

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**PRESENTING PETITIONS**

**Mr. Lyons:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition which says, in part, that the provincial government does not have a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan to impose the major tax increase which would result from its proposed provincial GST (goods and services tax).

And these petitioners, Mr. Speaker, humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to urge the provincial government to stop the provincial GST, until the people of the province have an opportunity to pass judgement on it, the government, in a provincial election.

Mr. Speaker, I was asked to present this petition by residents of the area up in the north-west part of Saskatchewan. They include the communities of Preeceville, from Lintlaw, from Kelvington, Hudson Bay, again many more from Preeceville, and I notice one also from Stenen, Saskatchewan.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to at this time lay this on the Table. Thank you.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Calvert:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule 11, I rise within the Assembly, as is my responsibility as a member of this legislature, to present a petition on behalf of many of my own constituents from the city of Moose Jaw.

Mr. Speaker, these individuals and citizens have signed a petition which urges the government opposite to stop its plans to introduce the provincial goods and services tax until the people of this province have had an opportunity to pass judgement on this tax, and on their government, through a provincial election.

Mr. Speaker, the signatories to this petition come from the constituency of Moose Jaw South, also from the constituency of Moose Jaw North, and some, Mr. Speaker, from that area in Moose Jaw North which may soon be part of the constituency of Thunder Creek.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, there are those who have signed this petition who come from, and make their homes in, the communities of Fir Mountain, Parkbeg, and Assiniboia. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to place this petition on the Table today.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I too rise pursuant to rule 11 of the rules of the Assembly to present a petition on behalf of a number of Saskatchewan residents who are asking this government to reconsider the imposition of the provincial goods and services tax, and to go to the people of the province and get a mandate

if they would still wish to introduce it.

Mr. Speaker, many of these petitioners are from my constituency. I notice here some from the member from Prince Albert's riding and as well from the member for Shellbrook-Torch River's riding. There's an address here from Spruce Home and from Shellbrook. I'm pleased to on their behalf lay this petition on the Table, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Trew:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm very pleased to join my colleagues pursuant to rule 11 and rise to present the petition opposing the imposition of the provincial GST. The signatories on this petition, Mr. Speaker, come from Walsh Acres — the area where I live — some are from Balgonie, a couple of names from the south-east part of Regina, Coronation Park in Regina as well as Uplands. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have added my name to those of the several names that I am presenting today.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Mr. Speaker, I too rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of residents of Saskatchewan. The gist of the petition, sir, is that they're asking the provincial government to stop the provincial GST, until such a time as the people of the province have an opportunity to pass judgement on it in a provincial election. The petitioners on this petition, sir, are all from the city of Moose Jaw and I'm pleased to lay this on the Table.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Upshall:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 of this Assembly to present a petition on behalf of several people from the province of Saskatchewan, who are exercising their democratic right by having their names added to those already presented in this Assembly, to protest the provincial government's imposition — unfairly, without a mandate — of the provincial GST.

These people come from many towns and cities in Saskatchewan, including Naicam, Melfort, Tisdale, Domremy, Kinistino, Ridgedale, Pleasantdale, Nipawin, Hagen, and Beatty. And it's my pleasure on behalf of these people to present their names to the legislature to protest this unfair tax.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Simard:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to rule 11, Mr. Speaker, to table a petition that's signed by a number of residents in Saskatchewan, protesting the provincial government's proposed goods and services tax and the fact that it does not have a mandate to be imposing this very major tax increase on the public of Saskatchewan.

The communities that are represented in this petition, Mr. Speaker, are as follows: Brownlee, Moose Jaw, Marquis, Mortlach, Caron, Swift Current. Mr. Speaker, thank you.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition on behalf of several people from Saskatchewan, all of whom have signed a petition urging that this government not impose its provincial sales tax, or at least not to do so until a mandate would be received to do it through a provincial election.

I hereby submit this petition.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Solomon:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present to this Assembly today, on behalf of many residents in the province of Saskatchewan, a petition urging the provincial government to reverse its decision to impose the 7 per cent provincial GST.

These petitions are from . . . signatures are from a number of people from across the province including Regina, and Melville, and from areas within my constituency of Normanview, Normanview West, Sherwood Estates, McCarthy Park and Regent Park, as well as from the south end of the city of Regina.

Both urban and rural residents are happy to work co-operatively to stop this GST, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Atkinson:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of several Saskatchewan residents.

These petitioners are urging the provincial government to stop the imposition of the provincial goods and services tax, as they believe the Government of Saskatchewan does not have a mandate to do so.

These residents come from Porcupine Plain, Bjorkdale, Tisdale, Archerwill, Crooked River, and Mistatim.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to lay this petition on the Table.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Anguish:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 today in the legislature to present a petition. Residents of the province of Saskatchewan have exercised their ancient and democratic right to petition this Assembly. And specifically they're petitioning the Assembly so that the provincial government does not have a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan to impose the major tax increase which would result from this proposed provincial goods and services tax.

This petition, Mr. Speaker, is signed by residents of the city of Saskatoon, the city in which today the Leader of the New Democratic Party announced that if the government . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order, order, order. The member is obviously engaging in and provoking debate and I ask him to stick to the prayer of the motion.

**Mr. Anguish:** — I certainly respect that, Mr. Speaker. I was carried away with the heat of presenting the petition. I present this petition on behalf of the petitioners to seek a remedy through this legislature.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Goulet:** — Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule 11, I present a petition from the undersigned people from . . . residents of the province of Saskatchewan. The petition says that the provincial government does not have a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan to impose the major tax increase which would result from its proposed provincial GST.

They're urging the provincial government to stop the GST and allow a provincial election to pass judgement on it.

The petitioners are from Melfort, Gronlid, Bjorkdale, and Mistatim.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hagel:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule 11, along with my colleagues, it is my honour to present a petition to the Legislative Assembly. These petitioners, Mr. Speaker, all come from my home city of Moose Jaw, from the constituencies of both Moose Jaw North and Moose Jaw South.

Simply put, Mr. Speaker, these people are of the opinion that this government has no mandate to introduce the provincial goods and services tax, and that it does not have a mandate and can seek one in a provincial election, and thereby earn a mandate to introduce the tax, and ask that in the meantime that the tax be withdrawn. It's my honour to present this petition on behalf of these citizens of my city and our province, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly for a number of petitioners from the city of Saskatoon. And they wish to inform this Legislative Assembly that they are opposed to the provincial GST and are asking the government to withdraw the Bill because of the adverse effect that it will have on these people.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to present this petition on behalf of the residents of Saskatoon who, I note, reside mostly in my own constituency. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As has been the case with the others before me, I rise to present a petition on behalf of a number of people who state that the provincial government does not have a mandate to pass this tax, and urge the Legislative Assembly . . . urge the government to stop the tax at least until after an election is called.

Mr. Speaker, these people come from Prince Albert and

the surrounding district. At a glance I see Prince Albert, Buckland, Hoey, among others.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in presenting a petition here under rule 11 of the Legislative Assembly. The people who have signed this petition wish to join with thousands of others in asking of the legislature that the provincial government does not have a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan to impose the major tax increase which would result from its proposed provincial GST. And they sign this petition and bring it to the Assembly. We present it on their behalf and would urge the provincial government to back away from Bill 61 and . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order, order. The hon. member, as he knows, is engaging in debate. I once more ask him to . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I join with my colleagues, also pursuant to rule 11, to present this petition on behalf of a number of citizens of Saskatchewan who are urging the government opposite to stop the provincial GST, arguing that the government, at its stage in its term, does not have the mandate to proceed with such a massive tax increase, and asking that this tax be set aside so that the people . . . this Bill be set aside so that the people of Saskatchewan could pass judgement on it, and the government, in a forthcoming election campaign.

On behalf of these citizens of Saskatchewan, I am pleased to present this petition at this time.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise also pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition on behalf of a number of citizens of Saskatchewan. As is indicated, Mr. Speaker, by the number of petitions that have been put in, signed by the citizens of Saskatchewan, the people of Saskatchewan are speaking out in respect to this here tax.

And accordingly it gives me a great deal of pleasure to submit this petition, Mr. Speaker — petitioners from across Saskatchewan, in particular from Prince Albert, from Spruce Home, from Meath Park, and Duck Lake. I am pleased to present this petition, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of residents of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are urging the government to reverse its decision to impose the 7 per cent provincial GST. These petitioners are from a number of communities including Prince Albert, Saskatoon, Regina, Tisdale, Ile-a-la-Crosse, and Crooked River.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise under the opportunity that is provided by rule no. 11 to present a petition. The petition is addressed to the Honourable Legislative Assembly of the province of Saskatchewan assembled here. The petition of the undersigned residents of the province of Saskatchewan show the following: that the provincial government . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order, order.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I think it's very important that the Assembly hear this petition and the people of Saskatchewan hear this petition, that the provincial government does not have a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan to impose a major tax increase which would result from its proposed provincial GST. This of course, Mr. Speaker, is encompassed in Bill 61 which is before the House.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to urge the Provincial Government to stop the provincial GST until the people of the province have an opportunity to pass judgement on it in a provincial election, (Mr. Speaker).

This particular petition is representative of thousands upon thousands of Saskatoon people; this particular petition is all from the city of Saskatoon, and I notice they also cover one of the areas of the city of Saskatoon known as Lakeview. It's good to see Lakeview represented on this petition.

Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to lay it on the Table for the Assembly.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

## READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

**Clerk:** — According to order, I have reviewed the following petitions that were presented on May 20 and under rule 11(7) find them to be in order. And they are hereby read and received:

Of certain residents of the Province of Saskatchewan praying that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to refuse to extend the P.S.T. to goods and services.

And according to order, I have reviewed the following petitions under rule 11(7) and find them to be in order. And they are hereby read and received:

Of certain residents of the Province of Saskatchewan praying that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to urge the Provincial Government to stop the provincial GST.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Ms. Simard:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I take great pleasure in introducing to you, and through you to the

other members of the Assembly, a group of some 20 grade 5 and 6 students from Argyle School in Regina, Mr. Speaker. They are seated in the west gallery and they are accompanied by their teacher, Miss Rosanne Fournier.

And I will be meeting with the students later, Mr. Speaker, for drinks and to talk with them, and for pictures. Thank you.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Martin:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my privilege and pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to all members of the House, 29 grade 4 students from W.F. Ready School in the constituency of Regina Wascana. They are accompanied by their teacher, Kelly Orban.

And I will have the opportunity and the pleasure of having my picture taken with them in a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, and then the opportunity to meet with them in the members' lounge, and discuss what they have heard here today and hear what's on their minds, Mr. Speaker. Please welcome the guests from W.F. Ready School.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Effects of PST on Saskatchewan Business

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Economic Trade and Development and it is to do with the PST (provincial sales tax) and its effects on the business community.

Since your government took office, Mr. Minister, business bankruptcies have increased in this province by 280 per cent. Now your newest strategy to alleviate the problems facing the business community seems to be to impose this provincial tax, this PST.

Mr. Minister, how can you possibly proceed with the PST when Minot, a North Dakota community of about twenty some thousand, nearly doubled its population over the weekend, when thousands of Saskatchewan families crossed the border, travelling across the border to shop, and escape your PST.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Mr. Speaker, first of all there's a considerable difference between North Dakota and Saskatchewan. In Saskatchewan the members opposite brought us medicare and it has to be paid for, and in Saskatchewan it has to be paid for by taxation. The members opposite are in favour of medicare but they don't want to pay for it. They want somebody else to pay for it.

The Leader of the Opposition has a theory on who should pay for everything — somebody else should pay. He says Ottawa should pay. No we shouldn't pay here; Ottawa should pay.

I want to point out for the members opposite that

bankruptcies are a function of the economy and the economic base. Members opposite, when they were government, believed in building the economic base of Crown corporations. They bought holes in the ground; they did not diversify through community bond projects in towns like Elbow, and Lemberg, Rosetown, and Kindersley. They did not build the economic base. You have to have a base on which to tax.

We are building an economic base under the provincial sales tax. The tax is applied to the retail sector and not to the business sector.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Mr. Minister, based on your statement, and based on last week's traffic pattern, you could more justifiably be referred to as the minister of economic trade and development for North Dakota, not for Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Your report on the impact of the provincial GST makes this ludicrous statement, and I quote:

As far as business purchases are concerned, the border problem with both the United States and Alberta is completely corrected by Saskatchewan's decision to harmonize with the GST effective January 1, 1992.

What you're telling us, Mr. Minister, is that if a business can survive until 1992, they can pay for the same tax . . . the same tax for the new cash register as their counterparts in North Dakota and Alberta. But what comfort is it to have a cash register when there is no cash ringing in it because of your PST?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the problem of cross-border shopping in a more competitive United States is even a greater problem in Ontario, where the provincial sales tax is 8 per cent. And the NDP haven't done anything to reduce it in Ontario; it's 1 per cent higher than Saskatchewan. I detect that the members opposite here do not understand what their colleagues are doing in Ontario, and I would challenge them to denounce what Ontario is doing with an 8 per cent tax.

In addition, let me quote from the Investment Dealers Association last week, commenting on the economy in Saskatchewan:

. . . in effect, the money our economy is losing on agriculture, it is being made up through investment in projects such as the Husky Upgrader, Saferco, Rafferty-Alameda, the Shand Power Station, pipelines, oil and gas wells, uranium development, Millar Western's pulp mill, the Pound-Maker Ethanol plant and further modernization at Regina's IPSCO plant.

I quote, Mr. Speaker, that's the independent Investment

Dealers Association of Canada. They understand business but the members opposite do not.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Well, Mr. Minister . . . Question to the same minister, Mr. Speaker. You made a report and in that report you did admit that the problem of cross-border shopping became worse following the implementation of the federal GST.

The question is, why did your government not investigate the impact of adding the provincial GST on top of the federal GST on cross-border shopping? Why does your report neglect the negative impact on the Saskatchewan business community, of the Saskatchewan provincial GST, Mr. Minister?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — In addition, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition was in Saskatoon today because he couldn't face the Regina media. The Leader of the Opposition couldn't face the legislative media here in Regina. He's not here to ask these questions and be challenged by us.

He put out a paper on how he would get the economy going. It is vague. It is full of economic nonsense. It is full of distortions. It is full of quotes from people who didn't even want to be quoted because they weren't quoted accurately. And in addition, Mr. Speaker, in addition he suggests that he would create jobs, that jobs need to be created. We agree on that.

How would the opposition create jobs? Well they would start by cutting government advertising. I did a calculation. That's 3 jobs at the paper in Melville; that's 6 in Yorkton; that's 10 or 20 in Saskatoon. That's job cuts at the TV station. That's how they would create jobs — by cutting jobs and cutting expenditure in government.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Mr. Speaker, new question. Mr. Minister, actions speak louder than words, and last week, Mr. Minister, thousands of Saskatchewan families took action. They travelled to North Dakota to spend their shopping dollars. And what happened? In North Dakota, the hotels are booked until Labour Day but not . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Excuse me. Excuse me. Order. There are a couple of the members who are consistently interfering. I think they know who they are, and I ask them to refrain.

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — In North Dakota the hotels are booked until Labour Day. Their hotels are booked — not ours. Their restaurants are full; ours are closing. Their tills are ringing; ours are quiet. Your study claims it's currently investigating a broad range of options to alleviate the problem. Mr. Minister, isn't the best option simply to drop the tax before it has a more prolonged and devastating impact, or do you have a better solution?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Of course, Mr. Speaker, our solution is better. What's better about it is that we have a solution. The opposition has no solution. They haven't had an original thought since 1962; 1962 was the last time they had an original thought. They cannot address wealth creation, Mr. Speaker; they can only address redistribution of misery. And that's what they have in their document. That's what they've put before the people. These people . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order, order. Order, order. Order. As I have asked hon. members to allow the member for Prince Albert to make his remarks, now I'm asking hon. members to allow the minister to do the same.

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Mr. Speaker, the people in the opposition have no policy to address wealth creation. They have no policy to build an economic base. They are opposed to everything. They are even opposed to our people travelling to North Dakota.

We have to be competitive with North Dakota. That means we have to keep our costs down. That means, on a provincial sales tax that is rebated to business on input, they are more competitive. Canada will be more competitive, Saskatchewan will be more competitive, and we will have a better economy.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### Effects of PST on Employment

**Mr. Shillington:** — My question is to the Minister of Finance. Today, Mr. Minister, before a standing-room only crowd of Saskatoon business people, the Leader of the Opposition released a study on the impact of your PST.

The study points out, Mr. Minister, something that is painfully obvious to everybody in the business community, whether Saskatoon or elsewhere, and that is that your tax isn't creating jobs, it's destroying them — 7,500 to be precise, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Minister, in the face of this highly credible evidence, will you admit what the entire Saskatchewan business community are saying, and that is that we just simply can't afford your tax and it should be withdrawn?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Well first of all, Mr. Speaker, we don't accept what the NDP (New Democratic Party) caucus research economists have come up with for numbers as it relates to jobs, Mr. Speaker. There is no consideration there of, as my colleague made the point before, wealth creation and a larger economic pie. Making businesses more competitive is what this harmonization is all about.

The argument that the NDP would advance is somehow we should have businesses in this province continue to pay \$260 million, that we should continue to make businesses pay \$260 million in taxes on their inputs. We

say that should come off so they can be more competitive, create new economic wealth, create new jobs, and expand their businesses, flow some of the benefits back to consumers, Mr. Speaker. And most importantly, come up with \$125 million to fund GRIP (gross revenue insurance plan) and NISA (net income stabilization account).

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order. Now before the hon. member begins to put his question, I'm going to bring to the attention of the Assembly, including my friend from Regina Elphinstone, that there is too much interruption, too many interruptions on both sides of the House, and I'm going to start interrupting so that question period may be more smooth.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Let me say, Mr. Minister, that this tax has not so much expanded the pie as caused the angel food to fall. That's a better image.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Minister, you referred to the paper put out by the NDP caucus. You didn't, Mr. Minister, mention that it's been endorsed by a respected academic, Professor Neil Brooks from the University of Ottawa; by a respected academic from Saskatchewan, Alex Kelly; by a statistician and pollster, Doug Elliot of Environics; and last but certainly not least, by a spokesperson for the Saskatchewan business community, Dale Botting.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Minister, if none of these people mean anything to you, do not the cries of the Saskatchewan business community mean something to you? Will you not listen to them and withdraw this tax?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Speaker, in so far as the paper and who . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order.

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Speaker, in so far as the paper and who has endorsed it, I am led to understand that one of the people's names that's on that paper, somehow an endorsement, when that was asked of him he said, well that's a complete surprise to me that my name turned up on that document. But I'm sure others will want to check into that more fully.

Mr. Speaker, why we have to question the NDP caucus research economist numbers as to the impact on . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order. Now it's impossible to answer a question if you're always being interrupted. I especially bring that to the attention of the member for Regina North West in this instance. I bring that especially to your attention.

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — The point I want to make first of all, Mr. Speaker, is one of the reasons that one would question the NDP . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order. Order, order. Now let's not get into this business of who's making the most noise. Let's all be quiet and let the Minister of Finance answer the question.

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Speaker, one would have to question their numbers, and why I say that is for this reason: back in October of 1989, the New Democratic Party caucus put out a paper entitled *The Goods and Services Tax and Saskatchewan*. In that paper, on page 18, they made the point, Mr. Speaker, that a 9 per cent GST on top of the provincial sales tax — not side by side like we're currently doing it — would result in 2,775 jobs being lost. Now somehow with a lower rate, Mr. Speaker, they're suggesting more job losses. It simply doesn't add up, Mr. Speaker. It simply doesn't add up.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order. Order, order, order. The member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, I'd ask you to co-operate and to refrain from interruptions.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Minister, you've accomplished a very considerable feat. You have persuaded business, labour, the young, the old, the consumers, in fact the overwhelming majority of Saskatchewan people — you've persuaded them you're wrong, Mr. Minister.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Shillington:** — My question, Mr. Minister, is: if business think you're wrong and labour thinks you're wrong and the elderly think you're wrong and the young think you're wrong and the consumers think you're wrong, Mr. Minister, to whom are you accountable with respect to this tax?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm not suggesting that these tax changes or the cuts in spending, Mr. Speaker, are somehow easy. All of the choices that have had to be made are difficult ones, and we try to do them in a fair and reasonable way.

They say, Mr. Speaker, that they would repeal this, that they would take away the \$260 million benefit to business. We've heard this before, Mr. Speaker. I say to them, can the public trust them? I say to the NDP, come clean, come clean with the public, Mr. Speaker, because, Mr. Speaker, there is no plan in this document as to how they will stabilize the economy, how they will pay for the GRIP and NISA premiums which will pump \$1.3 billion into our economy, Mr. Speaker. And there is no mention of where they'll come up with the \$125 million for that or the 100 and more millions of dollars to control the debt and the deficit.

Where is their plan? I say come clean with the public, Mr. Speaker.

## Student Summer Employment

**Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Speaker, in response to the Minister of Finance let me simply say, by the petitions that have come to this House, the people of Saskatchewan are saying, let them exercise judgement, earn a mandate, and call a provincial election.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hagel:** — The trust can be earned, the trust can be earned.

Mr. Speaker, I address my question to the Minister of Human Resources, Labour and Employment. Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, in your report analysing the impact of the provincial GST, you point out — your government points out — that there are lots of problems. There's problems for restaurants, there's problems for tourism, there's problems for border communities — lots of problems you say, but a little short on solutions.

We say, Mr. Minister, and credible third parties also agree, that the direct impact of your provincial GST over the next five years is a loss of over 7,500 jobs, starting now — starting now, unfortunately, Mr. Minister.

Students are looking for summer employment, Mr. Minister. For them it's a crisis. And I ask you, I ask you on behalf of those students looking for employment now, can you give them anything more than hollow rhetoric and PST job cuts? What's your government's plan for student employment this summer, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Klein:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, if the NDP would let this House progress through the natural stages, we probably would have been into Labour estimates by now, at which time the member would have found out that the budget for this year for student employment is what it was last year. And clearly the students are going to find employment, and the budget covers it.

**Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the same minister on the same topic. Mr. Minister, whatever your plan is so far, it ain't working, it ain't working. In April of this year, there were 3,000 fewer young people between the ages of 15 and 24 working than April of last year, and it was no raving success last year, Mr. Minister.

Your provincial GST impact statement admits it'll be tough finding work this summer in restaurants; it'll be tough finding work this summer in the tourism industry, and it also admits, Mr. Minister, it'll be virtually impossible to find employment in tourism in border communities this summer, Mr. Minister. And yet your government reduces funding for student summer employment.

I simply ask you on behalf of the young people of our province, Mr. Minister: why won't you give Saskatchewan's young people a chance?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Klein:** — You know, Mr. Speaker, I don't know where my critic gets off saying that we've reduced

summer employment. Far from it. We haven't reduced summer employment; they've just changed their figures arbitrarily.

A couple or three months ago they said 2,700. Now a couple or three months later, because it suits their needs or their requirements, they've pooped it up to 7,000. Neither one of those numbers make any difference.

Now I don't know where the member has been, but in Regina today there's a hundred million dollars worth of construction activity in downtown Regina — new office towers going up. Mr. Speaker, we are not only the envy of the country, we're the envy of North America with the construction that's going on here. Name one other city in North America with that kind of construction.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the Minister of Human Resources, Labour and Employment: Mr. Minister, you talk about giving young people a chance. Somehow young people in Saskatchewan seem to have missed all these grand job opportunities that you're talking about in Saskatchewan, you say.

Mr. Minister, young people in Saskatchewan today are finding this in terms of post-secondary education — class cut-backs, quotas, ever increasing tuition fees. And higher education simply becomes tougher and tougher for them to reach, Mr. Minister. If they pursue it, they have a hard time getting a summer job. We know that from your impact study. And if they, Mr. Minister, if they get an education, it's still tough.

You know and I know that there are 30,000 fewer young people working in Saskatchewan . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order. Order, order, order. Order. I've given the hon. member considerable latitude and I believe he should get to the question now.

(1445)

**Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Minister, I ask you, in light of the fact that there are 30,000 fewer young people working in Saskatchewan today than when your party came to government, in light of that, Mr. Minister, is it any wonder that more and more of Saskatchewan's young people are leaving our province to go to other provinces to build their future outside our Saskatchewan?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Klein:** — Mr. Speaker, rather than make up numbers, I believe the proof is in the pudding. Last month Saskatchewan again had the lowest unemployment rate in the country. I would suspect that as the summer goes by we will continue to have the same number.

## Sale of SaskPower Building in Saskatoon

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Minister of Economic Diversification and Trade, took notice of a question on my behalf a few days ago when we had question period. And I have the answer to that

question, Mr. Speaker, now. And the question was from the member from Regina Rosemont concerning a SaskPower building in Saskatoon as I understand it.

The question raised by the member for Saskatoon Rosemont, in the way in which NDP members have often raised questions, without facts . . . and he raised it again without facts. Mr. Speaker, he asked the question using terms like corruption and those kinds of terms in this House.

The answer to the question, Mr. Speaker, is the following: There was no sale of SaskPower Saskatoon district office to Victory Companies Ltd., K.W. Nasser, that he referred to in here. The recommended sale did not materialize due to the inability of the purchaser to secure financing, due to their inability to obtain an adequate lease.

The building was listed for sale with the Saskatoon Real Estate Board for listing with their member agencies. Can't get more public than that, Mr. Speaker.

The member accused this side of the House and this minister and SaskPower of corruption. He uses those terms like his colleagues continue to use them — uses them in an ill-advised way in the House.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are these, and they need to be laid out there for members of the media and the members of this public. Mr. Speaker, the building has been relisted . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I should have an opportunity to finish when they make such accusations in this House, Mr. Speaker. What?

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — I agree that the minister should have an opportunity to finish. But I don't agree that he should have the opportunity to enter into long debate and make extraneous comments. I don't agree with that. I'm going to now go to the member for Regina Rosemont.

Order, order. Order, order. Order! Order, order. I believe the hon. member has had an opportunity to make his point.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the same minister. Mr. Minister, we produced in this House an order in council which showed the sale of the SaskPower building in Saskatoon to Victory Construction.

I ask the minister this, Mr. Speaker: where is the order in council that in fact does away with that sale, which abrogates that sale? Is the reason there is no order in council because you got your hands caught in the cookie jar, that you found out that you couldn't sell it, that you didn't want to do it before the election because it's one in an endless list of long and corrupt practices of your government — without tender, without allowing the people of Saskatchewan to be able to participate in that kind of business opportunity, Mr. Minister?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, my point exactly . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member, I'm very pleased he had an opportunity to stand because he made the point very clearly that I was trying to make, and that is that they make unfounded allegations, that member and many of his colleagues. He made it . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order! Order, order, order. Order, order. The minister has the right to answer the question.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said in this House that the sale that he had referred to was done without public knowledge. The building was listed for sale with the Saskatoon Real Estate Board for listing with their member agencies. The building has since been relisted with the Saskatoon Real Estate Board for listing with their member agencies. Independent commercial agencies have also been advised that the building has been relisted for sale.

And, Mr. Speaker, the final point is the following: the recommended sale that the member referred to, it did not materialize due to the inability of the purchaser to secure financing, due to that purchaser's inability to obtain an adequate lease.

Mr. Speaker, yes, there was an OC (order in council) based on the recommendation. Yes, Mr. Speaker, they talk about corruption; they raise unfounded allegations, that news media carries it, and we have little opportunity to raise the facts of the case.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

### Bill No 82 — An Act to Implement Certain Provisions Respecting Pension Benefits and Annuity Plans for Teachers Agreed to in the 1990-91 Provincial Teachers' Collective Agreement

**Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to Implement Certain Provisions Respecting Pension Benefits and Annuity Plans for Teachers Agreed to in the 1990-91 Provincial Teachers' Collective Agreement.

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

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### MOTION UNDER RULE 16

#### Condemnation of the Opposition for Exploiting the Democratic Process

**Mr. Britton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's with mixed feelings I rise in my place today to address the question.



Mr. Speaker, at the end of my remarks, I will be moving, seconded by my colleague from Shaunavon, that pursuant to rule 16:

That this Assembly condemn the opposition for holding the public of Saskatchewan hostage by exploiting the democratic process for their own selfish political gain and refusing to address issues of great importance to the (financial) future of our province during times of economic hardship and uncertainty caused by low commodity prices, drought, international subsidy wars, and high interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, this motion is very important. It is very important to this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, and it's extremely important to the people of Saskatchewan. And I say it is important, Mr. Speaker, to the people of the province because they need to be informed. They need to be informed of what's taking place in this legislature. The people need to know, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP are holding them hostage by exploiting the democratic process and misleading the public through their deceit.

Mr. Speaker, I am ashamed to be in this same Assembly as those folks over there. I am ashamed to stand here, Mr. Speaker, and I am truly disappointed. And I see, Mr. Speaker, what is happening in this House — the very same thing that's going on now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we were elected to represent the people of Saskatchewan, and we were elected to uphold the principles of democracy. The recent behaviour, Mr. Speaker, of the NDP members opposite have made a mockery of the principles of democracy.

And I have become disillusioned, Mr. Speaker, with the total lack of responsibility, and the disgraceful behaviour from those individuals opposite, who were elected, the same as I was, Mr. Speaker, to uphold the democratic principles of our country, and particularly in Saskatchewan.

The members opposite, Mr. Speaker, especially the member from Riversdale, like to talk about cynicism of the public. Mr. Speaker, the very things they are doing . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. The hon. member for Quill Lakes, I just ask you to refrain.

**Mr. Britton:** — As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite, especially the member . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. I ask the hon. member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster also to refrain.

**Mr. Britton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The NDP, Mr. Speaker, by their antics in the House, are fuelling that cynicism. Just by the antics that have been going on here for the last two weeks, Mr. Speaker, just proves they have no plan of their own. They have nothing that they contribute but stalling, criticizing the government on this side of the House with no plan of their own, Mr. Speaker.

The NDP sitting across from us today, Mr. Speaker, are in opposition and they are no different than the NDP that

was tossed out of here in 1982. The 1982 NDP lost touch with the people. They lost touch with the people; that's why they were thrown out in '82. And, Mr. Speaker, that's why those people are going to be tossed out in 1991. They have lost touch with the people. They are still out of touch with the people, Mr. Speaker. And I hear the catcalls from across, Mr. Speaker, which proves what I'm saying — no respect for democracy.

They talk about debate. Mr. Speaker, they abrogated their right to debate when they said they were not going to let that Bill pass. There's no debate. A debate is when you put your ideas on the table and I put my ideas on the table and we shake them up together and we come up with the best thing. No debate, Mr. Speaker, nothing left from that side but obstruction. I don't have the right to stand in my place, Mr. Speaker, and debate this because they won't allow it. That's what debate is all about, Mr. Speaker.

They gave up their right. They gave up the right to debate this subject. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, I'm ashamed to be in the same room with them people in a democratic society. And I'm ashamed for the people of Saskatchewan, not myself. That's what I'm saying.

It's been proven, Mr. Speaker. You listen from a quote. I'll give you a quote from the member from Rosedale, when he spoke to some people in Melville. And this appeared in the *Melville Advance*, May 15, 1991 — not so long ago — and in this article, Mr. Speaker, if you'll permit me, he said this and I quote. There are several quotes here, Mr. Speaker. And he says: This is the way we've done it in the past and this is the way we're going to do it in the future.

Mr. Speaker, what does that tell you? It tells you that they haven't any notion of any new ideas, nothing for the future. Do it like we did before. Well, Mr. Speaker, I say to those members if they do it like they did before, they'll be sitting over there for ever, and that's the place for them. They're the best opposition we could have because they have no ideas, nothing for the people, no future, no ideas.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Britton:** — That's the place for them, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in this article, he admits he has no plan, except the one from 1982: that's the way we've done it in the past; that's what we'll do in the future. And as I said before, it's a direct quote. Mr. Speaker, I don't have to go into it again.

The people of Saskatchewan didn't buy that in 1982, Mr. Speaker, and they didn't buy it in '86 and they're not going to buy it in '91. The people of Saskatchewan have had to go through some tough times, Mr. Speaker. The national economy's in recess. The provincial economy has been devastated. And there had to be some tough choices made, Mr. Speaker, tough choices. Tough times meant tough decisions.

Mr. Speaker, the member from Rosedale and his cohorts over there have fought every decision we try to make over here. They fought it all. They never had anything to contribute; they just fought it. Mr. Speaker, when decisions are tough, decisions have to be made. And we have the backbone to make those decisions.

We have a plan. We've laid out our plan, and our plan will work. And part of that plan is the harmonization of the GST.

Mr. Speaker, when I was in business, I was considered a small-business man. If this GST had been in effect when I bought the last \$200,000 of capital equipment, I would have saved nearly \$30,000. That is a fact. That is a fact, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

(1500)

**Mr. Britton:** — And they try to tell me, there is no help for small business. That is not true. I was there, Mr. Speaker.

They don't understand. They don't understand business. They don't understand creation of wealth. They don't understand anything but give it away, drag everyone down to the lowest common denominator, a pit of misery. Mr. Speaker, you know the motto of the socialist is simply this: if it's for progress, I'm against it. I'm against it if it's progress, profit, prosperity, production.

In order to understand Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, you have to live out in Saskatchewan and you have to listen. Mr. Speaker, you have to be able to understand the people, listen to what they're saying. And that's something the NDP is not capable of.

They go down to the union halls and listen to those folks. And they try to tell you that's Saskatchewan. That is not Saskatchewan. I know where Saskatchewan is. I know rural and I know urban people, Mr. Speaker.

They want power for power's sake, nothing else. They don't care about the people of Saskatchewan. They're so thirsty for power, they're just slaving over there, Mr. Speaker. And I know those words are harsh. I know that.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am telling you I am disillusioned and I am ashamed that I have to stand here day after day after day, can't represent my people because of the antics of those people over there, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I'm being a bit harsh.

Mr. Speaker, they never tell the same person the same thing. Let's take a look. Let's take a look. The member from Riversdale, he spoke to a group of farmers in Harris, Saskatchewan. He told these farmers, you've suffered enough. Well, la-di-da, he finally realized it. He said, you don't have to pay any more. Then he goes into the city and he talks to the Federation of Labour, and they lambasted him for saying that, that labour had to pay the shot. So he changes his mind. He's in a different place. Oh, he said, not you guys, no, no, not labour. Well, who does it leave?

Do you know who I think about? Business. That's all that's left. I was in business. I've got to pay it or my colleagues have to pay it. Mr. Speaker, who do they want to pay for? Their promise is business, resource sector.

Well I was involved a little bit in the resource sector, Mr. Speaker, so I know where that's coming from. They drove

it out. In this city, the company that I worked for closed down the refinery, took 480 jobs out of this city and went to Edmonton, Alberta, and built a refinery. And they built a fertilizer plant because they were afraid that this government was going to take them over. That's right, that's what they did, and I know that.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in my budget address, the list of promises that they have made are long and expensive. An NDP government today would hand the taxpayers of Saskatchewan another bill of \$3 billion. That's what they'd hand you and me, Mr. Speaker.

I can't stand that. My business colleagues can't stand that. My farming son-in-law can't stand that. My business man son-in-law can't stand it. My labourer son-in-law can't stand that. I know, I've got the whole spectrum in my family. I know what I'm talking about.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the members: where are they going to get their money? Are they going to get it from the seniors — they're going to reinstate the inheritance tax? Mr. Speaker, I worked for 32 years trying to build up a little nest-egg for my wife and myself and hopefully something to pass on to the kids if they need it.

Are they going to take that away from me now? Is that where the money's going to come from? Are they going to chase the oil industry out of this country? Ask those people out in my constituency in the RM (rural municipality) of Senlac, did they drive the oil company out of there? What's holding their mill rate down? — the resources they get from the oil companies, Mr. Speaker. They're going to drive them out again?

Well, Mr. Speaker, if there's anything that made me determined to stay in this House, on this side of the House, and keep them out, it's because of their tactics they're using today.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Britton:** — Mr. Speaker, I will not be defeated on this side of the House by that crazy stuff that's going on over there.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order. I understand and appreciate the hon. member has strong feelings on the issue he's discussing, however he should try to temper his remarks in the last couple of words he just said.

**Mr. Britton:** — Mr. Speaker, I apologize to you, sir, but I am upset. And, Mr. Speaker, I believe I have a right to be upset. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to continue.

I have a copy of an article, Mr. Speaker, where three of the NDP members stated that they would increase taxes on the resource sector. They would use the resource sector as a cash cow. The very same article, Mr. Speaker, two other members including the member from Riversdale said a government would co-operate.

Well what does that mean? Does that mean they'll co-operate with the other three members to milk the cow? Or does that mean that, Mr. Speaker, they're going to co-operate with the resource sector? I can tell you the

resource sector don't trust them. They don't trust them, Mr. Speaker, and neither do I.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask you, which one is it? Which decision is it? Which group of those members are deceiving this House, deceiving the province of Saskatchewan? Mr. Speaker, the people that work in the oil industry, they know what's going on. They can see through all the smoke and mirrors and they can see the truth.

The NDP are the same, Mr. Speaker, as they always have been. They have no vision and indeed they have no future. The people of this province will not be fooled, Mr. Speaker, by the travelling road show sitting across the floor, Mr. Speaker. The people of Saskatchewan want and deserve more than that.

We have spent long and hard hours diversifying this province; \$700 million more money in diversification, in industrial spending, in this province than when they were in power — 700 million.

**Some Hon. Member:** — Where does all the money go?

**Mr. Britton:** — Where does all the money go? There's a question, Mr. Speaker. Where does the money go? I'll tell you where some of the money went.

Mr. Speaker, we have four programs, and I'll leave the rest to my colleagues — interest protection, interest reduction plan, farmers oil royalty refund, and fuel tax. In my constituency, the constituency of Wilkie, we had a total of \$4,145,297.96. That's what they got. That's where some of the money went. Mr. Speaker, the total provincial protection and help to those people was \$323,712,626.48. That's where some of the money went.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that's waste and mismanagement, I plead guilty. I plead guilty, Mr. Speaker. If you're going to tell me and they're going to tell me that . . .

Mr. Speaker, could I read the motion.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member from Shaunavon, pursuant to rule 16:

That this Assembly condemn the Opposition for holding the public of Saskatchewan hostage by exploiting the democratic process for their own selfish political gain and refusing to address issues of great importance to the future of our province during times of economic hardship and uncertainty caused by low commodity prices, drought, international subsidy wars, and high interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to present this motion to you. Thank you very much.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gleim:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure to be able to second the motion from the member from Wilkie today. It gives me great honour.

Mr. Speaker, in this day of age you wouldn't think it would be necessary to bring a motion such as this, as my colleague from Wilkie has presented to this legislature . . . is one of the most respected democracies of the world. The one, I guess, which we will all take part in, the one our fathers, mothers, friends, relatives, grandfathers have fought many, many times for.

In times, I guess when we're being born around this world, you wouldn't think it would be necessary to second a motion that condemns an opposition party for using cheap, political tactics to halt the operation of this legislature, Mr. Speaker. But then again we are dealing with an opposition, I guess you might say, that is holier-than-thou attitude, an opposition that is truly concerned for their political future because it has no plan for the province and in the future.

So to compensate they have to stoop to extremely low levels, exploiting the political workings of the House for their own gain. I guess now, Mr. Speaker, you could just write their tactics off as using the rules of the House to an exaggerated state, a state which they were not intended to be used for. But in times when it is extremely important to carry on with the business of the province, it does not serve the public's interest to write it off as that.

We in this province, and especially those of us here in this legislature, have a duty to perform and I guess perform the business of this province. We are not elected to exploit the political process simply because we have greed for power. And that's exactly what those people across the way . . . just greed for power. And, Mr. Speaker, that is what the members across the floor are doing when they filibuster, propose debates, and walk out of the House at the drop of a hat.

I can't imagine any of those people — and I don't think any of them have across the way — have ever sat on a board or a town council or an RM council because if they didn't get their way, walk out of the council meeting. You don't do that out there, Mr. Speaker. I don't know why you should be able to get away with it in here.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gleim:** — And well, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to inform the members opposite that this is not going to work. If that's what they call their plan, is to sit across and erupt and House and disrupt the proceedings of this House, if that's the kind of plan they got, good luck to them.

The public of Saskatchewan can see through their political gains, Mr. Speaker, and quite frankly they are tired of it. They are the people in this province who are hurting severely from depressed commodity prices. They are the people in the province who are hurting because of drought. They are the people in this province hurting because tough economic times our country is in, has required every one to tighten their belts.

And, Mr. Speaker, there are people hurting in this province because they have an opposition that refuses to deal with the issues and have no plan for the future to stabilize growth and the development of this province.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is visually important that the government get on with their plans to stabilize rural and urban Saskatchewan. When you talk about rural and urban, they don't know what rural and urban is even all about. With no rural, Mr. Speaker, there would be no urban. Because without a rural population out there, rural growth out there, Mr. Speaker, you would have no hospitals, you would have no schools, you would have no recreation.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, we have teams in recreation in the winter-time come out from the city of Regina, come out from the city of Saskatoon, Swift Current, Weyburn, Estevan, come down to the far south-west on a weekend for hockey tournaments, because they don't have the opportunity to play at a decent time in the city of Regina and Saskatoon. So they come out and take the weekend off with their family. What is so wrong with that? But without a rural, Mr. Speaker, you would not have that.

I guess the importance is too magnified because the opposition just lacks that plan.

And we talk about rural, Mr. Speaker. I just want to bring across to the people opposite across the way, that there's over 50,000 producers have signed up to the new GRIP program, Mr. Speaker, which is rural Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. And I'm proud of that, Mr. Speaker. We must protect our farmers' communities and our health and education system here.

I just heard somebody across there say, blackmail. That member across the way that said blackmail, don't even know what farming is all about. He hasn't got a clue what it costs to put an acre of wheat in the ground, Mr. Speaker. I know he hasn't, or he wouldn't have made a statement like that.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

(1515)

**Mr. Gleim:** — But I have to apologize for him because he don't know the difference, Mr. Speaker. And that's what I said, it takes money to do all that, Mr. Speaker. To pay for their protection, protection that is so badly needed, we must make difficult fiscal decisions, Mr. Speaker. We have made those difficult decisions and we have stood by them, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to say one more thing about another member across the way. I heard him chuckling here just a bit ago, and it's the same fellow that warned the chamber of commerce out there. He warned our little . . . our rural chamber of commerce out there, you better or you will pay for it, Mr. Speaker. And I just want to remind him of that, Mr. Speaker. I belong to the chamber of commerce. I was the president of the chamber of commerce for two years and I went to many chamber's meetings, Mr. Speaker. I'd have liked to have heard somebody come into our chamber meeting and made a remark like that, Mr. Speaker.

You can be very proud of it, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member for Battlefords, if he don't

remember his own constituency, I'll remind him. It won't be for long, it won't be the member from . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order. Order, order. I ask the hon. member not to refer to the presence of members. Order, order, order. Order, order, order. Order, order, order. I fully realize that members can do this without any intention of doing it, but I must bring it to your attention.

**Mr. Gleim:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I guess decisions that consider what is best for the province may not always be the best for politics, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to say something about the opposition again, Mr. Speaker. What does opposition mean? Does that mean you oppose everything that somebody tries to do, that people try to do for the interests of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker? What does it really mean, Mr. Speaker? Does it mean that it's the best for the political interests that hold this legislature as a hostage? Is that what the opposition is supposed to do, Mr. Speaker, prevent passage because they don't like something that wasn't proposed to them? There's nothing wrong with opposing something if you have an alternative. But I have not heard an alternative over there.

I heard and I read, which I have right here, from the member from Riversdale, the opposition member or the Leader of the Opposition, as saying in the press this morning that they have a plan. Well I read through it and it says nothing about a plan, Mr. Speaker. And if anybody can show me there's a plan in there, I wish . . . I'll take him aside; I'll take the time if you can explain it to me. But I did not see a plan and everybody else that read it did not see a plan in there either.

And I guess they feel it's to their political interest, Mr. Speaker. It is in the best interests of this province. We know that, Mr. Speaker; we know that because the opposition has no idea what is good for this province. They only know what is good for themselves.

We have heard them for the past week crying about the lack of opportunity to debate government business. Now, Mr. Speaker, you and I know that's simply not the case. Last Tuesday they refused to do government business. They simply didn't want to take part in the governance of this province. They've had numerous opportunities in question period to debate. They've had five to six weeks, Mr. Speaker, to debate this Bill, Mr. Speaker. They have not. They do not want to debate it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, they've had the opportunity to present arguments. But rather they have chose to filibuster, call quorum. Is that what you call keeping this House in order? And have walked out to prevent debate, Mr. Speaker.

They have said that we don't have a mandate, Mr. Speaker. We were elected, Mr. Speaker, to run this . . . we have a mandate. We were elected, and until the day the election is called . . . that's when we don't have a mandate — after that, Mr. Speaker. Until that day we are here to govern, and we are governing.

They forfeited there because they have no thoughts or plan for this province, physical or otherwise. We have heard a lot of different positions from the members opposite, but never any policy or plan. One day the member from Riversdale says one thing — and I guess we've repeated that many times, but I'll repeat it again — he says one thing one day, checks the weather the next day, and says something else, Mr. Speaker.

I don't feel that's a plan, Mr. Speaker, because you never know which way the wind is going to blow the next day, and it is tough to make decisions on which way that's going to go. And I feel, Mr. Speaker, for their own selfish political gain, that's what they're doing. They are down-playing the significance of their actions because they don't understand the gravity and urgency of the crisis facing rural Saskatchewan. They don't understand the ties that just exist between rural and urban. And I guess you must say, they just don't understand.

Mr. Speaker, in the light of the fact that the basic principles of democracy are being sacrificed, because they feel the only way they can build support for their party . . . my question is to you, Mr. Speaker, is that the right reason? Is it good enough to do what they are doing simply because they feel it would win them political support? Do they really think the people of this province are naive? Well, Mr. Speaker, they have given us reason in the past week for their actions in this House, by their constant flip-flop and by their lack of a plan, that they do think the people are naive.

They have given indications that the only thing they really want is power and that they don't care how they get it. And they don't care what they sacrifice or what they do to destroy it. And they don't care that agriculture needs financial assistance, Mr. Speaker. And they don't care about the financial shape of this province. They are playing political games with the people of this province, Mr. Speaker, and they are going to lose on account of that.

And at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I feel it's very, very . . . it's a sad situation that we have to sit in this House, Mr. Speaker, and take up good time, Mr. Speaker. The people of us that do have a business back home and that have farms or have a small business, have to sit here and somebody during the day . . . Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure to second that motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. At the conclusion of my remarks I am going to move a motion which will amend the resolution in the following way:

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

(that this Assembly) condemns the government for its unprecedented, unjustifiable and unacceptable attempts to limit debate on the provincial GST Bill and force the passage of this massive and unpopular tax increase in the dying days of the government's mandate.

Mr. Speaker, it is worthwhile recalling what has gone on so far in this so-called debate on Bill 61, the provincial PST. It is worth our while to remember that only three people have spoken on it — none of them at any sort of inordinate length.

Mr. Speaker, the member from Wilkie said that he hasn't had an opportunity to speak on it. That's quite right. Nor will he. Due to the action of the Government House Leader, it is unlikely that the member from Wilkie will have an opportunity to speak on it, nor will the member from Thunder Creek or the member from Rosthern or the member from Melville or the member from Moose Jaw South or the member from Moose Jaw North, etc. None of those members will have an opportunity to speak on the debate.

Mr. Speaker, it's worthwhile remembering as well that not once was the debate on that Bill ever adjourned. Only three people spoke on it, and the debate was never adjourned. It was before this Assembly on only two different days.

Mr. Speaker, one might argue about the use of closure. The custom of this . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well I trust the member from Rosthern will get up and explain to the Assembly how my nose is growing . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order. Order, order. The hon. member for Regina Centre has referred to the presence of a member, and I simply bring that to his attention.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Speaker, I simply point out that I was simply reciting the amount of time spent on this Bill, which has really been very little.

One might argue, Mr. Speaker, about the use of closure. The custom of this House was not to use closure — to allow debate to continue until the members felt the subject had been dealt with extensively and sometimes dealt with exhaustively.

It's worthwhile recalling, Mr. Speaker, that at the time the Bill was brought before this Assembly to nationalize the potash industry, that debate went on for over seven weeks of non-stop debate, day after day. While there were those who felt that the subject was not only extensively debated but exhaustively debated, nevertheless the right of the opposition members was never interfered with.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, if closure wasn't necessary to pass the Bill which expropriated the potash mine, it should not have been necessary to pass the Bill to sell the potash mine.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill before the Assembly now did not go on for seven weeks or even for seven days. There were three people who spoke and never once was the Bill adjourned. While we might argue about the use of closure, certainly in this case its use was premature. By any rational standard, by the standards of any government but this, by any sense of fair play, closure in this case was premature, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, one has to wonder why members opposite were so quick to want to terminate the debate. It may well have been, Mr. Speaker, that their primary motivation was that they knew the public sentiment, knew the public are adamantly opposed to them and wanted to terminate the debate, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, terminate the focus of the public anger. I think that's really what they were trying to do. They were trying to extinguish the focus of public anger with respect to this tax Bill. That could be the only explanation for the unusually short debate allowed.

Mr. Speaker, I think one can argue generally with respect to closure. A closure itself has been used to impair the effectiveness of the legislatures. In its annual year-end sounding of the state of public opinion in Canada, the editors of **Maclean's** magazine made a comment, Mr. Speaker, that in Canada many people feel we have an elected dictatorship. Governments are elected and then for four years do whatever they want.

That state of affairs, Mr. Speaker, has come about because legislatures have been emasculated in their effectiveness. Heretofore, it is no longer possible for legislatures to say no to a government; a government did whatever it wanted.

And one of the reasons why legislatures are no longer thought of by Canadians as a effective expression of their view is because if the opposition are opposed to a Bill and have the public support, what does the government do? Does it listen? Just ends the debate.

The use of closure is contrary to the best interest and the best functioning of a legislature. And the growth of the use of closure had been paralleled by the decline in the influence of parliaments and legislatures in Canada. Mr. Speaker, the members opposite say that that's nonsense. It is not nonsense.

Two decades ago closure was rarely used. It was used for the first time in a long time in the House of Commons in the pipeline debate. It was used by the then member of parliament from Prince Albert, John Diefenbaker. He used it as an argument for defeating the St. Laurent government, and they were defeated.

Now, Mr. Speaker, closures become routine in the House of Commons. And with the use of closure has gone the decline in the effectiveness of the House of Commons as an expression of public will. Closure, Mr. Speaker, has had the effect of robbing legislatures of their influence and effectiveness.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it may not be possible for us to change that; to create in the legislature of Saskatchewan an expression of public anger. And there can be no question by anyone that the public are very angry about Bill 61.

It may not be possible for us to create in this legislature an adequate expression of public anger, but that's what we're attempting to do. With the petitions, with the adjournments, we are attempting in the only means which has been left to us, to give expression to public anger with Bill 61. That's all that's left to us because of closure.

If the government is unhappy with the petitions and the adjournments, then all they've got to do is lift the closure motion and those tactics will come to an abrupt halt. Those tactics have been used because it is all that's left to the opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I know time is running on, and not having the advantage of seeing the clock, I'm going to move, seconded by the member from Prince Albert:

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

condemns the government for its unprecedented, unjustifiable and unacceptable attempts to limit debate on the provincial GST Bill and force the passage of this massive and unpopular tax increase in the dying days of the government's mandate.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

(1530)

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Mr. Speaker, it's indeed a pleasure to second the motion of the member from Regina Centre today, Mr. Speaker, because this topic of the PST is the uppermost topic in people's minds this day. And it's very important that it be given and this legislature be given full opportunity to debate it without any restriction so that the complete and thorough opinions of people in Saskatchewan can be voiced through their elected representatives.

The government intention, indicated to us a week ago, that they wished to close debate, to limit the time of the debate on this motion, is in itself an affront to democracy, an affront to the right of members to speak as long as they feel that the public wants them to speak and wants representation on a particular topic.

In view of the fact that the government has brought forward, or has proposed to bring forward this time allocation motion, we in the opposition have taken it upon ourselves to resist the passing and prevent the passing of this tax to the extent that we are able on the behalf of the people of Saskatchewan by going through procedural, accepted procedural . . . using accepted procedural items in the hope that the government opposite will eventually get the story straight; that they will realize that this tax is opposed by 80 per cent of the people in Saskatchewan, and will reverse their decision.

This tax is completely unfair to the people of Saskatchewan. And this tax will wreak, and is already wreaking havoc with the economy of Saskatchewan.

The members opposite say, well we should let it go. They don't quite understand that the duty of the opposition, that it is the duty of the opposition to point out — in fact the member was asking — to point out an alternative. And that's exactly what we're saying. The alternative is not to impose this tax.

But the members in government seem to be hidebound. They've got their blinders on. There's all type of evidence around, all type of evidence around that the people of Saskatchewan do not need this tax.

The member further asks the question, what would you do? I wonder if the member has ever occurred to ask his government members the question of can we figure out a better way of spending the money that we are already receiving from the people of Saskatchewan? Can we ever figure out a better way of managing? But no, they just keep going back for more and more taxes. They came back for taxes through the lottery scheme and failed there, Mr. Speaker. They came back for more taxes through the used car tax, and they failed there.

And now they've got this new tactic, this new tax that they put on. That's the addition of the PST, the provincial PST. That's after tax increases in gasoline, that's after tax increases from 5 per cent level to the 7 per cent level, which was a broken promise.

Mr. Speaker, this province is now collecting somewhere between 4.4 and \$4.8 billion to the treasury of Saskatchewan — this government is collecting. I say they've got to learn to live within their means. Every one of us here has to learn to live within our means.

And what are they doing? They're spending another 20 per cent. Using that technique without asking themselves a question — how can we spend our money better? how can we stop the waste and mismanagement? Instead of asking that question, they're trying to push through another tax.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that my leader has today in the city of Saskatoon made an announcement, and I want to read to you and into the record briefly the main thrust of his announcement. It's two paragraphs, Mr. Speaker; I hope to indulge the House on that. Mr. Speaker, the member from Riversdale, the Leader of the New Democratic Party today in Saskatoon made the announcement that, and I quote:

Our goal is still to prevent the expanded PST from becoming law before the next provincial election. We will continue to fight in the Legislature as long as we can.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to continue to fight in the legislature as long as we can. It is our objective through extended debate, through question period, through petition, to make an impression on the government members that it is still not too late; they can withdraw the tax. They can withdraw it any time. We will give them leave to withdraw that tax Bill at any time. They can withdraw it and save the economy of the people of Saskatchewan and save the people of Saskatchewan from an unfair tax.

Mr. Speaker, for the record, I think it ought to be noted that for four days running now, while we have prevented this tax Bill from coming before the legislature and the closure being imposed on it and time allocation being imposed on it, we have written and indicated to the government members that we are now, in the opposition,

at any time prepared to proceed to government business on any government day. We are prepared to go to any other piece of government business, whether it be estimates, any Bills they may have to put forward — any other Bill, but not the PST.

Why, Mr. Speaker? Because the people of Saskatchewan have been taxed to death. They have told us to stand up and oppose this tax, and we will do so, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a few other comments I would like to make with respect to this tax which is being imposed upon us.

I want to talk very briefly, Mr. Speaker, about the impact of the tax on the economy of Saskatchewan. And I will try to simplify this, Mr. Speaker, in order to make an argument about how this tax is going to hurt the economy of Saskatchewan.

If I divide the economy of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, into two portions: agriculture, primary industry and manufacturing sector, that would be the one sector; and then the other sector would be the service sector, which includes construction, transportation, communications, utilities, finance, insurance and real estate, various kinds of services, and public administration.

Mr. Speaker, those sectors that I mention in the latter case provide by far the bulk of the jobs in Saskatchewan — 73 per cent of the jobs in Saskatchewan. Our closest estimate would be 329,000 jobs in Saskatchewan come from the service sector, compared to 38,000 from agriculture, primary industries, and manufacturing. So, Mr. Speaker, by far the bulk of the jobs in Saskatchewan come from what I would label in the broad sense as the service sector.

The effect of this tax will be borne largely by those people that are in the service sector. In fact, the people in construction and transportation are protesting all over. People in restaurants are the ones that are the most advocate opponents to this tax. People in finance, real estate, who will be having to charge an additional service charge, are the ones that are going to be feeling the brunt of this because the money is being extracted from the economy. People in retail business will not have the money coming into their stores.

So while the sectors, the agricultural sector, the primary industry, and the manufacturing sector will not be affected as greatly by the tax — hardly, if any, in this particular case because they will have the business write-offs — those industries, the bulk of the industries in Saskatchewan, the ones that produce the 329,000 jobs will be affected adversely.

So if you take and compare these two now as to what's going to happen to the jobs in each case, a very interesting scenario emerges, Mr. Speaker. If you take one and a half per cent of an increase in jobs in the primary industry and in the manufacturing industry . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Time has elapsed.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hopfner:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I guess probably my opening statement would be that it's too bad that we have to be speaking to such a motion here in the legislature this afternoon. And I agree with the member from Wilkie when he made his opening remarks in regards to the hijacking that has been taking place once again in the Assembly.

I want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that the member from Regina Centre had indicated that members of the government side would not be speaking in regards to the PST Bill that's before this Assembly, even if they did agree to move to debating it. I'd indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that I as one member and the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster have already taken the liberty to speak on behalf of that Bill. And I had a good opportunity to have some input on behalf of my constituency in my riding in this legislature.

I, Mr. Speaker, would love to get on with the workings of this House. I believe that, as the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster, that my probably privilege has been kind of taken from me in some form of matter. I would like to say that I've always had the feeling that this forum was a forum where all members of this Assembly would have an equal opportunity to express what their constituents were telling them or what the particular members had on their mind.

I would like to, Mr. Speaker, say that I've not had that opportunity for the last several days now because of the gerrymandering and the striking attitude of the radical NDP members. And I ask them to give me my privilege back and allow me to start dealing with this Bill, so that I too may ask questions of the Bill, so that my constituents will once again be able to get a better understanding and explanation of the Bill, other than what the members opposite are trying to give to the public.

(1545)

I'd like to indicate to you, sir, that the Opposition Leader in Saskatoon had indicated that he was going to repeal the PST. And, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to indicate . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well the member says we won't get an opportunity to use it. Well I would ask the members opposite then, with their explanation to the public of Saskatchewan, what their plan is. Because once again, Mr. Speaker, we've had one great, great display in front of the media, one big show from the NDP opposition as to what they're going to do.

They're going to repeal the tax, but what's that going to mean to the public of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker? I'm going to tell you what it's going to mean to the public of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. It's going to mean higher income taxes to the public of Saskatchewan, something in the neighbourhood of around 15 per cent. It's going to mean . . . And that's just a quick analysis; it could be even higher. And I want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that it's not only in income tax, it's going to be also a higher increase of the gasoline tax. And so what's it going to be, another 5 cents or 10 cents a litre in the province of

Saskatchewan?

I want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that if you go to Ontario, Ontario has got one of the highest gasoline taxes across Canada. We have the second lowest in the country here in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. We are approximately 1 cent lower than . . . or higher than what they are in Alberta, and the province of Alberta is the lowest of all gasoline tax in the province of Saskatchewan.

These are the kinds of things, Mr. Speaker, that are going to have a great impact and effect on the public of this province if an NDP administration was ever again elected in the province of Saskatchewan.

I want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP have taken away my privilege of being able to talk to the people of Saskatchewan about what the PST is actually going to mean for them — the benefits that the PST will mean for them.

I would like to talk to the people of Saskatchewan and ask the minister here about these kinds of exemptions that are going to be taking place. I want to know about the exemptions of the basic groceries and the prescription drug plan. I want to know about the exemptions between the medical devices and agricultural products.

I want to also say, Mr. Speaker, that members of the NDP opposition on the last . . . I would say it was probably the last 30 days at least of this session, have not asked one agricultural question in this Assembly. They haven't got any idea of what is affecting agriculture, Mr. Speaker. We have a GRIP and NISA program that we are responsible for. We have a mandate to bring this program in for the farming community in this province. And, Mr. Speaker, it's a security program for the farmers. Farmers — 55,000-plus farmers have signed up for this program, Mr. Speaker.

And I want to indicate to you, sir, that members of the opposition, the NDP, are not allowing us to get on with the business. They're not allowing us to get past Bill 61 in this Assembly so that we can pass that GRIP and NISA program. I'm telling you, Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP know that if they were right they would have been out of this legislature on strike and we wouldn't have seen them back in here. Mr. Speaker, they're looking for a way to get back in here to deal with Bill 61. That's what it is. They're looking for a way.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hopfner:** — But I'll tell you what happened, Mr. Speaker. Members of the NDP opposition have just backed themselves a little bit in the corner on this one. I have had petitions handed to me asking for the NDP to come back into this Assembly and get on with the business of this Assembly.

And I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, those members would not pay attention to it. And I've explained to the folks that I'll hang on to those petitions a little bit longer and that maybe one day there will be many of us having to stand in this Assembly and present petitions from the public of



Saskatchewan, telling those folks to get back to work.

They are wasting the time . . . the Clerks, the costs of this Assembly, to run this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, is \$20,000-plus a day, and what do they do? What do they do? They walk out of this Assembly like \$20,000 a day was nothing — absolutely nothing.

Mr. Speaker, that takes away my privilege; that takes away everybody's privilege; that takes away the privilege of all people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again tell you as well, I've heard the heckling of members opposite when they've talked about . . . when they've made the motion, they say, well this Assembly is for the protection of the minority. Well, Mr. Speaker, what about the majority? What about both? They both have a right for an explanation. They both a right for an explanation of what Bill 61 means.

And, Mr. Speaker, once the people on the negative side sees what Bill 61 means for them, they might just tend to want to agree with what Bill 61 is all about, once they see the benefits — once they see the benefits, Mr. Speaker, the benefits that the NDP are misleading the public with. The NDP aren't out there telling what Bill 61 will do. They're out there . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Name the benefits.

**Mr. Hopfner:** — Well the member opposite from Quill Lake says that I should name some of the benefits. Well, Mr. Speaker, for the first time . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Name one benefit.

**Mr. Hopfner:** — Well I'll name one. For the first time in my life, as a restaurateur and a hotelier, I get a portion of my input credits finally back. Seven per cent of what I've had to pay on tax in the province of this . . . in the province of Saskatchewan, I finally get a little bit of it back.

Well I've never gotten that back before, Mr. Speaker, and members of the NDP rightfully know that. They rightfully know that, and they know that every other business man across this province never got even a little bit back under their government when they were in. Mr. Speaker . . .

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order. The member's time has elapsed.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hagel:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, I've listened to this debate with some interest. And I am particularly interested in the remarks of the member who just spoke previously. He made a bit of a vociferous presentation in this House here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, and he puts on a brave face.

But we know in this Assembly, and his constituents know, that that brave face is not consistent with his private opinion within his own caucus or within his own constituency. Because that member knows what the impact of the provincial GST will be in the province of Saskatchewan. And he asked the question — a very valid

question, Mr. Speaker — he says, what will the New Democratic Party do if the people of Saskatchewan give us a mandate, a mandate to govern?

And I'll tell him and I'll tell the people of Saskatchewan. I'll tell the members of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, a New Democratic Party government will stand firm behind constituents in border communities, will stand firm behind young people who are looking for employment, will stand firm behind those people in Saskatchewan who are saying that they are taxed to the limit with right wing PC (Progressive Conservative) taxes. A New Democratic government, Mr. Speaker, will stand firm with the people of Saskatchewan who want some hope for the future of our province.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hagel:** — I find it interesting, Mr. Speaker, that the members opposite talk about mandate. It seems to me that there are two ways of getting a mandate if you're a political party that wants to govern.

One, you get a mandate in an election to serve for four years. That's the strong tradition in Saskatchewan — four-year mandate.

**An Hon. Member:** — Or five.

**Mr. Hagel:** — Oh they say five. They say five. We know by the Canadian constitution, that when you go five years, if you go five years, the Lieutenant Governor will drag you kicking and screaming for your day of reckoning with the people of Saskatchewan. We know that.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hagel:** — But we know as well that the history of our province, Mr. Speaker, the history of our province is a four-year mandate. It's a four-year mandate. They know that. That's the history.

And there's another way of getting a mandate, Mr. Speaker. The second way is to make commitments in an election. So what have we got, Mr. Speaker? We have a government opposite that is in the seventh month of the fifth year of its four-year mandate, attempting to ram through the biggest single tax increase in the history of the province.

And we know as well, Mr. Speaker, that sitting opposite are a group of individuals who have promised . . . what have they promised the people of Saskatchewan? They said that they would lower income tax by 10 per cent. Did they lower it by 10 per cent? No. No, they got a flat tax now — 2 per cent on gross income.

They promised the people of Saskatchewan that they would completely eliminate the sales tax. Did they do that, Mr. Speaker? No. They moved it from 5 per cent to 7 per cent and then, in this Bill that they are attempting to ram through the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, they are moving to apply that 7 per cent to every good and service in this province.

And so I say, Mr. Speaker, they have no mandate. And

now, Mr. Speaker, they come before this Assembly to condemn, they say, the official opposition for holding up this biggest tax grab in Saskatchewan history, for which they have no mandate. And they suggest that they are justified in using closure, in cutting off debate after only three opposition members have had a chance to speak on two different days of debate.

Mr. Speaker, there are people — in fact the majority of people in this world in which we live — the majority of people in this world in which we live would give, in many cases, would give their lives to have a democratic assembly where people express their differences of opinion and express their oppositions of ideas through the expression of words — of words. Because the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the fact of matter is in the majority of countries in this world, there are not democracies. And far too frequently in this world in which we live, opposition is expressed not with words but with bullets.

And, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's extreme to bring that to the attention of the member opposite. He looks with a mystified look all over his face. The consequence, Mr. Member, and I say to the government members, when you move to take away the ability of elected members to use words — words! — you're afraid of words, is what you're afraid of, words that represent the democratic will of the majority of Saskatchewan people.

You say, we can't stand words. We're going to have to cut off your ability to debate, to bring words. And the consequence, you know, in a society in which words no longer serve to express the will of the people, is that increasingly violence becomes a way of expressing the opposition of the people. And I deplore — I deplore — the actions of this government, of these members, in moving this Assembly in that direction.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I stand here in support of the opposition amendment to this motion, the amendment which says that this Assembly condemns the government for its unprecedented . . . never before in the history of Saskatchewan has closure been used on a tax Bill — unprecedented. Yet another PC first, yet another PC first for which they somehow feel proud.

Condemns the government for its unprecedented, unjustifiable and unacceptable . . . “unacceptable” clearly demonstrated by the fact that over 60,000 Saskatchewan residents have had their opinion in opposition to the provincial GST and asking for them to seek a mandate in a provincial election — over 60,000 Saskatchewan residents have petitioned this Legislative Assembly, and saying stop the tax and call an election.

This Assembly:

condemns the government for its unprecedented, unjustifiable and unacceptable attempts to limit debate on the provincial GST Bill and force the passage of this massive and unpopular tax increase in the dying days of the government's mandate.

But I want to say as well, Mr. Speaker, that I oppose this

motion today because I oppose the impact of their proposed provincial GST. They say this provincial GST is going to produce 5,000 new jobs because of the 7 per cent PST they say.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if that's true, if it's true that they can produce 5,000 new jobs with a 7 per cent PST, why not produce 10,000 new jobs with a 14 per cent PST? Or why not go whole hog and give us a 70 per cent PST and produce 50,000 new jobs? And I say, Mr. Speaker, that is obviously a silly argument. It's obviously a silly argument. But it's silly because of the basis on which it starts.

(1600)

And what do these folks say here? They say that it's based on the forecasts of the federal GST, from their Tory friends in Ottawa, forecast that history has proven to be blatantly false.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the alternative was produced today by the Leader of the Opposition in Saskatoon. A paper was produced today and released to the public, endorsed by several credible parties outside of the New Democratic Party, which admits that in the manufacturing and other primary industry sector, the provincial PST has the potential to produce 716 new jobs over a five-year period.

But also, Mr. Speaker, which recognizes that in the domestic sector, made up of construction, transportation, communications, trade, finance, insurance and real estate, service and public administration, that over the next five years, as a result of the proposed provincial GST, there would be the direct loss of 7,500 jobs. Seventy-five hundred jobs lost to Saskatchewan people because of their proposed provincial GST.

And I say on behalf of my constituents, when I go door to door in my constituency and when we receive petitions on this side of the House from all across the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan understand economics more than these folks opposite. They understand the provincial GST means jobs lost and a blow to the economy.

And so therefore I stand, Mr. Speaker, I stand with my constituents who want fair taxation, who want job stimulus, not job deterrent; who want democratic debate in this their Legislative Assembly, and who want the opportunity to give a mandate to a Saskatchewan government to govern truly in the interest of the people of Saskatchewan.

I stand in support of the amendment and opposed to the resolution proposed by the PC government of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Why is the member on his feet?

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would ask for leave to introduce guests.

Leave granted.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to this Assembly, 22 grade 8 students seated in your gallery. They are grade 8 students from Ituna High School in Melville constituency. They are here touring the Assembly today. I would ask all members to welcome them here and wish them an interesting and educational stay.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

## MOTION UNDER RULE 16 (continued)

**Hon. Mr. Gerich:** — Mr. Speaker, thank you. I would like to speak in favour of the motion, to bring it back to the attention of some of the members that were out of the House. And I would like to read it to the Assembly:

That this Assembly condemn the opposition for holding the public of Saskatchewan hostage by exploiting the democratic process for their own selfish political gain and refusing to address issues of great importance to the future of our province during times of economic hardship and uncertainty caused by low commodity prices, drought, international subsidy wars, and high interest rates.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the statements made by some of my previous government colleagues. And I'd like to read to you, to remind my colleagues, the motion that they have brought forth to the Assembly:

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

condemns the government for its unprecedented, and unjustifiable and unacceptable attempts to limit debate on the provincial GST tax, or GST Bill and force the passage of this massive and unpopular tax increase in the dying days of the government's mandate.

I find that just appalling, Mr. Deputy Speaker, appalling. It's just very unacceptable, and I'd like to quote out of the *Moose Jaw Times-Herald*, April 11, 1991. This is a quote: Mr. Bob Lyons has stood up and said he's proud to be a radical and has pledged to make this province ungovernable, Mr. Speaker. It's just shameful how the opposition carries on.

Another quote I'd like to bring forward, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on stalling: This just proves the NDP doesn't have the strong passion and argument it claims to have against the Bill. It clearly demonstrates that they cannot produce a rational or logical arguments. In effect, they have done . . . to limit the debate themselves, Mr. Speaker.

Another quote from the *Saskatoon Star-Phoenix*, March 15, 1991: The New Democrats have vowed to use every procedural trick in the book including walking out of the legislature to block the motion for time allocation.

Another quote, Mr. Deputy Speaker, *Saskatoon Star-Phoenix*, May 17, 1991:

Lingenfelter says he still has some goodies left in his bag of procedural tricks.

That's just terrible.

We get down to the *Leader-Post*, May 11, 1991, Mr. Speaker:

Strangely Thursday afternoon, NDP MLAs that had been so bitterly complaining about a lack of opportunity to debate the PST Bill quietly began slipping out of the assembly while debate was in progress (to call quorum).

And then they talk about their opportunity . . . that it's been an unacceptable . . . unacceptable that we're . . . its unjustifiable and unacceptable attempts to limit debate.

Well that's a farce, Mr. Speaker. I think that the government has gone out of its road to present time to anybody that wants to debate the motion at hand. I can say about the NDP, Mr. Speaker, they will get pointless, wasteful ways of stalling tactics, to be done to score any of their political points. The NDP will say or do anything to get elected. And they only think of the citizens of this province when they can use them for any political issue that motivates whatever they have. The NDP members across the floor are using the people of Saskatchewan as pawns in their silly little political games. Life in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, is not a game. In the last 10 years it's . . . at the best, we have a terrible economy. You can see it in everywhere where you go, in Maidstone or Canora or even Regina.

In the last 10 years it's been proven that when times are tough on the farm, they're tough all over. And the NDP don't understand that. When the farmers are facing the high interest rate and they asked the NDP government for help at that time, the member from Riversdale, the deputy premier at that time, told the people of Saskatchewan, no. He said no to helping the farmers. He said no to helping small business. He said no to the seniors in the province when they placed a moratorium on nursing beds. And ever since we came to power in 1982, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we've built more than 1,000 nursing beds throughout the province.

The member from Riversdale has also said no, and no to the people of Saskatchewan when time comes . . . As I mentioned earlier in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has gone through some tough economic times, tough times and real tough decisions. Through these despicable antics of the NDP in this legislature, Mr. Speaker, many of these tough and necessary choices cannot be made.

One of the decisions I'm speaking of, Mr. Speaker, was the choice of harmonization with the federal GST. Mr. Speaker, these changes will benefit Saskatchewan. The federal GST is not going to go away. We had to find the best possible way to deal with it — the best possible way for our low income families, our rural families, and people in small businesses, and everyone in

Saskatchewan.

The member for Riversdale has said he would drop the harmonized tax, Mr. Speaker. How will he pay for GRIP and NISA if he does this? Is he going to tear up the agreement with the federal government? Has he promised to do that? Does he want to let our farmers go bankrupt? Well he says he's going to get the money through some spending cuts.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when the member starts talking about spending cuts you have to be very careful because his figures can't be trusted. They just grab their figures right out of the air and then present them, even if they're not right.

For example, he said in the past that eliminating legislative secretaries and cabinet salaries would save \$100 million. Well in fact they would save less than a million, Mr. Speaker. So a hundred million dollars to a million dollars, there is quite a difference.

But even with these wildly exaggerated figures, the member from Riversdale can only find \$76 million in cuts. He needs \$180 million to pay for GRIP and NISA alone. Where's the other \$104 million to come from, Mr. Speaker? Higher income taxes? What's the rate going to be? Destruction of the oil industry?

Mr. Speaker, the member from Saskatoon has no idea what he's doing — no idea at all. He promises that he'll create a 3 billion . . . the promises he makes will create a \$3 billion per year deficit. And he still has no plan to fund GRIP or NISA. When he needs a hundred million dollars, he comes up with only 76 million. He's using the shotgun approach, Mr. Speaker. He just shoots and any way that his pellets are going to land, that's probably who he's going to tax.

Clearly the members opposite are only interested in power and will say anything to the Saskatchewan people to get it. They don't have what it takes, Mr. Speaker, to make a hard decision. They don't have what it takes to stand up for people and to do what's right. Why? Well they likely don't understand, Mr. Speaker. They're just worried about power.

The members opposite display a lack of understanding time and time again by walking out of the House and letting the bells ring, not getting down to debating the GST and the PST. They just move out and they present petitions with only two and three names on them, and stall for time instead of presenting these all at once.

Do they look at the farm safety programs at all, Mr. Speaker? I don't think so. But for the first time in the province's history, farmers and their family are being offered some stability, some protection against factors beyond their control.

And what do the NDP say, Mr. Speaker? Well we've seen what they can do. They tear up a deal and they'd likely start over here with our GRIP and our NISA programs. And they'd hold the farmers hostage by not allowing necessary legislation to go through like they've been doing in the last week or so, Mr. Speaker.

The people of Saskatchewan don't want to wait any longer. Our farm families were forced to wait for help for high interest rates, while the out-of-touch, out-of-date NDP government spent all of their money on buying potash mines, or a pulp or paper mill that already existed. Their only solution is to buy things that already exist. They'll tear everything down that the people of Saskatchewan worked for and have built for themselves in order to create bigger government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan don't want bigger government.

**The Speaker:** — Order. Your time has elapsed.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that the public of Saskatchewan is not buying what the government is saying on this. The people of Saskatchewan are only too well aware that members of the Legislative Assembly no longer receive the daily expense per diem for sitting here every day. And they know that there's something more to this closure motion than what the government has been saying. It's the per diems that's behind this, Mr. Speaker. They know that members no longer receive a per diem, which is why the government wants to shut down the debate on this motion. That's what this is all about, Mr. Speaker.

I can tell you that New Democrats will continue to put principle before per diem. We want to debate this Bill, the most significant tax Bill in Saskatchewan history. We want to give it the kind of debate that the public feels it should get, which is extensive debate, and we will not hurry up the debate on this motion, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — We want to see a full debate. There wasn't any debate before the government came up with this idea — not like the GST at least got from the federal government. We believe it should get a full debate now after it's been introduced. That's what we want to give this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

The members have raised many good questions. We believe these questions should be dealt with during debate, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** — The time has elapsed.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

(1615)

## MOTIONS

### Resolution No. 11 — Government Program of Restraint

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a pleasure to again enter into debate in this Legislative Assembly and bring forward a motion, a motion that reads, Mr. Speaker, be it resolved:

That this Assembly commends the Government of Saskatchewan for showing leadership by initiating an internal restraint program so that in these

difficult times additional moneys may be used to continue to protect our farmers, small businesses, home owners, health, and education.

Mr. Speaker, we've just heard this afternoon some of the members talking about restraint and talking about spending of money and talking about waste and mismanagement, but let me point out first of all, when we talk about the member from Regina Victoria . . . just talked about the lack of per diems. Well, Mr. Speaker, that was one of the facts that this government did right off when we came back into the Legislative Assembly and to this session, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this government indeed continued to show restraint by first of all restricting legislative salaries and as well, restricting cabinet ministers' salary increases as well as restricting MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly) salary increases. And then as well, Mr. Speaker, showing restraint by sitting in this Legislative Assembly and doing it because we believe in working for the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, restraint is important in these days, and it's difficult. I've said it before, I believe, a couple times even in this current sitting of the Assembly, any government that is facing an election in the next while would find it very difficult to show the restraint that the leader of this province has shown and your government has shown at this time. It's not easy. It's not easy, Mr. Speaker, to bring in a restrictive budget.

It would be very simple, Mr. Speaker, indeed to do like Ontario and bring in a \$9.7 billion deficit. It would be easy to spend. It's easy to spend. And, Mr. Speaker, we have seen over the years that it's always easier to spend than it is to show fiscal restraint and fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, we've all learned, and many of us have grown up through generations of farm families and small-business families or the leadership of our parents where they have taught us how to be responsible with how we spend our money. And it is important that this government take the initiative.

Certainly we can look at 1982 and we can look back at what the previous government had done, Mr. Speaker, and how they didn't show any care or concern for the people of this province. What did they do for the seniors in rural Saskatchewan? Did they build any care homes? Did they show anything to the seniors that they cared? No they didn't, and yet this government has put money into health, money into education.

And certainly in the last number of years, Mr. Speaker, we have seen the difficulties that the farm communities in rural Saskatchewan have faced, and the province of Saskatchewan has continued to show support for the rural economy by strengthening its base through manufacturing and processing.

These are all parts of a process of bringing the government to a point where it can manage and be fiscally responsible. Your government, Mr. Speaker, has committed itself to taking action, not just idle, empty promises — something the member from Saskatoon

Riversdale in the recent times has been very familiar with. Even today we look at the plan of action that he has laid out. And I looked very carefully but it was very difficult to find a plan laid out by the member from Riversdale. However we on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, are leading by example.

Let me give you a quick list of some of the initiatives that this government has undertaken. Talking about fiscal responsibility, talking about waste and mismanagement, we have decreased the duplication of services that have commonly taken place in government by amalgamating departments. These amalgamations will reduce the cost of running the government on a day-to-day basis without affecting the level of service that has been provided.

In fact, in most cases the level of service provided will be enhanced. For example, the creation of the new Saskatchewan Community Services department allows for consolidation of all urban municipal financing and programming, therefore improving the delivery of services at the local level.

We have also reduced inefficiencies at the department and agency level by implementing many cost saving measures. In 1987-88, the civil service was reduced by 2,000 positions; 104 programs were terminated and 72 programs were significantly down-sized. Does this talk about waste and mismanagement?

In 1988-89, expenditures were reduced in 11 government departments and agencies. In 1989-90, 12 government departments were either held at zero per cent or had their budgets reduced. In fact, I've already talked about cabinet and legislative salaries being rolled back, Mr. Speaker.

Although these ideas were not looked upon favourably by the opposition, it was a step that government members felt had to be taken to demonstrate the government's determination to solve the current situation.

We eliminated as well, Mr. Speaker, MLA severance packages, again leading by example. We will be eliminating a further 600 positions in the civil service over the next two years. Restrictions have been placed on the purchase of office equipment. There will be no government vehicles purchased in 1991 unless for safety reasons. And there will be continued restrictions on government travel.

These are all changes that will use taxpayers' money more efficiently and effectively. We have implemented a policy that utilizes reasonable wage guide-lines — something that is vitally important in any effective financial plan. In fact, in January of 1991, guide-lines to restrict increases in wages and compensation to a maximum of 4 per cent were announced by the current round of bargaining. Wages and compensation will be further restricted to 2 per cent commencing October of this year through '92 and '93. All of this was done, Mr. Speaker, at the request of people across this province.

We knew this because the Minister of Finance went out and asked people for their ideas and for their input. And those were suggestions that they had presented to the

Minister of Finance and certainly to myself and many of my colleagues and many cabinet ministers. We went out and asked the people of Saskatchewan what they wanted from government. Their response, Mr. Speaker, was that they wanted to see government tighten its own belt. Tighten, so we could continue on with the positive direction we have been taking regarding diversification, economic stabilization, and the provision of health, education, and social service programs.

Mr. Speaker, we have listened and acted to their requests. Not because it was politically favourable, but because we recognize and appreciate the delicate situation that exists in a great deal of communities across this province.

We know the desperate need to stabilize the farm economy, not only for the sake of the farmer, but for the betterment of the entire province — the small-business man, the wage earner, all the people of the province, certainly in rural Saskatchewan. We know the difficulties of living through very depressed world-wide economic conditions. We know, Mr. Speaker, what desperately low grain prices and drought will do to an economy that had been primarily based on agriculture.

And we know what it will take to put this province back on track. It will take a government that is willing to put its positions and policies right out there in front of the people. It won't take a party that time and time again refuses to give a position on anything. It won't take a party whose leader ducks and dives away from anything that remotely resembles a policy question.

It will take a government with a plan, Mr. Speaker. And, Mr. Speaker, the Finance minister of this province has laid out a plan of financial and fiscal responsibility and fiscal restraint, and government managing and leading this province into the 1990s and certainly into the year 2000.

It will take a government that has proven it is willing to make very difficult decisions, and certainly this Premier and this government has made those difficult decisions — decisions, Mr. Speaker, that place the priorities of the people of Saskatchewan first. And, Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to be able to stand here as a member of a government that has a plan, a leader, and has the priorities of the people in mind.

Now what, you may say, are those priorities? Well, Mr. Speaker, people have indicated through a series of meetings that the two highest priorities should be health and education. And, Mr. Speaker, this government continues to protect those areas of health and education.

We have done this by reduced spending in some areas so we could increase funding to education and health programs. But this all requires a guide-line. We needed a system that would implement realistic operating grants to education and health care facilities. The 1991-92 budget is a perfect example. Difficult decisions had to be made to ensure the priority areas could be protected. The decisions regarding where the spending had to be reduced were difficult ones, Mr. Speaker, but they were made.

As a result of our cost-cutting measures we have been

able to once again increase the amount of spending in the health care sector. This year the health budget was increased by 6 per cent. Now this province spends almost \$1.6 billion on health.

And if you want to bring it down to a figure that many people can really understand, if you figure that there are 50 million cultivated acres in the province of Saskatchewan, that means \$32 an acre. And education, it works out to almost a billion dollars or \$20 an acre. And our commitment to agriculture this year is in the area of 200 million or \$4 an acre. So I believe, Mr. Speaker, this government has shown its commitment to health, education, and the people of this province.

The prescription drug plan will receive funding of 93 million, an increase of over 15 per cent from last year's budget. The Cancer Foundation will receive an increase of 10 per cent, higher than the funding it received last year. Hospitals will receive 683 million, an increase of 22.9 million over the last year. Increases in the commitment of this government to the provision of health care.

And the same can be seen in education. Operating grants for schools were increased by 3.5 per cent. As I've said, it works out to \$20 an acre on 50 million acres in this province. The 3.5 per cent increase that the members opposite call peanuts will provide 373 million to K to 12 education, 164 million to universities, \$73 million to SIAST (Saskatchewan Institute of Science and Technology), \$6 million to the regional colleges, and \$5.1 million to federated colleges.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, we have led the nation in adult illiteracy programs as well. PALS (Principles of the Alphabet Literacy System) which is an easy to use computer system has helped 2,225 youths and adults to learn to read and write. And recently I had the privilege of attending a graduation of some adults who had upgraded their education, Mr. Speaker. And certainly it was a real excited group of individuals as they received their diplomas for upgrading their education, looking forward to better jobs and better opportunities in the work force.

Mr. Speaker, we have invested over 17 million to build a language training institute at the University of Regina and a new College of Agriculture building at the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon.

Certainly the development of the SCN (Saskatchewan Communications Network Corporation) program has improved the access to education programming all over the province. In fact, Mr. Speaker, young people across this province, in fact adults can receive university education without even having to attend the university campuses of Regina or Saskatoon or SIAST through the SCN network.

And, Mr. Speaker, I believe that is going to go a long way in the future in helping to educate the young people of this province. I believe these are dollars well invested in the people of our province — dollars invested in Saskatchewan's future.

And they represent increases to areas that the people of

this province want to see protected. It doesn't matter where you go in this province, Mr. Speaker, you will find that people believe health and education are the two areas where government must continue to increase its funding, continue to protect and preserve the institutes that we've worked so hard to enjoy, so hard for — protection we could not provide without following a strict, sensible, fiscal restraint program; and as I indicated, unlike the Ontario government who felt it was better to buy their way out.

They also told us we have to fight for the survival of our small communities and farms. And again, Mr. Speaker, I bring you back to the new agricultural programs of GRIP and NISA, programs which are going to give farmers the opportunity to carry the insurance they feel they need to protect themselves from agricultural subsidies and trade wars in other parts of the world to give them an opportunity to strengthen their farm base.

Mr. Speaker, this government was there to fight to protect farmers, to protect home owners from high interest rates. We have saved farmers over \$388 million in interest payments alone since 1982. We have provided over 115 million through crop and livestock drought programs and over 100 million in other *ad hoc* programs.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about GRIP and NISA, GRIP and NISA this year have the potential of injecting into the provincial economy some \$1.3 billion. And you can be assured, Mr. Speaker, that a \$1.3 billion injection into the Saskatchewan economy will not only be welcomed by the farmers of this province but will be welcomed by every business person across the province, not just in rural Saskatchewan, like the area I represent, but also in our major centres.

(1630)

Again it is money invested in the future of the province. Again, possible only because a fiscal restraint program was put into place. Mr. Speaker, this government had difficult choices in how to pay for programs such as GRIP and NISA. It would have been simple just to add to the deficit.

Or we could have put a tax on the root of the problem — Canada's cheap food policy. And when you talk to farmers and when you talk to people in rural Saskatchewan, they continually bring up the fact that the food in this country is just too cheap. If people were paying appropriately so the producer received his fair share, we wouldn't need all these programs.

But instead, Mr. Speaker, this government chose the most responsible course of action. And we have followed some of the examples or some of the suggestions laid out by members of the opposition who have been arguing for a considerable time that we should harmonize our sales tax. And as a result, the provincial portion of GRIP and NISA will be able to be paid for without having to increase other areas of taxation — something the members opposite agreed with.

Mr. Speaker, this was a difficult decision to make. But we made that decision because we knew the importance of

providing a long-term safety net for farmers and for rural Saskatchewan. As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, earlier in my remarks, we need to stabilize rural communities and that need is very real. The people of this province have been doing their best to keep the communities alive through some very tough times. And it is imperative that we as a government do everything within our power to assist these communities and the province of Saskatchewan survive.

The internal restraint programs that have been implemented are a part of that solution, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, being financially responsible does not only involve hacking and slashing. It involves foresight. It involves vision. That is why we are marketing our technology like never before.

A case in point is our world-renowned health card system, a health card that many countries around the world are certainly looking at. That is why our evaluation program in the K to 12 system is under review, to be updated to provide our young people with the best opportunities to find employment and to support themselves; to encourage their personal initiative to develop as leaders of tomorrow.

It involves policies that promote the creation of wealth for the people of the province, putting their money to work for them.

And, Mr. Speaker, there are so many more other things I could add to the motion, but I believe one of my colleagues would like to say a few words as well. So at this time I would like to move, seconded by the member from Shaunavon:

That this Assembly commends the Government of Saskatchewan for showing leadership by initiating an internal restraint program so that in these difficult economic times additional moneys may be used to continue to protect our farmers, small businesses, home owners, health, and education.

I so move. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gleim:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm very pleased to have the chance to stand in my place and speak to this motion that my colleague, the member for Moosomin, has brought before this House today.

For the past 10 years Saskatchewan has faced a difficult economic situation, Mr. Speaker. Prices of our natural resources like potash and oil have been depressed. Our farmers have been hit again and again with low prices, interest rates, drought — you name it, they've had it — along with high input costs, Mr. Speaker. And that in turn has caused damage to small-business sectors as the farmers have less and less money to spend, Mr. Speaker.

The Saskatchewan economy has been hard hit by circumstances totally out of anyone's control. Our farmers can't be blamed for it. I know it's tough. They get criticized for hand-outs. That's not what the farmers want. The farmers just want to have a fair chance to make a fair,

decent living in their business, Mr. Speaker.

Our families can't be blamed for it and, Mr. Speaker, the government can't be blamed for external forces that have affected our economy and economies of every province in this country, Mr. Speaker. The problems that have plagued our province are out of everyone's or anyone's control. In fact, as much as the NDP would like to make people believe that government can handle everything for everybody, I am sure that they even try and make themselves believe that they can make it rain.

There is no question that times have been difficult for the people of Saskatchewan. And this has proved a real challenge to the government because whether times are good or times are bad, we still need to educate our children. We still need to provide health care services. We still need to have social services, and we still need to protect the backbone of our economy which is agriculture.

And, Mr. Speaker, perhaps more now than ever, we have to continue to create our environment that will encourage the development and diversification of our economy so that in the future we won't be affected as drastically by downturns in single sectors of our economy.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have a situation where we must control or continue to provide the essentials for people in terms of health care, education, long-term farm safety nets, and as it goes on, at the time when our economy is suffering, Mr. Speaker. And that kind of situation calls for careful choices, difficult choices, choices that involve restraint, choices that involve priorities.

The opposition seems to have a problem with principles, and I have just referred to them. They seem to have problems making choices, Mr. Speaker. In fact, Mr. Speaker, they have such a problem making choices that they just promise everything to everybody without ever considering how they would ever pay for it.

We saw the total lack of restraint and lack of responsibility outlined point after point by my colleague, the member from Rosthern, in his reply to the budget, Mr. Speaker. We heard detailed stories of the NDP critic for the Social Services telling one group after another in this province that an NDP government would give them more and more and more. More than this province can support, Mr. Speaker. Now I ask you: is that fair? Is that right, to string the needy people of Saskatchewan along, making promises that can never be kept, Mr. Speaker?

And this lack of responsibility and the lack of restraint on the part of the NDP goes beyond the commitments they made for Social Services spending. My colleague, the member for Wilkie, talked about the broad-based promises made by various NDP MLAs — promises to the people of Saskatchewan that run up in the billions of dollars, Mr. Speaker. Now I ask you again, Mr. Speaker, and I ask the members of this Assembly: is that responsible? Is that any way to treat the people of Saskatchewan?

We are here today, Mr. Speaker, to talk about restraint and to talk about how internal restraint, government

spending less on government, fits into our plan for the province of Saskatchewan. You see, Mr. Speaker, it is the philosophy of my colleagues and I that we are in government to build the province, not to build a bureaucracy or make government itself bigger.

It is our philosophy, Mr. Speaker, that we are here to protect our economy through diversification and growth, to stabilize our communities through the efforts of programs like Fair Share Saskatchewan and community bonds, to continue to protect our farmers and their families, and to provide equal education and health care for all Saskatchewan people. And as I've said before, Mr. Speaker, to do that in difficult times means difficult choices, and that means difficult choices for everybody.

I heard the people across the way mention something about people going across the border shopping. Mr. Speaker, that is choices people have been doing for many, many years. If any of you people have lived along the border like I have, Mr. Speaker, 1970, the biggest choices the people made in those years was to go across the border when our money was at par.

There's nothing wrong with travelling back and forth to countries, Mr. Speaker. We enjoy the people coming up here in tourism time, Mr. Speaker, they come up to hunt. They do everything. They spend money up here. There's nothing wrong with that.

And we talk about Alberta. Alberta has the same problem as we do, Mr. Speaker, about people going across the border. They don't even have a tax, Mr. Speaker. I have a fellow with a business partner that lives in Alberta . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You sure will, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I sure hope you do because you don't live down there, the member from Prince Albert.

**An Hon. Member:** — I grew up down there.

**Mr. Gleim:** — You grew up there? No, you never did grow up.

And I guess, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to just mention that, Mr. Speaker, because one of the members from the opposition worked on one of them border-crossing towns in the 1970s. He knows what it's all about. That when we had the biggest number of people going back and forth, doing business back and forth. And there is nothing wrong with that, Mr. Speaker.

And I guess when we went into the process of developing our budget this year, Mr. Speaker, we were faced with the situation as I described to you. We had less and less money to work with, but more need than ever to protect our farmers, build our province, provide adequate health care, education, and all of the things that are crucial to Saskatchewan.

We talked with people in our constituencies. And I'm sure you remember the consultation my colleague, the Minister of Finance, had with the people across the province. I was at a few of those meeting. We heard again and again that they wanted education, health care, agriculture to remain priorities with this government. People wanted those areas to be protected.



They also expressed a desire to continue economic development so that they would have a chance to stabilize their communities and build a future for their children right here at home, Mr. Speaker.

But those people realize as much as we do that it's difficult to achieve those things in tough economic times. They realize that doing things, doing the right things, would involve some sacrifices, Mr. Speaker. And as government, we too realize that along with the rest of the people in the province, government had a responsibility to tighten its own belt. So we made some moves to eliminate restraints and restrain some of the expenditures, Mr. Speaker — I guess to get rid of some of the fat and redirect some moneys into the areas that people who have these problems identified as being the most important to them. Those were some of the things that come up in the meetings with the Minister of Finance as he was travelling the province.

And some of the steps, I guess, the steps were to take and to cut spending at government level was a start. We eliminated the severance packages — completely done away with, Mr. Speaker, as of today. And before the members of the opposite go off on a tangent about government members abusing severance, let's not forget who was the first person ever to receive a severance package, Mr. Speaker — a severance package, Mr. Speaker, that those members opposite helped design and a benefit that they voted in favour of.

To refresh some memories, Mr. Speaker, the first person ever to benefit was the former NDP leader, the Hon. Allan Blakeney, who interestingly enough is now employed in an institution that gets its money right from the taxpayer, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Blakeney, the first person ever to walk away from this legislature with a severance payment. Allan Blakeney still has a government job, Mr. Speaker, still feeding off the government, Mr. Speaker. I want you people to defend that across the way.

The people across Saskatchewan said that this was wrong, that they wanted it gone, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, it was the people on this side of the House that did away with that exactly, Mr. Speaker, the severance package.

We should not forget, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite on this matter. You people were all for it at the time, Mr. Speaker. And one of their very own was the first to grab it, Mr. Speaker. And we should not forget who that person was, Mr. Speaker. We should not forget, Mr. Speaker.

(1645)

But that is just one area, Mr. Speaker. It was obvious that additional restraints were needed. So we looked at it a little closer to see where else we could cut, Mr. Speaker. And the people told us we have to lead the way, Mr. Speaker.

So for the third straight year, the salaries of cabinet ministers, legislative secretaries, were frozen. Three years, Mr. Speaker, three years in a row, Mr. Speaker, we were taking the lead. That's what the public wanted, Mr. Speaker. It was our duty.

I heard one of the members across the way talking about the big tax grab. I just thought maybe — I'm going to sit down here in a couple of minutes . . . Talk about a big tax grab, the biggest tax grab in history. Has anybody forgot about the big tax grab in the 11 years that they were in power?

They increased the income tax by 50 per cent, Mr. Speaker, 50 per cent in 11 years, Mr. Speaker. Do you not call that a tax grab, Mr. Speaker? I believe that was the biggest tax grab in the history of the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it gave me great pleasure to stand up here this afternoon and defend this government and commend them on the things they have done, Mr. Speaker. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this Assembly commends the Government of Saskatchewan for showing leadership by initiating the internal restraints programs so that in these difficult times, economic times, additional moneys may be used to continue to protect farmers, small-business men, Mr. Speaker, home owners, health, and education.

With that I'm glad, it gives me great pleasure, to second that motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As I rise to speak to this motion, Mr. Speaker, I would want to indicate that I intend to amend this motion to make it more aptly reflect what this government has been about since 1982.

As I look at the motion the member from Moosomin put forth — and I just want to quote a part of it, Mr. Speaker — it says here: "... showing leadership by initiating an internal restraint program . . ."

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I've sat in this legislature since 1986, and many of my colleagues since 1982 and some of them before, I think it's pretty clear where this government is with respect to expenditures and where they are with respect to restraint.

And the question members on this side of the House ask, Mr. Speaker, is: restraint for whom? Middle and lower income people in Saskatchewan have seen the biggest tax grab under this government's administration that any, I would say, jurisdiction in this country has ever seen in the history of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, session after session, budget after budget, this government has attacked middle and lower income people. But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, there's restraint for those people — yes, there is. There's restraints because it's imposed by this government; there's spending restraints on those folks because they've got no disposable income.

But I tell you who there isn't restraint for, Mr. Speaker. Let me list some of the internal restraint and some of the people who've been involved with this caucus for whom there is no internal restraint.

And I want to mention the former member from Kindersley, now the trade emissary in Minneapolis at a salary of \$97,000 a year. For Bob Andrew, Mr. Speaker, there's no restraint. For Bob Andrew there's no restraint program, Mr. Speaker.

For the deputy premier, the former deputy premier, now the Senator, now the campaign manager for the PC Party, there's no restraint — no restraint at all. His annual salary \$71,000, albeit paid by the federal government now. He's been at the provincial trough for years. For him there's no restraint, Mr. Speaker.

For Larry Birkbeck, Mr. Speaker, there's no restraint. Receives a contracting of \$48,000 through Venus contracting. No restraint for him, Mr. Speaker.

For Gordon Currie, no restraint; for Gordon Dirks, no restraint; for Louis Domotor, no restraint; for Sid Dutchak; for Tim Embury; for Ralph Katzman. There's no restraint for those people, Mr. Speaker. For Myles Morin there's no restraint, and for Keith Parker there's no restraint, and for Paul Rousseau there's no restraint. For Jack Sandberg there's no restraint; for Paul Schoenhals there's no restraint. Mr. Speaker, there's no restraint for Graham Taylor either.

But I tell you we listened in February to this Finance minister introduce the most massive tax grab that middle and lower income people of this province will ever face. This tax grab, Mr. Speaker, is clearly going to chase many small businesses out of this province. And, Mr. Speaker, I say there's restraint for some but there's no restraint for others.

Ten legislative secretaries at \$8,000 apiece, sitting on that side of the House and doing nothing — for them, sir, there's no restraint. But I tell you for single parents, and for senior citizens, and for students, for children who want to read, who want to buy books, there's restraint for them. There's another 7 per cent tax imposed upon them, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this motion put forth by the member from Moosomin is a joke. If it weren't so sad there would be people throughout this province, I tell you, laughing about it. But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, it's not a joke. It's not funny. And I'd like to know if there is restraint for the member from Moosomin, with respect to sitting as a Legislative Secretary in the PC government, taking \$8,000 home to do nothing — one of the ten. Is there restraint for him, Mr. Speaker.

The Finance minister was chastising members on this side of the House two weeks ago for not standing up and giving some positive ideas as to how to cut back expenditures. Well, Mr. Speaker, five or ten minutes later I stood up and asked him if he was willing to axe the 10 Legislative Secretaries. And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, there's still no restraint for those people because they're still on the public salary, and they're still paid \$8,000 a year for doing nothing.

**An Hon. Member:** — With the exception of the member from Yorkton.

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — I say to you, Mr. Speaker, with the exception of the MLA, the member from Yorkton, everyone of those are getting extra pay — everyone of the members on that other side of the House. And I ask you, Mr. Speaker, I tell you there's restraint for the average, ordinary people of this province, but for them there's no restraint.

Mr. Speaker, this government has been money greedy and power hungry since 1982. And you can justify saying that and I want to tell you why, Mr. Speaker. Since 1982, when there was a total provincial revenue of \$2.3 billion, or roughly thereabout, they've increased that to \$4.8 billion. Taxes, taxes, taxes. They've more than doubled the revenue, Mr. Speaker, and yet they're coming to the people of the province in this budget, and with Bill 61, for yet more.

Mr. Speaker, I say shame on this government. And I say shame on that member, if he believes that the motion he put before this House is the truth, for not understanding what this government has done. Because as a Member of the Legislative Assembly he should acquaint himself with what this government's really done. Albeit he's not sitting in cabinet, he supported this government on every vote since I've been here, and I say shame on him.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — Mr. Speaker, restraint for the people of this province, but not for this government. A salary for Chuck Childers — \$745,000 a year. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's not all.

I looked through the list of travel where the places where the cabinet and members of this government have been. And you know, Mr. Speaker, there's a page and a half here. It goes everywhere from Helsinki, Finland to Reno, Nevada — goodness knows what we'd be doing there — to Palm Springs; Jackson, Mississippi.

And here's one I think you'll find interesting, Mr. Speaker. There was no restraint for Jim Garner, the former minister of Highways, to go to a convention in Honolulu, Hawaii. And I mean nobody questioned the fact that he was going to Hawaii, just because it happened to be in the dead of winter and it's cold here in Saskatchewan. But I mean was there restraint for him, Mr. Speaker? The answer is: there was no restraint.

And I tell you, the list of the places where these people have been is enough to scare the people of the province if they knew how many dollars that actually cost them, Mr. Speaker. There's restraint for the average people in this province, but there's none for this government.

And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, Vienna, Austria — there's another spot. Now there was no restraint for the cabinet minister who went there.

Here's where the Premier and his cabinet ministers have been: Reno, Paris, London, Brussels, Geneva, Tokyo, Honolulu, Athens, Phoenix, Helsinki, Miami, Seoul. Mr. Speaker, restraint for some but not for others.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that these people could have funded and ably, through public dollars, financed an airline with the amount of money that they've spent in travel over the last years.

Mr. Speaker, \$740,000 for Chuck Childers — there's no restraint for him, but there is for the average family in this province. There was no restraint for Norman Riddell when he left the Premier's office and moved to Quebec to work for Premier Bourassa there. There was no restraint when they paid him \$165,000 severance package. I'll tell you there was no restraint for that, for him.

And I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, it's a sad commentary when you realize that there are people living on minimum wage who don't have access to the public purse, and who are having a hard time to make ends meet from month to month. There's restraint for those people, Mr. Speaker, but there's none for this government, and there's none for members of this government.

Mr. Speaker, there's no restraint for strategic marketing, Strategic Direct Marketing — Nancy McLean. There's no restraint for her. I see payments here in the neighbourhood of \$635,000, and what for? To tell the Deputy Premier how to comb his hair? To tell the Premier how to wear his tie?

Mr. Speaker, that's almost a million dollars of public funds. There was no restraint for them. But I tell you, Mr. Speaker, the average people of this province know with the GST there's restraint for them.

Mr. Speaker, I tell you, the people see through this government. They understand where this government comes from. Mr. Speaker, let me list for up to April 12, 1991, some travel by some of these people: the Premier of the province, \$53,500 in a year — and I say to you, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of families who would know what to do with \$55,000 because they'd be buying clothes and supporting small businesses in this province. They'd be buying fridges and stoves and things that they need.

And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, the list of these cabinet ministers that have been travelling throughout this province is enough to scare you. I see here, the member from Maple Creek — for goodness sakes, no longer a cabinet minister — \$14,509 in a year. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd say that that does very well, that does very well. And some of us can drive Corvettes around this province and travel at public purse, but I tell you, Mr. Speaker, there are other people in the province who don't have the same access.

And I tell, Mr. Speaker, if this is restraint, if this is restraint Tory-style, then they'd better go to the people of the province and let them pass judgement, to see if they feel that that's the kind of restraint that they want, if that's the kind of restraint that they've asked this Premier for, and if that's the kind of government that they asked for in 1986.

Mr. Speaker, I've referred in my remarks to the new provincial goods and services tax, one of the most massive tax grabs that's ever been introduced in this province. And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, it's paying for the

waste and mismanagement of this government. That's what it's doing. It's paying for the lack of restraint since 1982. That's what it's doing.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, this morning I had a phone call from a senior citizen in Prince Albert. And this gentleman's born and raised in Saskatchewan; he's lived here all his life; he's worked hard. And he says to me, you know, he says, I kind of found . . . I was sitting here this morning and I'm thinking, he says, there's some things in Saskatchewan that have really changed. And I said, well what might that be? What might you be referring to? And he says, I want to tell you one of the things that's really changed.

He says, you know, there used to be a day in Saskatchewan when you'd go to a bootlegger and you'd pay an inflated price for whatever the bootlegger had to sell you. And he says, you know how it's changed and how this Tory government's changed it? Now you go to the bootlegger to buy it cheaper.

Because, Mr. Speaker, what they're doing is they're bringing in cheaper product from out of province because this government is taxing themselves out of business. That's what's happening, Mr. Speaker. They're creating a black market.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that as I've looked at what they're doing, the people of this province don't deserve it.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I've got more remarks to make, and I would want to continue my remarks after supper. It's close to 5 o'clock, and I would move to adjourn the debate.

Motion negatived.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.