

EVENING SITTING

MOTIONS

**Resolution No. 11 — Government Program of Restraint
(continued)**

Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, just to refresh the memory of the House, earlier this afternoon we were debating a motion put forth by the member from — where is it? — Moosomin. And the member was speaking through his motion to this government showing leadership by initiating an internal restraint program of some sort.

Now, Mr. Speaker, members on this side of the House, and I would suggest the majority of the people of Saskatchewan, are not quite clear what this new restraint program that this government may have embarked upon, but I guess didn't, was all about, because you see, Mr. Speaker, the memories are very fresh in the minds of people of Saskatchewan — the number of transgressions that this government has committed since 1982.

And the fact is, sir, that this latest budget has not shown restraint on behalf of the government. Nor has any budget prior to this budget shown any semblance of restraint, Mr. Speaker.

I had indicated to the House that somewhere in the neighbourhood . . . in 1982 the budget was . . . the revenue of the government was around \$2.3 billion. That has grown in this last budget to a projected revenue of some \$4.8 billion — much more than double the amount there was in 1982.

Mr. Speaker, before supper we had spoken about a number of issues in terms of this government's spending of public tax dollars. We had talked about Chuck Childers, the president of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, and the fact that he hadn't been asked by this government to show restraint. He sits with a \$470,000-a-year, no-cut contract . . . or \$740,000-a-year, no-cut contract.

We talked about the government's record of travel and the fact that Jim Garner had spent some time during one winter, at taxpayers' expense, in Honolulu — Jim Garner being the former Highways minister.

We talked about trips to Chicago and Fairmont, Colorado and Palm Springs and Rio de Janeiro and Paris. We talked about some of the trips, sir, that were taken by the Premier and his cabinet ministers to Reno, Nevada and Phoenix and Helsinki and Miami and Seoul, Korea and Denver and Moscow and Zürich and Vienna and Berlin. We talked about trips to Amsterdam, Palm Springs, Singapore, New Delhi, and Brasilia.

And, Mr. Speaker, as well, we talked about former cabinet ministers and defeated MLAs (Members of the Legislative Assembly) who were on government payroll, and I'd like to go through some of those if I could, again just to refresh the memory of the House, sir.

We talked about Bob Andrew, the trade emissary in Minneapolis at \$100,000-a-year salary. We talked about Eric Berntson, former deputy premier, now the campaign manager for the PC Party in this upcoming election, being appointed by their federal cousins, the Tories in Ottawa, at a salary of 71,000. We talked about Larry Birkbeck with a \$48,000 contract. He was a former MLA in this government. Gordon Currie, chairman of the board of the youth drug centre in Yorkton. Gordon Dirks, Louis Domotor, Sid Dutchak, Tim Embury. We talked about Ralph Katzman, Myles Morin, Keith Parker, Paul Rousseau, Jack Sandberg, Paul Schoenhals, Bud Smith, and last but not least, Graham Taylor, who is the trade emissary in Hong Kong.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's talk about restraint, and for who. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the people who work in restaurants in this province who are going to be affected by this government's decision to impose the provincial goods and services tax, and the waitresses in those restaurants who are asked to show restraint, because the people clearly are not tipping as they may have before the federal goods and services tax and now the provincial goods and services tax were imposed upon the people.

And I guess I want to talk about clerks, maybe single mothers who are working in retail outlets throughout this province who are being laid off because retail sales have dropped, and I want to talk about the hardships that they are facing. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that through the provincial goods and services tax, this government has imposed restraint upon them, but not upon Bob Andrew and Eric Berntson and the list that I just mentioned. And let me talk about, sir, where these people came from before they were put on public payroll.

An Hon. Member: — Where? Where did they come from?

Mr. Lautermilch: — Well some of them may have come from private industry or private enterprises. They may have been; I don't know. But you know the list that I read here, for the most part, were elected as PC (Progressive Conservative) MLAs. Some of them ended up in cabinet, some of them quit of their own volition, and others were defeated. But, sir, each and every one of these people that are not asked to share in this restraint and were put on big government salaries came through the ranks of the PC Party of Saskatchewan, sir. And when we want to talk about restraint, Mr. Speaker, maybe we should be talking in terms of fairness and fairness for all people in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the Member of the Legislative Assembly, a member of the PC Party who put forth this motion, this motion patting themselves on the back and commending the PC government for restraint, is the same MLA who takes a Legislative Secretary salary of some \$8,000 a year, Mr. Speaker, to do absolutely nothing. Travel, the use of vehicles when he's on whatever they deem to be government work, which nobody knows what that may be.

But, sir, Mr. Speaker, it's not that he's the only member, because he has nine other of his colleagues who are

taking the same salary — a total, sir, of \$80,000 a year. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that they haven't been asking, this Premier hasn't asked his back-benchers who sit as legislative secretaries, he hasn't asked them to share in the restraint, Mr. Speaker.

But you know who he's asked? He's asked clerks in retail outlets who have had their hours cut back because of drops in retail sales. Those are the kinds of people he's asked, Mr. Speaker.

And I want to say as well, Mr. Speaker, the hoteliers of this province have been asked to share in restraint. Their retail sales have dropped, which means their bottom lines are dropping.

And those in the southern part of the province are faced with customers running across the border. And I can't say that it's not justified that they would go across the border to shop, Mr. Speaker, because down in the northern states they don't have the 7 per cent goods and services tax provincially imposed upon them, nor the 7 per cent federal tax, sir.

What I'm saying is that these people are facing restraint because it's been imposed upon them by the Mulroney government and the Premier of this province and his cabinet. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that that is an unacceptable situation.

And the Leader of the Opposition announced today that we as a New Democratic Party will do our part to ensure that there are fair opportunities in this province and that people can afford to shop and to live here. And we're going to, sir, if we're elected after the next election, get rid of the provincial goods and services tax if these people ever ram it through the House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I haven't seen, and nor did the member from Moosomin speak to the \$26,000 that Terry Leier, a friend of the PC Party, was given to take some schooling down in the United States, an eight-month course I understand, Mr. Speaker. And I want to say . . . One of my colleagues asks me to repeat that. That Terry Leier . . .

An Hon. Member: — Who's this Terry Leier?

Mr. Lautermilch: — He's closely tied, sir, to the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan, was given \$26,000 to take an eight-month course in the United States of America. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, he wasn't asked to share in restraint, but students in our own province, children who were born here and who want to take post-secondary education in our universities can't get in because the universities have had to impose quotas because of underfunding by the provincial government, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — And I say, Mr. Speaker, shame on the member from Moosomin. Shame on him for introducing this motion to the legislature, because I tell you it's the

height of hypocrisy when you see a man who represents perhaps 10 or 12,000 people that would introduce this kind of a motion, given the government's record that he votes for in every occasion that he's been asked to.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about a man by the name of Waschuk who received a \$150,000 loan, interest free, from a man by the name of Guy Montpetit. And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, he wasn't asked to share in this restraint.

And I want to explain to you why I mention this man's name, Mr. Speaker, because that money came directly from the taxpayers' pockets, the taxpayers of this province, because of an ill-conceived, ill-planned deal to bring French translation to this province — technology that wasn't available and won't be for a considerable period of time, from what the experts tell us, Mr. Speaker. The deal that this government blew five and a half million dollars on — \$5.5 million, Mr. Speaker — of money that could have gone to ensure that our children can get an adequate, post-secondary education in this province, and an education that they can afford.

But, Mr. Speaker, the priorities were wrong. There was no restraint when it came to Guy Montpetit and GigaText. The money funnelled into his pocket as fast as he could spend it, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me tie Mr. Ken Waschuk's \$150,000 loan to this PC government and to the lack of restraint. Mr. Speaker, Guy Montpetit was the main actor in the GigaText scandal. He was the man who was mostly responsible for spending some five and a half millions of government taxpayers' dollars. And I tell you he was the man that Guy Montpetit said tied the connections between the PC government and his corporation and himself.

Mr. Speaker, some would say that this \$150,000 interest loan was a finder's fee, a fee to find the biggest suckers in western Canada over decades, Mr. Speaker, and it happened to be the Premier and this cabinet and the members of that party, the Government of Saskatchewan, and that cost the taxpayers five and a half million dollars.

And I say Mr. Montpetit and Mr. Waschuk and the members of this cabinet who flew back and forth to Winnipeg and to Montreal, who drove around in Montreal in the back of big, black limousines — some would say drinking champagne; I don't know that, sir. But the fact is they did get taken for a ride, and it cost the taxpayers of this province some five and a half million dollars.

And, Mr. Speaker, there was no restraint for Guy Montpetit and those that travelled in his circle. But there is restraint, sir, for the students of this province.

And I say to you and I say to the member from Moosomin, where was he? When we asked the new member from Thunder Creek, when we asked him to stop the foolish waste and shut GigaText down that was costing us some \$50,000 a month, where was he?

Mr. Speaker, there was no restraint. He sat in his place as

he does now, quietly. And when this government asked him to raise his hand in the air and support whatever it was they were asking for that day, he saluted. And he said, aye, aye, sir, Mr. Premier, I support you. And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, the people in that riding are waiting for him to come back and answer for that. And that's going to happen soon because after five years, almost five years, the people of this province, whether this Premier wants it or not, are going to get a chance to voice their opinions, and they're going to pass judgement on that member and others.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, he talks about restraint. And I see the member from Lloydminster sitting in his chair as well, and he was one of the ones that supported and voted. And I say, Mr. Speaker, where was that member? Where was that member when the people of this province were looking for restraint? Instead of hearing about it through a motion from the member from Moosomin; where were they?

And what did they say about the \$150,000 interest-free loan to Ken Waschuk? What did they say? What did they say about the \$26,000 that Terry Leier got to go to school down in the United States? To go back to school — a grown man — when people in our own province can't gain entrance to our post-secondary facilities. Where were they, Mr. Speaker? I tell you they were silent; they never said a word. We've watched for four consecutive years. Since the election of 1986 every one of those members from the back benches . . .

(1915)

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. Order, order. Why is the hon. member on his feet?

Hon. Mr. Swenson: — Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — What's your point of order?

Hon. Mr. Swenson: — The member opposite is making allegations that are unfounded and is misleading the House. The member had this line of questioning in Crown Corporations last year. All the answers were given to him. The questions that the member opposite is raising about members on this side and alleging criminality have been dealt with. The RCMP (Royal Canadian Mounted Police) investigated the question that the member raises, that the member raised in Crown Corporations, Mr. Speaker, and had all of those answers provided.

The allegations that the member is making are very unparliamentary because he is alleging criminality of members of this government. He has mentioned the Premier; he has mentioned ministers; and those things were all covered in that particular forum which is the forum that members should use to discuss these issues. The member now raises it again, allegations that are unfounded and I feel are unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker. And I think that that member should apologize to the legislature for implying criminality by members to this government, when he had that opportunity as a member to examine it in Crown Corporations and review the

report of the RCMP, and yet he makes those allegations. I find that unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I've been listening carefully to the member from Prince Albert talk about the many, many trips this government has taken. And the list of trips is taken from public documents that the government has provided to the public, and the list is long. Some would say that it's mismanagement and waste, and others would put it in stronger words.

The member talked about GigaText and Guy Montpetit, and the fact that the Premier drove around in the limousine with Guy Montpetit in Montreal; that's no secret. These are from court documents, Mr. Speaker. Whether or not the public presume or assume criminality is something of the member's imagination. Not once was criminality mentioned here. The issue here is the waste of \$5.5 million to Mr. Guy Montpetit with the Premier's full knowledge and involvement. That's what it's about.

And also the member talked about the use of Guy Montpetit's aircraft to fly other cabinet ministers around Canada. That isn't a figment of our imagination. These are court documents out of Montreal that our caucus took the time to go to the court proceedings, get the transcript from court, and translate them — manually, I might add — you from French to English. We didn't have the access to this fancy equipment that the members opposite seem to have.

The member's point of order is clearly out of order because there was not a mention of criminality, only corruption and scandal that this government is knee-deep in all the time in the last nine years.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I've listened to the hon. member from Thunder Creek's point of order and I have also listened to the member for Regina Elphinstone. Let me say that personal charges against hon. members are indeed unparliamentary and that is accepted practice. I did not hear the hon. member make a personal charge — personal charge. However, I did hear . . . I believe I did hear him make a general statement, a general statement of corruption of activities of the government. Normally, even though that is a language which we may not consider temperate, by and large is acceptable. However, I must say that I will be listening closely to the use of unparliamentary language, and I now ask that the debate continue.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much for your ruling and I do appreciate and understand your remarks. And let me begin, sir, by saying that I do understand why the member from Thunder Creek is as sensitive as he is. Because you see, sir, since 1986 when I was elected, I watched him first as a back-bencher support every move by this government.

An Hon. Member: — Why?

Mr. Lautermilch: — And I know why and I think the

members of this side know why. Because he was working his way, sir, towards a cabinet position. Irrespective of whether a decision might have been in favour of what the people of this province would want or not, he voted with this Premier and with this cabinet, sir. So I understand his sensitivity and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is a lot that I would like to speak of tonight so I'm going to continue with my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in terms of restraint, I didn't notice any restraint with respect to the public funds that were put into M.A.S. Medical in Saskatoon when an American entrepreneur made some commitments to open up a manufacturing . . . a medical manufacturing plant in Saskatoon and got some government money and nothing happened. And I saw, sir, nothing in terms of restraint from SEDCO, the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation. I saw, sir, no restraint at that time, and I felt, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this province will agree with me that they would want to have seen some restraint from this government, but it clearly never happened.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that they've built the \$5 billion deficit. The fact is that they've raised the debt in the Crown corporation side by over \$9 billion. And the fact is, sir, that they didn't show restraint since 1982, and they haven't shown restraint since their budget of this spring. And I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, the people of this province clearly understand the hypocrisy of a motion put forth by a member who was part of the government that allowed this massive debt to be built, that allowed the out-migration of our young people, that allowed the regulations to be ever increasing for people who want to get into post-secondary educational facilities.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this province know that there's been no restraint. Oh they talk about restraint prior to an election, but the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that this government doesn't practise internal restraint; they go to the people of this province for more taxes.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, when they announced in February the introduction of the provincial goods and services tax that are going to take \$440 million directly out of the pockets of consumers in this province, we know who's been asked to practise restraint, Mr. Speaker; it's ordinary, average people in Saskatchewan but not this government. That's what's been happening, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, every member on that side of the House, every member on that side of the House, including the Minister of Finance who can't keep his lips from flapping . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order, order, order. Order. Number one, we do not refer to members' presences. Number two, even though one might not like a remark another member has made, I believe that the language used in this case should be more temperate than you did in this case. And it isn't good for the House because what one gives, one can receive back, and then the House unravels and of course we don't want that.

So the hon. member for Prince . . . Now the Minister of Finance, I believe, should not interrupt, should not interrupt, and then the House perhaps would proceed a little more smoothly.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you once again, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your intervention. It was becoming more and more difficult to continue my remarks as the Minister of Finance spoke from his seat and I do appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that of all of the members in this legislature, the last one that should be speaking should be the Minister of Finance who is responsible for imposing this provincial goods and services tax. I would think with 85 per cent, roughly, of the people of this province opposed to this tax that he's trying to ram down their throats, that he would be the last one to be even seen in public, sir, because I think he should be ashamed of himself and he should be embarrassed with the way he has imposed this unfair tax upon the people of Saskatchewan.

And I want to say to the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, that members on this side of the House, members of the New Democratic Party, are going to do everything that is possible legislatively to ensure that this Bill never passes this House because of its unfairness and because it does nothing to heighten the economy of our province. It only dampens the economy and will drive us into a worse recession than we're already now in because of this government's mismanagement and because of the kinds of budgets that him and his predecessor have delivered, sir.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk and I want to get back to the motion with respect to restraint and the lack of restraint. And I want to indicate to members of the House and members of the public that tonight I'll be introducing an amendment to this motion patting the government's back for whatever kind of restraint he feels may have happened.

We're going to be, sir, amending this motion and it's going to be seconded by the member from The Battlefords. And the reason is clear, sir. The reason is because we are listening to the people of Saskatchewan and we understand that they do want a government with restraint. But they also understand that it will never come from members on that side of the House. That's not their record. That's not where they're headed. And that's not what they're about to produce for the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I have a list of a number of ventures that I would consider ill conceived and that show no restraint — no economic restraint. And I intend, during the course of my remarks this evening, to go through that list because I think it's fair for the people of Saskatchewan to have an overall understanding of how we've built this deficit, how we've built this debt in the Crown corporations of which SEDCO holds some hundred and fifty million dollars of debt. I want them, sir, to better understand how this government has put us into the situation that it has put us into.

We've seen, as I mentioned earlier, the GigaText scandal — some five and a half million dollars of government money wasted — without a word from any member on that side of the House. And I say to you, sir, in all honesty and in all sincerity, I feel that's one of the reasons that members of that side of the House shouldn't be returned to this legislature.

Each and every one of them, sir, has supported on every occasion, every move by this Premier, by this cabinet, by this government. There is not one exception that I can think of where in this Chamber one of those members voted for restraint, for sound fiscal management, in the cases that I am about to cite.

Because you see, sir, they have blindly followed the path of this Premier, the path of this cabinet, without any concern for what it's doing to the people of the province, without any concern for our young people who can't gain entrance to post-secondary educational facilities, for those who may have learning disabilities, to cite an example, in a school, in one of our public schools, who aren't getting the kinds of programs that they need and that they should have, sir, because of his government's choices and their priorities and their last lack of fiscal restraint.

You see, sir, I think that the people of this province understand that these members have to be held accountable — each and every one of them, from every corner of this province that they may represent. Those who supported this Premier so blindly; those that supported the decision to put money into the Northern Lights game farm — the former member from Indian Head-Wolseley's son involved — some \$200,000 of SEDCO financing; and that then supported him when he was up defending his intervention with the federal minister to get, as I recall, some \$460,000 of western diversification fund money. An operation, sir, that has now closed its doors and left many creditors in that community — honest business people, honest men and women who've been trying to make a living retailing and supplying goods and services to their customers — left them holding debts.

(1930)

You see, Mr. Speaker, when this government, and when their members, talk about restraint, it has no credibility because the record is not there. The record of accountability and the record of restraint just isn't there.

The fact is, sir, that we've had about nine and a half years of waste, mismanagement. They've turned a surplus budget of \$139 million into a \$5 billion debt on the general revenue side. They've turned Crown corporations that generated income for this province, that generated wealth to deliver education and health care and other issues, other items, they've turned that into over a \$9 billion debt.

And you see, sir, that's why I say, Mr. Speaker, that the government has no credibility when it stands before this House tooting its own horn and talking about fiscal restraint, because the facts just don't support that, sir.

The facts are that the government has over doubled its revenue, still not been able to balance a budget one time, that there's a litany of failed businesses that have been financed by this government. And there is, sir, a litany of scandal, and I don't know how else to describe the GigaText fiasco. I don't know how else to describe the expenditure of that five and a half million dollars other than to say it is a scandal.

And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this province believe that; they know that to be the truth. And I say whether the member from Thunder Creek wants to believe that — that in fact is the case — or whether he doesn't, the people of this province don't support his position. The people of Saskatchewan don't support the position of the member for Moosomin.

And they don't believe, sir, that this government has any intentions of fiscal restraint other than to talk about it prior to an election campaign that is rapidly coming. Because if they don't call the election, the Lieutenant Governor is clearly going to have to call it and the people of Saskatchewan know that, Mr. Speaker.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, and I want to speak a little bit about one of the business deals that this government embarked upon in my home community. I want to talk about the sale of the PAPCO (Prince Albert Pulp Company) assets to Weyerhaeuser. Mr. Speaker, members on that side of the House like to hold this up as a beacon of their economic diversification. And I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, we do welcome the jobs at the paper mill in Prince Albert. We always have and we've never disagreed that diversifying that forest industry is a good idea, a positive idea.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, we have no quarrel with Weyerhaeuser. We never did and we never will, to my knowledge. I can't look into the future to see what kind of negotiations may be with that corporation, but I believe them to be good corporate citizens in our community. But you know the fact is, Mr. Speaker, the problem is with the government. The problem was with the deal and that's what we criticized.

We said that we don't feel that you should be selling a quarter of a billion dollars of assets, because that's not fiscal restraint, and getting no payments. Mr. Speaker, it's sad and I'm sad to say that a lot of people in Saskatchewan don't realize that Weyerhaeuser, under its obligations and under that contract, has not had to pay back and has not paid back 1 cent in the principal of the \$250 million . . . of the \$239 million — not a cent.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, it's the height of hypocrisy when you have a record number of bankruptcies in the province of Saskatchewan — 650 bankruptcies; small businesses, small family businesses many of them — and there's not one single program to help them. There's not one program of help from this government other than they get stuck with the provincial goods and services tax, Mr. Speaker. There's \$239 million of money and investment capital available to Weyerhaeuser but there's nothing for Saskatchewan business people.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that Weyerhaeuser has

done well since they've taken over that corporation, and I knew they would do well, sir. If you plot the cycle of the pulp and paper industry, it would only make common sense to know that in 1986 there were going to be massive profits. And it wasn't isolated to just the Prince Albert operation. That was an industry-wide cycle and it's plottable; you can do it on graphs; you can see it; you know it's going to happen.

But this government didn't take that into account when they made that deal, sir. Weyerhaeuser makes profits with what used to be our assets with no obligation to pay back a penny — not 1 cent on the principal. And at the same time we see over 600 Saskatchewan businesses going broke in this province.

And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, when people see that happen and they see small businesses closing down and they see this Premier instructing his Finance minister to go to the people of Saskatchewan for the provincial goods and services tax — what will be, when totally harmonized, to our understanding, about \$440 million a year — people say this government has no credibility, Mr. Speaker.

People say that when the member from Moosomin raises this motion before the legislature talking about government restraint, they have no credibility, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, that's why from one corner of this province to the other, wherever you go, whether it be rural Saskatchewan or urban Saskatchewan, whether it be in the North or the South, the underlying question of the vast majority of the people of Saskatchewan is, for goodness' sakes, when is this man going to call an election, and when could we turn things right side up again in Saskatchewan as opposed to what we've had?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch — Mr. Speaker, I've talked about Weyerhaeuser, and there are other business deals that this government was involved with that turned sour, that clearly didn't show economic restraint. There's the closure of the High R Door factory in North Battleford, and we don't, frankly sir, know how much that's cost the people and the taxpayers of Saskatchewan because that particular deal is before the courts. And like so many deals that this government has embarked upon, they refuse to answer questions because it's before the courts or the business is still . . . a shell corporation but still there, and so we can't answer questions about that. Like so many of the deals, High R Door serves just another example of where this government failed to exercise economic restraint and where they failed the taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, if you move a little closer to Regina, you can talk about the Joytec operation. Company invested hundreds of thousands of dollars . . . the government invested hundreds of thousands of dollars in that company, and they're gone, sir. They're not operating in Saskatchewan; they're just not working here. They're not creating jobs here for our people. Saskatchewan people are left holding the bag. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, it's a sad commentary on a government, and members of that government, who don't understand really what they've

done to the economy of this province by involving themselves in what turned out to be some very sour deals.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I see the list of money that this government has borrowed, and some of these bond dealers are from New York, and from Tokyo, and other places. And, Mr. Speaker, these people have set themselves an interest rate — a rate that's ever increasing because of the lack of confidence in this government — they set an interest rate that they feel comfortable with, based on the risk and based on the abilities, they feel, of the government to manage the economy.

And I tell you there's no restraint for those people, Mr. Speaker, because when this Premier and when this Finance minister sit in their offices and go before their boards to ask to borrow yet more money, they set the rate that they want. But I tell you when you bring that back to Saskatchewan, the young people that are working maybe part-time in a gas station, who were asked now to pay this provincial goods and services tax, don't have the option of setting the interest rate, or their wages, or how much they pay for goods and services.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that this Premier and this government are setting those rates for them. And I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, they're grossly unfair; they're grossly unfair. And the small businesses in Saskatchewan, the family businesses who work long and hard hours, Mr. Speaker, in order to take home a salary — and I want to remind you that those small-business owners are the last ones to receive a pay cheque out of those businesses — they, sir, don't have the opportunities and they don't have the options, because they have to work with what's left of them.

And this government . . . in February, this Finance minister stands before the people of this province without even bringing it to the legislature, stands outside of the legislature, hiding from this place, which is where legislation and budgets should be introduced, and he announces another budget — a new budget — that's going to take some \$440 million a year out of the hands of Saskatchewan consumers.

Mr. Speaker, the economic spin-offs, and the ripple effect of that budget and of that move by this Finance minister, if left unchecked, sir, if left unchecked, is going to destroy and do a lot more to destroy the economy of this province than even the nine years, nine and one-half years of this government's previous record.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, you can go from one end of this province to the other. Car dealers understand what it's doing to their business. Restaurateurs understand what it's doing to their business. The hoteliers understand what it's doing to their business. And I want to tell the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster, if he doesn't understand what his colleagues in the hotel industry are saying, let me tell you that there are some people in this province who happen to understand what this PST (provincial sales tax) is doing to their business and what your economic disasters have done in the last nine and one-half years.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, inflation: 1.4 per cent last month in Regina, and 1.3 in Saskatoon — increases in both communities of almost one and a half per cent in a month. And where are the economic gurus who dreamed up this scheme for the people of Saskatchewan? Where is their plan? I say to you, Mr. Speaker, there is no plan. This plan was thrust upon them, I would suggest, by the bond dealers who, because of their mismanagement, this government's mismanagement, have forced them into finding more revenue. Because I don't think even the bond dealers believe that these people have the ability to work within the \$4.8 billion of revenue that they get each year.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, you have to lead by example, and this government hasn't done that with respect to internal restraint. Mr. Speaker, why haven't they rationalized some of the expenditures — the internal expenditures? I tell you why they haven't, Mr. Speaker, because they're too busy with their little junkets, their flights from here to there; and we've gone through that list and we can go through more of them. And they're too busy dealing patronage. And I've gone through a list of former MLAs who've been defeated, and former cabinet ministers who've retired, all of whom are living very comfortably on government payroll — hands in the pocket of Saskatchewan taxpayers. These people are doing very well, Mr. Speaker.

And I think the bond dealers understand that this government is not willing to look internally in terms of saving the taxpayers of this province money. Mr. Speaker, I think the bond dealers, as well as the people of Saskatchewan, understand that when a government will sign an agreement with Chuck Childers, the president of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, for \$740,000 a year on a no-cut contract — which means you can't get rid of him — and then sign it just on the eve of an election and tie the hands, perhaps, of other administrations, that they understand these people are not willing to look internally, and they're not willing to deal with the problems internally before they ask people outside to share.

Mr. Speaker, what's been happening in this province is a total, total destruction of the confidence of the people in their own communities and in their own province.

Mr. Speaker, when you see headlines as there was in the *Leader-Post* — Devine's office tracking student job applications — what hope does that give for any young student out there who may be non-political or whose families may be non-political, just wants to maybe go to school, get a summer job to help pay that tuition? What happens with the confidence of those people, Mr. Speaker?

(1945)

I think all you have to do is walk around this province and ask the one question: what would you most like to see in this province? And the response, as I've indicated before, is an election. That's why it's happened, Mr. Speaker, because this government has gone wild with power, and the litany of patronage has become so long, and it's so

entrenched in the minds and in the thoughts of this government that people no longer believe that there will be changes.

Mr. Speaker, when people look through *Public Accounts* . . . and I want to say that I think a lot of people are interested in how this government is spending money, that little bit that they will show us as to how they're spending it. And when they see people who have been involved with this government to the level of the Premier's office, like David Tkachuk, who's involved in a corporation called D-Mail, what, sir, what could they think but that there's restraint for some but not for others?

Mr. Speaker, look through *Public Accounts* and you see Strategic Direct Marketing, a total of \$635,400 to improve the image of — I presume — the cabinet. I mean we're not sure; it's never been articulated. But what else could people think then there's restraint for some but not for others.

The Corporate Strategy Group, I see here the Department of Education, 275,000; Executive Council, 87,000. And what's the function of this company, Mr. Speaker? They do direct mail and they set up direct mail to target groups. And most would say — a lot would say — Mr. Speaker, it's nothing but to promote the government's programs and their policies.

I see here Decima — polling, clearly — I mean it looks to me as a polling company, \$301,000. Well, Mr. Speaker, is there restraint for that? Is there restraint for Decima? Not on your life, Mr. Speaker, but there is restraint for senior citizens who've got this new tax imposed upon them. There is restraint for school children when they go to buy their clothing. There's restraint for families. There's restraint for businesses. And, Mr. Speaker, the sad fact of the matter is, up until this point they don't have a choice, and they're looking for a chance, sir, to choose. They're looking for a chance to choose whether or not they want this provincial goods and services tax, or whether they can choose a government that will impose internal restraint and will do some sound fiscal planning and some fiscal management and will start living within the means of the revenue that the people of this province give them through tax dollars, and will live within the means of the money that comes from the resource revenues in this province.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, they're looking for restraint. You bet they are. But they're looking for a government that will deliver it, and they know it's not going to come from this Premier or his cabinet. And I say, Mr. Speaker, when we're four and a half years, far past what is a normal mandate in Saskatchewan, for a government to have the audacity to thrust this massive tax grab on Saskatchewan people, I say shame on you. Shame on this government, Mr. Speaker. A government that has hundreds of thousands of dollars for travel and makes the choice to travel them and their staff around the province and around the world before looking after the needs of Saskatchewan people, it's no wonder people are cynical about his government.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned earlier today about Norman Riddell, who resigned as the Premier's deputy minister.

He resigned to accept a job with Premier Bourassa, on his own, of his own volition, moved to Quebec, took a job with that Premier, and this government gives him \$165,000 in severance.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that would fund an awful lot of families; that would buy an awful lot of groceries; it would pay an awful lot of rent; and it would buy an awful lot of clothing for those in this province who can't afford that.

But, Mr. Speaker, this government has made some choices. They chose Cargill over the Saskatchewan business community. And they chose to fund Weyerhaeuser over the Saskatchewan business community. And they chose to fund Peter Pocklington, sir, over the hoteliers of this province who are looking for some help and are in rural Saskatchewan in some desperate straits. And, Mr. Speaker, they didn't show restraint. I look through the list here and I see the member for Melville, the Minister of Economic Diversification, a travel bill of \$16,709. Mr. Speaker, that in no way indicates to me restraint. And I see the former deputy premier, Mr. Berntson, at \$17,689. Mr. Speaker, neither does that show restraint to the people of Saskatchewan. And the member for Regina South, who is quite interested in this debate, I can tell, spent a total of \$24,527.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that's why people are saying that they're feeling betrayed by this government. It's why they're asking for an election: because the member for Regina South in one year racks up a travel bill of \$24,527, which to my mind, Mr. Speaker, is outrageous. And I think the people of this country and the people of this province feel it's outrageous. I think he should be more interested in what's going on around him, Mr. Speaker, but I guess that's why we're in a problem.

I listened today to the member from Shaunavon explain the cross-border shopping — and I mean, Shaunavon, Mr. Speaker, very, very close to the American border . . .

An Hon. Member: — Forty-five miles.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Very much affected, some 45 miles one of my colleagues says, and very much affected those communities are by cross-border shopping. And he stands in his place today; then he said well gee, I mean it always happens; it always did happen.

Well I say to you, Mr. Speaker, I grew up in that part of the country, and I know well what cross-border shopping has been, and I know the history of cross-border shopping as does everyone down there. And the biggest thing they did to enhance the economy of North Dakota and Montana was to impose the federal goods and services tax. And now this government heaps the provincial goods and services tax on top of that.

Mr. Speaker, if there ever was a plan for economic development — clearly, clearly it was the plan of this Premier and of his Finance minister — but it wasn't for us in Saskatchewan; it was for the northern states. That's who the plan for economic development was targeted to.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's a shame when you've got a

member of the legislature who stands up . . . who can stand up and support the moves of a government that caused the demise of the economies in ridings that he represents without saying a word, as I referred to earlier. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, shame on that member and I say shame on the government that he represents and shame on the political party that allows those kinds of statements to be made in this legislature, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — And I said, Mr. Speaker, earlier today, that that portion of *Hansard* is going to be spread far and wide in that riding, and it is. Because I think the business men and women in that riding and in that area have the right to know. They have the right to know what he says when he comes to Regina. And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, we're not going to let him get away with saying one thing in Shaunavon or in Aneroid or Kincaid, and coming into this legislature and taking another position.

It's not going to happen, Mr. Speaker, because the people in this side of the legislature aren't going to allow it to happen, and we're going to expose members on that side of the House for exactly what they support when they're sitting in here in Regina, and we're going to maybe help explain to the people in their ridings why the economy has been destroyed the way it is — simply because of the attitude of members in here who don't understand what's going on.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, when a member of this legislature, 45 miles from the American border, can support American business men and women over the business people in his own riding, is it any wonder why we've had the highest bankruptcy rate of any time — the highest bankruptcy rate of any time in this province. Last year 650 bankruptcies in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, and that member is a good indication of why it's happened to us in this province and I say shame on him.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — You know, Mr. Speaker, it's indicated that in one border crossing there are 800 cars going through in a day. Can you imagine that, Mr. Speaker — 800 cars going through one of our border crossings in Saskatchewan, people leaving this province to spend their hard-earned money to escape these unfair taxes imposed by Mulroney and by this Premier. Eight hundred cars a day through one border crossing — can you imagine it, Mr. Speaker? Can you imagine why businesses are closing their doors? Is there any wonder why Saskatchewan business men and women are upset with this goods and services tax? And is there any understanding of why a member of this legislature would stand in his place and say, well, I mean, it just happens?

As my one colleague said one time, well wherever you go there you are. And I mean if that's the attitude of members of this PC government with respect to cross-border shopping, is there any wonder, sir, people are asking for an election to turn things right side up again?

Mr. Speaker, I say to you, this government has no intentions of changing. This government is so deeply entrenched in the mire and in the muck that there's no way to change the way things are happening in Saskatchewan here other than to change the Premier and the cabinet and the back-benchers and put someone in there who really cares.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I have listened quite closely, quite closely I've listened to the comments of the Minister of Finance since we've been back in the legislature and he's somehow got some convoluted idea, some mixed up, jangled up idea that the imposition of this \$440 million tax on Saskatchewan business people is going to create 5,000 new jobs.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, when I first heard this I thought, well he's an educated man and I mean there has to be some reasoning. There has to be some kind of an economic study, an impact study on the different sectors of our economy. And I mean somebody has sat down with the Finance minister and said, yes, you can create 5,000 new jobs, just keep taxing those guys. You give them another \$440 million worth of taxes and that's going to equate to 5,000 jobs. I promise you. I know it's going to.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, day after day we ask for this Finance minister to table this study. But you know what? — he didn't have it. He didn't have it day after day after day. He had nothing to show the people of this province until today, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: — What did he show today?

Mr. Lautermilch: — Well, let me give you the chronology of today. What happens today is the Leader of the Opposition, the member from Riversdale, has a press conference in Saskatoon, and he makes a commitment to the people of Saskatchewan that we're going to reform government. We're going to practise restraint. We're going to look at the internal expenditures of government and we think there are ways, there are different ways, and are there other choices that can be made. And we think that the provincial goods and services tax is unfair and it's going to be a negative on the economy of this province. And as a matter of fact, we've done a study on the economic impact of the provincial goods and services tax, and it's been looked at by a number of prominent people in this province and in this country. And by golly, they agree that this . . . first of all the goods and services tax is no good and that it's got to go.

And so we're making this commitment to you; we're going to table our study. And the other thing we're going to do is, if we're elected, we're going to get rid of the provincial goods and services tax provincially if these people can ram it through the legislature.

And I want to say, it wasn't long after, Mr. Speaker, that the Finance Minister was scurrying for a rehash of the federal analysis of the federal goods and services tax. And lo and behold! He pounds together a little book and he presents it to the people of Saskatchewan.

(2000)

Mr. Speaker, that impact study that he tabled just recently could have been put before the people of Saskatchewan. It could have been put before the people of Saskatchewan when he made the announcement that he was going to oppose it, so that we could have passed judgement on whether or not it was fair and whether or not it was right to do.

And, Mr. Speaker, I have that study with me here. And I want to refer to the two studies tonight, first of all the one that was put forth by the Minister of Finance, and the document that was put forth by the Leader of the Opposition.

Well first of all, let me take you to back page . . . and the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster is laughing. I want to take you to the very back page.

The Speaker: — Order. I'm going to once more . . . order. I'm going to ask the hon. member not to refer to the presence of members.

Mr. Lautermilch: — I appreciate your ruling, Mr. Speaker. So let me address, sir, this to you. On the back page of the Finance Minister's study, he's got a list of groups that have been . . . consultation on harmonization, he's got it, provincial consultation.

And there's a whole list here, but I tell you, Mr. Speaker, there were two that stood out in my mind. The first one was the restaurateurs' association. And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, if they were consulting with the people who own restaurants and make their money out of the food business in this province, they didn't hear what they had to say.

And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, there was one, to me, that was even a little bit more glaring. It was the Canadian Federation of Independent Business. Now, Mr. Speaker, pretty clearly this Finance Minister and the Premier and the cabinet and, I would assume, a number of the back-benchers got huddled around and they went out and they said, well we're going to have a little meeting with these groups and then we're going to go ahead and impose this provincial goods and services tax anyway; it doesn't matter.

And I tell you why I would say that . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Why is the hon. member on his feet?

Mr. Hopfner: — I was wondering if the member would entertain a question, sir.

The Speaker: — Would the hon. member entertain a question?

An Hon. Member: — No.

The Speaker: — The hon. member refuses.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, if I thought the question

would have any semblance of common sense, I might, but I don't.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer back to the document presented by the Minister of Finance. And he talks about the list of provincial consultation on harmonization and the different groups.

Well, Mr. Speaker, here I see the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, which brings me to the document presented today by the Leader of the Opposition. And in it there are some people who are well-known throughout Saskatchewan, western Canada, and indeed throughout Canada, the list of people who had reviewed the research done by the caucus, with our caucus, with respect to this PST. They've reviewed it and they've endorsed it as a fair and reasonable assessment.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I don't know all of these people. But by the one that I do know, Mr. Speaker, I believe this to be a fair and honest assessment of what they've read, of the document presented by the Leader of the Opposition.

Because you see, Mr. Speaker, there's Professor Neil Brooks, professor of law, Osgoode Law School, York University. And I don't know him. There's a Dr. Alex Kelly, professor of economics, University of Regina. And I can't say that I've met him but I know that Mr. Kelly is very well respected throughout the province; Doug Elliot, editor and publisher of Sask Trends Monitor. And the members on the opposite side laugh and that's fine.

But there's one gentleman on here, sir, whose judgement I do trust and who I do know, and that's Dale Botting of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, the same operation who this government says they've consulted with.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that's what consultation Tory-style is all about, I say to you, we don't need any more of it. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that's why people will no longer believe, if they ever did, that this government's rationalization of internal spending is nothing but a joke. And for members on that side of the House to stand up and applaud themselves for embarking on that particular role is a . . . it's a laugh, it's a joke.

On one hand they misrepresent. They say they consulted, and sure they consulted but they didn't tell the whole story . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order, order. The member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster and the member for Regina Lakeview are carrying on simultaneous debate. The member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake has the privilege of having the floor. Allow him to continue.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the point that I was trying to make is the Finance minister indicates he's consulted widely. And I don't know how many of these other groups that he may have consulted with, but by golly you know, when I see an analysis of the negative impact and one of the groups who has been consulted has been clearly ignored, that tells me something, Mr. Speaker. It tells me something.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is one of the reasons we're going to be presenting the motion to change this motion because it doesn't really represent what's been happening in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. If anything it's a misrepresentation, and the people of Saskatchewan, I say, Mr. Speaker, deserve more than that.

Mr. Speaker, I had touched on out-migration earlier this evening, and I talked about cross-border shopping, and I want to spend a little more time talking about cross-border shopping and the effects on communities like Estevan, like Shaunavon, Coronach, and Rockglen. I want to talk about what's happening in those communities, Mr. Speaker. At a time when their Premier is spending \$53,000 a year flying around the world, around the province, their people, their customers are getting in their cars, driving across the border to avoid an unfair tax that's imposed upon them because of these kinds of wild expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, in the Premier's own riding, in Estevan, I've talked with a number of business men and women who have said, we can't exist. We can go another couple of months maybe, but I tell you the shopping down in the United States is killing us and we can't survive. We're going to close our doors. The Co-op farm service centre in the Premier's own community, one of the communities in his riding in Estevan, closes down; 17 jobs disappear.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier spends \$53,434 in a year flying around Saskatchewan and around the country and there are businesses closing. And he imposes a tax — a tax that's chasing consumers out of this province — to cover the costs of his flying around the province, around the country, and around the world.

And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, if this government was serious about internal restraint, the first thing that the Premier should do is live up to the commitment that he made to the people of Saskatchewan that his cabinet and his caucus are not going to be flying all over the place and are going to be spending less money on travel. Mr. Speaker, that's one of the first things that has to happen.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, \$501,845 spent in one year by members of this caucus — cabinet, none the less — flying back and forth. And I understand that there's some of those flights they will have to make. But I say to you, Mr. Speaker — and I refer again to the former minister of Highways, Jim Garner — when you see a trip to Honolulu in the middle of the winter to go over to Hawaii to learn how to build roads, you know that there's something wrong. Because I'll tell you, there's a different industry in Hawaii building roads, to my mind, than building roads here in Saskatchewan. It would lead some to believe that it was nothing but a winter holiday.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, that if that's the restraint that this government is exhibiting, how can the member from Moosomin stand in his place and applaud the actions of the government?

Now, Mr. Speaker, we've talked about just about every aspect of how this government has turned things upside down in this province, and I think I've made a strong

argument to suggest that in fact there has been no internal restraint. And I think, Mr. Speaker, by my conversations with people throughout this province, it's very, very clear that this government, and that people know and feel that this government, has no intentions to constrain their spending internally.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I shared a little story and I want to repeat that story because I really found it interesting. Before supper a friend of mine, a gentleman, a senior citizen that I've known for many, many years and who knows Saskatchewan very well . . . He's worked, spent all his working life here in Saskatchewan and he's retired now, and a well-deserved retirement he's having.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, he phoned me with a little story. He says, you know, he said, I got up this morning and he says, I was just thinking how things have changed in Saskatchewan and how things have really been turned around. He said, it used to be that years back when people would rush to the bootlegger, they were paying twice the price for whatever they were buying. And he said, you know this government has turned things around so dramatically that now people are going to a bootlegger to save money, because it's all cross-border American whisky.

And you know, I thought, I guess you're right because really that's what's happening. And it's not only those that are selling American whisky illegally and cigarettes that are brought in from the States illegally. This government, sir, is forcing people out of their home communities, forcing them to buy groceries, and forcing them to buy clothes. And I say, Mr. Speaker, when a government has to force its own people out of its own jurisdiction, out of its own province to buy elsewhere, something's got to be wrong.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, the first thing that's wrong, the first thing is this government's priorities. Their choices that they've made with respect to expenditures, that's been one of the first problems. But it's created, sir, a second problem and that second problem is that they've had to go to the well too often and still not be able to balance a budget. An increase in revenue from 2.3 billion to 4.8 billion in nine and a half years — Mr. Speaker, it's a shame.

I would defy you to find one family in this province who has over doubled their income. You may find some; I would say not very many. For the most part they've gone down. I believe that perhaps Chuck Childers's family has doubled their income. I think that to be the truth, but I say, Mr. Speaker, that opportunity and that option hasn't been open to Saskatchewan families for the most part. They've had to live on less and less disposable income because of the attitude of this government towards working men and women.

I look, sir, at the constraint that they've imposed upon the construction industry. People that were working at well-paying jobs prior to 1982 — prior to this government allowing spin-off companies — people were working at jobs maybe making 15, \$16 an hour, some maybe more. Some of those people who can find work in Saskatchewan are working for 8 and 9. And I tell you

they've felt restraint. They understand restraint, Tory-style. And when they see people like Chuck Childers, with a \$740,000-a-year salary and a five-year, no-cut contract, is it any wonder why they're angry at this government and when they don't believe them when they talk about restraint, internal restraint?

Mr. Speaker, I talked about the construction industry because the riding that I represent was home to an awful lot of construction workers: electricians, plumbers, bricklayers, and other different jobs. And I tell you what's happened to them, Mr. Speaker. A lot of those people are working outside of this province.

An Hon. Member: — Where?

Mr. Lautermilch: — Alberta and . . . The member says, where? Listen, Mr. Member, let me tell you, in the community of Duck Lake there are 12 bricklayers, journeymen bricklayers, and I want to tell you that there hasn't been one of them that's been working steady since your government took over. And I say to you, Mr. Member, you have nothing to say.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — What you should be, is embarrassed. What you should be, sir, is embarrassed. And I say to you, sir, those that have left this province to seek employment and a reasonable standard of living in other areas have left because of the . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order, order, order. I ask hon. members to . . . Without repeating the words, I simply ask hon. members to refer to each other with respect, number one. Secondly, I remind them again not to interfere with the member on his feet.

(2015)

Mr. Lautermilch: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I talked about restraint and about priorities, and restraint for some, and choices. And I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, when I see that the chairman of the Saskatchewan Liquor Board receives an increase of tens of thousands of dollars, and it isn't even legislatively correct — they have no legislative power to increase that salary — I say to you, Mr. Speaker, the auditor says it, and members on this side of the House say, that they had no right to give that kind of an increase. It tells you where restraint is. I tell you, the chairman of that commission, there was no restraint for him. The government coffers and the pocket of the taxpayers was wide open for that gentleman.

But the people, the working men and women in my riding who've had their wages decreased and who've been relegated to the unemployment rolls, they know where restraint has been. And I tell you, they feel restraint when they've had to sell their homes and when they've had to sell cars, and then finally when they've had to leave the province, they understand restraint. And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I could take you through a list of businesses in Prince Albert that have found restraint and have felt the impact of restraint. MacDonalds Consolidated closing very shortly in Prince Albert, 31 jobs gone — those people know restraint; Western Grocers closed, dozens

of jobs gone — they know restraint; Grosser & Glass, a well-established wholesaler, long time in our community — they know restraint and their employees know restraint. And I tell you, the sport shops that closed down on Central Avenue in Prince Albert, three young men trying to start a new business, and because of the way this government has destroyed the economy, have had to close their doors — they understand restraint.

And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, when they see the list of travelling that this cabinet and this Premier does, and when they see the double standard and what's in it for them, they understand where there is restraint and where there's a lack of restraint. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan are more than willing, and in fact are anxious, to go to the polls and display their feelings with respect to motions that come before this legislature by members on that side of the House. They're more than willing to pass judgement on those comments.

And when they see their MLAs from the southern part of the province stand up and so callously shrug off hundreds of thousands of dollars, millions of dollars of Canadian and Saskatchewan consumer dollars moving across the border to the United States, and when they see members defending that, they understand what they need to do and they understand what they want to do. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, it's going to be not long before they have the opportunity to explain exactly how they feel, and that's when an election happens.

Mr. Speaker, cross-border shopping, the loss of Saskatchewan businesses, the out-migration of in two years 42,000 of our young men and women who were looking for the opportunity to be employed and to create employment in this province . . . And the out-migration of 42,000 people, roughly three-quarters, I understand, which are under 35 years old, is an economic disaster in itself, sir.

And had this government looked internally and reprioritized their expenditures, I would suggest that there may have been money for economic development programs, and there may have been money for the Saskatchewan business community. And I say, Mr. Speaker, if this government had practised restraint and if they had looked internally, there may have been help for the hotel industry where you've got hotel after hotel after hotel going bankrupt. There may have been help.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, people understand double standards. They understand them clearly and they understand flip-flops. And they understand the Farm Credit Corporation writing down loans for some and not for others. They understand when that opportunity is available to one of the members of the Executive Council who garners a salary of in excess of \$110,000 a year. They understand double standards. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, they understand, when there's a write-down for one and not for another, that there's a double set of standards. And that's why they understand there's restraint for some and not for others.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, the people of this province understand clearly why there's a need for a change of this government. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I'm

pleased to have been part of this term these last four years. It's been very much a learning experience for me, and I want to say partly the learning has come from the people who I represent in the riding of Prince Albert-Duck Lake, because they've helped me to understand what a hardship a callous and unfair government can impose upon its constituents.

They've helped me to understand what it's like for a single parent who is asked to practise restraint by an uncaring and callous government and to try and eke out a living on two or three minimum wage jobs . . . and when they see because of the goods and services tax, their tips dry up. They've helped me to understand why it's so important, Mr. Speaker, that we return again to a fair and a caring government.

And I want to say as well, Mr. Speaker, members of that side of the House have helped me to understand why it's so important that we never ever allow a Tory government in this province ever again because of what they've done in the last nine and a half years. And, Mr. Speaker, members of that side have helped me to understand just where right-wing thinking governments come from, when the priorities of Cargill Grain come before the business men and women of this province, and when the aspirations of Cargill Grain come before the working families and the home owners in Saskatchewan. They've helped me to understand why it is that we can never again in this province have a Tory government. And I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, when this government can make a decision to put some \$3 million a job at risk at the Saferco plant of Cargill Grain, and business men and women who have operated in this province, who've approached SEDCO for some financial assistance and found out there's nothing there, Mr. Speaker, they've helped me to understand why the people of Saskatchewan are so serious about getting rid of this Premier, his cabinet, and his back-benchers.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, that I'm thankful for that lesson. And it's a lesson that I'll never forget. It's a lesson, sir, that I'll carry with me for a long, long time. Mr. Speaker, when I see this uncaring and callous government impose what has to be the most massive and unfair tax grab without even bringing it before the legislature; Mr. Speaker, when you see a government that will on the one hand do that action, and then in the next day stand before the legislature and talk about internal restraint without having balanced one single budget, sir, in 10 years, Mr. Speaker, I say to you that there is need for change.

It's well past time for a change and I believe the people of Saskatchewan will work and work hard to ensure that that change in actual fact does happen. Mr. Speaker, we're only days, weeks — well for sure no more than months — away from another election. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan will indeed select for change and I believe that to be in the form of a New Democrat government because, Mr. Speaker, we've got a commitment to reinstating a fair government, open government, and an honest government.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, there's going to be an end to the flights of Jim Garner to Honolulu. There's going to be an end to the trips to Athens, and Winnipeg, and Calgary,

and London and Edmonton and Brasilia and Fredericton and Washington and Phoenix and Quebec, and you can read on the list because, Mr. Speaker, this next election is going to introduce a government that is willing to live within its means — a government with a commitment to balanced budgets, a government to commitment for fairness for people, a government that will commit itself to programs for Saskatchewan people and not for multinational corporations.

Mr. Speaker, therefore I wish to move an amendment to the motion put forth by the member for Moosomin, and the amendment would be:

That all the words after “Assembly” be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

condemns the Government of Saskatchewan for failing to initiate an effective internal restraint program during the past nine years, and for its unprecedented waste and mismanagement of taxpayers’ dollars.

And this, sir, is seconded by the member from The Battlefords.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Well thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to participate into the debate on this motion today during private members’ day. I certainly support the amendment put forward by the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake. And I found it somewhat hypocritical for the member from Moosomin to bring forward a motion to this legislature calling on the government to be commended for its internal restraint program through the difficult economic times.

Mr. Speaker, I do believe that the Minister of Finance should subscribe to a little publication called Building Budgeting Skills. I mean there’s more fiction than fact in what the government is putting forward over the past four years.

They certainly have not been in a mood of restraint when they looked at such programs as the funding of Austrak Machinery Corp. Canada. On June 1, Mr. Speaker, or June 31, pardon me, the Minister of Finance, on behalf of the minister in charge of SEDCO, announced that Austrak would be locating a tractor plant in Weyburn and this \$2.4 million project was to initially employ 20 people with expected growth to 100 jobs within five years. Of the total cost of the venture, Mr. Speaker, SEDCO provided the company with a loan of \$700,000, Mr. Speaker.

Now as I said, this company was announced on June 31 of 1989. Austrak ceased operations on August 29 of 1990, Mr. Speaker. A little over a year and after putting in \$700,000 into this company, it folds up shop in Saskatchewan and leaves the province.

What about GigaText translation systems inc., Mr. Speaker? Do they show restraint with GigaText? In May of 1988, GigaText began operations in Regina with an initial investment of some \$4 million from SEDCO. And in March of 1989, after it had become clear that

the company was in financial trouble, SEDCO took over control of the operations of the company and provided it with another infusion of capital of some \$1.25 million, Mr. Speaker.

And then after that happened, GigaText ceased operations on November 16 of 1989. On March 16 of the following year, the government announced that SEDCO had invested a total of some \$5.5 million into a venture that could be expected to have a total recovery of maybe a million dollars, they said, from the sale of the company’s assets, plus a federal tax credit that the firm held for some \$950,000.

(2030)

Mr. Speaker, it’s not really fair game for this government to mislead the people of the province of Saskatchewan into thinking that this government has practised restraint at any step of the way throughout their mandate over the past four and a half years. And in fact what people in Saskatchewan are saying, Mr. Speaker, is that this government’s mandate has run out. The Minister of Finance should pack his books into a bag, hand them over to the Premier, and ask the Premier to call an election so the people in the province of Saskatchewan can decide about the cruel and unusual punishment that this government has inflicted on the people in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, what about the restraint they showed with Pro-Star Mills Ltd.? On March 2, 1983, SEDCO provided Pro-Star Mills with equity financing of \$490,000, with this financing aimed at assisting the company in developing new markets. The company Pro-Star, Mr. Speaker, ceased operations in January of 1985. Is that restraint that this government has shown, after putting in \$490,000 to a company that closes up their doors? No it’s not restraint, Mr. Speaker.

The only people who have been punished by this government have been the people of the province of Saskatchewan whose tax dollars have had to pay the bills because of the cruel and unusual treatment that this government has inflicted upon them: the lack of budgeting skills, the lack of integrity, the lack of planning, the lack of financial accountability. Mr. Speaker, I say again, the people in Saskatchewan are saying, enough is enough; tell the Minister of Finance to pack his flawed, cooked books into a big bag, hand them over to the Premier of this province, and tell the Premier to call a general election so the people in Saskatchewan, the voting public, can decide where restraint should be put, Mr. Speaker. That’s what should happen.

How about, Mr. Speaker, Nardei Fabricators of Saskatchewan Ltd? On October 14, 1986, just six days remaining before the general election campaign of October 20, the Premier of the province officially opened Nardei Fabricators’ new \$600,000 pipe fabricating plant in Regina. Three days following the October 20 election, the plant permanently closed. Mr. Speaker, an announcement on October 14, a closure on the October 20 — six days have transpired. And the people of Saskatchewan were duped into another false promise by the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan and a

government just trying desperately to win a provincial election in the province of Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it worked in 1986, but it will not work in 1991 because this government has gone far beyond their mandate and far beyond the integrity and the confidence that people in Saskatchewan should normally show on a government. This government has lost complete confidence with the people in the province of Saskatchewan, and the Minister of Finance and the previous minister of Finance that would almost bankrupt the province of Saskatchewan should be ashamed to show their face in this province, Mr. Speaker — ashamed to show their face in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about Canapharm Inc. medical textile division? That was a plant proposed for Swift Current, Mr. Speaker. On October 15, 1986 — five days prior to an election — the Premier of the province announced the construction of a new \$12.5 million bandage plant in Swift Current, Saskatchewan. It was reported at the time that the plant would create 100 jobs. To date, this plant has not yet been built, Mr. Speaker.

There's no integrity left in this government, Mr. Speaker, and no confidence that the people of Saskatchewan can place in a government that's so flawed and lacking in integrity.

Mr. Speaker, what about High R Doors Manufacturing Ltd. in my own constituency of The Battlefords? On April 14, 1987, it was announced that High R Doors would be establishing a plant in the city of North Battleford, creating 175 jobs, Mr. Speaker. SEDCO invested \$2 million into this venture.

On August 8, 1989, the company ceased operations. In the following year the plant was sold to which is now a reputable firm who's doing a good business. But the government took another bath on that one, pumping in \$2 million, Mr. Speaker,

The Deputy Speaker: — Order, order, order. Why is the member on his feet?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the hon. member would entertain a question, Mr. Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: — Would the member take a question?

Mr. Anguish: — I only entertain serious interventions, Mr. Speaker, while I am giving a debate in the legislature.

Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. High R Doors in North Battleford never came close to employing 175 people in North Battleford. In fact, High R Doors is lucky if they ever employed 20 people in the city of North Battleford and surrounding district, Mr. Speaker.

It's an atrocity what this government does to waste and just blatantly misuse the taxpayers' dollars in the province of Saskatchewan. They have no shame in what they do, and the people in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, will have no shame in what they do when this government finally

screws up the courage to call an election and place their record before the people of the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

What about Joytec limited? Was that financial restraint, Mr. Speaker? Joytec, a Saskatoon company which attempted to develop a golf simulator, raised \$4 million under the province's venture capital corporation program. Investors received some \$1.125 million in provincial government tax credits. Moreover, the company received \$76,000 in assistance from the Department of Science and Technology. Is that practising restraint in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker? No it's not.

Joytec took Saskatchewan taxpayers' dollars, left the province of Saskatchewan, moved to British Columbia, associated themselves with a company called Technigen. Technigen and Lyco — a marketing agent for Technigen — ended up having charges laid against them in the province of Saskatchewan under the Securities Commission, Mr. Speaker.

Part of those charges carried on over into the province of British Columbia, Mr. Speaker, where either Lyco and Technigen, or possibly both of them, are up on charges before the Securities Commission, because they said that they had this company with Corporacion Relacio of Geneva to sell millions of dollars worth of golf simulators, Mr. Speaker. But when we tried to find the company Corporacion Relacio in Geneva, it didn't exist, Mr. Speaker. Where did we finally track down the company, Mr. Speaker? In Panama. And did the company have an office and an executive over in Panama? No they didn't have an office or executive officers in Panama, Mr. Speaker; they had a post office box in Panama. That's what Corporacion Relacio had in this great marketing scheme through the company Joytec and Technigen and Lyco, Mr. Speaker. That's what happened.

Is that restraint when they waste taxpayers' dollars like that, Mr. Speaker? I would think that that's not restraint, Mr. Speaker. That's not restraint at all. It's a disgrace and it's deceiving to the people in the province of Saskatchewan who put so much faith into this government in 1982 and rapidly, rapidly lost that faith. And today we have a government that has no confidence from the people in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, none whatsoever.

I think we also want to look at the restraint practised with Supercart International, Mr. Speaker. On April 15, 1986, Supercart International opened a Regina plant to produce plastic shopping carts. It was estimated that the plant would create 150 jobs. Federal government contributed \$366,000 to the venture and the provincial government an additional \$250,000, as well as a program to hire 47 people on welfare.

Well less than a year later, on December 16, 1986, Supercart laid off all but 5 of its 35 employees — long shot from what they said they'd hire. And on January 29 of the following year the company ceased operations. Is that restraint shown by this government, Mr. Speaker? No that's not restraint shown by this government, Mr. Speaker. It's waste and mismanagement. This company . . .

I said company, just a slip there, Mr. Speaker. No company in the world would act like this government has acted over the course of their mandate, Mr. Speaker, none whatsoever.

What about M.A.S. Medical Ltd., Mr. Speaker? On June 25, 1990, the provincial government announced that SEDCO and the Department of Economic Diversification were assisting M.A.S. Medical in relocating to Saskatoon with \$703,000 in loans and grants. On October 5, less than six months later, M.A.S. Medical ceased operations and is currently under investigation by the RCMP, Mr. Speaker.

Was that a restraint program, providing them with \$705,000 after the same principals, Mr. Speaker, had gone from the Maritime provinces where they had ripped off one of the Maritime governments out there? You would have thought surely that this government would have practised restraint in checking out a company that they would give \$705,000 to, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we look at the cabinet in this government. This cabinet is so huge and bloated that it can't even function. People in Saskatchewan say the biggest lie now is not, the cheque's in the mail, any more. They say it's when a cabinet minister appears to speak to them and says, I'm from the government; I'm here to help you. That's the biggest lie in the province of Saskatchewan now.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. I'd ask the member to refrain from using unparliamentary language.

Mr. Anguish: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd definitely do that; there's no question about it.

It's just not our words, Mr. Speaker, that talk about this government's lack of restraint and their lack of integrity. What about statements by the Provincial Auditor? With the appointment of more private sector auditors, the auditor now sees about 50 per cent of the expenditures from the public purse. That's what the auditor says about your expenditures. Is that practising restraint or is that hiding the expenditures of taxpayers' dollars, Mr. Speaker? I say it's hiding the expenditure of taxpayers' dollars and doesn't have diddly-squat to do with practising restraint, Mr. Speaker, none whatsoever.

What else does the Provincial Auditor say? I have been interfered with in the execution of my duties. That's the Provincial Auditor, an officer of the Legislative Assembly — not an individual who works for the government, not an individual that works for the opposition, not an individual who works for you, sir. The auditor is an officer of this Assembly. He is the watch-dog over the public purse. And he says, I have been interfered with in the execution of my duties. Is that practising restraint? No, that's tampering with due process. The people of Saskatchewan are saying, enough is enough. What does this government have to hide, Mr. Speaker? What are they hiding from the people of Saskatchewan when they interfere with the duties, the execution of the duties of the Provincial Auditor?

The public accounts are not timely, and they do not

provide correct and complete information to the Assembly. That's another statement by the Provincial Auditor. And what happens when the Provincial Auditor questions the practices of this government? They don't say, well gosh, we made a mistake; we'd better correct that because the Provincial Auditor says we're doing something wrong — an officer of this great, or at least once great institution in our land; the place where democracy should prevail; the place where laws are made and changed and made again and deleted if they're obsolete; a place where democracy is protected.

(2045)

But what does the auditor say? The public accounts are not timely, and they do not provide correct and complete information to the Assembly. Is that practising restraint, Mr. Speaker, as the member from Moosomin puts out in his motion here this afternoon that we're still debating here this evening? No. I'd say it's a government that has something to hide, Mr. Speaker. The people in Saskatchewan are saying, enough is enough. Open the books in the province of Saskatchewan. Don't use your rhetorical comments about restraint when you hide the real facts from the Provincial Auditor, an officer of this Assembly.

People in Saskatchewan are saying, enough is enough — shame on you, the government of the province of Saskatchewan. Shame on you Tories for what you have done to the Saskatchewan community.

But then again you must understand their attitude, Mr. Speaker. The attitude of the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan is reflected back in 1982. What did the Premier say then? He said, deficits are just a deferred tax that must be paid by future generations; 1982 the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan said that, Mr. Speaker. And what does he do? He allows his ministers of Finance to run up a deficit over 10 consecutive budgets, Mr. Speaker, where as at the end of the 1990 fiscal year we're looking at debts on the Consolidated Fund — that's the operating account of government — of about four and a half billion dollars.

Up until 1982, Mr. Speaker, when this government came to office, there had only been two deficit budgets since the 1940s, and both of those were very, very small. But what happens in less than a decade? We have over \$4 billion in accumulated deficit budgets, Mr. Speaker.

What are people in Saskatchewan saying? They're saying, enough is enough. They're saying, why are you doing this? Why are you doing this to us? Do you make your friends in the resource sector pay? No, they don't make their friends in the resource sector pay. Do you make your corporate elite giants like the Weyerhaeusers and the Cargills pay? No, they don't make them pay, Mr. Speaker. They make the ordinary men and women of the province of Saskatchewan pay, Mr. Speaker. They make the small businesses pay, Mr. Speaker. They make the farmers pay, Mr. Speaker, for their incompetence and mismanagement and lack of planning and lack of restraint, Mr. Speaker.

No way could anyone in Saskatchewan, let alone

members on this side of the House, support the motion by the member from Moosomin put forward this afternoon in this Assembly, commending the government on practising restraint. Mr. Speaker, what a joke, what a cruel joke on the people of the province of Saskatchewan. Those people are saying, enough is enough; we won't tolerate it any more. And we can't do much about it right now but we want you to voice our concern in the provincial legislature. And when the time comes that they muster up their courage to call an election we'll tell them clearly what we think at that point in time, Mr. Speaker. We'll tell them enough is enough; no way we want a Tory government in the province of Saskatchewan.

Let's look at some of the other examples of restraint, Mr. Speaker — \$17,423 in expenses run up by the Premier's office at the Regina Hotel Saskatchewan in one year. What's wrong with this great building we have here, Mr. Speaker? Is there a problem with this building? **The Speaker** could meet assemblies in here. He could meet them in the government's caucus room. He could meet them in his own office. We'd even lend him our caucus room if it saved them \$17,423 a year of the taxpayers' dollars, the hard-earned dollars that men and women in the province of Saskatchewan have to pay to this government.

The government wants it shovelled in the front door of the legislature and just siphoned out the back door, Mr. Speaker. Hardly even stops to get any appreciation for the kind of volumes of money that this government has dealt with. Sixty-four thousand, two hundred and fifty-three dollars paid to the British merchant bank, N.M. Rothschild & Sons for two months of privatization — excuse me, privatization consultation. Is that restraint?

People in Saskatchewan told this government what they thought about privatization, Mr. Speaker. People in the province said what they thought about privatization, and that was, we don't need two-bill Hill. We don't need another billing for our electricity, and another billing for our gas charges. We were happy with SaskPower, and people won't forget two-bill Hill come election time, Mr. Speaker.

Most people in Saskatchewan would like to earn \$64,253 for the two months that they told the Government of Saskatchewan what they thought about privatization. Privatization is another cool hoax played by a government that doesn't represent them, Mr. Speaker, played out almost to its fullest line, until the people in Saskatchewan spoke out, and through the opposition in the Legislative Assembly stopped them in their tracks on the sale of SaskEnergy, Mr. Speaker. Stopped them in their tracks. Is that restraint, when they paid \$64,253 to the merchant bank, N.M. Rothschild & Sons, for two months of privatization consultation? No that's not, Mr. Speaker. That's not restraint.

The people of Saskatchewan offered that advice for nothing. The government didn't take that advice but charged them thousands of dollars more in tax dollars to the business people, and to the farmers, and to the working men and women in the province of Saskatchewan.

People in Saskatchewan are saying, whoa. Enough is enough. We're not going to take this any more. Why are you doing this? That's what people in Saskatchewan are asking. They're asking, why don't you call an election? Mr. Speaker, that's what they're asking people like the member from Kelvington-Wadena and the member from Redberry. This government is telling the people of Saskatchewan they're not ready. People can't afford for them not to be ready much longer, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: — What about the people?

Mr. Angus: — What about the people in the province of Saskatchewan? Instead of their own largess at the public trough — like the member from Kelvington-Wadena, and the member from Redberry, the member from Shaunavon — why don't they call an election to see how long they leave you there?

Let the people of the province decide. Let them decide that, not your own smug disrespect. And then to stand up in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, and for them to talk about restraint is one of the most hypocritical comments that any member on the government side could put forward, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, just as a side note, it should be noted that part of this restraint that the government is bragging about is now costing taxpayers in the province of Saskatchewan about \$550 million a year in interest on a debt — a debt that wasn't there in 1982 when they took office, Mr. Speaker.

Is that restraint? No, I think it not be restraint, Mr. Speaker. I think it is waste and mismanagement in the worst degree that Saskatchewan people have ever seen, Mr. Speaker. That's what it is.

And again I go back to it being part of an attitude by the government opposite. In 1983, the Premier of this once great province said, and I quote: Saskatchewan has so much going for it, you can afford to mismanage it and still break even. Well he was right on the action, Mr. Speaker. They did mismanagement in the province of Saskatchewan but they didn't break even, Mr. Speaker. That's why taxpayers today in Saskatchewan have to pay over \$550 million a year of interest on a debt that did not exist in 1982 when they took office, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many items, so many items that appal the people in the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I often hear from my constituents is that even when we get a pay raise any more, we earn less. What's the point of still working to build this once great province? I'm losing hope in the future, they say to me. Why are they losing hope in the future? Because they're on the verge of a tax revolt, Mr. Speaker.

The people in the province of Saskatchewan, unless they are given a remedy through the electoral process or through this Legislative Assembly, they will wage something in Saskatchewan that will make proposition 13 from the province of California look pale by comparison, Mr. Speaker. They are tired of seeing waste and mismanagement, no plan, no restraint, blatant

disregard for the public, and at the same time their taxation burden going up.

Let's look at the provincial income tax comparisons, Mr. Speaker, for 1990 on a family, not an individual, but a family income of \$40,000. That family living in the province of Alberta, Mr. Speaker, would pay \$1,664 in provincial income tax. That family living in Manitoba, to the east of us, would pay \$1,958 in income tax, Mr. Speaker. But what would that same family in 1990 — they've just sent in their income tax — what would they pay in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker? Not 1,664. Not 1,958. They would pay \$2,426 in income tax, Mr. Speaker. The highest income tax anywhere in the great country of Canada, Mr. Speaker — the highest rate of income tax. No wonder people in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, are saying, enough is enough, ease us from this burden, forget about the provincial goods and services tax. Call a provincial election and let the people of the province decide. Stop the waste and mismanagement, stop the incompetence, stop the lack of planning, stop this government gone astray, because they're surely hurting us deeper than we've ever been hurting before, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, no wonder people are saying, whenever I get a pay increase it doesn't matter, my take home pay is less. It's because Saskatchewan is the heaviest taxed province in all of Canada. Why? Because this government has not practised one ounce of restraint. Since the day they came to office they have practised waste and mismanagement, Mr. Speaker, nothing about restraints.

Mr. Speaker, what about some of the other increases on people in the province of Saskatchewan, that they don't see coming off of their income tax and their small business at the end of the year, or their farm income tax due about the end of the year, or their source deductions.

What about the resident white tailed deer licences, up 100 per cent; class 4 driver's licences, up 122 per cent; road tests for driver's licences, up 67 per cent; electrical inspection fee per hour, up 60 per cent; wiring permits, single family dwelling, up 89 per cent; wiring permit for a suite, up 90 per cent; wiring permit for a school — and they talk about helping education — wiring permit for a school has gone up 100 per cent, Mr. Speaker. Journeyman electrician's licence, up 100 per cent; replacement driver's licence, up 100 per cent; boiler and pressure vessel engineering certificate, up a whopping 471 per cent, Mr. Speaker. Registration for business corporation and annual return, up 100 per cent; business corporation certificate of incorporation, up 150 per cent; business corporations certification of documents, up 300 per cent; certificate to amend the articles of a non-profit corporation, up 100 per cent; special care home charges, up 73 per cent; change of name application fee, up 300 per cent; certificate of incorporation for non-profit corporation, up 100 per cent; registration of business name, up 150 per cent; better not get married more than once, marriage licences up 250 per cent; incorporation fee, home building co-operatives, up 100 per cent; outfitter's licence issued after June 30, up 200 per cent; guide's licence issued after June 30, up 200 per cent; provision of a transcription to a university in

Saskatchewan, up 400 per cent; duplicate teacher's certificate, up 150 per cent; correspondence school fee, per subject, up 67 per cent; renewal of fireman's certificate, up — I thought it was a misprint at first but I checked it, Mr. Speaker — up 700 per cent.

Is that restraint, hon. gentlemen opposite? Is that restraint? What hypocrites you are to put forward a motion that says you should be commended for your restraint. You should be condemned for your waste and mismanagement and the cruel hopes that you have played on the people . . .

(2100)

The Speaker: — Order. Order. What is the hon. member's point of order?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — While belligerence may not be unparliamentary, I believe calling a government hypocrites is unparliamentary language, and therefore you should rule that the member restrain himself.

The Speaker: — Order. As I listened to the hon. member, I don't believe he levelled a personal charge against an individual member. He did that on the government as a whole. And I do agree that this language is intemperate, and while I will not rule it unparliamentary, I will certainly ask hon. members to be aware of the language they use in response to other members. Intemperate language leads to further problems in the House. And I think hon. members, it is their responsibility to keep that in mind when they speak.

Mr. Anguish: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well these are certainly intolerant times. And the people of Saskatchewan expressed that intolerance, Mr. Speaker. And I know that the government doesn't like some of the language used against them. If they don't like the language in this legislature they should go out in the streets of the province of Saskatchewan and hear some of the language used against the government of the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. That's where they should go.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — How about increases to total provincial taxes? The Saskatchewan average family, between 1981 and 1990, provincial income tax went up by some \$320; utilities, some \$936; sales tax, \$285; gas tax, \$132; prescription drug costs, \$181; property taxes, \$576; loss of the property improvement grant, \$230, for total increases of \$2,660, Mr. Speaker. That's an increase in taxes on the people of the province of Saskatchewan imposed by this government. And this has no reflection of the provincial goods and services tax that this government wants to bring into place, Mr. Speaker, which will be a further burden of hundreds of dollars a year on Saskatchewan families. It's unfair, it's unequitable, and it's undeserved by the people in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. Let's stop the waste and mismanagement.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of comments I think we should look at in the past, that we should go through some of the comments made by a former minister

of Finance, Mr. Speaker. I quote: we believe that all governments must work in concert to reduce budget deficits. Failure to accomplish this will force harsh financial penalties on our children. It is inevitable that mounting deficits will result in unwanted reductions in government services and tax increases.

Now who do you think would say something like that? Finance minister, Bob Andrew, in 1984. And up until 1984 they'd had a deficit budget in 1983 of \$227 million and then another one of \$331 million, for an accumulated deficit at that time of \$558 million in the first two budgets of this government, Mr. Speaker. No wonder when a minister of Finance in that year stands up and says that, and it's continued every since, people in Saskatchewan do say the "H" word on this government. In fact if it's not unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker, they call this government hypocritical when they make statements like that, and they call them hypocritical when they bring in motions like they brought in here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. There's no place in the democratic system for what this government is doing to the people in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Well and then we look at another statement by the same minister of Finance a year later in 1985 and I quote: the preliminary deficit for 1984-85, at 379.4 million, was 112.2 million higher than estimated. Finance minister Bob Andrew, 1985. That's the end of that quote, Mr. Speaker. Now how is that, that they could misproject a budget like that? Well let's move on. Here's another quote, **Mr. Speaker:** the deficit for 1986-87 is currently forecast to be 1.2 billion.

It's not million, Mr. Speaker. That's the "b" in front of it — 1.2 billion, about 800 million over the budget figure of \$389 million. Now who would we say that quote would be attributed to, Mr. Speaker? I'll bet every member on the government side of the House knows who made that statement. I know every member on this side of the House knows who made that statement. It was Finance minister . . . Well I don't know if I can say it in the House. It was Finance minister Gary Lane in 1987, the member from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden. They only missed their projection by \$800 million. Is that restraint?

Which member on the government side of the House could stand in his place this evening and describe that as restraint? Did their revenues go down, Mr. Speaker? No, their revenues have not gone down. As the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake pointed out in his presentation here this evening, the government's revenue has increased since 1982 by 69 per cent, Mr. Speaker. Inflation hasn't come anywhere close to that. So they're raising more revenue than they did in 1982 by 69 per cent and they over-shoot a budget by \$800 million — way over 200 per cent, almost 300 per cent greater than what they forecast the deficit to be.

Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that this government was practising restraint? Were they practising restraint on behalf of the people of the province of Saskatchewan or were they gouging them for their tax dollars? People in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, think they were being

gouged for their tax dollars. That's why they're saying enough is enough, Mr. Speaker. Enough is enough.

The people in Saskatchewan are saying, why are you doing this to us? The government doesn't have an answer for it. They manipulate reality. Thank goodness that they don't write history. Future generations would be deceived by the kind of restraint this government is talking about. You know why, Mr. Speaker? Because it's not restraint, it is incompetence. It is mismanagement. It is deception. It is deceitful. It is not the decent thing to do to the people of the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. It's a betrayal of faith, and that's why this government has lost confidence in the people of the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Enough is enough. They want this government to come to their senses, Mr. Speaker. Either call an election or get on with the business of governing the province in a planned and in a sound and in a fiscally responsible manner, not by the waste and mismanagement that you have inflicted on the people of the province of Saskatchewan. That's what they're saying, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let's go to another quote by the minister of Finance, the member from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden back in 1989. I quote: through the careful balance of priority spending and sensible revenue measures, we will reduce the deficit.

What a joke, Mr. Speaker. They have not got one concrete plan that they can put forward that shows deficit reduction as a priority. After 10 consecutive years of deficit budgets, running up an accumulated debt for the Consolidated Fund of about \$5 billion or thereabouts — we'll see what it is when the auditor gets a chance to look at the books — after 10 deficit budgets, Mr. Speaker, and such a huge debt, this government then says they'll balance the budget in three years.

Some members laugh, Mr. Speaker, but the people in Saskatchewan don't laugh. The people in Saskatchewan are ashamed, ashamed to admit that this government has driven them into a state of almost bankrupt, almost unrecoverable because of the mismanagement and the financial waste, the incompetence and the lack of planning of this government, Mr. Speaker. What a cruel joke to play on the people of the province of Saskatchewan, to say that they'll balance the budget in three years. Could it be an election promise, Mr. Speaker? Could it be an election promise? They certainly can't run on their record. They certainly can't run on their planning. They certainly can't run on the programs they've delivered.

So what do they do? They try and fool the people of the province of Saskatchewan by saying, oh we'll balance the budget; in three years we'll balance the budget. They would break every taxpayer in the province, Mr. Speaker, is the way they would balance the budget in three years, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let's look closer to home, more recent years. The Minister of Finance, the member from Weyburn, in 1990 said, and I quote: we want a lower deficit because deficits add to the provincial debt which in turn leads to

higher interest costs. What a profound economic statement. What a profound economic statement by the member from Weyburn.

Anyone could figure that out, Mr. Speaker. We don't need the Minister of Finance to tell us that. We need the Minister of Finance in the province of Saskatchewan to tell us he's going to stop the waste and mismanagement and be a responsible custodian for the taxpayers' dollars and the resources of the province of Saskatchewan. That's what we need a Minister of Finance to say in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

What else did the current Minister of Finance say, Mr. Speaker? He says and I quote: continual deficits and the debt they produce create problems. The province cannot sustain deficits at the current levels on an indefinite basis. Did it take them 10 years to figure that out? There isn't a business, there isn't an individual, there isn't a law firm, there isn't an accounting firm, in fact there isn't anyone except the Government of Saskatchewan that would think you could run perpetual deficit finances and have it be healthy toward the economy of the province. Anyone else would be bankrupt, Mr. Speaker, but thank goodness the only thing that's bankrupt right now is the government of the province of Saskatchewan and those Tory back-benchers that sit across here. They're bankrupt of ideas.

They're old and they're tired, Mr. Speaker. It's time to put them out to pasture, Mr. Speaker. They're not fit to run in the race of life any more. Put them out to pasture, let them graze awhile, soak in the sunshine. And we're sorry we took away their severance pay if it affected them to that degree, but they'll all be dealt with fair enough, I'm sure, by their friends. So out to pasture with you. Or conversely, if you think you had the confidence of the people of the province, call a provincial election.

(2115)

See if they'll put you out to pasture or see if they'll restore you to government. See if they'll make you a loan. See if they'll let you run a project or a business in their communities. By the time this Tory government is done with the people in the province of Saskatchewan, I predict they won't want you to run anything — private sector, public sector, co-operative, or otherwise.

But I could be wrong. People in Saskatchewan are saying though, enough is enough. And by that I interpret that people want an election held because enough is enough in the province of Saskatchewan. Members ask me about the chamber of commerce. I ask members out there about the trailer court in Hudson Bay. I ask members whether they are like the member from Yorkton about the court house, in Yorkton. Yes, not much integrity in your positions. I don't think we want to get into a situation of personalities. Let's run on the record of your government.

I think that the waste and mismanagement runs so deep in that government over there that if the books were opened up and the true story was told, the people of Saskatchewan would want you punished beyond defeat at the electoral polls, because of what you've done for your own largess and what you've done to the people in

the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should review a record of cumulative provincial deficits. Mr. Speaker, 1983 deficit, \$227 million; 1984 deficit, \$331 million; 1985 deficit, \$379 million — and I'm rounding these off, Mr. Speaker. I'm rounding them off to the lowest number; the highest number would be even worse — 1986 deficit, \$578 million; 1987 deficit, \$1.232 billion, Mr. Speaker; 1988, \$542 million deficit; 1989, \$324 million deficit; 1990, \$379 million deficit. And the 1991 estimate is \$365 million deficit.

What a shame. What a cruel hoax they've inflicted on the people of the province. And what have they done during the same time? Since 1982 they've increased their expenditures by 90 per cent. Talk about big government, big bad government. That's what people feel of the government in the province of Saskatchewan right now — big bad government. Ninety per cent your expenditures have increased since 1982.

And how much have your revenues increased? How much have your revenues increased? Your revenues have increased by 69 per cent since 1982. That's what your government has done. Waste and mismanagement. And where have they got their funding from, their increased funding? The vast majority of that, Mr. Speaker, is from individual, ordinary men and women working for wages in the province of Saskatchewan. The next place they got it from are those small entrepreneurs who slave and work and sometimes can't even draw an hourly wage because of the state of the economy. That's where they drew it from.

But they don't draw it from their friends in the corporate sector. Corporate income tax from '81 to '91 rose by 54 per cent. And I'm sure some of the corporations aren't even very happy with that, Mr. Speaker.

But let's look at personal income tax through that same period of time — 75 per cent increase, 75 per cent increase. It used to be, back in the 1950s, Mr. Speaker, that governments in this country got about half of their revenue, their taxation revenue, from corporations and half from personal taxation. Now it's way out of balance with that. We find that the vast majority comes from personal income tax and about 14 per cent . . . 12 to 14 per cent nation-wide comes from corporations now, Mr. Speaker. That's where the inequity lies. That's what people in the province of Saskatchewan are upset about.

What about the royalty structure, Mr. Speaker, in this country? How about the royalty structure in Saskatchewan where resources used to pay a fair share? Resources no longer pay a fair share in the province of Saskatchewan. I base this not on statistics, because I don't have them here with me this evening. I base this on a quote from the Saskatchewan Trends Monitor, Mr. Speaker, dated April 1990. I quote:

Even with the declining prices, had the royalty and taxation levels remained at their earlier levels, the current provincial debt of \$4 billion would simply not exist.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. People in Saskatchewan are saying: why are you doing this? Why are you doing this to the people in the province of Saskatchewan? What more do you want? What more do you want from the people in the province of Saskatchewan? They've already worked their fingers to the bone, and now you're trying to force through a provincial goods and services tax.

Well what's going to be taxed? Children's clothing and shoes, adults clothing and shoes, restaurant meals, soft drinks, snack food, tooth paste, diapers, cough syrup, books, magazines, newspaper subscriptions, natural gas, electricity for residential use, haircuts, car repairs, postage stamps. And you know, Mr. Speaker, those are some of the things that came in on April 1 of this year.

The government announced it back in February, a press release, and they still don't have the legislative authority to impose the tax. How arrogant can this government be, that they would impose a tax by press release on people in the province of Saskatchewan without the legislative authority to impose the tax. A legislative authority, Mr. Speaker, I'll do my best to prevent them from getting, because they don't deserve it, Mr. Speaker.

There's enough money come in the front door of this Legislative Building and we want to stop it going out the back door before the auditor gets a chance to look at it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — But it doesn't stop at the increases that came in by press release on April 1, Mr. Speaker. By January 1 of 1992, if we allow the government to proceed with Bill 61, they will be taxing everything that the federal goods and services taxes right now, Mr. Speaker.

When you're born you'll be taxed. And even your funeral service when you die you'll be taxed. This government even wants to tax you after you drop dead, Mr. Speaker.

Enough is enough, people in the province of Saskatchewan are saying. People in Saskatchewan are saying, for goodness sakes, Tory government, take your hand out of our pocket. We can't afford to pay any more. And the government continues to want to increase their revenue. They believe in growth of revenue within the coffers of the provincial government.

But there's a false premise there, Mr. Speaker. Any government that can't live at this day, at this point in time, with projected revenues of some \$4.5 billion coming into the provincial coffers this year, should turn over the reins to someone else.

Some of them would say, where is the NDP (New Democratic Party) going to get this revenue from if you don't bring in the tax? I say, Mr. Speaker, you don't need any more revenue if you responsibly administer the province of Saskatchewan with due regard for the taxpayers' dollars and the public purse.

Mr. Speaker, you don't need more revenue coming into the province of Saskatchewan. You need better management, and you need a government with some integrity that will stand for the people of the province of

Saskatchewan and not for their own friends and their own deals and the things they want to hide from the Provincial Auditor.

These aren't our words, Mr. Speaker. These are the words of the auditor of the province of Saskatchewan. And they are in increasing numbers the words of the people of the province of Saskatchewan who want their say. They want their day in court. Their day in court happens to be, Mr. Speaker, at the point in time when this government calls a general election. When is that going to happen? Surely it will happen before November 12, Mr. Speaker, because that is the date at which the Queen's representative would have to step in and dissolve the government because they no longer have a constitutional mandate to govern.

And April 12 is coming very, very close, Mr. Speaker. April 12 is rapidly approaching. And this government doesn't even have rules before the legislature to approve which provincial boundaries they're going to run on. There has never ever been a government in the history of the province of Saskatchewan that has been so blatantly, unscrupulously disregarding their role as a government. No boundaries, Mr. Speaker, on which this government can call an election. One set of boundaries is held up in the Supreme Court under appeal. The other set of boundaries is under study soon by the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. But here we are in May 1991, the fifth month of the year, and in less than five . . . pardon me, in less than six months, Mr. Speaker, this government has no choice but to call an election or the Queen's representative will have to intervene.

And what are they doing? They're still fooling around after all the consultation they say they did, still fooling around trying to impose the biggest tax increase in the history of the province of Saskatchewan on the people of the province, of this great province, Mr. Speaker. After all the opinion that they've had that this tax is wrong, they don't need it, it's harmful to the economy. And if you want this tax increase so bad, you put it on the line to the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

This is the government, Mr. Speaker, that advocated referendums to the people of the province of Saskatchewan. But they won't even let them vote on the most basic democratic right, and that's to elect their representative, Mr. Speaker, let alone to vote whether they want the tax or not. What a hypocritical stand by the Minister of Finance and others on his side of the House. They won't even let them vote in a general election, let alone to vote on a tax increase.

And what about the by-elections, Mr. Speaker. There have been vacant seats in the province of Saskatchewan for somewhere between the period of 16-or-so months that those constituencies have been without representation. Why? Because government thinks they can't win the election.

They talk about democratic reform. They talk about democratic reform. That's another hypocritical statement by that government. If there was any kind of democracy, representation . . . no taxation without representation. It goes back to the Magna Carta for Heaven's sakes.

How can this government impose a tax upon those four constituencies, one of which has been without a member in this Assembly for 16 months? And they're imposing a tax that has no legislative authority. That is anti-democratic, not democratic.

No representative in Souris-Cannington. The member from there, Eric Berntson, left here after saying he was opposed to the federal goods and services tax, resigns from this House, goes to the Senate and helps Mulroney, the cousin to this government, force through a goods and services tax through the Senate. Now he's back running the campaign for the Conservative government. Campaign by press release would it be? I think they're scared to call the election, Mr. Speaker.

The constituency of Turtleford. That member at least left with some integrity left intact. I think he had too much integrity and that's why the Premier overlooked him for promotion so many times. That member had more integrity than any six cabinet ministers you could put together over there. He's now working elsewhere, Mr. Speaker. On his own hook he went out and got a job. That's more than you can say about the rest of their members who have departed.

(2130)

What about the constituency of Indian Head-Wolseley. Should they have taxation without representation? Their member went off to Hong Kong to be a trade commissioner, got all his benefits from this place and is still drawing more benefits, Mr. Speaker, from the public purse. Can you honestly say it's fair to have taxation without representation on those people from Indian Head-Wolseley? No, it's not. I'm sure most members opposite don't know what the Magna Carta is, let alone to quote anything about taxation without representation.

And then what about the constituency of Kindersley, Mr. Speaker? They have no representative in this Legislative Assembly either. Four constituencies in the province of Saskatchewan, no representation. Why don't these government geniuses over there put the test of their mandate and their tax Bill and all the great things that they say they've done — put them to the test in those by-elections.

If you're too afraid to call a general election, call those four by-elections. You should be confident. You should be confident that those four constituencies would be yours. Souris-Cannington was yours. Indian Head-Wolseley was yours. Turtleford was yours. Kindersley was yours. Why don't you call the election in those? Wouldn't that be a great idea? Then you could call it a test for the general election. You could also call it the referendum for your tax increases.

And do you think that the people in those ridings would treat you well enough to say, yes, take more tax from us because we want you to help the province of Saskatchewan recover? I don't think they would — but you should put it to the test — because I don't think the people in those four constituencies want taxation without representation. And I don't think they would agree with

the member from Moosomin who said that this government should be commended on their restraint. What a cruel joke on the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

There are not many people . . . well the member from Morse says I'm repeating myself. I'm repeating myself so that people in the province of Saskatchewan remember very clearly the cruel and unusual punishment this government's inflicted upon them. And I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, there are other examples that I think that we should look at.

I want to look at some of the analysis of the provincial goods and services tax, Mr. Speaker. Before I do that though, I want you to know that we are aware that repeatedly this government was asked for their economic impact analysis from the harmonization of the provincial sales tax, making it the provincial goods and services tax. And not once have they laid that document on the table for public scrutiny, not once.

Therefore we can only conclude that they have either not done an economic impact analysis or the results of it are so bad they don't want the public to know. In that case it would be just like hiding the expenditures from the Provincial Auditor.

People in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, are saying, enough is enough. They're saying, why are you doing this to us? Why is the Conservative government in Saskatchewan doing this to our province? They can't understand it, and yet the government hides behind what they call their mandate. You have no mandate to provide government any longer in the province of Saskatchewan. You have no mandate to call an election.

If you want to go till the bitter end, dissolve the legislature and go back home and listen to your constituents. See what your constituents say to you. It's obvious you haven't been talking to the people of the province of Saskatchewan or you'd react differently in this legislature. It's very obvious that they're not talking to their constituents. So if you're not going to call an election, dissolve the legislature and go back home because we're not going to allow you to pass the provincial goods and services tax through this legislature. Because people have told us enough is enough; don't let them take any more money out of our pockets to waste and squander through their mismanagement as a government in the province of Saskatchewan.

That's what people in Saskatchewan are saying. That's what we've heard many, many times. I don't know whether or not the government isn't paying Decima enough for their polling any more or what, but I'm sure that their polling must show the same thing as what people in Saskatchewan are saying to us.

And it's not very friendly, what the people in Saskatchewan are saying about this Conservative government, Mr. Speaker.

And I think any of the back-benchers over there, any one else associated with this government should give themselves as much distance as possible. Don't tie

yourself, you back-benchers, to this government. Don't let them use you as the anchor on the Titanic. Don't let them do that to you. Some of you I'm sure have worked far too hard to be used as a deck chair or an anchor on the Titanic. That ship has had many paint jobs, but it's still the rusty old bucket that it was a few years ago.

Mr. Speaker, today in Saskatoon the Leader of the Opposition released an economic impact of the provincial goods and services tax on Saskatchewan. This paper was prepared by our own research staff, but there have been outside experts who have endorsed it as a fair and reasonable assessment of the impact of the provincial goods and services tax on the Saskatchewan economy. These people are Professor Neil Brooks — Professor Brooks is a professor of tax law at Osgoode Hall Law School, York University. It has been endorsed by Dr. Alex Kelly, professor of economics at the University of Regina. It has been endorsed by Doug Elliott, editor and publisher of the Sask Trends Monitor. It has also been endorsed by Dale Botting, vice-president, western Canada, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, by way of introduction, the leader of the New Democratic Party today talked about . . . on January 1, 1991, the Mulroney government imposed its 7 per cent goods and services tax throughout the Canadian economy. While it was too early to ascertain the full economic impact of the new comprehensive federal sales tax, preliminary indications from the first quarter indicate that the goods and services tax's dampening effect on consumer spending, retail trade, and employment, have aggravated the recession.

Six weeks after the imposition of the Mulroney government's federal goods and services tax, the provincial government announced its plans to impose a 7 per cent provincial goods and services tax in Saskatchewan. The government's plan entails harmonizing the new provincial goods and services tax with the federal goods and services tax by: (1) extending the existing 7 per cent provincial sales tax to all goods and services covered by the federal goods and services tax; (2) establishing a business input tax credit as with the federal goods and services tax; (3) establishing a family tax credit for low income families with children; and (4) implementing the provincial goods and services tax in two stages, extending the 7 per cent provincial sales tax to a wide range of goods previously untaxed — and they extended that on April 1 of 1991 — and extending it to services and establishing the business input tax credits on January 1, 1992.

And at that time, Mr. Speaker, this — what we know today as the E&H (education and health) tax or some call it the provincial sales tax — will be a full-fledged goods and services tax. Virtually everything you do that has got a service performed or goods purchased, will have a 7 per cent tax imposed upon it.

The provincial government announced its intention to impose the new provincial goods and services tax in Saskatchewan in a press release. Can you imagine that? — in a press release on February 20 of 1991, in the absence of a budget or draft legislation, thus giving

consumers and businesses only 40 days to prepare for the second major new 7 per cent consumption tax in three months, Mr. Speaker.

To date the government has not yet tabled any legislation with respect to the second phase of its provincial goods and services tax to be implemented on January 1, 1992. And while the government has asserted that this new 7 per cent provincial goods and services tax will create 5,000 new jobs in Saskatchewan and will raise an additional \$181 million per year, it has not released any credible economic or fiscal analysis of the impact of this new tax on Saskatchewan people, Saskatchewan business, or the Saskatchewan economy.

Although there are, of course, many similarities between the Mulroney government's national goods and services tax and the new provincial goods and services tax proposed by the Government of Saskatchewan, there are significant differences as well.

First there is the question of timing and consultation. The Mulroney government initially proposed a 9 per cent goods and services tax in its detailed discussion paper released in the summer of 1989, then reduced the proposed rate to 7 per cent and published a second detailed technical paper, and had a parliamentary committee conduct extensive public hearings across the country long before the proposed implementation date.

In Saskatchewan the public was given only five weeks warning, and the government has published no credible studies or analysis, and held no public or legislative hearings on its proposals before it began to impose the tax.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the tax was imposed two weeks before the enabling legislation was introduced for the first phase and three weeks before the provincial budget was introduced. That has raised questions about the legal and constitutional validity of the tax, quite apart from the issues of equity or fiscal and economic impact.

The Speaker: — I have been listening to the hon. member with great interest. And I would now like to ask him to relate his remarks to the motion which are dealing with an internal restraint program initiated by the government. Would you please relate your remarks to that motion.

(2145)

Mr. Anguish: — Well thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for your ruling. I will want to relate what I'm saying now to the government's motion and to our amendment. Our amendment, sir, says:

condemns the Government of Saskatchewan for failing to initiate an effective internal restraint program during the past nine years, and for its unprecedented waste and mismanagement of taxpayers' dollars.

What I'm talking about here, Mr. Speaker, are taxpayers' dollars. I've laid out the case earlier this evening of the waste and mismanagement and the terrible fiscal state of affairs that this Tory government has drawn

Saskatchewan into.

I am now talking about the other end of that, Mr. Speaker. I'm talking about the desire of the Tory government in Saskatchewan to increase even more tax burden on people, that they don't care about restraint, and that they want these tax dollars to do some vague thing they talk about with no assurance of that.

And when there's expenditure there's raising of revenue, Mr. Speaker, and I want to tie those two together here this evening, so people in Saskatchewan can understand both ends of what happens when you have waste and mismanagement on the extravagant scale that this government has elevated it to in the province of Saskatchewan, especially over the past four and a half years.

Mr. Speaker, whereas the Mulroney government was replacing one tax, the manufacturers sales tax, with a new one, the Government of Saskatchewan is effectively adding a new tax and replacing nothing. It is therefore not surprising that the new 7 per cent goods and services tax is being widely and correctly perceived as a major tax increase. Almost certainly the largest single tax increase in the history of Saskatchewan.

There are some crucial questions that must be looked at in this respect, Mr. Speaker, about the waste and mismanagement. Government says they've done restraint; we say they haven't restrained one bit. I think it is the purpose of our party to examine the economic impact of any proposed new tax on Saskatchewan people and unfortunately this must be undertaken in the absence of any professional studies or analysis from the provincial government — the government that has refused to release any that they may have.

The critical questions to be considered, Mr. Speaker, are firstly: Will this new tax be a positive or a negative effect on the Saskatchewan economy and particularly on job creation? Secondly: Is this new tax equitable?

Now, Mr. Speaker, it's hard to answer those two questions conclusively, but I think that the people in Saskatchewan will try. They'll try at election time to answer those questions.

Because is this new tax equitable? No, it is not equitable, Mr. Speaker, because the burden of the tax falls on the ordinary men and women of this province who already have an unfair tax burden placed upon them because of this government's waste and mismanagement, Mr. Speaker. And will this tax have a positive or a negative effect on the Saskatchewan economy, and particularly on job creation? It will have a negative effect I submit to you, Mr. Speaker. It will have the negative effect of people being laid off because the businesses no longer have the cash flow in many sectors of our economy to sustain the staffing component they once had, those in the food service industry in particular, Mr. Speaker.

Although the provincial government has not been forthcoming with analysis, evidence, or rationale for its claim that its new provincial goods and services tax will create 5,000 jobs over the long term, that claim appears

to be based on two arguments.

First, the government may be claiming that the removal of the provincial sales tax from business inputs will lead to some businesses relocating to Saskatchewan from other provinces. Second, the government may be claiming that the removal of the provincial sales tax from business inputs will lead to increased investment and job creation in the capital-intensive manufacturing and resource industries. In order to assess the likely overall economic impact of the new provincial goods and services tax, it is therefore useful to examine each sector in turn. And I'd like to do that here this evening, Mr. Speaker, if time permits and I'm not sure that it will.

In agriculture, the Saskatchewan economy accounts . . . or agriculture sector accounts for some 10 per cent of the gross domestic product and 18 per cent of total employment. A wide range of agricultural inputs are already exempt under provincial sales tax. This sector is dominated by the production of wheat and other grains and oilseeds for export to world markets, and is heavily influenced by world prices, by the exchange rate, and by interest rates. The new provincial goods and services tax regime is not likely to have a discernible positive or a negative effect on employment levels in agriculture. That's what I say to you, Mr. Speaker.

The other primary industries sector of Saskatchewan's economy include gas, oil, mining, forestry, fishing and trapping, and they account for some 6 per cent of the gross domestic product and 12,000 jobs with 3 per cent of total employment.

The manufacturing sector accounts for 7 per cent of the gross domestic product and 26,000 jobs or 6 per cent of total employment. The claim that the new provincial goods and services tax regime will create more jobs rests on the assumption that there will be an increased job creation in these two sectors which together account for 38,000 jobs or 9 per cent of total employment.

The provincial sales tax on business purchases of goods and services is far less important than other costs of production and location factors in these capital-intensive industries. When making location decisions firms must take into account a wide range of considerations, including proximities of markets, the availability of a skilled work force and the relative costs of land, labour, and capital.

Firms in the resource sector of course, are particularly affected by the nature and physical location of the natural resources. The potash mines are located in Saskatchewan because that's where the potash is, not because of the presence or absence of any provincial sales tax, Mr. Speaker.

In addition, firms in the manufacturing and resource sectors are primarily sensitive to interest rates and to the exchange rate, two major factors which are far more important than the provincial sales tax is, Mr. Speaker.

One of the province's largest manufacturings, Ipsco, reported that in 1989 its export sales were curtailed because of the high exchange rate. Nothing to do with the

tax, Mr. Speaker. And I quote: by the fourth quarter Ipsco had cut back substantially on exports of flat roll products to the U.S. and offshore because exchange rates rendered many potential sales unprofitable. End of quote. And that came from the Ipsco Annual Report in 1989.

In the same year the province's largest potash producer, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, reported that changes in the exchange rate between 1989 and 1988 had cost the company \$13 million. And I would . . .

The Speaker: — Order. I wonder if the hon. member can relate that to the motion. You receive a certain latitude and I'd ask him to relate that to the motion.

Mr. Anguish: — Well thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I simply relate that to you and through you to the House, that this tax that the government wants to fill in the voids of their waste and mismanagement, they're making some false assumptions on that tax and what it can do. And by them making those inaccurate assumptions on that tax, they are deceiving the people of the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, into believing — they're manipulating their opinion — into believing that something can be attained at this tax that cannot be attained from their waste and mismanagement, Mr. Speaker.

And certainly we have to talk about both ends. We have to talk about the waste and mismanagement. They talk about their restraint; we talk about waste and mismanagement. Taxation is always tied into there, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, that quote that I just made about the exchange rates . . . I'll just start the quote again. I quote:

Comparing the average exchange rates of 1989 to 1988, the effect was a drop in net income of approximately \$13 million.

That's the PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan Inc.) annual report in 1989, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since the new 7 per cent provincial goods and services tax will entirely fall on the backs of individuals and families, it will tend to increase the cost of living and put upward . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. Order. I don't want to interrupt you but it seems that there are a good number of members who wish to enter the debate. I would ask them to wait their turn.

Mr. Anguish: — Well any form of stimulation effects of the new provincial goods and services tax regime in these sectors will be significantly offset by making workers relatively more expensive and capital equipment relatively less expensive, thereby providing incentive for firms to replace workers with machinery, Mr. Speaker. Finally of course there is no . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. The hon. member is not on the topic. I ask him to come back on the topic; simply not on the topic. And I'm not satisfied with the relationship you've drawn, and I ask you to get back on

the topic.

Mr. Anguish: — Well, I guess I'd talk about straight restraint again then, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — Order. I'm asking you to draw your remarks to the topic.

Mr. Anguish: — I, as always, Mr. Speaker, respect your ruling. But if I'm only given two minutes between each time, it's kind of hard in a long, important debate to keep . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. Now you've been given a short time . . . Please sit down. You've been given a short time because you're not on the topic, sir. And I keep having to ask you to draw your attention . . . to relate your remarks to the topic, and if you are unable to relate your remarks to the topic, I will interrupt you again and if necessary, ask you to assume your place. I draw that to your attention clearly, and simply keep your remarks on the topic.

Mr. Anguish: — Well thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for your ruling. I certainly will honour that.

Restraint by this government. Let's talk about patronage. Does that tie in to restraint? Do restraint and patronage go hand in hand?

How about Bob Andrew, trade emissary at the Saskatchewan Trade Office in Minneapolis — salary, \$97,000 a year; Eric Berntson, appointment to the Senate — salary, \$71,000 a year; Larry Birkbeck received \$48,028 for a contract to his company, Venus Consulting — Venus Consulting, Larry Birkbeck, former MLA for the Tories — \$48,028. Now he received a 10-year appointment to the Saskatchewan Municipal Board at a salary of \$57,820 a year.

Restraint, Mr. Speaker? Who pays that restraint? The people of the province of Saskatchewan pay that restraint, Mr. Speaker. But that's not restraint. That's waste and mismanagement and a blatant misuse of taxpayers' dollars in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — How about some of these other defeated Tories in the province? Gordon Currie, Gordon Dirks, Louis Domotor, Sid Dutchak, Tim Embury, Ralph Katzman, Myles Morin, Keith Parker, Paul Rousseau, Jack Sandberg, Paul Schoenhals, Bud Smith. Graham Taylor, trade emissary at Saskatchewan Hong Kong Trade Office, salary approximately \$97,000 a year. Is that restraint? Ladies and gentlemen of the opposition, is that restraint? I think not, Mr. Speaker.

What about the former deputy minister of the Department of Environment, Mr. Speaker? You look in the most recently released *Public Accounts*. Do you know what the deputy minister of Environment got paid in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1990? Two hundred and forty-six thousand dollars in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1990. Is that restraint, Mr. Speaker? I think that's not restraint, ladies and gentlemen of the opposition. That's

not restraint. What a hypocritical statement by this government. They don't understand the meaning of the word restraint. They should use the Webster's dictionary, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — I don't know how many members in the House would remember the CJV Carpet song, Mr. Speaker, but it listed off a number of communities and then said: I've been everywhere, man. Well, where's all the money gone? Where's this government travelled to? I understand all governments have to travel but in times of restraint how about Minneapolis; Dublin; New York; Ottawa; Hong Kong; Rapid City; Vancouver; Atlantic City; Helsinki; Reno; Toronto; Athens; Winnipeg; London; Calgary; Cairns, Australia; Edmonton; Brasilia, Brazil; Montreal; Fredericton; Washington, D.C.; Phoenix; Quebec City; Miami; Port of Spain; New Orleans; Zürich; White Horse. I've been everywhere, man. San Francisco; St. John; New Delhi; Kansas City; Jackson, Mississippi; Beijing; Grand Falls; Chicoutimi; Palm Springs; Geneva; Victoria; Cleveland; Thailand; Columbus, Ohio; Manila; Colorado; California; China; California; Hawaii; Newfoundland; Germany; P.E.I.; Ireland; Nova Scotia; Germany; Quebec; Banff; Digby, Nova Scotia; Waterloo, Ontario; Los Angeles, California; Winter Haven, Florida; East Germany; Corner Brook; Spain; Digby, Nova Scotia; Moncton; Chicago; Antigonish; Hecla Island; Fairmont; Colorado Springs; Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; Seattle, Washington; St. Andrew; New Brunswick; Paris, France; Prince Rupert; Bulgaria; Brussels . . .

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

The Assembly adjourned at 10 p.m.