

April 4, 1989

EVENING SITTING

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTION FOR COMMITTEE OF FINANCE
(BUDGET DEBATE)

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Lane that the Assembly resolve itself into the Committee of Finance.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Before adjournment for supper I was making a few remarks, and I had followed, just to refresh the members on the other side, the member from Redberry and his remarks regarding his analysis of this particular budget speech, which he spoke of in very glowing terms.

He spoke of this budget as being one that has the deficit under control. He spoke of how the people in the Redberry constituency are in total acceptance, and feel so very comfortable with the administration of this Premier and of this government on this side.

And I, on the other hand, in my remarks before supper, was indicating to the member that not all people in Saskatchewan have the feelings towards this government, and can stand up and speak in the glowing terms of this divine administration. And I am not referring to the Premier by name; it was . . .

The Speaker: — Divine administration sounds very much like the Premier's name. I'd just like to bring that to the attention of the member.

Mr. Lautermilch: — I understand, Mr. Speaker. I would perhaps then spell it d-i-v-i-n-e. But at any rate, there is a difference of how people perceive this particular government and this administration, and tonight, in the course of my remarks, I would like to explain, on behalf of those who no longer believe that this government is sincere in delivering honest and fair government to this province, I would like to deliver their feelings to this House.

When we look at the promises that this administration made in 1982 and what has in actual fact happened, we find two totally separate and different pictures. I recall the open-for-business slogan that we no longer hear because people simply don't believe that. I . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . and it didn't work, as my colleague says. I recall the open-for-business slogan that people no longer believe because it didn't work.

And I recall many of the one-liners, the business-like government that was to be delivered by members opposite. I recall the Premier, the then aspiring premier, indicating that they were inviting all of the young people back to Saskatchewan. I recall all of those one-liners, and I also know that people no longer believe that this government can deliver, if they even have the intention to deliver on those promises.

I can recall, Mr. Speaker, the promise of fiscal management that would bring this province into a new era, a new era of prosperity. I can recall this government, this party talking about how their party was going to deliver a small, efficient, effective government on behalf of these people. And I also recall the term, there is so much more we can be.

Well I guess since 1982 we've had a chance to see this government's vision of how much more we can be. We've had a chance to see how much longer we can be unemployed, we've had a chance to see how many businesses can be closing their doors, we've had a chance to see how much young people can pay in order to get a post-secondary education. We've had a chance to see how young people have had to leave this province in order to get a job. And we've had a chance to see how working men and women of this province, who used to have a reasonable level of income, have had to survive on the \$4.50 an hour minimum wage society that this government seems bent on delivering. We've had a chance to see hundreds of our farmers forced off of their land. We've had a chance to see their young families, who no longer have a hope that there is a future for them in agriculture, we've seen these young people leave Saskatchewan. We've seen 6,000 people leave Saskatchewan in February of this year, Mr. Speaker. We've seen what this government is all about.

The people of this province no longer believe in the pipe-dreams and what was to be the vision of so much more we can be and open for business. That's all gone, Mr. Speaker. No longer do people believe a Premier, a cabinet, and a caucus, a government, that has been deceitful, that has been totally betraying their promises of that particular time of the 1982 era. People now understand what the agenda of this PC government is. It's an agenda of destruction. It's an agenda of betrayal. It's an agenda that is taking this province apart piece by piece. They've deceived us in terms of the economic management and the way they've promised to balance budgets and put more money into the hands of people. They've betrayed us on that. They've betrayed us when they told us that they could manage this province, and that there was room for everyone in this province to make a reasonable standard of living. In all of these things they've betrayed us.

They used to talk to the small-business people in glowing terms, suggesting that this government, this party, is friends of small business. But small business understands who their real friends are. Small business understands that unless you're a Peter Pocklington, or unless you're a card carrying member of that particular party that governs, that you don't exist for these people.

And they're asking questions, and they want to know what it takes to qualify to be one of the friends of this government. They want to know how long you have to carry your PC membership card. They want to know how closely connected you have to be to one particular cabinet minister or the other. Those are the kinds of questions they're asking now.

They're no longer asking, what kind of opportunities are

there going to be for me in terms of tendering on this particular contract or other. The question they're asking now is, how much do I have to put in a paper bag and deliver to some unknown name in order to get a contract? Those are the questions. Those are the questions that the business community are asking now.

And a member across said, that's really low. Well I want to tell you that the business people that I talk to figure it's really low as well. Because what they're asking for is a fair opportunity to tender and to bid on any government expenditure or anything involved with this government. But they don't see that. And I say to you that there's a feeling of discontent out there; I would go as far as to say anger, but mostly there's a feeling of distrust.

And there's another understanding that I think is happening in Saskatchewan — the business community, and the working people. There's an understanding that our economy can't function when you're putting all your eggs in one basket.

There's an understanding, I believe, that you can't develop a sound and a solid economy in Saskatchewan when you've destroyed the middle-income people; when you've put minimum wage workers in the position where all they can afford is a roof over their head in some cases, and groceries to feed their family. There's an understanding that you can't have a buoyant economy in Saskatchewan without a middle class. And that's what this government has been attacking.

And, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe any longer — I may have at one time — that it happened by accident. But I no longer believe that. I believe this is an agenda that maybe not even members on that side of the House understand. Because I don't even believe that they understand who's in control of this government any longer.

I don't believe that they have the feeling that I do, that it's people from the Fraser Institute who are dictating how this government operates, and the kinds of programs that this government delivers. It's an agenda that's been imported from the Maggie Thatcher government in Great Britain and the Fraser Institute and the Ronald Reagans. That's what this government's about.

It's no longer about governing for Saskatchewan people by Saskatchewan people. It's a right wing agenda that is leading this province on a very slippery slope, that I believe the people of the province will be stopping when they get a chance, come the next election.

I talked about what was happening in sort of the global sense, to the people of this province. And in the course of my remarks tonight, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in a little more detail in terms of what that means to small business; in terms of what it means to Saskatchewan families; in terms of what it means to the future of this province. And I said before that I'm not sure that small business in Saskatchewan feels that there's a place for them — and I believe that to be the case — and I'm not sure that average men and women in this province who've worked for decades in Saskatchewan, on Saskatchewan projects, any longer feel that there's a place for them in Saskatchewan, either. And they're

worried, Mr. Speaker, about the future.

Let me talk a bit about the future and what's been happening with the future, not only in this budget but in every budget that this government has delivered since 1982. Not one time, not one budget, that this PC government has delivered in this province, have their expenses been equal to their revenue. They've always been a little bit more. They started with about a quarter of a billion dollars — the first budget — and I want to talk a little bit about how that happened. How did that first deficit happen? This government campaigned in 1982 — and I would suggest that that was one of the major reasons it was elected — on the removal of the gas tax in Saskatchewan, and as I recall that figure was around some \$140 million directly into the government's coffers. Well I also recall the Premier standing up after he was elected and he wiped that gas tax out the day he was elected or a couple of days later. And what did this Premier tell us? He told us that never again, as long as there's a PC government in Saskatchewan, will the people of this province be subjected to a gas tax.

(1915)

Well now what's happened since then? Now what's happened to this Premier's thinking, to his feelings in terms of that gas tax; the strong feelings he had in terms of removing that gas tax? Let's have a look at what's happened.

In this year's budget, I see on the revenue side, under fuel, \$204,000,100 expected in revenue — estimated revenue. Well, now we're not talking 140 million; we're talking 204 million — but what changed? What's changed? This from the same Premier who was determined he could rid himself of the gas tax, rid the people of this province of the gas tax. He could go down to New York, indicate to financial people in the international banking system that Saskatchewan was such a wealthy place, such a healthy economy, such a great place that you could mismanage the place — which he has done — and you could still break even.

That's why, Mr. Speaker, the people of this province no longer believe in what this government has done. That's why, Mr. Speaker, the people don't trust this government any longer.

They inherited in 1981-82 a surplus of \$139 million. Elected in '82. First deficit they bring in, how much was it? It was \$227 million. But they didn't stop there — no, no. There was so much more we could be. Well what could we be? We could be more in debt. And this Premier has got a track record of proving that second to any government in North America: the fastest growing debt; the most farm foreclosures; the most businesses closed down in the history of this province; the most decent province's programs scrapped; and the more people leaving this province than ever before. The PC government of the 1930s can't even compare with what this Premier has done.

But we were talking about his deficit. So '82-83, what did he have? Well \$227 million he spent more than he took in. Well that wasn't enough, so he tried again a little

harder; '83-84, he said, we can do better. There's a lot more we can be — there's so much more we can be. We can be further in debt. So he laid on another \$331 million. But he wasn't to be stopped there, because this is the Premier that says, never say whoa in a mud hole, and he didn't. He's got us in a mud hole that is longer and deeper than the people of this province ever dreamt or ever hoped it would be. In '84-85, this overexpenditure came to 379 million — not enough, not for this Premier, not for the Minister of Education, not for the Minister of Highways. No, no. Never mind that we don't know how to gain the revenue, how to bring the revenue into this province. We know how to spend, that's what we know.

An Hon. Member: — Free trade, that's the answer.

Mr. Lautermilch: — And one member across says, free trade — sure, free trade. Saskatchewan people, Mr. Minister, know where you guys are at. I still want to explain just exactly what this Premier has done in terms of the deficit — 379 wasn't enough, so the next year he brought in a deficit of 584 million.

Well now I haven't added any of this up yet, but I will. I will, it'll come. But '84-85 — or '85-86, 584 million for that particular year, we've spent more than we've made. But ah, election year, the Minister of Finance, the same minister that's delivered this budget that we're looking at now, the budget that he tells us is going to be a deficit of \$226 million — which isn't the truth, by the way — in '86, election year, tells us it's going to be 389 million. He's bringing the deficit down from 584.

Well we have our election. People still had some faith in this Finance minister and in this Premier. But what did it end up being? Mr. Speaker, the deficit in '86-87 election year was \$1.235 billion. Now how much was he out? Only 800 million, you may say. Well, now this business-like government that my business colleagues look upon with a little bit of disdain . . .

An Hon. Member: — Aghast.

Mr. Lautermilch: — . . . are aghast at what's happened, my colleague from Rosemont says, and that's exactly what's happened. But they're not done; '87-88 they project \$328 million in deficits.

But now we come to this year. We come to the same Finance minister who has misled, consistently, the people of this province. And all his colleagues over there speak glowingly in terms of the way he's . . . the ability he has to give financial direction to the people of this province and to this government.

And he tells us the other day that, by golly, he's got spending under control, and we are projecting a deficit in this province of only \$226 million. What he's done is projected the same amount that he started with in 1982-83. So what he's done is he's just about come full circle. He's gone from 227 million deficit to 1.2 billion, and now he's predicting down to 226. But do you believe him?

An Hon. Member: — That's pot-belly curve.

Mr. Lautermilch: — My colleague from The Battlefords says it's a pot-belly curve, and it is. And I'd like to be able to show you this, but we can't use graphics in this House.

What I can do, Mr. Speaker, I can look through his book of *Estimates* and I can tell you, as anybody who can read numbers can tell you, that the \$226 million that he's projecting in terms of this year's deficit is nothing but an absolute unmitigated falsehood, another one perpetrated by this same Finance minister and the same Premier who misled us in 1986, and let me tell you why.

On page 10 of the estimate book you'll find a little item here — it's a 2 and there's a whole bunch of zeros behind it. Like a whole bunch of zeros, like \$200 million. And in front of that it says Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan, and that's under budgetary revenue. Well now, I say to this Finance minister, that's quite an initiative. You find \$200 million in revenue, you put it on the revenue side of your budget, and you balance that with your expenditures and yes, indeed, it comes to a deficit of \$226 million. But what, Mr. Finance Minister, about the 200 million that you brought in from Crown corporations? Where does that come from? And where does that money come from and why is it there? And how can you then say when you borrow 200 million and put it into revenue under the guise of an investment for Crown Investments Corporation, can you still then stand before the people of this province and say that your projected deficit is only \$226 million?

I would suggest to you that there is some numerical wizardry going on over there. It may be called creative financing, it may be called deception, and there are other terms that I can't use in this House, and you can call them all of those. But there's more, there's more. There's projected income here, and I'm going to talk about this in the course of my remarks tonight as well.

The federal government is about to bring down a new budget. And when I look on the revenue side of this budget, this government tells us that through equalization payments this year they're going to bring in \$440 million as a gift from the federal government — equalization payments. Equalization payments are payments that go to provinces that are deemed to be have-not provinces, for whatever reasons.

Now, Saskatchewan . . . That is relatively new to us. We've had it for the last couple of years, but certainly not under a New Democrat administration because we didn't need them. But under this government we need equalization payments.

Now this same Prime Minister, the friend of the Premier, is talking about cut-backs to his budget because, you see, the right wing Liberal and Tory governments in Ottawa have had the same expenditure problems that this government has been having since 1982, in that they know how to spend, but they don't know how to raise the money. So he's got to cut back on his expenditures.

Now we ask: has this government had any guarantees that those equalization payments aren't going to be cut back? The answer is no. We've asked if there is going to be money in the federal-provincial cost-share agreements

in terms of forestry and northern economic development. And the answer is no, they don't know. But, ah, they can come up with a figure, and the figure happens to be more than what was projected for last year.

Now in light of the fact that the federal government is talking about cutting their deficit and their expenditures, this government can budget for an increase. And now I wonder, when those actual dollars start flowing into this province, and if we were to find out that in fact there isn't as many dollars as what this Finance minister is projecting, what will be the excuse? Will there be an explanation that because this government's run this province into money, we've had to depend on the federal government to balance our budgets, and because of their cut-backs, we can't balance?

An Hon. Member: — That sentence doesn't make sense.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Well neither does your budgeting. He says the sentence doesn't make sense. Well let me take it through step by step. This Finance minister, through equalization payments, budgets \$400 million for this year. The federal government says that they don't have the money; they're going to be cutting back, Mr. Education Minister. And that's probably . . . You're one of the reasons we've got this kind of problem, because you can't understand. You've got no guarantee that there's going to be an increase of equalization payments from last year to this year.

So the next step will be . . . The excuse for an increased deficit will be because of revenue-sharing cut-backs. Now if I haven't made that clear, we can talk behind the rail when I'm done my remarks, and I can take you through it dollar by dollar and line by line, and even you might be able to understand it — but I'm not convinced.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we've gone through a couple of fallacies here, and I don't want to dwell on them. But what I want to do is talk about some of the problems that the people of this province are facing because of the jiggery-pokery that these guys have been using since 1982.

So maybe we want to talk a little bit tonight about the gas tax and the effects upon the people of this province and what's been happening to the business community. And I'd like to speak a little bit about what it's costing school boards and local taxpayers at a time when school boards are paring their budgets to the bone, cutting back on capital expenditures because this government hasn't been putting the revenue into those governments. They're hit again with another increase in the gas tax. Every time the school bus runs down between Lafleche and Kincaid, or between Gravelbourg and Lafleche, or between Duck Lake and Prince Albert, or between my home town Woodrow and my neighbouring town Meyronne, they're paying a little bit more. And does that money go back to the school boards in the form of a rebate? No. And the people in this province might ask how much, in fact, that's costing them. Well if you add every school board in this province and you look at the total cost in terms of this fuel tax, it's an amount of \$2.7 million a year. This 3 cents a litre increase is costing roughly \$700 million in this budget.

I would ask any one of the members opposite to go back to his riding and ask any of those school boards if they can afford their share of that. And I know what the answer is from the Prince Albert area because I've met with them. And some of the government members from that area have met with them as well and know full well they can't afford it. They've cut back the number of new school buses they've bought. They've cut back on roof repairs. They've cut back on all of those expenditures, and the minister sits back and knows full well what's going on, knows full well that the amount that this government is putting into education has been decreasing. But he's building for the year 2000 and those school boards are trying to deal with the politics of this government's cut-backs in terms of the funding to them.

(1930)

But what do we see in this budget? We see an increase of 3 cents a litre. What about the small-business people who don't get a rebate? We've been talking with a cab driver who last year worked . . . or indicates to us that on 246 working days, he'll end up paying an extra \$1,000 a year because of this tax. Now I want to ask you: is that the kind of government that should be delivered by people who are talking about open for business and there's so much more you can be? I say to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's not.

What about a bus company in this province that maybe runs 12 buses? Our understanding is that that's going to cost that company about \$20,000 a year. And where's it going? Is it being turned back into this economy? No, it's not. It's being turned into the companies whom this government borrowed money from in order to build that deficit, in order to feed the pockets of their friends. It's money that's coming from small-business operators so that Peter Pocklington can gain some 10 or some however many million dollars he did. It's going into the pockets of the people who picked up Manalta Coal, and it's going into the pockets of the John Remais of Saskatchewan.

But is it being moved around in this province so that we can have this economy in a buoyant state? Is it going to people, to families so that they can build new houses and get the construction industry going in this province? We've got the lowest number of housing starts, Mr. Speaker, in this province; the second lowest retail sales in this country; and it's all because we've got a government that doesn't understand — or if they understand, they don't care and they've got different priorities.

And they talk in glowing terms about how much they care for the people of this province. Well it didn't manifest itself in this budget. It didn't show; it isn't there. You've got a hypocritical throne speech which had no relation to what's really happening in this province.

I recall a couple of months ago the Premier put out a statement regarding the economy of this province, and he was speaking on how wonderful it was and how the economy was growing and how they'd been building and how they'd be diversifying. Well nobody out there sees that, Mr. Speaker. The working people don't see it, the

small-business community doesn't see it, and I'm going to tell you that those that are forced off of their family farms don't see it.

Those that are for the last time closing the door on their homes, on their home quarter, and getting into their truck with their furniture and moving to whoever knows where — maybe the city, maybe out of the province — they don't see it. They can't speak of the economy of this province in the glowing terms that the Premier does. There are a few that can, and I'll grant you that — friends of this party.

But, Mr. Speaker, this government has to understand one thing, that when you're government of a province you don't govern for a select few; you govern for all of the people. That's your mandate and that's your job.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — I said before that this budget is a piece of . . . It's been orchestrated and it's nothing but deceit. I don't know really how to explain it in very polite terms. And it's not going to cure the problems of this province.

The government's embarked upon privatization now. This is going to be solving all of our problems. They've started the privatization of SaskPower, which is a betrayal, because they promised they would never privatize the utilities. They've started the privatization of SaskTel, which is another betrayal. They promised they would never do that.

They're moving to the privatization of the potash corporation, which showed over \$100 million in profits last year. They're moving to privatize SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance). I believe they're moving to privatize the Liquor Board and the Liquor Commission, the liquor stores. And I have to ask myself why. For what reason?

We talked a few minutes ago about the \$200 million that they've taken from the Crown corporations and put into this budget in order to decrease the amount of the deficit for this year. Well I say to the Premier and to the Finance minister, you can't have it both ways. You can't have Crown corporations that generate revenues to decrease deficit budgeting — that even an incompetent government like this embarks upon — and then, at the same time, sell off that goose that's laying this golden egg.

Now which is it? Are these Crown corporations so ineffective, so inefficient, so irrelevant to the economy of this province that they're worthless? If they are, then members on that side of the House would have to explain to me how the \$200 million came into this budget for 1989-90, because, you see, I can't understand that and nor can anyone who understands what you've done. It doesn't work.

So they're moving to privatization, betraying the promise that they make never to privatize a utility company — SGI, SaskTel — we've talked about. And why? And what has been the gain by the privatization that they've embarked upon?

Well let's maybe have a look at their past record and what's really happened under privatization so far, and maybe what we can expect in the future.

One of the first moves that this government moved upon in terms of privatization was highways. Now at that time we had a Highways minister by the name of Mr. Garner. Well this government gets into power and one of the first things they did was fired 157 people. That's one of the first moves to privatization. And he was telling these people that he's giving them an opportunity to work for the private sector.

Well now all of those folks and all of their families were really quite impressed. And I don't think that it really upset them the fact that they might be asked to work in the private sector as opposed to the government — really what they wanted was work. But unemployment increases after this first move of privatization. And then after he gave these first round of employees the opportunity to work in the private sector, he decides that he might get rid of the equipment that we use to build highways in this province, so he assembled some 400 pieces of equipment from all throughout the province. I can remember there were semi-trailers driving through Prince Albert at this time, loaded with highway equipment, some of it brand-new, never used; scrapers and cats, those kinds of equipment, and they assembled these all in Saskatoon.

And instead of saying, look, we're getting out of the highway business; we're going to give the municipalities a chance to buy some equipment that they might want to upgrade to build municipal roads, they went to the United States and invited all of the large contractors in from the United States. They went to other provinces and invited all these people in and they said, hey guys, we've got a deal for you. We're embarking on one of the first privatization moves that this province has seen. We're open for business, your business, and we're going to give you a deal. In Saskatoon we've got some \$40 million worth of equipment sitting there, some of it not even used. And because, you know, you're kind of like us, you're decent folks — I mean you might not live in this province, but you don't feel, as we do, that the people of this province own this equipment, so what we're going to do is we're going to offer you a real deal.

So they held a little auction sale there and got some of their friends together with their auctioneer's hats on, and they sold it. And they sold it for \$6 million. Forty million dollars worth of equipment; two days, \$6 million is all we net.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this province clearly understand what privatization means. It's meant lost jobs, it's meant lost equity, and it's meant lost control. And as we talk about highways, maybe it might be a good idea to speak a little bit about why the Department of Highways got into the construction business. When the Department of Highways made the decision, under a New Democrat government or CCF (Canadian Commonwealth Confederation) government at the time, to get into the construction business, what they wanted to do was have an understanding of what it would cost to build a mile of

highways. And how better to do that than to be directly involved?

They wanted a window on the industry. They wanted to work together with the private sector in developing a highways network in this province that was second to anywhere — a province that's sparsely populated, large in area. And, Mr. Speaker, with the co-operation of the private sector and the public sector, the Department of Highways we were able to build one of the finest highways networks anywhere in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — But why then did this government move to privatization of the Department of Highways? Why would they give that equipment away? I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, it's totally ideological. It's not based on sound business practice, not based on common sense. It's based on a right wing philosophy. So what did we gain? Have we seen a better highway system built for less dollars? No we haven't. Have we seen our highways upgraded on a regular basis, or do we see pot-holes?

I just drove back, Mr. Speaker, from Saskatoon last night on a road that was almost beyond belief. Washboards, holes — one of our major highways that's been neglected.

And I talked about the gas tax and what it's going to be costing the people of this province. It's not just the 1,000 dollars that it's going to cost the cab driver in the increase in gas tax. It's not just what it's going to cost Saskatchewan's trucking industry for gas, driving over these pot-holed roads. It's not what it's going to cost the travelling salesman in just the increase in gas tax. It's what it's going to cost them in repairs to those vehicles.

The trucking industry in this province is taking a fairly severe beating under the hands of this government. The deregulation of their routes has meant lost opportunities for Saskatchewan people — and opportunities, I agree, for many, but certainly no type of a uniform, know-where-you're-at type industry any longer. The privatization of the highways and of the trucking industry, and the increases to the taxi-driver who spends an extra \$1,000 a year are all things that are causing mistrust in your government, Mr. Speaker.

There are so many different numbers of privatization that have been embarked upon that have been poor business deals. Manalta Coal, just as an example, had assets worth \$129 million. Well we sold that operation for \$102 million which, if you had to get rid of it in a hurry, may not have been a bad deal. But then we lend them \$89 to ensure the deal. This, Mr. Speaker, is not good business sense but another example of this government's privatization, another example of why people no longer trust you.

(1945)

They promised us that the utilities wouldn't be touched, but they have. SaskPower is being privatized. The lucrative portion, the utility portion . . . or the resource portion is being sold. We keep control of the utility

portion which is basically a costing proposition, and it's going to mean, once we lose our source of revenue for that corporation, it's going to mean higher power rates. And people have already experienced the results of that form of privatization. They see the two bills come in the mail every month, one on utilities, one on the energy portion. And they know what privatization is costing and what it's meaning to them.

But why would you want to sell it? I think it would be interesting to look back to why SaskPower is there in the first place. It was there to deliver a service. And what was that service? The service was to ensure that there would be power to rural homes and families in Saskatchewan, power to small towns, and that all would share. The people of this province would share in developing a first-class service for all of the people of the province. And the people of this province did it. It wasn't any particular government. It was the people of Saskatchewan that decided, firstly, that they wanted that service; and then secondly, decided how they wanted to ensure that that service was there. And it served its purpose; it's kept utility rates down for the most part.

But why sell it? In whose pockets do the assets of this particular Crown go? Are these assets back into the hands of the people of Saskatchewan? I say to you, they're not. Are we going to get any better service by privatizing it? I say to you, not. Are we going to get cheaper power rates? The answer is clear. No. But then why do we privatize it?

And the same thing with SaskTel. We were told that was one utility that wasn't going to be tampered with, wasn't going to be touched. It's a direct parallel to SaskPower. Why was it there? The people wanted a service; the people demanded that service; so the people got together and built that service. It's delivered very good service, reasonable rates. It's serving the purpose for which it was intended. Why do we sell it?

Well this government's decided that yellow pages, which is one of the most lucrative portions of SaskTel, a consistent money raiser, that that has to go. Well who does it go to? It goes to the friends of this government, to serve the purposes of this government, that's where it goes. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And the member from Saskatoon indicates that they've got a lot of friends out there. Well I want to suggest that if that minister was true and, in fact, there were a lot of friends out there, then everybody would be sharing in the graft and corruption that's been going on under this government instead of a select few.

But they unloaded that. And on the agenda I understand, now, is SGI — well they want to privatize SGI. It's the same old story. What was the purpose for SGI? We wanted to deliver a universal, reasonably costed insurance service to the people of the province. So the people did that. It's done that consistently over the years. We've had the lowest rates for car insurance in Canada. And we were able to do that because we worked together in order to ensure that that would happen.

There was room for private industry in the insurance industry in Saskatchewan. They flourish; they've been doing well. And SGI was there to deliver the service that

we knew the people of this province wanted. So why would you sell it? It doesn't make sense.

And in each one of these cases of privatization, Mr. Speaker, this government has never got fair value for what they've privatized. And now they want to move to privatization of the liquor stores. And I'll go back to the estimate book. On the revenue page it indicates this year that from the Saskatchewan Liquor Board, some \$215 million will be . . . or 215 million on the revenue side. Last year was estimated 150 million. So why do you want to sell it?

And as a business person I try to go through this and rationalize what they're doing, and I'm having a very difficult time to. Governments don't own because they want to own. Governments own because there's a reason; there's a service that otherwise may not be delivered. And that's why Crown corporations have started. That's why the people of this province have used Crowns as a tool — a tool to build the kind of a province that they wanted.

But this government has decided that they're going to neutralize that sector of our economy, that it will no longer be around, it will no longer be something that we can use. And people don't understand why, Mr. Speaker. And that's why this government's been spending hundreds of thousands of dollars of public money trying to sell their concept, this concept of privatization, or piratization, as the member from Moose Jaw says.

But if you go through this whole thing, what's happened? In '83 they privatized SaskPower assets. Power rates are increasing. In '84 the highways go. So what happens? Taxes increase. The quality of those roads decrease. In '86, PAPCO (Prince Albert Pulp Company) is gone, taxes increase, the deficit increase; '87, the dental plan is privatized. Did service to those children increase? Did it improve? Of course it didn't. If they cut expenditures in that area and if they save the people of this province lots of dollars by privatizing the dental plan, did taxes go down? Did the deficit go down? Clearly, Mr. Speaker, that never happened.

In '88 they privatized Sask Minerals and SaskCOMP. Did taxes go down? Did the deficit go down? Of course it didn't. And now they're moving on some major forms of privatization. The one example would be the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan that they're moving towards. They indicate . . . The Premier goes off to Asia for . . . to China for a month, communist China, one of our better customers for potash. And what does this genius do? He promises to sell to those folks, our best customers, a portion of a company that made a lot of revenue in this province over the years. Now any business man that I know would say, if you've got an industry, if you've got a revenue that can deliver profits like potash corporation did last year of \$106 million, why in the world would you sell it to your customer? I have a difficult time to understand that. It's hard to rationalize that, and I've still yet to hear the Premier be able to explain that in terms that anybody would believe would make good business sense.

But that's part of why we've got a problem, Mr. Speaker,

in this province with the deficit. That's why we've got a problem with our economy, and that's why we're losing thousands of people every month to other provinces and other areas of Canada. And that's why we can't deliver the services that we do because we're spending millions of dollars every year just paying interest on the lavish and foolish spending of this government since 1982.

But it's not enough, Mr. Speaker, that they've mismanaged this province; they know that already. And now they fear for their political future.

So what do we see in this budget, or in this particular session of the legislature? We see a new electoral boundaries Act introduced. Now I understand that this government was speaking about fairness, and about the desire to have all folks equally represented in this legislature, whether they be urban or rural. But, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe it and the people of this province don't believe it.

The agenda was a gerrymander. The agenda was to maintain political control of this province, no matter how few the number of votes. And it's been said by some who've done some figures, that with 37 per cent of the popular vote this government may be able to maintain power. But I would suggest to you that people see through it. And I would suggest to you as well, Mr. Speaker, that they aren't going to get the 37 per cent, or if it's 30 per cent, they're not going to get the required vote in order to maintain power, because people are fed up with the kind of government that they've been delivering.

You see a riding like the riding of Morse, with some 7,700 people in it, represented of course by a PC member — 7,700 people have the ability to send one member to the Legislative Assembly.

Well now, we look at the riding of Humboldt, represented by a New Democrat. And it's my understanding that we've got 12,500 voters in that particular riding. Now is their vote any less relevant? Is their vote any less important, the people from the Humboldt riding, than those from Morse? Of course it's not. Of course it's not, Mr. Speaker.

But this government will do anything they can to maintain control and to maintain power, whether it means running over democracy roughshod. It means little. Power's the game; power's their aim. But the people understand that. And I would suggest to you that they're not going to get away with it.

I represent, Mr. Speaker, a riding that comprises roughly two-thirds of the population in urban Prince Albert and one-third in the rural. And the people of that riding have an awful lot in common with each other. They have a common shopping area. They have a lot in common in terms of where their kids play hockey and where their kids play ball. They have a lot in common in terms of coming to social events together, the Prince Albert Exhibition. They go to church together. All of these things, Mr. Speaker, they have in common. It's one community. And whether it be urban or whether it be rural, it's one community. They have a common school board, they have common aspirations, and I believe, Mr. Speaker,

they have a lot of common beliefs.

But what has this government done? This government, in legislation, dictated that no longer can urban and rural people have the same MLA. They're saying that you can't represent the interests of people in an urban community and still represent the interests of people in the rural. Or that you can't represent the interests of people in the rural and still represent the interests of the people in the urban. What they're saying and what this government said in that legislation, Mr. Speaker, is that the people in my community are wrong, that they're different, and that they shouldn't have the same representative. That's what they're saying.

This government has been working unmercifully hard to develop an urban-rural split in this province. And I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is one political party in this province who doesn't believe that that's the direction for Saskatchewan, and who is going to work and fight very, very hard to ensure that Saskatchewan people are Saskatchewan whether they're urban or rural.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — But it's more than just an urban-rural split, Mr. Speaker. It's more than that. My colleague from Humboldt says it's democracy out the window, and that's exactly what it is.

This PC Party and this government doesn't believe in the idea of one person, one vote. They don't believe in fairness, in democracy. And it's easy to tell when you have a look, Mr. Speaker, at what they introduced for legislation in this House.

There's no longer a piece of legislation that comes before this legislature that dictates that when there's changes to be made that the elected representatives from all over Saskatchewan come to this forum and debate changes. Oh no, not any more. There's very little in statute in any legislation that this government produces; it's all regulation. And regulation means that the cabinet ministers sit down around their table and determine changes to legislation without bringing it before the people of this province. They do it behind closed doors, and I would suggest to you, in the dead of night, and it's not healthy for a democracy.

But it's part of what this government does, and it's part of what this government does. A Bill to create a vicious gerrymander in Saskatchewan; that we've seen. Legislation that pulls democracy from this forum to closed cabinet doors — and they're yapping now; it's bothering them a little. I see the member from Regina South yipping. But that's what's happened, Mr. Speaker, and that's the kind of government that the people of this province have been subjected to. And I wouldn't suggest to you that it will last much longer.

I've spent a while talking about this government's direction in terms of fairness, in terms of competence, and we could go on for hours and hours and hours, because there's so much more that can be said about the incompetence and the mismanagement that this government has embarked upon.

(2000)

But I'd like to talk specifically, if I could, about what they've done to the small-business community in Saskatchewan. I had a meeting just the other evening with about 20 people in a city in this province — people who have, over the period of time of their political lives or of their adult lives, looked objectively at different political parties and at different governments, and people who have not been tied particularly to any political party but who are so fed up with this government and so disillusioned with what this operation has been doing since 1982 that they're looking for a change. They're looking for a government that will be open, a government that will listen to them, and a government that understands their aspirations and cares about what they want to be as small-business people.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that they're starting to look very closely. Many of them have indicated that they feel that would be the direction if they had a chance to vote, and they're starting to look very closely at what a New Democrat government would do after the next election.

They know, Mr. Speaker, that we've got an awful job in terms of, first of all, cleaning up the mess that this government's created, and they understand that. And they understand that people on this side of the House don't pretend to have all of the answers. But what they do know is that the New Democratic Party, and that this caucus is willing to try, is willing to do it with fairness, with honesty, with openness, and with their involvement. And that, Mr. Speaker, is why this government is on a slippery slope that has no bends.

It's little things I would suggest to you, that have been bothering them as well as the deficit and the fiscal mismanagement. All of those . . . there's just a number of little things that are burs in their side.

I recall this government saying they were going to do away with all the red tape, that government would be streamlined, and all the forms that would come to the good folks in the business community would be simplified so you wouldn't have to deal with all this government bureaucracy. Well what have you seen?

An Hon. Member: — Patronage.

Mr. Lautermilch: — You've seen patronage, my colleague says. You've seen an increase in every fee that you can think of. And I should give you just an example, the pettiness of this government — fees to inspect a boiler in a little bakery.

In 1982 . . . I'll go back right to 1982 just so the member, the Minister of Education can have a little understanding of why people are upset with his government and his colleagues. A boiler inspection fee in 1982, I look through the receipt here and I don't see a fee paid at all. It says nothing under fee paid; '83 the same. And lo and behold, '84, this government wants \$19 to send someone over to inspect that boiler, which is fair, I suppose.

That was just the beginning, because then in '85 the \$19 turned into \$30. So this small-business person isn't asked to pay \$19 any longer, he's asked to pay \$30. But then that's not enough, because this government is really tightening down and they're going to put these small-business people in their place where they should be. The next year they come in and they say, well I'll tell you what, our fee is \$60. In 1986 our fee is \$60, but if you pay before a certain date, it will only be the same as it was the last year, \$30.

That's why the people are getting upset with these guys. That's why there's problems within the business community, and these people know it. Every fee, as I said, Mr. Speaker, has been increasing. Car dealer licence fees up from \$50 to \$250 — 250 per cent increase. That's in the rural; 500 from \$150, the urban.

And auction companies. The Minister of Highways would probably understand clearly what this is about, being an auctioneer. They now have to pay \$300 as opposed to the hundred dollars they were paying before. This government has been nickel and diming small business to death.

But they don't stop there; they get even a little more petty. And I really had to laugh at this one. It's dated '87 but it's maybe old news. But I think it tells a little bit about what this government's done. And it's a memo to all marriage licence issuers, and it says:

In accordance with the new governmental fiscal restraint policy (fiscal restraint now, get this), the practice of supplying prepaid returned addressed envelopes has been discontinued.

Now these marriage licence issuers now have to put a stamp on their envelope to send to the government, at a time when this government increases a deficit to a 1.2-some billion dollars. They talk about fiscal restraint to the small business community; at the same time they're blowing up a billion-two that they don't have. I mean, there's a double standard here. And at the same time when they're hiring defeated cabinet ministers all over this province, and former party presidents, they go to a little marriage licence issuer and they want him to put a stamp on the envelope.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, this is the mentality of this government, and this is why the government's in a problem.

Mr. Speaker, this government no longer deserves to govern. They no longer have the respect of the people of Saskatchewan, and I will give you another example why. At a time when they're going to small licence, marriage licence issuers to put a stamp on their envelope, they're leasing \$34,000 a day worth of empty office space. Now does that make sense? Is there a double standard here? I would suggest to you that there is, Mr. Speaker.

They've got the money to spend \$34,000 a day to rent office space from their friends, but they haven't got the money to maintain the school-based dental program. They haven't got the money to send a stamped envelope to a marriage licence issuer. They've got to increase every

fee that a small-business man faces. I would suggest to you that they're a disgrace, and probably will go on record as being the worst government that ever operated in this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Now, Mr. Speaker, there's an awful lot that can be said about this government; there's an awful lot that should be said about this government; and I'm afraid to say that there isn't an awful lot of it that can be said that is good.

But I would ask them, in the last years of their government, to change direction, to change the direction in which they've been going; to start listening to the middle- and lower-income people and the small-business people in Saskatchewan; to stop hurting those families that they've been inflicting the pain upon; and to try and do what this province needs, to deliver an economy that all of Saskatchewan's residents can be proud of and work with and work under. That's what the direction of this government should be.

But I'd want to say that it's a sad commentary that that isn't what this government's been doing.

This budget didn't offer any direction for the small-business people. The most positive thing they could say for business was that they're spending a billion-one on capital works projects. Well they've been spending on capital projects in this province, as every government does, for years and years, but it hasn't stopped those small businesses from closing their doors. It hasn't stopped the receiver from moving in on businesses who can no longer operate under the economic conditions that this government has thrust upon them. Those things haven't changed. They're still dealing with the interest rates that their friend in Ottawa, Brian Mulroney, is perpetrating upon them.

And maybe I want to talk a little bit about what's happened with interest rates in this province, and perhaps why it's happened. Their friends in Ottawa fuelled the southern Ontario economy, injected hundreds of millions of dollars into that part of the economy to the point where inflation was starting to scare them. So the next move, of course, you've got to cool that economy down in southern Ontario. So how do you do it? You raise interest rates. Well what happens to the good folks out west here? Well the bankers don't want to deal with them any more, so they're closing their doors and they're moving out.

Mr. Speaker, this Premier tells us time after time and day after day how he works with the Prime Minister, and how they've built this team, and how the federal operation listens to what's happening in Saskatchewan and listens to this Premier.

But what happens in terms of interest rates? The interest rates go up; this Premier sits on his hands and businesses go bankrupt. The interest rate goes up; farmers lose their farms; this Premier sits on his hands and not a word is said. He promised us, Mr. Speaker, in the election of 1988 — in the federal election — he promised the farmers that

there would be a drought payment, and that it would be in the area of 40 to \$45 an acre.

Well now, what happened to that promise? We ask in the legislature on question period day after day after day, and what do we have for an answer? This Premier will talk about anything but the question. I can honestly say that I don't recall a question period in this legislature since I have been here in 1986 when one of those ministers would respond to an answer. They'll talk about the weather, they'll talk about cutting their grass, or they'll talk about anything, but they don't want to talk about what the issues are.

We'll ask them about the wheat board and the demise of the wheat board — and the Minister of Education who hasn't shut his mouth since I stood to speak — but we'll talk about the wheat board and what is happening with the wheat board. But does this government ever stand up to defend the wheat board? Not on your life. Day after day after day you question on behalf of the farmers whether this government is willing to stand up on behalf of the farmers and support the wheat board, and to lobby the federal government to ensure that that wheat board isn't destroyed, as it is being done. Not a word. So whose side are they on?

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is a government that speaks for multinationals, for Cargill. This isn't a government that speaks for farmers. This is a government that speaks for Peter Pocklington as opposed to small meat-packing operations in Saskatchewan. This is a government that has forgotten about middle-income people.

This government, Mr. Speaker, is trying to build an economy based on \$4.50 an hour minimum wage. Their goal is cheap labour and the wealth polarized into the hands of a few. We don't have reasonably well paying construction jobs as we used to have. Families that were supporting themselves on \$15, \$16 an hour prior to this government's election now find themselves working on \$6 and \$7 an hour jobs — and part-time at that. We see families who are supporting themselves with two and three jobs at \$4.50 an hour — a subsistence living.

And what's been the result of all of this? The whole economy has been pulled to the bottom. There's no longer any disposable income. Families don't have the money to buy fridges or stoves, to go out and buy a new car, or to buy homes.

(2015)

But this government tells us free trade will solve all that. And they don't have the money to go out to a dinner and a restaurant. They're struggling just to pay their rent and to pay the increases in power that they've had since 1982, and they're struggling to pay telephone bills that have increased. They're struggling to pay taxes, municipal taxes that have increased — and not, as these people would suggest, because of urban government mismanagement in the cities in this province. It's because of the cut-backs to programs that used to keep those taxes down in cities like Regina and Saskatoon and in Prince Albert.

These families, Mr. Speaker, can't be fuelling this economy as they used to because that middle-class dollar is disappearing. And it's moving into the hands of a select few — a select few friends of the PC government.

And I want to say that if there is one suggestion that members on this side would want to leave with this government or if there is one idea that they'd want to share with this government, it would be the idea that if you have money in the hands of working people, that money revolves in the communities and it keeps small business vibrant. And if you let that money revolve in those communities, you're going to have healthy communities.

And if there is one message I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this government should have and members of this side would want to share with you, it would be that the direction you've been going is just totally the wrong direction, and that we want to work with you to see a healthy Saskatchewan. But in order to have a healthy Saskatchewan, you're going to have to start listening to the people who you are hurting. And the people you're hurting right now, Mr. Speaker, the people that this government are hurting, are not only the farming community — because you're hurting them; I note in this year's expenditures, I note in this year's expenditures that this government has budgeted a \$50 million bill less than what was spent in agriculture last year.

And let me say a few words on that, Mr. Speaker. The problems in agriculture haven't disappeared. There's no less a problem out there now than there was last year. And there may not be. Now we may be blessed with good weather and good crops. That may be the case, but we don't know that. And this government budgets for \$50 million less than what it spent last year for the agricultural community.

Small town Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, depends upon agriculture. And it depends upon decent paying jobs, whether they be government or whether they be in the private sector. Small town Saskatchewan depends on those types of things to survive. And we on this side of the House understand that, and I think all of the people in this province understand that.

But you've been taking part of that away from those communities. They're dealing now with extended store hours that are polarizing what expenditures there are. Those dollars are now being spent in the cities, and this government caused that. They caused that by a piece of legislation that put the responsibility on the shoulders of municipal governments who are having a very difficult time to deal with it. There's going to be competition between the different jurisdictions, which may, in the end, cause wide-open store hours.

This government was lobbied long and hard by small-business people, small-business people who asked this government to take a stand on store hours and say that, yes, we need some protection for the small business community in rural Saskatchewan. And yes, we, as people in this province, demand a common day of rest. They weren't asking for a lot. They were asking for

leadership. But instead, what did this government deliver? This government did as it's been doing; it shirked its responsibilities, passed on to the municipal governments the need to pass legislation to regulate store hours. And it's not a responsibility that they wanted. They were expecting leadership from a senior government, but the senior government wasn't there.

And they're going to be fighting court cases in jurisdictions throughout this province. They're going to be fighting court cases with money that they can ill afford. They're going to have to go to the taxpayers and say, because this government has abrogated responsibility to implement store hours legislation and passed it on to us, we've got to come to you. We need some more money because we've got to go to court, we've got to hire lawyers. Put your tax dollars into the hands of lawyers while your provincial government sits on its hands.

And that's been, Mr. Speaker, the problem with this government. They've shirked their responsibility. They've shirked it when it came to ensuring that there was some adequate financial resources for a drought payment. They shirked their responsibility when it came to legislation to control store hours.

But they have taken responsibility in other areas, Mr. Speaker. They've taken responsibility away from municipal governments where it came to the ward system, where people demanded a ward system of electing civic officials that they were very comfortable with. But without consultation, this minister pulled that ability and that responsibility from them. And they didn't ask for that, but there it was gone by the stroke of a pen from this minister. And that's not what they were looking for.

They weren't looking for an electoral boundaries Act that would mean that their neighbour's vote meant less than what theirs did. People in Saskatchewan understand fairness. They understand what the role of government could be or what the role of government should be. They understand what this government has done in terms of those responsibilities. They were waiting, Mr. Speaker, for a drought payment. They were waiting for some long-term planning in terms of drought and disaster in agricultural Saskatchewan. They've been waiting for that for a long time.

The federal government and this government, both PC governments, promised that there would be a long-term plan to serve the needs of agricultural Saskatchewan. But that long-term plan hasn't come. It's long overdue, everyone agrees. But has this government moved? Mr. Speaker, they have not.

And if there is a plan . . . They've had an advance on their drought payment. Agreed. But how can they do some financial planning when they don't know what the details of that program are going to be? They don't know how much they're going to get from it. Oh yes, they've got half-phrases from the Premier and from his cabinet. And they've got the back-benchers scurrying around the province telling the agricultural community, oh don't worry; we've got matters in hand; things will be fine.

But you know what they don't have? They don't have any idea of how much they're going to get in terms of a drought payment. And they can't go to their bankers with a promise from this Premier and the Prime Minister because, Mr. Speaker, the bankers don't believe this government any more than the rest of the people of this province.

This Premier promised he would participate in a drought pay-out during the federal election. What did we see after the election in 1988? No payment, because he's got no money. He's got money to pay for \$34,000 a day in empty office space, but he hasn't got the money to put into a drought payment for the farming community in this province.

At a time when farmers are being forced off of their land, when their children are forced out of this province to seek employment other places because the agricultural community is in a very tough state — and it's causing the small communities to be devastated as well, and the business people — this Premier promised to participate in this drought payment. But what did he do? He broke his word.

People expect honesty from their politicians. But I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that's a quality that is becoming very apparently sadly lacking in the prime minister of our province.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I will be working with my caucus colleagues, as you will be, I hope, to ensure that we don't lose another 16,000 people this year to other provinces and other jurisdictions. People on this side of the House are going to work with the business community and with the agricultural community and with the working men and women of this province, to ensure that we don't lose 6,200 people in one month. People on this side of the legislature are going to be working to ensure that we don't have a 50 per cent drop-out rate of our high school students. And we're going to be working to ensure that people of all income levels can get into post-secondary educational facilities.

We're going to be working to ensure that those facilities are funded adequately so that the average enrolment qualifications don't exceed what most people can obtain. Because you see, Mr. Speaker, people on this side of the House believe in opportunity for all regardless of your income, or regardless of your political stripe.

And we understand that when you govern you can't govern for one particular political party, nor can you govern for one income level. You have to govern for the advantaged, for the disadvantaged, for those that believe in your political philosophy and for those that don't believe in your political philosophy, because all of the people have a right to decent government regardless of your political stripe.

I want to say that I find it sad to see in this province that we have a minister of privatization but that we don't have a minister of co-ops. We've built this province using the co-operative sector and the private sector and the public sector, and that's no secret to anyone. But what's happening? What have we lost? Why have we lost this

vision of working together? We've lost this vision of working together, Mr. Minister, because we've lost a government that cares. We've inherited a selfish, self-centred, incompetent government, and this year's estimates clearly show that that's the case.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, before I close, that I want to move an amendment, and the amendment will be seconded by the MLA from The Battlefords who wants to speak to this motion.

The reason we're moving this amendment, Mr. Speaker, is because people of this province are dissatisfied with what's been happening. So, Mr. Speaker, I will move:

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

This Assembly regrets that the provincial budget imposes unfair tax increases on ordinary families, reduces funding for youth job creation and agriculture, fails to restore the damage caused by provincial government cut-backs in health, education, and other social programs, and completely fails to address the cause of Saskatchewan's population loss to other parts of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, that's what's been happening in Saskatchewan.

I therefore move this.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(2030)

Mr. Anguish: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My apologies to the member from Shellbrook-Torch River. I was just a little too fast for him getting to my feet here this evening.

I am pleased to be able to enter into the debate on the budget. I didn't have an opportunity to speak to the throne speech debate. It seemed to me that the members of the government side were trying to filibuster the throne speech debate, which I find very strange. They laid several attacks on New Democrats on the opposition side of the House. And they look back years ago, trying to blame history for their problems of the current day.

We don't believe that, Mr. Speaker. We know that this Assembly does not believe it, and we know the people in the province of Saskatchewan do not believe that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — The people in the province of Saskatchewan will lay the blame where the blame is due. And it's on that government opposite, under the leadership of the farmer from Albert Street south.

When the budget came down, Mr. Speaker, on March 30, the Premier's government announced their plans to spend approximately \$4.2 billion between April 1, 1989 and March 31, 1990. Now assuming, Mr. Speaker, that there are a million people in the province . . . Actually

there are not because our population is now below that figure since over 6,000 people left the province in the month of February, and our population is now declining at a very rapid rate. But anyway, assuming that there are a thousand people, this means that for every man, woman, and child in Saskatchewan, this government wants to spend \$4,266. So if you have a family like I do — four children and my spouse and myself — we're looking at the government wanting to spend on our behalf over \$24,000 in the fiscal year 1989-1990.

The Premier's government also announced that they would collect approximately \$4.025 billion in revenue during that same time period, and this leaves us with a deficit, according to my figures at least, of some \$241 million by the government's own figures. That's an increasing problem, Mr. Speaker. We seem to keep adding to the total provincial debt. It's perpetual deficit financing. I don't see the sense of the members opposite.

When New Democrats left office in the 1981-82 fiscal year — right around that time — there was a surplus left, Mr. Speaker, of some \$139 million. And since that time, Mr. Speaker, the . . . From the \$139 million surplus, all of these red bars represent the increasing deficit that the government has brought in. That's very unfortunate, not only for the government, because they'll have their day of reckoning when people of Saskatchewan get a hold of them at the next provincial election, but it's also unfortunate for those same people, because we have a debt burden now in the province of Saskatchewan that will take many generations — not just years, many generations — to recover from.

We look at 1982-83 fiscal year, \$227 million; '83-84 fiscal year, 331 million deficit; '84-85, \$379 million deficit; '85-86, \$584 million deficit; '86-87, election year, they projected a deficit of \$389 million, but what was it? It was \$1.235 billion. Year after the election they said, well we got to try and get things under control, Mr. Speaker. And so they got under control to the extent that, well the deficit that year was only \$328 million — which is an estimate — because that brings up another point: we still don't have the public accounts for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1988.

That's over a year ago, Mr. Speaker, and we still don't have the public accounts from this negligent, mismanaged government opposite.

So this year now they're going to tell us, well according to their figures they say they're going to have a deficit of \$226 million. The Minister of Finance says he's getting things under control. Well we'll see how much we can believe him, because he has in the budget documents, revenue of some, oh, \$200 million from Crown investment corporation, sort of the banker for the Crown corporations that generate revenue in the province of Saskatchewan.

But these people want to sell off all the Crown corporations. They want to privatize. If it moves, privatize it. So if they privatize it all, where's Crown investment corporation going to continue to come up with this money to help reduce the deficit? It's going to be non-existent.

They pump in a larger than usual sum of money according to their past tradition, if they do have any tradition, from the Liquor Board. And then they pump in a larger amount from what they're going to get from the federal government.

So we say, Mr. Speaker, and we predict that the deficit for this current fiscal year is going to be closer to 500 million than it is to the 200 million that the Minister of Finance is telling us.

So every year since this government's come into place, we've got a deficit. And I call it the beer-belly curve, Mr. Speaker, because as you can see, it starts out smaller and gets bigger and bigger and bigger, and then the public perception is so bad, Mr. Speaker, that it starts going back down.

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order, order. I'm afraid that the reference material the hon. member is using is being used in a fashion that is interpreted as an exhibit, and I ask him to refrain from that.

Mr. Anguish: — I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I was getting carried away with my enthusiasm about the problem with the deficit, and I'll try not to do that. I hope I can use some of these charts like this, because it refreshes my memory so I can be more exact as to the horrendous problem that's been created by the government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, where is this going to end? Deficit financing is not necessarily a problem if you're borrowing the money to invest in some future venture, or if you have some way of recovering that deficit and paying off the debt. But there's no debt repayment schedule by the government. They aren't investing in anything to bring back a return. It's perpetual deficit financing. I've said this in other addresses to this legislature, and it'll have to be said many, many more times, because the problem is going to last for a long, long time in the future.

Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that when you borrow money you're going to be paying back more than you borrow. And the reason for that is known as interest. And interest is a very interesting thing when we look at the deficit that we have. The budget has estimated that there will be \$380 million spent on interest fees and commissions to service the debt.

Well we should look at the Finance documents here, Mr. Speaker. If we look here on page 44 of the budget, Department of Finance, servicing the public debt . . . And I'll read it. This is just interest. Item 1, debt servicing, interest on public debt, government share, \$373,346,800. Just interest — just interest on the debt.

So those families out there in Saskatchewan, when they sit down at the breakfast table in the morning, before they eat breakfast, if it's a family of four, they have to take and set aside \$4 just to pay the interest on the debt — \$4 just to pay the interest on the debt. Every single day of the year — Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday. Even before they go to church, they have to take their \$4 for that family of four, set it out on the table, and if they left it there for a year it would

accumulate and that would represent . . . They could see in a visual effect how much money is being paid on interest by the debt that's been created by this mismanaged, gone-astray government, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it goes on. I said it was 380 million. Item number 2, fees and commissions on public debt, government share — 7,500,000. Total for Finance, servicing the public debt, government share, ordinary expenditure — I find it extraordinary — \$380,846,800. That's the effect of having perpetual deficit financing, Mr. Speaker, and I think that people should take a very careful look at that and question the financial management of this current government.

Mr. Speaker, another way to look at this money that has to be set aside to service the debt is that in the entire government, all the government departments, there are only two government departments that have a higher budget than the money set aside to service interest on the debt; those are the Department of Health and the Department of Education. Every other department in government has a lesser budget to provide their programs and services than the amount set aside to pay interest on the debt. We think that's shameful, we think that's mismanagement of the economy, and there is so much more, Mr. Speaker, we could do with \$380 million in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — A second major problem, Mr. Speaker, that has received little attention during the budget debate are payments made to the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation.

An Hon. Member: — A slush fund.

Mr. Anguish: — Some of our members refer to it as the slush fund, and they may be accurate, Mr. Speaker.

Until 1987 there used to be a department of supply and service, and the department of supply and service had the mandate to provide office and services to all the government departments, Mr. Speaker, all the government departments. And so the departments weren't charged. You could see it very plainly; it was all there to see in supply and services in that one department.

Now after 1987 the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation came along, Mr. Speaker, and the problem arises in that it would appear that a department may be receiving a substantial increase in their budget, but the money does not go into programs and services, the increase in some instances goes to Saskatchewan Property Management services for rent. This year the departments will pay to the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation well in excess of \$150 million, Mr. Speaker, according to my calculations.

Let's look at some of these, how much they are. If you look, for example . . . I see the Minister of Education would make special note of this. In this budget document the *Estimates*, as it's called, Mr. Speaker, for the fiscal year '89-1990, payments from the Department of Education to the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation,

what do you think they total? They total \$45,698,500. Some members sort of cock their head to the side a little bit. Well maybe we should look at the document then, Mr. Speaker, because it's a document put out by the government, and we'll look up the Department of Education.

(2045)

Here we have the Department of Education, Mr. Speaker, page 29, payments to the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation — \$4,712,900. Turn over the page, on page 30, grants to Saskatchewan universities, repayment of principal and interest on capital loans from the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation, amount — \$19,500,000. On the same page, item 23, grant to Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology, payments to Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation, amount — \$21,485,600.

Well according to my figures, Mr. Speaker, if you added each of those three figures together, you would have \$45,698,500 paid by that minister's department to another department in government, and they're trying to snooker the people of Saskatchewan by saying they've increased the budget that much. False, Mr. Speaker. It's an internal juggling of figures and it's deceptive to people in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that's not the only department. The other major department I want to look at is the Department of Health, in terms of what they pay to the property management corporation. Because it's Health and Education, the two I'm going to use for an example, the only two that have a higher budget than the amount set aside to pay interest on the debt.

What have we got through the Department of Health? Well the government's document again, Mr. Speaker, *Estimates*, Government of Saskatchewan, 1989-90. What have we got here? Department of Health, page 46, item 17, payments to Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation, \$12,957,800. Is that it? No, no. Next page, Mr. Speaker, page 47, grants to hospitals.

But read on. Repayment of principal and interest on capital loans from the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation. How much? — \$16,042,000.

We're not done yet, Mr. Speaker. Hold on. Item 30 on the same page, grants to special care facilities — repayment of principal and interest on capital loans from the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation. How much? Oh, \$1,657,000. My goodness, it's not as much as the Department of Education.

But, Mr. Speaker, I did add these up, and the total payments from the Department of Health to the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation worked out to \$30,656,800. My goodness, that's a large amount of money, Mr. Speaker. In fact, if you add the amount paid to Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation from the largest two departments in government, it's over 75 — over 76, I should say — over \$76 million.

Well Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation is going to have a lot of funds to play with, Mr. Speaker. And the thing that's a shame about it is that they're not accountable for it. They don't . . . Sask Property Management doesn't reveal what they do. They're a Crown corporation, and as I said before, many of our members maintain it's a slush fund. That may be true, and we'll be attempting to prove that over the coming months, Mr. Speaker.

Sort of in summarizing the budget, Mr. Speaker, it's a budget with a bleak financial forecast for the province of Saskatchewan, and there's a lot of smoke and mirrors in there. As to the smoke and mirrors, there is two where money is actually spent and where the government is trying to say that they're increasing the amounts of revenue put into various government departments.

The other thing they don't take into consideration, Mr. Speaker, and I think that the public should know in Saskatchewan, is that when they say a certain percentage increase, they're not including supplementary amounts that were put into the particular departments the year before. They go from raw figures last year to raw estimates this year. And still estimates, I remind you again, from last year because the *Public Accounts* over a year ago, still are not tabled in this legislature, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I like the words of this individual, a Morris Shumiatcher, a lawyer from Regina. I found this quote the other day as I was doing some reading. And he once said that:

The only thing that governments today print more of than laws is money, and because there is much of each, the value of both our laws and our money is fast declining.

Now I think that applies more particularly to the federal government because they can crank up the printing press and cause or reduce inflation pretty well at will. If they want to print more money, they print more money. But the point for this provincial government is, they've totally abused money. They have no respect for the public purse. They just take money wherever they can get it. They project more money than they can actually receive, and they spend more money than they budget. And that's substantiated in every single budget that this government has brought down through their Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, and I think people in Saskatchewan are getting sick and tired of the deception and deceit that is spread by the government of this Premier.

Mr. Speaker, just before . . . just before I leave the topic of payments to property management corporation, I'd like to put into perspective what it is, is a comparison between what Health and Education pay to property management corporation versus budgets of other important government departments.

The Minister of Education knows very well that his department, Mr. Speaker, is going to pay in excess of \$45 million this year to the property management corporation. That's just payments to property management corporation.

What is the budget of the Department of Environment and Public Safety? Total budget of the entire department is \$11.5 million — \$11.5 million — about less than a third of what his department pays to rent buildings.

Energy and Mines, what's their total budget? Total budget \$12 million.

Economic Development and Tourism, what's their total budget? Sixteen point eight million dollars, Mr. Speaker. Remember how much he's paying to the property management corporation? Forty-five million he's paying, just to rent buildings.

What about the budget of Trade and Investment? The great saviour, according to that government over there, was going to be free trade. Now, Mr. Speaker, has your life been better since free trade? Have any of the members over there . . . Has the Minister of Science and Technology had a great boom in science and technology in Saskatchewan since free trade came along? Is the oil industry any better in the Cut Knife-Lloyd constituency? Is Arm River booming with their fertilizer plant? No, you're not getting the fertilizer plant.

Trade and Investment, the total budget, Mr. Speaker, is \$9.6 million. That's what great importance these people put on free trade. All the rhetoric they had before, and now they put less than \$10 million into the department that has to deal with such a vitally important part of our financial picture in the province of Saskatchewan — \$9.6 million, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Education can spend \$45 million renting buildings from the property management corporation. Lots of smoke and mirrors, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what's happening in the province of Saskatchewan? Are people being given the true goods? Well, let's look back to fiscal year 1981-82. The provincial revenue picture received \$120 million from fuel tax in the province of Saskatchewan. And the Conservative government, under the current Premier, said to people in the province, you're paying too much. We'll give you cheap gas; we'll give you almost free gas or remove all the tax on it. By gosh, you know, they got elected, Mr. Speaker.

And so the first year that the Conservatives were in, the revenue from fuel tax went from 120 million down to 13 million — 13.5 million, to be more exact. And then we move on a couple of years to '85-86 fiscal year. Well it's creeping back up — 30.7 million they made in revenue. What about '87-88, Mr. Speaker; '87-88, betrayal of a promise. The Conservative government receives \$142 million in revenue from fuel tax. Oh, that's more than the people were paying in 1981-82. And what does the government project in this current budget in the fiscal year '89-90? They project to bring in \$204 million.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I could show you this, but I can't; it would be an exhibit, I guess. But it does go from '81-82 to an increase in '88-90 . . . or '89-90, I should say, to \$204 million — getting pretty close to double.

So who's paying for all these deficits and interests? It's the people of the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Because we'd have to look at the corporation income tax in the province — '84-85, it was 156 million. Well what's happening? The *Globe and Mail* said last year that corporate profits for big business in Canada were up 56 per cent. That's from The *Globe and Mail*; that's not some Saskatchewan NDP rhetoric, Mr. Speaker, that's from *The Globe and Mail*. But what happens, this government drops corporate tax. So we went from 156 million and now we're down in '88-89 to 134 million — holy cow! — lost another \$22 million.

But what about individual income tax revenue, Mr. Speaker, individual income tax. In '85-86, that fiscal year, \$626 million, Mr. Speaker, was collected from individual income tax. In '88-89, the year that we've just been through, Mr. Speaker, this government collected \$831 million in individual income tax. And it's not, Mr. Speaker, because more people are working — there are less people working — but the income tax, with your flat tax of the government, has driven up personal taxation in the province of Saskatchewan from \$626 million to \$831 million. Corporate tax comes down, individual income tax goes up. People in the province, Mr. Speaker, are getting sick and tired of paying more than their fair share of the deficit.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: —What else do average individuals pay? Well they pay sales tax, Mr. Speaker. And what did this government say at election time? What would they do? They were going to eliminate the provincial sales tax. The 5 per cent provincial sales tax wasn't eliminated; it went up by 40 per cent. It went from 5 per cent to 7 per cent, a 40 per cent increase.

What a betrayal of a political promise by a government that is now bankrupt of ideas. They're so bankrupt of ideas that they have to break all the election promises they made. And so people are becoming more and more sceptical in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

So what happened in the sales tax revenue? In '84-85 there was \$372 million raised by sales tax — '88-89 this amount had gone up to \$476 million in sales tax revenue, Mr. Speaker.

And many people still remember the used car sales tax that came in for six months, and the reaction was so harsh by the people in the province that they dropped it. Never before in the history of the province has a government brought in a tax in a budget, and before the end of that fiscal year dropped it because it was so devastatingly unpopular in the province of Saskatchewan.

There's no plan there, there's no consistency. No one knows what they're going to do from day one to day two, let alone into next week or next month or next year.

(2100)

Well, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't going to dwell any more on the Department of Education, but I just have one more graph here that I want to use. In 1980, 56.7 million provincial grant school boards expenditures . . . or sorry, \$56.7 million. By 1988, what are they down to? — 49.4

million. Do you know why those grants to school boards are dropping? Well, it's because the Department of Education is paying that money to property management corporation instead of school boards in the province. If you look at the amounts, there's a very good correlation there between what they have to pay as a financial move within their own government as opposed to what they're taking away from school boards in the province of Saskatchewan.

An Hon. Member: — What's happening with the property management corporation money?

Mr. Anguish: — Well some of the members, Mr. Speaker, are asking what happens to the property management corporation money. We don't know. Why don't we know? Because they are not accountable to this Legislature, other than providing an annual report which has no detail of finances. They appear before the Public Accounts Committee and give very little information, none to determine whether or not people in the province are getting economy, efficiency, and effectiveness for the tax dollars that they are paying.

Mr. Speaker, people in Saskatchewan have been used to receiving a lot of benefits from their government, whoever has represented them in government — formerly Liberal, CCF, New Democrats — and they thought they'd receive a fair deal also under a Progressive Conservative government. But since this government was re-elected in 1986, people have seen a true picture of Progressive Conservatives in action in the province of Saskatchewan. It has devastated this province, Mr. Speaker.

And it brings to me a quote that I recall from Thomas Paine, who was involved in some of the writing of the American constitution just after the Americans ran the British out of the United States of America. And Thomas Paine said that the tree of liberty must be periodically bathed in the blood of patriots. And I couldn't understand what he meant for a long time, and I really only understood it when I saw a Conservative government in action in the province of Saskatchewan since 1986, and the devastation that they've done to people's programs in the province of Saskatchewan.

What Thomas Paine said was a very futuristic kind of statement. At that time it was revolution because they'd just come through a revolution. We don't want revolution in Saskatchewan; we don't need revolution, because the people of the province are going to throw the Progressive Conservative government of the farmer from Albert Street South out when it comes to the next election. I don't think there's any question about that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — And, Mr. Speaker, I maintain to you that this government not only shows disrespect for the people of Saskatchewan, it shows disrespect for this institution as well.

I just want to quote something, Mr. Speaker. I want to put it into the record. It's from the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix*, dated today, of this date, and it's an article, "Filming in

legislature denied."

Television crews won't be allowed inside the legislature after all, Speaker (blank blank) has decided.

I say "blank blank," Mr. Speaker, because the name of the Speaker is actually here and you can't say the name of the Speaker, so I just said, "blank blank."

I continue the quote:

Monday, (blank) confirmed that he has formally denied a request from the CBC to film several scenes of *Love and Hate*, the story of the 1983 murder of Colin Thatcher's ex-wife, JoAnn Wilson, inside the Legislative Chamber.

As Speaker, I have to be concerned with ensuring the Chamber is treated with the respect it deserves," he said.

Respect. I've seen nothing but disrespect for this Chamber from the government ever since I've sat in this legislature. I can't believe the disrespect shown. Quite often on Tuesday nights, especially at the start of the session, the government doesn't want to sit; they stand up and adjourn the House. It wasn't only a week ago we voted against an adjournment of them calling off the evening session of the legislature. We didn't have any problem sitting that particular evening.

Mr. Speaker, you will know that I formerly sat in the House of Commons, and I was defeated in 1984 by a well-respected personality in Saskatchewan who, in turn, was defeated by another well-respected personality in Saskatchewan in the last federal election. But my experience in the federal House taught me to have respect for the institution, Mr. Speaker. And here, when I compare the disrespect here for the respect of the parliament in Ottawa, there is no comparison, Mr. Speaker. I would go on with this quotation:

In making his decision, he gave careful consideration to the historical uses of the chamber, which has been limited to parliamentary functions, such as the youth parliament, he said.

History, this activity, the filming of the story, *Love and Hate*, will likely be remembered in Saskatchewan history as one of the most dramatic events that ever happened in the province of Saskatchewan. And much of that history happened in this Chamber, happened in this very legislature, Mr. Speaker. I go on, Mr. Speaker:

Although the producers of the six-hour, \$6 million program had managed to persuade the government of the economic benefits of the shoot, the decision to allow the filming or not was entirely his, (blank) said.

I always thought, Mr. Speaker, that the Speaker, who has said on many occasions is a servant of this legislature, the honest broker between the government and the opposition members and third-party members, if there were any in this legislature — now I don't see how some

person arbitrarily, who is a servant of this legislature, can just make a decision that they can't shoot in this legislature a film of a shooting and the life and a very important part of the history of this province and this legislature. I remember watching the member who is the focus of this film debate and sit and act as a minister of the Crown in this legislature, Mr. Speaker.

Saskatchewan (I go on, Mr. Speaker, the article, Saskatchewan) people expect him "to be a responsible custodian" of the legislature. "Most people wouldn't agree with the commercialization of the legislature," no matter what the short-term benefits might be.

Commercialization of the legislature — I can't think of any other event that would be appropriate to have done in this Chamber. Commercialization? Was somebody offered money so they could film in the legislature? Who was offered money? How was that commercialization? Is CBC going to sell this film to their own network? Boy, I think not, Mr. Speaker. So commercialization of the legislature — I don't comprehend that, Mr. Speaker. I go back to the article.

If it was opened to one commercial venture, "where would we draw the line?"

Last month, deputy premier (blank blank) said the government and opposition had agreed to shoot after lobbying by the CBC and ACTRA (that's the Association of Cinema, Television and Radio Artists).

We agreed many, many weeks ago to allowing this event to be filmed in the legislature so long as it didn't interfere with the daily functioning of this House. And according to the Deputy Premier, the Deputy Premier also agreed to that. I go back to the article, Mr. Speaker.

About 150 extras would have been hired — at \$100 apiece — and the film crew would have spent another \$35,000 in the city on hotel rooms and vehicle rentals. *Love and Hate* is scheduled to be shown sometime this fall.

Thatcher, a former PC cabinet minister, and son of former premier Ross Thatcher, is now serving a life sentence in Edmonton for the 1983 murder of Wilson.

He was first elected to the legislature as a Liberal MLA in 1975, (and) later abandoned the Liberals to join the Progressive Conservatives.

Mr. Speaker, I think it was a sad event that that had happened, but nevertheless it happened. The point I make is that, where has the respect gone for this institution, this legislature? Maybe when people see things like that happen, they lose respect in all politicians. I suspect some of the things that other politicians on that side of the House have done have drawn disrespect not only on themselves, but ourselves, because the majority of the general public look at all politicians as politicians.

And we have a mission, Mr. Speaker, to get out and

educate people in the province of Saskatchewan that a politician is not necessarily just a politician. There are politicians that have some integrity, and there are some politicians that don't have integrity, and they are not exclusive to any one political party. I would not want to say that there are no members with integrity over there. I believe in my own heart, Mr. Speaker, that there must be.

What else happens, Mr. Speaker? The dental plan, Mr. Speaker, is something that was devastated by this particular government. And the article, the headline in the article, Mr. Speaker, "Dental plan, drug program, surpass cost estimates."

So what's happening? They privatized a program that operated very well as a school-based dental program, and now we're finding it costs us more as a privatized program than it did as a public program, as a school-based dental program. And children were getting better service to more people under the school-based program than they are under a privatized program, Mr. Speaker.

What did members of the government say? The member from Regina South . . . I have an article here, and he says, we have to ensure that the government has its own house in order before asking the public to contribute to deficit reduction, he said. Well how long are we going to wait for your government, Mr. Minister, to get its house in order?

I pointed out to you earlier the problem with the perpetual deficit financing. Many of our members want the election to be called so that the people of the province can decide. We don't have to continue debating this issue in the legislature any longer.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to the budget for a few moments. The first item in the budget is agriculture. It's number one in order of the departments. It's number one in terms of our economy in the province, but it certainly doesn't seem to be a number one priority of the government. Some members say that agriculture is the number one priority, but it's not. The department has added responsibilities this year — it's called Agriculture and food now — but the budget was reduced. The budget was reduced.

I think everyone in the province of Saskatchewan today would acknowledge that farmers are in serious trouble in the province. And what does the government hold out as an answer to those serious problems? Well, a few years ago they threw out the farm production loan. Hassle-free cash; come and get it farmers! Twenty-five dollars an acre; step right up. So almost all of the farmers in the province of Saskatchewan took the \$25-an-acre, hassle-free cash at 6 per cent.

An Hon. Member: — Then what did they do?

Mr. Anguish: — What did they do? Well let me tell you. The farm economy was getting worse. The three-year plan to pay it back wasn't working out so well because farmers didn't have the money. The hassle-free cash in tough times wasn't able to come back, because the

hassle-free cash was not replenishing itself because farmers were in dire straits. So what do they do? They jack the interest rate up. What was it? They jacked it up to 10 per cent, or nine and three-quarters.

(2115)

Many of the government's friends in big business have a more preferred interest rate than the nine and three-quarters that they wanted to charge the farmers. And they said, well okay, we'll let you pay it back over 10 years at nine and three-quarters. Well, big favour.

And now what's happening in the province of Saskatchewan? Foreclosures in greater numbers than we've ever had before in the province. Regardless of what the members on the government side say, farmers know, small communities know, people in Saskatchewan know that there are more foreclosures going on, initiated by the Minister of Agriculture — who also happens to be the Premier — by the government sitting in the province of Saskatchewan. Ag credit corporation is foreclosing in record numbers.

So, Mr. Speaker, I guess the farm production loan wasn't the answer. They've tried at other times to get the federal government to throw their deficiency . . . so they throw out a deficiency payment. They did that. Things aren't any better yet. Free trade hasn't helped. Privatization of anything hasn't helped. Things are continually getting worse on the farm, and every single one of the rural members opposite knows that. You cannot deny that things are getting worse on farms in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they decided, well there's a drought last year so we're going to give a drought payment. So during the federal election, all the Conservative MP's ran around the province, with the MLA's from the Conservative government following behind them, carrying their bags, saying, yes sir, no sir, yes ma'am, no ma'am. And so the MP's from the Conservative side said, well, we're going to give you a drought payment. More hassle-free cash. Well we all know that the drought was last year, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Minister of Education — he seems to have lots of wisdom here this evening — have they got their cheques yet for the drought payment? Oh, the minister says that the cheque is in the mail. One of the biggest lies in mankind's history. One of the big lies, Mr. Speaker.

Now I want to tell you that the drought payment was promised. We know very well that the federal government said to the Minister of Agriculture, who also happens to be the Premier, look it, you share it, we'll share it; we'll go 50-50; put the money into a pot, the provincial government administer the money, and we will give it out as a drought payment. Well, the election got over . . .

An Hon. Member: — You're in dream-land.

Mr. Anguish: — . . . the election . . . well, just listen, the member from Arm River, just listen. I'm not reading this; I know this. Mr. Speaker, what happened? Well, the federal election was over and most of their MP's got

defeated, so the hassle-free cash for drought all of a sudden doesn't come — no more hassle-free.

And so negotiations go on between the Minister of Agriculture, who is also the Premier, and the federal government. The federal government says, you put in your share. Our government, the Conservative government, says no, we're not putting in our share, you pay it all. We only promised to administer the program. The federal government says, well, will you pay for administering the program? And the provincial government cares so much about farmers, says no, we won't pay for administering the program, you pay us for administering it. We'll just administer the program, you put in all the money.

Well, that's a good deal and good work if you can get it, but it ain't working out, boys and girls. It just isn't working out.

So the farm problem is increasing. The farm problem is increasing. What are the indications now? The drought payment might come in July with the balance of it maybe in the fall. Looks like it will come now. Must have been some agreement reached between the province and the federal government. Yes, the money is coming; they assure us now the money is coming for drought in the province.

Well the money won't come when it's needed. A number of farmers are saying to me that, boy, I could sure use that cash now, you know, because pretty soon we've got to put the crop in. But the money isn't coming till July, and I know if I plant my crop in July it won't come up in time to harvest it. Well, son of a gun, I thought that with all those rural members on the government side, Mr. Speaker, they would have been able to figure out that you can't give money in July to help for seeding in the spring; it just doesn't work.

What's the government going to say? What's the suppliers going to say? Go to the bank; go to the credit union; go somewhere and borrow it. Well I don't know if the government's heard or not, but they're not very anxious at the financial institutions right now to lend farmers money because of the uncertainty in agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan.

So the drought payment is coming, but it's not coming in time, and the government realizes . . .

An Hon. Member: — Promised 40; what are they going to get?

Mr. Anguish: — One of the members reminded me — the promise of \$40 an acre. What's it going to be? Maybe 12 now. How much? That's right; the farmers are very anxious to find out when, how much, why did you deceive us? They're going to be thinking, aha, it was federal election time. Yes.

But the government at least, to their credit, the agricultural economist who is the Minister of Agriculture and also the Premier in the province knows that there's still a problem there. So all indications are that they're going to set up a system of equity financing in the

province of Saskatchewan — equity financing.

And I can remember some of the members opposite going around the province last year, having this little travelling band that went around putting on their road show — nice banner there — and alternatives to farm financing. But what came out at every meeting? What came out at every meeting? Equity financing is what was being proposed by the government members. And the farmers that were at these meetings . . . I remember the meeting at the Elk's Hall in North Battleford. It was packed; there was standing room only. The farmers soundly said no to equity financing. What are the indications now? Throne Speech, budget, talk from the members opposite on the government side — we're going to have equity financing.

And how will that work out? Well with free trade and removing of ownership, foreign ownership of property to what we used to know it, freedom more so for foreign investment in country, we'll have foreign investors, certainly from outside the province of Saskatchewan, buying up farm land and then hiring people back to farm megafarms in the province of Saskatchewan.

Well it isn't going to work; it isn't going to work. One of the members opposite said I didn't know what I was talking about, Mr. Speaker. I invite him to join in the debate. I invite him to debate outside the legislature, because your government doesn't know what you're talking about. You never have. People are only just starting to realize it.

So there was a problem also, Mr. Speaker, with this equity financing because they know that it didn't fly with the farmers last year, the ones who are suffering the brunt of what's happening in the agricultural sector.

So what did they say in the throne speech? I was astounded. The farmers should have paid particular attention to what was said in the throne speech, that there will be provisions made by the Government of Saskatchewan so that farmers can own their home quarter. Well isn't that wonderful? Anybody who homesteaded in Saskatchewan got their home quarter then. Other people bought their home quarters after that.

It was very important, Mr. Speaker, for farmers to own their land. I've always assumed that farmers should own their own land. And now this government has thrown up its hands in frustration and said the only way to go is bigger and bigger farms, foreign investment, equity financing, venture capital farms in the province of Saskatchewan, huge agri-business, going back to the serf system — serfs in their own land. That is unbelievable, Mr. Speaker.

And now this government is going to allow farmers to own their home quarter. That is a disgrace, it's a denial of family heritage in the province of Saskatchewan, and this government has done more to destroy farm families than any government in the history of the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, what does the government

give for the reasons as to why this is happening? They say to a large extent it's because of things that have happened beyond our own boundaries; that we're caught up in a world, a shrinking world that's getting smaller and smaller because of the media and the communications and satellites and rapid travel and education of people; that the world is shrinking so much that we can no longer exist on our own in the province of Saskatchewan; we're caught up in a world trend and this cycle that we're on; we can't get off it; we just have to ride it out as best we can. My leader referred to it as a surf-board rider riding the surf-board out in the ocean, not having any option to get off.

The global village, Mr. Speaker, does affect everyone. But in Saskatchewan, in the province of Saskatchewan, where people are politically aware, they're politically active, they're concerned, they love their province. People can stand for Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, not some global village that's out there. The global village is certainly a reality.

But if Saskatchewan people had said back in the 1960s and prior to the 1960s that, well, we can't have medicare here because they don't have it anywhere else; we can't have medicare here because they don't have it anywhere else, do you think that we would have had medicare today?

There were some great leaders, Mr. Speaker, during the time that medicare came into place in the province of Saskatchewan. There were people like Tommy Douglas and Woodrow Lloyd and Allan Blakeney, and many people who worked behind the scenes. There were opposing forces, the Keep Our Doctors committees that were scaring people in the province of Saskatchewan, saying if medicare came in, doctors would leave; doctors will leave; hospitals will close; your family will get sick; they'll die because you can't get medical treatment. They scared people. There was money that came from the American Medical Association to the Keep Our Doctors committee to squash medicare.

And why do we have medicare today? Not because of leaders like Tommy Douglas and Woodrow Lloyd and Allan Blakeney and others that fought for that alone; it's because of the people in the province of Saskatchewan fought for what they believed was their hereditary right. They won then, Mr. Speaker. They won the medicare issue. Medicare came into reality and is now commonly accepted in every province in Canada. It is accepted in every province in Canada.

And watch the government that destroys medicare. They will never get re-elected in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. But that's what Thomas Paine meant when he talked about the tree of liberty must be periodically bathed in the blood of patriots.

Mr. Speaker, medicare is sacred. People should not have to worry because of their financial status as to whether or not they live or they die. People in Saskatchewan, during that time, fought for what they believed in. People believed that the private sector alone had taken too much. People don't mind the private sector having their fair share. I don't think anyone minds that.

Responsible corporate citizens are welcome in the province of Saskatchewan, but they have to pay their way just like everyone else in the province of Saskatchewan. They have to be willing to work with co-operatives. They have to be willing to work with public ownership. They have to be willing to work with public participation, because the public have always participated in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

(2130)

Saskatchewan is to a large extent alone in this, not only alone in the world, in that global village, but even in Canada. And for an example what I would point to, Mr. Speaker, is turn-out at election time. In the last provincial election in the province of Saskatchewan where your government, Mr. Speaker, formed a majority government in the province of Saskatchewan, even though they actually got less votes, but because of the distribution of those votes they formed a government — I don't complain about that; that's the way the democratic system works. I believe that over 80 per cent of the people in the province, or very close to — I don't have the figure before me — either over or very close to 80 per cent of the people in the province of Saskatchewan participated in the last provincial election because people in Saskatchewan care.

Let's look to our neighbour to the West. Alberta just went through a federal election . . . pardon me, Mr. Speaker, they went through a federal election, but they just went through a provincial election in which unfortunately their leader was defeated, the member from Whitemud. His party formed a majority government, there were some Liberals elected, there were a respectable number of New Democrats. New Democrats got 25 per cent of the vote in the province of Alberta. That is very respectable. One in four people in Alberta vote New Democrat. And do you know how New Democrats are going to form the government in the province of Alberta? Because only 50 per cent — and that's giving the benefit of the doubt — I should say less than 50 per cent of the people in Alberta voted in the last provincial election in Alberta, less than 50 per cent. Compare that to Saskatchewan: 80 per cent of the people vote in Saskatchewan elections. That is not uncommon because people here care.

And as soon as the 16, I believe it is — we have 16 New Democrats in Alberta — as soon as the 16 New Democrats that we have elected in the provincial legislature in the province of Alberta are able to get out and talk to enough people to convince them that not all politicians are the same and that we don't have to be caught up in this global village and world economy, you're all of a sudden dealing with at least 30 per cent more people voting. New Democrats in Alberta will bring that other 30 per cent to vote and they will not be voting Conservative, Mr. Speaker.

Well one of the members mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that there'd be an NDP sweep next time in Alberta. I don't want to be too optimistic. I'm not going to go out on a limb and predict that, but I do predict that an NDP government will come to power in the province of Alberta, and the reason they will is what I've stated. They

will talk to that other 30 per cent of the people who should be voting but don't vote. You're actually dealing with in Alberta . . . The majority of the people don't vote in the province of Alberta.

So I guess the point I was trying to make, Mr. Speaker — in case you lost it; I was a bit long-winded in that, and I see some of the members opposite have lost it as well — is that we do not have to be caught up in things that are happening in the rest of the world. Some of them affect us, yes, but Saskatchewan people have the desire, as long as their government has the desire to do something constructive for Saskatchewan, for Saskatchewan people, for all our betterment, Saskatchewan people will follow that. Saskatchewan people will not follow scare tactics. They will not follow devastation of programs that they have come to enjoy. Saskatchewan people will not support paying into their children's and grandchildren's future for debts that have been needlessly, needlessly created by this Progressive Conservative government, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to Saskatchewan families for a while. Saskatchewan families, Mr. Speaker, I think are worrying about society's social fabric. They worry about how they'll afford post-secondary education for their children and, if they retire, will they ever be able to maintain the standard of living that they currently enjoy. Families are being caused a lot of distress, and I think that families in the province of Saskatchewan have to see some vision for the future. You look at the people that have the greatest concern right now about things like the environment, which this government only wants to spend \$9 million on, when they're willing to spend \$45 million from the Department of Education budget to pay to another government Crown corporation, property management, to rent space.

They're so concerned about the future, the young people lose hope within their families, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I know in our own situation at home, we have four children. And the chances are if they were all to go on to post-secondary education, that at some point there may be three of them in post-secondary education at the same time. I wonder where I would get \$21,000 a year to be able to afford to send those three children at one time to post-secondary education.

That causes me concern, Mr. Speaker, and I have likely more means than a number of people in the province of Saskatchewan that have families of 1, 2, 3, 4 and maybe 5 children. Is it fair in a province like Saskatchewan that because someone is on low income or because they've been put on to the ranks of the unemployed and unemployment insurance and when that runs out face the Saskatchewan assistance plan to support their families, is it fair that their children can no longer afford or attain the right to go to university or to trade school?

The Minister of Education will say everyone has that right in a province like Saskatchewan. But it's becoming beyond the reach, beyond the reach of people. We have a preferred education system now, Mr. Speaker, where young people are being wasted in terms of their ability to develop the best that they can possibly be, and they should have that right. Everyone should have that right to

education in a province like Saskatchewan.

Wage earners worry about how they're going to make ends meet, Mr. Speaker, after the government has ravaged social programs and increased the tax burden, as I pointed out earlier this evening, by such innovative ideas as the flat tax, which is one of the most unfair and unprogressive taxes that has ever been placed on income in the history of Canada.

Wage earners are concerned about the federal government of the same political stripe as the government in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, putting in a national sales tax. National sales tax comes in, 9 per cent, added on to 7 per cent sales tax in the province. That's a 16 per cent sales tax, Mr. Speaker. So every time you go out and buy an item that's new for \$100, you have to pay 16 more dollars.

As I pointed out again earlier, Mr. Speaker, this government promised to eliminate the sales tax in the province of Saskatchewan. But they didn't. They increased it by 40 per cent. Went from 5 per cent to 7 per cent. Wage earners are worried about things like that, Mr. Speaker.

And wage earners are also concerned about the farce that's been made of collective bargaining in the province. Saskatchewan workers have always been proud of their right and their ability to organize. And if someone doesn't want to participate in collective bargaining they've never been beaten or forced to. It's not like our friends to the south where there's terrorism that runs between the political parties and some of the unions.

Saskatchewan has developed a different working relationship with wage earners and organized labour in this province than what we have to the south. We've cushioned that from the global village, Mr. Speaker.

What about small business? Small business is worried about meeting their monthly payroll. They're surely concerned about the rising interest rates which this government does nothing about. The only thing that's shrinking faster than the consumer dollar is small business's optimism in the province of Saskatchewan. Because as consumers, the wage earners and the other small businesses, the organized working people and families, as they have less disposable and discretionary income to spend, small businesses suffer.

Quite often in our constituency office, Mr. Speaker, we have people coming in that are either in small business or are interested in getting into small business. Mr. Speaker, when they come to the office and ask, what assistance is there for small businesses, Mr. Speaker . . . Mr. Speaker, they say, what assistance is there for small business? And I say, well I know there are some good people working at the business resource centre in North Battleford, but they have nothing to offer you because there is no government program for small business. Small businesses are still waiting, Mr. Speaker, for their business tax rebate forms. When are they coming out? Are they being distributed through the chamber of commerce, as the member from Regina South pulls up the rah rah flag for? Where are they, where are the forms for the small business tax rebate?

They don't exist yet. What programs are there for small businesses in Saskatchewan? I maintain, nothing, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I see there is not a lot of time left this evening, but there are couple of other items that I wanted to address before I took my seat.

What's been happening in the province in terms of privatization. We have a Minister for the Department of Public Participation, they call it. Most people, even the government members, refer to it as privatization. Some of our members refer to it as piratization, but what we do certainly know, Mr. Speaker, is that it is a very distinct change from what people have dealt with previously in the province.

They privatize things like our phone book in the province. That might not be as good as what the government said it would be; lots of mistakes in the phone book; sold the directory business.

Mr. Speaker, there are various ways that this government has gone about the piratization in Saskatchewan. Some of them are acceptable to people in the public. I say that none of them are acceptable. Some are more acceptable than others to people in the public. And I still say that none of them are acceptable by this government, because what they're doing is that everything that is being privatized by this provincial government is being sold at less than value. It is, in many cases, not paying anything back to the province.

And, Mr. Speaker, what seems to be happening is that the government retains the debt and sells the asset. As long as you sell your assets and retain the debt, you're going to get yourself into very serious problems. Because if you sell off all the assets and retain the debt, what have you got left if this government's trend continues? If this government trend continues, the only source of revenue we will have is from average individuals in the province of Saskatchewan. Corporate tax is going down, personal income tax is going up, sales tax is going up, and at some point, I maintain to you, Mr. Speaker, the people in the province of Saskatchewan will say, no more, no more are we going to pay for the havoc created by this government. They are not going to pay to see the destruction of things they've worked for in the province of Saskatchewan.

(2145)

Mr. Speaker, people have to ask themselves, with the privatization, how are things better for me? It's the same as the free trade deal that was being pumped up by the government. The government said, we've got to support this free trade deal, it's going to be a boom for our economy. This government told us that privatization would be good for the economy.

But are things better, Mr. Speaker? Tell me what's better? Are we paying less tax? No, we're not paying less tax. Well are we getting more services? No, we're not getting more services. Well then what can be good about it? What can be good about giving away assets and retaining debt? Could the motivation be that their friends will take care of them after they're gone? Because sure they'll be

gone; we know that many of them won't run again in the next election.

An Hon. Member: — Twenty-three of them.

Mr. Anguish: — One of our members says 23 of them will not run again in the next election. Why is that? Why is that? Because they are desperately trying to find a way to get re-elected. They know that they can't buy votes like they did in 1986, because it worked then — it worked then, but people are wise now.

People know that the government used their money to buy an election. They painted a false picture and deceived people in the province. They told them about the rosy economy — things were tough but we're doing better; we're doing good; watch out for the global village, the world economy; you got to have us or it will sweep us over. Well it's sweeping us over, Mr. Speaker, because of the Conservative government in the province of Saskatchewan. The giving away of the assets, the retaining of the debt, the support of free trade, the privatization. And how has it helped us? We invite any of the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, any of the members opposite to stand in this legislature and tell this Assembly and the people in the province of Saskatchewan, how are things better for them as individuals? They are not. They're desperately trying to find new candidates, it looks like. They're trying to portray some vision of the future. Well a vision of the future might work, but if the people in the province look at the legacy of the government over the past couple of years, they won't believe a vision of the future.

People want to have hope in the future. They want to have hope for their families; they want to have hope for themselves; they want to have hope for their businesses; they want to have hope and security for their jobs; and they want a sustainable economy in the province of Saskatchewan.

The economy that's being created relies, Mr. Speaker, only on one cylinder. It relies now on the private sector. And by the time this government is done wreaking and causing havoc, it will only have the private sector to rely on. That is not a sustainable economy in the province of Saskatchewan, because if the private sector is the only thing you rely on, the global village in the world economy will run us over because the only motivation is profit.

And I don't believe that anybody in the province of Saskatchewan, that sits down and thinks, cares only about profits. They care about their job, they care about their business, their farm, their family. They care about decent, caring things, and that's why 80 per cent of the people in the province of Saskatchewan vote at election time in the province of Saskatchewan.

An Hon. Member: — That's why they voted for us.

Mr. Anguish: — But they stand back and they watch . . . the Deputy Premier says, they voted for us, referring to the Conservatives. I maintain to you, they won't do it again. You will never get re-elected in your political life in the province of Saskatchewan because people have seen what you truly stand for. Since 1986, devastation has

happened in the province.

As I was saying, the private sector will be run over by world economy. The only way Saskatchewan can exist and cushion itself, at least to some extent from that world economy, from that global village, from things that happened beyond our borders, is to have the mixed economy in the province which worked during the '70s and will work during the 1990s, Mr. Speaker. And I think we have to keep re-stating what a mixed economy is all about.

A mixed economy believes that, yes, we need a strong vibrant private sector in the province of Saskatchewan. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we need a strong public sector in the province of Saskatchewan, because if we didn't have outside our borders would run us over. We need a co-operative sector, Mr. Speaker, in the province of Saskatchewan. Those three work together to make a mixed economy in this province, and this government wants to take away the latter two which are the most important in providing good, caring, compassionate programs for good people in the province of Saskatchewan. The private sector does not have a mandate to do that, Mr. Speaker.

Public sector co-operatives have a responsibility beyond the profit motive. I don't criticize the profit motive. If a business doesn't make profit, it's not going to be there unless it's a business that's propped up and pushed and supported by a senseless policy from a government that throws out cash whenever they see a problem. It increases their big deficit problem in the province, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, before I close, I want to say that people in Saskatchewan have fought for the things that they believe in. And I will restate that again just before closing. There's only about 10 minutes left this evening, so I might as well finish off for the evening.

But I want to talk about the commitment and the integrity of some people in the province. During the medicare crisis in the province of Saskatchewan, I mentioned earlier when the Keep Our Doctors committees were running around the province, Woodrow Lloyd was the premier of the province of Saskatchewan at that time, and there was hot and heavy debate in the legislature. There was hot and heavy debate on coffee row. Families were torn. Families argued about who was right. Was it the Keep Our Doctors committee, or was it the performance of medicare, so that all people could have good access to good quality health care in the province?

And I vaguely remember — I was very young when that was happening. I can remember, though, the tension that ran amongst families and friends and communities — communities that wanted to keep their medical facilities, that were afraid they'd lose them. Communities . . . I don't know about riots, but almost came to the point of riots within our own province over a thing like health care.

And one thing that always stood out in my mind, Mr. Speaker, was a meeting held by the Saskatchewan Medical Association in, I think, in the Trianon — was there a Trianon Ballroom here at one time? I believe the

meeting was at the Trianon Ballroom and the building was packed. The Trianon ballroom was packed in the city of Regina. And Woodrow Lloyd, as premier during this medicare crisis, was asked to come and address the Saskatchewan Medical Association.

And there was no security at that time, not like the government has now in their property management corporation — they hire a bunch of ex-RCMP officers to protect them from bomb threats and scares on their person because of how they've devastated and wreaked havoc — there was no security at that time, Mr. Speaker.

Woodrow Lloyd entered the hall at the Saskatchewan Medical Association. He had one other individual with him. That individual was a man by the name of Alvin Hewitt. And Woodrow Lloyd and Alvin Hewitt had to walk all the way up to the front of the Trianon Ballroom, and at the point they were walking up about half-way, someone from the audience jumped out and spit in Woodrow Lloyd's face and asked him why he was trying to destroy medicare in the province of Saskatchewan.

To tell you something about the integrity of that man, which doesn't exist in any of the members opposite, Woodrow Lloyd walked to the front of the hall, never raising his hand to wipe the spit from his face, stood in front of the Saskatchewan Medical Association, gave his address, left the stage, walked out of the hall, after having stated his case for why people in Saskatchewan should have access to medicare — regardless of their financial position, they should have access to good medical treatment — and never having raised his hand to wipe the spit from his face. That's integrity, Mr. Speaker. That's integrity, Mr. Speaker, that none of the members have opposite. It's courage, as well, as one of our members point out.

What were members on that side doing during that time? They were the ones spitting in the face of Saskatchewan people. They incited, they incited the Keep Our Doctors committees.

And, Mr. Speaker, just as a note to you, I find it very interesting when I'm in my seat, Mr. Speaker, if I say one word, you'll call me to order. And I've had to raise my voice all evening to try and raise it above the roar that's going on over there — the yelling and the hollering. And I refer back to the respect for the institution, so I don't bring that . . . or I didn't bring that to your attention. It's almost 10 o'clock, so I'll finish off my remarks and overlook what the members opposite are doing.

Mr. Speaker, I think that they're making fools of themselves over there. People like Alvin Hewitt and Woodrow Lloyd had the integrity that members on that side of the House will never understand, because they don't have integrity. Saskatchewan people say, Mr. Speaker, this government stands for no hope, no opportunity, no compassion, no security, no fairness, no co-operation, no democracy.

They don't ask people in the province about doing anything; they just do it. They're wreckers; they're destroyers, and they will have to, I say again, Mr. Speaker, account.

And for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I would want to say that I'm honoured to support the amendment to this budget address that was put forward by the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake earlier this evening. And I would like to read the amendment.

The amendment was moved by the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake, sir, and seconded by myself:

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

this Assembly regrets that the provincial budget imposes unfair tax increases on ordinary families, reduces funding for youth job creation and for agriculture, fails to restore the damage caused by provincial government cut-backs in health, education, and other social programs, and completely fails to address the causes of Saskatchewan's population loss to other parts of Canada.

And I know, Mr. Speaker, that my remarks have been varied tonight, but as you would know in the knowledge that you've gained in your position as Deputy Speaker — but I do refer to you as Speaker in the Chair; I believe you take on that authority when you sit there — that we had many things to say because there is latitude allowed in two speeches that are given. One is the throne speech debate, the other is the budget debate, and I appreciate the latitude that you've given me here this evening without calling me to order.

I quite honestly, Mr. Speaker, don't remember any time being in this legislature, other than tonight, that I haven't been called to order by you and sat back down in my seat. So I would have to think that I've learned a great deal from you over the course of my experience in this legislature, because you've not called me to order this evening for anything I've said. And I guess that means I'm paying particular attention to making sure that my language is parliamentary and that I haven't been saying anything too loud.

On the same token, Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate that you haven't called them to order, because it actually inspires me, in terms of the yelling and the hollering that they do from that side of the House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — I personally think it's disgraceful, the way that they act. The lack of decorum on that side of the House is a terrible, terrible shame, Mr. Speaker. But in any event, as I said, it does inspire me.

I've enjoyed being here with you this evening, and I can't think of anything in the world that I would pass this opportunity up for. And I want you to know that, barring unforeseen circumstances, I may be back tomorrow to give some inspiration, not only to our members but to your members as well, and for our federal colleagues that I'm sure, since their House is closed tonight, would be watching on satellite this provincial legislature here in the province of Saskatchewan, because the federal system

has learned a great deal from the province.

The other thing that people are watching right across Canada is to what happens to Conservatives in the province of Saskatchewan. It's a test case for the entire country, as many programs have been in the past. And we know, we know . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order, order. Being 10 o'clock, this House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. tomorrow.

The Assembly adjourned at 10 p.m.