

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Clerk: — According to order, yesterday I received certain petitions which were laid on the Table. I have examined the petitions under rule 11(7), and hereby present them for reading and receiving.

The first group of petitions were:

Of certain citizens of the province of Saskatchewan, praying that the Legislative Assembly may be pleased to urge the Government of Saskatchewan not to limit the universal accessibility of Saskatchewan people to ensured chiropractic services.

The second group of petitions were:

Of certain citizens of the province of Saskatchewan, praying that the Legislative Assembly may be pleased to urge the Government of Saskatchewan to retain the school-based dental plan.

And the third group of petitions were:

Of certain citizens of the province of Saskatchewan, praying that the Legislative Assembly may be pleased to urge the Government of Saskatchewan not to change the Saskatchewan prescription drug plan.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the legislature, Sean Carragata and Peter Tolman, who are seated in the Speaker's gallery. Sean is the president of the University of Regina Students' Union, and Peter is the external vice-president for the University of Regina Students' Union.

I had the opportunity to meet with them just a few minutes ago to discuss, among other things, the post-secondary education conference that's going to be held in this province here later this fall, which I think is going to be a very exciting event and one that will set the course, I believe, for post-secondary education across this country for the next decade or two.

Although it is summer, the students at the university are being well served by their executive, not the least of which are the president and the external vice-president who are, albeit that it is summer, hard at work on their behalf. I would ask for Peter and Sean to stand and be recognized, and for all members of this Assembly to welcome them here today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Legal Aid Commission Fees

Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, my questions involve the Minister of Social Services, but I will address them to the Premier.

I questioned the minister in this Assembly about the Legal Aid Commission's plan to begin charging fees to poor people for the services rendered by the legal aid clinics. I did this on July 22 and he answered my question in these terms, Mr. Premier, and it's reported at page 1319 of *Hansard*. He said:

I believe the member opposite knows that I have no direct control over the Legal Aid Commission and very little influence over what they do. I am merely the minister who sends cheques to the Legal Aid Commission to pay the bills.

And later he said:

However, they have not as yet communicated that information to me. And I understand from the media, and maybe you have better sources, that they're considering some charges, and I will study them when they send them to me.

Now in light of that statement I would like the Premier to explain, on behalf of the minister, a document which I have in my hand and which I'm prepared to table after question period, which is a letter from the deputy minister of Social Services, to the acting chairman of the Saskatchewan Legal Aid Commission. The letter is dated July 16, 1987, and I quote:

I wish to inform you that Treasury Board Minute no. 1229 relating to the Department of Social Services Budget has approved an immediate implementation of a \$50 per case charge for legal aid services applicable to non-SAP clients. This approval was based on your cost recovery strategies submitted to Treasury Board.

Now the question that I have for you, Mr. Premier, is: was the minister misleading the legislature last week when he answered my question in those terms, or did his deputy minister fail to inform him of the treasury board decision?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I will take notice of the specific question in the absence of the Minister of Social Services. I would only say that at . . . The statement I think two days ago in the House, I think the head of the Legal Aid Commission indicated . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order. I'm sorry. The minister has taken notice and no explanation can be given.

Mr. Mitchell: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, which again ought to be answered by the minister, but which I will direct to the Minister of Justice. Another reason that I

was surprised with the answer given by the Minister of Social Services, denying all knowledge of these charges, is that I understand in a meeting with the Legal Aid Commission earlier this year he told them that budget cuts were forthcoming and asked them for ideas.

Now in light of that, and in light of the document that I've just referred to, indicating treasury board has approved the fee, I would like the minister to confirm that this is the history of this matter, that it is the history of this matter that he raised the subject of budget cuts with the commission and got this response from them — the idea of a contribution plan — and that this was approved by treasury board, in fact, and communicated to the commission on July 16.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I think, from my knowledge of what has transpired in the House — and I will simply obtain that information for you, bring it back to you — but it would seem to me that the way this thing unfolded is far more detailed than the hon. member would have us believe. But I will take notice of that and bring it back to him.

Mr. Hagel: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the Minister of Social Services, I will direct my question, a new question, to the Premier. Mr. Premier, there is another troubling aspect to this July 16 memo from the deputy minister of the Department of Social Services to the Legal Aid Commission. It says, and I quote from that memo of July 16 . . .

Mr. Premier, in light of the fact that the Minister of Social Services just walked into this Assembly, Mr. Premier, you're off the hook, and I'll direct my question to the Minister of Social Services.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Minister, you are aware that on July 16 of this year your deputy minister sent a memo to the Legal Aid Commission and, in part, it says, and I quote to you, Mr. Minister:

Revenues generated by the commission cannot be used to cover additional expenditures but must be returned to the province: The most efficient and effective method to account for your revenues would be to reconcile the collection at year-end (and I underline this last phrase, Mr. Minister) and we will reduce your final grant payments by that amount.

Mr. Minister, in light of that memo and the fact that the Legal Aid Commission suggested a fee schedule as a way to make up its 8 per cent, \$500,000 reduction, and the fact that none of those fees will go to the Legal Aid Commission and that they will go directly to the Minister of Finance to help pay for the provincial deficit, will you admit to this Assembly, Mr. Minister, that that is a tax on the poor, albeit a hidden tax on the poor? And I ask you, Mr. Minister, to justify to this Assembly how you justify that hidden tax to the poor of Saskatchewan. Will you justify that?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — The memo you refer to, I have had an opportunity of looking at. And it's clearly a case of bureaucrats quibbling about money. And that's what that letter and the letters going back and forth suggest.

I can tell you that that is not a final policy of this government, now was the letter personally sanctioned by myself.

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Minister, if you . . .

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

An Hon. Member: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Yes. And while I'm on my feet, I wanted to remind you, as I had mentioned yesterday, to direct all remarks to other members through the Speaker.

Mr. Hagel: — My apologies and, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary, directed again to the Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Minister, if you do not sanction memos submitted by your deputy minister, then who is responsible in this Legislative Assembly for those memos submitted by your deputy minister?

I submit to you, Mr. Minister, another question: that in light of the fact that two groups — Lawyers for Equal Justice and the Canadian Native Law Student Association — have both spoken out strongly against this destruction of the principle of legal aid because they see this plan as unfair and possibly even open to court challenge — in light of those concerns, Mr. Minister, will you reconsider this unfair plan and look for other ways to cut the deficit? Will you consider attempts by your government to cut the salaries of some of your political staff, or to apply cuts to the advertising, the self-serving . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order, please. Order, please. The supplementary question is getting way out of line and lengthy. As a matter of fact, you have asked two in quick succession. So please, if you have a question, put it directly without any further preamble.

Mr. Hagel: — The question directly, Mr. Speaker, to the minister is this. Why not cut the political fat of your government instead of making the cuts on the poor of Saskatchewan? Will you answer that question?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — I can say, Mr. Speaker, that the majority of the public is in favour of the policy that is in place. I've even read favourable comments in the media that this is a reasonable way of proceeding, and therefore we will not be changing the policy.

Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Social Services. The minister has acknowledged that he is familiar with the memorandum of July 16, which I'm going to table after question period. And I refer him to the

first paragraph of that document which makes it clear that the treasury board had approved the implementation of a user fee system at least six days before the minister answered my question in the House on July 22, 1987, to the effect that he was merely the minister who sends cheques to pay the bills, and who had not received any information from the commission as to any user pay program.

My question to the minister is simply this: did you deliberately mislead the legislature last week when you answered my question; or is it a matter of your deputy minister not telling you what's going on in your own department?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order, please. The hon. member for Regina Centre has been kind of carrying on a running commentary since the beginning of question period. Please refrain from that.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question is no, I did not mislead this Assembly, either negligently or deliberately. At the time I had no knowledge of the treasury board minute, nor does it matter, because the treasury board minute, which we will not produce but which is referred to in that letter, would indicate that the situation is that legal aid was considering a fee and that treasury board was not opposed to that fee and had for some reason granted approval.

Now treasury board does not need to grant approval, nor can it require the Legal Aid Commission to charge a fee. And it is quite clear, as I said to the member opposite, Mr. Speaker, in the day in question, that we did not oppose a fee for those people who were capable of paying some form of fee. So it is totally consistent. What we are doing here is we have members opposite playing around with little memorandums, little documents that I have not seen and that I did not sanction at the time.

Mr. Mitchell: — Supplementary. It's not a question of the opposition playing around with anything. It's a question of getting straight answers from ministers in this House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Will the minister admit that in January or February of this year he met with the Legal Aid Commission, warned them of impending budget cuts, and asked them to come up with a plan whereby they could help cover the budget cuts that would be coming?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, I met with the commission. I advised them that the government was going to have to reduce expenses in all areas, and asked them to think about ways of efficiently reducing their expenditures.

Mr. Mitchell: — A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister admit that he received as one of the options from the Legal Aid Commission, the option

of imposing a contribution system on the users of the legal aid plan, and that this option went forward over the minister's signature to treasury board?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — There were two questions there, Mr. Speaker. The answer to the first question is, yes, this was one of the options that they had indicated they would consider. And the second question, with respect to my signature to somewhere or other, I don't recall ever sending anything of that nature to treasury board.

Mr. Goodale: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the same minister on the same subject. Earlier this week I asked the minister some very direct questions as to whether or not certain instructions had been given by the government to the Legal Aid Commission, and *Hansard* records that the minister, on several occasions, responded that he did not recall any such instructions, or not to his knowledge, I think was some of the language used.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, how a decision of treasury board could be taken on a subject that is absolutely germane to your responsibilities and you not know about it. And how could your deputy minister write to the acting chairman of the Legal Aid Commission on a very critical subject to many people in Saskatchewan, directly falling within your responsibility, and you not knowing about it? How could that have happened?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, I didn't particularly concern myself with treasury board, because they have no jurisdiction over the Legal Aid Commission.

Mr. Goodale: — Further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The document that has been referred to in the House today in terms of cash flow arrangements between the government and the Legal Aid Commission was mentioned by the minister in a previous answer where he said, I think, something to the effect that this was just an argument among bureaucrats about how the money should flow, or something to that effect.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you're in a position today to elaborate upon that comment a bit further. What was the government's proposition to the Legal Aid Commission in terms of cash flow, and what was the Legal Aid Commission's response to the government's position, and what is the state of affairs now in terms of this flow of cash to deal with legal fees under the legal aid program?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — The answer to most of that question is, I don't know, because I didn't instruct any bureaucrats to quibble about money that I didn't know might be there. And when I found out about this I said, you wait until there is any money, until they've made a decision, and then we'll quibble about who gets it.

And in particular, Mr. Speaker, this issue has not been resolved because it has not come to my level or the level of my cabinet colleagues. The bureaucrats do not run this government, cabinet does. And cabinet will decide on that issue.

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Minister, in light of the fact that in that memo of July 16 your deputy minister directed that the funds collected from fees to legal aid clients will go

directly to the Minister of Finance, will you ensure that those fees collected will go to help for the operations of the Legal Aid Commission? Will you at the very least give that assurance to those who are responsible, to ensure that Saskatchewan people who are poor can get legal protection in this province?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, at the time I answered the question for the member from Gravelbourg, I thought that if there were any fees which I knew were being considered — we did not direct them to charge fees, but if there were any fees, I thought they would use them for their purposes. This issue has now arisen with the technicalities of The Department of Finance Act and whether they have the power to keep funds collected, and this matter will be resolved by cabinet in an appropriate manner.

Mr. Romanow: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct a question to either the Premier or the minister in charge of the Legal Aid Commission, preferably the Premier. The minister just said a moment ago that it was the government and the politicians that were making the decisions, and not the bureaucrats. The memorandum to which the member from Saskatoon Fairview referred is a decision of the treasury board of this government, which is the government, agreeing to the imposition of fees on those who are needy in the legal aid system, in the face of a bald assertion to the contrary by the Minister of Human Resources a few days ago.

I want to ask, Mr. Speaker, the Premier or the minister in charge: if the government runs the Legal Aid Commission, why in the world does he not direct the Legal Aid Commission and the bureaucrats to stop this unfair penalty on those who can't afford to pay for legal services?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well the initial question raised by the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg was: did the government instruct the Legal Aid Commission to charge any fees? And the answer at the time was, not to my knowledge. And not to our knowledge today did we instruct them to do it.

Clearly they indicated it was something they were going to consider. It seems to me that the Legal Aid Commission has admitted that it was a submission to us that this is one of the things they would do if they had less money this year. We did not tell them exactly what to do. They have made their decision, and if treasury board has passed something saying that we can live with their decision, that is fine, because it is exactly what I've been saying all along. As long as it's fair and reasonable, the government will not try to interfere even if we could.

Prosecutions Regarding Non-Payment of Wages

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, My question is also directed to the Minister of Human Resources, Labour and Employment. It deals with the shocking document tabled yesterday by my colleague, the member from Saskatoon Fairview, a memorandum from your director to your deputy minister stating that there were about half as many

prosecutions in the last calendar year because of the election.

Simply put, Mr. Minister, it means that you have sacrificed the interests of workers, which this legislation was passed to protect, to the interest of your own friends. I ask you, Mr. Minister, now that you've had a chance to look at it, how do you justify for interfering with the administration of justice and sacrificing the interests of workers to those of your friends?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, I took notice of the question yesterday and I will be giving a more detailed answer once we have done a full investigation of that. The government has nothing to hide with respect to that memorandum whatsoever. I indicated that elections have nothing to do with the prosecution or collection of wages for employees. I believe that is how my department had operated during the last election and during every election. However, it seems that the department — and we have never been an incumbent government before, so it seems that the department during elections operates differently, and I didn't know that.

And I have a memorandum dated before the 1978 election and it's from the regional manager . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order, please. Order, please. Order. The minister's attempting to answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, in the 1978 election, the regional manager sent a letter to the labour standards officer in Saskatoon and it's got the name of the individual employee whited out on it. But it's got one sentence; it says: request to prosecute — better hold off until after the election. This is in 1978. And I believe that the member for Saskatoon Fairview was the deputy minister of the department at that time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, this election interference in the department seems to be a past practice I didn't know about and have not . . . You know, he brought it to my attention, Mr. Speaker, and I am pleased, and it will not happen in the next election. We will make certain that they don't follow the practices they did in 1978.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — New question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, the opposition is growing tired of your misinformation that you're bringing to this Assembly. And you've just finished doing it in the question that you just gave us. Mr. Minister, it has long been a policy not to initiate prosecutions during the period in which an election writ is outstanding. That does not explain prosecutions dropping in half during the last calendar year.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — I ask you to stop spreading

misinformation in this House and tell us how the prosecutions come to drop by 50 per cent in the last election year. What is your position with respect to this document? Is it a total fabrication? Did they just write it for the fun of it, or is, as I think is obvious to everyone else, that there's been political interference in the administration of justice in your department?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, that is true. There has been political interference in the operation of the Department of Labour. It was . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order! Order. Just let the minister answer the question. Order. Order. Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — There was election interference in that department in 1978, Mr. Speaker, when the member for Saskatoon Fairview was the deputy minister of the department. That's true. I didn't know about it, and I didn't know that that's how they operate during elections. And now that he's brought it to my attention, I can assure you they will not operate like that during the next election.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I want you to answer the question, and I want you to consider your answer carefully before you do. Is it your position that there was no interference in the prosecutions except during the period of time an election writ was outstanding? Because if your answer that in the negative, I think you're going to have trouble explaining these statistics. So I ask you to answer that question: is that your position, that there was no interference and no political considerations except during the period of time the writ was outstanding — the 28 days the writ was outstanding?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, the only political interference that I know of was during the 1978 election. I knew nothing about this. I was innocent until he brought it to my attention, the member for Saskatoon Fairview.

Mr. Speaker, the reason that there are fewer prosecutions is for a simple reason. That we have had a policy of trying to settle cases out of court, of taking other matters to other procedures, third-party demands. He understands a garnishment; he's a lawyer, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure he understands that. We have tried to have matters settled, especially the small matters, rather than a direct prosecution and a court case. And that is the reason, and I believe it is a very good reason.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Yes, that's the answer you gave yesterday. It's different than the answer you gave us today. But let's deal with the answer you gave us yesterday, to attempt to settle them. Let me just remind you — let me just read the sentence in this memo . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Sorry. Did you say it was a new question?

An Hon. Member: — Yes, he did.

Mr. Speaker: — Okay. Okay, fine.

Mr. Shillington: — Your director says to your deputy:

A direct result of the reduction in prosecutions has been an increase in the use of certificates and third-party demands. This has, on occasion, caused the department some embarrassment and delayed payments of employees' wages for lengthy periods of time. That's what your more accommodating attitude, during the period of an election, has meant.

Mr. Minister, I ask you: do you not agree that you've sacrificed the interests of the workers to the interests of those of your friends?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, I challenge the member opposite to read the next paragraph which says that the embarrassment and the problems caused to the government are because the employers are mad at us because we're garnisheeing their wages on behalf of . . . or their money coming to them on behalf of the employees. So because we are taking stricter measures, rather than take prosecutions, we are doing third-party garnishment on employers.

The next paragraph says that the employers are unhappy with us. Would I want to do that during an election? Not likely. We are doing our job.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Governors' and Premiers' Trade Forum

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to make a brief statement with respect to the recent governors' trade . . . premiers' trade forum in the United States. I attended and co-chaired two sessions of the National Governors' Association meeting in Traverse City, Michigan.

On Monday I was pleased to address a governors' committee meeting on agriculture, and there was widespread and practically universal agreement that agricultural subsidies in all areas of the world were the root cause of our depressed prices.

I made the case, as I have on several occasions before, that income-based support for farmers, like Canada's western grains stabilization fund, would be much less market distorting than current United States or European price subsidies. Governors, for the most part, support this theory and are encouraged by President Reagan's initiatives in this direction.

The agriculture session was important for two reasons, Mr. Speaker. First, governors were able to hear firsthand what the Canadian perspective of the problem was, and how crucially needed the solution is now. Second, the line of face to face communication was strengthened between premiers and governors. I am convinced that without this constant exchange, initiatives such as President Reagan's recent announcement to decouple supports would never have happened.

On Tuesday I was honoured to have been the Canadian co-chairman of the first meeting of the premier/governors' trade forum. Once again this initiative was undertaken to foster better understanding and communication between Canadian and American policy makers. Irrespective of whether a bilateral trade agreement is reached between our two nations, it is imperative that there is a mechanism to deal with ongoing trade irritants.

In this regard, many issues of extreme importance to both countries were raised, debated, and thoroughly discussed. These included energy, agriculture, and opportunities for economic co-operation in attracting new business. There was a general agreement that much more sharing of factual information was imperative so that decision makers were operating on the same level of understanding. As well, there was, on behalf of the governors and premiers, a desire to ensure that both nations understand why certain actions have been taken to date.

The forum also allowed various states and provinces the opportunity to share the success ... the information on successes of bilateral dispute mechanisms such as the Great Lakes Charter, the Saskatchewan Boundary Commissions with Montana and North Dakota, the National Association of State Directors of Agriculture, and the Canadian Ministers of Agriculture Annual Conference.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, although critics may say that these types of forums are not useful, I would maintain that without this kind of face to face contact, trade irritants could very well be much worse than they are currently. As former premier of Alberta, Mr. Lougheed, said:

It's not that our two nations won't have differences; it's how we solve those differences that will be the true test of our ability to work as two sovereign, sophisticated, and mature nations.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, a brief reply. Mr. Speaker, I had the honour to attend a governor's meeting some years ago when I was chairman of Canada's premiers, and while I found it interesting and entertaining, I was not convinced, at that time, that the governors, as a group, exercised very much influence in Washington. And nothing that has happened since then has changed my view.

This is not to suggest that we shouldn't use all methods to exchange information, and I commend the Premier for using this method of exchanging information. Whether or

not the whole process was useful, I think, will probably be a matter of opinion. I noted with some interest in the media that the Premier's co-chairman, Governor Sinner, of North Dakota, seemed a good deal less convinced of the value of the exercise than did the Premier.

However, be that as it may, we never are sure what will come out of an exercise of exchanging information with people with whom we carry on a good deal of business. I think the overwhelming message that came, at least through the media, was that we are a very long way from achieving any new understanding of what amount to, let us say agricultural subsidies on one side of the border or the other, based upon any common understanding of the facts.

I would therefore suggest that a great deal of work needs to be done; that the exercise which the Premier has engaged in, while not likely to be overly productive, was none the less very possibly useful, and we have no quarrel with him holding up the banner of Saskatchewan in that regard. And we can only hope that our friends south of the border will be a little more appreciative of the concern that Canadians and people from Saskatchewan have with respect to a wide measure of trade problems, particularly those of agriculture on which the Premier was focusing.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

STATEMENT

Tribute to First Woman Member

Mr. Gardner: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, and with leave of the Assembly, I'd like to pay special tribute to a past member of this Assembly, if I might.

On today's date in 1919, in a by-election in Pelly constituency, the people of this province elected the first woman to ever sit in the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, a lady by the name of Sarah Katherine Ramsland. And today marks the 68th anniversary of that occasion. And I just wanted to make mention of it, Mr. Speaker. I thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the document that I referred to in question period. It is a copy of a memorandum from the deputy minister of Social Services to the acting chairman of the Saskatchewan Legal Aid Commission, dated July 16, 1987.

Mr. Speaker: — Before orders of the day, I should also like to take this opportunity to table the 18th annual report, 1986, of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, Saskatchewan branch.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Before orders of the day, I would like to table a document I referred to in question period, a department memo dated October 12, 1978.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Motions for Interim Supply

Hon. Mr. Lane: —

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$363,072,500 be granted to Her Majesty on account for the 12 months ending March 31, 1988.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I will be sending over to the Finance critic the breakdown — it's a scheduled Bill — of those items where it is not one-twelfth.

As I indicated, as a courtesy prior to that, I think the area of concern to the hon. member is the need for additional funds on wind-down dental drug . . . I can go through the list, but I will forward to the hon. member a copy.

In addition to the matter of the changes to the drug plan and the transition to the new program, the dental plan, I think the main items are the revenue sharing, which is traditionally given at two-twelfths, August.

The Social Services, one point one-twelfth, and that's to cover the projected fall educational allowance to children in the August, Saskatchewan assistance plan cheque.

Urban revenue sharing to maintain historic payment schedule is at two-twelfths.

Grants to the parliamentary association and society of Clerks is at eight-twelfths. That's required to cover expenses of the Canadian Parliamentary Association conference being held in Regina.

A major change at eight-twelfths are forest fire operations — summer concentration, extraordinary fire expenditure, fire year. That includes forest fire operations, operating subsidy to the resource protection and development fund for fire suppression, payments to the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation in Parks — that's for SPMC payments, including \$2.9 million for water bomber rentals associated with fire-fighting.

In addition, in Parks, is the grants to the new careers corporation at eight-twelfths. Most of those, if not all of those, new career costs, are associated with summer construction projects.

Seven-twelfths to the Public Service Commission summer student employment program. Again those expenditures are over the course of the summer.

Rural Development has two-twelfths for ferry services. That's a concentration of activity by ferry operators over the first six months of the year.

Grants to community economic development at four-twelfths. There has been no provision in earlier special warrants.

I indicated the prescription drug plan. Grants to hospitals, repayment of principal and interest on capital loans from property management Crown, again at four-twelfths. The same for special care facilities and seniors' heritage grant administration.

The Department of Education — I'm sure the minister will specifically want to comment on these grants to the institutes. Higher cash flow associated with winding down — these are at two-twelfths to meet student financial assistance commitments. The operating grants to schools at two-twelfths, and that's according to normal schedule, according to the advice I have. Grants to school construction at two-twelfths again. That's according to normal schedule, according to the advice I have.

Environment and Public Safety, three-twelfths. Electric and gas inspection transferred to SPC; only six months funding provided, therefore one-twelfth inadequate, per monthly cost.

And finally, payments under the operation recycle program at eight-twelfths. That program, as we've discussed, is terminated July 1, and that's to pay out contract commitments.

(1445)

I might advise further that the Heritage Fund amount that we will be discussing is lower than one-twelfth, and the reason for that is that a full twelve-twelfths of the Science and Technology expenditure was provided by special warrant earlier this year.

I believe that covers them. I have now . . . I believe the hon. member now has a list of the areas where it's more than one-twelfth.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me begin, and I have a few remarks I want to make on this Bill which . . . or these resolutions which the minister has presented, and a Bill which will be presented later.

I want to point out first of all and acknowledge that indeed the minister did indicate yesterday that there would be some exemptions to . . . or exceptions to the one-twelfth provisions of the Bill, and I acknowledge that and I appreciate it.

But I want to make further comment on that process because of the new circumstances in which this legislature finds itself with regard to interim supply Bills which have never existed before. Now I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this interim supply Bill, obviously as it always does, asked the legislative approval for the expenditure of a very significant amount of money. But here it is asking this legislature to approve the expenditure of money for the fifth month of this fiscal year. That is unusual, and that is a first, and that has never happened before.

Why is it happening now, Mr. Chairman? Is it happening now because the government has been unable to put its act together since the October 1986 election and do

things in an orderly fashion. It continues to reinforce the kind of debacle of mismanagement that it began in 1982 and continued throughout that period of time, leading to the circumstances to which we find ourselves here today.

Now time after time, ministers have been in this House under their estimates which deals with the budget and the expenditures that those ministers are going to make of taxpayers' money. And time after time questions have been asked of those ministers which they have not been able to answer, even though the government has taken months to prepare its budget; even though the government delayed the presentation of the budget far beyond the beginning of the fiscal year, causing all kinds of problems for community organizations and for municipalities and for school boards and for hospital boards; even though this government had all that excess time, they still come to this House unprepared.

And now the minister comes with this resolution and he asks for something in excess of \$363 million. Well I say, Mr. Chairman, that it's this kind of mismanagement that has led to the kind of massive cut-backs that we're having in programs which are important to the very well-being of people in Saskatchewan. It's this kind of mismanagement that has brought about the massive tax increases, the massive tax increases which people are being burdened with in this budget on top of the increases that have happened before. So the minister today again, having mentioned yesterday that this would be in the House today, requests a major amount of money.

Now it's normal to ask for one-twelfth. That has happened in this legislature as long as it's no doubt probably existed. But the circumstances in which that request is being made are not normal. They're unusual. And one would have thought, one would have thought, and we would certainly, I think, have a right to expect that because of the abnormal circumstances which have been created by this government, that some advance information might have been provided. And I think that that would have been quite useful and quite appropriate.

We have been given here today a list, a long list of exceptions to the one-twelfth request. We're asked by the Minister of Finance and by the government in a short period of time to consider that list of exceptions and deal with it here this afternoon, which we're prepared to do.

But I question the process. I question the process where there is, in this kind of an exceptional circumstance, a refusal by the government opposite to provide some advance information so that it could be dealt with appropriately. It's typical of the style of this government, which is so incapable of managing the affairs of this province that it has to hide information from the very legislators who have to pass on it.

Why do we face the circumstances we face today? Because, Mr. Chairman, there has been the kind of mismanagement in Saskatchewan in the hands of this government that we have never seen before. That's why we face it today.

Now the minister asks here, and the government asks, for

over \$363 million in interim supply. I say to you that if there had not been the kind of mismanagement in the last five budgets, that amount of money would be considerably less, considerably less. This government has had, and proposes with this budget to have, six deficit budgets.

And it's not as if they accurately predicted what they would be. I bring to your attention, Mr. Chairman, that in 1983-84 the former Minister of Finance of this government said that the deficit would be \$316 million, and do you know that it was \$331 million? Now that's not good management. The former minister of Finance said in 1984-85 the deficit would be \$267 million. It turned out to be \$379 million. As the Minister of Finance would say, what's \$100 million?

In 1985-86 the Minister of Finance said the deficit would be \$291 million; it in reality turned out to be \$584 million. Almost 100 per cent increase over the forecast. And in 1986-87, the year of the budget of betrayal, the Minister of Finance, who is the present minister, said the deficit would be \$389 million. And do you know what it was? It's going to be \$1.2 billion.

Now, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, can there be any doubt in any one's mind that the ability of this government to manage is almost non-existent. That's why the minister is here today asking for \$363 million in an interim supply Bill, because they managed so badly. That's why the Minister of Finance is here asking for an interim supply Bill, for the first time in the history of the province, to cover the fifth month of this fiscal year.

Normally the budget, by this time of year, would have been passed, and there would not be the need for an interim supply Bill. But because of the lack of political gamesmanship and the inability of this government to get its act together, we're here at this time asking for an interim supply Bill.

And to some extent, a very significant extent, let's examine what this resolution and this request for this money is for. Well, Mr. Minister, to a large extent it's to pay for the mortgage that this government has created through its gross mismanagement.

They inherited in 1982 . . . this Conservative government inherited in 1982 a surplus of \$140 million that was left there in the bank for this government to use for a rainy day, maybe, or whatever the purpose might be. In five short years that surplus of \$140 billion . . . million has been squandered, squandered by this government opposite, which has created a deficit of \$3.4 billion . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — All because of mismanagement, Mr. Speaker, all because of mismanagement.

The people of this province understand that this accumulated deficit has now provided for every single

man, woman, and child a debt of \$3,400. If a child is born in Saskatchewan this minute, without even knowing its mother yet, inherits a debt of \$3,400, thanks to the Conservative government.

The managers, they call themselves. This government that was going to use a business-like approach, a business-like approach to government, no self-respecting business man or business woman, Mr. Chairman, would use that kind of an approach to their business, because they know that they wouldn't last two years.

A family of four, because of the mismanagement, is now indebted to the Consolidated Fund alone — the debt that exists there — to the tune of \$13,600. Now that's a lot of money. That's a lot of money which the people of Saskatchewan should not be burdened with, especially in light of the fact that in 1982, when this government took office, they had a surplus and they had cash in the bank. Now why then, one should ask, why then are we where we are? Well, Mr. Chairman, I'll tell you why. Because in this approach with mismanagement, the government has adopted certain practices.

First of all, give-aways. This government has literally given away hundreds of millions of dollars in situations where it should not have. That's bad management. You will recall, Mr. Chairman, very well, the give-away of the highways equipment at far less than it was worth to friends of this government in a so-called auction. And what has been the result? Well, Mr. Chairman, many of the members here drive home every weekend on the highways that have been allowed to deteriorate to the point where the people of this province are going to have to pay millions upon millions and hundreds of millions of dollars to get them back rebuilt because they have not been maintained adequately. Now that's mismanagement.

Now I know that there are some exceptions. I know that the member from Kindersley flies over those highways. And I know that the member from Wilkie, who used to be the Minister of Highways, thought that they were so bad that he wouldn't even use those highways. And where is he? So it's fine for those members opposite to think: well that's okay, the ordinary people can take what we give them, but we're going to live high on the hog. That's mismanagement, Mr. Chairman.

Another reason why there has been this mismanagement is because of the atrocious waste that this government has undertaken. Now there is a very recent example of this waste. Now I bring to your attention, and the attention of this House and the viewers of this proceedings of this Assembly, an editorial from the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* which I think highlights the kind of waste that this government has undertaken. It deals with the advertisements run by the Minister of Finance who comes here pleading for money; advertisements run on the gasoline tax rebates in which he somehow has concluded that it's going to be a great saving for the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, so the misleading ad says. Well the editorial states, and I read it to you, Mr. Chairman:

Considering the tax didn't exist at all prior to the recent budget, it's hard to understand how anyone

could consider a rebate of the tax a saving in the first place. When the new red tape required to save and itemize gasoline receipts, fill out forms, and wait for repayment by the government are added on top, most motorists are more likely to consider the whole process an expensive waste of their . . . money.

And it's true. And it goes on to say:

It's kind of like suggesting people buy a product for \$100 dollars, return it for a refund of the same \$100 dollars, (and) then tell their neighbors and friends (that) they "saved" a hundred bucks.

And somehow, Mr. Chairman, those figures just don't jibe.

Now I raise that one editorial and the example of the advertisement run by the Minister of Finance because that's not new in the approach, by this government, to waste. In 1985-1986 the government spent \$17 million in advertising, most of it political advertising, and the taxpayers of this province paid for it out of their pockets. In 1986-87, I suggest to you that the amount of money spent wastefully . . . wastefully for advertising purposes, will be about \$30 million, double what it was the year before.

(1500)

An example is the estimates of the Department of Environment which we considered not too many days ago, in which the minister admitted that his advertising budget had increased again for this year, even on top of all that advertising they did last year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, while the government is spending \$30 million in advertising for its own political side, do you know what they say to the children of Saskatchewan who used to have the best dental care program anywhere in the western world — maybe not New Zealand. They say to them, you're no longer going to have the program because the Minister of Finance has told his Minister of Health: you've got to save \$5.5 million. Now I ask you to consider: is \$5.5 million such a large amount of money to find out of a \$30 million advertising bill. What kind of priorities are those?

Now I know Dome Advertising, the Conservative advertising organization that does all the advertising for this government — that Dome Advertising is getting rich on this kind of blatant government advertising which taxpayers are paying for, because of the wasteful approach of this government. It's getting rich, but the dental health of the children of this province are getting poor. They're getting poor because of the kind of poor and misplaced priorities that come with bad management.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the way this government operates is that there are winners and there are losers. The problem is that there are so many more losers than there are winners. And I will use the dental plan, the children's dental plan, to illustrate how unfeeling, how insensitive the approach of this government has been when it comes to winners

and losers. Who are the losers when the dental plan was cut . . . And so the minister has to provide in this resolution money to wind down the dental plan and the drug plan? Who are the losers?

Well, first of all, they were dental therapists, not great wealthy earning people — earning modest incomes. They're the losers. The children who used to have a dental care program and now no longer will be covered — they're the losers. But the dental profession of whom I'm not critical of, but simply state something which I think is undeniable, who have had fairly good incomes — they're not exactly at the bottom level of the income scale of Saskatchewan — they will be the big winners. Tens of thousands of children will lose because they will no longer have the plan to cover them, but people who are making very substantial incomes have been bonused by the decision of this government on the dental plan, and they will be the winners.

Who else are the winners, Mr. Chairman? The minister asks for money to pay for some of this. Well he announced that there will be a gas tax once again in this province in spite of all the promises by the Tories that there wouldn't be any. And then he says, we're going to rebate it.

Well I can tell you that in the boardrooms of every credit card company in North America, a great cheer went up when they heard this Minister of Finance make that announcement, because they're going to be the winners. They're going to be the winners. Those credit card companies that are charging 19 per cent and 21 per cent and 24 per cent interest rates, they're going to be the winners because of the kind of system that this government has imposed through this gasoline tax rebate.

Filling station operators, the service station operators, the small-business filling station operators are going to be the losers, because when they have a large amount of money that's being paid to them through the credit cards, it costs them money. Isn't it amazing that a government that talks about being the friends of the business community, when it comes to their own political interests, casts them aside and no longer becomes interested in their concerns.

Now this resolution, Mr. Chairman, also asks for money to pay for revenue sharing. That's one of the exceptions — not the one-twelfth but the two-twelfths. While I know that that's necessary, and we will not object to that, but I want to point out to you, Mr. Chairman, the process that has led to the reduction in the amount of money that municipalities are going to get this year over last year because the revenue sharing has been reduced by 1 per cent.

I can remember in January — and it was very well written up in the press throughout Saskatchewan — where the Minister of Urban Affairs went to the convention of the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association. And he assured them — this is the Minister of Urban Affairs — he assured them that there would not be any reduction in revenue sharing. He said, you should plan with the very real possibility that there will be no increase in the revenue-sharing pool, suggesting the pool will stay at its 1986 level of \$67 million.

Not much later, when the delegates of the SUMA convention had left and gone home, we get the other announcements and the other foot drops. And the Minister of Finance announces that indeed there will be a cut of 1 per cent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, not only does this government suffer from the disease of mismanagement, it suffers from the disease of being dishonest — it suffers from the disease of being dishonest.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — When ministers of the Crown appear before the delegates of the SUMA convention they assure them there will be — they weren't happy about it — that there will be a freeze on the amount. But I think the delegates of that convention went away feeling that they had no choice, and they would have to accept it. And they went back to their councils, and they said to them here is what we must be facing. And they said: at least we know.

And very briefly and very soon after that, they get the brick that comes through their fiscal and budgetary walls. And the government who said on the one hand, when they were all gathered: you will not have a reduction, announce that there will be a 1 per cent cut. Now that's unacceptable in any kind of governmental system, Mr. Chairman.

What have the results been? Well I think that, for example, in the community of Humboldt they have had to struggle to find some money because the government at the last minute, having given no hints, cut off a huge sum of money for work that they had to do. This has happened in rural community after community after community.

It has happened in big urban centres like the city of Regina. And I have here, Mr. Chairman, a report on what the impact has been on the city of Regina because of this government's mismanagement, and because of its dishonesty. The impact of the 1987 budget has been a reduction in funding to the city of Regina of \$8 million — \$8 million — because of the cuts in the revenue sharing, because of the cuts in the urban assistance program, because of the cuts into provincial capital funding.

Now that's in itself bad enough, but it is much worse, Mr. Chairman, when one considers that this government stood at the SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association) convention and promised the delegates there that there would not be a cut. That's dishonest.

Now, Mr. Chairman, because of the mismanagement we have seen here, there have been other kinds of provisions that the government has brought in which has hurt people. There has been a \$73-a-month increase in fees to nursing home residents. There has been \$20-a-month increase in home care fees for low-income seniors, and a \$50-a-month increase in the home care fees for seniors who do not qualify for the government subsidy. A hundred and twenty-five dollar a year deductible on prescriptions under the drug plan, which will cost

taxpayers \$26 million — people who have to use a drug now will have to pay.

And all over Saskatchewan people are going to the pharmacies and they are being shocked by the fact that they are being asked to take out of their pocket in advance, \$60, \$80, \$100, at a time when many of them have incomes that are not far in excess of that, particularly if they're living on the senior citizen's pension and supplement.

All because this government blew it away. All because this government, having taken a surplus of \$140 million, decided to waste and to mismanage and to involve itself in a government of patronage, and created this deficit of \$3.4 billion which now they use as an excuse to do away with those very basic programs which the people of this province collectively and together put together, so that everybody can have equal access to health care without having to fear getting ill because they know that that would bring about economic disaster and catastrophe.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Now could it be that the government had no choice? Could it be that this government had no choice but to do these things and make this kind . . . do this kind of an act? Well, not so, Mr. Chairman. The government did have a choice. And because of its unwillingness to manage, it made the wrong choices.

I've heard the Minister of Finance and I've heard the Premier go around and telling everybody . . . and talking to everybody as if the world had collapsed around them. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the only thing that's collapsed around them are the figures that show where they're standing in the polls these days.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Did the world really collapse around them, or are we where we are today because of the mismanagement that has been brought about here?

Let me give you the facts. Let me give you the facts as they come from the government's own documents.

In 1980-81, it wasn't this government that was in power; it was a different government. As a matter of fact, I had the honour of being part of that government. In 1981, on non-renewable resource revenues, there were revenues to the treasury of \$787 million. The government of the day had a surplus of \$233 million. In 1981-82, the revenues from non-renewable resource money were \$760 million. The government of the day had \$139 million surplus, or \$140 million surplus if you want to round it off.

Then there was an election. Well, you know, resource revenues didn't change. As a matter of fact, in '82-83, under the first year of this government resource revenues were \$770 million — higher than they were the year before — and this government ran a deficit of \$227 million.

Well what happened in 1983-84? Did the world collapse around the Premier and the Minister of Finance at that time? No, because at that time resource revenues in '83-84 were \$760 million. But the government ran a deficit of \$331 million. And the revenues kept going up. In 1984-1985 the government had non-renewable resource revenues of \$865 million. And their deficit went up to \$380 million.

Now the only way, the only way that that can be explained, Mr. Chairman, is that the government mismanaged its fiscal affairs. You can't have revenues from the non-renewable resource sector going up or remain the same and legitimately explain a growing deficit, year by year by year, until we face an accumulated deficit of \$3.4 billion.

And so where are we? Who's paying for all this? Who's paying for this \$363 million for one month — \$363 million for one month, which the Minister of Finance is here asking for? Well, I'll tell you who's paying more and more. Individual income taxpayers are paying more and more.

In 1980 and 1981 the share, or the percentage of the total budgetary revenues, the percentage of the total budgetary revenues coming from corporate income was 5.3 per cent. The share coming from individual income tax was 16.3 per cent. In 1986-87, the budget for which we are now considering a resolution to provide some interim money, the share of corporate income goes down to 4.8 per cent, and the share of individual income goes up to 20.8 per cent.

(1515)

That's who's paying for the mismanagement, Mr. Chairman — the taxpayers of this province — while others, like some of the corporate sector, like the oil sector, are getting tax holidays to pump out a non-renewable resource, which will never be here again and from which we will never be able to get any revenues from our people; pump it out for three years and never pay a cent of royalty on it, because they have been given the holiday because of this kind of mismanagement that has created the situation which we face today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — That's why, Mr., that's why. That's why, Mr. Chairman, we now hear the Minister of Social Services and whatever else . . . And I'm not sure he even remembers what he's a minister of. He doesn't seem to remember anything else. Well the Minister of Social Services will stand up in this House and says as if he almost believes it. "Schmidt . . ." And I read the article in the paper: "Schmidt says saving money more important than jobs." Now what kind of a responsible government would use that approach?

I ask the government opposite through you, Mr. Chairman, if that was such an important concept — the saving of money — where in the devil was that minister between 1982 and 1986 when the government was throwing money away? Throwing money away and throwing revenues away to the oil companies, creating

the situation which we find ourselves in so that today the minister has to come in and ask, for one month, for \$363 million.

Now that's why we don't have money, at least in the view of this government, for students who need jobs, because their priorities are to provide \$30 million to Dome Advertising so it could get rich, because they're friends of the government, but the students who want to get an education and prepare for their future are given this lower class of consideration because somehow they are also to be the losers. Somehow they're also to be the losers.

And what has the result been? Well I want to just lead to my conclusion by giving you an example of the result of this mismanagement. In 1981 the number of young people employed in Saskatchewan was 110,000. You know what it is now, Mr. Chairman? It's only 89,000. That's a loss of 21,000 jobs for young people.

In 1981 the number of young people in the labour force was 120,000. Do you know what it is now? It's 104,000 — that's 16,000 fewer young people in the labour market. Is it any wonder that we get reports about net out-migration of people from Saskatchewan?

And I remind you that those aren't older people; those are young people. Those are young people looking for a future. But because there is none, because of the mismanagement that has been brought in and brought about by this government, because the future worries those young people, they're leaving, so that Saskatchewan, in 1986, had a net out-migration of 8,422 people. That's shameful. That, from a government that said in 1982 and 1983 how they were going to bring the children back home.

Is this bringing the children back home? When they're leaving by the thousands because they don't know that they will be able to find a job in Saskatchewan — because the Minister of Social Services displays, on behalf of his colleagues, the view that saving money is more important than jobs.

All those young people want to do is to be productive, to build a future, to raise their families like others before them have raised their families in what is one of the best provinces in Canada, beyond any doubt.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — It has the potential here in this province to provide all of our needs. And instead the government has chosen to provide for the needs of a few — of a few who are privileged, who are wealthy — at the expense of the many who somehow don't count in the eyes of this government.

Three hundred and sixty-three million dollars is needed. There indeed are bills to be paid. But I say to you that one of the reasons why we need so much money is because some of those bills have been created by this government when it mortgaged people of Saskatchewan. So that today, part of the request is to pay for the \$300 million a year in interest charges that we have to pay to the bankers and the bond dealers, which we didn't have to pay in

1982.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, want to enter into and make some comments, and to concur with the remarks of our Finance critic, and to indicate to the people of Saskatchewan what we are witnessing here today.

The people of Saskatchewan have seen the greatest degree of mismanagement of any government in this country. They have burdened the people of this province with \$3.4 billion in the Consolidated Fund alone. They have placed on the backs of the people of Saskatchewan \$296 million of interest payment alone — \$296 million of interest — which means we have to raise, before we can finance any program in Saskatchewan, we have to finance \$296 million to pay the interest first.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, it is an insult to this legislature that the Minister of Finance, who brought down his last budget, and who, I say, deceived the people of this province — deceived the people of this province — for one basic reason, Mr. Chairman — the Tory party's priorities are higher and more important than the priorities and the serving of the people of this country, in this province.

And you know what they did? They went into an election and they said: we're building and we're diversifying and everything is great. And I'll tell you, they said there'd be a \$389 million debt, and they came in with \$1,235 billion. And that was not to serve the people of this province. That massive debt last year was to attempt to get the Tory party of this province elected again. And the consequences are now being borne by the people of this province.

And I say it's an insult to this legislature that a Minister of Finance, who couldn't calculate a budget any closer than within 8 or \$900 million, and he's maintained as the Minister of Finance — I ask you: would any business man, would any corporation, maintain a chief executive officer who brought in a deficit over the amount that he had calculated to the tune of \$1 billion?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — I ask you. I'll tell you, any private sector would cast that person out of office. There would be no confidence left. And today, after the deceit during a Tory election campaign, we have the same Minister of Finance.

And I want to lay before the people here the true facts. Now only do we have a massive, massive debt heaped upon the backs of the people of this province, but I'll tell you what we have — we have seen a large amount of give-aways, and no longer do we have those assets. We've sold off Manalta Coal, over 100 million bucks — it's been blown. We've sold off the highway equipments; that's gone. We've sold off potash equipment; that money is gone. We've sold off Saskoil to the private sector, and that money is gone. Those assets are gone, over and above the massiveness of the debt.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — We never heard, during the last six, seven months ago in October, as we were heading into the election campaign, that we were going to have a complete rejection of the promises that this government made to the people of this province when they got elected in '82.

You know what? One of the prime election promises — and everyone here that was re-elected had in their brochures — do you know what they promised the people of Saskatchewan? We'll eliminate, in our first term of office, the 5 per cent E&H tax. That's what you promised. And do you know what? They came in here, after this last election, they increased the E&H tax to 7 per cent.

Do you know what else they did? They did away with the property improvement grants, 83 million bucks. They put on a flat tax of 100 million bucks for every point, and they double it this year for \$200 million.

I'll tell you, we have the greatest mess in this province of anywhere in Canada. And you know, when we left office, Mr. Chairman, do you know what the financial community said about Saskatchewan under the premiership of Allan Blakeney? I'll tell you what they said . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order. I've cautioned members before not to use members' names; to use their constituency or their position in the House.

Mr. Koskie: — As I . . . I'll accept that and I apologize for using a member's name — the former premier of the province, under the New Democratic Party.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — Do you know what the financial community was saying about the former premier of the New Democratic Party? I'll tell you what they said. They wrote and they said that Saskatchewan was one of the best financially run territories in North America. That is precisely what they said. And I'll tell you, this contemptuous group come in here, letting on that they know how to run a province, that they're business men, that they're looking after the affairs of the people of Saskatchewan. What deceit. What misrepresentation of the truth.

And I say to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if we take a look at what is gone on in the priorities of this government: the waste — \$20-25 million spent on self-serving advertising to elect the members opposite. We have seen priorities where we'll go to the multinational corporations and the oil companies and give them financial breaks — in fact, grants — but to our own business community, they have deserted.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, how does this government set its priorities? How can a government, so soon after being re-elected, change so suddenly the story and change so suddenly the facts.

Did any of the members opposite or the Finance minister indicate that 60,000 children were going to be cut out of dental services, going into that election? No. Did he say that we're going to revoke the policy that helped them to get elected, the 5 per cent sale tax? That we're going to have to increase it? No. Did they say they were going to increase the flat tax again? Of course not. Did they say there was going to be massive cuts in Education? Of course not. Did they say there was going to be massive cuts throughout the social programs of this province? And they didn't.

I say this government has lost all of its credibility. The people of Saskatchewan no longer trust the Minister of Finance or the members opposite in the front benches.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — A very clear message is illustrated in Canada. We have the Prime Minister of Canada that has completely lost the trust of the people of Canada. And he sits in a poll somewhere at 23 per cent. And I say to you, Mr. Chairman, history is repeating itself in Saskatchewan. You boys across the way were given a chance, but I'll tell you, the people of Saskatchewan have seen the true agenda of the Tory party.

(1530)

And the true agenda of the Tory party in Saskatchewan is the same as it is in Ottawa, and that is to treat their friends with patronage; hand out to multinational corporations; hand out billions of dollars to the oil company, and sock it to ordinary Saskatchewan people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — That's the legacy of your party. And I say that it has been deceitful. You have misrepresented facts to the people of this province. And I'll tell you, come an election, you boys won't be around again.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — I want to say in respect to what we're having take place here today, never before in the history of this legislature has there been such a contempt for this legislature, so much lack of respect for the democratic process as has been shown by the members opposite. I'll tell you, the record shows that no time in the history of this province has the budget ever been brought down later than in — and I go right from 1945 — primarily either in March or February. The only time it was brought down, and in my records here, is April, by the government opposite. And last year, in '86, March 26. This year, let it be known that in order to reconvene this legislature the New Democratic Party had to seek legal counsel in order to, in fact, prevent the government by governing by special warrants.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — I say they have lost all credibility. The people of Saskatchewan — go out into your communities — are disgusted with them. The Minister of Finance, who brought in a deficit of 8 or \$900 million over and above

what he estimated, doesn't deserve the confidence of this House, doesn't deserve the confidence of the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — And what I say, Mr. Chairman, that the time is rapidly approaching that this government had better clear up its act, or the right to govern this province will in fact be taken away from them.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that this government, in summary, has deceived the public; has misrepresented the facts; has mismanaged to the extent of burdening this province; has in fact dissipated the economic base of this province and, as a consequence, we, the citizens of this province, and particularly the young people, are denied the opportunities which this province could have afforded them.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Minister of Finance, as I said, has lacked the confidence of members on our side of the House. I don't know how the Premier could possibly leave someone who could mismanage during an election year to the extent that he did, who has denied the right of coming here when we should have been in this House. And I say, Mr. Chairman, the people of Saskatchewan are watching. And I'll tell you, the people of Saskatchewan do know what is taking place, and the will of the people of Saskatchewan will be heard. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Chairman, in the last few days we in the opposition have raised questions with the Minister of Social Services respecting the Legal Aid Commission and the funding that has been accorded in this budget, which is under consideration to the commission, and some of the steps that the commission has taken in response to pressure put on it by the government.

And I think that the story that's unfolding with respect to the Legal Aid Commission is a prime example of the mismanagement and the consequences of the fiscal irresponsibility of this government. The government has ruined the legal aid program of this province, and they've done this simply because they don't believe in it.

When the government was elected in 1982, the legal aid plan that was in effect in the province at that time was considered far and wide to be the best plan of its kind in the country. There was nothing to compare with it. It provided legal service to a broader range of people at a more reasonable cost than anywhere else in the country, and was a model much admired by people who are interested in the subject of legal aid.

Five years of drastic cuts has changed that situation completely. Five years of chipping away at that program, of reducing its funding, of requiring the commission to take steps to change the program and, in particular, to limit the people who were eligible under the program, has transformed it from the best program of its kind to one which is arguably the worst.

Now the situation before the present budget was brought

down was not at all like the Minister of Social Services told us in the House the other day. He painted a picture the other day of people working for the plant who worked four days a week, which is not correct; of people who quit work at 4:30 in the afternoon, which is not correct; of people who were sort of inefficient, which is most definitely not correct.

Mr. Chairman, it is well-known throughout this province in all of the cities where the legal aid plans work that there are no lawyers who are busier than the legal aid lawyers. They rush from court room to court room, from trial to trial, back to their offices to take care of appointments there, and are literally busier than their counterparts in the private bar. They have work-loads that are perhaps as much as four times more than a lawyer ought to be expected to handle.

And that's the case not only in Saskatoon or in Regina, but it's also the case in the other centres where the legal aid clinics operate, including the one which the minister of most familiar with, having practised law in Melville before his present incarnation. And the minister must know this to be true.

In all of my years of being concerned with the public service, which goes back to 1970, I never recall a minister standing in the House of Commons in Ottawa, or in the legislature of one of the provinces, or specifically in this legislature, and in effect attack his own department; in effect attack his own civil servants; tell the Assembly that his civil servants don't work hard enough; that you can't get them on the telephone after 4:30. And yet this man stood in this Assembly in the last seven days and said exactly that.

Now that was the situation, Mr. Chairman, before the budget was brought down on June 17. What was clear when the budget was brought down on June 17 is that this program, which is underfunded and understaffed, and where the staff is overworked, is subject to a further cut of over half a million dollars — a cut of 8 per cent.

And the tragic part about it is that it's more than a cut of 8 per cent. When you consider that costs have increased on account of inflationary factors, when you consider that the collective agreements in effect have increment dates that have to be observed, salary increases that have to be paid in accordance with freely negotiated contracts, the cut that is being suffered by the Legal Aid Commission is in the order of 15 per cent. And this, as I said, from a program which is already underfunded, where the people involved are overworked, and where the clinics are understaffed. And this is not just me talking, Mr. Chairman, this is well-known to everyone in the legal system in the province.

Now I want to specifically raise as a glaring, obvious example of mismanagement and poor administration by this government, the question of the contribution system that is to be introduced next week into this province. That contribution system, I remind you, will require the poorest people in our society to pay for their legal services. Now I realize that some exceptions have been made, and apparently they've been made since we started to ask questions in this House. But the effect of it

still is that the poorer people, people who can't afford to pay are going to be required to pay. Not only are they required to pay, but they're required to pay in cash and up front.

Now those of us who have practised law privately will now that you can make a better deal than that with a private law firm, with a law firm operating in the private sector. You can make credit arrangements. They're made every day, but not apparently at the Legal Aid Commission, the poor people's law firm in this province. There you have to have cash, you have to put it on the barrel head before a wheel will turn. Not that is not fair. That's absurd.

I can't think of anything more inconsistent with the notion of a public legal aid plan than requiring the poorest people in our society to pay for the plan. Now it didn't just happen, as the minister tried to lead us to believe, as the result of the Legal Aid Commission sort of coming up with this idea, and he knew nothing about it, but sits behind his desk reading his paper, waiting for the mail man to come along with a document that will inform him what are the plans of the Legal Aid Commission. Not so. Not at all.

What we had here was a minister who took the trouble to visit the Legal Aid Commission and inform them, among other things, that there was some bad news, from a budgetary point of view, in their future. There was going to be some budget cuts, and that they should plan for those cuts. and they should present some options as to how they were going to accommodate themselves to this new budgetary reality; that they'd have less money to spend. So the commission goes to work, as the minister had instructed them to do, and they prepare options. And one of those options is the very system of contributions that we now see being imposed.

And the minister is aware of those options. He admitted as much in the House today. He was aware that this was one of the options. And then . . . And I remind you that all the commission is doing at this point is responding to the minister's instruction to prepare some options that will take into account the fact that there's going to be budget cuts. So the commission operating in good faith comes up with an option which says that the people who receive service have to pay a fee.

And when the commission did that — and here comes the deceptive part of it — when the commission did this they were operating under the honest belief that if they imposed a fee, that fee would go to the commission and would help to cover the loss of money that they were going to experience as a result of the budget cuts. In other words, they were going to recover some of their loss from the people who were using the service. That's what the commission thought.

Now the minister, who has been sitting in that government for the last five years and has been a minister for about the last two years, didn't tell them that that's not how it worked. And his department, who must have known of this option being considered by the commission, also didn't tell the commission that that's not how it worked.

The commission didn't find out until July 16 of this year that their plan to impose user fees on the poor people of this province wasn't going to go to the commission at all. It was going to go into the black hole being run by the Minister of Finance. It was going to be sucked up into the Consolidated Fund.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — In effect, the poorest people of our society are being levied a tax on the service that they obtain from the legal aid clinic, and the proceeds from that tax are not going to go to the Legal Aid Commission.

(1545)

Now that came, I believe, as a thunderbolt to the Legal Aid Commission — a complete surprise. Because after the whole system is in place; after the legal Aid Commission had produced the option of contributions; after the minister had seen the plan, had seen the option of a contribution; after the contribution had been considered by the treasury board; after the treasury board had approved the plan in a treasury board minute; then and only then does the minister break the bad news to the commission, namely, that it's not going to do you any good.

Nice of you to have suggested this contribution option; nice of you to have put it down on paper and submitted it to the government; nice of you to decide to charge the poorest people for their legal services. But we've got this piece of bad news, and that is that it's not going to do you any good at all. The Minister of Finance is going to take the money into that big black hole he's maintaining and it's going to disappear. Now that is absurd. And, Mr. Chairman, the minister is not going to get away with it.

The Legal Aid Commission, I predict, is going to take him on on that because I think his position on the point is not legal. And he's going to have some tough sweating, not only in this House, but with respect to the people that he refers to as bureaucrats.

Now he characterized it, Mr. Chairman, as a dispute about money between bureaucrats, a petty dispute about money. Not so. Not so at all. What we had here was a minute of the treasury board — not the opinion of a petty bureaucrat, not the opinion of a deputy minister, but a minute of the treasury board.

And the minister knows perfectly well that the treasury board is the most powerful committee of cabinet that exists in our government system. It is the committee that makes so many of the financial decisions on the basis of which a government runs. So this was not some kind of a dispute between petty bureaucrats.

It also is a position that is based upon a provision of the financial administration Act, which must be well-known to a minister who's been in government for two years, would certainly be well-known to his deputy minister. And yet, the minister allowed the Legal Aid Commission to believe during all those months that their plan for a contribution was going to be effective as regards their budgetary situation. They actually thought they were

going to help solve their budgetary problem. And he allowed them to think that, and his department allowed them to think that. And I dare say that others in the government system allowed the commission to think that, and sprung the bad news on them only on July 16 of this year. Now that's no way to run a government.

In effect, what happened is the government changed the rule, changes the rules on the Legal Aid Commission when they had committed themselves to a most unfortunate course of action. This decision by the Legal Aid Commission, I believe was arrived at very painfully, so far as the members of that commission are concerned. I have no doubt that the members of the commission were most reluctant to damage the legal aid plan they were administering, by requiring the poorest people in our society to put cash on the barrel head before they get any legal services.

And those members of the commission, acting in good faith, coming with considerable pain and anguish to this plan, must sit here today and wonder what kind of a minister this is and what kind of a government this is; that the notion that these contributions will not accrue to the benefit of the commission but will simply disappear into the black hole of the Minister of Finance, must come as a terrible shock.

What is at stake here, of course, is not the funding of the Legal Aid Commission. What's at stake here is not whether contributions should go to the Consolidated Fund or should be retained by the commission. What's at stake here in this dispute is the right wing ideology of this minister and this government. What's at stake here is the fact that this government just simply doesn't believe in things like legal aid plans. The minister, I know, would like to contract this whole business right out of government. The minister would like to turn it all over to the law society, or turn it all over to the private bar in some way or another.

Now the law society said no. The law society said, we're not interested in doing that. The law society said, the plan works all right the way it is; and forget it, Mr. Minister, we're not interested in your ideological solution to the Legal Aid Commission.

And that's what's at stake here. And we see it happening right across the piece. We see moves by this government - cut-backs here, cut-backs there. John Howard Society practically wiped out in this province for a cut of a grant of \$193,000. And example after example of the right wing ideology of this minister and this government in action. And that's what's at stake here.

Now this is only one example, as I say. It is a long litany of mismanagement. It is becoming more and more every day, a story of the consequences of the fiscal irresponsibility of this government over the past five years, and it is something which we on this side of the House simply can never, ever support.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prebble: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm pleased to enter the debate and to speak in opposition to

this interim supply Bill which essentially provides the PC government with the ability to continue their unprecedented attack on our health care programs, our education programs, and our social institutions.

We see in this interim supply Bill, as we do in this whole budget, Mr. Chairman, a combination of incompetence and unfairness that Saskatchewan people haven't witnessed since the last PC government in this province that governed in the 1930s.

And we see in this interim supply Bill, as we do in this budget, Mr. Chairman, a betrayal by this government to the two social programs that it promised would be the pillar of its operations in the remainder of the 1980s — mainly the commitment that it claimed prior to the 1986 election it was making to medicare and the commitment it claimed it was making to health care in Saskatchewan.

Health care and education were to be two of the four pillars of this government's operation for the rest of the 1980s. And what we've seen instead, Mr. Chairman, in this interim supply Bill and in this budget, is an unprecedented attack on health care and education in Saskatchewan. And we on this side of the House are not only committed to opposing the education and health care cuts, but we are also committed to rebuilding education and health care when we next form government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say to members opposite and to all those listening, that this government was not obliged to cut education and to cut medicare in this interim supply Bill and in this budget. The moneys were available, Mr. Chairman, to fully fund education and health care, to fully fund programs like legal aid and the John Howard Society, if this government had had the political will to fund them instead of being committed to funnelling large amounts of money, large amounts taxpayers' money, to its friends in the private sector.

And there are some classic examples that I want to make reference to, that demonstrate this. First of all, Mr. Chairman, since the last interim supply Bill came down a month ago, we've seen clear evidence in this legislature that the PC government opposite have chosen to forfeit the collection of over \$400 million in 1987 alone from the Saskatchewan oil industry that they could have gotten if they had applied 1982 royalty rates to 1987 oil production — \$400 million, Mr. Chairman.

Instead . . . Let me put that in two contexts. First of all, instead of a deficit of over \$500 million that is now resulting from the incompetence of this government, oil revenues alone could have reduced that to just over \$100 million. Or put another way, Mr. Chairman, that \$400 million that the PC government has chosen to forfeit could have readily funded all the medicare programs, all the education programs, and all the social service programs that have been cut back, with a good deal left over. And that's just one example, Mr. Chairman, of how the PC government has chosen to attack education, health care, and social services at the expense of the Saskatchewan taxpayer and to the benefit of its friends in the oil industry.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there's been a second example of gross incompetence and unfairness since the last interim supply Bill came down a month ago. And that, Mr. Chairman, was the decision by this government to add \$810 million to the public debt of this province by saying to the people of Saskatchewan that the \$800 million debt that the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan had run up under the five years of Devine government that we've seen — the five years of PC government that we've seen in this legislature. Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, I retract my remark in terms of naming the government. I simply say the PC government. As a result of running up an \$800 million debt through bleeding the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan of all its major assets; through, Mr. Chairman, through choosing consciously, to pay out dividends in years when PC (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan) had actually run a loss; this government has bled the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, has run it into massive debt, and then has turned around and said to the people of Saskatchewan that they must bear this debt, that this becomes part of the public debt, rather than the debt of PCS. And he's added, Mr. Chairman, therefore, another \$80 million a year in interest payments that the people of Saskatchewan must now make that they did not need to make before. Another example, Mr. Chairman, of how this government has simply demonstrated fiscal irresponsibility, in this case to make the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan more attractive to sell to its friends in the private sector.

And we've seen, Mr. Chairman, a third classic example of incompetence and fiscal mismanagement that applies very much to the 1987 budget year. And that is that. Although the Prince Albert Pulp Company has been sold for a price supposedly of \$248 million, not a penny has been put forward by the buyer, Weyerhaeuser Corporation of Tacoma, Washington. Not a penny has been put forward in the form of a down payment to help offset this year's deficit, or to finance any health, education or other social program in this budget — not a penny.

So this government has chosen to forfeit more than \$400 million in potential oil revenue this year. This government has, since the last interim supply Bill, added another \$800 million to the public debt. And this government has chosen consciously, as a result of a sweetheart agreement between itself and Weyerhaeuser Corporation of Tacoma, Washington, to forfeit any funds being paid in 1987 by the buyer of the Prince Albert Pulp Company, either in the form of a down payment or in the form of an annual interest payment for 1987, to help offset the public debt and to help finance social, education, and health programs in this province.

(1600)

Mr. Chairman, I used the examples of Weyerhaeuser and the failure of this government to collect a fair share of oil revenue, to demonstrate that the cuts to medicare and the cuts to education were unnecessary, in addition to being unfair. Because the revenue was there, if this government had the commitment to collect that revenue, Mr. Chairman.

Now in this interim supply Bill, as in this budget, we see a

host of unfair cuts to services that the people of Saskatchewan have every right to receive, that we, on this side of the House, refuse to be part of and strongly oppose. We've seen, for instance, a \$73 increase a month to nursing home monthly fees in this province, a \$73 increase that the senior citizens of Saskatchewan can ill afford.

And as some of my other colleagues who have participated in this debate earlier have pointed out, we have seen grossly unfair cuts to the prescription drug program which are putting prescription drugs out of the economic range of many families in this province — many families who are going to have to choose between paying the monthly rent bill and feeding their children or, on the other hand, paying the medical costs that they now face with the increased, up-front cost of prescription drugs.

That's one of the most immoral and unfair cuts that this government has brought down in this budget and this interim supply Bill. And we, on this side of the House, say that those cuts are thoroughly unjustified; that the public revenues exist to fully finance the prescription drug program, and that when we return to government, we will restore the prescription drug program to what Saskatchewan residents had prior to July 1 of this year. We see, Mr. Chairman, a budget and an interim supply Bill that has eliminated the school-based dental plan, and that has run completely contrary to a lot of the basic promises that this government made in 1986 and in 1982 to the people of Saskatchewan.

This government, for instance, Mr. Chairman, in 1982 promised to eliminate, by way of a phase-out, the provincial sales tax in this province. The member for Kelsey-Tisdale ran advertisements in his local paper saying that the PC government would implement a 10 per cent across-the-board cut in personal income tax. And we've seen both the sales tax and the income tax promises violated by this budget, Mr. Chairman.

We've seen a government, that said it would eliminate the sales tax, increase the provincial sales tax to 7 per cent in this interim supply Bill and in this budget. We've seen a government that said it would cut personal income tax by 10 per cent, instead turn around and in this budget follow its former actions in 1986 and 1985 by further increasing the flat tax on personal income by another half per cent.

We've seen a government, in this interim supply Bill, who has betrayed the young people of Saskatchewan, promising during the 1986 election that there would be more funds and more support made available for youth employment, and then bringing down a budget, Mr. Chairman, and an interim supply Bill today, Mr. Chairman, which dramatically cuts back on assistance to young people for seeking work, eliminates, Mr. Chairman, some youth employment programs entirely, and takes the summer youth employment program and cuts it by over 60 per cent.

That cut, Mr. Chairman, has had a devastating impact on the young people in my constituency. It means that some students who were wanting to return to university and technical school in the fall will now be unable to do so

because they were not able to get a summer job. It means that many other students will return facing much higher student loans because they were not able to earn the savings during the summer that would allow them to at least partially finance their post-secondary education in the fall out of summer earnings.

Mr. Chairman, this interim supply Bill denies the young people of this province access to post-secondary education in an unprecedented manner. For the first time, as a result of the two-year budget freeze that this government is imposing on the University of Saskatchewan in this budget and in this interim supply Bill, for the first time in provincial history, the young people of this province who qualify to enter university are being told, as a result of the underfunding of this government, that a university education is no longer available to them.

We on this side of the House, Mr. Chairman, say that it is a disgrace that young people who have grade 12 averages of between 65 and 70 per cent are not being allowed access to the University of Saskatchewan as a result of the underfunding of this government.

And I say to the Minister of Education and the Minister of Finance today, we on this side of the House call on you, sir, in this interim supply Bill, to withdraw your two-year freeze on the University of Saskatchewan; to increase the funds to the University of Saskatchewan that are necessary to ensure that all students who have a 65 per cent average or more will be admitted to the University of Saskatchewan this fall.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prebble: — We on this side of the House, Mr. Chairman, say to the Minister of Finance, withdraw the provisions in this interim supply Bill that mean that 1,100 spaces in our technical institutes will be cancelled. Remove those provisions; reinstate those student spaces.

We say, Mr. Chairman, that you have an obligation to the young people of this province to ensure that accessibility to technical schools will be retained. You have no business cutting 1,100 spaces from Saskatchewan's technical institutes, and you had no business firing 142 technical institute instructors. I say to the Minister of Finance, bring forward provisions in this interim supply Bill that will reinstate the 142 technical institute instructors that you fired, and maybe then we'll give some consideration to supporting the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prebble: — Mr. Chairman, this government has brought down a number of measures which have been unfair to young people. I've mentioned a number of them. I want to mention one more. Never before in the history of this province since the student aid programs were initiated by the New Democratic Party in the 1940s under the CCF, never before have we seen such an erosion of the student bursary plan in Saskatchewan. This government has in effect eliminated the bursary program for young people in Saskatchewan. I can remember, Mr. Chairman, that in 1981, under the former NDP

government, a student only had to borrow \$1,100 in Canada student loan before they became eligible for a Saskatchewan student bursary.

Today, Mr. Chairman, we have a government that has brought down a budget in an interim supply Bill that translates into the young people of this province, if they want to pursue a post-secondary education, having to take out, in a single year, over \$5,900 in student loans, both Canada student loan and Saskatchewan student loan, before they're eligible for a student bursary. That's a five-fold increase since 1981 in the amount of money that a Saskatchewan student has to borrow and go into debt for before being eligible for a student bursary. And we say, Mr. Chairman, on this side of the House, that that's a disgrace.

I call on the Minister of Finance to withdraw this interim supply Bill, to change the provisions in the student aid program, and to reinstate the bursary program that was operating in this province until a few months ago to ensure that students don't have to borrow more than \$2,000 in student loan before they're eligible for a student bursary.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prebble: — Mr. Chairman, I want to make one other point about this interim supply Bill before closing, and that is that what we see in this government's request today, for the legislature to approve \$363 million in interim spending, is a provision that, in effect, will just barely cover the public debt on the operation of government departments in this province for a single year.

The annual debt on the spending in the Consolidated Fund for regular government departments is \$294 million, Mr. Chairman. And this provision, for the legislature to approve \$363 million, in effect, Mr. Chairman, is almost . . . All that money for the month of July is just barely going to cover the annual interest payments on the provincial debt for regular government departments.

For the government as a whole, including Crown corporations, Mr. Chairman . . . The annual interest payments on the total provincial debt, including both government departments and Crown corporations, is \$687 million, Mr. Chairman. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the \$363 million that we're being asked to approve for spending in the current month is just going to cover barely half of the interest payments on the provincial debt for the entire year.

And I make that point, Mr. Chairman, to underline the very serious fiscal situation that this government has got itself into through thorough mismanagement, complete incompetence. I say to the Minister of Finance, how can he possibly justify a situation in which he brings down an interim supply Bill for \$363 million?

And, in effect, five-sixths of that money — five-sixths of it — is simply going to go towards covering the interest payments on the 1987 provincial debt for government departments only, not counting any Crown corporations

at all. And I say, Mr. Chairman, that that single fact alone justifies all members of this Assembly voting against this interim supply Bill. I will certainly be doing so. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wish to make a few remarks in regard to the resolution introduced by the Minister of Finance today. He's brought in a resolution to provide interim supply of some \$363 million to carry on the operations of government, since the budget is not passed.

The budget was introduced very late this year, as you can appreciate, Mr. Chairman. The reasons that were given were that there was an election in the fall — October 20, to be exact — and they say they didn't have time to get their House in order to bring the budget in at the normal time which would be prior to the expiry of the fiscal year.

Now I had to do a little research, Mr. Chairman, to go back through some of the history of this legislature. And it seems that there is at least one example that comes very close to the late presentation of a budget in relationship to the date the election was called, and that was back during the Liberal years, and I'll refer to that a little later.

But we have to look at how we got into this mess in the first place, Mr. Chairman. The fiscal irresponsibility, the fiscal mismanagement of this government started with their election in the general election in 1982. And in the first budget that they brought down, they forecast a deficit of \$219 million. They overshot and they actually had a deficit of \$227 million. In the next fiscal year, '83-84, they projected a \$316 million deficit.

(1615)

They overshot that, and the deficit actually came in at \$331 million. In 1984-85 they projected a deficit of \$267 million. They actually came in at \$379 million. In '85-86 fiscal year they projected a deficit of \$291 million; they actually came in at \$584 million. 1986-87 fiscal year they projected a deficit of \$389 million, and they came in at \$1,235 million deficit, or \$1.2 billion.

This year, in the budget that we've been debating before this House, Mr. Chairman, they have projected a deficit of \$577 million. And who knows what the actual tally will be by the time this fiscal year has concluded on March 31, 1988. It could be a great deal of money. It will certainly add to the \$3.4 billion in debt that we're in right now; that we're paying some \$294 million per year in interest, in which I predict that projection is a bit low. The interest payments will be much more than that.

And as the member from Saskatoon Sutherland has pointed out, if you look at the interest that's paid on the debt for general revenue of the government, and if you look at the debt from Crown corporations and the interest that's paid on there — the interest that the people in the province of Saskatchewan are paying on this government's mismanagement and fiscal irresponsibility — comes to some \$687 million, Mr. Chairman. And I think that that's a disgrace. The people of the province of

Saskatchewan don't want to be paying for the incompetence and mismanagement of this Progressive Conservative government.

Mr. Chairman, the research that I did goes back to actually the election of June of 1944.

An Hon. Member: — That was a great day for Saskatchewan.

Mr. Anguish: — That was a very great day for Saskatchewan as the member from Quill Lakes points out, because that was the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation coming into government in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Chairman, that government, the CCF government in the province of Saskatchewan, led by two distinguished leaders, Tommy Douglas and later Woodrow Lloyd, held elections on June 15 of 1944, where they were elected. I shouldn't say they held it. Actually the Patterson government, the Liberal government that had as bad a record almost as the fiscal mismanagement of this government, had called the election for that date, and the CCF were elected at that time.

The CCF then were successful in elections on June 24 of 1948. They were successful on an election in June 11 of 1952. They were again successful on June 20 of 1956. They were again successful on June 8 of 1960. And unfortunately they broke their tradition from calling June elections, because the CCF up until that time had always called the election for the month of June. But they decided in their wisdom at that time — and we are not to question that in this House — on April 22, 1964 they were going to the polls; in fact were defeated by Ross Thatcher's Liberals in that particular election.

Now the point I make by this, Mr. Speaker, is that through all of those consecutive years, the latest that the CCF brought a budget into the Legislative Assembly in the province of Saskatchewan was March 15 of 1945 — well before the end of the fiscal year. And people that are listening here today will realize that the budget year, the fiscal year of the government, runs from April 1 until March 31 of the following year.

So March 15, through all of those elections in all of those years, March 15 was the latest that the CCF ever brought a budget before this legislature. We find this government didn't bring a budget in until months after the end of the fiscal year. In fact, the budget didn't come before this legislature until June 17. That's disgraceful.

It makes it very hard for municipalities, individuals, businesses, transit companies, school boards, hospital boards to do their budgeting which is tied in so closely because of the assistance that they get from the provincial government or, in this case, the assistance they hoped to have gotten from the provincial government and certainly aren't getting through this budget of the Devine Progressive Conservatives, Mr. Chairman.

But we all must also look at when the Liberals came in. The Liberals, of course, came into office, as I've already mentioned, on April 22, 1964, and they were there for seven long, lean years. The Liberals called their first election, Mr. Chairman, on October 11, 1967. They were successful in that election — unfortunately, as far as we're concerned on this side of the House — but they were successful in gaining re-election.

And they again went to the polls to renew their mandate by the people of Saskatchewan on June 23 of 1971. And at that time, I think, the people of Saskatchewan were fortunate in the fact that Ross Thatcher's Liberals were defeated, and the New Democrats formed the first government in the province of Saskatchewan as an entity under the New Democratic Party.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Now we must look, Mr. Chairman, at the latest that the Liberals, during those seven long, lean years, the latest they ever brought in a budget. The latest the Liberals ever brought in a budget, Mr. Chairman, was on March 2, 1970 — March the 2nd — well before the end of the fiscal year at March 31.

And it's always been an historical precedent, a tradition, that the budgets are tabled in this legislature that are brought forward for public scrutiny and debate in this forum, prior to the end of the fiscal year. And again I point out, Mr. Speaker, this doesn't happen under this government. They waited well past the end of the fiscal year. Now they're saying that they're concerned that they can't get the budget through.

People in Saskatchewan don't see this government as having any credibility. They want us to closely examine the budget. They want us to closely examine the record of this Progressive Conservative government, and that record is not good, Mr. Speaker. That's why we're here for a long term this summer, into the fall, into Christmas, and after Christmas if necessary, Mr. Speaker, until there's some changes.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Now as I mentioned, on June 23, 1971, New Democrats formed the government in the province of Saskatchewan, and they were successful in an election that they called on June 11, 1975. They were again successful in an election that they called on October 18, 1978. And unfortunately, very unfortunately, I'm sure my colleagues will agree, the New Democrats called an election on April 26 of 1982, and this government on the other side of the House came into power with a massive majority in the province of Saskatchewan.

The people had spoken on April 26, 1982, and we respect what the people of Saskatchewan were saying. But they were certainly deceived, because now if you look at the only indication that's there, that's in print, is the public opinion polls. And the public opinion polls show that the fate of this government opposite is going the same direction as when the Conservatives held the government from 1929 to 1934 in the province of Saskatchewan, where they went from holding government to being

wiped out in every single seat in the province of Saskatchewan.

Sorry for calling you Mr. Speaker all the time, Mr. Chairman, but if we weren't caught in this situation, we would be addressing the Speaker and not the Chairman of Committee of Finance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, during the years that New Democrats held the government in Saskatchewan in trust for the people of the province, between 1971 and 1982, the latest that a budget was ever brought into the provincial legislature was March 7, and that was in the year 1978. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that that's disgraceful that this government — again I stress — waited until June 17, because they didn't have their House in order; they didn't know what they wanted to do; they flew by the seat of their pants for over four years, nearly five years, and didn't have a plan together to bring a budget into this legislature, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: — Such contempt for the legislature.

Mr. Anguish: — Such contempt, as the member for Quill Lakes points out — such contempt for the legislative process and the people of Saskatchewan.

Now as I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, they said that one of the reasons it was so late coming in was that the election was held in October and there was a transition period. I don't know what the transition was — don't know what kind of transition was there, because they had formed the government again, to the dismay of many people in the province of Saskatchewan. Many people wonder why an election could be bought, but it certainly could be bought, and that's pointed out by the huge, huge deficit they incurred in the past fiscal year.

But, Mr. Speaker, I looked at the October 18, 1978 election. The election was only two days earlier than the election that was held on October 20, 1986. And do you know when the budget was tabled in the legislature, Mr. Chairman?

An Hon. Member: — When?

Mr. Anguish: — The budget was tabled in the legislature before the end of the fiscal year. My colleagues want to know when that was. It was March 7 in the year . . .

An Hon. Member: — In March?

Mr. Anguish: — I'm sorry, March, I'm sorry, I'm sorry, March 8, 1979. So the election was basically the same time as the election we've just gone through. But the New Democrats were able to bring the budget in well before the end of the fiscal year, Mr. Chairman.

We experienced the same kinds of difficulties, but the difference between New Democrats and Conservatives is that we've always had a plan that we've developed in consultation with Saskatchewan people, that we develop in consultation with people who work in government departments and agencies and Crown corporations. Because, Mr. Chairman, we see those people as being valuable assets to the province of Saskatchewan. They

deserve to be consulted, and provide valuable information in the budgetary process under which any responsible government would operate, Mr. Chairman.

Now let's examine the Progressive Conservative government since they came into office in April 26, 1982. Of course, they went for an extremely long time — longer than most governments go — without seeking to renew their mandate because they were buying time to buy votes with Brian Mulroney's money from Ottawa, and that's what they did. They had to wait until they got the confirmation from Brian Mulroney as to when they can call the election.

So the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan, the leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, went back and forth between Ottawa and Saskatchewan trying to get money to buy votes. And when they found they had enough money to try and buy people's votes, they went to the polls and were re-elected on October 20, 1986.

Now it's not only this year that the budget was brought in past the end of the fiscal year. In 1985, the budget wasn't brought in until after the end of the fiscal year, but not bad — only 10 days after the end of the fiscal year. Not the couple of months and a number of days and weeks, like we're talking about in this situation. But since 1944, Mr. Chairman, only twice has this tradition been broken, and both times it's been broken by Progressive Conservatives in the province of Saskatchewan. It's fiscal mismanagement, it's irresponsibility, and you've lost credibility with the people in the province of Saskatchewan.

(1630)

But even worse, in terms of irresponsibility, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that the public accounts don't come in on time. We're still waiting, in this legislature, for the public accounts for the fiscal year ending March 31 — not 1987 — but for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1986, many, many months after the end of the fiscal year. This has never happened in the recent history of the province of Saskatchewan, and we think that that's irresponsible. We think that the public and the opposition have the right to review the spending of the Government of Saskatchewan. And those documents are especially important, Mr. Chairman, when we can't get information that is public information from the members opposite. In questioning, they avoid the issues; they stonewall the issues; they avoid the topics that should be talked about; they are fiscally irresponsible, Mr. Chairman.

What about some mismanagement. Do any of you remember, over there, the Pioneer Trust deal in 1985? Does it come close to comparing to the Principal affair in 1987? Well people in the province of Saskatchewan think it does.

Through your incompetence you've bungled the Pioneer Trust deal. You've also sold out investors in the province of Saskatchewan — those people that thought that they were being protected by the Department of Consumer and Commercial (or Corporate) Affairs, whatever it's called now. They were being protected because they thought that the members opposite were doing their job

in providing protection for Saskatchewan investors. And we find out, the people who invested in First Investors and Associated, part of the Principal Group, have virtually no protection at all. And this government sits back and does nothing about that.

Mr. Speaker, those people feel like pouring money into those unprotected companies is just like pouring their tax dollars into the provincial government that we have today in the province of Saskatchewan. It's a useless endeavour. People are tired of paying higher and higher rates of taxes and seeing more and more programs cut and cut and cut. Fewer services from the provincial government but increased taxation — increased taxation to the magnitude that people do not want to pay any more, Mr. Chairman.

Do you realize, on the opposite side, on the government side of this House, that in order to pay off the debt that's been incurred, you would have to double everyone's income tax in the province of Saskatchewan over about the next 10-year period? People would not put up with that. People absolutely would not put up with that.

And then there's the Pocklington deal. Where are the contracts with Pocklington? We were thankful you gave us the documents on Weyerhaeuser because people could see in black and white how incompetent, inept, and irresponsible you were in handling the affairs of the people of this province. But where are the documents; where is the agreement?

The member from Wascana, maybe you could glean that out; you're a Legislative Secretary. Maybe you could get us the agreement between Peter Pocklington and the province of Saskatchewan. We'd like to see those documents. And when do you expect to table those here in this legislature . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I can't hear what you're saying there, Deputy Premier . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm sorry. There's too much noise on that side of the House. I can't hear what you're saying.

You could maybe participate in the debate and we could get some dialogue going between us. But obviously, no members opposite . . . I'm the fifth member to stand on this side of the House and question what you're doing. Not one person on the government side has stood up with the integrity to defend their actions on bringing in the interim supply that they're asking us to pass here in this House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — And what about the Weyerhaeuser agreement? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member opposite, the member from Souris-Cannington, the Deputy Premier, is asking, what does this have to do with the interim supply? It has a lot to do with the interim supply, because if you were fiscally responsible, we wouldn't be in the situation we're in here today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — What about the Weyerhaeuser agreement? You gave away about a quarter billion dollars in assets of the people in the province of Saskatchewan.

For what? What return? There's very little, if any, return ever going to come to the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

You couldn't run PAPCO (Prince Albert Pulp Company), so you got rid of it. How about Manalta Coal? Was that a good deal for the people in the province of Saskatchewan? Did they get good scales of economy for their buck that they had invested there?

How about the Highways equipment? Was that a good auction sale? I ask the member from Melfort if that was a good auction sale. Yes, they admit opposite, it was a good auction sale. Sure, it was a fire sale. You should have at least taken a blowtorch and scorched some of the equipment first before you sold it off at fire sale prices. That would have given you credibility with the people of the province of Saskatchewan because they would have known there was really a fire sale. Now it puzzles them that you've sold off those assets.

A billion and a half dollars to the oil companies in the province of Saskatchewan. Oh, you take away from those in Saskatchewan society that can least afford to pay. You give more and more to the oil companies. And the member from Saskatoon South, during estimates — and I'd invite people watching to read his interventions in this Committee of Finance when the Department of Energy was before this committee — made some very good points in terms of people in the province not getting value for the dollar that's being paid to oil companies in the province of Saskatchewan. The only way we're going to get out of this debt with any kind of dignity is to have the resources of the province that the people of Saskatchewan own, pay for a substantial share of the services and the debt now, since it's been created by the members opposite.

And what about the close to \$20 million in government department advertising in the latest *Public Accounts*. I believe it's somewhere around \$17 million in advertising.

And the patronage — the George Hill, bringing him in at over \$100,000 a year. The fellow that you fired to have him cover over and take in the job, is rehired on contract, so now you're paying two people to do the one person's job.

Paul Rousseau, nice plum — off to the old country. Gordon Dirks, Gordon Currie, Keith Parker, Paul Schoenhals, Tim Embury, Myles Morin, Bob Andrew. You know, the latest thing that this . . . You know what this resolution does here today? This resolution here today, if it passes — and it will, because the government of the province of Saskatchewan has to continue operating — but what this resolution does is it pays \$2,500 for the Minister of Justice's flight to Calgary to attend a wedding; and at the same time people who have to use air ambulance have to pay money up front, in some cases in excess of the \$2,500.

Is that any kind of fairness in the system? Is the Minister of Justice entitled to do that when people in the province of Saskatchewan suffer? They suffer . . . They see the suffering especially, especially in terms of the expenditures that are made that just don't have any

relationship to where we should be going in this province, especially in the area of health care.

Let's look at health care for a little while, Mr. Chairman. Guarantee . . . The individual who introduced this resolution here today is the member from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden. The constituency was formerly called the constituency of Qu'Appelle. And the former leader of the Progressive Conservatives, one Dick Collver . . . everyone in this House will certainly remember him. He was the individual that was instrumental in convincing Colin Thatcher and Gary . . . pardon me, Colin Thatcher and the current Minister of Finance to leave the Liberal Party and join the Progressive Conservative Party — that old tie—in that's always been there and is there again.

I don't know why some of you haven't been in close consultation with the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, but I think likely some of you have. Possibly, the member from Regina Wascana.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, please. Could you get back to the item which is the interim supply, please.

Mr. Anguish: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that you called me to order. I'll try and be more specific. But there is a direct tie-in. I'm relating money that's being spent in terms of health care, and I had to point out . . . because this is a historical document by now. You see, it's a guarantee.

The Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan is committed to continue the medicare system in our province.

The Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan rejects any form of deterrent fees or health insurance premiums.

The Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan will abolish the unfair deterrent fees for prescription drugs.

And now that's signed by a Gary Lane, MLA for Qu'Appelle-Lumsden. Now I assume that that's the same individual who is now the Minister of Finance in the province of Saskatchewan, but I can't be absolutely sure because I believe the Minister of Finance, his constituency is the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Lumsden. But I do believe that Qu'Appelle and Qu'Appelle-Lumsden are basically the same constituency and that's the same individual sitting over there.

And it's also signed by a leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, a guarantee that they placed before the people of the province of Saskatchewan. And do you wonder why they don't have any credibility . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Is there another one there?

An Hon. Member: — Here's another one.

Mr. Anguish: — Is this another guarantee? Oh, here's one. The Minister of Justice. Re-elect . . . I can't read what it says there because it's not proper to do that within the rules of the House.

An Hon. Member: — Read the ad.

Mr. Anguish: — Well it says, re-elected Bob Andrew in Kindersley. And it says:

Revitalize and improve health care. A new PC government will place great emphasis on improving the delivery of health services by providing more adequate financing to our hospitals; by avoiding waste and duplication between the Departments of Health and Social Services; by expanding the drug plan; by guaranteeing a first-rate ambulance system; by ensuring adequate special care facilities for senior citizens; by ensuring that all areas of the province have access to the best medical care.

It was there . . . it was in *The Eston Press* on April 21 of 1982.

And now let's examine what they're doing with the \$363 million they're asking for in the interim supply resolution that was placed before us today — \$18 million less this year in budgets for health care. Do an analysis; don't look at the bottom line in the budget documents; do some research into it. An analysis will reveal that there's \$18 million less for health care this year in the province of Saskatchewan.

The dental plan. Virtually the dental plan has been eliminated as we knew it previously in the province. Some children that were in the program are no longer eligible for the program. Over 300 dental therapists were fired — a very brutal action.

An Hon. Member: — Four hundred and eleven.

Mr. Anguish: — Is it 411? Our health critic says 411 people. So I stand corrected. I appreciate you bringing that to my information. Four hundred and eleven dental therapists that used to perform services to people right across this province, to young children who would go to school and have their dental work done in their home community or the community closest to the farm in which they would live.

And now people will find they have to travel many miles, make appointments with overbooked dentists to have their children's dental care taken care of. That's shameful, shameful that people in this province have to experience the real Progressive Conservatives after the October 20 election. You wouldn't recognize it as being the same organization, the same political party that was going into the October 20 election in 1986, because they were much a populist party at that time.

(1645)

But a populist party without a plan gets themselves into very serious economic problems, which I pointed out in my initial remarks. And they couldn't continue at that, so they've had to make some tough decisions, and the tough decisions have been against people. The ordinary, the average Saskatchewan people are the ones that are suffering the brunt of the punishment laid on by this

provincial government.

So the dental plan was very important. The dental plan was the most major extension of our medicare program in the 25 years since it came in. The plan came in in 1962. This is the 25th anniversary, and the dental plan was the most major and most well-accepted extension of medicare since 1962. And this government opposite has virtually destroyed the dental program as we know it, to serve young children in the province of Saskatchewan.

We should also look, Mr. Chairman, at the drug plan. The drug plan was likely the other important extension, outside of the dental plan, that was very important to the basics of medicare in the province. There was a small dispensing fee that people had to pay for the drugs that they required, the drugs that are prescribed by physicians in the province of Saskatchewan. Now that's gone. Saskatchewan people have to pay up front for their drugs, the total cost of which they must absorb themselves.

And granted, there's a deductible, and after that deductible is reached, people can submit their bills. And they tell us on the government side that there'll be a monthly payment coming back once people have reached their deductible level — it's only 80 per cent of what they pay beyond the deductible, but it'll be coming back monthly.

And we predict it won't be coming back on a regular monthly basis because there's nothing to indicate that you're geared up for such a massive change in the health care system in the province of Saskatchewan. In fact, if you look at the record of paying doctors through the Medical Care Insurance Commission, no one would believe you in the province of Saskatchewan that you'll be able to meet what you say, in terms of paying people back their rebate on drugs in the province of Saskatchewan for those prescriptions that they've had to pay up front.

The Minister of Health in this House, or it may be outside of the House, has said that by paying doctors late, and underpaying doctors from what they're entitled to for the schedule of fees that have been agreed to between the Medical Care Insurance Commission and physicians in this province, that they will save on the government side \$300,000. Is that correct?

That won't even pay the interest on the debt for one day. And you're jeopardizing the medical care program in the province of Saskatchewan for some \$300,000? Insanity. It's uncaring, it's irresponsible, and people will not have credibility in a government that misleads them to the extent that this government has misled them.

There's the hearing-aid plan. That was cut, Mr. Chairman. Well, it's virtually wiped out as far as we're concerned, Mr. Chairman.

In the area of mental health — and I talked about mental health, Mr. Chairman, in my budget address, so I won't get on at length in that — but around 100 positions cut in mental health and a policy to have people in the province of Saskatchewan have good mental health care so that they live and work in a caring, sharing society in the

communities in which other people live. We have to live together, but the support services in the communities are no longer there. Support services are being wiped out at the fastest rate of anything under health care, Mr. Chairman.

Community health services, in addition to the mental health, had a cut of some 20 staff positions. The patient care fund no longer exists. It just doesn't exist any more. The health capital fund no longer exists.

So we believe, Mr. Chairman, that there are many, many examples of fiscal mismanagement, and I've tried to outline some of those here today. There have been unfair and uncaring cut-backs, cut-backs that have affected virtually every family in the province of Saskatchewan with the possible exception of those that don't have a patronage contract with the Tory Progressive Conservative government opposite.

Misleading information about taxation, not releasing information that's public documented information that should be released, should be accessible to the province of Saskatchewan and the people, through this legislature. You've lost your credibility. The irresponsibility, we hope, will not go on for a long period of time.

We hope that instead of putting us in the position where we're fairly obligated to support the interim supply resolution because we are caring and sharing and we realize that you have to have money to keep the reduced levels of services going, that we're very reluctant, Mr. Chairman, but we will have to vote for the supply motion. And I would say that the members, in a responsible and caring way on this side of the House, are now ready to vote on this issue.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Be it 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 \$363,072,500 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Lane: —

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$41,063,800 be granted to Her Majesty on account for . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Order. Order. Excuse me, I still have one to catch up.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Lane: —

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$41,063,800 be granted to Her Majesty on account for the 12 months ending March 31, 1988.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Lane: —

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 \$41,063,800 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. 25, An Act for Granting to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year Ending on March 31, 1988, be now introduced and read the first time.

Motion agreed to and, by leave of the Assembly, 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 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 4:59 p.m.