

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

ORAL QUESTIONS

Mr. Speaker: — By special order of this House, question period will be at 2 p.m.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 97 — An Act respecting the Control of Distribution and the Consumption of Beverage Alcohol in Saskatchewan

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill respecting the Control of Distribution and the Consumption of Beverage Alcohol in Saskatchewan.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Executive Council Ordinary Expenditure - Vote 10

Item 1 (continued)

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. What I would like to do this morning, Mr. Chairperson, is just to review the events of the last year. When we take a look at the events of the last year, we see a pattern of anti-democratic decisions by the Premier and by the PC government. So if I take us back to the opening of the legislature in November, one of the first things that came on the floor of this House was a motion to change the quorum of committees in this House. It was a motion that was brought forward by the PC government without any consultation whatsoever with the opposition. It was a decision that was made by the government unilaterally and arbitrarily.

Mr. Chairman, there wasn't even any problems with the quorums in committees in the past. That was my understanding. There was no problem with the quorums. But they came forward with this decision unilaterally, and we suggest the reason for doing that, Mr. Chairman, was because the government wanted to stall the business of the committees when the heat was on, because if the quorum was changed in the fashion they wanted, they would have been able to do that.

It was only after vigorous opposition by the opposition party, by the New Democrats, to this unparliamentary decision on the part of the government, to a decision that was against the traditions of this House because the parliamentary tradition dictated that the government would consult with the opposition when it was changing

rules of the House, only after vigorous opposition to this anti-democratic, unparliamentary decision on the part of the government did the government back away from it. But that was the first indication that they were prepared to take anti-democratic decisions.

The next thing they did, Mr. Chairman, is they came forward with Bill 5, the reorganization Bill. This Bill was designed to remove decisions from the floor of this House and to put them behind closed cabinet doors so that decision that were formerly made in public would now be made in secret. And that's what that Bill was designed to do, therefore becoming an obvious anti-democratic decision by the government because what they were trying to do was avoid accountability to the public. They did not want to have their decisions with respect to reorganization of government being reviewed by this Assembly.

The House then adjourned, and March 31 passed us by and there was no budget forthcoming by this government — absolutely no budget — notwithstanding the fact that the fiscal year ends on the 31st of March. And there was no good reason for the delay in the budget because the government had had since October of 1986, October 20, to put together a budget. So there was no good reason for the delay.

And while this delay was taking place, while we were waiting for the session to be recalled, the Premier and his government engaged in a series of very anti-democratic decisions that were destroying families across this province, Mr. Chairman. They were slashing programs, they were destroying families, and they were spending millions of the taxpayers' dollars. And they were doing this, Mr. Chairman, with no mandate —no mandate whatsoever.

They had not campaigned on the fact that they would be slashing programs in government. They had not campaigned on the fact that they would be delaying the budget until some time in June and spending in total, I believe, over \$900 million by special warrants, which we suggest was illegal spending on the part of the government. They had absolutely no mandate to do that, Mr. chairman, but nevertheless they proceeded in that anti-democratic and unparliamentary tradition, and, we would argue, in that illegal fashion.

And I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Premier of this province cannot escape responsibility for what happened in those periods, in the periods preceding June 17 and shortly after. He cannot escape responsibility for all those families whose lives were destroyed because of this government's insensitive and anti-democratic decisions.

He may try to escape responsibility and say it's other people in cabinet who were doing this, and he wasn't spearheading this group, but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, the Premier is supposed to be the leader of the PC Party and of this government, and he accepts full responsibility for everything his government does, including the dumb statements of the minister from Melville, and he accepts full responsibility for all the actions of his government.

But while they were going around the province and destroying programs and destroying people's lives, Mr. Chairman, they were also hiring friends of the Tories, and hiring some, I might say, at very handsome salaries. Meanwhile other people's lives were being destroyed, Mr. Chairman, and to me this showed incredible insensitivity on their part. There was incredible insensitivity in the manner in which they conducted themselves before June 17 and shortly after, and there's absolutely no question that the people of this province were appalled by this government's right-wing, extremist decisions.

And yes, the decisions were extremist, Mr. Chairman, because the methods they employed were extremist. When one walks in to an individual and says, you've got one hour to pack your desk and leave, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that that's insensitive, and the approach that was taken with respect to the firing of people was extremist, in some cases.

People were very, very disgruntled and upset with this government. They were very dismayed at the actions that were taking place and a hue and cry arose across the province which culminated in one of the largest demonstrations that we've ever seen in this province, Mr. Chairman. Nevertheless, the Premier undermines the demonstration by refusing to recognize the numbers that were there, and I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that that shows his insensitivity to the people of this province who were trying to send a message to him and tell him that they didn't agree with what he was doing, and they didn't agree with his government's anti-democratic tactics.

But we saw the same display from the Premier in the health care petition. We had some, approximately 100,000 signatures across this province when all the health care petitions came in, and yet the Premier belittled the individuals who signed the petition by simply saying they were NDP hacks, or words to that effect, trying to connote the fact that it was just a political reason for them signing. That showed his insensitivity, Mr. Chairman, because there were thousands of people that signed that petition who had absolutely no connection whatsoever to the New Democratic Party.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — But one of the most striking examples of this government, and the Premier's incredible insensitivity and incompetence, was the manner in which they dealt with the dental workers and the dental program, the cruel manner in which they destroyed the dental program — privatized it, I should say — and in which they dealt with dental workers.

And I believe the Premier knows, he knows that he was insensitive and cruel in that situation, and that was evidenced by the fact that he made himself scarce when the dental workers filled the galleries of this Legislative Assembly. He wasn't here on that day, and that's an acknowledgement, Mr. Chairperson, that he realized that this decision by his government was an insensitive and cruel decision, not to mention the fact that it was also incompetent because they went for a program that in

effect will end up costing the taxpayers more on a per child basis.

An Hon. Member: — Gary made him do it. Right, Gary?

(1015)

Ms. Simard: — Well that . . . The member from Riversdale here said, "Gary made him do it." But, Mr. Chairperson, the Premier cannot use that excuse. He is responsible for every single decision made by his cabinet ministers. He can't use that excuse, and the people of this province don't accept that excuse.

And I might say on the dental program, Mr. Chairperson, that I am already getting complaints, not just from the rural area but from others in my constituency who are having difficulty leaving work to take their children out of school and take them to a dentist to have them looked after; not to mention the problems that mothers are going to have in rural Saskatchewan where they have to drive a considerable space in order to have access to a dentist.

And so, Mr. Chairperson, the session then finally reopened on June 17 with the latest budget ever, I believe, in the history of this province. And the public accounts weren't even forthcoming at that time. They weren't available at that time.

So there we were listening to the government's inadequate rationalizations for their cruel and heartless and anti-democratic actions over the preceding months. There we were listening to that on June 17, Mr. Speaker. The preceding months when cut-back after cut-back was dribbled out to the public of Saskatchewan, not unlike, I might say, an ancient method of torture whereby a technique is employed where you drop water drop by drop on a person's head. And so drop by drop, cut-back after cut-back, lost program after lost program, lost service after lost service, lost job after lost job, lost security after lost security, was slowly dribbled out to the public.

And there it was on June 17 — it was June 17 before this government had the courage to come forward and attempt to justify their actions of the preceding months. It was June 17, Mr. Chairperson, before this government had the courage to come forward and confront the people of this province.

And you know why I think they left it till June 17? Because they thought, Mr. Chairperson, that if they left it that long, if they dribbled out these cut-backs, dribbled out these firings over a period of months, that the impact on the province would be less than if they came down with a budget, in one fell swoop, that did the same thing. They felt the impact would be less.

And so they were prepared, they were prepared to spend some 900 million of taxpayers' dollars over a period of several months in an illegal manner in order to meet the goal of their political strategy and their political agenda.

They were prepared to do that, Mr. Chairperson — to deny a forum, to deny the legislative forum to the public of Saskatchewan as they continued to go across this

province and fire one person after another. They wanted to do it when the legislature wasn't open. They wanted to reduce the impact of these cut-backs. They hoped that it would lessen the impact by not having the legislature sitting and by not coming down with a budget in one fell swoop.

Well I suggest to you, Mr. Chairperson, that their political judgement was wrong, and because they've so enraged the people of Saskatchewan, that they will never be able to recover from their actions preceding June 17, from their heartless and cruel approach to the public of this province.

And I believe that there was another reason why this government delayed the opening of the session to June 17, and I believe that was because they felt that if they sat into summer that there would be very little publicity, that people would not be interested, and they would be more interested in going away on holidays or doing other things.

But once again, Mr. Chairperson, they miscalculated, because that was not the fact. People did care, people were interested, and we had a very lively session over the summer.

But they were trying to avoid, by calling the session on June 17, Mr. Chairperson, they were trying to avoid public debate and public accountability. And that is an example of the anti-democratic methods and the anti-democratic manner in which the Premier and his government are prepared to operate.

Another example of this government's anti-democratic approach was found in the appointment of the Ombudsman. That was another example. Parliamentary tradition, Mr. Chairperson, dictated that there should be at least, at the very minimum, consultation with the opposition on the appointment of the Ombudsman. In fact, in Alberta they set up an all-party committee to look into it, which . . . and there are other provinces that do the same.

But there was absolutely . . . Even though we had asked for an all-party committee, even though the former Ombudsman had suggested an all-party committee, there wasn't one iota of consultation with the opposition, not even a telephone call. And out of the blue they appointed an Ombudsman — out of the blue, without once consulting with the opposition. Not once. And I say to you, Mr. Chairperson, that that is anti-democratic, and that's unconstitutional, and it goes against the traditions of this House.

But did you hear the Premier stand up and apologize for the appointment of this Ombudsman in that fashion? Did you hear the Premier explain why the Ombudsman was appointed in that fashion, Mr. Chairperson? Not once. He did not come forward with an explanation. But as I said earlier, Mr. Chairperson, he takes responsibility for these decisions. He takes full responsibility.

And let's take a look at health care very briefly, Mr. Chairperson. We've seen some of the largest changes in history, in recent memory, in the area of health care in this

province, some of the largest changes, Mr. Chairperson. The health care system is being cut and wrecked, and yet there has been absolutely no discussion, before these cuts were made, with the public of this province. In fact there were promises made by the PC Party that medicare would be enhanced and preserved. And we have even shown ads in the . . . from election campaigns that the deterrent fees on prescription drugs would be withdrawn. So in spite of the promises that were made by the PC Party to preserve and enhance and improve upon medicare, this government, in its anti-democratic fashion, without a mandate from the public, has proceeded to cut and destroy and undermine the health care system. And I say that's anti-democratic and unconstitutional and totally unacceptable by the public in this province.

And let's just briefly take a look at the Public Utilities Review Commission which was a PC promise, Mr. Chairperson, in 1982, that there be a Public Utilities Review Commission for the purpose of obtaining public input into the setting of utility rates. And it was introduced into this House with a great deal of fanfare and with very fancy and elaborate statements on the part of the government about the need for a Public Utilities Review Commission and the need for public input. But in 1987 what happens is the Premier's government sets out to destroy the Public Utilities Review commission — sets out to destroy that, notwithstanding their promise of 1982, notwithstanding their promise of 1982.

And they had absolutely no mandate to do that, Mr. Chairman, without coming forward with an alternative to embody the concept of public input into setting utility rates; without coming forward with some alternative because that was their promise in 1982. That was what the public wanted. For them to backtrack on that promise, Mr. Chairperson, without coming forward with an alternative, is anti-democratic and totally unfair on the part of this government.

Bill 46 is another example, Mr. Chairperson, whereby the PC government destroyed the collective bargaining agreement between the employees of community colleges and the institutes, technical institutes, as a part of an attempt to centralize control; destroying a collective bargaining agreement, an agreement that had been negotiated over a long period of time and had been agreed upon just unilaterally. Destroy the collective bargaining agreement — totally unthinking on the part of this government, Mr. Chairperson, and highly anti-democratic.

There's absolutely no question, Mr. Chairperson, that the record of this government has been one — over the preceding months — one of incompetence, mismanagement, insensitivity, and one of a series of anti-democratic decision. And there's no question there's been a hue and cry across this province, as evidenced in the demonstration, as evidenced in the health care petition. And the people are still talking about the spring, and they're still talking about the heartless and incompetent budget, and they're not going to forget, Mr. Chairperson. They feel they cannot trust this government. And one cannot blame them for those feelings because what we've seen over the past few months is one promise after another being broken by this government.

And I only have to name a few. The tax increases, for example — notwithstanding PC promises that sales tax would be eliminated, personal income tax would be reduced, we have an increase in tax — PC promises that never again in the history of the province of Saskatchewan will there be a gas tax as long as there is a PC government. Well, Mr. chairperson, I hope you're keeping your receipts, because I'm keeping mine. Promises that the health care system would be improved.

The member from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden is chirping from his seat, Mr. chairperson. The fact of the matter is the gas tax is being paid by municipalities and by school boards, and every person in this province who's a taxpayer pays it through their taxes. To suggest that the public of this province is not taking responsibility for gas tax is very dishonest on the part of the member from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden.

Health is another example, Mr. Chairperson. Health is another example. Promises whereby the health system would be improved — totally ignored, promises broken. There's absolutely no way they followed through on their promises with respect to the health care system.

So it's absolutely no wonder, Mr. Chairperson, when we look at one broken promises after another by this government, by one anti-democratic decision after another, by one unparliamentary decision after another, that the public of this province is saying they can't believe what the PC government says, and they don't trust them.

And it's very important, Mr. Chairperson, and Mr. Premier, that we don't ignore democratic principles in our system. It's very important. We mustn't engage in illegal expenditures. The government shouldn't delay calling the House solely for political purposes and a political agenda. The government shouldn't ignore parliamentary tradition and just barge ahead like a bull in a china shop doing its own thing.

These things are there for a reason. These traditions, these customs, these democratic principles, Mr. Chairperson, are there for a reason. We have lived by them for decades and decades, and they have served us well. But democracy is a very fragile thing and it can be easily eroded. It can be eroded in the manner in which this government has been proceeding in the last few months. It can be eroded by the intimidation of people, people who are afraid to speak out. And I hear this repeatedly, people feel uncomfortable and afraid to speak out because it may have financial repercussions for them. That's an erosion. When we do that, when the government does that to people, intimidates them to that extent, it's an erosion of our democratic principles. And we'll all suffer some day as a result, if this erosion continues.

(1030)

And so I therefore want to urge the Premier, I want to urge the Premier, and I want to urge this government to reconsider its tactics of the past few months, to reassess the road on which it has been travelling, and not to make in the months to come decision of the nature and in the

manner . . . decisions in the manner in which they did in the past.

I want to urge the Premier and this government to uphold our democratic traditions, to respect freedom of speech on the part of individuals, to respect freedom of association on the part of individuals, and to discontinue its anti-democratic approach to governing this province. And therefore, I would like to ask the Premier, when this House adjourns, whether he is going to be continuing the sorts of decisions and cut-backs, cut programs, lost jobs, as he did prior to June 17 and shortly after. Is he going to be continuing with that method and manner of governing this province when this House adjourns. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to respond to the hon. member from Lakeview. She raises the point about not having her democratic rights exercised in Saskatchewan under this administration. She's on television free for over half an hour to speak on anything she likes.

These are Executive Council estimates; she never asked a question for over half an hour. She had never referred to the things that we normally go through, and she spoke to the people of the province with no regard for what we normally do in Executive Council, with complete disregard for the kinds of things that normally are the questions here. And after 30-some minutes she asks a question about, in a general sense, what's going to happen next year.

Well I can say to the hon. member, I mean, if people don't think that you have your democratic rights being exercised, I mean, we just let you talk and talk and talk and put you on television across the province on anything you wanted to talk about. I mean, if anybody's ever stretched the rules of the democratic process in this legislature, it was you just now.

So I mean, for Heaven sakes, let it be known that you have your democratic rights to free speech in this Assembly, and you can peruse, at length, all the things that you want to talk about. And I don't think you've fooled anybody in saying that you don't have your democratic rights — the process isn't democratic; I mean, you went on for some time.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, I also find it interesting that the social democrat would stand up and talk about rights when world-wide we know that socialist countries reduce rights — they remove rights, there's no freedom.

The member from Quill Lakes, the member from Quill Lakes, Mr. Chairman, would you ask him please to respect the legislative Assembly. He wants democratic right . . . If you want democratic rights, let me speak. The member from Quill Lakes is just like they are every place else where they have a radical socialist, that he can't sit in his place and let me have freedom of speech — he's got to bark, he's got to bark from his place.

Well I'll say, Mr. Chairman, in all respect, throughout the socialist world there are not rights to free speech and free

democratic association and free . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. I would ask members to allow the Premier to make his comments. The member from Lakeview made her comments. I would ask members to allow the Premier to make his comments in return.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I make the point, Mr. Chairman, that we allowed these people, the member from Lakeview, to speak for a half an hour and she wasn't really supporting the government, and she stretched the truth, and she wasn't accurate, and we sat here and let her speak. And when I stand in my place, in the first 30 seconds they're hollering because they don't respect the democratic process because they're so hypocritical all the time — classic hypocrites, classic hypocrites. World-wide, Mr. Speaker, they don't let people speak. They don't give them freedom of the press, or freedom of religion. When they stand in the legislature and speak for half an hour, we don't say anything. And when I get up to speak, they try to interrupt me. The member from Quill Lakes is the classic one.

An Hon. Member: — Speak the truth.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — The truth is, socialism world-wide restricts rights. You don't have the rights that you do in an open society. You don't have the rights. You stand . . . Look it! Mr. Chairman, we have in this Legislative Chamber a process where we respect each other and allow each other to speak. And she's talking about, the member from Lakeview, about democratic rights. When I get up on my feet, Mr. Chairman, they bark from their seat. I mean, they have no respect for the rights. They never did, and they never will. That's the way it is.

I will point out to the hon. members that one-half hour of free television to say anything you like is about an open democratic system as you can have. And the member from Lakeview exercised all that open democratic opportunity, spoke on anything that she liked, didn't get into Executive Council estimates at all. And that's about as free as you will find it.

I can say to the hon. member . . . and she talks about the fact that we have a deficit, and she talks about the fact that there's not enough money. And I can say to her, I wish we had more money. Doesn't everybody in the country wish that wheat prices were higher. It's difficult for farmers at \$2.50 wheat. I mean, I understand that, and that's why we spend money on farmers to help them. It's extremely difficult.

For people who have cancer disease, they want some help, so we build new cancer facilities. People who are going through rehabilitation want new facilities, and we build new cancer and rehabilitation facilities in the province. And we obviously would like to have more money to do that.

We don't like to see the price of oil go down. We don't like to see the price of wheat go down or the price of potash go down. We would like to see it higher.

And the hon. member says, well wouldn't it be better if we had more money to spend on it? I agree with her.

Wouldn't it be better if we had had more money? And she says, well it's not easy to raise taxes. It isn't easy to raise taxes. It's not easy to make choices with respect to how you're going to spend the money, and the hon. member knows that. Nobody says it's easy.

If you want to build more nursing homes, 2,000 more spaces for senior citizens, Mr. Chairman, it takes some time. And it's not easy. But we've asked people: do you need more nursing home capacity? And they say yes. And we have built more nursing home capacity. We've added expansion on City Hospital. We're building a new City Hospital, a new University Saskatchewan Hospital, an expansion on St. Pauls' Hospital, because people asked for that.

They want drought payments. You have to have some compassion for people . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And they want some help. Exactly. then we provide that kind of help. It's not easy when you don't have the money. People understand that. They would like to have as much assistance as possible when they have high interest rates or when it's dry or when it's flooding or when they are ill or when they have all kinds of problems.

And it's our intention to continue to provide that kind of support in interest rate protection, building new senior citizens' accommodations, removing extra billing. Mr. Chairman, for the kinds of things that people want to see. And that's very important.

And if you want to look at the various kind of choices we have to make with respect to young people . . . You talk to senior citizens today, and they're worried about their grandchildren when they hear about the AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome) epidemic. And they're worried about their grandchildren when they learn about the drug epidemic, and they want society and the government to help these young people get through these social problems of drugs and chemicals and alcohol and facing the AIDS epidemic world-wide.

They want us to help them. And it's not easy. I wish it was easier, but we have to address those kinds of things. We have to provide the money. We have to build those facilities. We have to build a new drug and rehabilitation centre for young people and the senior citizens worry about their grandchildren, and they worry about their children on the farms, their sons and daughters.

And they, Mr. Chairman, would like to see us provide those goods and those services and those facilities to people across the province, and that's why we're building, Mr. Chairman.

It takes a great deal of work in difficult times. Families know that. And members opposite would like to see us raise the price of wheat or raise the price of oil or not raise taxes and balance the budget all at the same time. Well it's pretty difficult. It's pretty difficult, and we know that it's difficult. It's difficult in Manitoba, it's difficult in British Columbia, it's difficult across the country to be able to do these kinds of things for people all at the same time so that we can provide the goods and services for people when they need them on time.

I can say, Mr. Chairman, if I might, the opposition raised the whole question of the democracy and providing the information as accurately as possible. They were wrong last night when it came to declaring Medicare Day. And the member from North Battlefords was obviously mistaken with respect to the pulp company, PAPCO (Prince Albert Pulp Company) in Prince Albert, the \$91,000 a day. They won't admit that, and I was right, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to remind hon. members that in 1981, when the hon. member mentioned Peat Marwick Mitchell had recorded a \$24 million profit, the interest cost was not charged against that, Mr. Chairman. So the company lost \$11 million in '81; \$39 million in '82; \$49 million in '83; \$15 million in '84; and lost another \$51 million in 1985, because the interest was never paid. And so if you take \$167 million and divide it by five years — 365 days a year — it's \$91,862 a day, Mr. Chairman.

And they didn't even include the interest rate expenses, and they wouldn't even charge it to the company. So, Mr. Chairman, I just make that point that they were wrong on both accounts. And when they make mistakes and when they lose all this money, they won't acknowledge it anyway.

So I will just say, Mr. Chairman, when they talk about their democratic rights, they don't let union members vote, Bob White won't let union members vote, the NDP don't let union members vote. The NDP won't even let people vote against . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Order. In estimates all members have their opportunity to stand in their place and speak, so I would ask members to allow the Premier to make his comments when he is speaking.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Obviously they don't respect the democratic process. They won't let me speak. They holler from their place because they can't stand to hear the truth.

I've just pointed out that, Bob White, the vice-president of the NDP across Canada won't let his union members vote on a very important issue about separating out a Canadian union from an American union. They're not allowed to vote — not democratic at all. It's consistent with socialism world-wide. They won't let people vote. There's not freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of press, freedom of association. And you can go all through the countries that are socialist, and that's the case.

And it's the same here with respect to the union members. They won't let them vote whether they want to be part of a union in Canada or be part of a North American union. They stand in their place and they talk about rights, but when we sit here and talk about them, they interrupt me because they don't believe in free speech. They are so inconsistent, Mr. Chairman. I think people have to acknowledge the fact that world-wide they're this way, and they treat people that way, and in this Assembly they treat us exactly the same way.

And the children that come in here know it as well. And

they look at the opposition and they say, you know, you talk about democratic rights but you won't live by democratic rights. You don't even let your own memberships vote.

Well I point out, Mr. chairman, that we have the ability, we have the ability and the talent and the capacity and the compassion to help people across the province of Saskatchewan in difficult times, whether it's because of high interest rates, whether it's because of drug problems, whether it's because of cancer clinics that we have to build or rehabilitation centres, new facilities for education, new facilities for health care. It takes money, and it takes a great deal of work. And it's not easy, Mr. Chairman, but we are quite prepared to make those decisions.

(1045)

I will say, Mr. Chairman, as a case in point — the opposition members would say, well yes, Mr. Premier, you're spending a great deal of money on health, much more than we did. But I think you should fix teenagers' teeth as opposed to a new drug rehabilitation centre. That's a fair argument. But we would choose, Mr. Chairman, to help young people address the drug problem, and they would choose to fix their teeth, free. Now there's a classic difference of opinion.

The problems of this decade and the next decade and the next century will be linked to chemicals and drugs and problems associated with the social pressures, and we are going to address those. Others might say, Mr. Chairman, that they want to address their teeth, and they can argue about that.

Well, Mr. Chairman, again I will come back to the decisions. There's no doubt that we spend more money on health and social services and agriculture and education than they did. We can argue about where it's spent, and I think that's fair ball, but not the fact that we are spending more for people when, in fact, they need the kind of help that is provided even in difficult times.

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The Premier had said that socialism restricts rights. Well I don't agree with that. Communism may, but so does Fascism restrict rights, and as far as I'm concerned there's not much difference between the two. But there are many socialist countries, and he knows it. He had Mr. Mitterrand here this winter, who is a socialist president in France. And we only have to name Sweden and Austria as examples. And the Premier is not being fair with the public of this province when he makes that statement. And he knows it, and the public knows it.

I just want to ask the Premier whether he thinks the decision in the electoral boundaries Act to eliminate opposition consultation in setting up the commission and putting in a Chief Electoral Officer, which is a political hack, and taking out a non-political person, the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, is a democratic decision on the part of his government?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I believe that there was recently an editorial in the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix*,

for example. It said nobody could question the impartiality of the appointments, and they are impartial as can be, and they're appointed from people from the bench, and it's precisely the way we should be able to appoint them. And they do the same across the country, Mr. chairman. So, as the editorial said, nobody could question the impartiality of this boundaries commission, and I agree with them.

Ms. Simard: — Well, Mr. Premier, what do you have to say about Dr. Norman Ward's comments, the head of the political science department at the University of Saskatchewan, who commented on the lack of impartiality in the way the commission was set up, and said he wouldn't even sit on it if he was asked. What do you have to say about his comments?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I've just said that we've had a major editorial in one of the leading newspapers that endorsed this, that said nobody can question it as being impartial. So if you question nudges . . . are you questioning the judiciary? I mean, if you want to find people who may agree or may disagree with the various opinions, we can go into Meech Lake, we can go into trade, we can go into agriculture policy — all kinds of different policies — where you can find somebody that says, well, I would do it some other way.

But I mean, clearly there will be differences of opinion, but this is as impartial as you can see any place in the country, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Premier, why do you give less credence to Dr. Norman Ward than you do to the editorialist to whom you're referring?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I've just pointed out, we put together a package in Meech Lake and some members of the NDP vote against it. Every political party in the country supported it; the premiers supported it; the Prime Minister supported it. And members of the NDP voted against it, and they found people in the academic community who said it wasn't any good. And it's good for the country. It knits us all together, brings Quebec into the country, because the NDP didn't bring them in when they signed the constitution in '81 — they failed. And they're finding all these people who would now support the position that they took, and they say, well, what about this?

It was right to give Saskatchewan a veto. Finally we've got the same power as Quebec and Ontario. And you can find academics in other places that say, well, I don't think that this is exactly perfect; I don't think this is right. And you can go dig them up.

Well on Meech Lake, it's right, and not the whole country agrees, and you can find academics that disagree. And I'm sure you can find academics that would disagree with things that happen in the legislature. You may find academics in parliamentary procedure who would question the member from Lakeview being able to stand here and talk about everything she wanted to for half an hour and never get into estimates. I mean, I don't even know where that's included in the rules. So I mean you can probably find people who would question her

behaviour and say, well, it's a little bit . . . it's stretching.

So Mr. Chairman, I would say, you can find your specialists; other people can find their specialists. Okay? You want me to respond to the question; I'll respond to the question.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Chairperson, the Premier obviously doesn't want to hear from me today because he's looking for some technicality to say that I shouldn't have made the comments that I made.

The fact of the matter is, he is Premier of the province, he is responsible for the decisions of this government; he's responsible for all the policies, and these are Executive Council estimates. And so we are talking about his government's policies under these estimates, and it's very relevant to the topic. He may wish to argue it's not relevant, because he doesn't want to account for his policies, Mr. Chairperson.

With respect to The Electoral Boundaries (Commission) Act, I think that it's just facetious to suggest that when the Chief Electoral Officer is appointed to the commission that it's not a political appointment and it's total impartial. Nobody's going to believe that out there, Mr. Chairman, absolutely nobody.

but I want to ask the Premier with respect to the Public Utilities Review Commission — in 1982 he spoke in favour of a Public Utilities Review Commission and talked about open government and public input into setting utility rates. Why was PURC good in 1982 and no good in 1987?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, the NDP had voted against PURC when we initiated it, and then when we cancel it they say, well, gee, are you sure that you wanted this. I mean, are you for or against PURC?

An Hon. Member: — Look at the record.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well tell me so that I can know. Are you for or against it?

An Hon. Member: — Well you just said you knew.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well you campaigned against it. You said it would be expensive. And when it comes to becoming expensive and we cancel it, then you say, well we should have it. Well which way do you want it?

We set it up to monitor utilities and the cost increases to consumers, and we found out because of the hearings and because of the legal people that you had to hire, that it wasn't saving any money. So we cancelled it because we can save more money by regulating the rates. And so you weren't for it when we set it up, and you're against it when we take it down. So I mean, I wish you'd make up your mind.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Chairperson, just for the record, and this is, I think, at least the third time I've said this in the House in this Assembly. The NDP voted for the Public Utilities Review Commission on third reading. Either the Premier doesn't know his facts and have them straight, or

he has decided to twist the truth on the matter. But the fact of the matter is that it was their promise in 1982. They promised a Public Utilities Review Commission, they were elected in 1982, they promised open government, and in 1987 that promise has been broken by this government. And they are now shutting the doors to public input into setting utility rate. And that's anti-democratic, and the Premier has not been able to give an adequate explanation here in the House today.

And I would like to ask the Premier, Mr. Chairman, what he thinks about the appointment of the Ombudsman and the fact that there was absolutely no consultation with the opposition? Does he not agree that that was an anti-democratic approach to take on the part of his government?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. chairman, let me say that the record shows that the NDP argued against PURC day after day.

An Hon. Member: — You're wrong. Go look at the records.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Yes, the record. And you argued against the principle, you argued against the principle of it for a long time.

An Hon. Member: — We would have done a cost study, at least.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well okay, he said he would have done a cost study.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Order. The member from Quill Lakes is continually interrupting. He has every opportunity to rise in his place and make speeches or debate or ask questions in committee, but when someone else has the floor, I would ask him to give him the opportunity to express his views.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the co-operation from the members opposite.

I said that we introduced PURC to help regulate utility prices and charges. It was found to be too expensive, Mr. Chairman, and so we removed the agency because people were literally spending millions of dollars to monitor the rates, and we were not saving the kind of money that we thought we'd be able to save for the consumers because the taxpayer ended up paying more and more money.

Secondly, with respect to the qualifications of the Ombudsman, I don't think anybody can question the qualifications and the professionalism of the Ombudsman that has been appointed — a man who has served in many capacities: he's served in government; he's served in his community; he's served in a law firm; he's served on volunteer organizations and . . . tremendous qualifications. So I believe the province will benefit to a very large extent and is fortunate to have a man of these qualifications serve in that capacity.

Ms. Simard: — Why didn't your government consult with the opposition in accordance with parliamentary tradition, Mr. Premier?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Chairman, we advised the opposition early in April, I believe, of the appointment of Mr. McLellan as an Acting Ombudsman and of his intention to be appointed permanently. And we got some response in the media from the opposition, and it wasn't favourable; it was negative; that this man was not qualified; he was just an anti-NDPer or a pro-PC supporter. And I mean it's the classic response. So I mean, the opposition was advised, and advised of an acting position, and then they complained. And obviously at the appropriate time, when the legislature came back in, we made it a full-time position and a permanent position.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Chairperson, the reason why the Ombudsman was appointed as Acting Ombudsman is because you had to come to the House, because the government had to come to the House to appoint this individual as a permanent opposition. But the Acting Ombudsman position was in effect a *fait accompli* for the appointment of the Ombudsman, and there was absolutely no consultation with the opposition in that regard whatsoever.

The tradition in other provinces, Mr. Speaker, is to set up an all-party committee, or at least to consult with the opposition before any names are put forward. In fact, and that has been our tradition as well in this province, and as well it's been our tradition to advertise for positions, not to just pick somebody out of Estevan for the job. So I think that I've . . . There's absolutely no question, Mr. Premier, that the decision was made contrary to parliamentary tradition, and it was an anti-democratic decision. And you can say what you like, Mr. Premier, but you haven't given us an explanation. We wrote to you on more than one occasion asking for input and an all-party committee. And we never received a reply, and your appointment was announced before we even heard anything about it. And I say that flies in the face of parliamentary tradition of this House, and it's another peg in the coffin of this government and its anti-democratic traditions.

Now, Mr. Premier, I would like to know, when this House adjourns, whether you are going to be engaging in further unthinking and heartless cuts to programs and further heartless and cruel cuts to jobs of the people of this province. Will you be doing that after this House adjourns, Mr. Premier?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member knows, the job record in the province of Saskatchewan is the best in western Canada, and has been for the last five years, and it ranks second now in all of Canada, because our concern is particularly for young people and providing them full-time employment. And it's not perfect, but it's obviously the very best in western Canada and second in all of Canada.

And we are increasing our diversification on processing and manufacturing, broadening, deepening the economy. The Minister of Tourism announced expansion of a whole thrust in that area this morning, or yesterday, Mr. Chairman, to increase jobs.

And if she is referring to jobs only in the public sector, I will say to the hon. member, yes, we have limited the size of growth in the public sector. In fact, government is about 2,000 people smaller than it was when we took office, and that's to save the taxpayers some money.

(1100)

Now I know as a socialist she'd rather have more people in work for government. That's why they bought mines, and they bought farm land, and they bought pulp companies, and they would buy packing plants, because they want everybody working for the government.

I'm a capitalist, and I don't believe in that. I believe as much as possible should go to the private sector. and world-wide, Mr. Chairman, more and more people, even in China, even in the Soviet Union, even in the real hard-core socialist countries, they are moving towards more free enterprise and more private sector. Even in Australia, in Great Britain, the Labour Party, for Heaven sakes, supports privatization. but not here in Saskatchewan, and not in Canada. They are still quite strident.

I would say most new jobs, almost all new jobs come from small business. And we encourage small business, and that's why we have a good record, reasonable record here in Saskatchewan in terms of employment.

So the hon. member wants to know if I will maintain my concern for protecting people against high interest rates, protecting them against drought, protecting them against disaster at the farm level. I will be concerned about jobs; I'll try to provide as many new jobs as possible for young people, and I think that's a good idea. I will increase my expenditures on health, education, and social services. They will be increasing, to a large extent, new facilities for cancer patients, new hospitals in Saskatoon, a new City Hospital, expansions there, new rehabilitation centre. Yes, yes, yes to the hon. member.

We will continue to provide good employment, good protection, and to have the largest expenditures any place that you would find in Canada, except for Alberta, on health care, education, social services, and we will continue to make those very large priorities.

And I can say, not only for young people, but indeed senior citizens, and that's why, because we cared a great deal, Mr. Chairman, we provided \$500 per person for senior citizens and up to \$700 per couple for those senior citizens that have low income. Now nobody else is doing that in the country, Mr. Speaker, and certainly the NDP didn't. But for senior citizens out there that are watching this morning, I can say, if you make below \$25,000, you get \$500 cash every year from the government, and if you live as a couple, you get \$700. And that, plus the removing of extra billing, saves thousands and thousands of dollars for people who have formerly had to pay.

So I say yes to the hon. member, we will continue to be compassionate and care, and spend more and more and more money on education and health care and social services so, in fact, young people and seniors and farmers

and others throughout the province can benefit from the fact that we can provide good and excellent service even in difficult times. And we all know that it isn't easy, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Chairperson, Mr. Premier, you indicated that the civil service was some 2,000 people smaller, but what you failed to state was the fact that some of the people who were fired were actually hired back as temporary employees and may not be included in the overall picture when you state your figures as to the size of the civil service. You've also failed to indicate that a lot of this work is being contracted out as well. So the money is still being spent but in different areas.

You had said that you want to send as much as possible out to the private sector. Well I would like to suggest to you that when you talk private sector, you talk friends of the Tory party. That's what you're referring to as private sector. A lot of the business that you're contracting out is going to friends of the Tory party. And we've received a number of complaints that the tendering procedures of this government are unfair and that people aren't being given an opportunity to fairly tender on some of these government contracts. So let's give the public the complete picture.

Now you didn't answer my question, Mr. Premier, and my question was: are you going to be firing more people when this House adjourns — firing more people in the public sector when this House adjourns? Are you going to be doing that?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, it's true that most people in business are free enterprise, and they support the PC government, and make no mistake about it. So if they want to say all the Tories in the province and all the business men that are free enterprise are our friends, I will say that. So they call it patronage because the free enterprise people and the small business support the PC government, and that's the time . . .

She talks about everything that the government does is patronage. Could I say to the hon. member, I think it's true that the member from Lakeview sought the nomination for the NDP in Regina North West in 1979.

An Hon. Member: — Regina North West?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Regina North West. And she received \$7,100 from the Attorney General's department in '81-82 for legal services rendered. Now were you NDP? did you run for the NDP, and did you get \$7,000 in legal services from the NDP from the Attorney General? Did you? Is that the case? Have you ever heard of . . .

An Hon. Member: — I'll bet you it was public tender.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Yes, was it public tender? There's a Mr. Alex Taylor who was a minister of the United Church, a defeated NDP MLA and former cabinet minister. In 1975-77 this fellow was appointed chairman of the Workers' Compensation Board; 1977-79 he was appointed special adviser to the assistant deputy minister of Health, at the same time; and chairman of a task force on rehabilitation in 1980; then received special

permission for a leave of absence to conduct a study for Sask Housing. Well I ask the hon. member from Lakeview whether her \$7,000 gift had anything to do with the fact that she was NDP when the NDP government was in power. Is that the case?

We could go through quite a number of these, Mr. Chairman, if they want to get into this. Margaret Fern, I think Margaret Fern was an NDP candidate and sought the nomination prior to '81, and she received \$9,700 honorarium for special services and from the Department of Labour — 1981-82. I think she was an NDP candidate, as far as I can tell.

We looked at former NDP MP, Mr. Bill Knight, who was appointed to the government of the NDP. His last salary was something like \$4,972 a month times 12 was 59,000 . . . \$60,000 a year in 1982 — 1982 equivalent dollars.

And we can look at . . . well, if you want to look at the list of the Koskie family that was appointed by the NDP to the administrations, I mean, it would almost fill the entire department of . . . well, at least . . .

An Hon. Member: — Telephones.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — The Department of Telephones, that's right. Koskies, Koskies, and Koskies, and Koskies, and I'm sure that they weren't NDP, I mean, they couldn't have been NDP if they were related to the member from Quill Lakes, but obviously appointed.

But I think it's very interesting to note when the hon. member talks about patronage from Lakeview, and I'm sure all her constituents are going to know because I'm going to make sure that they do know, that she received \$7,100 after she ran as an NDP from the NDP government of that day.

So if she says that all small business in Saskatchewan that receives economic incentives to encourage people to grow, all the people in tourism, and all the farmers, and all the other people who appreciate the government because we are free enterprise and because we are not socialist, are all patronage, well I guess you'd have to say that all these people support the government and that's why small business invariably doesn't support socialism because the government wants to take them over — they want to take them over.

Free enterprisers say, you go operate the business; and the socialists say, no, we'll tell you how to run it. Try to set up a small business in Czechoslovakia or in Poland or in the U.S.S.R. and see how far you get. Try to set up a small business any place where the socialists have control. Do you know what happens, it's impossible.

I will say to the hon. member . . .

An Hon. Member: — There's lots of small businesses in Czechoslovakia.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I want to put it on the record. The member from Regina North East and the member from Regina Rosemont are saying, there's lots of good small businesses in Czechoslovakia and in Poland.

They're defending it right now. Let the record show their heads are going up and down. They defend the system in Czechoslovakia and in Poland. I knew eventually they would because they can't stand to hear the truth. They want to live just like it is in Poland and Czechoslovakia and say, look at all the new businesses.

Well, you stand in your place, you stand in your place and say how much you like the life and the freedom of speech and the freedom of religion and the freedom of association and the freedom of press in Czechoslovakia and Poland, and how the small businesses like it.

Do you know what they . . . Well you can look at it in Poland, you don't even have freedom of religion. Well, Mr. Chairman, they can take a Catholic priest and they can dig him out of the trunk in Poland. And you can defend that system. You defend that system. Okay, you talk about freedom of religion and freedom of the press.

Okay, you want to talk about patronage. The NDP wrote the book on patronage, and the book is pretty deep. And, Mr. Chairman, I will just say, and finally, small business supports the PC government because small business believes in free enterprise and so do we, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Chairperson, this hilarious display is just an example of what I've been saying all morning. He refused to answer my question, and that's very typical about the way this government operates — question and answer period has deteriorated to a question period. We ask a question and we never get any answers, and that's one of the reasons why this House has been delayed because we have to ask questions a dozen times before we get an answer, and in many cases we still don't get an answer, because they refuse to answer questions because they don't want to be accountable to the people of this province. And that's another example of their anti-democratic approach to the governing of this province. He refused to answer my question.

And with respect to their whole approach while they're going out and paying George Hill some \$200,000, and giving money away to Peter Pocklington, and Weyerhaeuser; while they go around the province paying Paul Schoenhals and other Tory hacks tens of thousands of dollars, they are cutting back programs, they're cutting back people's jobs, firing people left, right, and centre, and destroying families. But they're lining their pockets and they're making sure that the friends of the Tory party are very well looked after. And I say that that's anti-democratic and the public of this province are not going to put up with it, Mr. Chairperson.

And with respect to the inhumane manner in which many of the firings took place before June 17, one of the individuals who lost his job, who had formerly lived some time ago in a communist bloc country, said to me that this system here in Saskatchewan was not unlike the country he had come from except in the country he came from he would have at least had two weeks notice. And that's what this government has deteriorated to in their tactics.

Mr. Chairperson, there's absolutely no question that this government does not want to change its tactics in spite of the fact we've brought it to their attention on numerous

occasions, in spite of the fact I've brought it to the attention of the Premier this morning. He does not recognize the fact that his actions have been anti-democratic and unparliamentary. He doesn't recognize that. He won't admit that, and by not recognizing it, and not dealing with it this morning, he is sending a message out to the public of Saskatchewan that he intends to continue in this inhumane, cruel, and anti-democratic fashion.

And I wish to warn him once again that the public is not going to stand for that. All he has to do is look at the polls to see that they do not appreciate it. And I challenge him, I challenge him, if he thinks he's right in doing the things that he's done, to call a by-election in Saskatoon Eastview so we can see how the public really feels about his government's policies. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, we were through this before. The NDP asked us to call a by-election in Regina North East and we did. And they said, oh look it, the people are saying this is going to be a big change. And then we had a general election and they lost again, and now they want another by-election, and they keep calling for elections.

I mean, they are governed by polls because they have no principles. They have no principles. If the poll told them to do this, they'd do that. If the poll told them to do this, they would do that. They don't believe in any principle. They're all over the place, Mr. Chairman. That's precisely what they do. If they didn't have polls, if they didn't have polls to talk about, what would they talk about?

All they could say is that . . . well their leader was in town last night for his big wrap-up. What he said in town was different than what he said in the country. Did you see that? The polls in the country say privatization is popular in the country. The polls say in town privatization is not. So when he's in town he says, we won't change our principles. That's what he said. When he's out in the country he says, we'll have to be more progressive; we'll have to try to find new ideas for the people.

I mean, these folks are governed by polls all the time. They go in front of the unions and they say what the union wants to hear and they get two standing ovations, and then they go downtown in Estevan where Rafferty damn is popular and they say, oh, we'd build Rafferty here. They come back to Regina and say, oh, we'd never build Rafferty. I mean, we see it all the time. It's the same hypocritical stuff they've been doing for years.

They will say whatever is necessary to any person, whether it's inconsistent or not, rural or urban, downtown or uptown. They've been doing it for years. Nobody believes that. So now they say the polls are up. And they say, well, call a by-election and we'll show you. Well, we've already done that, and you won a little by-election and we won the general election again, because people know when it gets to the bottom line, why would you want to give it to that bunch?

(1115)

I mean, they don't really care. They didn't spend half the money we did in health. They weren't spending the money in education. They weren't protecting people against high interest rates. They didn't care about seniors — they put a moratorium on nursing homes. Their leader right now says, ration technology for seniors. Keep them out of nursing homes, and he's on the record. I mean, you could just about . . . anything you'd want to write, you could put it in front of them, and they'd say it if they thought the polls would be right. Okay.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say this. This administration knows exactly where it's going. We are going to defend families; we're going to defend families' rights; we're going to defend children; we're going to defend young people, we're going to look after senior citizens; we are going to take whatever's necessary even if it means short-run deficits, Mr. Chairman. We are prepared to take that to protect families, and protect people. And you ask those that have faced high interest rates, or want to see new cancer facilities, or rehabilitation centres, or a new college of Agriculture, or new technical schools in Prince Albert, or new facilities across the province — that's what we're prepared to do.

Not just chatter about it, like you chatter and peep-peep along, like you've been doing for years and years, but actually deliver — actually deliver. Then, Mr. Chairman, we are prepared to do that because we've got direction. We do not govern by polls, we govern by principle, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Koenker: — Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Mr. Premier, in the Speech from the Throne on December 3, you announced the establishment of a potash institute. Where is that institute now?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — The potash institute, Mr. Chairman, was announced that it would be built and located in the province of Saskatchewan in the city of Saskatoon. It is the appropriate place for it because we are the potash capital of North America and indeed in the free world, and supply about 80 per cent of the potash, in fact, to the United States. So the Canpotex is headquartered there for world-wide marketing arms. The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and the potash institute will be right therein the critical mass of expertise that is necessary for domestic mining and international sales.

Mr. Koenker: — Where is the potash institute in Saskatoon, sir?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — We'll get you the address for the potash and potash and phosphates institute that is in Saskatoon. I don't have the address but we'll provide it to you.

Mr. Koenker: — Sir, where is the potash institute you announced would be established in the Speech from the Throne?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I said that the potash and phosphate institute is there now and there will be expansions associated with a world-wide potash institute. We have made the changes with respect to

Canpotex coming here and setting up its head office; the potash and phosphate institute coming here for research. And we're setting up a larger potash institute which builds on that critical mass.

You would say to me, well, Mr. Premier, where is the new College of Agriculture building? We've allocated the money to build it, the plans are there, the architects are doing the things, but I can't show you the building yet. But obviously you said the same thing about, well, where's the upgrade in Regina? Where's the paper mill in P.A.? Same story, go ask your friends from P.A. They said, well, Mr. Premier, where's the paper mill? right? That's what you were saying all during the election. Well the paper mill is now being built and you see it going up.

You will see in Saskatoon, I mean you can watch, the fact that there will be a potash institute, because I said there's going to be one and there will be one.

Mr. Koenker: — Sir, when do you expect this potash institute to be built? Can we expect it to commence, construction to commence, within the next year?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — I can only say to the hon. member, in the near future.

Mr. Koenker: — Well, sir, it's been, with all respect, it's been a year since you announced the establishment of that institute — just a month under a year. I don't think that is the very near future. People have waited almost a year now for it. They're anxious to know when it will be established, when construction of this building will begin.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I know this is the hon. member's first term in the legislature, and I don't know who got to him in terms of getting him to run for the NDP, but he should go back and look at the history of promises undelivered by your colleagues. I mean the Meridian bridge was offered, I think, five or six . . .

The member from Quill Lakes, Mr. Chairman, has finally woke up again. We should send him another cup of coffee, because every once in a while he jumps up.

The NDP have a litany of promises that they have not delivered on, undelivered. You take the Meridian bridge —how many years did you . . . How many years . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. I've asked members to allow the member on his feet to make his comments. Everybody in the committee gets an opportunity, so I would ask members . . . Order. Order. I would ask members to allow the member that has the floor to make his comments.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member asks me about the timing of a new facility. I could say, the Potash & Phosphate Institute (of Canada) is 704 CN Towers. The phone number is 652-3537.

Now we are going to be expanding the potash institute to make it a world-wide research . . . with some research capacity. And we have already got the phosphate institute that is there, the potash and phosphate institute, plus Canpotex. I say to the hon. member: look, when we say

we're going to build an agriculture college, or we're going to build a co-op upgrader or we're going to build a new bacon plant, we have built them — or the paper mill, and he knows that.

I just remind the hon. member when he starts to look at the NDP record of building, they didn't build one potash mine, they didn't build one pulp mill, they didn't build one packing plant and they didn't build one upgrader. They promised the Borden bridge for election after election and the Meridian bridge election after election; the P.A. technical school, I don't know how many elections they promised that, and they didn't build them. So, you know, before you get a little too sanctimonious, I mean . . .

Even if you had built one mine, one new mine, but you didn't even build one. And you're asking me about a potash and phosphate institute that has moved there since we're here — we brought it here, and we're going to expand it. I mean, how can you expect me to accept the criticisms that we're not building when you've never seen so much building.

Three weeks ago the Market Place of the *Leader-Post* had to say: a building boom going on in Regina, for Heaven's sake. We've got a new trade and conference centre, we've got the upgrader being built, we've got a rehabilitation centre. I mean, tremendous economic activity.

So, Mr. Chairman, I just point out that the Potash & Phosphate Institute (of Canada) is at 704 CN Towers in Saskatoon and we are going to . . . the phone number is 652-3535, for the hon. member.

Mr. Koenker: — Sir, where might I find the budgetary allocation for the expansion that you are going to be doing in association with making this institute a world-wide institute? Where is there provision for that in the budget? I am new to the legislation and I'd appreciate it if you could detail that for me.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, we have people . . . and I know that you expect government to run everything, and why you supported the unilateral purchase of the potash mines by government. You didn't call an election to do that, you just bought all those mines. Let's put that on the record.

Secondly, the private sector would like to invest in a research institute, in potash, that would give us expertise and the critical mass of that expertise to be associated with Canpotex, with the university, with engineering and the world-wide marketing of fertilizer here. And the private sector is interested in doing that.

I mean, the private sector developed North America. People built the farms, built businesses and everything, and you keep going back and saying, well what about government? Well government wasn't here. Government facilitated in allowing people to come into this country to build.

So I mean, there are a large number of people involved in the potash industry and the fertilizer industry in the

private sector, and they are very excited about the possibility of a research institution and a potash institution that they could allocate funds for research in China on productivity and looking at the whole question of fertilizer demand and growth for years and years to come.

Mr. Koenker: — Sir, in this same Speech from the Throne, you announced the establishment of a biotechnology institute. I'm wondering if you could tell me where that biotechnology institute is.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, the biotech institute is being planned for the University of Saskatoon, and it is to be fitted into the research critical mass that is there among specialists. And we are consulting with the western diversification thrust by the federal government and our own educational thrust, plus the research and technology in high tech, and putting together the best package that is possible for the University of Saskatchewan and the private sector and others that are doing high-tech research.

As you know, we are moving more and more towards an information-based economy and a technology-based economy. And the biotechnology research that is going on now at the U. of S. is some of the best in Canada, and certainly some of the best in western Canada. And we are accessing as many federal funds and provincial funds and private sector funds to knit them together with what the university is doing now, and particularly in agriculture and in biology, and in the combination of new tech, biotech, and the combination of things that we're doing there. So I would say that it's the U. of S. A combination of funds are being accessed, which is local, provincial, private sector and federal.

Mr. Koenker: — Sir, when will we see the establishment of this institute in terms of it actually beginning to become operative. It was announced on December 3. We sit here today on November 4 — almost a year later. When will we see the operative establishment of this biotech institute on the U. of S. campus?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, the Science and Technology officials tell me that it will be up and running in 1988, which is next year, and I believe that that's about on track and about on schedule, with respect to research institutions that you put together when you're accessing various kinds of funds — private, public, provincial and federal.

Mr. Koenker: — And, sir, where might I find indications of government funding for this institute at the U. of S.?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well we are in the process of accessing all sorts of money, and we are negotiating and working with various kinds of alternatives with the university money, private sector money, federal money, and provincial money. And depending on how much private money we may have, and how much federal money we have, and the priorities of the university, then we will know, at that time, the allocation of money in 1988 towards this institute.

So it's a combination of things. Put it this way, if we don't

have to fund it all ourselves, there is some incentive, and I'm sure you would agree, to get the private sector and municipalities or the university and its sources of funds, because it fits what they're doing in their biotech research, and the federal government, to get as much money from all these players as possible before we just jump up and down and say we have a 100 per cent funding for any particular project.

(1130)

Mr. Koenker: — Well sir, you jumped up and down last December talking about the creation of this institute. At that point, from what I understand now, you had no fiscal provision for it. I'm wondering how you can announce the establishment of a biotech institute at the U of S campus and have no fiscal provision in your own budget for it.

How do you know, in fact, that the private sector or the federal sector is going to participate and to what extent they're going to participate in this venture unless you, yourself, have made a commitment in terms of the budgetary allocations for the opening of this project in '88? And I'd like to know where provision for those allocations are indicated in the budget that you're responsible for?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well I know this is your first term in the legislature, but let me give another example. We announced that we were going to build an upgrader with the Co-op Refinery and the federal government. Co-op Refinery, federal government, provincial government agrees we're going to build a new upgrader right here in Regina — the biggest project in the history of Saskatchewan.

And it wasn't in our budget, wasn't in our budget. And it's going to be class of the world, world-class in terms of some of the finest . . . and if the NDP missed it, it was right in front of their nose. It's in Regina North West, and the member from Regina North West pooh-poohs it every day. He doesn't like it. He didn't build it . . .

An Hon. Member: — North East.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — North East, that's right, I'm sorry.

Now we announced that project, Mr. Chairman . . . Mr. Chairman, look it, when I talk about a project that they missed, because they are too busy buying rather than building, they have to chirp from their seat.

Let me just say to the hon. member, let me say to the hon. member, that when we announced building the upgrader it wasn't in the budget. We said we are going to build it — we've cut an agreement in principle with the federal government and Co-op refinery, and we're going to build that. And we just finalized the financing. It was a month or two months ago, all the financing came together, and we signed and had all the bankers and all this done.

Now we're going to have a new research institute in Saskatoon, and there will be some provincial money and hopefully some private money and federal money and other sources of money. And you will see it happen.

Now when its done, I hope you stand in your place and say, thank you, Mr. Premier, for the new biotech institute, and thank you for the new agriculture college, and thank you for the new biotech . . . or geological sciences building, and thank you for New City Hospital, and thank you for the expansion, University Hospital and St. Paul's Hospital, the new cancer facilities. Okay. You ask, we will tell you, and we will deliver them. And you can check them off — one, two, three, four, five.

And then you look back at the NDP's record and say, well it's pretty flat — pretty flat in the '70s and '80s in Saskatoon. What did they build? You know, they nationalized the potash industry, and that's about the size of it.

Mr. Koenker: — Sir, on December 3 of last year in the Speech from the Throne, you announced the creation of a grains institute, a Saskatchewan grains institute. Where is that institute?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, that institute is going through exactly the same process of federal and provincial and private in negotiation with people involved in the industry and putting it together.

An Hon. Member: — How far are you along in plans?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — How far are we along in plans on the upgrader and the paper mill? I mean the same thing they go through this. They want to frighten people and say, Grant Devine would never build a paper mill or an upgrade. And we build them, Mr. Chairman, we build them just as sure as you can stand here.

So let him rest assured that the grain institute will be in place, Mr. Chairman, and we're going to get funds from the private . . . They don't know how to get funds from the private sector because the private sector doesn't support socialists, but we get funds from the private sector. We even get funds for a new agriculture college from the private sector, and we're glad that can happen. And I suspect we'll get private sector funds for the grains institute, and that's why we're taking that process and that mechanism, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Koenker: — Sir, on December 3 of last year in the Speech from the Throne, you announced the creation of a uranium institute. Where is that uranium institute?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, yesterday the Minister of Tourism announced the formation of an advisory body with respect to tourism because we've set up this new private sector tourism organization. And that's precisely . . . he talked to the community, he talked to individuals, and he said, yes, that's the way to do it.

We are consulting with the uranium industry and with the private sector on what they want the institute to look like, and we will set up the appropriate institutions after we consult with people. And that's exactly what you would expect, because if we don't consult, you're asking me to go around the province and say, would you talk to the people that matter. When I don't talk to them you say, oh, he's just doing it because he's running it by himself; and

when I do talk to them, you say, well he's taking too much time. Well you can't have it both ways. We are setting them up in consultation and co-operation with the private sector.

Mr. Solomon: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I've listened this morning for an hour and a half at the Premier's comments about respect and how members of this Assembly should have some respect with regards to democracy, and respect with regards to elected officials. And what the Premier seems to disregard is that people respect each other and people respect, in particular politicians, because of certain elements. They respect them because they have some integrity. They respect us because we have some honesty. They respect us and other politicians because there's some consistency about them. And they respect us because there's some element of truth to what we say and do.

And, Mr. Chairman, what the Premier has been doing over the last number of years has been attacking all of those elements and breaking them apart, and showing very clearly to the people of this province, as a result of his actions, that they have no respect for the Premier and this government. Because they have in every case failed to establish some integrity, failed to establish some honesty and some credibility, and they've never been consistent about anything — in particular, the truth.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Solomon: — The Premier talked about promises made and promises broken. Well I can remind the people of this province, and I remind the members of this Assembly, that in 1971 the *New Deal for People* was issued from the New Democratic Party. It was a blueprint for what the government of the New Democratic Party would do in the first four years of government. In that *New Deal for People* there were 139 commitments to the people of this province, and in four years 134 of those commitments were carried out. That's 96 . . . 96 per cent, 96 per cent completion of promises made. In four years, Mr. Chairman, 96 per cent of all the commitments made of this party were finalized and carried out by the government of the NDP from '71 to '75.

From 1975, Mr. Chairman, to 1978, there was another, another blueprint for a government of this province. The NDP issued a *New Deal for People* . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Order. Allow the member that has the floor to make his comments. Anyone can get into the debate in Committee of Finance, so allow the member for Regina North West to make his comment.

Mr. Solomon: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In 1975 the NDP, being a government of their word, issued another program, a blueprint for the next four years for this province. And the *New Deal for People*, Mk. 2, provided 83 promises, and in three and a half short years carried out almost every single one of them except for two or three, and there were some good reasons for that because the term was shorter.

And, Mr. Chairman, what we have here is perhaps a glaring comparison between what the NDP has made in

terms of commitments on a provincial scale, from the provincial party, to deliver in terms of a provincial program for the people of this province, and what the Conservatives have made commitments on.

And I'll go on and get to that point in a minute. But I want to just underline some of the comments I made with respect to integrity and honesty and consistency and truth and credibility. Newspaper article appeared last week in the *Leader-Post*, and it quoted the Premier as saying:

We are going to shut this House down because the opposition is taking too much time speaking about all kinds of issues except the issues of the province.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is we have on every occasion in question period asked questions of this government, and on every occasion they have refused to answer. In estimates we have raised questions after questions about where their promises are and other matters relating to the people of this province, and in every instance they have not responded with anything, let alone the truth.

And what they're saying, what the Premier is saying, Mr. Chairman, is that the opposition is wasting time. Four months after the June 17 budget, after they launched the largest tax increase at a provincial level in the history of this province, four months after that budget, they tabled the gas tax Bill — four months.

Last week we had over 40 Bills tabled in this legislature — 40 Bills — after the 100th day of sitting. Who's kidding who? Who lacks credibility in this province? Is it the opposition? I don't believe so. Is it the Premier and that government? Absolutely. Everybody in this province are laughing at that government.

Another example of lack of credibility. On June 13, 1987, *Leader-Post*, the Premier says at a public meeting that the deficit for the coming year will likely be \$1 billion. The Premier of this province, eight short days before the budget was introduced in this Assembly, said the deficit will be \$1 billion. Eight days later, what is the deficit? — \$577 million. Now that's only 100 per cent off the mark. His Minister of Finance, the previous year, was over 200 per cent off the mark.

Now what kind of respect can people have for individuals and politicians like this, and particularly the Premier and the Tory government when they say one thing eight days prior to the budget, and they're 100 per cent off the mark eight days later? Is that credibility? Does that demand respect from anybody, let alone the people of this province?

Well I want to talk about some of the mismanagement and some of these promises and some of the misleading statements that the Premier has made. I have here, with the Premier's picture on it, a photocopy of one of his campaign commitments, a photocopy of a leaflet that he distributed to every household in the constituency of Estevan. And he says here, "A PC government will eliminate the 5 per cent sales tax." That it will be all gone; that we will eliminate the 5 per cent sales tax.

Well I'd like to ask the Premier, when is he going to do this? It's now been five years. The E & H 5 per cent tax has not been decreased. It has not been eliminated. It's been increased from 5 per cent to 7 per cent — a 40 per cent tax increase.

Cabinet colleague after cabinet colleague, the member from Kelsey-Tisdale says there will be a 10 per cent decrease in the personal income tax rate — a 10 per cent decrease in the personal income tax rate. We've seen the implementation not only of a decrease but an increase of a new tax, a flat tax. We now have two taxes in this province. But the total increase of taxes on personal and individual tax filers in this province . . . since 1982 there's been a 47 per cent increase in personal income tax. Is that integrity? Is that honesty? Is that truth? Absolutely not; there's no credibility.

Minister after minister, the member from Kindersley, the former minister of Finance, promises that he will eliminate the 5 per cent sales tax, that he'll eliminate the gasoline tax when they become government. In May of 1982 when the Premier stood outside this very building and announced the elimination of the gas tax, he said to the people of this province on province-wide television, as long as there's a Conservative government we will never reimpose the gas tax — we will never reimpose the gas tax. This guy, this Premier, here, Mr. Chairman, has given a new meaning to the definition of "never." Has he misled the public? Has he misled the people of this province? Absolutely!

The member from Maple Creek makes the same tax commitments. The member from Melfort, all cabinet members, provides the same commitment — the 10 per cent reduction in personal income tax, elimination of the E & H tax, the doing away with the gas tax. We've seen a 42 per cent increase in hidden taxes since 1982.

(1145)

And I could go on with all of the members in the Conservative front benches and back benches who made these commitments, but it's a matter of integrity and truth and honesty.

We've seen commitments from this government, and the Premier in particular, that we've got to do away with red tape. With the reimposing of the gas tax and an increasing of the gas tax from 6 cents a litre to 7 cents a litre, which is from 28 cents a gallon to 32 cents a gallon, we see the Premier again being a little off the mark when it comes to the truth. He says one thing when he's in opposition, and he does the opposite. With the gas tax we've seen the most horrendous red tape nightmare in the history of government, not in this province, not in this country, but in the history of government. He has now included 65 per cent more of the total population of this province into some red tape bureaucratic nightmare.

This is a man who is demanding respect for this institution and for politicians when he is the architect, when this Premier is the architect of misleading, double-crossing statements and untruths that cannot be compared in any other legislature in this country.

He talks about respect. I have here in the newspaper the *Grainews*, October 5 edition. The *Grainews* is a cattleman's corner newspaper, not an NDP newspaper. And they say here in this article, it says, "Boob of the month." And I'd like to quote from this article, and I quote, Mr. Chairman:

Lately our Saskatchewan Premier, Grant Devine, has been acting like a farmer who's going broke and gradually sliding downhill towards the poor house.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Order. Order. Members have been cautioned before about using member's names. Order. Order. The Speaker has ruled on this, from the Speaker's Chair. Order. The member for Regina North West.

Mr. Solomon: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your advice. In this article, I quote:

Lately our Saskatchewan Premier has been acting like a farmer who is going broke and gradually sliding downhill towards the poor house. He began by selling off assets he felt were no longer needed, such as timber rights in northern Saskatchewan and highway equipment.

They didn't bring much but it was better than nothing. It sounds like he is still trying to get rid of more property. We hear about the possible sale of pieces from SaskTel and Saskatchewan Government Insurance. Rental rates on remaining assets have been pushed as high as possible. People have to pay more to use provincial parks and fire departments if they live outside a town or village.

And it goes on and on. I'll skip over some of the more nastier comments they are making about the "Boob of the month," the Premier of this province. And I go on. It says:

On assets not yet sold or up for sale the Premier has been trying to shove inventory costs on to the taxpayer. The new drug plan is a really good example. Now, we have to carry the costs of drugs for (one or) two or three months before being reimbursed. On fuel bought at the pumps the principle is the same.

It all reminds me of a farmer in a panic, trying to do everything possible to save the farm and not having much luck. Had he been a little more careful when land and equipment prices were at a peak, there would be no need to act so desperately now.

(And) we aren't finished yet (the article says). What is he going to do next year for an encore? One morning, we will wake up to see highway workers picking bottles in the ditch to earn their own living (and in this case cans).

And this was written before the so-called free trade deal, that will devastate our economy in this country, that the

Premier supports. It was written before Bill 34 and a number of other Bills that we'll be opposing in this Assembly.

But, Mr. Chairman, the Premier got up in this House and he called members of the opposition hypocrites. He called us hypocrites, which by the way I think is unparliamentary. But with his Minister of Finance — who the Premier should know couldn't answer any questions about the gas tax when he was asked for an hour and one-half the other day — couldn't explain how it was going to run, or how it was going to be . . . who was going to administer it, and whether the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan records are going to be made public information to private companies. The minister couldn't answer any questions.

But with Mr. Premier here, and his Minister of Finance, and the member from Kindersley — the three of them — the member from Kindersley, the Premier, and the member from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden, they run a government like Huey, Dewey and Louie. Huey, Dewey and Louie could do better. At least they wouldn't be misleading people with all these comments.

So I ask the Premier, in view of all of these commitments that you've made, in view of these promises that you've made that I've quoted just in regards to the taxes — I could go on for another hour with the other promises you've failed to keep — but in regards to those promises and the commitments to reduce taxes in this province, how do you justify all of the tax increases we've seen to date?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, the hon. members have tried this before. I didn't promise \$2 wheat, and I didn't promise \$10 oil, and I didn't promise a drought, and I didn't promise an anti-dumping case by Americans on potash. And, Mr. Chairman, obviously we have to respond to adverse conditions as we see them. Now how could you remove all the taxes when you have your revenue, tax revenue cut by 47 per cent? It's impossible. I mean, you can't do that unless you cut expenditures by 47 per cent. It's not easy and I understand that.

But let me point out to the hon. member where it's important, where we have said we protect people against high interest rates, we have hung right in there. Where we said we'd expend much more on health, we've done that. Where we said that we would take the tax off clothes, we've done that. Where we said we'd take the tax off gasoline, and Saskatchewan residents with their driver's licence won't pay tax on gasoline, we've done that despite the economic conditions.

So increased spending in health care, new hospitals in health, new CAT scans, new additions to hospitals, new educational facilities, new agriculture college, interest rate protection, and many, many services, and it's not been easy, Mr. Chairman. In spite of economic conditions we've done that.

Now I know you've spoken that your record is impeccable but, you know, you were not successful in '64 and you weren't successful in '68 and you weren't successful in '82 or in '86 at the polls. The people didn't

believe you — they didn't believe you. They'd heard your rhetoric many, many, many times, and you said, oh well, we have this perfect record. Well the people didn't believe you. And every time, when somebody else won and you went up in the polls, you said, oh the people were wrong. And you said that. The NDP say that often, that the people are wrong. The people are never wrong.

The people are right, they elected the right government in '64 and the right government in '68 and the right government in '82 and the right government in '86. The people are always right, and in democracy only a socialist would say the people are wrong. Right? The people are always right. And they choose in a free democratic system the government that they want to protect their interest rates, to take the tax off clothes, take the tax off gasoline, to provide the kind of services that they'd like to have.

Lower income people — if I could, Mr. Chairman, let me just remind the hon. member. For a taxpayer with a total annual income of \$20,000, Mr. Chairman, Saskatchewan has the lowest overall tax bill for anybody in Canada with less than \$20,000 income. And the hon. member mentions income tax, I mean, we look at, in terms of tax credits and rebates, health care premiums, retail sales tax, gasoline tax, total taxes, car insurance, telephone, home heating and electricity, and Saskatchewan is the lowest taxed province of any in Canada for people with \$20,000 annual income.

An Hon. Member: — That's not true.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well it's right here. All right, for taxpayers under . . . with 35,000 — with 35,000, Saskatchewan has the lowest overall tax bill for middle-income families, Mr. Chairman. And if I could go down through it, with all the taxes, taxes and rebates, health care premiums, retail sales tax, gasoline taxes, car insurance, telephone, home heating, electrical charges, Saskatchewan has the lowest income tax and total tax base, taxes paid, of any place in Canada if you're making \$35,000 or less, and the lowest was \$20,000.

Well we can go back, Mr. Chairman, and point out that we have provided for the lowest income tax, or the lowest tax take in Canada, under very difficult times. Our tax revenues are down 47 per cent and we still have the lowest tax take any place in Canada, and the record speaks for itself. And if you want to look at premiums and sales tax on clothes and various kinds of other payroll tax that you have in Manitoba, and twice as much flat tax as they might have in Manitoba, and all kinds of other things under NDP administrations, higher taxation, the low income . . . Senior citizens in this province are better off than any other province in Canada. They get \$500 for individual senior citizens. They don't pay tax on clothes. They don't have to have extra billing. They don't pay health care premiums.

Mr. Chairman, all those things are there, and the hon. member stands up and says, you didn't cut income tax. We cut income tax for low-income people far greater than 20 per cent. Go look at the record. And we taxed those on high income. Those that have high income tax, we charged a little bit more, and those that were low income, we reduced the taxes.

And you look at the poor that had to pay sales tax on things. We cut that out altogether. And if you look at those on low income, Mr. Chairman, obviously they are the lowest taxed in Canada, under \$20,000 and under \$35,000.

So I would let the tax record stand, regardless of the hon. member's observations with respect to, did you cut income tax? Yes, we did, particularly for those on low income.

Mr. Solomon: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the Premier stands up in this House and he reads from some kind of a briefing note that he has and he says, believe me, I have credibility, believe me. This is something I'm reading from a piece of paper; it should be right.

Well I'll read something from a piece of paper that I have here. He says they're going to eliminate the 5 per cent sales tax. The Premier, in the riding of Estevan, his ministers, the member from Kelsey-Tisdale says you'd make a 10 per cent decrease in personal income tax across the board. And on and on. You can mention all the ministers. The Leader of the Conservative Party signs a personal guarantee to do away and abolish the unfair deterrent fees on prescription drugs. And his signature is here — the Leader of the Conservative Party.

What have we seen? We've seen an increase not only from the \$3 implementation fee, the fee for filing a prescription, but we've seen a clear example of dishonesty where the prescription drug plan is costing individuals a heck of a lot more than the modest little fees that they used to purchase drugs in the first place.

So how can we accept his argument that what he's saying is true? This provincial budget, Mr. Chairman, was the largest tax grab in the history of this province. For a family of four it was \$1,000 in net provincial taxes increased. A thousand dollars!

Since 1982 you've increased provincial taxes on a family of four to almost \$2,200. That's a decrease? I can't seem to figure it out on my calculator. Maybe your calculator, whatever you hit it, only has a negative.

An Hon. Member: — Just a deduct.

Mr. Solomon: — Just a deduct, as the House Leader from Riversdale says.

But I think, Mr. Chairman, people in this province would not be as upset about these tax increases if the money was used to create jobs, if the money was injected into the economy, and providing for a decent opportunity for young people and others in this province to work.

But this money has been watered away. They spend money like water. They have no management controls. They mismanage like crazy. And I think the people of this province are very upset with what they've seen.

The Premier was right. I must concede, on one item. He said, when the voters make their decision that they are always right. And in 1982 I can say, and I believe this

personally, that they were right, that they voted Conservative because they believe all of these promises that were being made in writing — eliminate the 5 per cent tax, do away with the gas tax, cut personal income tax by 10 per cent, free phones, you name it, all the things . . . But the people of this province, Mr. Chairman, have been misled. They have been misled by a Premier who begs for some kind of respect, who stands up in this House and demands respect from the people of this province. But he's the man that has been the architect of breaking down respect people have for politicians.

And I have more questions to ask the Premier, and I'll get back to that later, Mr. Chairman.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly recessed until 2 p.m.