.

Secondly, I have been advised by the Department of Justice that the actions taken by the government were that they were legal. Secondly, I do refer to the hon. member statements that some constitutional experts such as Dr. Eugene Forsey said that what the government was doing was . . . Oh, yes he did. He may not have liked it. He may

not have liked it, but he said it.

And then I refer again to the hon. member the practice of some other provincial jurisdictions in this country and the federal government from time to time, where the budget has not been brought in in a fiscal year. So one of the aspects of any constitutional legal debate is either precedent — and there was ample precedent in the Canadian constitutional practice for budgets to come in after the fiscal year — so I take the advice simply that I received from the Department of Justice that it was legal. Again, I have not bothered reading that of the Legislative Counsel. I think the hon. member should know that the Department of Justice is, by law, charged with the responsibility of advising the government on legal matters, and that's where I would normally take the opinion.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, did you get this opinion from your legal department before or after the judgement or the interpretation given by the Legislative Counsel?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Yes, it was obviously before. And I don't have the date as to when it was before, but I have been assured by the Minister of Justice that it was before.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — That, Mr. Minister, for the benefit of all members of this House, who I am sure, on both sides of the House, are interested in making sure that this process works in the best interests of Saskatchewan citizens. I think it would be worthwhile for everyone here to know what your Department of Justice said.

Mr. Minister, are you prepared to table, for the members information, the decision that was given by your Department of Justice on this matter? Since you did get the legal opinion, it must have been given in writing, because you know very well, as a responsible minister, something like that would be required in writing.

Now I think it's something that would interest us all, as it should, if you would table that interpretation. Will you table that legal opinion which you received from the Department of Justice, so that we can all benefit from the wisdom that was provided to you?

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

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — I think the hon. member knows, and he was a member of Executive Council, that it is not the practice of the province of Saskatchewan, nor has it been, to table legal opinions given by the Department of Justice for the operations of government — and that has been the practice. I think the hon. members all know, and you were certainly part of it, as legal opinions were asked as to the legality of the nationalization of the potash industry, when you were a government you refused to give the legal opinions. You said that that was confidential information given to the government. I think there was some considerable debate, if I recall, as to whether you should give the legal opinion. You refused to do so, and I just remind the hon. member when he was member of Executive Council that the precedent was well established at that time, and the precedent continues that the legal opinions are given for the operations'

government.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Minister I remind you that it was always also the practice to have a budget before the beginning of the fiscal year.

Now if you are so concerned about the practice, you obviously weren't concerned about following the practice on providing a timely budget. Now we are dealing with a matter of such importance to every single citizen in Saskatchewan that the appropriate practice would be to inform the people about what is the legal thing to do here. Now you stand, Mr. Minister, you stand condemned. You have been charged; you have been tried by the court of public opinion, and you have been judged guilty.

Now will you provide for us all in this House and the people of Saskatchewan, that information which you say you have, because if you don't, the only conclusion we can draw is that you never had a legal opinion. That's what I believe, that's what the public of Saskatchewan believes, and, in fact, I think that's what the case was. You're doing some more flimflamming here and by the fact that you refused to table it, you're telling us all that you never had a legal opinion; you went on your own for strictly political reasons, and now you refused to show us something which we know you cannot.

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — I find the logic somewhere humorous. This, you know, to quote someone else's *déjà vu* all over again in that we went through this debate on potash nationalization and that was not an everyday occurrence — that was not an everyday occurrence.

As a matter of fact we've only had one incident in the history of — certainly North America — where potash mines were nationalized. That was without precedent in any jurisdiction, and the hon. member opposite stood up in the House and said, yes, we have legal opinions, but no, we won't give them to you. Nothing more important I suggest in terms of the economic activities of this province over the last ten to fifteen years, than that single stroke of nationalizing potash industries — going to cost the province probably close to a billion dollars. But that was done by the assurances of members, and several sitting here today, that they had a legal opinion, and they adamantly refused, time after time after time, to give that opinion to the people of this province, and they were asking for it.

Secondly, let's also put in perspective, at the time of potash nationalization, the House leader taking the legislation through the Assembly was the then attorney general, who had the legal opinions, if there were legal opinions. So for the hon. member to argue precedent, this great importance, the delay — I've given examples of other provinces having a budget past the fiscal year. I've indicated to you that there was a legal opinion. I've indicated to you what the practice of the province has been historically and what it is today. So to take your arguments that because it hasn't happened before in the province, is not a fair one when one looks at past political debates in this Assembly.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Minister, I

want to go back to the issues raised during the question period, and the disgusting spectacle of a Premier who is too cowardly to meet the challenge in the legislature, and continually referred questions which only he could answer — because they dealt with his state of knowledge — to you, who patently couldn't answer them.

I guess one can say, Mr. Minister, that at least the Premier wouldn't lie to the House. But that's about all one can say. It was obvious by his silence that he was unable to deny the allegation, that he knew the facts of the case when he made contrary statements in October. By his silence, Mr. Minister, he stands condemned.

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

**Mr. Shillington:** — I said earlier, Mr. Minister, that at least one can say that he wouldn't lie to the House. Nobody can say that about you with any sort of certainty, because your comments just simply don't hang together. I want to know, Mr. Minister, what it was that you didn't know in October. In your economic statement which you gave in March, you claimed the \$300 million revenue shortfall, and you blamed that on oil, and you blamed it on potash, and you blamed it on agriculture. Oil prices, Mr. Minister, had already settled in the 10 to \$15 a barrel by that time. The unanimous opinion of oil analysts was that that was where it was going to stay. The potash prices had fallen in 1985, and certainly the agricultural situation was no surprise. So the revenue shortfall, you knew all the facts before you made up your budget. The other 500 million was an overexpenditure.

All of those, Mr. Minister, were in place before the election. I want to know what it was you didn't know in October that took you by surprise on November 1. What was it you didn't know in October that could have led to a statement of that sort during an election campaign? Or, Mr. Minister, were you just being a politician?

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

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — I believe that the comments made by the hon. member are less than warranted as they apply to the Premier. I think it fair to say that the Premier has participated in most question periods. And so I don't think your comment frankly holds much water.

I find it a little interesting, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member just said that oil prices had bottomed out in 10 to \$15 a barrel range. I think that was his statement. I think I'm being accurate when I . .

**An Hon. Member:** — No, you're not.

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — No, no, when I use his figures . . (inaudible interjection) . . Settled at 10 to \$15 . . (inaudible interjection) . . Well, you know, the difference between 10 and \$15 is somewhere around \$100 million. Now what's a million, \$100 million, the hon. member asked. So, so, you know, you can have, you can have your range right there when you begin to talk about those figures.

(2145)

But let's take a look at what figures you do not get . . (inaudible interjection) . . No, what you do not get until you begin to approach your fiscal year end. And I'm sure that you've participated in the budget process; you know some of them. You've got your corporate income tax figures; that is, as you get closer to year end, you get a more accurate assessment. Your sales tax, you get the same thing. As you get closer to your fiscal year end, your estimates get more precise. Tobacco, tax, the same. Oil, we've discussed. Potash, uranium, all of these – the closer you can get in most cases to your year end, the more precise your statement will be.

Let's take a look at some things that did come into play. We've got the Saskatchewan Pension Plan. We frankly did not know the cost of the Saskatchewan Pension Plan. We did have the discussions with the Provincial Auditor as to what the reserve should be. We did make some policy decisions, some significant ones.

For example, we had proposed revenues from land bank sales. As I indicated in my economic statement, there was a reduction. We made the policy statement to the effect of \$100 million, that we would not take projected revenues that we had put in, and we had debated in last year's budget, into the revenues from last year – we chose not to take them. One can name some rather significant figures in all of those that I've given which would indicate a difference.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — When the Executive Council had finally made a final decision on the 1987-88 budget . . When did you make the final decision and send it off to the printers?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — I can get you the exact date, but I would think it would be in the last three weeks. Somewhere around there. Yes, about three weeks.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Will you put a . .

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — If you want confirmation of the dates that this was done, February or March, it wasn't done then. And it wasn't finalized then. I think it was printed maybe ten days, fifteen days before the budget, somewhere in that time.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — What you're telling me, if it was sent to the printers by June 1, that the members of the Executive Council would have known what was in the budget by June 1. Am I correct? Then the members of the Executive Council would have known what the expenditures and revenues, the estimated expenditures and revenues, were in this budget. Correct?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — We got them back from the printers, I'm told, somewhere about June 12th.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — In other words, what you're saying to me is that certainly by June 1 everybody — certainly the Premier — would have known what the estimated expenditures and revenues were in the 1987-88 budget. Is that correct? The Premier would have known what the estimated expenditures and revenues were in this budget by June 1. Correct?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Pretty well. There were still some relatively small policy decisions being made in agriculture and, if I recall, property management capitalization, and a few items like that.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Mr. Minister, did you change your figure of \$577 million deficit after June 1?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — If it was, there'd be modest changes, just as you normally go to final printing you start to get some minor changes.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — What you're telling me, then, is that the Premier should have known that the forecast deficit was around \$577 million. Is that correct? The Premier should have known that.

Why then do you think the Premier, as quoted in the *Star-Phoenix* would have told the Canadian Club that the deficit for this year, 1987-88 — five days before you came into this House and presented the budget — why would the Premier tell the Canadian Club, and here are his words:

. . the deficit . . will likely be \$1 billion.

Only out \$423 million, five days before you presented the budget in this House. Why? Why would the Premier do this?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — I'm sure that the Premier was probably referring to last year's deficit rather than next year's projected deficit.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Mr. Minister, I could read the whole article to you. The Premier was referring to this budget, the budget that you represented in this House. Or is the Premier in the habit, as you are, sir, of saying, oh well, within the neighbourhood of five or \$600 million dollars, somewhere in there — somewhere in there, take my word for it.

And, Mr. Minister, that statement is in the *Star-Phoenix*. The Premier was referring to your budget. Are you saying that the Premier was purposely deceiving, or was he simply incompetent? What was he?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — I am sure that anybody was referring to what the deficit for last year would be, and it was better than a billion dollars. This year's projected estimated deficit is 577. And I'm sure that anybody could interpret that one way or the other, and I suspect that's what was said.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — One further question. I want to read to the minister: "The province could borrow more money," Devine said, "but the deficit for the coming year (the coming year) will likely be \$1 billion." I think you've answered it for me, Mr. Minister. That's all I have.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairperson. My question to the Minister of Finance regards the accuracy of reporting of the minister in comparison to the accuracy of his officials. I happened to notice in the *Public Accounts* of 1985-1986 on page 576, under revenue for the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund, the original estimate for

oil revenues derived to the province of Saskatchewan, the original estimate was \$641,700,000. The actual total by the end of 1986 was \$638,661,000 – a little over \$3 million short.

My question to the Minister is this: if, in fact, your officials were able to predict within \$3 million the amount of revenue accruing to the province of Saskatchewan, which in terms of economic forecasting is within a fine science, what happened between 1986 and 1987? Were the officials of your ministry out, which I don't think they were, or were you up to your old tricks of trying to put forward a political case using statistics and facts and figures which were dreamed up, not by your department officials but in some political back room?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — No, in the previous year the OPEC (Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries) agreements had been . . . had stood up and there was stability in the oil industry; and last year there wasn't. And I can assure the hon. member that of all the opinions we had from experts as to what the range of the oil prices would be last year we had none that went as low as \$10 and, you know, it started out at 30. So the previous year was very stable and that the collapse of OPEC during the year was not foreseen by anyone.

**Mr. Lyons:** — The facts of the matter were that oil prices were unstable throughout 1985 and 1986, and the facts speak for themselves in terms of the fluctuations of oil price. My question, it's a short question again, is: were your officials out in their estimate to you for the budget '86-87? Were your officials out, or were you out and just made up those statistics, facts and figures, for your own political purposes?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — The hon. member knows that the minister is responsible, not the officials. And I think, if the hon. member were fair, that the OPEC uncertainty began, if I recall, somewhere around December of 1985. There was a good deal of uncertainty – yes, there was – during that period of time. You may recall that the federal budget came out, and their figure was considerably higher than the figure that I put in our budget. And, of course, we had the debate at the time, during the budget, after our budget had gone to print, oil prices had even dropped during that interim, and we were high at that time. So I've assured the hon. member that we had numerous ranges. As the year went on, obviously those ranges got more broad as prices became much more volatile, but at the time of the budget preparation we were well within the ranges.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, this evening we have watched the Minister of Finance; we have put questions to him; we have sought answers from him; we have received no straight answers to any of the questions that we have asked.

The reputation of this minister is so damaged that the credibility with the public doesn't exist any more – a man that went into the Finance portfolio and indicated a \$389 million deficit, and he heaped upon the people of this province, because they wanted to get elected, a budget deficit of \$1.2 billion. He has poured on the backs of taxpayers across this province interest alone on the debt of \$294 million a year. And this minister, here,

comes forward now with no credibility. The Premier today demonstrated that he's up to the same games – give the public no answers.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion here, that we have listened; we have asked; we have been fair to the minister to reply to the serious questions put forward by my colleague. He has refused to do it. The public has lost confidence in him. This side of the House has lost total confidence in him and, accordingly, I am going to be moving, Mr. Speaker:

That the following words be added to the resolution: and that the salary of the Minister of Finance be reduced to the sum of one dollar.

I move that, seconded by my colleague, the member from Regina Centre. I think that fairly reflects, Mr. Chairman, what the people of Saskatchewan feel in respect to the performance of this minister and, accordingly, I so move that motion.

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

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order. Order.

(2202)

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division.

#### Yeas —18

Blakeney	Solomon
Prebble	Anguish
Brockelbank	Goulet
Shillington	Hagel
Koskie	Lyons
Tchorzewski	Calvert
Rolfes	Trew
Upshall	Smart
Simard	Koenker

#### Nays —31

Duncan	Martin
McLeod	Martineau
Andrew	Sauder
Berntson	Johnson
Lane	McLaren
Smith	Hopfner
Swan	Petersen
Muirhead	Baker
Maxwell	Toth
Schmidt	Gleim
Hodgins	Neudorf
Gerich	Gardner
Hepworth	Kopelchuk
Hardy	Saxinger
Klein	Britton
Meiklejohn	

(2208)

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

**Yeas – 50**

Duncan	Gleim
McLeod	Neudorf
Andrew	Gardner
Berntson	Kopelchuk
Lane	Saxinger
Smith	Britton
Swan	Blakeney
Muirhead	Prebble
Maxwell	Brockelbank
Schmidt	Shillington
Hodgins	Koskie
Gerich	Tchorzewski
Hepworth	Rolfes
Hardy	Upshall
Klein	Simard
Meiklejohn	Solomon
Martin	Atkinson
Martineau	Anguish
Sauder	Goulet
Johnson	Hagel
McLaren	Lyons
Hopfner	Calvert
Petersen	Trew
Baker	Smart
Toth	Koenker

**Nays – 0**

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Speaker:

Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1988, the sum of \$1,197,269,100.00 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Motion agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Chairman:

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$62,090,000.00 be granted to Her Majesty on account for the 12 months ending March 31, 1988.

Motion agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Chairman:

Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1988, the sum of \$62,090,000 be granted out of the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund.

Motion agreed to.

The committee reported progress.

**FIRST AND SECOND READING OF RESOLUTIONS**

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — By leave of the Assembly I move that the resolutions be now read the first and second time.

Motion agreed to and, by leave of the Assembly, the resolutions read a first and second time.

**APPROPRIATION BILL**

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — By leave of the Assembly, I move:

That Bill No. 13, an Act for Granting to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1988, be now introduced and read the first time.

Motion agreed to and the Bill read a first time.

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — By leave of the Assembly, and under rule 48(2) I move that the Bill be now read a second and a third time.

Motion agreed to and, by leave of the Assembly, the Bill read a second and third time and passed under its title.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:17 p.m.