

EVENING SITTING

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTION FOR COMMITTEE OF FINANCE
(BUDGET DEBATE)

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

Hon. Mr. Petersen: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In my opening remarks before supper, I dealt with an overview of some of the things that we've done, and I'd just like to highlight that for some of the members opposite and for some of the people who are viewing at home.

We talked about the budget and how we've put our dollars into priority areas. In education we had a 5.6 per cent increase in funding, a total of \$888 million being spent. Mr. Speaker, we've increased our student aid. Increases to universities, technical institutes, school boards, regional colleges are all part and parcel of that budget.

In the area of health, Mr. Speaker, in health care, we've almost had an almost 10 per cent increase in the spending, Mr. Speaker. That's an increase of \$136 million. The health budget is at \$1.5 billion, \$1,500 for every man, woman, and child in the province of Saskatchewan — \$4.1 million a day, \$172,000 an hour — however you want to put it, it's a lot of money, and a lot more than has ever been spent in health care before.

The budget includes increases for home care, nursing homes, and hospitals. Mr. Speaker, we care about the people that made this province — our seniors. We care about families. We've seen increased funding for the families, Mr. Speaker.

At the same time, we've attempted to use a certain amount of fiscal responsibility. There were no tax increases in this budget, no tax increases, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We've talked to the people; we've consulted with them. The Minister of Finance travelled the province, met with people, and they said, we can't take any more tax increases. Don't do it; we don't need any more tax increases. And we've done that, Mr. Speaker. We've achieved that. We have been spending in priority areas, Mr. Speaker. We have increased spending, as I said, in health, education, and maintained that spending, increased it with no tax increases.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we've also got to look at some of the things that are a priority in this province as far as the overall infrastructure is concerned, and transportation is one of those areas. We've entered into agreements with the federal government on a joint provincial and federal national highway policy.

The national highways should be a responsibility of all levels of government. In the United States the interstate

system is paid for 90 per cent by the federal government and 10 per cent by the state that it travels through. That doesn't happen in Canada. Here the funding in most cases is exactly the opposite, and we have to work towards achieving a more equitable situation as far as funding for our national highway system is concerned.

And we're working very hard on that with the federal government. And we've got to hold their feet to the fire, Mr. Speaker, because they have been guilty of off-loading many of their responsibilities onto the provinces. And that's resulted, Mr. Speaker, in situations where this year we see a decrease in our transfer payments to the province of Saskatchewan. We see them moving in other areas as well, and we've got to maintain solidarity. We've got to maintain the commitment by this province and other provinces that enter into an agreement with us to hold the federal government's feet to the fire and make them live up to their responsibilities.

In the 1990-91 Highways budget, Mr. Speaker, we see about \$233 million for highways and transportation. We're going to improve more than 1,000 kilometres of highways. We've got many projects. We've got 58 surfacing projects coming up, 30 grading projects coming up, 24 bridge projects.

And a few of the highlights, a few of the highlights in this year's array, Mr. Speaker, are the continued upgrading of Highway 11. We've got six surfacing projects on Highway 1; we've got five projects on the Yellowhead; reconstructing Highway 46 from west of Pilot Butte to Balgonie; reconstructing a section of Highway 302 west of P.A. I'm going to be tabling the entire list, Mr. Deputy Speaker, at the end of my remarks, so I won't dwell on it any further.

The major emphasis is going to be on rehabilitation. Rehab will exceed \$42 million, Mr. Speaker. We're going to improve 400 kilometres of paved highways. Now, Mr. Speaker, the maintenance budget increased by \$2 million to over 92 million this year. It provides a safe and efficient highway system, a very safe and efficient highway system, and safety is number one with us, Mr. Speaker. All of the employees in the Department of Highways have safety as their number one priority.

We've got the largest road system in Canada, over 25,000 kilometres, Mr. Speaker, and we've got to make sure that we keep those roads in a very, very safe condition. And just to talk to you about safety, we've had the fewest fatalities since 1961 in the past year. Unfortunately 192 people lost their lives in 1989. It's below the average, but we've still got to do better, Mr. Speaker.

Seat belt usages are at an all-time high of 88 per cent in the province of Saskatchewan; that's the highest in North America. We've seen headlight use during daylight hours. We've reduced the number of drinking drivers on the road — reduced the number of drinking drivers. We're seeing a lot more people acting responsibly in the use of alcohol, but it's still a major factor.

In 1989, 7 per cent of all accidents were alcohol related, and 45 per cent of all fatal accidents had alcohol

involved. We have got to continue our safety programs. We've got to continue our promotional programs as far as the use and abuse of alcohol and driving is concerned.

The department maintains as safe a system as it possibly can, but we require the co-operation of every citizen of Saskatchewan in order to make it even more safe. Our mission statement, Mr. Speaker, is very simple, very very simple. It's working together for excellence in transportation — very simple. We've got to set some goals and we've got to work towards that. We want to be a leading government department in the delivery of services and programs. We want to maximize transportation's contribution to the social and economic development of the province. Mr. Speaker, that means taking a look at our expertise and our innovation in transportation areas, using what we've got.

In the department we have a wealth of information and a wealth of knowledge and experience. The deputy minister, Mr. Jack Sutherland, started working in the Department of Highways in 1953. Mr. Speaker, that was the year that I was born. Needless to say, when Mr. Sutherland suggests something happen, I tend to give him some credibility.

We've got a group of people in the department, Mr. Speaker, that I am very proud of. They've worked very hard this winter to make certain that our highway's as safe as possible. They're out there at 4 o'clock in the morning putting sand and salt on the roads trying to make sure that people have as safe a system as possible, trying to make sure that no one is inconvenienced needlessly.

Mr. Speaker, they do that because they have a sense of pride in their job. They're proud of what they do. They're proud of the fact that they can maintain the highway system and as good a system . . . situation as they can. They're proud of the fact that many of them are 20- and 25- and 30-year employees, Mr. Speaker. They're proud of the fact that their department has a history of working for the public of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to see even more of that. I'd like to see the department work even closer with communities, with rural municipalities, with the public at large to make that system even more efficient.

We've looked at a number of areas in my opening remarks as far as diversification and innovation was concerned, Mr. Speaker. And I've dealt with the road-railer; I've dealt with Southern Rails. Members opposite perhaps didn't agree or didn't care to listen to what I was talking about, but indeed it is an important innovation.

We've got other types of innovations. We've got a type of paint called Technos 1000 — it's a two-part paint that is sprayed on and will last up to five times as long as the paint that's used now for striping on the highways, Mr. Speaker. That will cut our costs.

We've looked at weight and motion technology, and for members opposite, that means that we now have the technology whereby we do not have to pull a machine over, stop it, and move a little bar across a little weigh scale and take a look at them and see what they're doing,

see how much they weigh. Weight and motion technology is so advanced that it can tell you the weight of a vehicle as it's travelling down the highway. And that's an important part when we're looking at control and we're looking at regulation; when we're trying to consider all the factors that go into the life and life expectancy of highways, Mr. Speaker.

We're looking at other innovations, as well — container ports, container ports. Containerization is becoming a major method of moving many of the products that we are now manufacturing and processing in the province of Saskatchewan. Other provinces have had access to containerization for a number of years. And for members opposite, containerization is a very, very simple method whereby the product is processed, bagged, packaged, whatever, put into containers that are sealed in the province of Saskatchewan and shipped as a unit — a complete unit — lifted on to and off of our transportation systems by means of a crane loaded on to ships and sent directly overseas where the container is then opened and the product is removed and distributed according to their needs. Containerization allows us the ability to process right here in the province, to package it right here in the province instead of sending bulk shipments out to British Columbia for processing, packaging and loading there, or bulk shipments across the ocean to other countries for them to enjoy the benefits of the jobs.

Mr. Speaker, we've also had some other firsts. We've had a study to enhance the transportation and distribution capabilities in the province. Mr. Speaker, that will enhance our economic development in the province. And we all recognize that transportation and new methods of transportation will be key in the diversification of the province of Saskatchewan. We have to look at different methods of moving our product than what we're used to, and some of them are fairly innovative. And if any of the members opposite have any ideas at all in this area, or any ideas period, I'd invite them to come and share them with me.

We've also had, Mr. Speaker, for the first time a very, very prestigious group. The Canadian Industrial Transportation League met in Saskatoon for their 74th annual meeting. And that's the first time — first time — that that group ever met in Saskatchewan, and that includes all of Canada's major shippers, and indeed some from the United States as well. All of the major players in the transportation area of companies that are situated all across Canada met in Saskatoon for their convention, for their show. All of those people, Mr. Speaker, were surprised at what they found in Saskatchewan. They said, we didn't know that you had this type of facility; we didn't know that these things were available; we didn't understand the type of infrastructure that you have. Nobody's told us about you before. They were quite amazed at what they found. I'm sure that some of them will be setting up offices here in Saskatchewan and starting to look at Saskatchewan as a distribution centre, because we are geographically located very, very favourably for all the markets in the central United States. We've got access all directions, Mr. Speaker. We're centralized. We are right in the middle. We can move a product anywhere in the continent from Saskatchewan, so why shouldn't we be a distribution centre? Why

shouldn't we be?

But members opposite perhaps will disagree with that and say that we shouldn't do it, but I think we should. I think we should provide more jobs for the people in the province of Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, some of those are examples of the spirit of Saskatchewan and how the people are working here in the province and many of the innovations and new ideas that are coming from the people in Saskatchewan and from the department as well. And I say department as well because I'm very proud of the department. The department has worked extremely hard on new innovation and technology, as I've said — the road-railer and other innovations like that.

(1915)

But on the smaller scale at the local shops, Mr. Speaker, I toured every district office, both the administrative and engineering head offices and the mechanical shops around the province, and I met as many people as I could. Some of those shops manufacture their own equipment for use on the highways. Not the major equipment — they don't build caterpillars or graders or trucks there — but the smaller equipment, the specialized equipment that we need in Saskatchewan that's used exclusively for highway work. Many of those innovations developed in the local shops, like in Yorkton and Prince Albert and Saskatoon, Regina, North Battleford, Swift Current, are making the job of the people working in Highways much, much easier and much safer. A very simple piece of technology that's going to be tried out this year — everyone's known the consternation of driving down the highway when we've got a sweeper in operation, and there's dust blowing up from the sweeper as they're sweeping off some of the sand-sealed gravel or perhaps some of the winter accumulation of sand, and it's dusty and people complain about that. Or you see problems with that as far as construction is concerned, and people are concerned about it. And it's a little bit hard on them because they enter a dust area and they're a little bit worried about what might be through the dust cloud.

We're trying to improve that safety. We've already got signing. We've already got controls. We already advised people to slow down, take it easy, people are working here.

Mr. Speaker, a very piece of simple technology is to add a spray container ahead of the sweeper. We've tried it with water trucks in the past going ahead, but it got a little bit mucky. Now we're going to calibrate the amount of water needed right as the sweeper is travelling, just to keep the dust down, still remove the gravel and debris from the road and whatever's accumulated over the winter, but keep the dust down. It makes so much common sense, Mr. Speaker. A very simple thing, a very simple thing, but it will make things safer. It will help to alleviate the concerns that the public have and will make things safer for the highway workers.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I could go on for quite some time this evening, extolling the virtues of the people in the department and talking about this government and its

commitment to the province of Saskatchewan, and also I could go back to setting the historical record straight as far as members opposite when they were government as compared to ourselves.

But I'll just suffice it to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think the budget that we have developed, that the Minister of Finance has developed, is a very fine one, and at this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table for you the 1990-91 construction project array. Mr. Speaker, with that I will just say, thank you very much. I'll turn it over to another member.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it was interesting as I was listening to the Minister of Highways, not once did I hear the word VIA ever come out of his lips. In an hour and a quarter — that long, an hour and a quarter — in that time, while 12 people were leaving Saskatchewan, if you take the average of the number of people that left in the past year, while 12 people were leaving Saskatchewan, I can assure the member opposite they were not leaving Saskatchewan on a VIA train.

You know the difference, Mr. Minister, between people fleeing from East Germany and people fleeing from Saskatchewan, from the Tory oppression in Saskatchewan? They've got a passenger train; that's the difference. They can still take the train. It's interesting that you would talk not a word about passenger rail service while it's been eliminated by your cousins, the Conservative Party . . . the Conservative government in Ottawa. And nary a peep from government members here over that disappearing.

You know earlier, Mr. Speaker, we have heard government members talking with great glee about what events are taking place in eastern Europe and in the Soviet sphere of influence, and of course what they're referring to is the democratization process that is taking place. Members opposite simply can't believe that we are elated on this side of the House with events that are transpiring in eastern Europe and in the Soviet circles. We are elated with it, Mr. Speaker, because what is happening is we have millions of people who are now, for the first time in decades, getting a taste of what democracy is all about. They're moving to a multiparty system rather than a single party, oppressive system that government members opposite would have us believe would somehow serve Saskatchewan well. Somehow or other, government members opposite say, oh, the opposition has got to simply say yes to every single thing that they're about. Well the reason we're not saying yes to the things that they are about is the very people that I and my colleagues represent are feeling the pain. They're feeling the hurt from your government's actions.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — We think, Mr. Speaker, it is time for a tired government to get out of the way. They're obviously devoid of ideas. The best they've been able to come up with in the past two weeks is ConSask. Tonight, this very day, we see on the evening news, we see the Premier throwing sticks at some farmers, figuratively throwing

sticks. He was blowing his stack at some farmers, saying oh, you're not on our side, not on my side, the Premier says.

Well when did people of Saskatchewan have to pick sides? We had a large group of farmers visiting this very legislature earlier today. I had the pleasure of meeting with four of those people, Mr. Speaker. They made some very good points. Farmers right across Saskatchewan should be very proud of the work that those individuals did at great personal expense, because not only were they giving up a day of work on their farm, but it also cost them a significant pile of cash to come down here and visit us in the legislature. So I'm very pleased with the initiative that those farm groups took earlier today, Mr. Speaker.

As I was looking at the Finance minister giving his budget address, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't help but being struck by a feeling of, well what does this budget do for my constituents. How does it affect the good people of Regina North? How does it affect them?

Does it help any of the number of people who are currently fighting with the Workers' Compensation Board, battling for fair compensation after they have been injured at work and have now been, unfairly in many instances, deemed capable of earning X dollars a day, the problem of course being that they're deemed capable of doing jobs that simply aren't in existence. Did the budget address some of the fundamental problems of the Workers' Compensation Board system and how it affects my constituents? It did not, Mr. Speaker. It did not.

What about social services recipients, people who in virtually every instance, through no fault of their own, have been forced to approach the Department of Social Services and ask for what they hope, they sincerely hope to be temporary, short-term help? What did we see in this budget address, Mr. Speaker? We saw silence. We saw not even a hold the line budget; we saw, when you take inflation into account, we saw a decrease in the funding for the Department of Social Services.

Mr. Speaker, in the past few days I've had the — I'm not sure whether to say pleasure or displeasure — I had the opportunity to speak to a single parent who is a social services recipient, new to Regina, moved in from rural Saskatchewan in the hopes of finding a job. This woman, because she left her two children behind to finish the school year, is deemed to be a single employable welfare recipient. Because of that, the absolute maximum amount that she can receive is \$405 a month: 200 for housing; 140 for basic needs; and various from 35 to 65, that's the minimum and maximum amount for utilities. Taking the maximum amount for utilities, comes to a grand slam total of \$405 a month.

Mr. Speaker, there is no way that a human being can survive in Regina on \$405 a month. That is disgraceful. That is a discredit to the government members opposite. It is something that we will be looking forward to changing at the earliest opportunity.

People such as the woman I'm just describing want job opportunities. And that of course will be a priority with us, but in the mean time, she's got to have enough money

to be able to buy food, to be able to buy housing or rent housing, arrange for her housing, for clothing, food, transportation, and the various needs that we all have. And what did the budget say to her? Nothing. Nothing at all. What a disgrace!

I've also in the past two weeks, Mr. Speaker, had an opportunity of talking to a small-business woman in my constituency again. This woman has been dealing with the Department of Economic Diversification and Trade. I had to look it up because small business keeps rolling; we never know from one month to the next what department it's going to fit into. We don't know who's in charge, and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, nor do the small-business men and women of Saskatchewan know who's in charge. What this woman has done is gone three separate times to SEDCO, three separate times has been turned down. Despite the road-blocks put up by the government opposite in their lack of planning, lack of a clear indication of what is available and what is not for small business, she has spent an inordinate amount of time seeking out programs that might be of some help to her, when in fact the patent truth is there is nothing, no program this government has to offer for her.

Despite that she was able to set up her own business. It is running, there is some outstanding debt from the set-up, and she's currently working very, very, very hard to overcome those initial start-up difficulties. But I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, this business woman is going to do it all on her own because there's just nothing available from government members opposite. There was nothing mentioned in the budget speech; she's on her own.

And how did the budget affect another small-business friend of mine from out of town who had the displeasure of being foreclosed on? He's a friend of mine and the Minister of — what do we call it? — Economic Diversification and Trade thinks it's irrelevant.

An Hon. Member: — No, no, that's consumer affairs.

Mr. Trew: — Oh, consumer affairs, I'm sorry; used to be in charge of tourism and small business when it was called that — thinks it's irrelevant. But I can tell you it's not irrelevant. There's four members of that family. They have friends and they're talking. What has happened since his business has been foreclosed is now — I was talking to him about three-quarters of an hour ago. It looks very much like that family is going to join the exodus of people leaving Saskatchewan. They are going to wind up in all likelihood in Ontario. He has a job offer there. He told me on the telephone three-quarters of an hour ago, there is just nothing available for me in Saskatchewan. And what a crime, what an indictment on this hoping for business government opposite — hoping for business. It's amazing. Yet over \$360 million for Cargill, and yet the small business sector is really hurting and you've got apparently nothing for them.

What did the budget say about day care, Mr. Speaker? How does it affect the families who require child care in my constituency? Well, for the — I'm not sure how many years, but it's a lot of years — the day-care subsidy remains frozen in this year's budget, frozen again. Another hardship particularly on young families that are

struggling, trying to get their head above water. Many of them have not had wage or salary increases that even approximate what the cost of living has gone up over the last eight or nine years. And the day-care subsidy remains frozen; they continue to go further and further behind. So the budget really didn't have much to say to those people.

(1930)

Did the budget address pay equity? Did the budget address equal pay for work of equal value?

An Hon. Member: — Did that years ago. Did that in 1987.

Mr. Trew: — The member for Regina Wascana says we did that years ago, did it in 1987. Well that'll be a great revelation, Mr. Minister, to the many women, the women in Saskatchewan who continue to be paid on average less than two-thirds of what the men of Saskatchewan are paid — less than two-thirds. That's the Minister of Families telling us, oh, we dealt with that years ago, ergo it's irrelevant. We've crossed that bridge; we've done wonderful things, he says. Tell that to the women of Saskatchewan.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order, order. I've asked members to allow the member for Regina North to make his comments. Everybody gets an opportunity to . . . Order. Order. I've asked the member for Regina . . . Order. I've asked the member for Regina Wascana to allow the member for Regina North to make his comments on the budget speech.

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And it is a shame, and the women of Saskatchewan know exactly what I was just saying. They know that the issue has not been addressed, not addressed to any reasonable satisfaction. Not even close. Not even close. And the minister continues on it. You'll have your opportunity.

The budget was silent on pay equity, Mr. Speaker. And what did the budget have to say for the thousands, the tens of thousands of Saskatchewan men, women, and young people who are working at or near minimum wage? Nothing. No mention of a change in the minimum wage. Not a peep. Not a peep. So where is . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'll get to buses just now, Mr. Member from Regina South. Buses is coming; trust me, buses is coming.

In the meantime we have tens of thousands of people on minimum wage that are continuing to work at a level of pay that doesn't even approximate the level of poverty. We have men, women, and young people struggling to pay their bills, struggling to get by in life, and this government thinks, well it doesn't matter. They continue to fiddle while Rome burns, just like Nero of old.

I look, Mr. Speaker, at the budget given to us short days ago and I see the Finance minister has the gall to stand up and say, oh but there's no tax increases. No tax increases, he says. Well I think he misspoke himself, at very least he misspoke himself, because they cut \$375,000 in a grant to the city of Regina — this year's portion of the rail relocation. And it is going to lead — just watch — it's

going to lead to a dropping, a complete elimination of a \$25 million grant to the city of Regina for the province's portion of that rail relocation project.

In essence, the government members opposite have decided that they've heard enough. They've heard the people and they're quashing that project, and it's not their decision to quash. But the long and short of it is, it's going to cost taxpayers in Regina in excess of \$25 million. That's a tax increase on property owners in Saskatchewan. It's a tax increase on small businesses in Regina.

A look at the capital program to the major urban centres — the majors cities, primarily Regina and Saskatoon is what I'm speaking of right now — last year was capped at about one-third of the rate, per capita, as other centres were paid. Now the argument that government members opposite used at that time was: well, Saskatoon got some help with Saskatoon Place, quite a number of millions of dollars and Regina is going to get \$25 million for rail relocation. So on that basis, Mr. Speaker, they gave Regina and Saskatoon approximately one third of the funding for the capital program, per capita, that they gave smaller centres.

Well that argument's gone. Where is the increase? Where is the sense of fairness? Is this government again putting the boots to the people in the two major centres — Regina and Saskatoon? You're again putting the boots to my constituents. I object. This is an unfair budget. It's not worthy of us passing it, Mr. Speaker, because it is so, so unfair.

The Finance minister, Mr. Speaker, had the audacity — he misspoke enough to say there's no tax increases in this budget. Scant few days before, he stood up and addressed us with his budget.

The Premier goes on province-wide television and announces retroactively that he has eliminated the gas fuel tax rebate program, eliminated it completely. And for 1989 retroactively he cut half of it off. What that means, Mr. Speaker, is effectively a 20 per cent increase in the cost of providing fuel or buying fuel for vehicles. That's what my constituents will pay; that's what I will pay.

For a 60-litre tank of gas, this one magic stroke that's not a tax increase, according to members opposite — not a tax increase — but this little magic stroke of the wand for a 60-litre tank of gas is going to cost an additional \$6 for my constituents. An additional \$6, assuming they buy one tank, one 60-litre tank of gas every week, 52 weeks, it comes to an increased cost of running their vehicle \$312 per year. And that's not a tax increase?

I can hardly believe that the government would be so naïve as to believe that people would even for two seconds buy your lying that they're not faced with a tax increase. Three hundred dollars for a modest amount of gas for a vehicle per year. I think that the Minister of Finance has clearly misspoke. I wish he'd come clean with the Legislative Assembly.

But there's another issue to go with this now-we-see-it gas tax, and that is government members opposite can no

longer be trusted on absolutely any promises whatever. Because what they've done is after the fact in March of 1990, Mr. Speaker, they cut half the fuel tax rebate program for 1989, a year that was right completely into the history books, and this government has retroactively snatched away half of that fuel tax rebate program.

What about . . . Mr. Speaker, let me remind you about the students' union building right here on the campus at the University of Regina. I take you back to the heady days just before the October 1986 election. The government announced, we've got money, we'll kick in our share for this much delayed, much needed student union building. We'll kick in our share, you said at that time. The ink wasn't even dry on the ballots after the election, that money was snatched away from the University of Regina student's union, snatched away. To this very day they do not have that new student's union building that they so richly need, deserve. In fact if you would care to take the time to go out to the University of Regina campus, you would see that the existing students' union building is literally collapsing around them. It has long since served its time. The university students at the U of R need and deserve a new students' union building. That's another broken promise of the government members opposite.

So we see tax increases coming at ordinary people. That's what this budget has done, despite pleas to the opposite from government members. We see tax increases on regular people, and yet we see there is in excess of \$300 million for Cargill. What a double standard. Government members have got all kinds of money for the megaprojects, lots of money, but not anything for the real people, the people that matter, the people that count. The most important investment in our province is our people. It's the people that's going to turn Saskatchewan right side up again; it sure isn't government members opposite.

Look at the urban affairs. What's happened in the 1991 budget, Mr. Speaker, short list: Regina rail relocation, cut; Saskatoon Centennial Auditorium grant, cut; urban revenue sharing, zero per cent increase; northern revenue sharing, zero per cent increase; community planning grants, cut over 31 per cent; municipal transit grants, and that is going to cost the people of Regina \$700,000, that one neat little cut alone — \$700,000.

I don't know how, Mr. Speaker, the government has the audacity to say, no tax increases. The Minister of Finance in his opening remarks said, and I won't quote because I don't have the exact words here — I guess I could look it up, but words to the effect that, well the Government of Saskatchewan could have followed the lead of our federal government and simply transferred the costs to a lower level of government, but we chose not to, they said. Well what's that mean for the \$1.829 million plus transit grant, municipal transit grant that was transferred to the major urban centres.

You know, Mr. Speaker, this cut, this one cut in itself makes Saskatchewan the only province in Canada that has a major urban transit system that doesn't get any help whatsoever from the provincial government. Imagine that. Out of 10 provinces we rate tenth, tenth. Dead last. What a disgrace!

Business tax rebate program cut 25 per cent. Municipal capital program cut by \$4 million this year. Municipal transit for the disabled, zero per cent increase — nothing for them. And I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I do have a number of constituents who make good use of that service that's provided in Regina. It's a good service. The problem they have is a chronic lack of funding. There is a shortage of drivers, shortage of buses and people to drive them, and because of that the waiting period to get on to these buses is several hours. Can you picture, Mr. Speaker, waiting . . . You go to do some shopping. You're in a wheelchair; you go to do some shopping. The only way you can get there is on this municipal transit for the disabled. You get into the shopping centre, do your shopping, and then you have to wait several hours before the bus can come and pick you up — not exactly a happy situation. I wonder how many government members opposite would be happy if, day in and day out, they had to wait hours, hours for their transportation to arrive.

Mr. Speaker, I see that the revenue-sharing grants are again frozen. This is the third year in a row that the revenue-sharing grants to the urban municipalities has been \$67 million — third year in a row. Heavens, in 1983 it was 60 million, and by 1991, eight years later, it's gone all the way to 67 million. It's a pretty disgraceful record.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure if you're aware, but I rhetorically asked a question: what is the loneliest job in the PC caucus?

An Hon. Member: — Is it the Premier?

Mr. Trew: — It's not the Premier. The Premier has people that will talk to him. The loneliest job in the PC caucus is that of back-bencher, because the number of members opposite that are not on the public payroll for extra money, extra to their base salary as MLAs, the grand number is one. One back-bencher, and you've got all kinds of cabinet ministers, all kinds of legislative secretaries. We have just no shortage of people on the extra dole.

(1945)

I have a few examples, Mr. Speaker. Members of Executive Council . . . I'm going to just read into the record some of the changes in members of Executive Council. And I see under Agriculture and Food on page 20 of the 1991 *Estimates* . . . This is for legislative — pardon me — it's for cabinet ministers and legislative secretaries to cabinet ministers: 1989-90 there was a sum total of \$7,800 budgeted for that; 1990-91 it goes to \$36,600. Maybe that's where some of the increased spending in agriculture is.

Let's look at Consumer and Commercial Affairs: 1989-90 expenditure, zero; 1990-91 expenditure, \$36,600. Remember, this is for cabinet ministers and legislative secretaries.

You look at Culture, Multiculturalism and Recreation: 1989-90, zero; 1990-91 — the budget we're talking about now — \$36,600. And yet we see in the same Culture, Multiculturalism and Recreation, we see grants to local authorities and other third parties has dropped

from over 15 million to \$11.6 million. Seems to be not money for that, but watch out for the cabinet ministers and the legislative secretaries.

I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker, and I choose not to. I'd be happy to share that information with anyone who cares to contact my office. I'd be happy to share that information with them. It's a matter of public record, it's no big secret, but I'm not going to take the time of the legislature in this budget debate to get into that.

Mr. Speaker, the budget and how does it affect . . . Let's take an important area. I talked a bit about women's issues earlier. The women's secretariat had a cut again this year. They're down; they get a grand total of \$540,000, down from last year's 559,000 and the year before 777,000.

It seems to me, I remember in 1988 or '89 government members opposite touting how wonderful this government is to furthering the cause of women, to furthering issues like day care, to furthering issues like women's shelter, to dealing with the wage gap. I spoke briefly about the wage gap earlier. What we've seen subsequent to that is cut after cut after cut in these important areas.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out a quote from a December 6, 1989, *Leader-Post* article: "Family violence said a top government priority." And I quote:

Social services Minister Bill Neudorf says the province will consider launching an advertising campaign attacking violence in the home.

Calling the issue of family violence a government priority . . .

It's a priority, a government priority. I leave that and go to a subsequent paragraph:

(The minister) told a press conference that the government is committed to helping victims of family violence . . .

Committed. Well, Mr. Speaker, some kind of a commitment. What do we see? Actions speak louder than words. Show us in the budget where there's any kind of priority. This is not a priority. This made a nice one-day wonder — one-day wonder headline for the minister. A one-day wonder.

Meanwhile we have battered women and their children that cannot get into safe shelter. We have that situation. And it's not unique to Regina, but it's certainly here. We have that situation. We're not talking about millions of dollars needed, Mr. Speaker. We're talking about a considerable number of thousands of dollars.

Might I suggest that I talked about some of the areas where we see cabinet ministers and legislative secretaries, increasing the amounts paid for that. Agriculture and food, from 7,800 to 36,600. Well that's a neat little 28 to \$29,000 increase. That would have been I think . . . I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that would have been money very, very well spent on a very, very serious — sad and

serious — problem. Why is it that the government chooses not to see? Why is it they choose not to hear? Why is it they choose not to act?

Mr. Speaker, actions do speak louder than words. I urge the government to come in with some supplemental estimates; kick in some money there. It is desperately needed. It's sad to see a budget that doesn't address the problems of the men, women, and children of Saskatchewan, the people that make this province what is to me and what I hope it is to you as well.

Mr. Speaker, I have before me: business bankruptcies in Saskatchewan. And it's a chart that shows the number of business bankruptcies, and lo and behold! from 1982 it just mushrooms. I recall very vividly the very first nomination that . . . where I was first nominated to represent the constituency . . . the New Democrats in the constituency of Regina North. I was using numbers of business bankruptcies and I was explaining to the people how the business bankruptcies had spiralled. I think that's almost an identical motion to what I used then. I see here that in 1985 the number of business bankruptcies was 302. And that was way up, way up over anything it had been in the previous decade, 302 business bankruptcies. And yet I see for 1989 the number's not 302, Mr. Speaker; it's 542, an increase of 190. And it's not just an increase in numbers; those are real business bankruptcies. There's families that are involved in that. Families that were in business no longer are. What does the budget say to those people? It's silent. One can only assume, Mr. Speaker, it is because the government is so totally devoid of ideas. They don't know how to deal with it. They cannot.

I look at out-migration. Some of my colleagues have addressed that. I just wish to make two points, one being in 1989 the total out-migration from Saskatchewan . . . I'm sorry; not the total out-migration — the net migration. In other words you subtract the people that have come in from the people that have gone on, the net difference. We've lost 23,705 people from Saskatchewan in 1989.

The point I wish to make there is the last year that . . . in fact the only year that was higher was 1970, when Saskatchewan lost 28,358 people. I point out to you sir, that was the last year of the Ross Thatcher Liberals. They were on the way out the last time numbers approached this. Now we're over 23,705 with no apparent slowing of that out-migration trend. The dying days of a Liberal government; compare them to the dying days of a Conservative government.

We want to turn that thing around. We want not to make rhetoric out of bringing the kids home. Remember that line you used in 1982: we'll bring the kids home. We don't want to make rhetoric out of that; we want to do it. We want to just provide the opportunities for Saskatchewan people. We want so that people can come home, so there's a choice for them. Not everyone will choose to; some of them will be into other things and life goes on and we tend to move around a little bit in our highly mobile society.

But we want to be able to provide people a choice. Mr. Speaker, the choice is becoming ever more evident to the people of Saskatchewan. I look at the youth employment

in the 1990-91 budget that we're addressing right now, and the Opportunities '90 student employment program this year cut by half a million dollars. Put it another way, in 1985-86, sir, the government spent \$9 million; this year they're going to spend \$2.6 million or roughly one-quarter of the amount spent a few years ago. And that is going to mean 5400 fewer jobs for students this year, that alone 5400 fewer jobs.

You're telling people by your actions, you're telling them, we don't have anything to offer you in Saskatchewan. Go; find a job somewhere else; go. That's what you're saying. Wrong message. The Public Service Commission also has a PSC (Public Service Commission) student employment program; that too was cut by half a million dollars. So in total we've got a million dollars less spent this year than last on student employment at a time when youth unemployment is running in excess of 15 per cent, Mr. Speaker, and the government continues to fiddle while Rome burns. While students can't find employment the government chooses to hear no evil, see no evil, and certainly speak no evil.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal briefly with the goings on in the government as it relates to the Saskatchewan Transportation Company. We see in recent weeks and months, Mr. Speaker, very serious allegations. We see court cases. We see a government bouncing from pillar to post as they seem to be covering up; they seem to be dodging bullets; they seem to be in trouble on this issue, and it doesn't matter what . . . They just don't have an out. And I submit to you, sir, they don't have an out because there's a lot that we don't even know about, transpiring with Saskatchewan Transportation Company.

We see earlier today that being a fairly significant issue in question period here. I think it's symbolic. What happened in question period is somewhat symbolic of what this government truly is all about. Because we have government members who said, oh we're going to be consultative. We're going to seek consensus. We're going to listen and converse with people. We want to be open about what's going on.

Yet this very day we see an internal audit that was promised to be made public by the end of March, three or four days ago in other words, and we see that now being rolled into a judicial review. Somewhat symbolic, I think, of the secretiveness, the shrinking, the drawing inward of government members. No public consultation is involved in that, not a whit of it. And it's really tragic that we have these allegations going on.

I think enough said on that, Mr. Speaker. The events are unfolding, but the secretiveness — that is what is going to get the government. It's the very, very secretiveness, the saying one thing and doing another; saying we're for people and then increasing the personal income tax; we're for the people, then eliminating the fuel tax rebate program; we're for the people, and then eliminating the urban transit program that funded urban transportation systems, that costing, as I pointed out, \$700,000 this year alone to the city of Regina. It's the saying one thing and doing another that's going to do this government in. Government has lost all credibility and, you know, just symptomatic of it.

(2000)

I'm not going to suggest that there's anything other than what the government says in the latest increase in the price of alcohol. But isn't it a little bit mysterious, Mr. Speaker, that we have budget day, price of alcohol remains the same; next opening day of the liquor stores after that there is an increase. And it's announced, well this isn't a tax increase, this is simply passing on the increases from the suppliers.

Well normally that would be accepted at face value. This government has totally lost credibility. I have had a number of people that have asked me quite pointedly: do you believe that that's what really happened, or do you think the government is sneaking some more money in the back door? Don't have the courage to announce it as a tax increase, but they're sneaking it in the back door. I say that, Mr. Speaker, to point out the lost credibility.

This government refuses, absolutely, adamantly refuses to listen to the people of Saskatchewan. Adamantly refuses to consult. They try doing things in an underhanded manner. I pointed out the gas tax change. I talked a bit about the \$25 million that the city of Regina is losing this year because of the rail relocation decision. I misspoke when I said \$25 million this year; it's 300-and-some thousand dollars this year. But the ramification is the city will lose \$25 million next year; that's the ramification. And I would be very, very surprised, Mr. Speaker, if I'm anything but right on in that.

So what of the future? What should there have been in this budget, Mr. Speaker? What should there have been? Well it is incredibly obvious that we have got thousands of hungry children. I look at the Regina food bank had fed close to 60,000 people in 1988, a food bank that was non-existent before your government took office, absolutely non-existent, and yet 60,000 people were fed at the Regina food bank alone. Saskatoon, it was 76,164 people fed at a food bank, a food bank that was non-existent prior to 1982. The P.A. food bank fed over 12,200 people — again a food bank that was non-existent prior to 1982. Mr. Speaker, we have got to seriously get past the rhetoric in this Legislative Assembly. We have got to get past that and get on with the real job.

I shared with you the amount of help that a single employable person can expect from the Department of Social Services: a maximum of \$405. Mr. Speaker, that's inadequate. You can't feed yourself, you can't buy your shelter, feed yourself, clothe yourself, provide transportation and health care, or whatever else you may need. You can't do that on that miserly amount of money, so we need to increase the social services bottom rates, we need to create jobs, we need to invest in student employment for the summer. That is urgent.

We need to make some action, do some real things on the environment. In the budget speech there was talk of what was happening to the environment and yet the moneys for enforcement are identical this year to last. There's nothing new in environment. Government members talk a little bit about it but it's not there. We need to move into some very real environmental enhancing projects. We

need to move on revenue sharing, and yet that was woefully missing in the budget.

We have school boards that are looking at the provincial government increasing its share of funding for education. It's a goal that I support and I think the government should have been moving in that direction. Instead they're going the other way, they're reducing the provincial share of funding.

We need some open and fair government tendering, Mr. Speaker, so that there is no question that the government gets best value for its dollar on every project, on everything it purchases whether it's a goods or a service. There should be open and fair tendering so people can in fact compete.

Mr. Speaker, those are some of the things that my colleagues will be addressing at some greater length. I wish to allow other members of the Legislative Assembly to participate in this important debate. I thank you for your attention. I am most grateful to my constituents, the people of Regina North, for again providing me the opportunity to represent them in this budget debate.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed obviously to this budget. I am not in favour of it for the reasons I have outlined. There are some changes that need to be made. I urge government members to make some of those changes, and then I would happily support the budget. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McLaren: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's certainly an honour to rise in the Assembly and to join in this debate on our budget. I would like to compliment my colleague and the Minister of Finance for the way in which he presented his budget and for the timely budget which he delivered on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the 1990 and '91 budget tabled by the hon. member from Weyburn was, in my opinion, very responsible, very complete, and in fact very exciting, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And I would say that it is a common sense budget — common sense because it recognizes the difficulties facing Saskatchewan families; common sense because it addresses the difficulties that we are facing in these difficult times; and common sense because it not only meets the challenges facing us today, but because it charts a course for our future.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this budget maintains our commitment to protecting our Saskatchewan families, to protecting Saskatchewan farmers, and Saskatchewan small business people, to protecting the people of this province, people from all walks of life. And so, on behalf of my constituents and the people of this province, I want to comment on the outstanding ideas and initiatives outlined in the budget speech, ideas and initiatives which are responsive to the economic and social needs of Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are facing some very difficult times in Saskatchewan. We don't argue with that, difficult

times for economies, for government, and for the people. But Mr. Deputy Speaker, in 1982 we made a commitment to address the needs of Saskatchewan people, and this budget is a continuation of that commitment.

Saskatchewan has a proud history of facing difficult times, and we have a proud history of taking courageous steps to control our own destiny so that our people and our communities continue to have secure and rewarding lives even during tough times. The government, under our Premier, has provided courageous and determined leadership to provide that security, and we see that in this year's budget.

We see in Saskatchewan today a government that is flexible, a government that is compassionate, and a government that is able to adapt and change. This government has had to make some very difficult decisions over the past while. We had to make the difficult decision to cancel the gas tax rebate program, to cancel the home improvement program, and to modify the mortgage protection program. We had to make the difficult decision to cut department funding and to eliminate some grants and programs. We had to make these decisions, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because these are the difficult times that we are in. We made these choices so that we can redirect that money to areas where increased funding and support were required.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I speak of those areas, I am speaking of health care and I am speaking of education and I am speaking of the family farm. This government recognizes areas that require increased emphasis, and I believe this budget responds to those needs.

Take agriculture, for example. The excessive drought, low commodity prices, high interest rates, and increasing debt are devastating the family farm, along with the European-American subsidy wars that are also taking their toll on Saskatchewan farmers.

When farm families are literally about to lose their homes, their farms and their livelihood, we did not sit idly by, Mr. Deputy Speaker. When the realized net farm income for 1990 is forecast to be a negative \$9 million, the lowest level since the 1930's, we did not say, well that is too bad. No, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we did not say that at all. Instead we installed a safety net that is specific programs and policies targeted to agriculture.

We paid millions of dollars to Saskatchewan farmers to help them through this crisis. In 1982 we created the Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan, we introduced a guaranteed vendor mortgage program, and we established The Farm Security Act. And all this to protect farmers, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We helped farm families consolidate loans and manage their debt problems. We argued in Geneva for changes to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to eliminate unfair advantages for small grain-producing countries. We did that all, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because this government is committed to protecting farmers from things that are beyond their control.

But the farm crisis didn't just happen overnight, Mr. Speaker. Years of drought and low prices have placed an

unbearable economic and emotional strain on rural Saskatchewan. These farmers are trying to hang on to their livelihood and preserve Saskatchewan's way of life. They deserve our help as they face the harsh reality that the crop has to be planted, and we realize that some farmers do have a cash flow problem. And even though we called on the federal government for assistance, and we called on the federal government to alleviate the affects of international subsidy wars, we did not wait for them to act.

We understood that the crop must go into the ground on time, and so, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government, the Government of Saskatchewan, has dug deep into its pockets; we have tightened our own belts so that we could address the immediate crisis in agriculture.

I am very proud of the Saskatchewan spring seeding program that was announced in this year's budget, a program which provides some \$525 million to farmers in the form of operating loans. This program will equip our farmers with short-term loans at ten and three-quarter per cent. It will entitle them to borrow \$12.50 per cultivated acre for seed, for fertilizer and fuel, for chemical and repairs.

This program will give farmers the money they so desperately need to get this crop in the ground. We could have told the farmers of this province that we couldn't help them, that our hands were tied. And I can remember the members opposite during the 1979 and '80 when the interest rates went up to 20, 22 per cent. What answer did we get from them? Well, it's a federal problem. I can remember the now Leader of the Opposition making that statement.

We still do not know what the outcome of the federal commitment will be. They have their responsibility; we have ours. We could have said wait, but we didn't, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We responded with a responsible budget which puts money into the hands of our farmers to at least get their seed in the ground; a budget, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which allocates the \$525 million of provincial money directly to agriculture; a budget which contains an additional 400 million in spending and tax assistance to our farm sector.

That is almost \$1 billion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, \$1 billion dedicated to protecting farm families and to building the farming industry so that it may compete successfully in the world market.

We are also preparing our children so that they can compete in that same world market, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We are preparing them to make informed decisions, to understand their rights and responsibilities as citizens and participants in a market-based economy so that they understand the world economy and its impact on our daily lives.

(2015)

This government is committed to providing a quality educational system to ensuring that all students get a solid foundation to prepare them for a lifetime of learning. We are committed to building on our strengths so that

Saskatchewan people will have even greater access to learning opportunities. That is why we allocated \$10 million in 1990-91 to the new core curriculum agenda.

The core curriculum agenda is one of the most important initiatives we have ever developed. This new curriculum will teach essential skills, skills such as independent learning, creative thinking, and problem solving; skills which will enable our children to communicate and understand our society and technology; skills, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which will complement other subject areas which will enable our children to adapt to a rapidly changing world.

And we're also doing much in the area of literacy. The year 1990 has been designated International Literacy Year and we are at the forefront of the fight for literacy. We are reducing drop-out rates, and we are providing reading skills programs, and we are going to wipe out illiteracy in this province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in this year's budget \$740,000 was announced to deal with the problem of child hunger in our society. We also called on church groups, schools, parents, and volunteers to help us find long-term solutions that will eliminate child hunger in this province.

An \$8.1 million commitment was also made to the regional colleges for 1990 and '91, and that is a \$2.6 million increase over last year. There was a \$5.6 million increase for SIAST (Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology), a \$6 million increase for universities, and a \$10.5 million increase for school boards.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government has doubled the amount of funding available to students. This means that student aid for 1990-91 will jump to \$47 million. That is a tremendous amount of money, Mr. Speaker, and in total this budget provides \$888 million for educational spending; 888 million or one-fifth of our total spending budget for this fiscal year; 888 million which translates into 2,600 for every elementary and secondary school student, and \$8,500 for every university student in this province.

We have also done much in the area of health care, too, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This government is committed to ensuring that the people of this province have access to a comprehensive, province-wide, quality health care system. That is what the people have asked for and that is our number one priority. That is why we have announced a 10 per cent increase in health care spending for 1990.

We will be spending that money on hospitals, on long-term care, on prescription drugs, on the dental plan, on special care homes, on seniors' housing, on drug and alcohol clinics, on research, on preventative programs, and the list goes on and on and on, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We will be spending one-third of our total budget just on health care — one-third, Mr. Deputy Speaker, or the equivalent of \$1.5 billion.

These figures are very difficult to comprehend simply due to their sheer size, so I'm going to put them into perspective for Saskatchewan people. Broken down, that

\$1.5 billion for health care represents some \$172,000 spent every hour, 24 hours a day, seven days a week on health care. That is \$4.1 million spent every day for the year just on health care.

I think these figures demonstrate this government's commitment to our health care system, and I think it shows that we are here to protect, to maintain, and to build on Saskatchewan's health care system. We have done this and we will continue to do so. We have built in health care and we have built in education and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have protected our farm families.

We have done all of this, we have accomplished all of this during difficult economic times, as I mentioned before, and without raising taxes: no tax increases, Mr. Deputy Speaker; no increases on income tax; no increases in sales tax; no increases on consumption tax — absolutely no tax increases.

And, Mr. Speaker, this budget provides the resources for the programs and priorities set out by the people of Saskatchewan. It has done this in a situation of economic crisis. It has done it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, admittedly without significant deficit increases. But more importantly, at this time and in light of these economic circumstances, the people cannot bear any more tax increases.

And as sincerely as I can speak, Mr. Speaker, I invite members opposite to tell the people of Saskatchewan how they propose to spend billions of dollars on the programs that they have demanded in this House, not make any of the cuts which they have opposed, and balance the budget without imposing massive tax increases. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it cannot be done. This budget is a responsible budget without give-aways.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude, I'd like to make a few comments on the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake and the member from Regina North. Every day and every speaker, we've been hearing about the out-migration of people in Saskatchewan. They say that's what's been happening and that's true, but let's look at the facts. Let's look back to about 1972 when those members were in power. What happened to the population of Saskatchewan? There was out-migration. There was 900-and-some odd thousand, by 1973-74 it had gone down to 890,000. You had gone below 900,000 people. And then it started coming back; and then it got up to over a million people by 1983. And it's still not down to the numbers that you had in the province when we took over in 1982. We're still around a million people in the province.

And I can remember, Mr. Speaker, when I had to go out hiring people for the company that I used to work for — I had to go to Great Britain . . . I used to have to go to Great Britain to get welders. I went to Great Britain for welders because everybody had gone to Calgary and Edmonton, working in the oil patch. That's where they were. But no, that doesn't happen to the NDP. They never mention that kind of thing.

Why have we got a deficit? We keep hearing about the deficit. We could have not spent the money to help the

farmers. And the deficit, you keep saying, well we had a million and 100-and-some odd million in the coffers, which I presume you did. But where was the debt? I took over SaskPower and I found out where a bunch of the debt was, \$1.2 billion of SaskPower's debt, and you people were siphoning off the money out of SaskPower — \$100 million in ten years — to make your consolidated fund look like you were balancing your budget, which you weren't. That's exactly what was happening.

Now the member from Regina North keeps talking about the multinationals. I'd like the members opposite to tell me what a multinational is. Is it 50 people? Is it 1,000 people? How do you measure a multinational? For all I know, my company was a multinational. And how do we keep the people in Saskatchewan without diversifying our economy, without not promoting Gainers — and I'm sick and tired of hearing you talk about Pocklington. I wish I'd have got him in Yorkton. I tried. And he got was . . . The money that was there was an incentive to create jobs in our province. That's exactly what he did.

What about Weyerhaeuser? What about Nabu? What about Nabu? You lost 8 million; we only lost . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. All members will have an opportunity to enter into the budget speech if they haven't already entered into it. So I'd ask the member from Quill Lakes to allow the member from Yorkton to finish his comments.

Mr. McLaren: — How in Heaven's name do we get employment in our province without having megaprojects, without having small businesses? And we considered ourselves a small business, but we had 500 people working for us in Yorkton, Saskatchewan. Is that a multinational? What's a multinational? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I don't care what they are. Cargill is going to build a plant in this province that's going to sell fertilizer. Why should we not have the jobs here? Why not let it go to Alberta then? That's where they would have gone — or Manitoba. But no, we have to buy our fertilizer from the United States. That's what you people are saying. That's ridiculous. I never heard anything so ridiculous in all my life.

And what did they do? What did they do? They bought out potash mines for 5, \$600 million. And how many jobs did that create in our province? Not a one. Bought holes in the ground where people were already working, and that's all you folks created here.

I look at my own constituency. I try to look and count on my hand what happened there in the eight years prior to us coming into power in 1982: not one senior citizens' complex; no additions to the nursing home; no additions to our hospital. We got all that in four years. We had three of them . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You mention it. You tell me what it was. I can't think of any.

And then the other thing that bothers me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the comments about travel, and so on. We had a member from the Soviet Union in our gallery here two days ago. The only reason that he was here was because our Premier went over to . . . had the foresight to go and start establishing some markets in the Eastern bloc

countries.

You can't build business by sitting on your prats here in Saskatchewan behind a desk. You can't do it. I commend the Premier for having the initiative to go and do some of that sort of work over in the Eastern bloc countries.

Another thing that the Prince Albert-Duck Lake member mentioned was that privatization wasn't in our budget. And I think back to last year when about this time we were facing four walls here. There was nobody in here on that side of the House. Going out and scaring the people of Saskatchewan that we were going to privatize SaskPower.

We had no intention of privatizing SaskPower. SaskEnergy it was called. SaskEnergy is was called. And do you know what I did, Mr. Deputy Speaker? Out of those mounds of petitions that they supposedly brought in here, I went through every one of them, picked out every name that was there that was from Yorkton, and in the same exercise I found people there from British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick. What a farce. What a farce.

And I picked out 424 people out of Yorkton that had signed that petition, and I wrote them a letter. I wrote them a letter, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I told them the truth. You know what happened? People started coming back asking if I could get their names off the petition. They didn't know what they were signing. They didn't know what they were signing.

I found duplication. I found families of mother and father and six kids, name on one of them would be two years old. She sure didn't sign the petition, let me tell you. That's what I found.

That's what you people are doing all the time. Fear tactics to the people that started in 1978 when I became involved listening to you people with medicare. Little old ladies that I called on after them crying because somebody had told them that medicare would be gone if she didn't put a lawn sign on her lawn. That's what you were doing.

The same thing happened in '82, same thing happened in 1986, and the same thing happened in Assiniboia-Gravelbourg when your own leader spread a letter around that constituency and not telling the truth at all. This is the way you people operate and it just makes me sick.

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for the opportunity to say the few words, and I certainly will be supporting the budget, let me tell you that.

(2030)

Mr. Koskie: — Well thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm pleased to have the opportunity to enter into the debate on the budget. And I want to, at the outset, to indicate that the minister . . . no, the former minister, the member from Yorkton, who is running scared for his life, was trying to make a valiant attempt to defend the actions which is destroying this province.

I want first of all, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to indicate that I represent the Quill Lakes constituency for a number of years. And I want to say that that was a rich agricultural area and during the 1970s and 1980s many young farmers took up farming. And they were proud farmers and they worked the land well and they were efficient.

But there's more to the area of Quill Lakes than the agricultural scene, and I want to lay before this legislature what was achieved during our term in office. This government stands up and starts talking about diversification. Well let me take a look at the Quill Lakes and what was done. At Annaheim, Doecker Industries, founded during the Blakeney administration, employing 40 to 50 people on a constant basis. Let's go to Englefeld and we'll find Schulte Industries, manufacturing in existence far before the member from . . . what?

An Hon. Member: — Mayfair.

Mr. Koskie: — Mayfair ever came into this house — employing 40 to 50 employees. Annaheim, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Doecker Industries. Englefeld, Schulte Industries, manufacturing of mowers, manufacturing snow-ploughs, manufacturing rock pickers. Plains Poultry at Wynyard — and I remember, I recall the former Agriculture minister and myself helping them through SEDCO, taking an equity position and providing a base that they could continue to provide over 300 jobs.

I go to St. Gregor, a very small community in my riding, and do you know what I find? Three industries — diversification it's called. Western Industries, manufacturing truck boxes for farm trucks. Michel's Industries, St. Gregor, manufacturing windows and tarps. Hogemann Transport, operating some eight to 10 transports out of the town and community of St. Gregor.

I go to Leroy; Block's tarp, manufacturing tarps for trucks and boats. I go to the area of Drake, Bergen Industries operating. I go to Muenster, Al's Welding manufacturing hydraulic cylinders. I go to the area of Lanigan and the farmers started Pound-Maker, whereby they take in cattle, feed them and put them to market.

Those are some of the achievements and accomplishments of diversification that took place under our administration.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — And I'll tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it didn't take \$370 million to create the hundreds of jobs that are created by these industries in my constituency. But I'll tell you, this government decided that during the last election they're going to get into diversification and down they came to Kandahar. They said they are going to set up a potassium sulphate plant. A potassium sulphate plant they indicated they were going to set up in Kandahar. And they were going to extract the sulphate from Quill Lake, mix it with the potassium and make a special fertilizer called potassium sulphate. Wonderful idea.

Under our administration we had done all the research,

we had set up a pilot project and a mine west of Saskatoon. Well just before the election they said they were going to proceed with the potassium sulphate plant and there would be over 300 people employed in the construction of this plant. There would be over 150 people employed, they said, when it's in production. That was election time. Now, after the election, we have nine people working at the plant — nine people. That was the basic great diversification of this administration.

But I want to say that we are not going to stop because of this government, because the people of Quill Lakes are confident that they're going to be tossed out of office come the next election.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — And I'm pleased to indicate that at Wynyard we have developed — or at least a young business man has developed — the marketing of spring water called Quill Water. And in conjunction with it, he himself went to Japan and got the Japanese to come and join with him in the development of a plastic plant at Wynyard. And you know what? That is done by the entrepreneurial strength of the people that live in my riding because we've done it before and we can do it again.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — And the people are confident that there's going to be a change of government and that there is a future for small business and small manufacturers. That's the record.

I want to say that working with the people of Quill Lakes has been a great privilege and an honour. And I want to say to you that working together we have been able to provide many amenities of life for the constituency. I look in the field of education. We have a new school at St. Gregor recently, a new school at Lake Lenore, a new school at Wynyard. We have major renovations at the Lanigan school. We have a new gymnasium during my period of time at Muenster and Englefeld and at Quill Lake.

I've seen the development of a housing program under the Blakeney administration which provided senior citizen housing in every community throughout the constituency, Leroy and Spalding and Wynyard and Jansen and Lanigan and Quill Lake. I've seen recently the enriched housing in Drake and Wynyard, Quill Lake and Muenster.

I've seen the development of rinks under programs whereby we provided essential grants for communities to build these amenities. I've seen rinks built, curling rinks built, arenas built. And I'll tell the member from Mayfair, he ran out in the area, he says he's from Quill Lakes. And when he ran out there, they tossed him out. I doubt if his brother voted for him.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — I doubt it if his brother voted for him. In fact I talked to him and he was doubtful whether he would.

But anyway, what I'm saying to you, we have worked out in Quill Lakes and much has been achieved. And we're working to the future, as I've said, because this government's term of office is coming to an end and the people of Saskatchewan are rejecting their priorities.

And in working in conjunction with the constituents, I know at Quill Lake they're looking for a new community hall complex and I'm going to work with them when we form the government and they'll get it. I know at Leroy they're looking at a new nursing home. I've talked to the citizens of Leroy and it's a great centre of support, and I'll say that we'll bring a new nursing home to Leroy.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — I know that Wynyard has been neglected, and their nursing home, which has provided services and was built under our administration, needs some renovations and some additions since we introduced home care, and level 1 and 2 facilities are no longer needed but we really need level 3 and 4. So Wynyard, we need a major renovation in our nursing home — renovation and addition.

Spalding and Naicam have made a presentation to me as to what their needs will be. And they're looking at an integrated health care facility and enriched housing in Naicam. In Watson, which has seen such tough times under this Tory administration, where some 10 businesses have closed in Watson, but the people, again I have spoken to them, and they said, when will there be an election? That's the question they're asking. And I said it has to come soon because this outfit is bankrupt of ideas and bankrupt, the province they can no longer govern, and it's without a leader.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — And I talked to the people in Lanigan. And in Lanigan they also say there is hope again. And when you get into government, we want you to help us again like you did to other communities in building a new arena complex with some other offices or libraries attached thereto. And that's what we're going to do throughout this province, is to give the people of this province new hope. We're going to give this province a new direction. We're going to give to the people what they rightly deserve, and which this government has failed to deliver.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to what has really occupied my thoughts, and that is with the agricultural crisis that exists in Saskatchewan. No one who is familiar with the agricultural crisis can be less than sorry to see what is happening. There are farmers who are committing suicide because of the stress and on the verge of losing everything they built. There are families that are breaking up and there are homes that are being destroyed.

And I want to say that in respect to agriculture, the crisis can only be addressed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if we clearly articulate the vision of agriculture that we want. What is our commitment to agriculture? What do we want for agriculture in the future? Do we want, as I will refer to an article from United States, the huge multinational

corporations owning land and all of the processing? Or do we have a vision of wanting to keep the family farm strong and allow young people to enter the farming industry? We have to have a vision of what we want.

And I can tell the people of Saskatchewan, and I can tell the Tories opposite, that our vision is in support of sustaining the family farm, and not equity financing, and not multinational corporations owning the land.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — And I say, if we have a vision of what we want to preserve and build, then we can address the problem.

But I say the government opposite does not have a vision. I know they have a lot of rhetoric from the Premier — oh, that he's a farmer and his family has lost land and so therefore he's in the same boat. Except the Premier sits on Albert Street with a swimming pool in his backyard, with \$100,000 as Premier, and he compares himself and his plight with the farmers who are losing their land.

Yes, I think it's easy to know where the Premier and the Tory party and the Tory governments are coming from, because they are aligned with the banks — totally and unequivocally. Premier even went down to have a chat with them, to the bankers, and he says, Mr. Bankers, I'd like you to help out a little bit.

(2045)

Well I've referred to before, but I want the people of Saskatchewan to know what the banks think about the status of farming. They say there are three types of farmers. They say there are those who are on the leading edge entrepreneurs; they say there are the progressives; they say there are the traditionalists; and they say there are the marginal majority. By contrast he says, the marginal majority, which represents 40 per cent of today's farmers, do not use many information services, are poor managers — and you can hear the Tories running around; we have to let the market system get rid of the poor managers — they keep no records, they're not well organized, and they have no long-term plans.

And the bankers, you know what they said? The bankers who the Premier went down to chat with to help the farmers? Well they said they can profitably service the leading edge entrepreneurs and the progressives, and that's where it's at.

And this hypocrisy about going down to get the bankers, whose philosophy is to get rid of the inefficient — as they call them — majority of farmers. They don't want to support them. They wouldn't finance them. And the Premier goes begging — or pretending he's begging — to save the farmer.

But let it be made clear — and I want to repeat this, and it's been repeated in this House before — and I ask any of the farmers to do some research, and they are, by the way. And you'll find the position of the Premier of this province, when he was an economic professor at the University of Saskatchewan, where he clearly indicated

exactly the same position as the Royal Bank's position on agriculture, that 80 per cent of the inefficient farmers must go.

That's the vision. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, with that vision there will be no solution to the agricultural crisis. You know what? I agree that the Premier can analyse the problem. No doubt about that. He's fairly accurate. Because he went down East to talk to the bankers, and part of what he said . . . he noted that 20,000 farmers, one-third of the entire province, are faced with financial ruin. And he goes on to say: unless they get a cash bail-out of \$500 million, 20,000 farmers facing financial ruin. And there's more. And he says, get \$500 million, \$10 an acre pay-out, and that's going to save their operation. No way. He knows it, the farmers now know it, and I'm telling you, that's the scam that is tried to be perpetrated on the farmers of this province. They aren't looking to solve the major problem.

But the Premier stands on this, and the Minister of Finance, and he says: we're committed to agriculture. Whoopee, he said, look what we have done. We have set up . . . He says, first of all, the major problem is the farmers are carrying too much debt. They can't service that debt. And the Minister of Finance and the Premier come into this House, and what do they bring and what do they offer to the farmers of Saskatchewan? Five hundred and twenty-five million dollars available at ten and three-quarter per cent interest — more debt. More debt.

And you know what the total cost of that is? Thirty to 40 million at tops. That's the commitment of that Tory government across the way to agriculture. Thirty or \$40 million is what they said. And that is for 60,000 farmers across this province.

And you know what they offered to Cargill? Three hundred and seventy million dollars, \$60 million in equity — no problem — 370 million with equity and loan guarantee. Sixty million to help Cargill, one multinational corporation, and \$30 million for 60,000 farmers across this province.

Let's take a look at what deal they gave to Weyerhaeuser. They gave Weyerhaeuser a pulp mill, 239 millions, and you know what the terms that they gave them — 8 per cent interest. But the farmers of this province, that built this province, it's ten and three-quarter per cent. And then they say to Weyerhaeuser, well you don't have to pay anything unless you make a profit of 12 or 13 per cent. That's the commitment.

Let's talk a little more about their commitment. Let's talk a little more about their commitment to farmers. Thirty million to the farmers. Thirty million to 60,000 farmers — that's his commitment. And you know what? The Tory government in Ottawa, the Tory government in Alberta, and the Tory government in Saskatchewan put up close to a billion dollars to help finance an upgrader in Lloydminster. And you know who they're helping to finance? A billionaire from Hong Kong. A multibillionaire from Hong Kong who has the controlling interests of Husky Oil. Priorities, but boy, are we for farmers!

An Hon. Member: — You're against it.

Mr. Koskie: — Ah, the member from Lloydminster says we're against it. I say there has to be priorities, member, and the priorities have to be to the people of Saskatchewan that built it, not the billionaire from Hong Kong.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order, order. The hon. member will allow the member from Quill Lakes to continue.

Mr. Koskie: — And you know what the problems is now? They gave out about \$30 million to 60,000 farmers — that's 50 cents an acre, someone said it came to. That's about what they're offering. That's really going to solve the problem. The Premier says 20,000 farmers are going under, they're in financial ruin. And then he goes to Ottawa. He says, I got a commitment for \$500 million. Then he goes to Ottawa, he comes back — well I don't have a commitment. And the situation is getting so bad that meeting with some of the farmer union people that wanted to discuss it with him, the Premier made finger-pointing accusations against those that were talking about the crisis — what a Premier.

But now the game is on. They're going close to an election, so what are they going to do? They are going to try to play the same game that they did prior to 1986. In 1985, going into the '86 election, boy, we'll put out a production loan of \$1.2 billion at 6 per cent; that's going to solve the problems.

That's what they did in '86. What are they doing in 1990? Another type of loan, just about the same . . .

An Hon. Member: — Half.

Mr. Koskie: — Half, that's right. Thanks for your help, member of . . . I was going to mention it that you . . . now they only have half the commitment that they had then, and they doubled the interest.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — I want you as my prompter, by the way.

Mr. Speaker, that's the situation. They're going through the same act. Only during the '86 election, in desperation the Premier got on to the phone and he says: Brian, boy, I'm losing this election; I need your bucks. And it wasn't mentioned in the House of Commons, and the Prime Minister said he'd bail him out. And it came through. It wasn't a billion dollars for Saskatchewan as was alluded to at the time of election. That was deception. But what are they doing again? Now we have an election again on the horizon, and those people across the way are playing with the lives of the people of Saskatchewan because they're playing games with the federal government as to when that payment is going to come, to suit their political agenda rather than helping farmers. And that's where it's at.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — But I'll tell you, they've done a wonderful job. There is a crisis. There is no doubt there is a crisis.

Here are some of the statistics. Interest expenses for Saskatchewan's farmers in 1989 was 473 million. Ten per cent of Saskatchewan farmers have been involved in formal debt review procedures. It goes on to say that the number before the debt review has decreased in Alberta and Manitoba, but Saskatchewan has experienced an increase of 19 per cent in these applications.

The financial institutions, according to the Premier's figures, that the financial institutions have repossessed from farm families 850,000 acres. This has taken place . . . this compares with three years ago, 121,000. There are 5,400 Farm Credit Corporation accounts in arrears in Saskatchewan, or roughly one-quarter of all the corporation's Saskatchewan accounts.

An Hon. Member: — One in four.

Mr. Koskie: — One in four. Four thousand of these accounts are over one year in arrears; 1,500 are over three years in arrears. And then as December 31, '89, and the statistics will be worse by now, 33 per cent of agricultural credit corporation's 3,687 capital loans were in arrears — one third. Production loan program had 17.9 per cent in arrears, up from 10.5 per cent.

Now, boy . . .

An Hon. Member: — What a job.

Mr. Koskie: — What a job, is right. What a performance, what a . . . meeting the crisis that exists in agriculture. The crisis is there but the will is not there. What we have is another political game being played, saying it's federal responsibility; it's provincial responsibility; we can't get together; we can't agree, while the farmers leave the land or are driven off the land.

And I say to the 20 thousands of farmers that are out there that are in financial ruin, in the description of the Premier, don't be bought by hollow promises come the next election. I say to the farmers across Saskatchewan, the cash is fine but get rid of the Premier.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — Across this province there is a way of addressing it, and you have to address it with a comprehensive program. We support getting some assistance of \$500 million. We say, okay, give them some operating loans, but only the operating loans if you have a complete package of addressing the crisis.

There has to be debt restructuring, and not tomorrow. And the Premier says, well we're studying it. But he's been studying it for five years. He said in 1985 he's going to have a long-term agricultural policy. And today what we have is the same *ad hoc* program that we had in '86.

We need an income assurance program, we need a longer tenure for leasing back land that had been seized by financial institutions, and we need an intergenerational transfer system. These are the objectives of the New Democratic Party, and the farmers of Saskatchewan and the people of Saskatchewan are turning to us for that leadership.

(2100)

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn a little bit to one other topic that concerns me to no end. And that is the absolute crippling mismanagement and waste and corruption of this government. Nine successive budgets, nine successive deficits. And at budget after budget they say they were going to bring down that deficit. In fact, they promised by the year 1991 they'd have a balanced budget. And last year they said we are on the road down. We'll get a smaller deficit. We got only 226, we brought it down from 358, I believe. So we're really on the right direction.

But what happened? They came in with \$390 million. And this year they come in and they say, well we have cut a lot of fat from government. We got it under control. We've cut a \$150 million in programs. We have cut \$60 million in two years from internal cut-backs and cabinet ministers' salary and travel and those internal matters. Three hundred million dollars they said they cut.

And so they come in this year, and they come in with another devastating deficit of 363 million. And I predict, Mr. Premier . . . Mr. Speaker, pardon me. I predict, Mr. Speaker, that that is just a figure. I predict that if we have an election this year, that the party opposite, the government members will spend any amount of money that it takes to try to get them elected.

Because history demonstrates what they do. In 1985-86 the budget was just over 325, 28 million. And you know what they brought in? They overspent by a billion dollars. That's what the people of this province have in store for them again. The same old format, the same deception, and trying to buy the people with the people's own money while at the same time putting a mortgage on the future of the next generations.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Speaker, these numbers are almost unbelievable. And I would have thought that the member from Yorkton, a former business man, would have shown concern. But he joined like a trained seal to give the same lines that are written by Nancy McLean or by Decima advertising or whoever their advisers are going into the election. I thought he would have had the decency to stand in this House and protect the future and future generations, but not him.

Do you realize that the third highest expenditure in this province is servicing debt? — \$493 million annually just to pay interest; \$1.35 million a day. We have a total debt in this province of \$13.2 billion, and they say they can manage and the people should trust them.

I'll tell you, you ask what future does the next generation have with this crippling debt, this crippling debt perpetrated on the people of Saskatchewan by the so-called business men while they waste the money on GigaText, while they give it to their corporate friends, and while they desert the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, others of course want to speak in respect to

this budget speech. But I see and hear there are three or four principles that were put forward in the budget address. And what the budget address said is that, oh, we were consulting with the people and the people of Saskatchewan were telling us what to put in the budget. Well I'll tell you, they told us . . . one fact that is true in this one. They told us to eliminate waste and inefficiency in government. And I'll tell you, that's what the people in every town and every city is saying. This government no longer has the moral right to govern this province because of the waste and mismanagement and the corruption that is going on.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — In the last session we spent a considerable amount of time digging into the scandalous GigaText fiasco. And today, this session when we first came in, what are we plunged into again? Into another scandal; scandal of operation of this government. Talk to any business man across this province and you know what they say: this government has no integrity, it can't be treated, and it's not fair. That's what they're saying. And, Mr. Speaker, I am confident that this is not a budget for the future, but this a budget for the death of the Tory party.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gleim: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure this afternoon to have the opportunity to support the Minister of Finance on the 1990 budget. Economic times are tough and it does hurt agriculture, oil and the potash. But I guess what I'd like to say: in my constituency I have oil, I have agriculture, and we have some industry. And when times are tough in the agricultural industry, it's tough for all the rest of the people in my constituency.

I think the budget that the moneys were going to in agriculture, education and health is the right way to go. Those are the main pillars in this province, and it is very, very important for rural Saskatchewan.

I know what tough times are. I went through them as a boy. I come from a very big family, a family of 13. We went through tough times, but I guess in those times we were diversified because we had chickens, cows, pigs; we farmed a little bit. It didn't mean anything for the two of us to sit down and milk 20 cows at night and 20 cows in the morning. It is not something that I can say that I'd want to do today, but I'm proud of what I did.

Maybe that's some of the things that we're going to have to start now to maybe survive on the farms, is maybe we're going to have to have a cow, a chicken, a pig, or whatever it takes to help on the kitchen table . . .

An Hon. Member: — Go sheep, goat.

Mr. Gleim: — Right. There are some people across the way probably have never experienced that. And I don't imagine they'd know how to cope with it if they did have to . . .

An Hon. Member: — I give you two coyotes for your three goats over there.

Mr. Gleim: — That's right. You're probably making money on coyote there. The member from Elphinstone, maybe you should buy some coyotes . . .

An Hon. Member: — How many goats you got out there, Ted. I'll take a couple.

Mr. Gleim: — I have two. I guess that's what I'm trying to get at, Mr. Speaker, is that we have to diversify, and this is what this government's all about, is to diversify.

I just want to speak on a few areas. I'm not going to carry on too long; I'm not going to get long-winded like the member from Quill Lakes. I want to talk about some of the things that is important in my constituency.

In agriculture alone, Mr. Speaker, the ACS (Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan) program, loan program, subsidized loans to farmers to establish and expand livestock and irrigation operations . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order, order. The member's being interrupted and he's having difficulty being heard by the members. Allow him to speak without interruption.

Mr. Gleim: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The ACS livestock cash advance improved cash flow for position of the livestock producers and to help them retain their herds. The ACS production loan program assisted farmers with the expense of seeding in 1986 and was similar to the same program we have here announced today, or last week that the Premier announced.

Between 1984 and 1988 this provided financial and management counselling, operating loans, and consolidated loans guaranteed to farmers in my constituency. The feeder association loan guarantee program to promote cattle feeding in Saskatchewan authorized loan limits of \$4.85 million. This, Mr. Speaker, was a great asset and a great, I would say, probably one of the most positive things done in the last three or four years in my constituency. It increased our cattle feeding industry by 60 per cent.

At one time we used to feed probably 12 per cent of our animals in Saskatchewan, and as of last year we were up to 70 per cent of the animals that were fed in Saskatchewan were finished in Saskatchewan. And that, as I say, Mr. Speaker, that's what I say is diversifying. We are processing; that's where the jobs are, in processing. When you process an animal here, that means a job. You process that animal in Ontario or wherever else, that is a job down there. And I think this is a great step forward, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to mention a couple of things about the spring seeding program that the Premier announced, the \$525 million up front with a ten and three-quarter interest rate that the member from Quill Lakes was making a joke of. This loan program is for spring seeding program. This is at ten and three-quarters. I don't ever recall those people across the way, when they were in government, ever giving an interest rate reduction on any loan programs that they ever put out. It was always the interest rate at whatever you paid, and I remember paying 22 per cent

interest rate, and that wasn't that many years ago, and that will never be forgotten.

Agriculture in my constituency is the backbone of my constituency, and I think it always will be by the way it is situated down there and with the cattle and livestock and with a lot of prairie Crown lands that are there.

In my constituency the natural gas, the individual line service, the underground power has made it, I would say, for the farmers. At one time . . . Well, when we got in 1982 we had no natural gas, we had no individual line service, we had no underground power. That is a service that the people in my constituency deserved. They shouldn't be treated as second-class citizens as what they were treated as before. Plus with the water corporation programs, the well testing, the dug-outs, and the water assistance for the communities has been something that have been well accepted in my constituency.

As we all know, water is a problem. Once the water leaves you, it never usually comes back — at least I have never seen it come back. And this is what I think I have heard the member from Rosemont has indicated that some day maybe the water will come back, but there is no use to save it, we'll get it when we need it. Well we do need the water, Mr. Speaker. And that is why we are putting on the programs that we have; that is why we're trying to build dams, is to save water. We're not just building dams to create jobs; we're building dams to save water. Water is a great natural resource that is sparse actually. Water is a resource that is probably the deepest to my heart of anything in agriculture, because where I live we have a shortage of water.

(2115)

One of the other things in my constituency that is very important is health — what this government has done for health. They have had a nursing home construction program that is all over my constituency that was never there before. They built one and another one under way. There's the programs for the home care. Just the increase in health alone, 10 per cent, which we've heard from across the way is not near enough. They talk about deficits — maybe we should have taken the increase in health and put it towards the deficit. What would they have said then?

The increase in education, the same thing, the same tune from across there. We've given out grants to eight different towns that have nursing homes and hospitals in my constituency. They all appreciate that. We haven't cut back on that. We increased the home care, like I mentioned before.

The education in my constituency is very important. It is another one of the pillars that I was talking about. We've had grants go to . . . I have nine different schools in my area that got education grants, and the 5.6 per cent increase was welcome. I talked to two directors, education directors, on the weekend. They always say, you know, we appreciate more, but we understand where the money is coming from; it comes from the people. And with economic times the way it is, Mr. Speaker, it is tough to get a hold of money these days.

I want to talk about some programs that I am very proud of that this government brought in since it's been in power since 1982. And some of these programs have just come in, been implemented in the last two to three years. There's the new tourism program, the rural medical practice, the new rural development corporations. I believe that the people in rural Saskatchewan want to help, but you have to give them the chance to help, you have to consult with them, and you have to have the people working together. The people in rural Saskatchewan want to work together. They want to have some responsibility. They don't want the government to run their lives.

The rural medical practice is probably one of the first, besides another one up North, that was started two years ago. Actually we started it three years ago, but it's under way. We have the town of Eastend, the town of Climax, the town of Shaunavon that are working together. They have the base hospital in Shaunavon where they're doing minor operations. They had the doctor from Eastend and a doctor from Climax. Under some of the changes in the regulations, they all work together. They can all cover up for each other. One goes on a holiday or wants to take a weekend off, somebody else can cover for him.

I'm sure not all the kinks have been taken out of this program yet, but it's progressing. The people are accepting it, the doctors are accepting it, and the boards are working together. They have all the boards. Out of those boards they have two people from each board, and they have a regional board, and these people make the decisions. I'm just going to mention that later on again.

We have a CTAP (Community Tourism Assistance Program) program, tourism program, that was implemented two years ago. This program is probably one of the programs that I'm very proud of. We have 10 towns, communities that have joined forces. They call it the horseshoe circle. And all these communities have organized their own CTAP program, their tourism program. It has to be a . . . a sponsoring body has to sponsor this, and it's usually the town that they're in that sponsors this. They appoint their members to this board. These members are from all walks of life: ranchers, farmers, business people, whoever, school teachers, whatever.

These boards have to set up by-laws that are approved by the program. These people have the chance to have ten different areas that they want to go into, that they feel their community can proceed with. That gives these people a chance. They get some seed money; they have to match this seed money. That gives them the chance to promote their community.

Every community has something to offer, Mr. Speaker, even though they feel . . . I know there was a lot of quotes were made, say, well what do we have to offer, you know; what is it going to do for us? These same people that organized this program sat down and before the night was over they had a list this long what they have to offer in their community that people don't know about. This gives them the opportunity in the horseshoe circle that is being organized right now. I was part of that. This horseshoe

circle has organized and they're going to be putting out a brochure which is going to be ready in about three to four weeks time for the spring tourism, to promote areas from Consul right up to Cypress Hills, to Maple Creek, across to Swift Current, down to Ponteix, down to Val Marie, up to Shaunavon, down to Climax, down to Frontier, including Eastend.

This is going to be a horseshoe circle that they're going to promote, that if somebody comes into that area, he's just not going to . . . he may be visiting Shaunavon or Climax, he can pick up this brochure and say, well if I'm going to be here a couple of days, maybe I can stay a couple days longer; these are the things I can see; here's something that you people have to offer that has been kept a secret. And that's why one of the slogans is the town of Eastend is called the valley of hidden secrets. It's been a secret for a lot of years and it's time to promote them secrets.

With this tourism program we are involving the state of Montana. We went down and had a meeting with the governor earlier on, but since then we've went down and we've met with the chamber of commerce, the department of transportation, the agricultural department, the governor's office, the senator's office, and the congressman's office, and the department of tourism. That was in the town of Havre. We had a real good reception. These people are interested, the same as we are, for tourism. They want people to come down and have a look at what they got. They've been sitting back the same as we were probably . . . you can say, we're responsible for that, sitting back and letting the people say, well we know it's there, we'll come down. This does not just happen. You have to promote your community. They're ready to do this in co-operation with us.

We have formed a committee between Montana and Saskatchewan. The next meeting is going to be in Saskatchewan. It's going to be in Eastend. These people are going to come up and have a joint meeting with us to promote . . . to tell us what their promotions are going to be. There's going to be representation from all those committees that I talked about: the tourism, the congressman, the governor, maybe the . . . I think that we're even going to have the congressman and the governor up to this meeting.

They have lots to offer the same as we do. I think with a joint effort, and this is why I say it has to be a joint effort that we can promote each other. And this is what this is all about. You promote me; I promote you.

In conjunction with this I want to mention the other program, rural development corporation. We have a rural development corporation that has been founded down there. It has 10 RMs; five towns are involved in this. This is to promote your community, promote industry, trying to get industry to locate industry into your community. This rural development corporation has by-laws, has rules to go by under legislation.

This rural development corporation has seed money. Mr. Speaker, this rural development corporation can go out and have the powers to go out and hire somebody to go out and promote them, whoever they think is the best; they decided that; they've hired somebody already. This

person is responsible for taking in conventions here and there to find out if there is an opportunity and to tell these, wherever they're at, we have an opportunity down in the south-west. Here's what we have for you.

So this is how the rural development corporation . . . I could go into more detail. But the point I was getting at, there's these three programs that are all working in conjunction, working in conjunction of rural Saskatchewan — tourism, rural development corporation, the rural medical practice. All these three programs are going to promote health and education.

Recreation: we have a recreation grant that I'm very proud of too, Mr. Speaker, because without this recreation grant right now, some of these recreational facilities would be in jeopardy. We all know what it costs to build the new facilities. At least I do; I was involved with a new facility. It was over \$1 million. We're not finished yet. I was involved with it from day one. I know what it costs; I know how many dollars it's going to take to finish it; I know how many hours it takes. Most of that is free labour, Mr. Speaker.

With the three items or the topics that I was talking about here, it makes it so important for rural Saskatchewan that if we lose one school or one hospital or one recreation facility, that community is probably in jeopardy, because we are working with the minimal number of people with just about everything we do. That's why working in co-operation, everybody co-operating, I do believe that we have a chance in rural Saskatchewan. Everybody's thinking positive. I've been to all their meetings. Even when the rural medical practice started up there was people who were a little negative. They said, it'll never work. Those same people are saying right now that it's probably going to be the saviour of our hospitals and our nursing homes.

The same thing as the tourism program; some people said we have nothing to offer. And like I mentioned, by the time the night was over they had their committee formed. They had lots to offer. There's people out there saying, we have to maybe think about where these people are going to stay. What have we got for facilities? They're even talking about setting up venture capital corporations for maybe a motel, maybe a café, or whatever. They're thinking about increasing golf courses. The town of Shaunavon is going to spend a quarter of a million dollars on their golf course, because they feel without that we just don't have the attraction there for the people to come with the golf course the way it is. They want to put grass greens, grass fairways, watered fairways, to make it a number one spot, a class one spot for the tourism.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we are ready to fight. The people that are out there are thinking positive. I can stand here and mention some of the things that the people opposite were talking about. Negativism, be negative; this is what they're preaching — preaching be negative, because that's the only way they feel they can get elected is they can get the people thinking negative. Well, Mr. Speaker, the people aren't going to . . . they're not going to swallow that, Mr. Speaker. People out there are going to think positive. This is not the first time this has happened to this province or this whole country. We've had our

problems before. You can talk, you can ask your ancestors, your grandfathers, grandmothers, your fathers, they all say the same thing: times are going to change. I just hope that I'm here when the change is here. Mr. Speaker, I know it's going to change.

I've just got one thing I'd like to mention. I heard the member from Wilkie talk about the Co-op upgrader, Husky, Husky upgrader in Lloydminster, jobs. Those are things . . . Those two co-operations — corporations, you might call it, a corporation in co-operation with the government are jobs. They call them multinationals. What have they got against multinationals? They don't believe in jobs, I see. Any time you start spending \$600 million on the Co-op upgrader and a billion dollars on the Lloydminster project, that creates a lot of jobs in that community. That creates a lot of jobs all across Saskatchewan. And I guess if you people, if the people across the way want to play political games with that, they can go right ahead. The people aren't going to believe you.

I come from a constituency where we have oil. The Co-op upgrader was a blessing. The Lloydminster upgrader was a blessing. They've been waiting for it for years. The people across the way talked about it, but that's all they did; they just talked about it.

We have a project down there that we are starting that I have to credit to the Minister of Agriculture, both ministers, the associate and the minister.

(2130)

A water project. We're doing a study on it on the Battle Creek. You want to go down there, maybe, and take a little trip down there some of you some day and find out the appreciation the people are giving the people of Saskatchewan for even considering building something in that area, because that's all that's ever been done, is considering. We are serious about this project. We have dealt and we have met with United States.

We have met with the governor; we have met with the people in Montana. These people down there have the same problem as we do. The water goes by and it don't come back. These people want to co-operate. They want to work with us on this project. We are going to work together on this project and we are going to build it. Mr. Speaker, that is positive.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close by saying I feel much better going to bed at night thinking that tomorrow is going to be better than thinking that tomorrow is going to be a sad day. With that, I support the Finance minister in the 1990 budget.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Calvert: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I am grateful for the opportunity to participate in this budget speech debate. The member who just concluded his remarks spoke with some optimism about the future of Saskatchewan. I share that optimism. He spoke about change and I, too, believe the change is coming. The change is coming when the Premier calls the election in

this province. And there is going to be a big change, a change in government and a change in direction for Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, since the budget was delivered to this House and the people of Saskatchewan last Thursday night, I've had the opportunity to visit with a fair number of people in my own constituency. I've had the opportunity to travel to the city of Swift Current and meet people there. I've had the opportunity to travel to the community of Girvin and meet people there. And I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, and all members present, that no matter where I travel in this province, either before the budget and particularly since the delivery of the budget, people across this province are indicating to me that they have lost their confidence in this group of men and women; that across this province this group of men and women no longer enjoy any credibility. They no longer enjoy the confidence of the people that they were elected to govern, Mr. Speaker, and so I'd describe the situation in Saskatchewan today as a crisis of confidence.

The Minister of Education should know this that across the province I believe there is a crisis of confidence. When the people of this province have lost confidence in the men and women they elected to lead them, then it is time, Mr. Speaker, it's time to defeat that group of men and women and replace it with a group of people who can restore the confidence of the people of the province.

Mr. Speaker, I would argue in this debate that the budget that was delivered to us last Thursday evening in this House by the Minister of Finance only goes on to deepen that crisis of credibility and the crisis of confidence in this province.

In his budget address, Mr. Speaker, I heard the minister say, and I quote, the people have "told us to eliminate waste . . . in government." That's what the minister said in his speech, and then he went on to claim in his speech, we have reduced inefficiency and waste. He went on to claim, we first tightened our own belt.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when the people of Saskatchewan hear that kind of comment from the Minister of Finance, is it any wonder this government lacks in credibility? How, Mr. Speaker, can the people of this province be expected to believe what this government says when they see what this government does?

Mr. Speaker, by way of illustration, while this Minister of Finance in the House and before the people of Saskatchewan was indicating that this government was coming to grips with inefficiency and waste, even while the words were leaving his mouth, for an example, at our home I receive, delivered by the letter carrier, three bills — one from SaskPower, one from the gas division, SaskEnergy, and one from SaskTel — all of them in three separate envelopes, each with three separate stamps, delivered by the letter carrier to our home. Now you will know, Mr. Speaker, that I can pay each of those three bills with one cheque in one envelope. Mr. Speaker, while this is this government's best attempt at efficiency and the elimination of waste, Mr. Speaker, three bills in one envelope with one stamp would save the consumers of Saskatchewan literally hundreds of thousands of dollars.

But somebody over there can't seem to figure that out.

While this Minister of Finance is talking about inefficiency and waste, and how they've really tackled the problem, his own colleague, the Minister of Education, is delivering to the parents of every child in the school system in Saskatchewan another letter, on fancy government stationery, delivered to our homes in what is obviously the use of taxpayers money in pre-election propaganda. Mr. Speaker, if this government was truly interested in dealing with waste and inefficiencies and mismanagement, that kind of letter would never be sent to the parents of this province.

While he talks about the elimination of waste in his budget, the very same week in this House we learned that his colleague, the former minister of Finance, last year alone spent \$99,000 so that he and his entourage could travel around the world. Mr. Speaker, is there any wonder we have a crisis of credibility here? Is it any wonder the people will not believe what they say when they see what they do?

And then he said in his speech, well we've tightened our belts; we have a grip on it and we've tightened our belts. Well you'll remember, Mr. Speaker, and the people of the province remember about six months ago they loosened their belt about eight notches; they fattened up this government about eight notches. Now by my count I think there is only one member on the government benches now who doesn't receive extra pay for some cabinet or Legislative Secretary responsibility — only one left who would be considered a true back-bencher. Know what that means, Mr. Speaker, and what the people of the province know it means, is it's not only a question of extra salaries. It's a question of extra pension benefits, it's extra offices in this building, it's extra staff, it's extra cars, extra airplane trips.

He says, now but whoa, we've tightened out belts. We're going to cut back on this severance thing to ministers who leave the government. Well what's happened here is they may have pulled the belt in by one notch, but six months ago they let it out by eight. And they want the people of the province to believe that they've got some grip on waste and inefficiency and expenditures right out of line.

So, Mr. Speaker, is there any wonder that we have what I describe as to be a crisis of credibility, a crisis of confidence in the province, and a crisis, Mr. Speaker, that I argue begins to put into question our whole democratic system and process in this province. That's what is truly sad about this.

So, Mr. Speaker, I repeat that when a government has lost the confidence of the people, when it has lost its credibility and demonstrates as much in a budget address, then it's time to defeat that government. It's time to put into place in government a group of women and men who will indeed restore confidence, not only to the budgetary process and the financial management of our province but confidence to our people in what we can do and be in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this budget, as I have studied its documents and its implications, I believe it's a budget that

will continue to press hard on Saskatchewan households, and yet at the same time does not offer to the Saskatchewan household, to the Saskatchewan family, the kind of hope and the kind of promise and the kind of direction that Saskatchewan people are looking for.

You know, Mr. Speaker, in my hearing, when someone was asked to comment on this budget in a succinct way, that individual responded, well, I guess we're another day older and deeper in debt. That's a very succinct analysis of this budget. Yes, we're another day older and we're in deeper in debt.

It needs to be recognized, Mr. Speaker, that this budget that's before us now is not simply the consequence of the last year in this province's history. This budget that we were delivered on Thursday night last is the consequence, not of one year but of eight years — of eight long years of financial mismanagement in this province.

Mr. Speaker, it is provided in the estimate figures that accompany this budget, it is accompanied in the minister's own . . . it is indicated in the minister's own address that we, the people of Saskatchewan, we, the province of Saskatchewan, we, the government of Saskatchewan are now handcuffed by the debt that has been put upon us by this group of men and women since they came to office. Mr. Speaker, I say we are handcuffed as a people by this debt. The budget indicates now that the debt of the province and the operations of government has reached \$4.36 billion — \$4.36 billion in debt put on the people of this province by this group of men and women since they came to power.

Mr. Speaker, I point out again as other members have that the interest payment now on this debt is the third largest item in the Saskatchewan provincial budget. I point out that figure is very near to \$500 million a year which amounts to \$1.35 million a day in interest payments to service this debt accumulated by the government opposite since they came to power in 1982 — \$1.35 million a day to service the debt, Mr. Speaker.

And that money, Mr. Speaker, comes directly out of the pocket-books of the Saskatchewan people, right out of the bank accounts of Saskatchewan people through their tax dollars, and right into the vaults of the financial institutions in New York, Tokyo, and Geneva. Mr. Speaker, this kind of a debt handicaps . . . this kind of a debt handcuffs the government of Saskatchewan.

Speculate, Mr. Speaker, if you will, what we could do as government if we didn't have this entry in the budget, \$500 million a year interest payment; what we could do with \$500 million. For the agricultural community of Saskatchewan this spring, if we had \$500 million, what could we do? If we had \$500 million, what could we do, Mr. Speaker, in terms of creating jobs for the people of this province? If we had that \$500 million, what could we do in health care, in education? Imagine what we could do to feed the hungry children of this province. Imagine what we could do to provide day-care spaces if we had that \$500 million.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Calvert: — But no, Mr. Speaker, that \$500 million, that \$1,350,000 a day goes straight from your pocket-book, from my pocket-book and all of the pocket-books of Saskatchewan taxpayers, straight into the vaults in New York and around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I argue that the budget we have before us, with its lack of service to people, with its tax burden, is a result not of just one year but of eight years of mismanagement. It is a natural consequence — this kind of budget — of a province that is technically bankrupt.

And I might add, Mr. Speaker, it's a natural consequence of privatization, because in sacrificing the revenues that came to the people of Saskatchewan from the assets owned by the people of Saskatchewan and sacrificing that revenue, we have no vehicle now to deal with this debt except taxation. And I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the great tragedy in my view is that this debt will remain; this debt will remain when this government is gone; that this debt will remain with this generation and the next generation and very likely the next generation, and it will continue to handicap the people of Saskatchewan, my children, and their children. That's the tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, this budget would also indicate that this government is simply not capable. It demonstrates incapacity to be able to manage, to deal with this debt. There is nothing in this budget address, we heard nothing in the throne speech, that would indicate that this government now has a plan to see us out of this financial morass.

Mr. Speaker, what the people of this province want is a plan. They understand this is going to be a long-term problem, but the people of this province want and need and deserve leadership from their government, a plan that will see us through this financial catastrophe that we're now in.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague in saying that that will take a new government.

(2145)

Mr. Speaker, I want in this budget debate to reflect for a short while on the implications, as I see them, of this budget on the community of Moose Jaw. And then I would like to, if time permits, to comment how this budget reflects on those areas that I serve as the official opposition critic for.

So in terms, Mr. Speaker, of my own community of Moose Jaw, I have looked very carefully at the budget speech and the accompanying documents, the *Estimates* and the *Supplementary Estimates*. I've looked at them very carefully and I can find, Mr. Speaker, no specific reference in these documents to a new St. Anthony's Home for the community of Moose Jaw. Mr. Speaker, I remind you that the commitment was made to the community of Moose Jaw prior to 1986 by the Premier himself that a new St. Anthony's would be built. Mr. Speaker, you will recall after the election that commitment was put on hold.

Now since then, members opposite know, and we all

know, that a good deal of thought and reorganization and replanning has gone into that project for St. Anthony's Home, and the community and the board and the people of Moose Jaw are ready to go. Houses in fact these days are being levelled to make way for this new home. Mr. Speaker, I cannot find in these budget documents a specific commitment to ensure that project. Now perhaps I may be naïve, but I am trusting the money is there. And this will be a question that I will be anxious to put either to the Associate Minister of Health or the Minister of Health when we come to the estimates of his department. The community of Moose Jaw is anxious to know about that very specific commitment . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Now the member from Lloydminster wants to know if we will publicly thank the government when that commitment is made, and in fact I will. In fact I will.

The citizens of Moose Jaw will long remember that the commitment made by the Premier before 1986; they will long remember that commitment being put on hold; they will long remember the delays. But when in fact you commit finally to that project, you will receive the gratitude of this member and the people of Moose Jaw.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, I have looked carefully in this budget at the estimates for the Department of Education, and I have done that because education is vital in Moose Jaw, as it is in every other community of the province. But I looked with a very specific eye to the funding for SIAST, to the funding for SIAST, STI (Saskatchewan Technical Institute), the Palliser Campus, located in Moose Jaw. Mr. Speaker, I am left with some concerns.

Given that the Minister of Education and other members of the government have repeated over and over again that the increased funding in Education is 5.9 per cent — I believe that's the figure they're using — when I turn to the very specific item, which is a grant to the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology, I find that in 1989-90 the estimated funding was \$69.8 million. The bottom-line figure for the current year, Mr. Speaker, is \$65.7 million. Now, Mr. Speaker, that, in anybody's language is a decrease in funding from 69.8 last year to 65.7.

Now I want to be fair to the government, Mr. Speaker, I want to be fair to the government because under the grant to SIAST you'll find two categories: one is in payments to the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation and the other is for operations. Now I note that much of the decrease in funding to SIAST is a decrease that is against the payments to Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation. Frankly, I don't understand that. We'll want to ask the minister about that in Estimates.

In operations I see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that in fact funding has increased. It's gone from 48.3 million to 49.8 for the operations of our technical schools. Now, Mr. Speaker, again I don't think you need to be a Ph.D. in mathematics to understand that that is a 3 per cent increase — 3 per cent increase to the fundings for operations of our technical schools — 3 per cent. Now,

Mr. Speaker, you and I and members in the House know that inflation, in fact, is running in the neighbourhood of 5 per cent or greater. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will want to ask the member and the member from Moose Jaw North will want to deal with this in the Minister of Education's estimates. How will the board of SIAST, the staff and the students of SIAST live with a 3 per cent increase in funding when inflation is running at 5 per cent, and somehow be told that they're a lot better off than before this budget? Now we'll want to talk to the Minister of Education about that.

Mr. Speaker, in the city that I represent and am proud to represent, our small-business community, our city council, the people of Moose Jaw are working hard in terms of attempting to revitalize our downtown in a variety of ways. I do not find, Mr. Speaker, within the budget any assistance in that regard. I do not find in this budget any specific mention of the kind of downtown revitalization projects that would serve our community and others. And so again, I and the member from Moose Jaw North will want to pursue this with the ministers responsible. Can we find in this budget some very tangible assistance to downtown revitalization in the city of Moose Jaw.

Mr. Speaker, I've reviewed these documents and I've asked the question: how will this budget affect the property tax payer in Moose Jaw? How will this budget affect the people that are paying property taxes on their homes or through their businesses or as renters through their rents in apartments. How will this affect?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I really think for unmitigated gall this statement in the budget must rank among one of the best. The Minister of Finance stood in this House and he said:

We could have followed the Government of Canada's example and shifted our fiscal problems onto others.

Further on he says:

We recognize that shifting costs from one government to another does nothing to relieve the burden on the taxpayers . . .

The implication here of course is that they're not shifting any burden of taxation onto the local municipalities. Well he said he's not going to shift it, he's not going to off-load on the municipalities, and then he did it, he did it. The urban revenue sharing is frozen. In the period of inflation, that means obviously a 5 per cent cut, a cut that the city of Moose Jaw is going to have to deal with. City council of Moose Jaw is going to be faced with that unhappy prospect of either cutting services or raising property taxes. There's no option. They don't have the option of deficit financing like this group have used; they're going to have the unhappy choice.

If, in fact, as I read the budget the base funding to education is in the neighbourhood of 2.9 or three per cent, a gain of less than inflation, the school boards in Moose Jaw are also going to be faced with that unhappy choice. You either cut or you ask more from the property taxpayer. This budget is not good news for the property

taxpayer of the city of Moose Jaw, Mr. Speaker, or in any other municipality in this province.

Mr. Speaker, in the community that I represent we have a high percentage of seniors, and a goodly number of those seniors depend on the bus, the city bus, for their transportation. On Sunday evening, Mr. Speaker, I was speaking to a senior in Moose Jaw, one who I know quite well who lives in my constituency, and her question to me was: what's going to happen to our buses? Are they cutting the money for our buses? The answer is yes. They've cut the municipal transit grant.

Now that for the city of Moose Jaw amounted to \$140,000 a year. That is not an insignificant amount of money for the city I represent. Mr. Speaker, the city of Moose Jaw are going to be faced with the unhappy choice: what do you do, cut services, raise fares, or increase taxes? And that service in my community, Mr. Speaker, is an important service.

So I say to the Minister of Finance, just as Michael Wilson off-loaded on to you, sure enough you've off-loaded on to the taxpayers of the municipalities of the province, including the city of Moose Jaw. The difference is at least Michael Wilson was honest about it. He didn't try to disguise it; he was honest about it.

Well you know it's often been said, Mr. Speaker, you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all the people all of the time. And the people of Moose Jaw are not fooled by this budget and the consequences that it may in fact have on our community.

Mr. Speaker, I just also want to say just a word about households in the constituency I represent. I want to say a word about families and the households of Moose Jaw South.

In the last decade, Mr. Speaker, those households, they've seen their real disposable income decline. It becomes harder and harder for families in my constituency to make ends meet. People in my constituency are being forced to give up their homes. They no longer can make their mortgage payments. People in my constituency, many people in my constituency have seen their jobs disappear. Even as we meet tonight, a good many workers from Canada Packers are being laid off, are laid off.

And they have some real serious concern about their future. We've lost, just recently, 20 jobs from Via Rail. In Moose Jaw we've seen our SaskTel crews and our SaskPower reduced. Stores have closed down on our Main Street, throwing people out of work. And, Mr. Speaker, the stress shows — it shows in the households, in the homes and the families of Moose Jaw. Parents and grandparents in my constituency are watching as their children and their grandchildren leave the province in search of jobs elsewhere. Families are being torn apart.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most tragic indication of this situation, of this lack of employment and jobs, is the fact — and this is fact, Mr. Speaker — that in a school not far from my home, in Westmount School in Moose Jaw, 28 children, 28 hungry kids lined up this

morning for breakfast at school.

Mr. Speaker, that is an absolute first in the city of Moose Jaw. In Westmount School, this morning, 28 kids lined up for breakfast. And I know for a fact, Mr. Speaker, I know for a fact because I sat behind that desk for a number of years — that in the course of this day, people will have lined up at Zion United Church to get a referral for the food bank in Moose Jaw. That's the tragic reality. That's the tragic indicator of the lack of employment opportunity, the lack of jobs, the lack of economic direction being provided by those men and women who are charged with bringing that into my community and to this whole province.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that in this budget the households of Moose Jaw were sincerely looking for an economic game plan. They were looking for opportunities where they might have the prospect of working again. They were looking for a plan that might give them the prospect of long-term and secure jobs, an economic plan that could begin a turnaround in the state of this province. And what they were delivered, by the Minister of Finance, was more taxes; in spite of what he said, more tax. They were delivered a fair bit of rhetoric and no plan, no plan.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Moose Jaw are not fooled, and they want a difference. They want a change. And I tell you what they want is a New Democratic difference. They want a New Democratic change and that's what they'll see again.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, I want to quickly deal with two of my critic areas. I listened again very carefully to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Affairs as he gave his address in this budget debate, and again I note that the minister did not comment on the investors who have lost much of their life savings in the collapse of Principal Trust.

Mr. Speaker, I remind you again, we are talking here of thousands of Saskatchewan people, mostly seniors, who either currently, or come from farming or working backgrounds or small business, who invested in Principal Trust, trusting in their government to have regulated; trusting in their government to have policed; trusting in their government to ensure that operations in this province were safe.

Since last we sat, the Ombudsman of this province has delivered his scathing attack on the ministers and the government opposite pointing out what investors have said, what Saskatchewan people have said, that the collapse was due to the negligence of this government and the minister responsible for their concerns. The minister responsible for the concerns of these thousands of Saskatchewan people comes into this House, not only in his throne speech but also then in his budget speech, and fails to mention, fails to mention, says not a word in regard to the investors in Principal Trust who are looking now to him for some assistance in their plight. And when he's approached by the press outside of this House, I quote from the *Leader-Post*, March 30, 1990, an article

that points out there was nothing in this budget for the investors.
I quote from the article:

When questioned about the possibility of compensation,
Consumer and Commercial Affairs Minister, Jack Klein
refused . . . comment . . .

Refuses to comment in his throne speech; refuses to comment in
his budget speech; refuses to comment to the press. Well, Mr.
Speaker, again I serve notice that before this session is completed
he will comment.

The Speaker: — It being 10 o'clock the House stands adjourned
until tomorrow at 2 p.m.

The Assembly adjourned at 10 p.m.