

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

**Clerk:** — According to order, I have reviewed the following petitions that were presented on June 6, 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 Assembly may be pleased to urge the Provincial Government to stop the provincial GST;

Of certain residents of the province of Saskatchewan praying that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to urge the Provincial Government to reverse its decision to tax reading materials.

And of certain residents of the province praying that your Assembly may be pleased to urge the Provincial Government to properly fund and provide in-patient facilities such as Myers House in Regina.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Hon. Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Speaker, it's a privilege for me today to introduce to you and to the members of the Assembly 16 students from Dickson School in Swift Current. Dickson School has been an important part of my family. Dickson School was where all three of my boys went and they became a part of that school, and I want to welcome the students. And by the way, they were all in grade 4 there at one point in time. And so I want to welcome the students.

I'll be meeting with you at 11 o'clock to have some pictures. And I want to welcome the teachers, Mr. Phillips and Mr. Mah; and the chaperons, Mrs. Rempel, Mrs. Kent, and Mrs. Burgess. And I want to thank you for coming.

I understand in Swift Current today it's raining; everything's been cancelled in Swift Current, so you're fortunate to be here perhaps. And I want the members of the Assembly to join us in welcoming these students to Regina.

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

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an introduction to you, and through you to all members of the Assembly. Seated in your gallery is a gentleman who is becoming increasingly more known throughout the province with environmental matters. Under ministerial statements I will be making an announcement with respect to Don Somers, who is seated in your gallery.

Don is from Saskatoon, and I will be making a more

formal statement respecting his involvement in the environment and business a little later on. I'd ask all members to join with me in welcoming Don Somers to the legislature.

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

**Mr. Pringle:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the minister in welcoming Don to the Assembly. Don is a constituent of mine and he's also . . . he and I are both members of McClure United Church, and so I want to join the minister and welcome you here, Don. I hope you enjoy the proceedings and have a successful day.

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

**Hon. Mr. Gerich:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To you and to the members of the legislature, I'd like to introduce to you a tour group visiting from Borden and Radisson schools, grades 3 and 4. There's 33 students. They're located in the west gallery.

They're accompanied by their teachers, Mrs. Assman, Mrs. Buswell, Mrs. Meister, Mrs. Mueller, Mrs. Hamp, Mrs. Hamm, and Mrs. Joncas.

I will be meeting with the students for pictures at 11 a.m. and for refreshments after and any questions that you want to ask about the legislature. I hope that they find this morning's proceedings educational and entertaining.

Borden and Radisson schools, Mr. Speaker, have been promoting tourism by coming to Regina over the last few years and visiting the legislature and other points of interest in Regina. I'd like to ask the members to make our guests from Redberry welcome.

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

**Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I too would like to join with my colleagues in welcoming all of the students that are with us this morning.

But it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce two guests who are seated in your gallery this morning, Dr. Barry Earl and Mr. John Chyzowski from the LEADS organization, which stands for the League of Educational Administrators, Directors, and Superintendents, in this province. And these two gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, have been very involved over the last several months in working with their colleagues in drafting legislation which I'm going to have the pleasure of introducing a little bit later — the LEADS Act.

And I would ask all members in the legislature this morning to join with me in giving a warm welcome to our two special guests here this morning.

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

**Ms. Atkinson:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to join the minister in welcoming the two members from LEADS, in particular Dr. Barry Earl and John

Chyzowski.

I'd like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that Dr. Barry Earl was a high school teacher at Walter Murray way back in the '60s when I was a student. I can assure the members of the legislature, he was an excellent science teacher at Walter Murray Collegiate. And I'm pleased to see Dr. Earl in the legislature today. Welcome.

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

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Mr. Chairman, I think I would be somewhat remiss if I didn't welcome John here. John and I go back a fair number of years when we were colleagues . . . Well over the years we have amassed a lot of wisdom together, John.

John and I were colleagues together at Holy Cross High School. And I welcome John here, and also Barry. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Hon. Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I guess I would like to join with the member opposite as well in welcoming John here. Our relationship goes back a fair amount of years as well.

But my primary objective, Mr. Speaker, is to introduce to you and through you, Mr. Speaker, to the other members of the Assembly, a group of 41 grade 11 and 12 students from my home town of Hague where of course I spent many years teaching as well.

I know many of these students personally because they are . . . many of them are neighbours of mine and so on. And I would in particular like to welcome Margi Corbett as one of their teachers here. I taught together with Margi for a number of years. And also Grant Ellce who is one other teacher that is here. And also Henry Unger I see is up there as the bus driver. I know these people very well.

Mr. Speaker, I've also had the opportunity over the last month or so to be in the Hague High School where I met with these students. And let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, these students are very astute when it comes to politics. They've asked some very piercing questions and I had a great time with them. I look forward to taking pictures at 10:30 after question period and meeting with them later over drinks for questions and so on.

They were in here yesterday already so they spent a couple of days in Regina. I hope you're enjoying yourselves. I hope you find it informative. And I look forward to meeting with you later. I ask all members to join with me in greeting and welcoming the students from Hague High School.

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

**The Speaker:** — I also have an introduction. It's my pleasure this morning to introduce to the Legislative Assembly two special guests from New South Wales, Australia. They are the Hon. John Johnson, president of the Legislative Council of New South Wales; and Mr. John Evans, Clerk of the Parliaments and Clerk of the

Legislative Council of New South Wales.

These parliamentary visitors are here in Saskatchewan to meet members and staff of the Assembly and to discuss a wide range of parliamentary issues. I will be meeting with Speaker Johnson and Mr. Evans shortly after question period this morning. On your behalf and on behalf of the Saskatchewan branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, let us welcome Speaker Johnson and Mr. Evans.

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Election Date

**Mr. Romanow:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question today is to the Deputy Premier.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Premier, outside of this legislature I might add, told members of the media that he would be not prepared to go to an election and to call an election for at least two months and possibly even as long as November of 1991.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is this: Mr. Deputy Premier, given the Supreme Court's ruling of yesterday, given the commitment of your Attorney General of March 19, 1991, what possible good reason could there be to yet again frustrate the demands of the people of the province of Saskatchewan to have an election now — four years, eight months into your mandate?

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

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, I assure the hon. member they will have their opportunity for an election. What the Premier said very clearly yesterday based on the . . . and the Supreme Court, obviously came down with a decision, gave some legality to the boundaries, the 1989 boundaries.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan will have an election. The Premier clearly said that there will be an election in a manner . . . (inaudible) . . . The business of this House, Mr. Speaker, the business of this House for a good number of weeks has been held up by hon. members opposite, led by that member who just asked the question — delays, obstruction, whatever.

There is an agenda that we have laid before the public of Saskatchewan, a plan we've laid before the public of Saskatchewan. Something I would invite the hon. member to do in his own right — lay his plan before the public of Saskatchewan.

We have referendum legislation to come forward, medical professional legislation regarding rural doctors. We've got The Teachers' Superannuation Act which is before the House. We have energy sector legislation dealing with horizontal drilling. All of those things are important to the various sectors of this province. All of those things are part of the agenda of the House. They will be dealt with and we'll have an election.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the Deputy Premier. I guess, Mr. Speaker, that the Deputy Premier is confirming that which the Premier said yesterday outside the House and the Attorney General said inside the House, and that is that the commitment of March 19 in a letter to myself and to the people of Saskatchewan is out the window. That the promise that the boundaries, if decided by the Supreme Court, would be the basis of the election, is out the window. That's the commitment that you made, and I guess you're confirming that that again is yet another broken promise.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the Deputy Premier is this: why won't you recognize that another four months of your policies, the scorched earth policies of this government are harming Saskatchewan people almost beyond repair? Why can't you recognize that? Why don't you acknowledge that the people of this province want an election and they want it now. Get on with the job.

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

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, I would invite the hon. member as they have finally decided to do at 1 o'clock last night, to deal with the business of this House. We've laid out the agenda for the House, the agenda for the House and for this spring session. And those Bills that I made reference to in my first . . .

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

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Those Bills which are before the House which I made reference to in my earlier answer, Mr. Speaker, important Bills for the province — they are, I don't believe, controversial in any way. I'd invite the leader of the obstructionist party opposite to deal with these Bills, deal with them as we go forward on this thing.

We deal quickly with the legislation, Mr. Speaker. We have an agenda before us. The public of Saskatchewan has an agenda before them.

As it relates to the boundaries, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General made it very clear yesterday there's one set of boundaries that the Supreme Court has dealt with. We have leaders of other political parties who say go with the Archer Commission.

Mr. Speaker, that decision will be made in due course.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question to the Deputy Premier. Mr. Deputy Premier, why don't you say what you really feel? Why don't you say what you really mean? You and your government are afraid to face the people, and that's not a good enough reason. Just tell them that.

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

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — As I've said, we have an agenda laid out. We've had a plan laid out by the Minister of Finance. The hon. member opposite doesn't agree with that plan. The hon. member opposite doesn't agree with the plan. He doesn't agree with the financial plan for the

province laid out by the Minister of Finance; he's made it very clear. He's given no alternatives, Mr. Speaker.

I invite the hon. member once again, before the public of Saskatchewan finally votes — before they vote, before the public of Saskatchewan votes — that hon. member and all of his members over there will have to put before the public their plan for this province.

And their plan has not been . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order.

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

### Public Servants' Demonstration

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Speaker, my question . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order. I realize it's Friday morning, and perhaps a great many hon. members wish to get into question period. However, it's not possible. You'll simply have to wait your turn. And let us allow the member for Regina North East . . . The member for Regina Lakeview and the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster, plus one or two others — plus one or two others, plus one or two others — allow question period to proceed.

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

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Deputy Premier. Mr. Deputy Premier, last night we witnessed another example of your government's arrogance and bunker mentality.

You and your colleagues, Mr. Deputy Premier, hide in this building. You play games with the lives of families in this province, but you haven't got the courage to face public servants and their families who come to this building to talk to you about their concerns. You lock the doors. Your so-called decentralization, Mr. Minister, has become a disintegration of public services in the province of Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — My question, Mr. Minister, is this: if you are convinced that this is the right thing to do, why haven't you got the courage to face your critics and explain this disintegration which you are about, Mr. Minister? Why haven't you got the courage to do that?

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

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, once again that member from Regina North East — and I want to make this absolutely clear, Mr. Speaker — that member last night in this House made the accusation that it was members of the government and the government that had anything to do with whatever security precautions were taken last night. That's what he said last night and he says it again today, Mr. Speaker. It's absolutely not the case. And the member . . . more importantly, Mr. Speaker, the member knows it full well. The member knows full well that that's not the case.

Security for this building, as you know, Mr. Speaker, and as every member of this House on either side knows, is the responsibility of the Office of the Speaker through the Sergeant-at-Arms. The hon. member knows that full well. All hon. members in this House on both sides have a responsibility as well. They have a responsibility as well to support the Speaker and this legislature and the staff and the Sergeant-at-Arms and the Sergeant-at-Arms' staff. All members have a responsibility to support that.

That hon. member who just asked a question could have made a decision last night that it would have been a responsible one, to bring calm to a circumstance that was somewhat out of control. He could have taken that decision as a responsible hon. member. But did he take that decision? No, Mr. Speaker, he took the decision that was based on pure politics of the NDP (New Democratic Party). No responsibility to this House or to your office. Mr. Speaker, that hon. member . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order.

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

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — A new question to the same minister, Mr. Speaker. The first and foremost responsibility of any government is to listen to the people of this province.

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

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — And an equal responsibility of any government is not to be afraid of them and run and hide when they want to talk to you, Mr. Minister.

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

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — The Premier is being quoted by the media as saying that he is now looking at hiding from the voters until this fall. You have locked the people out of their Legislative Building last night because you won't face up to them and explain the programs that you are announcing which will affect them and all of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Minister, I ask you this question: why have you shut the door of the legislature to some people like these that were here last night? Why are you afraid of them? Why have you shut the door to open government? Will you stop this kind of arrogance, Mr. Minister, and will you open the government up as you committed you would when you introduced the legislation on freedom of information and other things earlier this year. Or was that just another false promise to try to get you to buy an election?

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

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, the policies of this government are for the people . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order. Order. The member for Regina Centre, order. Order, order, order. And for Regina South. Order please.

Order! I'm going to ask you again. I'm going to ask hon.

members again. I'm going to ask hon. members again.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, the policies and the responsibility of the government is to the people of the whole province. The policies that we have for stabilizing rural Saskatchewan are fundamental to the stability of that economy in rural Saskatchewan. And we've said that here before and the hon. member knows that.

Mr. Speaker, the question here is . . . and in another question again, the hon. member who knows full well that it is not the government, it is not the government who is responsible for security at the door of this building.

The hon. member, as a member and a long-serving member of this legislature, had a choice to make. And last night he chose . . . And I say to that hon. member he knows not only was he a part of it by opening the doors, that hon. member knows, he knows who was responsible for injuring the lady security guard in this building. He knows who was responsible for those injuries. That member knows that, Mr. Speaker. And I say it very clearly in the House for all to see. That member from Regina North East was there in the midst of the pack with several of his other members.

Mr. Speaker, that's the fact of life on that case. They can say all they want for politics. But, Mr. Speaker, the facts are your office through the Sergeant-at-Arms and the staff that all members here have a responsibility to support . . . We're responsible for what happened in the way of security last night.

But that hon. member knows who was responsible for injuring that lady who's on your staff, Mr. Speaker, and he should be telling the public and telling you about it, telling somebody in authority about it.

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

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — A new question to the minister, Mr. Speaker, who once again tries to overdramatize for simple, cheap, political purposes to try to save his hide.

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

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

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, the demonstrators who were here yesterday are people that you hired to work for you and work for the people of Saskatchewan and many of their supporters.

These are not wild-eyed radicals. They are working men and women. They are raising their children and their families. They work hard and they pay their taxes like you or I or anybody else, Mr. Minister. And you haven't even got the courage to face your own employees and explain your program to them.

Instead, Mr. Minister, you make political decisions. You break up families or throw them into economic ruin, and you haven't got the guts to face them and tell them about what you're doing.

I ask you, Mr. Minister: aren't you ashamed of your behaviour, and is there nothing that you won't stoop to because of your political desperation?

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

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, it's very clear. The hon. member, there are two issues here, and the one issue in terms of the government policy and so on, and I've answered those questions before.

The issue here is what I've said to that hon. member. I've accused him directly and I accuse him again, because he does know. He was there and he knows who was responsible for the injury to that lady last night. He knows. That hon. member knows, a member of this legislature, knows that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there's no right of free speech, that the hon. member is very sanctimonious in drawing to the attention of the House . . . No right of free speech gives anyone the right to injure another. That hon. member was right there in the midst of it. He was right there in the midst with several of his colleagues, and they're sitting here today with their heads bowed, and they should be.

Mr. Speaker, the acts of that member, the Deputy Leader of the NDP, who had a decision to make . . . He could have brought some calm to the situation because of his stature. He could have brought some calm to the situation. But did he do that, Mr. Speaker? No. He chose to do the exact opposite and incite those people.

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

**Ms. Atkinson:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of the Family. Last night hundreds of men and women and their children were outside on the steps of this legislature, protesting the government's attitudes towards families in this province. Last night the Minister of the Family didn't have the courage to go out and meet with those families. The Minister of the Family is doing everything he can to support the Deputy Premier in his allegations about some woman that was hurt.

Now I ask you, Mr. Minister of the Family, I ask you . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order. Order, order! Was your question complete?

**Ms. Atkinson:** — I ask you, Mr. Minister of the Family: what about the hundreds of families that were outside last night on the steps of this legislature? What about the women and children that were outside on the steps of the legislature, and you refused, as the Minister of the Family, to go out and talk to those families, Mr. Minister.

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

All sides of the House please come to order. I want some order in here. I know it's difficult. I know it's emotional. Members on both sides of the House are emotional about the issue under discussion; however, as I said last night, it's still imperative that we respect each other and I say it again. And now let us recognize the Deputy Premier.

And I don't know who's hollering over there on the opposition benches as I'm talking, but the very thing I'm talking is showing some respect; he's demonstrating he's not doing. Now let us work together and allow the Deputy Premier to answer this question.

I'm going to ask the Member for Humboldt to refrain from interfering.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, the policy of the government — I've said on several occasions before as it relates to Fair Share and stabilizing a very difficult economy across this province — deals with families in all parts of the province, Mr. Speaker.

Now the hon. member refers to families in Regina, families of public servants of the Government of Saskatchewan, who are feeling significant consternation because of this policy of decentralization. I'm aware of that and I know it, and I feel badly about it. There's no question that that's true.

Mr. Speaker, but public policy for the whole province and for the stability of the economy across this province is very important to the province. We take that responsibility seriously, and we're exercising that responsibility.

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

#### Advance Notice of Decentralization Plans

**Mr. Anguish:** — My question is to the same minister, Mr. Speaker. The people who appeared outside last night worked for the Department of Agriculture. They worked for the Liquor Board. They worked for many government departments that feared for the havoc you've wreaked over their lives over the past couple of weeks. That's what was happening last night. But we find that there's fair share that's fairer for some than others, Mr. Minister.

It appears that there's a quote in the *Leader-Post* story today of a person who was talking about the movement to Gravelbourg of the minority languages office. He noted that Archambault, who is married to Chantal Devine's sister, had already sold his house in Regina and made plans to move back into his former home in Gravelbourg.

How is it, Mr. Minister, that some people who are friends of your government get couple months notice, and others find out through news releases that they have to have their lives destroyed?

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

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — No, Mr. Speaker. There was no advance notice for any employee in those departments with one exception, with one exception, Mr. Speaker . . . and that was where there was a leak of the information that took place in the case of the Department of Agriculture, the first announcement of Fair Share. That's the case, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member, the muck-raker from North Battleford, can make any allegations he wants to, but that is absolutely not the case, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Anguish:** — To the same minister, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure that the minister will want to review his comment that he made just now. Mr. Archambault himself, he says: But Archambault angrily denied the accusation of the two months notice that he got, explaining he only found out about the move to Gravelbourg last week. Mr. Minister, that's advance notice.

You'd also like people to believe that the provincial goods and services tax will create jobs and that GigaText was a solid investment for people in the province of Saskatchewan and like them to believe that you could balance the budget, Mr. Minister. That's what you'd like people to believe.

Can you tell us that in fact you give special treatment to some people that you want, that are your friends; and others, you want to destroy their lives.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, I stand by what I said earlier: no advance notice to employees in the various departments. The only people who knew were the senior manager in each case — the senior manager, the deputy, the president, whatever was the case — who would know in advance because we were working with them in terms of the configuration of the department when it was moved.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member, who makes all of his allegations and his role in that caucus is obvious to all of us and to everybody, is always to be he who makes allegations, he who stands and rakes through the mud. That's the nature of his role in the caucus; fair ball, I guess that's his role. And he's accepted it willingly.

That's the same member that goes to his own chamber of commerce in his own city of North Battleford and gives them a warning, Mr. Speaker, a warning to his chamber of commerce.

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

**Mr. Anguish:** — Mr. Speaker, to the same minister. Everybody in this province today knows that you locked the doors to some people, but you open the doors to the brother-in-law of the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Anguish:** — Mr. Speaker, at one point there was decentralization in Saskatchewan — Sask Forest products in Prince Albert, Department of Northern Saskatchewan up in La Ronge, the dental program and Highways workers all across the province.

Will you tell us today, Mr. Minister, that you'll stop your decentralization plans as a political gimmick, call an election, let the people decide, and then we'll talk about decentralization in Saskatchewan?

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

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, the same hon. member made a request to my office in a phone call to an

office staff member of my office about what's coming to North Battleford — that hon. member. Mr. Speaker, so all I'll . . .

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

I'm going to have to ask the hon. member to apologize for that very direct accusation of lying which he just made.

**Mr. Anguish:** — I certainly withdraw that comment, and I apologize for using unparliamentary language, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** — I'd like to ask the hon. member to conclude his remarks and end our question period.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member talks about an election. Mr. Speaker, there will be an election, I said in an earlier answer. There is a plan laid out very clearly by members of this side of the House. There is no plan laid out by those hon. members, their leader, or anyone else.

Mr. Speaker, when there's an election, the people will choose based on good planning. And we have done that.

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

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

### New Executive Co-ordinator of Corporate Environmental Management

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, just a few months ago I announced the establishment of a new post. That post was unique in Canada. It was called the executive co-ordinator of environmental business development. Our objective with that is to identify opportunities for Saskatchewan businesses, to provide new environmental services . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order, order. Order. Let us all listen to the ministerial statement of the Minister of the Environment. And that includes the member from Saskatoon Nutana; I ask her also to pay attention. And the members will also have an opportunity to respond at least to the representative from the opposition. And let us now perhaps tone down the emotions a bit and carry on.

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am today pleased to announce another new and important post within the Department of the Environment and Public Safety. And I'd like to announce at this time the new executive co-ordinator of corporate environmental management will be Mr. Don Somers, seated in your gallery, Mr. Speaker, and introduced a few moments ago.

Mr. Somers' job will be to work with senior corporate executives to develop environmental activities within their businesses and industries from the executive level on down. He will be working out of the city of Saskatoon, out of the offices of the Environment and Public Safety in the city of Saskatoon.

Business and industry in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, I think are ready today to take very much a leadership role in protection of the environment. And when we say that the healthy environment is everyone's responsibility, we don't just mean individuals, Mr. Speaker, we mean businesses, corporate structures as well. Business and industry in Saskatchewan, I think, are ready to take a leadership role in many respects, have in the past, and will continue in the future.

Just a brief outline of the program, Mr. Speaker. The program will review current and projected environmental regulations, and together working with industry, develop a broad policy of corporate responsibility and action development. We will also see the government and Crown corporations also play a leadership role . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Excuse me for interrupting, but I'm going to ask the hon. member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster to allow the Minister of Environment to continue. And perhaps if we ceased debates across the floor and listen to the hon. member who happens to have the floor at the time, the House will run a bit more smoothly.

And I ask the hon. member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster to do that and the hon. member for Regina Lakeview.

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, there will also be development of a prototype program for corporate involvement in environmental management. You will also see government and Crown corporations take this same leadership role.

To briefly give you a summation of Mr. Somers' experience, Mr. Somers has been involved in environmental and biotechnology consulting with the international accounting firm of Peat Marwick Stevenson and Kellogg. He was also a senior executive with a Saskatchewan mining company involved in the environmental impact of mining.

Mr. Somers is a former university faculty member. He has taught, conducted research, and published in the field of molecular biology and genetics. He is founder of the awareness science and technology education program, a Saskatoon-based program involving school boards, university researchers and business. Mr. Somers was recently one of the three commissioners with the Saskatchewan Environmental Assessment Review Commission, and he has also sat on the Key Lake uranium board of inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Mr. Somers will serve very well in this capacity, and it's my pleasure to make that announcement this morning.

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

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I just want to respond by saying that we extend our congratulations to Mr. Somers on his appointment. We wish him well.

In many ways this move is a step in the right direction. But

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that it takes more than simply the minister saying that this is going to happen. I urge the minister to pay attention to recommendations that may come forward, because one of the greatest shortcomings in recent years — in the last nine years of this government — has been where the government has had a double standard in environmental policy.

It has had one standard in environmental regulations and policy for everybody else; it has had another standard when it came to political projects that the government wanted to put into place. And it did not apply the some kind of stringent environmental regulations and policing and requirements as it has on everybody else.

I hope that this is the beginning, Mr. Speaker, of a change to all that. And we will be watching it at least for the next six months until the electorate has made a decision on which way this province is going to go on environmental matters.

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

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

### Bill No. 23 — An Act respecting the League of Educational Administrators, Directors and Superintendents

**Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn:** — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to move first reading of a Bill respecting the League of Educational Administrators, Directors and Superintendents.

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

(1045)

## POINT OF PRIVILEGE

**Mr. Anguish:** — Before orders of the day, I want to rise on a point of personal privilege before this legislature. Earlier today I used unparliamentary language in this legislature and I apologize for that. And I did that because I was very angry, Mr. Speaker, at a comment made by the Deputy Premier.

The Deputy Premier, as close as I can tell, and I've asked you to review the record, pointed across at myself and said: that member phoned my office and asked what was coming to North Battleford.

Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents watch this Assembly proceedings, especially during question period. The provincial media take almost all of their newscasting from this question period.

Mr. Speaker, it's my solemn oath as a member of this Legislative Assembly, that is totally, totally inaccurate, fabricated, and false; made either in error, either in error, Mr. Speaker, or intentionally by the Deputy Premier.

I would ask that you find the question of privilege, because there will be no evidence that can be presented by the Deputy Premier that there is one iota of truth to the statement he made.

I have not called his office in one instance to ask what would be coming to North Battleford, Mr. Speaker, nor have my staff called the minister's office and asked what was coming to North Battleford, Mr. Speaker.

I am so angered by what the Deputy Premier would do to not only bring disrespect on this Assembly but to try and bring disrespect on me as a member of the legislature. And it certainly affects in the eyes of my constituents, my integrity.

And I ask you, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to examine the record and find that my privileges as a member of this Chamber have been violated by the Deputy Premier. Thank you, sir.

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

**The Speaker:** — Order. I have listened to the hon. member's point of privilege which pertains directly to him and I'm prepared . . . Order, order.

Actually in this particular case I don't know if it's really necessary to hear anybody else because it's the individual himself complaining that something's happened to him. If you wish to make a brief comment, I will listen to it, but on this particular issue quite frankly I don't intend to hear a large number or even a smaller number of members speak. It is something that is directly pertaining to him.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your ruling to allow me to speak and I will be very brief.

But during question period, the Deputy Premier I believe made disparaging remarks about one of our members in an attempt to discredit the member in a very substantial issue that he was raising at the time.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order. I'm going to have ask the hon. member for Quill Lakes and I believe it was Cut Knife-Lloydminster again, but I'm not sure — and if it isn't I apologize to him — but one of the members on the opposite side. And the hon. member for Quill Lakes, I'm going to ask him to refrain and allow his own colleague to speak.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to get up just for a short moment to defend the member from The Battlefords.

During question period the Deputy Premier indicated, and I think in an attempt to discredit the member because he was asking tough questions about the relocation of the Premier's brother-in-law from Regina to Gravelbourg . . . My comment here, Mr. Speaker, is based on what I believe are the rules of the Assembly that indicate that reflections on members, as indicated on page 19 of Beauchesne's *Rules and Forms*, clause no. 64, under "Reflections on Members," indicate that:

The House has occasionally taken notice of attacks on individual Members.

And it goes on to explain how, if remarks or attacks are made on one member to another, that the remarks are

either substantiated or withdrawn. And, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that you would today ask that the member from the Meadow Lake would withdraw the comments he made about a member on our side of the House.

On another point, Mr. Speaker, the words were used by the minister against the member from The Battlefords, using the term "muck-raker," and I would just ask whether or not that is parliamentary language from the Deputy Premier.

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

**The Speaker:** — I have listened to the hon. member's point of privilege and would like to respond to it in this manner, by drawing the attention of hon. members to Beauchesne's, 5th Edition. You will find under citation 19, page 12, 19(1):

A dispute arising between two Members, as to allegations of facts . . .

Order, order, order, order. Now the member for Regina Lakeview, I realize that she has an interest in this, as many other people, and the member for Saskatoon Nutana.

Now here is Beauchesne's, a time-honoured rules. The member for Regina Elphinstone, just allow the ruling to go forth.

Now whether hon. members agree with it or don't agree with it — Order! — that is another matter. However, this is the ruling as I see it.

Now citation 19, page 12, Beauchesne's, 5th edition once more:

(1) A dispute arising between two Members, as to allegations of facts, does not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege.

Now let me draw your attention also to citation 322, headed by "Statements by Members:"

It has been formally ruled by Speakers that a statement by a Member respecting himself and particularly within his own knowledge must be accepted, but it is not unparliamentary temperately to criticize statements made by a member as being contrary to the facts; but no imputation of intentional falsehood is permissible. On rare occasions this may result in the House having to accept two contradictory accounts of the same incident.

Therefore, based on those two citations, I find that the hon. member has not established a prima facie case of privilege.

## POINT OF ORDER

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Speaker, the speed with which that ruling came forth is contrasted with what I gather is your failure to deliver your ruling and your response with respect to the document you quoted from the other night. We contrast the speed with which the two have been



dealt with.

I want to ask you as well, Mr. Speaker, since I guess you're not going to respond today . . . As Mr. Speaker will know, members on this side of the House have the gravest concern about the fashion in which the incident last night was handled. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that the government is overdramatizing and exaggerating the situation for their own use, for their own narrow political benefit.

A group of peaceful protesters came to present some views and you would think this was 1789 and the storming of bastille. That was the way the government reacted last night.

If the staff . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order, order. Order, order! Order, order, order. Order, order! Order, order, order. Order, order. Order. Now just a minute, just a minute. Just a minute. You people hold it, hold it. Order, order. Order, order.

Now I believe that the demonstration I'm seeing here — just terrible. Now I got up, I got up . . . Order. I rose to my feet because I heard the statement and I was going to draw it to the attention of the hon. member. Now if you people would just stop interfering, I will be able to do that. And that was exactly my intention. And you're being most unfair, most, most unfair and unparliamentary by doing that.

Now the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster made a statement, that there is the wife-beater. And that's unparliamentary. I must ask him to rise and apologize for that remark.

**Mr. Hopfner:** — Mr. Speaker, I will apologize.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order. Order. It isn't funny. The member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster, I'd like to . . . It isn't funny at all. It isn't funny at all. And I'd like to draw that to his attention, and I think that he should act in a parliamentary manner after apologizing. It isn't funny at all.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I said, a peaceful group of demonstrators came and I think the government entirely over-reacted. And if there is a rule of the Assembly which actually authorizes the locking of this Chamber, I and my colleagues want to be very clear about it.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the point of my rising in the first place, before I was apparently accused of being a wife-beater . . . I'm not sure many of my constituents would believe that and I'm not particularly concerned about it. Apart from its rather unparliamentary approach, I don't think it'll be widely believed.

Mr. Speaker, when you are returning with your . . . with the copy of the security document, if there's some explanation for not having it today, I'd be interested in that. I'd also like to know the authority for the use of that document. If Mr. Speaker intends to refer to the

committee of expenditures, the Board of Internal Economy, I would like to have the minute number and the date of the minute which authorizes that. Because frankly to be fair, the two members who sat on that between '82 and '86 are no longer a part of our caucus. It is possible.

But we vehemently disagree with that treatment of the public. And we want to be very sure that the rules of this Assembly authorize that sort of treatment, because we think it is entirely inconsistent with everything this Legislative Assembly stands for.

(1100)

**The Speaker:** — I listened to the hon. member's remarks, and I listened to them and I know he puts them forth with concern and sincerity.

I don't have the ruling for you this morning for a very good reason. I wanted to do the total research and I will provide you with all the answers that it is possible for me to provide to you. You may be assured of that. Whatever information we have, you will get.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

#### Time Allocation on Bill 61

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move a motion this morning respecting the remaining time that this Assembly will deal with Bill no. 61. The motion that I will be moving is seconded by my seat mate, the member for Regina South.

And in effect what this motion will do amongst other things is to extend a normal Friday sitting day. We'll probably be here past the 1 o'clock normal time of adjournment and we will spend I believe it's four hours on . . . or up to four hours, not necessarily the full four hours, but up to four hours on Committee of the Whole.

In reviewing this Bill I have taken note that there are six rather straightforward sections to the Bill. I freely admit that the issue and the principle here is a big one that has been debated at length in the Assembly in one form or another.

The issue is a big one; it's not, however, complex. It's not a complex piece of legislation. It's rather straightforward. And as such, I'd like to move, seconded by my seat mate:

That notwithstanding the rules of this Assembly, and following the adoption of this motion, when the order is called for Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 61 — An Act to amend The Education and Health Tax Act (No. 2), not more than four hours shall be allocated to debate on such order and that at 15 minutes before the expiration of the allocated time, unless sooner concluded, the Chairman shall put all questions necessary to dispose of every section of the Bill not yet passed, and shall report the Bill forthwith to the House, and that the question for the first and second reading of any amendments shall be put forthwith

and decided without amendment or debate; and,

That there shall be one hour allocated to the consideration of the motion for third reading of Bill No. 61, and at 15 minutes before the expiration of the allocated time, unless sooner concluded, the Speaker shall interrupt proceedings and put every question necessary to dispose of the order for third reading of the Bill; and,

That in the case of any recorded division relating to any proceeding on the Bill, the bells shall be limited to 10 minutes; and,

That rule 3(3) be suspended on the sitting day in which proceedings on Bill No. 61 pursuant to this motion begin.

Mr. Speaker, that's a brief summation of what this motion would do and I would trust that the Assembly would deal with this in an expeditious manner.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I'm afraid I have to interrupt you immediately. The member for Regina Victoria I see is on his feet.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce some guests.

Leave granted.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would introduce to you Ling Ling Fan and Xihe Zhao. These are new Canadians — scholars, engineers, who have moved here from Beijing. They are accompanied by Betty Lewis who is helping them to learn the English language. And I would ask all members to join with me to wish them a very warm welcome, Mr. Speaker.

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

## GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

### Time Allocation on Bill 61 (continued)

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What we have witnessed over the last few months, but particularly over the last few weeks and days, is a government which is increasingly reluctant to discuss any subject with which people disagree with them. They're increasingly reluctant to permit a full debate on this Bill. And I'm going to take a moment, Mr. Speaker, in a while, to talk about the magnitude of this Bill and what this sort of thing represents. It's a government which is increasingly reluctant to listen to the public.

I am not, Mr. Speaker, going to again make my comments with respect to what occurred last night. I won't go through that again, but neither has the government heard the last of it. Mr. Speaker, it is our view that the

government exists to serve the people.

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

**Mr. Shillington:** — The government of this province does not exist to serve Cargill, it not does exist to serve the friends of the Conservative Party, it does not even, Mr. Speaker, exist to serve the Conservative Party. It exists to serve the public. When the public want to make themselves heard on a government issue, they have every right and responsibility to do so.

The fashion in which this government has begun to close the doors of government to the public is truly breath-taking. Mr. Speaker, I recall in the '70s a number of different groups — the natives, Indian and Metis were one group; the oil men were another group who demonstrated and came in. I remember when the natives were here, there were literally thousands of them outside. They brought in their war drums, the big drums; they weren't war drums, the big drums. And what did they want? They wanted to speak to the premier. And they stayed there, and they were welcome to come. And indeed, Mr. Speaker, they met with the premier. And when they met with the premier, they left.

What the public want is an opportunity to address themselves to the government, and that's what they're being denied. That's what they're being denied with closure and that's what they're being denied with the pathetic displays . . . with the pathetic behaviour which took place last night. That's all they wanted.

The style of your government, the style of this government would embarrass a military dictatorship in South America, much less a North American government. In catcalls earlier to the member from Regina South, I said to him, where do you think you are? Is this North America or South America? This is a democracy. People have the right to come, they have a right to address themselves, and they have a right to speak to their leaders. And they have done that since time immemorial.

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

**Mr. Shillington:** — It is the legacy of English and French notions of democracy which we have inherited. They have a right to come here and speak to their government. They have a right to do that directly, and they have a right to do that indirectly.

And this government isn't giving them the right in either way. You aren't allowing the members to speak to it, and you won't listen to them directly. And what do you think you're going to face, apart from . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well I delight . . . I have accomplished something. Mr. Speaker, the day has not been totally wasted; I have accomplished something. Apparently we're going to get some members opposite into the debate, which we have not been very successful in doing so far.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that the best way to resolve disputes is to throw open discussion until the matter has been resolved. We believe . . .

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

Now perhaps hon. members feel strongly about certain issues. However I don't think that gives them the right to disrupt proceedings in the House. It doesn't give them that right. Now I have asked the hon. members this morning several times to control themselves, to refrain from disrupting the proceedings of the House. Regardless of how strongly you feel, I think there are times that you must just simply learn to control your feelings, as it were.

And let us allow the member for Regina Centre to continue.

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

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is our view, Mr. Speaker, that the best way to resolve legitimate disputes between people in a democracy is to permit the discussion to continue until there is some measure of agreement. And that is the way these matters are resolved.

I remember, Mr. Speaker, and I've said this before, when the potash industry was nationalized. The largest nationalization in human history took place in this province. It was enormously controversial. Mr. Speaker, the debate on the Bill continued non-stop from early in December to early in February — non-stop. Nothing else was discussed.

And eventually the discussion came to an end. And, I may say, eventually there was a measure of agreement as to what ought to be done. And the issue was not an issue thereafter. There was a measure of agreement. But it continued, as I recall it, for seven weeks.

What's the hurry to deal with the tax Bill? It's this government's political agenda. This government is putting its election timetable ahead of the public business. And we object, and we object in the strongest possible terms.

I'm going to be interested to hear the comments of members opposite. We witnessed a spectacle this morning, of members making the most derogatory, might I say obscene, comments from their seat. Then they're asked a question and they won't get up and respond to it. We witnessed that this morning.

I'm going to be interested to see whether or not the member from Wascana takes the opportunity to make his comments on this subject, very closely related. I'm going to be very interested to see whether or not the member from Weyburn takes the opportunity to put his comments on the record instead of making them from his seat.

I shall be very interested to hear the member's view of how a democracy functions because we don't think it functions in this fashion. We believe the public have a right to be heard. They have a right to be heard in this Assembly and they have a right to be heard outside the Assembly. And when members opposite take steps to limit discussion on issues, then you are doing almost irreparable harm to the public good in this province.

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

**Mr. Shillington:** — What took place last night, Mr. Speaker, was a peaceful demonstration, largely of women and children since they are the ones who are affected by the disintegration. There was largely women and children here last night.

If there was excessive frustration on the part of that demonstration, it came about because nobody would talk to them. Nobody from government would walk outside the door and face the music.

Members opposite are fond of quoting Allan Blakeney. Why I've heard his name a dozen times in the last few days. Well let me tell you one of the rules when I was in Allan Blakeney's cabinet. Nobody ever ducked a demonstration. You didn't do it.

I recall having gone and spoken to some very angry crowds, but nobody ducked it. It wasn't done. I spoke to trade unionists about wage and price controls — anyone thinks that was a piece of cake you should have been there. I spoke to gay rights people when we didn't support their view, when the government did not support their view.

All of those groups were met. And so were the demonstrators who came inside the building. They had their day. And when they had their day, they left. And indeed with respect to the natives, I just might add the sequel to the story was that that was the beginning of the process whereby we began to settle Indian land claims.

What was, Mr. Speaker, what was in a sense heart-warming about the natives who were in the building was they believed in the system. They come in with one request. They wanted to meet the Premier. And they believed when they met the Premier the problems would be resolved. They believed in the institution; they believed in the leaders who were there.

(1115)

And that is of the most fundamental importance. What happened last night, and it is symptomatic of the sickness of this government, and there's no kinder language for it than sickness — symptomatic of the sickness of this government, is that nobody would talk to them, and that left them with the impression that nobody was ever going to listen. And if there was some frustration, it was bred by the government's behaviour.

Mr. Speaker, the same problem repeats itself with respect to closure on this Bill. This is a Bill of the most fundamental importance. It goes to the manner in which this government manages its affairs. And the management of this government's affairs has been truly dreadful. Look what nine years of fiscal management by this government has brought us.

I had two rather interesting pieces of mail from this week, Mr. Speaker. One was something that I had not forgotten about but I've lost my copy of it. The member from Moosomin might be interested in the name. I ran into John Porter, lives in a small community, Kelso.

He happened to have his copy of it. What is it? The clipping from *The New York Times* in which Saskatchewan, 1981, in which Saskatchewan was described as the best managed jurisdiction in North America. It was 1981, Saskatchewan had a reputation in the largest daily newspaper on the planet, the largest daily newspaper on the planet, *The New York Times*, had the reputation of being the best managed jurisdiction in North America. I'd read it and I frankly lost my copy. I ran into somebody who'd saved it.

What's happened after nine years? Well I want to read — and I don't often do this — I want to read a letter which I got from my brother living in Manitoba. It illustrates what has happened to this province over nine years.

He writes — and we'll skip the preceding paragraphs — he says also on trivia: I hear Saskatchewan mentioned in an interesting context in Winnipeg, where presently a full-scale civic debate is going on over the possible construction of a new \$60 million arena. It is generally conceded that if a new larger glitzier arena is not constructed, the Winnipeg Jets will have to be sold, in the face of escalating player salaries.

One city councillor remarked this week — and this is the point of this paragraph — that if it was not built, Winnipeg would become another Regina. My Heavens above! Winnipeg is going to become another Regina, a prospect that apparently strikes cold terror into the hearts of any Winnipegger. Indeed, he goes on, today's Sunday *Free Press* headlined on the front page, build Manitoba gardens or we'll just be another Saskatchewan.

That's our reputation after nine years. In 1981 we were the best managed jurisdiction in North America. In 1991 people fear that they will turn out like us. That is what nine years of Conservative government have meant. That's what your style of management have meant.

And you want to choke off debate on the central issue of this session. It is an issue which goes to the very core of your style of management. We have said to you that you have plenty of revenue to provide the services which you need. I said before, I'm going to say today, and I'm going to go on saying, that in the nine years from April 1982 to April 1991, in those nine years, inflation has gone up by 48 per cent but your revenues have gone up by 61 per cent.

The fiscal problems of this government have nothing to do with not having enough revenue. You've got more than enough revenue to provide the services you need. You have problems because, while your revenue's gone up by 61 per cent, your expenditures have gone up by 85 per cent. We say, Mr. Speaker, the problems which this government has has everything to do with waste and nothing to do with revenue. You've got lots of money to provide the services they need. And that, Mr. Speaker, has become in a way the central issue in the political landscape today.

Wherever you go you hear people talking about this issue in different ways. They may call it waste and mismanagement. They may complain about the former member from Kindersley, now ensconced in I gather

rather posh offices in Minneapolis doing I don't know what. They may talk about the member . . . the former member from Indian Head-Wolseley, Graham Taylor, ensconced I guess in some of the world's poshest offices overlooking the Hong Kong — and some of the world's most expensive offices — overlooking the Hong Kong bay.

But when they're doing it, they're talking about the same general issue. It is the level of taxes and the level of expenditures. And not a soul in this province believes that the money which comes into the public treasury is being spent efficiently or effectively. Not a soul believes that. Mr. Speaker, I sometimes believe that this government doesn't believe it and that's why they want to end this debate.

From the very beginning of this debate, the government's sole objective has been to bring the debate to a close. In early May, a month ago, this government introduced a motion. After three opposition members had spoken, on the largest tax increase in the history of the province, after three opposition members had spoken, they moved closure.

There was a day, Mr. Speaker, prior to 1982, when not only were people allowed into the building, but when debate went on, closure was never used. Closure was never used up until 1982. This was a society which believed in free and open discussion, and it was a hallmark of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity . . . Whenever I'm travelling I always stop and see the local provincial legislative buildings in the state capitals. I always make time for it.

I want to quickly relate a couple of very different experiences. One was in Hawaii. Their state capital in a sense reflects the people — an open and free society. There are no doors on the building. It wouldn't work in Saskatchewan; we have a different climate. But they have no doors on the building nor are there any security people. The only way you can tell the Canadians from the local legislators is that we're wearing heavy, dark clothing and they're wearing white shirts. But apart from that you mingle freely. There were no security people. And that is the way the Hawaiian society is structured.

About three or four years ago — three years ago to be precise — my son and I were in Mexico City. I had obtained from an employee who works for the member from Regina Rosemont, I had obtained the name of a deputy in Mexico City. I asked them to call me. He didn't. So I thought I'd just jolly well trot down to the Legislative Assembly and look him up myself. So I did that.

My son and I headed out one bright, sunny morning, went down to . . . Their legislative building in Mexico City is called the National Palace. Went in with a stream of tourists into what I thought was the National Palace, but discovered there was one door for tourists and one door for deputies. And I realized after I was in it, I was in the wrong spot. So as soon as Ron and I could extricate ourselves, we got back out. The door where the deputy was in was obvious enough.

Neither my son or I spoke Spanish, any meaningful amount of Spanish, so we couldn't explain to the guard what we wanted. The person at the door was not a Mexico City policeman. It was a soldier armed with a sub-machine-gun. When we started to come to the door, he went like that. I gave him the biggest Canadian smile and kept on going because when I got there I had the name of the person I was going to see. I took a couple of more steps. His machine-gun came down. I heard the distinctive click of a safety coming off, and we were looking at the business end of a machine gun. We slowly backed up and we walked quietly away from the door. I gave up any attempt to see the deputy — no longer a priority.

As we were leaving, my son who was 10 years of age, asked me about it. One of the questions he asked was: what were they afraid of? I said, Ryan, I don't know; it's not the kind of society we live in. I do not know what that soldier thought we were going to do inside the building.

Well to some extent we are becoming that kind of a society. To some extent we are moving from the Hawaiian model of a free and open democratic society to a society where government protects itself and the people through security. We do not have soldiers with machine-guns at the front door of this building, but we have a group of people with the same mentality, and that is anybody who wants to argue with you is dangerous. Anyone with a disparaging comment is a dangerous person and must be treated as such.

There was a day in this province when we treated people as the Hawaiians do. Everyone can be trusted, and it's your building, come on in.

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

**Mr. Shillington:** — There was a day, Mr. Speaker, when the debate in this Assembly was conducted in the same fashion. It is the people's business; let them be heard. The largest expropriation in the history of the province can wait on the discussion until the discussion brings itself to a conclusion. Closure was never used in this Assembly up until 1982. None of us . . . indeed there was an argument in our caucus by people who have been here a long time about whether or not closure existed. We never thought of it. It was never discussed.

What do we have now? We have a government which, after three speakers on the largest tax increase in the history of the province, moves closure. And then what happened? We had to resort to the most extraordinary measures — the introduction of petitions, thousands of them, 120,000 names to be more precise. We had to resort to that measure to get the right to speak. And to put it mildly, that process has not exhausted itself.

We had three speakers speak beforehand, and some of us wanted to speak at length, for a longer period of time than many of the public would think perhaps is necessary. I spoke for two and a half hours. My colleague from Moose Jaw North spoke for about the same length of time. We did so because we felt it was important. We wanted to make the arguments on behalf of our constituents and on

behalf of the people of this province.

What happens after four days of debate on the largest tax increase in the history of this province? The government moves closure again. To put it mildly, we are upset with this.

This government doesn't believe in listening; it doesn't believe in even allowing the public to speak. It is one thing not to listen. No one can make you do that. But it is quite another thing for members opposite to deny the public the right to be heard. And that's what you're doing.

The incident which occurred last night and the closure on this debate are all part and parcel of the same attitude. It's all part and parcel of the same attitude. It is, Mr. Speaker, an attitude which says the public have no place in public business. Well that isn't our point of view. That isn't our point of view.

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

**Mr. Shillington:** — Apparently, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite are going to continue with this charade. Apparently reason is not going to prevail. Members opposite have one thought in mind, and that is to get us out of their hair. That's the way they view us.

They view us as a nuisance, not as part of a great democratic institution which has been copied around the world as an institution which permits and ensures that governments will be accountable to the people. And it is. It is an institution which has been copied by white, black, north, south, east, west. This institution — almost carbon copies of this institution exist in every corner of the globe. Some mighty nations, India, land of hundreds of millions of people, and some very small ones with 100,000 people — all have the same institution. Why? Because it has proved successful in ensuring that governments are accountable to the people and government do what the people want.

What we have witnessed in this province over the last few years and in this country is a dangerous erosion of that accountability — a dangerous erosion.

The editors of the *Maclean's* magazine in their last edition — each December they do an accounting of the nation — they made I thought a very interesting comment in their last December's issue. The December issue is done with a poll, and then there's a discussion of the poll of public opinion and then a discussion of what the poll meant.

In the discussion of what the poll meant, the editors of *Maclean's* magazine describe the Canadians' attitudes toward their government as one of an elected dictatorship. Canadians believe that you elect a government and then you have absolutely no control over it. They do whatever they want as if they were a dictatorship.

That, Mr. Speaker, is a recent phenomenon. And it has occurred because members opposite have adamantly refused to listen to the public. But what is even more serious, they have refused to allow the public to be heard. The public have every right to hear each member of this

caucus discuss it and discuss it for as long as they want. They also, I hesitate to add, have every right to hear members opposite, government members, defend it.

(1130)

The public, for the taxes which these people pay . . . And I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that Canada is one of the highest-taxed nations in the world, and we are the highest-taxed province in Canada. So we can justly say that we are the highest-taxed province in one of the highest-taxed countries in the world.

The taxes of that sort, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Upshall:** — Mr. Speaker, with leave, I would like to introduce some guests.

Leave granted.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Upshall:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure today, Mr. Speaker, to introduce to you a group of school grade 6 children from Humboldt, about 40 of them. And they're in your gallery. They're visiting Regina today and taking in the legislature as one of their activities.

Their teachers are Jerry Kuntz and Janine Bauml, and chaperons Debbie Wiens and Beverly Yeager. I will meet with the students in a few minutes for a chat and some refreshments, and I'd like all members to welcome them here and join with me in wishing they have a good stay in Regina.

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

### GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

#### Time Allocation on Bill 61 (continued)

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much. I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this province, the highest-taxed province in one of the highest-taxed countries in the world, surely for those sort of taxes they're entitled to something more than what we witnessed this morning on this very topic.

We witnessed the spectacle of the Minister of the Family making derogatory, and I'm going to say obscene, comments from his seat. Then my colleague, the member from Saskatoon Nutana, asked him a question and gave him an opportunity to speak. What happened? As silent as a fence post. He had nothing to say.

Surely for the taxes which these people pay, they're entitled to something more than that. Surely they're entitled to an explanation for what the government's doing. You don't have to listen. You don't have to listen, but you do have to explain what you're doing. You are under an obligation to do something more than call the members of this side wife-beaters. They're entitled to some better explanation of why we have a goods and services tax than simply that you think we're wife-beaters. Mr. Speaker, and members opposite, you owe them more than that. And if you have any passing interest in where

you are in the polls, you need look no further than your arrogance and your adamant refusal to listen to the public.

Let's just do a little review of where we have been since 1986. Where have we been? You went through the 1986 election promising a deficit of some 360 million. Presto! After the election it's \$1.3 billion. That still stands, Mr. Speaker, as an all-Canadian record as the highest deficit per capita in the history of the dominion. That is a record which still stands, the Ontario budget notwithstanding. That is the record.

What was the minister of Finance's response when the reporters asked him: Little mistake in the arithmetic, Mr. Minister? He said, with a smirk on his face, ah, we're politicians you know. What do you expect people to think?

What happened then? Having gone through the election promising medicare was sacrosanct and would never be touched, you then proceeded to dismantle it. You did away with the drug plan, and you did away with the children's dental program. That was 1987.

What happened in 1988? What did you do in 1988 to restore public faith in these institutions? Having gone through the election faithfully promising you would not privatize Saskatchewan Crowns, you proceeded to privatize the biggest one of them all, SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation). Having faithfully promised 20 months earlier you wouldn't do it, you went ahead and do it. What do you expect them to behave? What do you expect them to think of you? That was 1988.

1989-1990, well perhaps you were just too distracted by one stupidity after another: GigaText, SED Systems, Supercart, Joytec. The list goes on and on and on and on and on.

What happens in 1991? In the face of public opinion, which everyone agrees that waste and mismanagement is the overarching issue in the six months leading up to the February announcement of February 20, everyone agreed the overarching issue was waste and mismanagement. And in the face of that kind of public opinion, what do you people do? You introduce the largest tax increase in the history of the province. How on earth do you expect the public to respond? What arrogance. What flat refusal to listen to public opinion. What flouting of the taxpayers who sent you here. What do you expect? What do you expect?

Not only did you not . . . not only did you introduce the largest tax increase in the history of the province, not only did you do that, but you did it outside the legislature in a fashion which is clearly illegitimate, clearly illegitimate to be introducing a budget outside the legislature, never intending to bring it to this legislature.

To members opposite who accuse us of being governed by the polls, all I can say is the party which has postponed the election for four years and eight months, ought not to lecture anyone about being governed by the polls.

**An Hon. Member:** — Four vacancies.

**Mr. Shillington:** — And four vacancies. Because I would say the polls have something to do with your thinking as well. Anyone who's delayed the election as long as you have cannot be entirely oblivious to the polls.

Mr. Speaker, we have the spectacle of a government introducing the largest tax increase in the history of the province and flouting public opinion in doing so — the public who were saying waste and mismanagement is the issue with which the parties must deal. And what did the government opposite do? You flout public opinion and you increase taxes instead — the exact opposite of what they were telling you to do. You did it outside the legislature.

Then when you couldn't avoid a legislature — and only because the boundaries were overthrown by the Court of Appeal — what did you do? You introduced a Bill in the legislature but you introduced closure three days later. There's nothing new or different about the way you're behaving on this thing. The only difference is that it's that much closer to the election.

But this, Mr. Speaker, is part of a pattern of behaviour which has existed non-stop since 1986. You have flouted public opinion on every issue which came before them. And what do you expect people . . . how do you expect people to describe you as other than an elected dictatorship.

Mr. Speaker, this government has been oblivious to our arguments, the public opinion, for four years I guess, five years. I don't entertain a lot of hope that I'm going to change them this afternoon. I do make you one promise. I gather, Mr. Speaker, that we're now looking at a November election. I gather the Premier has announced that his legislative calendar is so stuffed, so stuffed that he cannot get around to an election before late fall. I gather that's the announcement. I haven't heard it, but the reporters told me that.

I promise members opposite one thing. Come November 1, if there is a change in administration, this building and this institution are going to be open to public opinion.

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

**Mr. Shillington:** — My colleague, the member from Saskatoon Eastview has done some excellent work on democratic reform. And I can promise members opposite that that is going to be implemented so that once again this is the institution through which government is called to account by the people. This institution is going to operate as it once operated so well.

I make one other commitment as well. That after November 1, Mr. Speaker, this building is going to go back to being a building which belongs to the people and they are going to have free access to it and it is . . .

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

**Mr. Shillington:** — It will not be a fortress within which a tired and sick government hides from the public. It will cease to be that. It will cease to be that. After November 1,

if we do nothing else, we are going to bring the public back into public business and back into public buildings so that once again government will work in partnership with the public of Saskatchewan.

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

**Hon. Mr. Klein:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll just speak very briefly to this motion. It may not have been apparently noticed by many, Mr. Speaker, but I have not spoken in this Assembly for quite a long time. The last time I spoke, Mr. Speaker, I indicated my shame and my embarrassment for being part of this proud institution. For that reason I have sat here in silence.

You know this whole institution that was so special to me my entire life has been transformed into some kind of a spectacle by the members opposite, and I've simply . . . I used to consider them my colleagues. I even got close enough, Mr. Speaker, to perhaps consider a couple of them my friends. But no more. No longer can I make that statement.

And it disturbs me greatly, Mr. Speaker, that my attitude is like that. But there are many instances that I will bring forward in my few moments to tell my people why. Last week we all remember that they proudly invited their union leaders into this Assembly and put them in the galleries and proudly introduced these people.

Member opposite says, so what. Proudly introduced their friends and guests. And yet we all remember very clearly the disturbance that those guests of yours created as they left this place. And it was your fault because you brought them here and you incited them into that very thing. And it's you people that assume the responsibility of transforming this place into what you have done.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite accuse us of not meeting with demonstrators or members of the public that may disagree with our policy. It's typical distortion. I expect that from those members opposite as they sit there in their smug arrogance believing in their own selves that they will inherit government, and that's all they have to do. Be silent; say nothing; have no policy; have no plan. They will inherit government. And they sit there so smugly and so arrogant. They believe that they can destroy this institution and become that government.

They still must account to the people. And when that time comes, Mr. Speaker, I will proudly go to the people and tell them my colleagues are not afraid to meet with the public, as they claim in here, bordering fabricated stories, distortion and all the like.

Very clearly on my own record, people will remember, again sparked by the members of the opposition, galleries full, the people of the Principal Trust affair. That day made me meet with them as a result of question period rather than asking in a normal fashion to have a meeting with me. I met with them, Mr. Speaker. No problem.

A couple of weeks ago, Barb Byers, who probably runs that outfit, came to this Assembly with a group from Hudson Bay. I met with them, Mr. Speaker. We have no problem meeting with people of the public. We never

have and we never will.

Mr. Speaker, they said at the outset of this session that they were out to destroy and disrupt this Assembly. And I congratulate them for that, because their record is clear and they have done that. They simply don't have the right, Mr. Speaker, to discredit the Chair the way they do, the Assembly, and the parties the way they do time after time, and finding necessity to bring them to order regularly. They don't have the right to say that they represent all of the people and expect people to believe that. They don't have the right to say last night's peaceful demonstration was led by families and children. Families and children don't injure security guards, particularly female security guards. And when some of those people are mixed in with a crowd, they become an accomplice to that, Mr. Speaker. And as a result of being an accomplice, they must have to bear the result that occurred last night.

(1145)

**The Speaker:** — To be quite frank, some hon. members are bothered by the remarks of the member for Saskatoon South. However, having said that, having said that . . . I'm sorry, yes it isn't Saskatoon South. I apologize for that. They are offended by the remarks of the member for Regina South.

The debate started with the hon. member for Regina Centre who spent some time on the issue himself. As everybody in this House heard, the member for Regina South is also spending some time on that issue. Quite frankly, I don't think we should be spending that much time on this issue in this debate, because the debate shouldn't be centred on that one incident, as important as it may seem to hon. members. So I'm just bringing that to the attention of members.

While some members may be upset with the hon. member's remarks, it is an issue that has been brought in, brought into this debate prior to him rising to speak. However, that doesn't justify it, and I don't want him to continue on that issue at any great length.

**Hon. Mr. Klein:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will respect your ruling. And when I say that, I am sincere about it.

We've heard the members opposite speak at length about nothing. We have heard stories about the Alamo go on for hours and hours. We have heard stories about all kinds of trips and escapades and biblical readings and all the rest of that stuff. We've heard it all from those members opposite who say that they want to get into a debate. They can't carry a debate. They can't say in 15 or 20 minutes what they should be able to say.

And this motion, Mr. Speaker, simply allows us to bring some sanity back to this Assembly, and it will bring sanity to this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I wind up and I am indeed pleased and proud to second the motion.

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

The division bells rang from 11:48 a.m. until 12:56 p.m.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

# Yeas — 28

Devine	Neudorf t
Muller	Gerich
Schmidt	Swenson
Klein	Britton
Hodgins	Sauder
McLeod	Toth
Hepworth	Duncan
Meiklejohn	Gleim
Hardy	McLaren
Kopelchuk	Baker
Petersen	Swan
Martens	Muirhead
Hopfner	Johnson
Martin	Gardner

# Nays — 24

Romanow	Kowalsky t
Prebble	Solomon
Rolfes	Atkinson
Shillington	Anguish
Lingenfelter	Hagel
Tchorzewski	Pringle
Koskie	Calvert
Thompson	Lautermilch
Brockelbank	Trew
Mitchell	Smart
Upshall	Van Mulligen
Simard	Koenker

(1300)

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

### Bill No. 61 — An Act to amend The Education and Health Tax Act (No. 2)

#### Clause 1

**Mr. Chairman:** — Would the minister introduce his officials.

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and other members of the committee, seated to my left, John Wright, deputy minister of Finance; behind him, Murray Schafer, director of our E&H (education and health) sales tax division; and to his right, Kirk McGregor, executive director of tax policy.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Chairman, it does not give me pleasure to enter this debate on clause 1 of this particular Bill, Bill 61. And I must say, Mr. Chairman, as well that these last two days, today, we as legislators of the province of Saskatchewan are making history of sort. But I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that it's history which should make none of us in this legislature, and especially no one on the government benches, very proud.



Because, as has been said by my colleagues and by the people of the province of Saskatchewan, the history that we're making is this. For the first time in the 86 year history of this territory called the province of Saskatchewan, for the first time, a provincial government has stooped to using closure to force approval of a tax Bill.

Think of it, Mr. Chairman. Closure. The denial of elected members to advance arguments which the government may not accept, may not agree with, but the denial of the right of the opposition — any opposition — to speak, to speak on the kind of legislative provision which has been the well-spring in the development of the history of parliament: taxes.

No representation; no taxation without representation. All of these slogans and ideas which gave birth to this great institution called parliament or legislature being denied today — we are making history in what can only be described as an act of unprecedented arrogance, in what can only be described as closure, the ultimate proof of political cowardice.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Chairman, I've been in this legislature for some time. I've taken part in debates in opposition and in government. Mr. Chairman, I recall many debates, many contentious issues such as deterrent fees imposed by the Liberal government of the late premier Ross Thatcher, something which he felt in very strongly and to his credit — I didn't agree with him — but he advanced as a matter of principle. And as a matter of principle, we on the opposition opposed him. There was no closure used by the Liberal Party or the Liberal government at that time. The debate ran its course.

I remember being myself on the government benches when we introduced legislation dealing with the question of the potash controversy, a matter of major tax and mineral resource development and federal-provincial relations which had widespread ramifications on whichever side the debate one was on. That debate, Mr. Chairman, lasted for three months. I'll never forget it because it was my responsibility to pilot the legislation through the House.

That debate was challenging and difficult every step of the way as the opposition used every tactic that it could legitimately, from petitions to speeches to letters to questions to long speeches, to try to deter us from what we felt we were doing right and correctly and pursuant to a mandate. There was no closure used, Mr. Chairman, at that time either. That debate ran its normal course.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, we had in those two examples — but there are many — clashes over principles and differing ideas and differing ideals. We had clashes over differing visions. We resorted, all of us on both sides of the debate, to various tactics to try to move the debate along or to extend the debate.

But at no time did any government contemplate stooping to the use of the dreaded tool of closure, the most basic

fundamental right of any elected man or woman coming to this Chamber, the tactic of denying speech, the tactic of denying the advancing of ideas.

This, Mr. Speaker, is an act of arrogance, I repeat again. And more than that, Mr. Speaker, it is confirmation that it is an act of political cowardice from a government that is afraid of, as one of my colleagues said last night, the power of words and ideas, a government that has lost all touch and all courage to advance its ideas and its Bills.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — It's a government that has lost touch. It's a government that has lost the authority, the moral authority, the political authority, to govern.

Can you imagine, sir, four years, eight months into the second term of any administration, the introduction of a tax Bill which will take out of the pockets of Saskatchewan people approximately \$440 million each and every year. Three to four months left to go before the constitution will impose an election on these people opposite.

Can you imagine the audacity, can you imagine the disrespect, can you imagine the bull-headed determination, whatever the merits of this tax might be in the minds of the government, of proceeding in the absence of getting the approval of the electorate for what they're doing in advance, in the absence of allowing a full and proper debate about this particular issue.

This, Mr. Chairman, is not an act of leadership that the government is resorting to, as it would have us believe. This is an act of a government which, I say again, has lost authority and has lost its purpose. This is an act of a government which knows that it cannot win this debate with reason, so it resorts to the only tactic that old, decrepit, and decaying and soon to be defeated governments everywhere in the world resort to — gagging the opposition and gagging the people.

It cannot force the opposition to approve this tax to the weight of its arguments brought to bear on public pressure. No, it cannot get us to amend our position because their arguments are strong, so it moves to stifle the public debate. Tonight, last night, today — these acts are really the final act of a government in its desperate attempt to impose undemocratically this unfair tax; that the whole history of this shoddy Bill is one which will not make any of us proud and which will not make any of the government members proud when the history of this province is written.

Think of the history of this Bill. February 20 or thereabouts, the government purports to introduce this legislation . . . not legislation, this tax measure by a press release. It proposes to do so without a public accounting. It proposes to do so without meeting the legislature. It proposes to do it without telling us why it is that in a budget of four and a half billion dollars they can't find the 3 per cent necessary to fund GRIP and NISA by cutting back on some of its own waste and mismanagement.

No, it proposes to do it by avoiding all of these answers to

these questions. Its idea was to put out a press release budget and to hide from the legislature, to hide from the public, to impose this massive tax grab in this thoroughly despicable and undemocratic way.

And then the next step, Mr. Chairman. When finally the legislature is convened and this legislation is introduced — I might add, long after the tax has begun to be collected by the government and I think under questionable legal authority, but I'll leave that aside for the moment — the government then attempts to introduce a gag motion limiting the right of the opposition to debate this Bill; a total of only five hours.

Any self-respecting opposition had no choice, in fact had to do what was right, and that is to resort to measures, unprecedented measures I admit, to prevent the government from invoking closure in this Draconian way of five hours of debate only. And the opposition responded and so too did, Mr. Chairman, the people of the province of Saskatchewan respond.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — More than 120,000 names on petitions have been tabled in opposition to what this government has been doing — the largest petition drive in the history of the province of Saskatchewan. And I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, that I'm proud that our caucus provided this vehicle and sided with the people in order to allow the voice of the public of the people of the province of Saskatchewan to be heard.

It's ironic that this very same government which has introduced what it calls democratic reform legislation, so-called, before this Assembly at this time — legislation which would allow citizen-initiated plebiscites for example, signed by about 110,000 people — it's ironic that a government that introduces this legislation finds it compatible with its principles to ignore the views of 120,000 Saskatchewan voters and taxpayers who don't want this tax Bill to pass.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — So much, Mr. Chairman, for the commitment to democratic reform. So much to the rhetoric of the words by the Minister of Finance and the Premier that they're going to listen to the people. So much to their vaunted new legislation. Deeds speak louder than the words of this government.

But that wasn't all. Not only did they try to introduce it by press release, not only did they try to limit us to five hours, not only did they try to stop the petitions, not only did they ignore the 120,000 names on the petitions, then there were citizens' after citizens' groups coming to this Assembly, pleading with the government to be heard, business coalition after business coalition. Here's a partial list: The Saskatchewan Business Coalition to STOP the PST, the Alliance Against a Tax on Reading, the independent automobile dealers and suppliers, border community retail merchants, the Saskatchewan restaurant association, the seniors groups, trade union groups — just to name some more.

I could go on and make a long speech on this, but the point is they all took time from their own work schedules and from their own efforts. They took the time to say that democracy is not dead. They came to this legislature in an effort to say that they want their views to be known and to be heard.

And has the government listened, Mr. Chairman? No, blind. Again, it ignored the petition. It ignored the various submissions of the groups, locked the doors last night on people who had a submission on another area. It shut down the right of people to come to this Chamber owned by these people.

That, Mr. Speaker, is a government that is afraid of its own shadow, Mr. Chairman. It is a government which is so fearful that it can no longer meet the public. It is a government which is so out of touch with the feelings, so arrogant, so one-dimensional, so destructive in its pursuit of the policy of scorched earth in the province of Saskatchewan, that the only solution is going to have to be a provincial election, Mr. Chairman. And we say the sooner the better to get rid of these men and women and to get rid of these attitudes and to elect a new government.

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

(1315)

**Mr. Romanow:** — But, Mr. Chairman, as ashamed as the public is of this government in its dying days, I want to tell you that I am, and I think the public is, quite proud of what the members on this side of the House, my colleagues in the Assembly, have done to fight this unfair tax.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, to everyone who took the time to sign the petitions, to everyone who took time to write letters to the editor, to everyone who helped organize public meetings, to everyone who came to this Assembly but was not heard by the government, I say to each and every one of them, thank you. I say to each and every one of them, thank you. Because you have shown everyone, including this timid, afraid government opposite, you've shown everyone that the spirit of democracy in this great province of ours is still alive and well.

And I say this to the people of the province of Saskatchewan, have faith. The PC (Progressive Conservative) government today might win this vote, but to the people of the province I say, have faith because you will ultimately win. Today the government opposite will use closure to force this tax through. But I say to you, Mr. Chairman, and I say to the people of the province, this victory will be as hollow as it will be temporary. Because sooner or later there will be an election and the people will have the last word and a lasting victory when it comes to democracy and this Bill.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — Yes, those people opposite may win today. The people will win tomorrow.

Because I make this commitment to you, Mr. Chairman, as I did on May 21 in Saskatoon, that right after the next

election, one of the first legislative acts of a New Democratic government will be to repeal this expanded 7 per cent PST (provincial sales tax) and to cancel the government's plan to further expand the PST until January 1, next January 1.

I say to the people of Saskatchewan, that is our commitment. And I say to the people of the province of Saskatchewan that you will have a choice. You will have a clear choice in the general election which is only days or weeks ahead, and that choice we will present to you as the opposition. And I'm confident, Mr. Chairman, the people of this province will take the right choice to defend their families and their communities.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman. I said there will be a choice and there will be. This next general election, which I will say there is no reason any longer for the government to delay, challenge them to call it, urge them to call it. The people challenge them, urge them to call it. There's no reason to delay it.

This next election is going to be an election about two different visions about the province of Saskatchewan for the 1990s. Make no mistake about that. There is the one vision — the plan, the difficult-choices theme of the Minister of Finance. That I say, with the greatest respect to the Minister of Finance, is a wrong title. Difficult choices? That's an aspect of government all right. But what's more important are right choices, Mr. Chairman. Not difficult choices, but the right choices.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — The correct choices. The correct choices. There's going to be a choice between the government which is now nine-years-plus in its age. A government which is offering the people of Saskatchewan in the next election what can only be described as more of the same as we've had in the last nine years.

I will not describe — because although it's related to this Bill, this is where the money is going — I will not go through the litany of the GigaTexts and the M.A.S. Medical Ltd., and the Joytec and the Supercarts and the Bob Andrews and the Graham Taylors and the Senator Berntsons. One could go down the line. That's where this money really is going.

They have a choice of that for another four more years. They have a choice about their future plan which is summarized in this recent budget — the so-called, difficult-choices budget — when the real issue is the right choices for families and for people. They have a choice all right — government's 10th straight deficit budget, 10th straight deficit budget.

Mr. Speaker, do you know since 1947 — I think I'm right on this one, doing this off the top of my head, I think I'm right on this — since 1947 there have only been two deficit budgets prior to 1982. I think it was in '60-61 and '61-62. Since 1947, Mr. Chairman, to 1982. And we had droughts during that period and we had difficult times

and we had too many grasshoppers and we had too many Liberals and Conservatives. We had lots of difficulties to overcome. But only two deficit budgets during that period.

And, Mr. Chairman, in that period this great province of ours, more importantly the people of this great province, they somehow found it within their means to build two great universities. They established a post-secondary education system which at one time was second to none.

They established jobs for working men and women. They put support under the programs for rural Canada and for rural Saskatchewan. They provided paved highways, a highway system which is virtually second to none. They did it, and they did it within their means because there were only two deficit budget during that entire period from 1947 to 1982.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, the people of the province of Saskatchewan introduced medicare in 1962. By the way, that's another one where there was no closure introduced. That's another one. Fought by the Conservatives and the Liberals, many in the opposite benches there fought medicare tooth and nail. Some of them were at the rallies. I know that they were there because I was watching them. They fought it.

And you know, Mr. Chairman, when we introduced medicare, we the people of the province of Saskatchewan, we financed it, and we financed it basically out of the Saskatchewan taxpayer because there was not federal cost-sharing arrangement.

It wasn't until 1968 that federal medicare came into office and then the financing arrangements took place at that time. We did it because we had our financial house in order, because we were able to have governments which were prudent, fiscally responsible, that had their priorities for people. They did not have deficit budgets.

And along came 1982. Nine years, ten straight deficit budgets, culminating in this great, unfair tax which takes another \$440 million out of the taxpayers' pockets at a time when our economy is extremely under difficulty and stress.

And today we've got an accumulated deficit, as everybody knows, of \$5.2 billion. And what this Minister of Finance and this Premier wants to do in this Bill is to say more of the same. More of the same. Yes, since 1982 they've increased the taxes, all to fight the deficit. Of course what we've had is more taxes and more deficit. They've sold off the Crown corporations, all to fight the deficit. Instead we don't have the Crown corporations and the deficit continues to go on.

And now in this Bill they say, well we're going to be increasing the taxes. Why? Well to pay for GRIP (gross revenue insurance plan) and NISA (net income stabilization account) and to also fight the deficit. And we know on the track record that that is going to be about as factual and about as believable as any of the promises made by the Premier opposite in the province of Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — Did it come forward with a plan to say that it's going to get a handle on its spending instead of more taxes? No, the government didn't say that. That was too difficult a choice apparently, for this government. Instead it proposes to raise your taxes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I say to all the members of this House, I say to the Minister of Finance with the greatest of respect, the provincial deficit is not out of control because our taxes are too low. The provincial deficit is out of control because we've got a government that's out of control with its spending and its careless operations.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — Don't tell the senior, don't tell the unemployed, don't tell the struggling small-business person, don't tell the farmer, don't tell the young student that's trying to get a job working or otherwise, that the taxes are too low and we're going to fight the deficit.

We know what the statistics are, whether we're the second highest or the highest in Canada or if the Minister of Finance could come up with some other configuration of numbers. The taxes are too high. That's not the reason why the deficit is too high. The deficit is too high not because our taxes are too low; the deficit is too high because these men and women opposite, charged with the sacred trust of managing the finances of the province of Saskatchewan, destroyed all of the opportunities for balancing and providing services through a period of nine years of reckless waste and want and mismanagement. That's why the deficit is there.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — But they're coming to this House and to this people to say, more of the same. More of the same.

Well that's their vision. But I tell you, Mr. Chairman, it isn't the New Democratic plan to get our economy growing and prospering in the 1990s. We say it's got to be done better than that and it can be done better than that and it will be done better.

Our plan calls for the provincial government first to cut waste and careless spending — first — before it asks anyone to pay higher taxes. First. This is where these people keep on coming forward and saying, well where are you going to get the money from?

They spend all these ads saying, where are you going to get the money from? Are you going to be increasing income tax, by some wild figure they pull out of their advertising — by 23 per cent? Are you going to be doing any . . . where are you going to be getting the money from? You see where their mind-set is at?

They think the only way you can get the money from the people is by increasing the taxes. They cannot think of cutting their own spending because they've got so many ward heelers and hangers-on and contracts and other wasteful deals around that they cannot cut them. They're dependent upon those people, and that's where the

money should come from.

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

(1330)

**Mr. Romanow:** — That's why we say, Mr. Chairman, there's going to be a choice in this election campaign. That's why we have fought the PST so vigorously, because that's what people have been telling us in the petitions. There's a choice. The choice is this government can start cutting back.

People are telling us also that this government has no mandate, as I've said earlier, to bring about these plans — all of them. I'm talking about the tax Bill, but decentralization is another one. When an election is days away or at least only should be days away — no mandate — let the people speak first.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say a word about this tax in more specific detail. We contend that this . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Excuse me. Ignore the back-benchers on the government side because these people have, as I've said many times, an allergy to truth which gives them a very negative reaction to the democratic process; and are so silent, so silent of their defence of their electorate that most of them have fled from public office for fear of what the result's going to be in the next election. Ignore them. They're irrelevant; ignore them. They're irrelevant.

Mr. Chairman, I want to come back to the point. I want to come back to the point about the PST and the tax, and what I contend is a major argument about this tax. My argument that it's going to be an extremely harmful tax, and is proving to be a harmful tax on our economy. If fully implemented, if the Premier and these men and women opposite are re-elected, this 7 per cent is going to take, as I've said, \$440 million additionally a year, each and every year, out of the pockets of farmers, business people, consumers. That's the situation.

That, Mr. Chairman, assumes that there's another \$440 million a year of disposable income to obtain from our families, and there isn't. Simply put, this tax grab would drive an already vulnerable provincial economy into deeper recession, and we have many examples of this already as to what's been done already. Everybody knows the statistics on the cost of living which has increased in Regina and Saskatoon according to the latest figures. In the other major cities it's either been on hold or declined. There have been job losses and bankruptcies in the service sector, many examples of that, and the restaurant and hospitality sector.

Cross-border shopping is on the rise. Why, we had the federal minister coming all the way to Saskatchewan to deal the problem, and I find the solution to be somewhat again reflective of Tories. The solution is not to deal with taxes, the solution is to put more police-officers on the border to really tax and make sure nobody escapes from this province of Saskatchewan.

I've quoted often an Estevan business person, Tim Walliser, who I've never met this gentleman, but who said in his local newspaper in Estevan, the Premier's

home riding — Quote:

“Eight hundred cars a day going through the border at one customs port. I would think that is telling us something,” Mr. Walliser says.

“(The government) . . . are simply forcing more people like us out of business.”

The government is simply forcing more people like us out of business.

That’s what it’s done so far. Now the government’s defence is, well there are going to be these input tax credits which are going to offset some of the negative impacts.

**An Hon. Member:** — For who?

**Mr. Romanow:** — And the question that my colleague, the deputy leader says, for whom? But that argument is essentially flawed.

First of all, in speaking to the question, for whom, you must remember, Mr. Chairman, that a whole class of businesses, those in the service sector, are going to receive little if any help from these tax credits because these tax credits are designed primarily to help large companies which purchase large quantities of machinery, raw materials, and other taxable supplies rather than employ people. That’s the nature of the tax input credit scheme. And that’s why we saw the Minister of Energy making the case out for the oil companies and somebody else making out a case for a few of the larger operations.

Restaurants, hotels, engineering firms, retail merchants, among others, will receive little if any benefit from these tax credits. There’ll be some, but very little. And if we’re out there to help the big industries, surely there are more cost-effective ways to help local manufacturers than the way this government is going about it in order to improve their export positions in the world. I can think of a number of programs which would be targeted especially to the manufacturer or the industry involved.

Surely it is not argued that a 7 per cent tax on everything from hamburgers to children’s books is the solution. That’s a blunt instrument by which to try to help a selected industry with some sort of a sense of competitiveness in the international market.

There are other ways of doing this. And the fact that there are other ways of doing this, Mr. Chairman, is verified by the fact that the majority of the other provinces have not harmonized their tax system in order to get the tax input credits. They can survive. Manitoba is surviving; Ontario is surviving.

This tax, Mr. Chairman, will be and is a major body-blow to the Saskatchewan economy. And to buttress this argument we have released our arguments which show, as we contend, that the tax will cost 7,500 jobs over the next five years; that we’re going to lose \$1.37 billion worth of economic activity over the next five years.

I think this is a fundamental point about this tax. Even if you’re a proponent of it, one of the fundamental issues is: do you introduce it at this time when the economy is hurting so much in Saskatchewan? I’m not a proponent of the tax. But if you’re a proponent, surely to introduce the tax at this point is to severely punish an already ravaged economic system in the province of Saskatchewan. Nobody can deny that. The statistics are everywhere.

The Minister of Finance says: well in the medium run or the long run, things are going to improve. I question that statement. But even if it’s true, I say to the Minister of Finance, in the medium run or the long run, many businesses and consumers will be dead economically until we get there.

Our job is to govern now as best as we can, given the circumstances that we have before us now. And I might add that with this kind of a depletion from the economic activities of this province, there is going to be also of course diminished revenues to the coffers for the Minister of Finance because his businesses and his people leave, economic activity dries up and the tax base dries up as well.

Simply stated, Mr. Chairman, the evidence is, in our judgement, too compelling. We cannot afford to allow this tax to stand. And that’s why the protests. You don’t need to be a Ph.D. economist from Harvard. You don’t need to be, with the greatest of respect, the deputy minister of Finance. All you have to do is be an ordinary working person or farmer who applies common sense to economic matters, and look around at what’s happening to Sturgis or Preeceville or Kindersley or Kerrobert or Weyburn or Saskatoon or Regina to know that this tax is a killer on an economy already which is struggling for survival, and should be stopped.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — How else do you explain why 120,000 people have signed their names?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I could stop here and say, kill the tax for this reason, the economic reason that I’ve said, and call the election. But I want to say a few more words about this issue in another context. I want to advance the context of longer-term principles by which I think our finances in this province need to be managed for the future. This government’s not going to do it. It’s going to take a new government to do it.

First of all, what’s required is a common sense, clear game plan that is a game plan that the government will stick to. That is absolutely crucial. I want to make one point on a game plan that the government will stick to and how crucial it is. Mr. Chairman, the members of the government opposite are saying, you know, what is your plan? Why do you keep on making these changes? Or not changes. What is the position that you . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Freudian slip.

**Mr. Romanow:** — No, even changes. Yes, even changes. No, I have no problems in admitting to changes when the people of the province of Saskatchewan say you should

change your policy. Unlike the Minister of Finance, I'm prepared to do that.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — But I want to make this point, first of all, about a clear plan, a clear plan. Mr. Chairman, I have before me here the budget address of the Minister of Finance for the province of Saskatchewan, March 1990. Here it is, sir.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to state the obvious. This is not a speech by a leader of an opposition. It is not a speech by a trade unionist or a farm leader. It's not even the speech of some citizen. This is the speech of a minister of a Finance of a responsible government in a responsible province in a responsible country to which financiers and business people look to determining what the government's priorities and commitments are and to decide whether the government has a plan.

What happened last year? Page 13 on this speech, quote, the minister opposite says:

Loudly and clearly, taxpayers throughout Saskatchewan are saying that tax increases are not acceptable.

I'm going to read that again to you, Mr. Chairman:

Loudly and clearly, taxpayers throughout Saskatchewan are saying that tax increases are not acceptable.

The tax on lotteries was rejected (this minister said), even though the money was destined for the Province's hospitals. People are outraged with the federal government's Goods and Services Tax (and, Mr. Chairman) — and with good reason (the Minister of Finance says). It is unfair (is what the Minister of Finance said).

He said, "It is unfair." And he said something more. He said, "It is too complex." And then in bold type he says:

The Goods and Services Tax is unacceptable. Quite simply (he said), the people have said they have no more to give — enough is enough.

And the Minister of Finance said:

And so, Mr. Speaker, I say to you, and to all the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, this Government has listened. There are no tax increases in this Budget. No increase in personal income tax. No sales tax increase. No other tax increases. The people have spoken. Enough is enough.

Those are the exact quotations.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance says from his place: that was a good speech; why don't you keep on reading it? I could because I have read it.

But here, Mr. Chairman, is the point that I'm trying to make. This is a financial document from a corporation if

you will — if you can liken a government to a corporation. I don't, but let's call it that way. It's a budget of the province from the chief financial officer of the province, of \$4.5 billion. And he has set out a game plan, less than a year ago or about a year ago, saying that the people of the province of Saskatchewan say, enough is enough, no more taxes. That's the game plan upon which he says he is going to proceed.

Mr. Chairman, why I got off onto that little side diversion was to emphasize and to underline my point that what this province has not been getting for the last nine years has been a common sense, clear game plan economically and fiscally, to which the people of the province could adhere to and understand and get behind and rally.

First of all we're going to privatize like crazy, and then we're going to pull back on privatization because the public doesn't want it. Now we're going to tax on lottery taxes, but then we're going to pull back because enough is enough. We're saying there's no more sales tax increases, and all of a sudden, whoops, here comes a big, harmonized 7 per cent expanded PST sales.

There has not been in the nine years of this administration any consistent economic game plan. They have had one foot on the gas pedal and one foot on the brake. Is it any wonder, therefore, that our economy is skidding out of control and is about to wreck on the shoals of PC policies opposite.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — How does the Minister of Finance meet with the financiers of New York city to justify this budget? When the Minister of Finance travels to New York and says, I need the money to keep this province afloat, how does — I'm not going to mention the officials because I'm a firm believer it's elected people to elected people — but how in the world do these people hold their heads up in the financial community, in the business community? It's no wonder that the business community has basically, has basically written this government off.

Well my answer to the Minister of Finance is very simple. If you were of that mind, why didn't you tell the financial community in 1990 that's what you were doing to do? Why didn't you tell them that?

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — I'll tell you the real reason why he didn't tell them that in 1990, the people of Saskatchewan. Because they were gearing up for an election in 1990, so they thought. He will advance another reason about the GST advisory committee. But the reality is that this was an election budget going in 1990. That's why all these false promises with a financial document like the budget that was made, and the lack of the game plan. That's the real reason. Enough is enough.

And this is not a Leader of an Opposition making a reversal. This is not my colleague, the member from Elphinstone or the Deputy Leader or my colleague from Quill Lakes. This is the Minister of Finance for the province of Saskatchewan.

There used to be a time, Mr. Chairman, when what the Minister of Finance said in a budget and what the financial documents were could be relied upon as part of a game plan whether you agreed with it or disagreed with it. There used to be a time of integrity in finances and the only way we're going to recapture that time again is if we defeat every one of those Conservative members opposite.

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

(1345)

**Mr. Romanow:** — Oh yes, there will be choice in this election campaign, Mr. Chairman, so we need a plan. And what would be some of the key elements of a plan as we see it?

Well first of all, obviously, since you cannot rely virtually on anything that the department of budget, Minister of Finance documents say — that is clearly the case, because they keep on changing from year to year — the first thing we've got to do is open up the books. I make a commitment to you, Mr. Chairman, and the people of the province of Saskatchewan, that within the first 60 to 90 days of a change in the government, we will have a thoroughly completed, independent check of the financial records of the province of Saskatchewan from top to bottom. We will invite those members who are still here to explain; and those who are not here, we will invite them in to explain.

We will open up these books from top to bottom and we will invite independent people who are not political to tell us exactly how it is that the debt of the province of Saskatchewan, according to the last statement of 1982, the July 1982 statement, signed by one Mr. Bob Andrew, showed the net debt to be \$3.3 billion; and why it is that today's debt under the latest budget address, under the current Minister of Finance, under the same category, shows the debt not 3.3 billion, but in nine years, \$14.1 billion. We want to know that.

We're going to want to know this. We want to know how bad things really are. We want to know how bad things really are. So the first thing that any responsible government, new government, will do is to come in and to check the books and to do the audit of the books. That's what they do when corporations move in and take over other corporations. We'll have an assessment. We're going to find out exactly how bad things are and then we're going to settle on the new priorities that the people of the province of Saskatchewan want us to pursue — priorities for families and for people. That's the first thing.

Secondly and concurrently we've got to start a meaningful economic development strategy. Not one which has one foot on the gas pedal and one foot on the brakes as the members opposite do, but a different one. I won't bore you with the details today because we're discussing another Bill. But we will use our tax money in this way, Mr. Chairman, rather than being mesmerized in the 1980s by megaprojects like the big projects at Cargill and Pocklington and the like. We think the 1990s and the financial picture of the 1990s dictates that we look to

Main Street in Saskatchewan and to local business to create wealth, targeting profits for them and targeting their export opportunities and their innovation and their entrepreneurial skills and their job creation. Because this is a key, when people work, they have happier, more productive lives. But to state the obvious, everybody gets more revenue, including the province of Saskatchewan, without tax increases — jobs, creation, stimulation.

Thirdly, you've got to look at the question of ending government waste. I want to stress this point very briefly, Mr. Speaker, in the context of this Bill because the government says it needs more. Mr. Chairman, \$4.5 billion is what the government proposes to spend. I say to you, sir, I say to the Minister of Finance, I say to the members from Yorkton and others that in a province of less than a million people, in a province where there may be — what, Mr. Minister of Finance? — 350,000 taxpaying people, I say that \$4.5 billion in a province of less than a million people ought to be enough to get the job done in 1991.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — And to get the job done to finance GRIP and NISA, \$123 million for GRIP and NISA, the Saskatchewan portion . . . which by the way can make another speech on an occasion about whether or not we negotiated the best deal for the taxpayers, just the cost. Be that aside for the moment, 123 is about 3 per cent, by my calculations on the budget, of \$4.5 billion. And this Minister of Finance and this Premier are going to tell the farmers in this election campaign that they couldn't find that money out of \$4.5 billion.

Well I tell you that we'll find that \$123 million, and we'll find it through that independent audit of opening the books. And we'll find it by changing the priorities from all the Bob Andrews and all the Cargills of the world and changing the priorities to the farmers and the working men and women of the province of Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Chairman, what the Minister of Finance is telling, and what the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan is telling our people, is that out of a budget of \$4.5 billion, he can't find that money for GRIP and NISA. What business person, what farmer in the last few years hasn't been forced to cut back by 3 per cent. Mr. Chairman, I know that you're a farmer and I know things have been tough for all farmers. I don't know your personal situation. I think you're a very good farmer but probably you've had the same pressures. You've had to cut back by 3 per cent on your expenditures and you've had to make do.

You've had to live within your budget, sir. I've had to live within my budget. The Minister of Finance has had to live within his budget. Why in the world can't the Government of Saskatchewan live within its own budgets? It must under a new government.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — So we're going to open the books.

We're going to tackle the waste and mismanagement, to live within our means. We're going to stimulate the economy in a different way than these people are — huge bucks for the Cargills of the world — we're going to put them to Main Street.

We're going to do a fourth thing. People say: where are you going to get the money from? Well we're going to do another thing. We're going to review these business deals by this government.

Mr. Chairman, this is against all that I have been used to in political life but I just can't hold back — Cargill and the deal at Belle Plaine. This, of the documents that we have which are press releases, is structured on this basis — \$64 million cash Cargill; \$65 million cash the taxpayers for Cargill. By the way, the world's largest privately owned corporation. I don't think, Mr. Chairman — I think I'm still correct on this — that you can buy a share of Cargill if you had the spare money . . . privately held. One million dollars by some yet unnamed, third-party banker.

They now form Saferco. Then they go and they borrow another \$305 million for which, Mr. Chairman, all of us in this Chamber and all of us in this province are committed solely.

**An Hon. Member:** — But what about Cargill?

**Mr. Romanow:** — No, no, Cargill's not on there. That is the existing deal. But here's the point that I want to make. In what jurisdiction in Canada could you get away with this deal without having any of the documents or the contracts or the financial arrangements or the marketing arrangements or any of the other deals and side aspects of this, being fully tabled on the floor of this legislature, for the people of the province of Saskatchewan and the journalists.

Have the journalists inquired? I don't see much of that. Surely the back-benchers, they must in caucus ask: now what in the world are you doing here, Mr. Minister of Finance? What fee does Cargill get paid for its marketing? We don't have the facts. You see the point that I'm giving by this example. When they ask where are you going to get the money from, well I'm saying to you, sir, and to the people of the province of Saskatchewan, that we're going to open up all of these business deals.

I'll give you another example, Mr. Chairman. When they applied closure for the first time a year ago so back on the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan privatization, we find out subsequently that that deal cost the taxpayers \$440 million. That's an undisputed figure. That's a good deal. And mainly it cost it because in their rush to go to the market, they made the share offering so attractive that it simply didn't work out in a way that the taxpayers got their fair share, talking about fair share. Four hundred and forty million dollars . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — What about share offerings?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Yes, share offerings because you went at the time when you know doggone well it was not the time to get the best price for what you were offering. You did that.

And you're doing that now with Cameco exactly the same way. Scorched earth policy. You want that 15 per cent privatized in Cameco because you think somehow that when an NDP government comes into place, we will not be able to look at that privatization. Think again, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister of Finance, because we will review every one of these privatizations.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to clarify why I'm doing this. Not because I approach this from an ideological perspective, I'm approaching this, Mr. Chairman, from the question about how do we get money elsewhere — as the Minister of Finance challenges us, I've already defined three or four sources — with respect to financing for these programs and tackling the deficit of the budget over the longer while.

And I'm going to ask business people and others in the community, publicly, to open the books in those deals — publicly, every one of them. And they're going to be asked to help us answer the question: were they done in accordance to business terms? Were they done in accordance to economic and fiscal terms? Were they done in accordance with the practices of the day? Were they done in the best interests of the province of Saskatchewan?

Because I believe, Mr. Chairman, that a lot of them were not. And if not, a new government is going to renegotiate with a view to maximizing the revenues for the taxpayers of the province of Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — There's another source. I want to identify a fifth area where you can get the money from: federal off-loading. I say this government has been as silent as a pussy-cat — or how silent can you get? Pretty silent — to whatever Mr. Mulroney says. And when Mr. Mulroney embarked on off-loading, there was absolute silence.

You know, if I'm correct here . . . the Minister of Finance can correct me. But on my research as I understand it, federal transfer payments to Saskatchewan — Mr. Chairman, get this — federal transfer payments, money moving from Ottawa to Regina to help us finance our operations here, will be down by more than \$423 million a year for each of the next three years. That's about the amount that the new PST when closure — looks like its going to work — comes into place. That's the loss of revenue. Now if we could afford it, if Saskatchewan was a have province, maybe you could say that there's some argument to this.

But this is wrong for two reasons, Mr. Chairman. It's wrong because we are in an economically difficult province and difficult strait right now. And we should be having a Minister of Finance and a Premier saying to the Prime Minister, look you have obligations under the constitution with respect to equalization; you simply cannot do it. You have a responsibility; you cannot do it. That's one reason.



And there's another reason. He should be saying to the Prime Minister of Canada, you can't do it because as Prime Minister of Canada you cannot allow the regions of the country to fall into disparity like this does. It's happened in health care. It's happened in education. It's happened on GRIP and NISA.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that what we need to have is a government here in Saskatchewan which is prepared to bargain tough and to bargain patiently, not to bargain in any offensive way but to bargain with reason to convince Ottawa that it's got to live up to its responsibilities, financial and otherwise, as the true national government for all Canadians. And if we succeed — and I think we will succeed — there will be additional revenue to be able to finance these programs and handle the situation.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — Now, Mr. Chairman, I could go on in answering the question, well where are you going to get the money from? I've given you four or five areas here of where we think we can get the money from. I predict, as I stand here, that the Minister of Finance's defence will be, you can't do it, because all during this debate the back-benchers got up and they said, well you can't do it.

No, Mr. Chairman, that's not an answer. Not that you can't do it, the answer is they cannot do it, Mr. Chairman, and will not do it. That's the answer.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — Four point five billion dollars for a province of less than a million people, and they say they can't do it. That's got to be enough. That's how we're going to have to start rebuilding confidence in the economy of Saskatchewan, business into us and us into business and how we're going to start rebuilding the confidence of the farming community. They say they can't do it.

Well, you doggone right, Mr. Chairman. They've proven it; ten deficit budgets in a row. They can't do it. But a brand-new government, an NDP government, will do it for the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

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

(1400)

**Mr. Romanow:** — A plan. Oh, they'll get up and say that's no plan. That's the plan. They may not like it, but that's the plan.

**An Hon. Member:** — It won't work.

**Mr. Romanow:** — And it won't work the Minister of Finance says right now. He can't do it. I know he can't do it. That's why they're riding at 18 and 19 per cent of the popular opinion polls because the people of Saskatchewan know that they can't do it.

Yes, there will be a choice — theirs which is more of the same which we say is wrong, or ours which is a consistent

game plan. And in this next election campaign therefore, Mr. Chairman, Saskatchewan people will have a clear choice. They'll have a clear choice about vision and philosophy; compassion; hope versus despair; incompetence. They'll have all those choices. They'll have choices with respect to candidates.

But they'll have another choice. They will have a clear choice between two economic plans. A vote for the Premier and the PCs will be a vote for the new 7 per cent expanded PST with all of its damaging consequences to our economy and a continuation of more of the same. And a vote for the New Democrats will be a vote to stop this tax, restore confidence in our economy, provide jobs, and get building again as the province is used to. That's the choice.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — That's the choice.

So, Mr. Chairman, as I close, today the government is using its legislative majority and closure in an unprecedented way to force this tax through and get its way.

But, Mr. Chairman, I urge you, sir, and the members opposite, not to think for one moment that the battle is over. The battle may be over in this legislature, Mr. Speaker, but this battle is only begun and it will continue right till election night when the ballots are counted. The battle now moves to the voters and the farmers and the business people, in the towns and the villages and the streets and everywhere in the province of Saskatchewan. This battle is not over. This battle has only begun.

Mark my words, Mr. Chairman. And we know where you stand. We know your situation. We know your game plan. You know ours. That is where the battle will be.

And each one of these people opposite who stood last night and voted: (a) for an attack on democracy by closure; (b) for the biggest tax increase in our history; (c) for a continuation of more of the same — each one of these men and women opposite will be required to answer to their constituents, sooner now than later.

What is tragic about this, Mr. Chairman, is the legacy that will be left behind by this administration. When the historians write of this nine years, when they write of this nine years of debt, waste — just think of all of the scandals after scandals after scandals — when they see the partisanship of government approaches to people like the Provincial Auditor; when they see the misuse of trust with respect to advertising; when they see the confusion; when they see the sheer incompetence; this is a legacy that historians when they write will condemn this sorry nine-year period as one of the worst blights in the history of the province of Saskatchewan.

I'm sorry to use those words. I am very sorry to use those words because I do think they are in a way excessive. But I use them because, Mr. Chairman, the evidence is so overwhelming, so overwhelming that that's what historians will write and conclude.

Shame on them, Mr. Chairman, shame on them. Having inherited a province with traditions and with assets and with hope, they have brought us to this. Shame on them. Shame on them for not standing up for the people. Shame on them.

And I say, Mr. Chairman, that come the next election the people of the province of Saskatchewan, I know, are more resilient than nine years of Tories. They are more optimistic. They are more innovative. They work hard. They're compassionate and they're co-operative. I have more faith in them to rebuild the province. I know that we can do it, and I know that the decade of the 1990s can once again be Saskatchewan's decade, if only we get a new government. Thank you very much.

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

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Well I don't know as there was a question there, Mr. Speaker, relative to any of the clauses, but I'll pick up on some of the points that the hon. member has raised.

I mean, really when you look at all of the issues and the challenges that face Saskatchewan today, this man would have us believe that he has some kind of magical power, Mr. Speaker.

He has said that he can find the money to fund the farm programs — the \$125 million — which he says aren't good enough and that he would renegotiate. And Lord knows what that might cost. He says he can lower taxes. He says he can give targeted assistance to business. When he was asked about the three and a half per cent increases that we gave Health and Education this year, he said we would absolutely give them more, so he can give even more than the hundred-and-some-odd-million dollars that we gave Health and Education budgets this year. And he and his members have also said in all the other areas that were cut back, Mr. Speaker, he has said that he would spend that money and more and add back to those budgets, that he would tear up other agreements, Mr. Speaker. And all of this, he says he would still balance the budget, Mr. Speaker, and balance the books, and that he could accomplish all of this, Mr. Speaker, within that framework.

But I say to you, Mr. Chairman, and to other members of this legislature and to the public, can this man be believed? Can this man be believed, Mr. Chairman? I think why the public say no to that question, Mr. Chairman, is for this reason: when he made the announcement, not in this legislature, not before the Legislative press gallery, but in Saskatoon where he couldn't be questioned, Mr. Chairman, because his handlers whisked him away, one of the NDP handlers said to the media afterwards — because they were displaying some frustration at not being able to ask him questions about his policy and his plans — he said, well it made great TV and that's all that counts.

Mr. Chairman, this plan of attack by the NDP on this Bill, this populist approach to say to the world that we can reduce your tax and still handle all the challenges, is nothing more than pure politics to get that member elected, Mr. Speaker — nothing more, nothing less.

Some members of the business community that were called upon to examine some documents that later showed up in quite a different context than they had expected, Mr. Chairman, called his approach intellectually dishonest. And quite frankly, I think the public of Saskatchewan will see through that, Mr. Chairman. I believe they will see through that.

I think the public of Saskatchewan have had enough of the NDP leader's pretensions that somehow all of these challenges don't exist and that somehow by controlling this infamous waste and mismanagement that he continually refers to, that he can get the books in order, still fund the programs, still balance the books, still drop the deficit and do all those kinds of things.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that simply, he is being intellectually dishonest as others have said outside this Chamber.

Let's pick up one of the first points that he raised, Mr. Speaker, and that is the announcement of the budget outside . . . the announcement of the tax changes outside the legislature. If he really believed in that principle, the principle that major tax announcements ought to be made inside this legislature, I say to the Leader of the Opposition and the NDP: where were they in late December of 1990? Where were they when the Minister of Finance, I, announced outside this legislature a \$25 million tax change?

Did we hear cries of protest from the opposition, from the Leader of the Opposition then, just four or five months ago? Did we hear one word of protest, that what is going on here, Mr. Minister of Finance? You should be in the legislature if you're making announcements of that magnitude. There is a principle at stake here. Did we hear one word of protest? No, we didn't, Mr. Chairman. Do you know why? Because that tax change put \$25 million on an annual basis into the pockets of the consumers of Saskatchewan.

The tax change I'm referring to is the clause — clause 3 in this Bill, Mr. Chairman — that changes the law of Saskatchewan today, which reads that the Saskatchewan E&H tax will be collected as the last tax. Cost of the item, federal taxes, total cost of those things, and we always put our tax on last, so we're in effect putting some tax not only on the item, but also other taxes that on that item, we put it on. Now with this, Mr. Chairman, we'll take that tax off and put them side by side.

Now if this man is so principled as he suggests, Mr. Chairman, why was there not an outcry? Why was there not an outcry from that member and that member and that member when that tax change was made, Mr. Chairman? Is there an element of hypocrisy in this holier-than-thou stance of the Leader of the Opposition? I would suggest, yes, there is, Mr. Chairman. That's what I would suggest.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard no alternatives as to how this opposition would indeed come up with \$125 million to fund the farm programs, or \$100 million to reduce the deficit year over as we have this year.

Of course when he's asked about his plan, he talks about waste and mismanagement. That's where he'd get the money for the farm program. But then of course when he's asked about . . . well you said you wanted to spend more money on health and education, where would you get that money, he said: well I'd cut down on those three or four examples of waste and mismanagement that I gave you. That's where I'd get the money. And when he's asked about, well where would you get the money to reduce the deficit by a hundred million dollars: well I'd cut down the waste and mismanagement in those same three or four areas.

Now, Mr. Chairman, and members of the legislature, I mean I've heard of double counting before but this is triple and quadruple counting. I ask you: how many times has the Leader of the Opposition spent the savings that he said are there by cutting back on paper and advertising? How many times has he spent those five or ten million dollars or whatever the number is?

Is that being intellectually honest with the public? Don't you think that the public know that if we could balance the books by cutting back further . . . because we have cut back. We've been accused every budget that I've been in this legislature by the NDP opposition, we've been accused every budget that I have been in in this legislature that we've been making cut-backs, cut-backs, cut-backs, cut-backs, when in fact the budget was going up and up and up and up, Mr. Chairman. We've been accused of that.

(1415)

And now he's saying by cutting down further than we have on travel and the size of government and paper and advertising, that somehow you can do all these miraculous things in all of these areas.

The public see through it, Mr. Chairman. The reality is, when he announced that if he's elected that he'll repeal this tax, the reality is, Mr. Chairman, what he is really saying to the public of Saskatchewan . . . he looks around him, he sees a debt and deficit that must be dealt with, he sees an economy that must be dealt with, he sees the challenges that we face of moving into the global realities of the 1990s. These are major, major challenges; major, major problems for some.

And I just repeat, I just repeat, Mr. Chairman. It's like Linus told Charlie Brown — that's just what the NDP are doing — they're saying, as Linus told Charlie Brown when Charlie Brown went into all these problems that Charlie Brown always has, Linus said to him, well there's no problem too big you can't walk away from. And that's exactly what the Leader of the Opposition has done.

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

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — He said the problems are so massive, I'll just throw up my hands, promise the people I can lower their taxes and expect them to believe me. Well I'll tell you the public of Saskatchewan will not be fooled because they expect, yes, responsible government, but they also respect responsible opposition.

And he talks about, Mr. Chairman, he talks about reckless spending in this decade. And yet, as I said earlier, every budget that I've ever been a part of in this legislature now for some nine and a half years, every time, no matter what the area was that didn't get enough money or if it was cut back, the opposition would say, spend more, spend more, spend more, spend more; you've cut back, cut back, cut back.

And now they suddenly say, oh you've been spending too much. It's reckless spending, Mr. Chairman. How is it, unless you're really wanting to be intellectually dishonest, how is it that you can go through and trace back through 10 years of our government's administration, how is it that you can trace through that period and not mention once, not mention once the challenges that this Premier has faced in this decade that are very real and that we faced elsewhere.

If you really want to be honest with the people, how can you go through a recitation of the economic challenges that we face and where we're at today and not mention some of those challenges.

Now I'm not saying that they're responsible for everything that we face fiscally, Mr. Chairman. But I think if you're going to be honest with the people, at least you've got to acknowledge the price that we've paid because of high interest rates and a high dollar policy.

The fact that we did have a couple of years drought; the fact that our farmers have been caught in a cross-fire, a trade war, cross-fire for some several years now, that has resulted in a 61-year low price for wheat.

Now don't you think, Mr. Chairman, because you too do farm, don't you think that a Leader of the Opposition in a major speech on the state of the economy and the state of the budget, don't you think he would have to mention the word agriculture? And if he did mention it, don't you think he'd have to say, yes that is a major challenge we face when wheat has been forced down because of this trade war, to a 61-year low.

Is it not intellectually dishonest to ignore that fact, Mr. Chairman? Is it not? And why we're doing these difficult changes, because we believe this party, this Premier believes, it's our duty to help farmers and the farm families and the farm communities cope with the fact that wheat is at a 61-year low and we will help those farmers and farm families, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — They have been silent on how they would help farmers and farm families, except to say that we'd tear up the existing deal and renegotiate a new deal with the feds.

Well that was part of his remarks today, Mr. Chairman. He says, if you elect an NDP government we're going to strike a better deal with the federal government and Prime Minister Mulroney.

Now I'll tell you, I saw a cartoon in the paper the other day with a bunch of guys with long noses. Well that

would pretty well epitomize I think that kind of statement coming from that kind of member. They have constantly criticized the Prime Minister and yet they say, well I think if we were in these chairs, because we're on good terms with the Prime Minister, we could probably have got a better deal on GRIP and NISA, etc., etc., etc.

The reality is, Mr. Chairman, when they were in power, did they get a deal on anything that helped our farmers or Saskatchewan? I'll tell you what kind of a deal they got. They didn't get one ounce of movement on interest rates, Mr. Chairman. They just said no, that's a federal responsibility.

When interest rates were 22 per cent in 1980-81, they said that's a federal responsibility. We can't do anything about it. I know home owners are losing their houses, but I'm sorry, it's a federal responsibility. And when farmers were losing their farms and couldn't buy farms because of 22 per cent interest rate, they said no, that's a federal responsibility, I'm sorry. We can't do anything about it, Mr. Chairman. And yet today he would have us believe, no, I'm sure we can cut better deals with the feds than those Tories can. He said yes, I'm a good guy and I'm sure I can cut a better deal.

What kind of a deal did he cut? Only one deal and he sold out Saskatchewan. The oil, the national energy program, and he was part of that deal, Mr. Chairman — and what good was that for Saskatchewan? Cost us maybe six, six and a half million dollars. Well if that's the kind of deal-making he's talking about, I say to you and I say to the oil patch and I say to the taxpayers of this province, I hope he never gets close to the levers of federal-provincial negotiations ever again, Mr. Chairman. Because that is his track record.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I've already talked about the fact that on the one hand the Leader of the Opposition would say that \$4.5 million in spending should be enough for a province of a million people. He says \$4.5 million should be enough. And yet he says, when asked about would you spend more than a three and a half per cent increase on health and education, which make up 53 per cent of the budget, Mr. Chairman, he says no, I would absolutely give them more, I would absolutely give them more, he said.

I think in fact I even have a news clipping where he said that, Mr. Chairman. In fact I do, recently. Melville *Advance*, very recently, and I quote from this article that's headlined: "Romanow evasive on health, education spending increases".

In an interview following his speech, (and I'm quoting) Romanow said an NDP government would (and this is in quotation marks, Mr. Chairman) "absolutely" give more money to health and education than the current PC government's 3.5 per cent increases as announced in the recent provincial budget.

But he refused to be pinned down on the exact amount of the increase.

You see, what he's saying, Mr. Chairman, is he'll say

anything anywhere to get the vote. You see, he's saying that if they're asking if this legitimate special interest area of health needs more money, and somebody asks him, do you think you could give more money or would you give more money? Yes, I sure would.

What about education if he's at the university or at a school board? Yes, I'd give him more than those darn Tories gave. And what about culture? Yes, I'd give more there. And GRIP and NISA, our farm program? Yes, I do better than Devine did there. He says, I'd give more everywhere, and yet today he stands in his place and says: but we should only spend \$4.5 billion.

Well, Mr. Chairman, this budget here proposes to spend \$4.8 billion. Now he says he's going to give more in all of these areas and as well spend \$300 million less than we're spending this year, balance the books, tear up GRIP and NISA, get rid of the sales tax, which would cost him . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Chairman, he's got to find, I don't know, 5, 6, \$800 million. He's going to spend \$300 million less than we're proposing here, Mr. Chairman, and give more money to all of those areas. Now this is indeed an amazing magician, Mr. Chairman, an amazing magician, Mr. Chairman.

Well, he talks . . . he went on then to talk about, Mr. Chairman, game plans. Now I should back up, Mr. Chairman, first. And I think he acknowledges or has acknowledged in his budget reply on budget night, he acknowledged that businesses would benefit from harmonization. I forget what his exact words were but I think he said something to the effect that some businesses undoubtedly would benefit from harmonization. But of course when it was a matter of politics and votes, Mr. Chairman, he made ultimately the decision to repeal. And so with it goes the biggest tax break that business has probably ever seen in this province.

And what he says, how he says he would replace it — and this is another area where he's going to spend some more money, Mr. Chairman — he says he would replace it with a targeted assistance program, a targeted assistance program. He doesn't put any dollar value on that. That's another one of these things. I'll spend more but I won't tell you how much, and nor will I tell you how to do it or where I'm going to get the money. Now I would suggest to me that this notion of his, targeted assistance, speaks volumes about that man and about his economic game plan.

You see, Mr. Chairman, if he truly wanted to be the modern socialist he kind of likes to present himself as, that he sort of, you know, left back the old ways of the democratic socialist government of the 1960s and '70s, and that he really is now a socialist who has been able to grapple with not only wealth distribution, but wealth creation, when he comes out and tells me his economic game plan is targeted assistance for business, it tells me he's just lapsed back into his old ways, Mr. Chairman. It tells me that this member tested the water, dipped his foot in the water of the ocean of the 1990s, Mr. Chairman, and found the water not to his liking.

It shows you, Mr. Chairman, that yes, the 1990s is out there and it represents hope and opportunity for our young people and for our province, and yes, we do need to make changes and they have to be fundamental changes, but it's too big a challenge and it's too politically risky. So rather than, really for the first time, endorse a policy that speaks directly to wealth creation, which is what harmonization speaks to with the business input tax credit, he said, no, I'll repeal it and I'll give them the old sort of 1960s aid-for-trade targeted tax assistance program.

Now why do I say that that is actually absolutely a step right back into the '70s and '60s, Mr. Chairman? This reason: in this day and age of global trade liberalization which they themselves spoke so much about during the free trade debate about the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) — you know, don't put all your eggs in one basket; we should look at the multinational dimension — this targeted business assistance approach that he's talking about is exactly why we have the problems today that we have in the world.

You see, targeted assistance, which he has consistently been against, until now, is countervailable. You see, he has no sense of what is going on in terms of global realities today. You name me one industry where you can target assistance and not have it countervailable, Mr. Chairman. I challenge him to name me one.

And that's why in any of the ventures that we are into, we've been extremely careful to construct them as strictly a commercial deal. Because, Mr. Chairman, we don't want our products being denied access to the world markets, because people in this province make their living, Mr. Chairman, by selling into the world market-place.

This man has global myopia, Mr. Chairman, and our children would pay the price if we ever let him get close to the levers of world trade in his role as a premier of this province, Mr. Chairman. That is the fundamental flaw with that old '60s approach, Mr. Chairman. It would be countervailable. It would shut our products out of the world market-place. And yet that's what he says is his game plan. That's what he says is his game plan, Mr. Chairman. Well what are others saying about the game plan of the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Chairman? What are others saying?

Let's look, Mr. Chairman, at what others are saying. They don't call . . . some journalists have called the NDP lack of an economic game plan a shabby performance, and quite frankly I agree with them. Well let's look at an independent group, the independent Investment Dealers Association of Canada. And what have they said about Saskatchewan and our economic game plan, Mr. Chairman? One of the headlines was, Mr. Chairman, in May of this year: "Sask. gets an A for economic growth".

Doesn't sound too shabby to me, Mr. Chairman. One of only three provinces projected to have a real increase in GDP (gross domestic product), Mr. Chairman — 10 per cent increase in business spending because of upgraders and fertilizer plants and diversification.

(1430)

Mr. Chairman, manufacturing investment now one-quarter of total business investment, tripled since 1986. I want to repeat that one, Mr. Chairman. Manufacturing investment is now one-quarter of total business investment in the province — tripled since 1986. Saskatchewan personal income taxes rates, second lowest in the country.

And what was their summary conclusion, the Investment Dealers Association of Canada, Mr. Chairman, relative to Saskatchewan? Their summary was this and I quote: that consistent application of fiscal restraint, the hallmark of fiscal policy for the last five years, will lead to steep declines in the budget deficit over the next several years as the economic recovery takes hold. This fiscal discipline also underlines the government's commitment to meet its target for a balanced budget in '93-94.

And, Mr. Chairman, that's why we get headlines: "Sask. gets an A for economic growth", Mr. Chairman. In fact, after the budget, an official from the Canadian Bond Rating Service, Mr. Speaker, said "Lorne Hepworth's three year plan to balance the Budget is a good sign." That's another thing, what a bond rating agency was saying, Mr. Speaker.

Now other governments, one other government, Mr. Chairman, across Canada has taken quite a different approach than we have and a quite different approach than most other provinces, Mr. Chairman. That government is the NDP government of Ontario, the NDP government of Ontario.

Now what are the investment dealers saying about the NDP budget with its spending going like this, Mr. Chairman — up, up, and away? Well the headline in the *Toronto Star* was, Bay Street protests NDP budget. Now that's the same investment dealers, Mr. Chairman, that said Saskatchewan gets an A. And what do they say about the NDP budget in Ontario that's going the opposite direction to everybody else in the country? Bay Street protests NDP budget. And they've called it lunacy and fantasy land and all the rest of it, Mr. Chairman.

Now one other thing, one other agreement, this man said that elect him and he will tear up or re-examine — or whatever his words were — is the Cargill involvement, the Saskatchewan government's involvement in the Saferco fertilizer plant. He says, Mr. Chairman, that quite simply he didn't get enough information. He didn't get the books opened up to his satisfaction in Saferco. That's what he said consistently.

Well two points here, Mr. Chairman. I would like the hon. member to get his research or his hacks . . . and there must be lots of them, and they must be good, Mr. Chairman, because they wrote the report — the NDP hack economist report about the harmful effects of harmonization, so they must be good. He must rely on them. Why don't you ask them to dig up your remarks — yours, sir. When you nationalized the potash industry and you were asked to open those books up and you talked about, well no, we can't do it, Mr. Chairman, because we can't give away that kind of information, Mr. Speaker,

because it's confidential information. It might jeopardize our business position.

So that's one point I would make, Mr. Chairman. But I see, Mr. Chairman, I've hit a bit of a nerve there. I've hit a bit of a nerve there. So, Mr. Chairman, I want to submit this to you. Do you think it would be reasonable, Mr. Chairman, if the U.S. Securities Commission, do you think it would be reasonable, Mr. Chairman, if the U.S. Securities Commission . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order, please. Order. Until about 10 minutes ago, the decorum in the committee had been relatively good, I would say. And in the last few minutes — order, please — in the last few minutes the decorum has been dwindling and I would ask members on both sides of the House to please adhere to the rules of the committee and allow the Minister of Finance to continue.

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Speaker, they don't like the argument I just used that in the potash debate — if you check the records — they would not because of the business confidentiality reveal those numbers.

But let's suppose you don't accept that number. Let's suppose . . . do you think, Mr. Chairman . . . let's ask this question. Do you think an examination of the books by the U.S. Securities Commission would be a satisfactory bench-mark as to whether there's been sufficient work done and homework done and examination of the books been done relative to the . . . (inaudible) . . . If they gave it their seal of approval, had all the questions that they need to have answered, wouldn't that be a reasonable test of the fact that the homework has been done and investors could invest in this project with confidence, knowing full well that their interests have been protected and all the hard questions have been asked?

Now it seems to me that's a pretty prestigious organization in North America, the U.S. Securities Commission. Why I use that example, Mr. Chairman, is that Safeco had to borrow money to build the fertilizer plant. They borrowed it in the U.S. market. One of the reasons is because the fertilizer will be sold in the U.S. market, and you can get a natural hedge on your price, your interest rates, and your capital cost, Mr. Chairman. They went into the market and of course they had to file a prospectus that has to meet with the approval of the U.S. Securities Commission.

You see they talk about the books not being opened and the data not being available and the details of the deal not being there and how do we know if the taxpayers of Saskatchewan — the guys who are putting up the cash — are really getting the answers.

Well these people here also have those same questions needing to be answered on behalf of bondholders, Mr. Chairman, and that's why you have securities commissions, to act as the asker of the tough questions and the protector of . . . and protect the investor. Now I think that's a pretty prestigious, well renowned outfit, Mr. Chairman.

Now I'll bet you, Mr. Chairman — because I know some of the media haven't — I'll bet you the Leader of the

Opposition has never opened this. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I invite the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Opposition to stand in his place and say he has gone through these books and that after going through these books, he still wasn't satisfied. If he will say that, then I accept the fact that he doesn't accept the U.S. Securities Commission. But I will bet that he can't stand this moment and say he's even paged this book open. And I challenge him to say so. I challenge him to tell us whether he's even looked at it. And if he has not, I will be happy to send this copy over to him. Because you see, Mr. Chairman, if he has not, how can he . . . it's that old thing, intellectual dishonesty or honesty. How can he honestly say that he hasn't seen the facts, Mr. Chairman, if he hasn't taken the time to read what is available, Mr. Chairman? How can he say that?

And that brings me to a final point, Mr. Chairman, on this whole question of . . . You know, part of his game plan is, I repeal the tax, okay, and then I say . . . and he went on to talk about a game plan, never did lay it out. And then he says, you know, I want to get the books open. Well like I said earlier, I doubt that he's even read this one, and I sent it over to him so now he can read it, okay.

He says, open the books. Well open the books, Mr. Chairman. And I think what he's trying to suggest is that if we get these private guys, whoever they are — they're always against private guys, but anyways, private guys — he says, I think the numbers will actually be worse than they're telling us. Well I'll tell you what, Mr. Chairman, he can get started any time.

I mean we got \$5 billion in one place and \$13.1 billion worth of debt on the Crown side. I mean how big does the number have to get before he's going to come up with his game plan? He thinks it's bigger.

I say, the audited numbers, the projected numbers, the estimated numbers are \$5 billion roughly on the consolidated side of government. How big does the number have to get before you actually start doing something? The books are open, Mr. Chairman, the books are open, and they show the debt of the province of Saskatchewan and it is sizeable. And that's why we've put in place a six-point plan to deal with it.

I say to him, the books are open, the numbers are there. How much bigger does it have to get before you'll do something about it, Mr. Chairman? It's not a question of opening the books. The trick is to do something about it, Mr. Chairman. And we hear nothing from the opposition on that point, Mr. Chairman, nothing at all but the old, tired, worn-out stuff about paper and advertising and those kinds of things, Mr. Chairman.

Well I want to come back and make a final point about harmonization. And even if you don't accept, Mr. Chairman, the government's analysis of what ought to be done, I say what about these people? If you don't accept this Minister of Finance, this government's analysis of the situation because we say harmonize, then I want him to tell me, what does he say to the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, to that organization.

What does he say to the Society of Management

Accountants, the Consumers' Association of Canada, the president of Ipsco, the Institute of Chartered Accountants, Producers Pipeline, the Regina Chamber of Commerce, the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce, the home builders, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, Sask Sport Inc., the Western Canadian Wheat Growers, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

What does he say to these people who sat diligently and tirelessly for a couple of months last year as an expert committee relative to the GST and harmonization, Mr. Speaker. And their first and foremost recommendation was to harmonize.

In this report the committee recommends the following: first bullet, Mr. Chairman, harmonization. The committee recommends first and foremost that the government of Saskatchewan endeavour to participate in a joint federal-provincial sales tax as soon as possible with the objective of full integration by 1992 or earlier. That is their first and foremost recommendation.

Now even if you don't like our view, our analysis, what do you say to these people? Well I'll tell you what he said, Mr. Chairman, last fall when we were long ways from an election. Okay? And we didn't have an election and we weren't in the heat of an election campaign, an election that we know is imminent, when more cooler heads and reasoned minds in the opposition were prevailing. His Finance critic and indeed the Leader of the Opposition put out a press release saying, adopt this report that these experts served on that said harmonize. They said, adopt your own committee's report.

Well have we harmonized, Mr. Chairman? And are we proposing to do it in two stages? And the answer is yes. Now how is it that that recommendation was good in October, but today in the heat of an election it's not. Well I've told you why earlier, Mr. Chairman. And the reason is because his political well-being, he's putting it ahead of the interest of the public of Saskatchewan.

He checked the water, he checked the polls, he checked the TV cameras and said it sounds better and it looks better on TV to say: I'm against the tax and I'll roll it back, so that's what I'll say. Never mind whether we'll put the kids another \$125 million in hock, never mind where I'll come up with the money for the farm programs. He said, it makes good TV and that's all that counts.

Well I said yesterday in this legislature, Mr. Chairman, and I say again today, if that's all it's come down to, if that's all it comes down to as to why you are here and why I am here and why he is here and why our Premier is here, I say we don't want to be here. I say we are prepared to take the tough decisions on. I say we're prepared to take the challenges on and we know the decisions are not easy. We're not going to try and sugar-coat the realities, Mr. Chairman. We're not going to try and kid the public, Mr. Chairman. We know there are real problems.

This member here, this Leader of the Opposition went on for nearly an hour this afternoon. And did he mention once how he is going to deal with the implications of a 61-year low price of wheat and what it does to our economy? Did he mention the word wheat once? Did he

mention the devastation that is occurring across the municipalities where these farm families live and the hurt in those communities?

Mr. Chairman, no question about it. When you get into a decentralization process like we are in to stabilize the economy, families are faced with major decisions, and it's not easy.

But I say to you, Mr. Chairman, this is not a question of dividing the hurt. The reality is we have hurt all across this province in terms of our farm families and what's going on in our rural communities, Mr. Chairman. How is it that he can speak for 50 minutes, Mr. Chairman, and not once address that?

Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't think the public will be deluded. I don't think they'll be deluded at all. He, Mr. Chairman, knows the problems are out there and they're big. But the course he has chosen, Linus has told Charlie Brown there's no problem too big that you can't run away from, and he has chosen to run away from it.

And the people will find him out because I tell you what, you can run but you can't hide. Sooner or later you're going to have to come clean with the public and tell them where you're going to get the money from, Mr. Chairman.

(1445)

That's the old style politics. That's the politics of the '60s and the '70s. It is not the politics of our Premier; it's not the politics of the members of his cabinet, and it's not the politics of our caucus, Mr. Chairman. It may be your politics, Mr. Leader of the Opposition.

Say anything, anywhere, any time, for the vote and so long as it looks good for the TV camera and sounds good, that's what you say and that's what you do. If it makes to say in Harris, Saskatchewan, one thing, and contradict yourself at the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour Congress with Barb Byers standing by your side, he'll say it. I mean they pull the strings and he says what it takes, Mr. Chairman.

Is that the hallmark of a true leader? I say it is not, Mr. Chairman. And that really is the issue here. Leadership in the '90s. Anybody who thinks these issues and solutions are simple is wrong, Mr. Chairman. They're deluding themselves. They're saying the problem is so big, I'm going to run away from it.

Well I'll tell you what they're saying in my riding, Mr. Chairman, as I close. I'll tell you one thing they're saying in my riding. And I have a significant oilfield component in my riding, Mr. Chairman. And I just happened to have a chance to meet with some of them here a couple of nights ago.

Do you know what they're saying? They're saying they hear this Leader of the Opposition saying he thought he was going to repeal this tax. Now they know that the challenges are out there, and they understand the farm community because they live right next door to them.

And they say, you know, we're a little worried about

where he's going to get the money from if he repeals that tax. First of all he says harmonization is good for our industries, so we're a little concerned that he's going to take that away. That's first and foremost.

But then he says, Mr. Chairman, they say, Mr. Chairman, we've been getting very strong signals from the opposition that to elect them will board up and close up the oil patch again in Saskatchewan like it was in the '70s. And the talk was there again about Bill 42 that I remember well because I worked in the oil patch row where I had my clinic in Weyburn.

And they have not forgotten, Mr. Chairman. They're very nervous, Mr. Chairman. They're nervous. The oil patch is nervous about the increased royalty talk that comes from the members of the opposition. They're worried about the talk that we heard last night from one of the Regina members. And they're worried about what they hear from the Saskatoon member who says the oil companies have had a nice time under the Tories, Mr. Chairman.

Well I say to you, if it isn't income tax, it'll be higher royalties. Mr. Chairman, the reality is there is no magic, as I suggested in my opening statement, when it comes to stabilizing the economy, getting some cash into the farm economy, and balancing the books.

Mr. Chairman, we have laid out a plan to accomplish those things. These tax changes are a part of it. We hear nothing but empty rhetoric and intellectual dishonesty, and sheer intellectual emptiness from the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker.

This Premier, this government, have a plan to help stabilize our economy, help revitalize our economy, Mr. Chairman, help or control the deficit, and we're going to stick by it. This Bill is part of that, as difficult as it may be, Mr. Chairman.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Chairman, it was a pleasure listening to it-just-can't-be-done Mr. Minister of Finance, and the argument that I can't do it, a confirmation that he can't do it. There's no doubt about that. This Minister of Finance can't do it and the Premier opposite cannot do it.

I want to make just a couple of points before I take my place. The Minister of Finance made a great deal about mailing or delivering over to us this document with respect to Saferco, which will be a bit of a question which I'll be directing to the minister in a moment.

This is the document which he says tells all. By the way, a document, according to this minister's rationalization, which should go to the United States Securities Commission, he led us to believe, but somehow that the people of Saskatchewan didn't have the right to get that information.

Well, Mr. Chairman, do you know what this document is? It's a compilation of the last two or three years of budget speeches of the Minister of Finance — exact replication. I'll even read you the section from the March 1990 budget speech where the minister said, enough is enough. It is a

compilation of the blue books that the government tables. That is all it is. There isn't an assessment here by the United States Securities Commission. There is nothing new in this document that hasn't been tabled through every budgetary process.

And this minister has the audacity to accuse us of being dishonest by representing this as some sort of new information.

I ask the minister to prove me wrong. You know what I say is the truth. You have misled the House. There is nothing about the Saferco deal, your financing, nothing here. This is a compilation of your budget speeches, including the 1991 that said enough is enough, which you broke the promise. How dare you misrepresent the legislature this way? This is shocking. Take a look at this.

**An Hon. Member:** — Have you read it before?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Had I read it before? Yes, because I had the misfortune of reading every one of your budget speeches before.

**An Hon. Member:** — But there's more than the budget speech in there.

**Mr. Romanow:** — More than the budget speeches. All the callable loans, the Minister of Finance says. Yes, I've read all the callable loans that you owe. But I have nothing here about Saferco and neither does the people of Saskatchewan have it. Nothing. And you know it.

How dare you do this to the legislature this afternoon? That's what this is. You've got four or five of your top Finance department officials there. Here's your chance. Blow me out of the water. Tell me that what I'm saying is wrong.

What an incredible performance, Mr. Minister of Finance. Can you believe that, Mr. Chairman?

**An Hon. Member:** — Are the words too big?

**Mr. Romanow:** — No, the words aren't too big. They weren't too big when I read it in 1990 and when I read it in '89. They're not too big at all. But they add naught at all to the argument that I make about the need to open the books.

**An Hon. Member:** — Can't you figure them out?

**Mr. Romanow:** — We can figure them out all right and what we figured out is a debt of \$14.1 billion, Mr. Minister of Economic Development.

Now I have another proposition. And this I'm going to ask the Minister of Finance. I'm going to ask the Minister of Finance to give me an answer on this. The Minister of Finance was challenging me about targeted assistance and the global world being countervailable. You can't have governments in there helping industry because the product that those helped-out industries, the product that they sell ... and it would be countervailable in other countries — and then a few minutes later, he tabled this so-called Saferco document. Now this is an industry



which this government is pumping in \$65 million of taxpayers' money plus cash, cash plus a loan guarantee of \$305 million to an American corporation to produce a product which will be competing in the United States.

Is the minister saying that this is not targeted assistance? I know his argument will be: oh well it's equity. And is the minister more importantly saying that somehow his form of assistance can escape American scrutiny but other governments' forms of assistance — perhaps not like this because we do not want to follow this pattern — won't escape government American scrutiny?

How do you explain the Saferco operation for goodness sakes, Mr. Minister? You challenged me; well I challenge you. How do you explain your argument about free enterprise being free in the whole world when you people are backing this thing until your nose bleeds, or excuse me, until our noses bleed — our taxpayers' noses bleed.

You're backing these people at Cargill right to the very maximum with every bit of taxpayers' bucks and you know doggone well what the implications are for that and somehow you say he challenges me to give an example — I give you an example; you give me the answer.

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

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — The answer is quite simple, Mr. Chairman. This project and this deal has been put together from day one as a strictly commercial deal with no subsidies because from day one, Mr. Chairman, the view was that a significant amount of this product would be shipped into the U.S., into that market-place, and it was constructed with that in mind from day one, as a commercial deal, no subsidies, because we didn't want to have any problem shipping into that U.S. market. That's why, because there are no subsidies here, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Romanow:** — You see, Mr. Chairman . . . I don't wish to be overly personal because I don't want to sink to the level of the Progressive Conservatives with respect to negative advertising, and I don't. And to the minister's opposite complaints about, you know, dishonesty and the like.

But I mean surely to goodness, Mr. Minister, you could at least give me the courtesy and the House the courtesy of saying, when you challenged me, that at least one — I can give you more — with respect to Cargill and the Saferco operation, that your proposition is not supported by what you're doing in Cargill. Your proposition in fact is undermined by what you're doing in Cargill.

You know, if I really wanted to be an advocate on his side, I would argue that in fact there is some legitimacy to his argument. I would have thought he could have come back to me and defended him that way.

Because what they've done on the Cargill deal has raised great concern in the United States about countervail. He's dead right. We know about that. We know that Senator Tom Daschle, for example, has introduced a Bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to strengthen the United States' ability to respond to foreign trade practices that

threaten the United States' commerce in the committee of finance. We know that; I have that right here. And we know that Senator Tom Daschle has identified the Cargill cooked-up deal as an example of an unfair trading practice. So he could have used this argument very well to have supported his case.

But he didn't use it. You know why he didn't use it, because he catches himself coming around. To use that argument "to support" catches himself thereby supporting our proposition that this Cargill deal and the total secrecy of the documents is so loaded with potential financial obligation by the taxpayers of the province of Saskatchewan that he couldn't admit that. That's why he didn't say that.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — The Minister of the Family denies it. I'll read from a *Congressional Record* of Wednesday, March . . . this, Mr. Chairman, is Wednesday, March 13, 1991, the *Congressional Record* — Mr. Tom Daschle, dealing with unfair trade practices:

One of the reasons I am proposing this clarification (referring to the Bill) is to address a situation that has raised concerns among many people in my State and around the country. The Canadian Provincial Government of Saskatchewan has approved plans to enter a joint venture with a Canadian company to construct a world-scale nitrogen fertilizer plant. The provincial government is providing significant equity and is guaranteeing commercial debt that will account for most of the plant's cost. (Those aren't my words; that's Senator Tom Daschle.) Industry analysts and U.S. producers have concluded that this heavily subsidized plant will cause serious injury to the United States market.

And he's been joined by Senators Bumpers and Burdick and Burns and Cochran and Conrad and Craig and Dixon — 16 of them in the United States.

But we're on the hook \$370 million, and he says to me: where to get the money from. I say to him, why has he got the taxpayers involved in this kind of a deal? Give me an answer to that.

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

(1500)

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — You see, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member — with respect — has not rebutted my original contention here. He said in his remarks today at the outset that he would give targeted assistance to business grants alike, Mr. Chairman. That's what he said.

I said that approach might have worked in the '60s and the '70s — his era — but in the global economy of today, it does not work, Mr. Chairman. You cannot have targeted assistance. That's why the Saferco plant is built strictly as a commercial deal, no subsidies. The loan guarantee, Mr. Chairman, is being paid for; that's why it is not a subsidy, Mr. Chairman. There are no breaks here.

You see the real issue here, Mr. Chairman, number one, is we don't have assistance in here — commercial deal, no subsidies. His approach would be countervailable, Mr. Chairman, would be countervailable.

But you know what the essential problem that the NDP have with this project, Mr. Chairman? You know what the essential problem they have with it? It's got nothing to do with whether we should diversify the economy or restructure the deal this way or that way. You know what the problem with the deal is that that member and all those other '60s members have, Mr. Chairman? You know why they're against it? Because it's Cargill. And what is Cargill? It's a U.S. based, multinational, vertically integrated company; hence it is bad. They are totally against us — nothing to do with the project — because their ideology cannot let them be in favour of doing a deal with Cargill, Mr. Chairman. They are ideologically hidebound, and it's going to keep them held back into the '60s and '70s, Mr. Chairman, if they keep thinking that way. That is the essential objection that those ideologues over there have with this, Mr. Chairman. That's the problem they have with the deal. Nothing else. Nothing more.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, if anything is confirmed in this debate is the I-can't-do-it mentality proven again by the Minister of Finance and the PCs. You're right; they cannot do it.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — They couldn't do it in Supercart; no, I can't do it. Couldn't do it in Joytec; no, can't do it. Couldn't do it in GigaText; no, can't do it. These modern-day people, these modern-day economic wizards, these global economists — they say you can't have targeted . . .

Get the logic of this, Mr. Chairman — \$65 million outright cash of your taxpayers' money to Cargill, a loan guarantee of \$305 million of which we're exclusively on the hook, and this minister's got the audacity of saying that that's not targeted aid and that's consistent with the 1991 . . . notwithstanding the fact that the American senators, by the way, support his argument that there's a problem.

Is this competence? Mr. Chairman, I tell you, this argument . . . I'm going to withdraw from this debate for one other reason. My colleagues want to get into it, but I also, as you might tell, have a sore throat today. That's maybe good news for you, Mr. Chairman, and the members opposite, but I'm running out of my capacity to speak here. But I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, I couldn't believe the argument about displacement. I mean, I want the journalists to look at this. I'm going to make copies of this available to journalists because this was an out and out, flat out, misrepresentation by the Minister of Finance this afternoon — out and out.

And secondly, since he simply fobs over . . . he's caught, you see, between — as they say in the vernacular — a rock and a hard place. On the one hand, he wants to make the point against me that you cannot have targeted

aid, but he does not on the other hand want to admit that the United States Congress says that there is targeted aid on the Cargill operation because that would make our point about it being a problematic situation. You see he's trapped.

And I simply want to close my intervention in this Committee of the Whole by saying that this example by the Minister of Finance's own offering, makes the point about the new '90s which is required; why this old, incompetent bunch is done; why we need to have a new approach.

And what is the first step in the new approach? A new government's going to open the books. All of these deals are going to see the light of day. We're going to open the books and we're going to find money and we're going to stimulate the economy and we're going to give assistance to Main Street, not to the big-time boys from the United States. Not to those, but to our entrepreneurs, our business community.

That's the direction, that was my message, and that's why this tax is unneeded. This tax is needed because of the boondoggles like GigaText and Joytec and Supercart and the Cargill and the other deals — the Weyerhaeuser deals. That's what we're paying for. That's what we're paying for. Don't be mistaken otherwise, Mr. Chairman.

We're committed to the payment of the GRIP and financing of the GRIP portions of it. But I'll tell you we're not going to go back to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan and say to them that \$4.5 billion is not enough. We're going to find it. And that's why they are so bitterly personal because they know where the money is to be found.

Each one of them is sitting on a powder keg of an issue about ready to explode in their departments, and they are just frantically hoping that they can keep that powder lid on before the election takes place. They know where the powder kegs are and we know where many of them are, too.

We'll open up the books; we'll cut the waste and the mismanagement; we'll give confidence to the business community again. And I tell you this province of Saskatchewan is going to grow as it once did before this bunch took office. Thank you.

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

**Ms. Smart:** — Mr. Chairman, this Minister of Finance has shown us this afternoon the absolute depths of his waste and mismanagement. And I say that a New Democratic government is going to get to the bottom of this. He made light of waste and mismanagement earlier, but we're going to peel it away layer by layer by layer. He's up to his ears in waste and mismanagement and it's going to be uncovered and the people of Saskatchewan will know where their taxpayers' dollars have been wasted.

I've heard this minister talk about intellectual dishonesty, and I must say that he himself is a walking, talking example of dishonesty both intellectually, morally, and every other form that's possible for dishonesty to take.

What we've heard this afternoon has been shocking. Mr. Minister, I want to turn to an area that's particularly important to me as critic for seniors' issues. This week your government has declared Seniors' Week and this should be a time when we take a moment to honour the people who built this province, whose tax dollars have been at work over many, many years creating our hospitals, our schools, our highways, and our farm support programs.

But instead of honouring seniors, this minister and this government opposite, have chosen to gouge each one of them an extra \$440 per year with this new provincial GST.

And, Mr. Minister, you may not recognize it, but I want to remind you that a great many seniors in the province of Saskatchewan have to survive on a fixed income. Unlike your government, they have to learn to budget their money. They are concerned about deficits. They cannot live with deficits. They don't like the provincial government's deficit. But they have to live on very low incomes and they have to balance their budgets. They have to budget carefully.

Mr. Minister, I want to ask you: what do you propose the seniors give up from their budgets in order to cover the provincial GST? Should they cut back on food? Should they cut back on medication? Should they cut back on home heating? Why do you want to gouge them so heartlessly, and just what is it that they should give up, Mr. Minister of Finance?

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Chairman, as it relates to seniors and how government can help, especially those who are perhaps on lower and more modest incomes, cope with living expenses, etc., Mr. Chairman, I think the points that would be relevant here for the member, in terms of what our government is doing to help provide for those categories especially, is: number one, the \$36 million roughly, I think it is, for the heritage rebate program for recognizing those seniors, Mr. Chairman.

Number two isn't maybe very much more specifically as some several millions of dollars that accrues to seniors through the low income tax reduction, Mr. Chairman. And there's the seniors income program and of course subsidies, home subsidies through Sask Housing and those kinds of things, Mr. Chairman. So those would be three or four examples of how we're trying to help seniors there, Mr. Chairman.

**Ms. Smart:** — Mr. Minister, your budget this year has a \$1.5 million cut in the heritage grant program, a 25 per cent cut in the Saskatchewan Income Plan which was established to help the lowest income seniors, a program which your government promised to increase every year and then broke that promise. Increased it once some years ago and hasn't increased it since. Where they were promised an increase this year and instead of that you cut the budget by 25 per cent.

The Minister of Seniors did not speak to this Bill. He had nothing to say on behalf of seniors. And the only provision your tax Bill makes to the reality that many

people in our society do not have a lot of disposable income, is your tax credit for low income families.

Mr. Minister, you talk about reality, but the reality is that your government does not provide a tax credit for seniors. It only pays out in accordance with the number of dependent children that family has, and most seniors do not have dependent children. Yet many of them have an income that's barely adequate or is often inadequate.

So can you explain to the seniors why it is that they are not worthy of any special consideration, given their income situation, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Chairman, I can only reiterate what I said earlier. I think seniors always, because of the close tie that we've all had because of the relative newness of a province like Saskatchewan where forefathers in my family and many families here settled this province and broke the ground some 85 years ago or so — 1906, 1907 . . . I think all of us have a special place in our hearts for making sure our seniors are provided for and well cared for as best we can.

And that's why there are these programs in place like the heritage program; seniors income program; the housing subsidies; what we've done in nursing homes; the low income tax credit — those kinds of things. I think as it relates to harmonization, Mr. Chairman, as well that's why, you know, the essentials in life are still tax free, Mr. Chairman.

Food, Mr. Chairman, prescription drugs, Mr. Chairman; you know, health and education service, Mr. Chairman; long-term rent, Mr. Chairman, is essentially tax free. And I think that's why when you're designing some of these things, and why society traditionally here in Canada and Saskatchewan has taken that approach, because we do want all to have access to those kinds of basics in as large and unhindered way as possible, Mr. Chairman.

**Ms. Smart:** — Mr. Chairman, I can hardly believe my ears. That this is a Minister of Finance who has not given the seniors a tax credit, who stands in his seat and says that the essentials are not taxed with the provincial sales tax. Heating is not an essential? Clothing is not an essential? Where are you? You talk about reality and you haven't got a grasp on it at all.

Mr. Minister, I want you now to address this question of the 25 per cent cut in the Saskatchewan Income Plan. These are the seniors on the lowest income. They do not get a tax credit with this new Bill and this new tax, and yet there's a 25 per cent cut in that program. Why?

(1515)

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — As it relates to the seniors' income program, I think in the last nine or ten years the benefits have gone from something in the order of \$25 a month to now — and I don't have the precise number — but I think it's somewhere in the area of 70 or \$75 per month. And so I think that speaks of the kind of priority we place in that area, Mr. Chairman.

**Ms. Smart:** — The question was: why did you cut the

budget this year for that program by 25 per cent?

You promised earlier this year that that would be an increase to the seniors. The ones on the very basic income, Mr. Minister, for your information, get \$80 a month from that program as they have for about the last four years. They were promised an increase. Their costs are going up, and with this provincial sales tax their costs are going higher. And you've cut that budget by 25 per cent, and I want an answer on behalf of the seniors of this province who make up a larger and growing proportion of the population. Why did you cut that by 25 per cent? You should know; you're the Minister of Finance. Answer my question.

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Chairman, I think, as the hon. member herself has said, there's been a significant, large increase there relative to the per month benefit. If there's been any change, Mr. Chairman, it's been as a result of the fact that seniors' incomes have grown, and this is an income-tested program with changes in pension programs and elsewhere. And so there's less seniors having to rely on that program, Mr. Chairman, and that would be reflected in the bottom-line numbers. But per individual senior citizen, no matter how you cut it, the benefits are up more than triple, or more than triple what they were 8, 9 years ago, Mr. Chairman.

**Ms. Smart:** — Mr. Minister, the budget for the Saskatchewan Income Plan has gone up steadily until this year, and then a drop of 25 per cent. And you stand in your seat and tell me that that's because within one year a whole group of senior citizens have suddenly gotten higher incomes.

You have reflected to me and to my colleagues and to the seniors of this province that you haven't any idea how to budget whatsoever. That you could stand and talk in those terms about the lives of the seniors of this province who worked for so many years to build this province up and are now suffering under the kind of changes and scorched-earth policy that you're presenting, can suffer that kind of a cut in one year and you stand here and say it's because they've suddenly got larger incomes, that is incredible.

**An Hon. Member:** — Poofonomics!

**Ms. Smart:** — Poofonomics, my colleague says. And I won't give you a chance to go any further with that kind of poofonomics. Your answer speaks for itself. You don't understand what you're talking about and you just underlined what I said earlier about your intellectual and moral dishonesty.

I want to ask you about some more cuts that you've put in your budget because of the impact of the GST, and see how you answer these questions, Mr. Minister.

This spring your government decided the seniors in nursing homes should pay a \$50 deductible for prescription drugs plus a 25 per cent dispensing fee. A whole new charge on people in nursing homes and it's your government that only allows people in nursing homes \$100 extra a month for all their needs. It's getting less, but the nursing homes are taking them for extra

charges, and that's the point.

And this government decided that seniors should pay more for home care, that chiropody services and hearing aid services should be increased, and you even decided that they should pay more to visit our provincial parks. And you've already decimated their disposable income and now you want to damage it even more with this provincial GST.

And I ask you why are you making the senior citizens of Saskatchewan carry the burden for your government's nine years of waste and mismanagement, Mr. Minister? Why are you letting the seniors carry it?

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Chairman, as it relates to the question on the change in the prescription drug plan for those living in nursing homes, although it may well be beyond the scope of the clauses in this Bill that are here before the committee, and recognizing that, but if it is in order I will just say this to it.

I'm sure the issue could be gone in more detail in the appropriate budget estimates debate, Mr. Chairman. But the question there was fairness, a matter of those seniors who lived inside the nursing home versus those who lived in their own homes. And that was the reason it was done for, was fairness and equity. And I think that would be something that the hon. member would agree with.

It's well recognized I think, if the member reads in this year's budget documents, because of the importance we place on looking after seniors and the importance of nursing homes for part of that, the taxpayers of Saskatchewan through our government are providing 21, \$22,000 a year per senior citizens' nursing home place, per person if you like. To offset the cost of buying that service would probably run 30, \$35,000 per place.

So you can see 21 or \$22,000 is a substantial help I think for those seniors — per year — living in those nursing homes, Mr. Chairman.

**Ms. Smart:** — My final comment, Mr. Minister, is to say that for you to use the terms fair and equitable about these kind of charges to the seniors that are in nursing homes again displays that you have no concept of what the words fair and equitable mean, and no understanding of the amount of income that seniors have who are in nursing homes.

They have to pay this new tax on everything that they want to buy out of the measly amount of money that you leave them per month to cover all their expenses. And you've heaped on them a \$50 deductible for their prescription drugs and now they have to pay 25 per cent of the charges of all their drugs on top of everything else.

There's nothing fair or equitable about that, Mr. Minister. And so it shows just exactly the kind of government that you've led us to and the kind of government that you support — intellectually dishonest, unfair, and inequitable. And this tax represents more of the same. And that's why the people are opposed to it and that's why they're going to turf you out whenever you get the courage to have an election.

**Ms. Simard:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Mr. Chairperson, we're nearly ending this debate on a very historic piece of legislation. It's historic because of the fact that it is the largest tax grab in the history of this province, some \$440 million per year from taxpayers.

It's historic because it's to pay for a deficit that is unprecedented in this province, a deficit that is making it extremely difficult for this government to properly operate the affairs of this province.

It's historic, Mr. Chair, because of the fact that the public has spoken out loudly and clearly with respect to their opposition to the PC government's tax.

What we've seen are some 120,000 petitions tabled in this legislature — another first in the history of this province, Mr. Chair. And all these things are happening because this government is driving this province to the brink of economic ruin and is desperately grasping for some way to make the taxpayers pay for its momentous mistakes and mismanagement.

And in the face of that, Mr. Chair, we have the government moving with closure to end the debate — to stop the people of the province of Saskatchewan from objecting to their mismanagement and incompetence; closure on this debate to muzzle the opposition and stifle debate in the legislature.

That's what's taking place here today. And this debate is very near the end, at which time the government will ram it through, notwithstanding the vast majority of people's opinion and opposition to the tax, notwithstanding our opposition to the tax, they will end debate and ram this Bill through to insist that the taxpayers of this province pay for their mistakes, Mr. Deputy Chair.

Oh they try. They'll offer another reason or another argument that they needed to pay for GRIP and NISA, but everybody knows that's not true. Everybody knows it's to pay for their mismanagement. If we didn't have that deficit there, Mr. Speaker, if they had properly managed the affairs of this province we would have lots of money for hospitals and GRIP and NISA and transition homes and schools in this province, and programs and job creation.

But the people of this province are suffering and they're suffering from a callous, arrogant government that has mismanaged the economy and has mismanaged the affairs of this province. And they're four years and eight months into their mandate — four years and eight months into their mandate. And they don't have the courage to call an election.

They look for excuses. Every time they turn around it's another excuse. And they change their mind and flip-flop all the time on whether or not there's going to be an election or what the ground rules are with respect to an election. And they're doing this because they're running scared and they're afraid to go to the people.

This Bill is going to be passed through this legislature without full and proper debate, because the government has chosen to muzzle the people and to muzzle the

opposition. And they are doing it against the will of the people. The people are opposed to the tax and they're opposed to the government's arrogant, ramming practices of forcing this Bill through this legislature and on the public.

And so what are they going to do with the money that they receive from this tax? Well let me tell you about some of the things that they've spent our hard-earned tax dollars on in the past. Let me talk about the give-aways that were discussed even earlier here this afternoon, the Cargill situation for example, that the Minister of Finance got caught on. Let's talk about the GigaText mess the taxpayers paid for in this province. Let's talk about the sweetheart deal for Weyerhaeuser that this government engaged in at the expense of the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

And the numerous patronage appointments that we've heard about over and over again that the taxpayers are paying for, and that this government is ramming this Bill through in order to obtain revenue to maintain some of their patronage appointments, appointments like a former member of this PC government — Graham Taylor in Hong Kong, Bob Andrew in Minneapolis, Paul Rousseau in London, Larry Birkbeck's appointment to the Saskatchewan Municipal Board, Paul Schoenhals at PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan), Gordon Dirks, Sid Dutchak, Jack Sandberg and the list goes on and on and on — one patronage appointment after another, Mr. Chair. One patronage appointment after the other, by this government. And they are asking for the taxpayers to dish out another \$440 million a year — another \$440 million a year to pay for these types of wrong-headed priorities, for this type of incompetence and mismanagement.

(1530)

And the Minister of Finance says oh, where do you get the mismanagement? And he starts going through his little list and says that only adds up to X number of dollars and it's not going to pay for what the NDP want to do. What he fails to take into consideration is the millions and millions and millions of dollars that taxpayers have to dish out, that taxpayers have to dish out and that result from wrong decisions and wrong-headed priorities.

Waste and mismanagement isn't simply advertising. It isn't simply travel — out-of-province travel at exorbitant rates. Of course it's those too. But it's also wrong-headed policies and wrong-headed priorities of favouring and giving, putting us on the hook for huge sums of money with respect to Cargill, the attempt to privatize, privatize, and privatize, and sell off the future of this province. And still the deficit rises.

Their policies that have led to this deficit to a tune of virtually \$5 billion, Mr. Deputy Chair, that's the mismanagement we're talking about. And if the Minister of Finance attempts to make a small, little, narrow argument out of it, it only shows how simply petty one can get in the entire debate on the issue.

Let's look at this government's treatment of schools and hospitals in this province. Let's look at its treatment of nurses — the lay-off of nurses, the lay-off of school

teachers, the lay-off of highway construction workers, the firing of dental therapists. That has an economic effect on this province. When some 400 dental workers are fired and most of them leave the province, it has an effect on the economy and on our small rural communities where the majority of these dental therapists live. It has an enormous and substantial effect.

And this government in the last nine years has involved itself in policies that have cut back on jobs in rural Saskatchewan and has in this way affected the economy of rural Saskatchewan. And now, faced with all these wrong decisions that they've made, they see themselves in a desperate situation, a situation where they need more money to pay for their mistakes. And so they're going to the taxpayer.

And they're doing this in spite of the fact the Minister of Finance said a year ago the people are fed up with high taxes; enough is enough. And he has the nerve to stand there and say that the NDP changes its mind. Well I would say that that is a very, very major flip-flop on the part of the Minister of Finance. Enough is enough. And a year later we see him levying on the heads of taxpayers in this province the hugest tax grab in the history of this province. Well I say, Mr. Chair, enough is enough. And the people of this province have had enough of this government.

And we see a continuation of these wrong-headed policies of privatization and cut-backs and firing of people out in rural Saskatchewan and urban Saskatchewan, of patronage appointments and silly, hare-brained schemes like GigaText. And we see continued policies such as these. And that is the heartless and cruel way in which this government is proceeding with its policy of decentralization.

Without a plan and without a vision, it is proceeding with this election ploy because that's all that it is. It isn't anything that's been well thought out. It isn't anything that's been planned. It's an election ploy at the expense of the taxpayers. An election ploy.

Go to the people with your plan, Mr. Minister. Go to the people with your plan in an election instead of putting the taxpayers in hocks for tens of millions of dollars because of yet another wrong-headed decision that is made without any vision and without any planning.

And, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, there is a list, item after item of waste and mismanagement. I have a list here of 50 ways they waste your money. And I'm not going to go into the details of it but let me tell you that it's not simply a matter of talking about air fare and the cost of furniture and GigaText.

It's not simply a matter of talking about those specific items. It's a matter of talking about wrong priorities and wrong policies and how hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars have been wasted in this province because every time this government turned around it had no plan and no vision and made wrong decisions that were made to benefit their friends, their Tory friends, Mr. Deputy Chair.

And I say, stop the waste and mismanagement. Stop the wrong-headed decisions and the misplaced priorities before you go to the taxpayers for more money to pay for more hare-brained schemes, Mr. Minister. Clean up your own house before you go to the families of this province for how many more hundreds of dollars every year to pay for your hare-brained schemes and mismanagement.

You have no right to implement this tax — no right. And when you're four years and eight months into your mandate, you have no right, Mr. Minister, and your obligation is to put this forward as a proposal and call an election and let the electorate decide.

But no. The government doesn't have the courage to go to the people. And we witnessed that last night. The government doesn't have the courage to put this Bill before the electorate. They don't even have the courage to talk to their own employees, who incidentally, Mr. Deputy Chair, are taxpayers in this province and who will have to pay under this new tax of the Tories, and who pay their salaries as well as . . . along with all the other taxpayers in this province.

They don't even have the courage to go to the people of Saskatchewan who pay their salaries and talk to them about why they are doing certain things. And do you know why they don't have the courage? It's because they can't look them in the eye and tell them — we believe in what we are doing, that it's not an election gimmick, that our decisions were right, and that there wasn't any mismanagement, because they can't look them in the eye, Mr. Deputy Chair, and hold their heads up. They can't. And that's why they're afraid to go to the people, that's why they're afraid.

They're fearful of the people and very uncaring because their policies are destroying lives. Their policies . . . And I'm not overstating the case. I am flooded with phone calls as an MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly) from people whose lives are being destroyed today because this government has no plan and no vision, but is engaged in another election gimmick that I say it has an obligation to go to the public about. But it's scared to.

And yet it persists on this path of destroying lives — children crying, women crying to me on the phone. And I'm telling you, Mr. Deputy Chair, I have never in my life seen such callous, uncaring attitude as this government as they sit in their seats and smirk and shut doors and refuse to talk to people face to face and look them in their eyes, and yet are bent on their policies of destruction.

And this tax, Mr. Deputy Chair, is another aspect. And the way in which they're trying to push it through this legislature is another aspect, Mr. Chair, of how callous and out of touch this government is. They are prepared to further destroy the economy in this province through the implementation of this tax.

And we've heard a lot here in this debate today and in preceding days about how this tax . . . and the very substantial effect it's going to have on our economy. It's going to cost us jobs.

Oh I know the Minister of Finance will say something else

and come up with his foolish answers. But let me tell you, the people don't believe them. The people tell me — they are out on the streets of Regina and in rural Saskatchewan — they know this tax is going to drive more people out of this province because it's going to cost jobs and because it already has cost jobs. And it's costing jobs, Mr. Deputy Chair, particularly in the retail, restaurant, and tourist industries.

It's going to drive businesses into bankruptcy, Mr. Deputy Chair. It'll drive businesses into bankruptcy. And that's what the business community is saying, Mr. Deputy Chair. It's going to have a devastating effect on business. In communities near Alberta and near the U.S. border, what was it? Some 800 cars a day going south of the border near Estevan because of the goods and services tax.

There's already evidence on the record, before this even becomes law, of the effect, the devastating effect this tax is going to have on our economy. And to suggest it's going to be a good thing for business is ludicrous. Business people tell me, if consumers aren't going to spend, how does that improve my business opportunities?

If people lose jobs over this tax, how does that improve Main Street, Saskatchewan? Well it obviously doesn't, Mr. Deputy Chair. This isn't a tax to create jobs. This isn't a tax to pay for GRIP and NISA. This isn't even a tax to try and reduce the deficit, because they won't use one penny of it to reduce the deficit. They will use it to pay for more hare-brained Tory, PC, wrong-headed schemes. That's what they'll try and use it for.

Well I tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they won't get a chance to do it. Because whether they like it or not, the Lieutenant Governor will have to be calling an election pretty soon and we'll be in an election in this province. And when the people do get a chance to vote at the ballot box, which they so desperately want to do, Mr. Deputy Chair, this government is gone and the tax will be gone with it.

This government has said in the past . . . The Premier, for example, in 1982, Mr. Deputy Chair, is quoted as saying: the deficits are just a deferred tax that must be paid by future generations. Well that's exactly what the Premier and his Tory government have done. They've created a deficit that is going to be paid by future generations. In other words, their mismanagement, their incompetence, their waste, their wrong-headed priorities, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has virtually ruined the future of our children. That's their legacy to the children of this province. A future of high deficits of the responsibility and weight of trying to provide quality life for their own children with a Tory legacy of nine and a half years of deficit budgeting. They have ruined the future of our children. And I think they should hang their heads in shame, Mr. Deputy Chair.

(1545)

I just simply cannot comprehend how these people can get up in the morning and look in the mirror because I'm telling you I have never sat here and seen such arrogance, such callousness, such false bravado from these members opposite as they shout and heckle and carry on over

there. And I search the faces, and I try to look for a heart that knows and understands how they've devastated families in this province and how they've ruined the future of their children. Sometimes I think I see a glimmer, but I'm never sure.

And I'm telling you, Mr. Deputy Chair, if we should have the bad luck — which I know we won't — of ever having another Tory government in this province in the next 30 years, I just hope I'm not around to see it — to put it quite bluntly — nor my children because this province cannot withstand another Tory government and the incompetence and mismanagement and patronage and stupidity and wrong priorities that we've seen in the last nine and a half years. We simply cannot take another four years, five years of Tory government. And let me tell you, by far the vast majority of people in this province feel exactly the way I do and the way my constituents do.

And the thing that I find of course the most difficult to understand is why in nine and a half years they haven't learnt anything, why they haven't learnt their lesson. And what I can't understand is why they don't care. Why don't they care? Are they really that callous? Are they really that callous, Mr. Deputy Chair? Well I'm telling you, the people of this province care. And the New Democrats care. And when this government is turfed out, I'll tell you what our plan is. Our plan is to clean up their mess. Thank you.

**Mr. Pringle:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, as has been well referred to by my colleagues, this new tax Bill is going to raise some 440 million new tax dollars, taking that money away from families, Mr. Chairman, money that families don't have.

Families are telling me — they're obviously not telling the Minister of the Family this — but the families are telling me that they can't afford this new tax increase. They just simply cannot afford it.

They've had some \$1,500 for the average family in new taxes from this government since 1982; another \$2,000 from their federal PC counterparts. They just simply cannot afford this new provincial goods and services tax. Because one of the reasons is that the federal goods and services tax is costing Saskatchewan families, average families, 50 per cent more than the federal government said it would cost, the federal Tories said it would cost. And that was no surprise to anybody. So families are telling me as a critic for families, that they cannot afford this tax.

In my riding of Saskatoon Eastview I have a high number, a very high number, of senior citizens. And the Minister of Education, knowing Saskatoon, would know that. I've a very high number of seniors in my riding.

Now the Minister of the Family is also the minister responsible for seniors' issues. For some reason seniors are not telling him that they can't absorb, they can't stand this additional tax. Or at least I assume that they're not telling him because he's not spoken on this Bill.

So here's the Minister for the Family who did not speak on this Bill. I mean for the life of me I can't figure out why he

wouldn't want to justify this Bill, defend it, if it's so good.

The minister did not speak up for Saskatchewan families. The same minister, who's the Minister responsible for Seniors, did not speak up for seniors. We know seniors are opposed to this Bill. Where on earth was the Minister of the Family? Where on earth was the Minister responsible for Seniors?

Now this is the same minister, Mr. Speaker, who is not standing up for family small businesses. I've met with the small family businesses in my riding. They can't absorb this tax either. Where on earth was the Minister of the Family? He wasn't standing up for small family businesses. That's his responsibility.

This is the same minister who happens to live in the city of Regina, who's responsible for the Public Service Commission. And it's clear by the decentralization plans, which are going to continue to cost the Saskatchewan taxpayer more money and add to the debt, which has a negative impact on families and the lack of services that they'll have in the future.

This is the same minister who's responsible for the Public Service Commission and did not even have the courage last night to meet the 800 family members who were out in front of the legislative steps. This is his town. He's the minister that these people work for and he's not sticking up for them as this decentralization sham, this Tory-style decentralization plan, wrecks families and tears them apart.

Now this is related to the Bill, Mr. Chairman, because it's this kind of waste and mismanagement that makes this Bill necessary, because they're not prepared — it's very clear now — they're not prepared to look at saving money. They're not prepared to down-size the cabinet. They're not prepared to down-size their 10 legislative secretaries — 10 legislative secretaries. No other province has 10 legislative secretaries but this government, because everybody's getting extra pay for something except one person as far as I know. So this very much relates to the fact that this new tax is needed because the government is not prepared to look at where they can save money.

And the Minister of the Family, I would suggest, based on what I just said, should have his salary reduced because he's not sticking up for the people who he's responsible for as the minister of the families and seniors and the public servants in this decentralization plan.

And to top it all off, this minister has not even spoken to this Bill to defend this tax increase. He's had a lot to say from his seat and he's threatened to get up, but he never had the courage to get up. On that basis he should be resigning, Mr. Chairman.

And I want to know from the minister . . . This Minister of the Family is getting \$90,000 a year, not even spoken on this Bill. It's his job as the Minister of the Family to analyse the impact of government policies on families and to advise the government accordingly and to hold them to account. That's what the Bill said when his ministry was established. In that, he has failed miserably because since

he has become the minister we've gone to the highest rate of family poverty in all of Canada.

This Bill is simply going to add . . . this new tax increase is simply going to add to the family poverty and the growing food banks in the province of Saskatchewan.

And I would like to ask the Minister of Finance, I'd like to ask him what advice the Minister of the Family and the Minister of Seniors gave him in cabinet when this Bill was being developed. Did the Minister of the Family and the Minister responsible for Seniors issues say that yes, seniors and families can afford to have this new tax increase? Did he give you that advice? He obviously lost the battle, but did he give you that advice in drafting this Bill?

And don't talk to me about rebates to poor families, because we've been around that one before. And I've read your phoney report, so don't bother referring to it. I want to know specifically what advice — this is a very simple question — what advice did the Minister of the Family and the Minister responsible for Seniors give you in developing this new tax Bill?

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Chairman, the view of this government and all of its ministers, whether it be the Minister of the Family or others, is the same. And that is that because wheat is at a 61-year low and because our rural economy is faced year after year after year after year with the challenges of either trade wars or drought or those kinds of things, and because each year we, like farmers, thought next year would be better and you'd, you know, buy a little time, act as an economic shock absorber, but the reality is that after four or five years we recognized that something had to be done.

And what that something was — or at least one part of it — was the long-term farm programs, to inject that \$1.3 billion into our economy ultimately over this next 12 months or so. And we did that and made that decision and believe that cash is important to the economy, and that's cash that's important to the economy whether you're a senior or anyone else out there, because it speaks directly to the health and the vitality of the towns, so many of these towns that our seniors live in today.

I dare say that you aren't really familiar with what's going on in rural Saskatchewan and the numbers of seniors that live in some of these small rural communities. And if another store or two was to go there, the seniors would be the only ones left living in town. And that's why they too, if you go and talk to them, they too would agree just as these ministers would agree, that something had to be done to shore up that economy.

I know you're against it. You're against community bonds, you're against decentralization, you're against this budget. They are not. They are not. They have a very good feeling for what's happening on the farms outside their towns. And that's why I say this strategy is important to them and it's important to everyone in this province regardless of their age.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Thank you for recognizing me, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the minister



some questions about the Bill. There's something I don't understand.

When the government takes in tax revenue or royalties or revenues from any source, it usually goes to one big bank account and then whatever bills they have to pay, they take it out of that bank account and they pay it. It's just like many families. Both the husband and wife work and they both put the cheques into the same account and then they sort of pay for things out of that account.

The government also sometimes will have something called dedicated funding and that is the money that's raised in one way is there to pay for some specific purpose. And for example, I know that the government collects I think it's an extra nickel on every pop can, and the extra nickel is put into a special account to do with the environment.

And I understand that on fines in the province that there's an extra 5 or \$10 tacked onto every fine and that extra 5 or \$10 goes into a special account, not the main account, and that's used for Crimes Compensation. And you call that, as I understand it, dedicated funding as opposed to general revenues — moneys that's raised from whether it's personal income tax or the fuel tax or sales taxes or oil royalties or money from the federal government. All that money goes into the general government account to pay the bills with.

(1600)

And so the reason I'm raising this is that one of my constituents got a letter. And the minister in this letter says that the PC government decided to harmonize this provincial sales tax with the federal government's goods and services tax in order to achieve a number of objectives, the most important of which is the paying for our share of the premiums for the gross revenue insurance plan — it's called GRIP — and the net income stabilization account called NISA. And these programs will protect Saskatchewan farmers, etc., etc.

That was on April 15. And then a couple of days later in the legislature here the minister said, the application of the education and health tax to a broader range of goods will also provide the necessary financing for farm safety net programs. And that's the GRIP and NISA programs.

So it's not really clear to me whether this Bill that we have before is Bill 61. And I've read through the whole Bill, and I've checked it all over. And the explanatory notes and . . . Even though the minister is saying that all the revenue from this Bill 61, the one that we're debating and asking questions about, is supposed to go for these farm safety net programs, and I thought then that it was some kind of dedicated funding like the 5 cents on pop cans and so on. There's nothing in the Bill about this.

And so I guess the question I have for the minister, is this a matter of dedicated funding? Are all the proceeds that are going to be raised by this Bill, are they all slated to go into the GRIP and NISA programs?

**Mr. Shillington:** — I recognize that I'm not in my own seat. The minister stepped out for reasons that I think we

understand. If you want to give two or three minutes, I think he'll be back. The associate minister stepped into this at a rather difficult time. It may be just as well to take two or three minutes until the minister comes back and let him deal with the question. I think he got the import of it before he left, or the associate minister can answer it as you see fit.

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — What we have done here, Mr. Chairman, is we recognize that we needed to get this . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order. Order, please. I wonder if we could just bring the decorum of the House back to a little higher level and allow the minister to answer the question that has been put to him.

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Chairman, relative to GRIP and NISA, the strategy there is this — I think we've articulated it many times — the reasoning here was we needed some cash into the economy as part of a multifaceted plan to help stabilize and revitalize the economy. The first part of that plan entailed getting cash into the farmers' hands so it would get into the economy, into the cities, into the communities. That required a new generation of farm programs to be put in place. They are insurance programs. This isn't the old style *ad hoc* emergency, one-time kind of approach that hasn't served either our farmers or our taxpayers well. We now have an insurance program funded by the farmer, the provincial government, and the federal government.

To fund our share of the premiums which will this year be estimated at \$125 million in the budget documents, I think, or 126, something in that order, Mr. Chairman, what we did is harmonize and then leave the rate at 7 per cent. And in so doing that will generate, as we estimate, about \$125 million this year.

We have, although there is no separate fund *per se*, we have targeted that revenue to paying the premiums that we have to pay to trigger that \$1.3 billion.

What we've additionally said . . . And next year of course we'll know what the numbers are better and we'll have exact figures after we see what sign-up rates are and the mix of the program on the various farms. But indeed on an annual basis we expect leaving the rate at 7 per cent of the full harmonization to bring it to about \$180 million. And if that does exceed the premium requirement, Mr. Chairman, what we have said is that we will take that incremental revenue and apply it to the debt and deficit, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — I thank the minister for that explanation, Mr. Chairman. Well I know what the farm programs are supposed to do, but I'm not quite clear now. He said that there's no separate fund that's being set up for the moneys that are coming as a result of this Bill, but the moneys will be targeted for the farm safety programs. And I guess I don't understand those financial terms and just how that would work in the Department of Finance.

And I wonder if he could explain to us just how this money will be targeted for those programs. Will there be some special accounting mechanism within the Department of Finance to follow the funds to make sure

that these dollars are going to go to the farm programs?

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — So you're saying that these funds are going to be specifically targeted and you're going to follow their trail. Like any money that comes that's raised by this, extra money, you're going to follow it through the Department of Finance to make sure that these funds go to the farm safety net programs, and if so, how do you do that within the Department of Finance? I've spent, like, four or five years on the Public Accounts Committee trying to understand how the province's finances work and this is the first time I've ever heard of this sort of targeted process.

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — In terms of this is the first time he's ever heard — excuse me, my throat is getting a little raspy, Mr. Chairman — it's an interesting comment for the hon. member to make about the first time he's heard about this target approach.

The very Bill we're talking about amending when it first came before this legislature, I expect, had similar objectives in mind because it's called the education and health sales tax, Mr. Chairman. And I suspect then the idea of the legislators of the day was to take these funds, that the revenue that came from this tax and earmark them especially for education and health.

The hon. member asked how we know — and a legitimate enough question. We know what revenue was last year. We go to a new system. The difference is the change in the base, Mr. Chairman, as it relates to harmonization. And so we'll have a pretty good handle on the revenue gain, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Well my sense is, Mr. Minister, that you've been trying to put one over on the people of Saskatchewan. I know that the sales tax that we've had is called the education and health tax, even though when it was first set up, I believe in the 1940s, it was set up to raise money specifically for education and health. Then they changed it and all the money from that has gone into what's called the combined funds, which is the big bank account for the government.

In fact your budget this year says that all the sales tax, this E&H tax revenue, is going to go into the combined fund. But yet you're saying to people that, no, no, no. The money from this is going to go into this GRIP and NISA program.

Well you know that's not really true, is it? I mean this money is just simply going to go into general revenues, into the combined fund, isn't it?

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Chairman. I think I'm at risk of being repetitive here. As I said earlier, no special fund . . . we know what we're collecting under the old system. We know what we'll collect under the new system. We estimate \$125 million incremental this year under the new system. We estimate the farm Bill to be 125; the two numbers match fairly well. We hope that that's what . . . the estimates will be the reality, Mr. Chairman. But of course they always are just that. Estimates next year, we

estimate the number on an annualized basis to be \$180 million. If there is incremental revenue, we'll put it against the deficit.

We'll have a better idea then exactly what the cost of the new farm program premiums are because we'll have sign-up rates. And more importantly I guess the mix of what it is that farmers insured on their farms and how many acres they insured because you don't have those numbers merely with just the sign-up. So that's the process, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Well, Mr. Minister, here you go again. You and your political advisors are trying to put one over on the people of Saskatchewan. In fact all the money from this Bill, as I understand it, and getting beyond the double-talk, that all the money is going to go just into general revenues.

And the money from this Bill could just as well be going to pay for the increased debt payment that we have this year. It could just as well go to pay for the increased expenditures in the Premier's office that we have forecast for this year.

The money from this could be used to pay for Graham Taylor's salary in Hong Kong, or to Bob Andrew's office expenses in Hong Kong. The money from this Bill, this extra money could be going to pay for those things as well. Isn't that true, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, we're going to take the \$125 million roughly incremental revenue, under the new system compared to the old system, we earmarked, and flag that money to pay the premiums that will . . . I think that's a pretty good investment. By paying \$125 in insurance premiums will trigger something in the order of \$1.3 billion of cash in the farm economy. That's what's going to happen to that money and that's the process we're going through, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Can I then ask the minister, if the revenue from the sales tax, the extra revenue, is going to pay for the extra expenses of the farm program, which revenues are sort of set aside then to pay for the extra expenses of the debt payment this year and for the extra expenses of the Premier's office?

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Chairman, there is no specific set aside for those purposes. They're part of the bills the government gets and that the government will pay, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Well there's no special set-aside funds for those but there is a special set-aside fund for the GRIP and NISA programs, Mr. Minister.

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — No, as I mentioned right at the outset, Mr. Chairman, we didn't set up a specific fund. What I said is we'd earmark those funds that come in from incremental revenue which are easily identified. Here's what the old system brought in. Here's what the new system brings in. Subtract the two. The funds are easily earmarked, Mr. Chairman. And that's why we're taking the approach that we are.

(1615)

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Well, Mr. Minister, this is like going to the magic show where the magician hopes to put one over on you by, you know, the hand is quicker than the eye. But I tell you, I don't have any more comments except to say that the reason that you're going to lose the election is that even at this last stage you continue to try and fool people with what's really going on.

The fact of the matter is that the money from this Bill, from this sales tax, is going to go into your general revenues. And those general revenues will be called upon to pay for GRIP and NISA, to pay for education, health, Graham Taylor's office in Hong Kong, Bob Andrew's office, used to pay for the debt, used to pay for the extra expenses in the Premier's office. And that's what's going on.

But yet you're trying to tell people that oh no, no. We need this Bill because we need it to pay for the farm programs. Well that's not true. In fact the money from this Bill is going to go . . . could just as well go to pay for the \$100 million in waste that we see every year. This money could well go to pay for the high travel expenses that your government has or all the unnecessary advertising that your government does.

But you're trying to . . . I think you're trying to be dishonest with the people of Saskatchewan. I tell you the reason you're going to lose the election is that even now, even now, you can't come clean and you can't be honest with the people as to where this money is going to go to. You're trying to put one over on people about, oh, we need this Bill because the money is needed to pay for GRIP and NISA. Well that's not true. It's just not true. And you've admitted it here today that it's not true.

And, Mr. Minister, there's some words that we don't use in the legislature here, but when you stand here . . . You know, the other day where you say that, oh, this money is necessary for financing the farm safety net programs, you write to my constituents and say, oh, we need this money for the farm safety programs like GRIP and NISA, and you make comment after comment that this money is necessary for those farm safety programs. It's just not true.

And there's some words we don't use in this legislature, but I'm very tempted to use it with you. And I won't use it but you certainly are prevaricating. I can use that word. You're prevaricating. You're not telling the truth to the people of Saskatchewan. And, if for no other reason, you're going to get turfed out of office because you just can't tell the truth.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. No, it's not over. Unfortunately it is going to be over sooner than I think the people of Saskatchewan and the members of this House would have liked.

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

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — And I want to make some comment on that, but I want to ask several questions. And in the process of asking my questions, Mr. Chairman, I want to make a number of points, and the points I want to make I'm going to summarize for the purposes of the minister

and you, Mr. Chair, and the House.

This debate is more than just a debate about a tax Bill. This debate is about, first of all, it's about a government and a government's arrogance. It's about a government that is not interested in the process of government, the democratic process. And it's about a government which has developed a policy which I can only define as economic insanity, and I will elaborate on that further in a moment. The other thing that this debate is about, Mr. Chairman, it's about leadership. And in the case of the government opposite, the lack of leadership or misguided leadership.

This debate, thirdly, Mr. Chairman, is about two contrasting visions of this province and management of government. And fourthly, Mr. Speaker, this debate is about where we are, from the point of view of the fiscal position of this province. It's about where we have been. It's about what has happened in Saskatchewan since 1982. In other words, where has all the money gone? All of those things plus many others, but I highlight those, Mr. Chairman, on what this debate has been all about.

But first of all, let me comment on the first point. Like the rest of my colleagues, I too rise with some extreme and grave disappointment with the knowledge that I will not . . . on behalf of the 10,000 or more constituents who I represent, although they have strongly said to me I should have the time to bring their concerns to the floor of this House because the government chose to use closure to make sure that those people could not be heard.

I find that extremely distasteful. I never believed in all the years that I've been involved in public life that I'd ever have to stand up in this place and see this happen. I think it's a black day that we are making history with here today, Mr. Chairman, because of that.

Now those people I referred to, Mr. Speaker, are people who live in Regina North East and they're not any different than people who live in Gull Lake, Saskatchewan or Hudson Bay, Saskatchewan — which is my original home town — or Saskatoon or Ponteix or North Battleford or Meadow Lake or anywhere in Saskatchewan. Those people, Mr. Chairman, are people who work for a living. They struggle to pay the bills by the end of the month, that in many cases they have to really tighten up and wait for that pay cheque to come at the end of the month so they can start over again in the next month.

There are many of those people. In fact that's probably the majority of the people who live in this province. Those people, Mr. Chairman, in many cases . . . and I have visited at the door as I go visit my constituents, people who in many cases at the end of the month barely make it in order to be able to meet their mortgage and pay their power bill and their light bill and get the groceries and buy the necessities for the children.

And I do not exaggerate, Mr. Chairman, but I have in fact visited families in my constituency where they have sat down at the kitchen table with me and with pencil and paper showed me, on the basis of their monthly income, how each month they barely were able to make it and all

the things they could not have for the children which the children should have been able to have, and then pointed out to me how an additional 7 per cent PST will make it impossible for them to get by.

That's the circumstances that this government is creating for thousands of people in Saskatchewan. In fact some of those people, Mr. Chairman, because of the impact of this extension of this PST, will not be able to meet their mortgages and there's going to be some of them who will have to lose their home. And that is not any way an exaggeration. That is a fact of life. That is a real fact of life.

Now the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster with his MLA salaries and his Legislative Secretary or whips, extra pay duties and all those things that the members oppose, all the back-benchers are getting at the taxpayers' expense, may think that that doesn't make sense and maybe it doesn't to him.

But I'm telling you, Mr. Chairman, for those people in Regina North East and anywhere else in Saskatchewan who work for a living on not a very high wage, for them this is real, and this hurts. And the thing that they can't understand is when they want an opportunity to say to the Minister of Finance and the Premier, the member from Estevan, to explain to them how they're going to be affected by this so that the legislature on the government side of the House would understand, the government opposite says we're not going to give you a chance to do that.

That, Mr. Chairman, is unacceptable. I object to it. All the members on this side of the House object to it . . .

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

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Even from one end of this province to the other, all of the people of Saskatchewan object to it, Mr. Speaker. They oppose this gouging tax because they can't afford it.

Now the Minister of Finance makes some kind of an argument how somehow it is part of this government's economic development strategy. Well I'm sure with that kind of an argument, he must be listening to the election planners in Eric Bernston's office and not to the economist in his department, because not one of them would give him this kind of advice nor would any other economist anywhere in the country who knows what he was talking about.

Let me give you this example, Mr. Chairman. We are undergoing in Saskatchewan today as we are across this country, a recession. It is grave. What's a recession? It is when consumers spend less. It is as a result of that when the goods and services being bought are not being bought at that kind of rate that they need to be, or could have been, or were. And that results, Mr. Chairman, in lay-offs and fewer jobs because fewer goods are being manufactured and we have a recession.

What is the government's answer to this? The government's answer is we're going to take another \$440 million out of the consumers' pocket so they will spend less. Now how in Heaven's name can that make

economic sense? It cannot make any economic sense, and that's why some of the best work we've been able to have done for the New Democratic Party caucus shows that this tax, Mr. Chairman, will cause the loss of 7,500 jobs in the province of Saskatchewan, when we already had a net out-migration in the last several years of almost 90,000 young people.

And the Premier and the Minister of Finance in some strange, perverted way yet can still stand in the House and call this an economic development strategy. Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't buy that. The people of Regina North East don't buy that. And for the information of the member from Wilkie, the people of Saskatchewan don't buy that. If the people of Saskatchewan were buying that, Mr. Member from Wilkie, and Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that the Premier's standing in the polls would have been more than third place at — whatever it was — 16 per cent or 17 per cent. Those statistics should tell that Premier, the member from Estevan, and the Minister of Finance that they're wrong.

Well do they listen? Well of course they don't listen. And when the people come here with petitions and send their members here to speak on their behalf, the Premier and the Minister of Finance and the member from Regina South and the House Leader, the member for Melfort, say you have no right to talk to us.

Last night we had people who came here as well. And last night we had people came here as well. They're concerned about this gouge tax. They're also concerned about the fact that the government is disintegrating government services and ruining families and hurting children. And when we ask the Minister of the Family about where does he stand on this devastation that this government is wreaking on families who've been affected by this, the minister wouldn't get up in his chair and answer the question. He hid behind his desk, and he had the deputy leader get up and defend it.

I'm telling you, Mr. Chairman, I never believed that I would see the day when there would be a government — and I don't care what political stripe it is — I never thought I would see the day when I would find a government that would be so callous, so uncaring, so simply politically motivated that it would deliberately go out and hurt people the way this government deliberately goes out and hurts people.

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

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — And I don't say that lightly, Mr. Chairman. I don't say that lightly because that is no way for any government to function or operate. The member from Kelsey-Tisdale sits in his seat, and it's not even his and he talks about not caring. Well I'll tell you, the member from Kelsey-Tisdale when he talks about not caring should talk about the 600 jobs that have been lost in Hudson Bay because of his and his government's inaction.

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

(1630)

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Six hundred jobs. He should talk about the people in Hudson Bay who he knows and who I know personally, whose unemployment insurance is running out at the end of this month. And this government has been sitting on their hands not dealing with the forest industry and announcing the policy that will get that forest industry going again so that those people can feed their children. And the member from Kelsey-Tisdale laughs about that. And I say to him, shame on you because all that is, is a reflection of the bigger picture about the attitude and the approach of this government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the other point I want to make is that this debate is about leadership, and leadership, Mr. Chairman, is doing the right thing when you have the mandate to do it. Well what are some of the right things? One of the right things, Mr. Chairman, would have been not to leave 40,000 people unrepresented in this legislature for two sessions. We didn't have the leadership from that Premier. And he has said to four constituencies, we're going to pass a \$440 million tax Bill, but you people in Kindersley and Indian Head-Wolseley and the other two constituencies — some 40,000 strong — you're not going to be represented. That's not leadership; that's not leadership.

We are now in the fifth year, in the eighth month of the fifth year of the term of this government, long beyond its mandate, and this government has no right or mandate to implement this kind of a measure. But yet they go ahead and do it. That's not leadership.

Government is at 19 per cent in the polls. The people are saying to this government: you have no mandate. And it bowls ahead and brings in closure to force this Bill through. Mr. Chairman, on the part of that Premier over there, that's not leadership; that's arrogance. That's fear. That's saying to the people of Saskatchewan, I don't care about you. That's not leadership. That's cowardice, Mr. Chairman. That's downright cowardice.

And when the people come to this Legislative Building either through petitions or in person and want to talk to that Premier about their concern, he hides in the members' lounge on the government side of the House and will not come out and talk to them. That is not leadership. That's cowardice.

Mr. Chairman, the Premier is so discredited, he has so lost the respect of the people of Saskatchewan that he has no right to bring this form of legislation and pass it at this time. He should call an election so that the people can tell him whether that's the kind of thing he should do.

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

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Now is it because he has come around the corner and saw the light? Is it a consistent position that this Premier has taken on this tax Bill? Well let's examine that, Mr. Chairman.

I'm just going to read from headlines of various newspaper stories, and here's what they say. And because I'm reading, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to read names because I'm reading from the newspaper articles.

One headline: Devine considering a value added tax. Then: Wilson says GST a certainty. And what does then the Premier do? Because he's in the pocket of Mr. Mulroney, he changes to some degree and he seemed to come stronger now. He says: Devine stands ground in support of sales tax. This is talking about the GST.

And then he came along and he said: Devine hints at food tax. But something along the way said that the Premier was thinking about having an election in 1990, and we began to hear him say things, oh but that GST isn't so good. And it was reinforced by the Minister of Finance in 1990 who read in his budget that there would never be a GST in Saskatchewan.

But yet today we're considering a Bill that will impose a provincial GST, Mr. Chairman. That is not leadership. That's deceit. And the people of Saskatchewan have been deceived. And they won't even be given the chance to say what they want to say about it, because the government has brought in closure and won't allow them to speak.

Thirdly, Mr. Chairman, this debate is about vision. Well what are the visions for the '90s? Well first of all, how are we going to — in this case because I'm going to talk about the tax Bill, I'm going to stick to this — how are we going to manage things in the '90s? Well all of my colleagues have already said — and I can't say it better than them — we need to do away with the waste and the mismanagement and even the corruption which has brought us from a surplus of \$139 million in 1982 to an accumulated deficit of \$5.2 billion in nine short years. Do away with the waste and mismanagement.

Look at the tax system so that it is implemented on the basis of fairness and ability to pay.

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

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Rejuvenate, rejuvenate our economy, Mr. Speaker. Rejuvenate our economy and create jobs using the strengths in Saskatchewan instead of relying on the Pocklingtons and the Cargills and those that come in here and do it for us, because that has created practically nothing from the point of view of jobs in Saskatchewan.

I say to the Premier, if you've got \$60 million to spend — which is what you're spending, and that's a conservative figure, excuse the term — if you've got \$60 million to spend to ruin people's lives and make children unhappy and traumatized with this so-called decentralization, if you've got \$60 million to do that, put that \$60 million into rural economic development and you'll create many, many jobs and they will be new jobs.

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

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — What wouldn't have a fraction of the \$60 million done in Hudson Bay to create new jobs? Think about it. What wouldn't a fraction of that done to create new jobs and help to stabilize that economy? Jobs that would be producing things. That's what has to be done.

What's been the government's vision? Well it can be

capsulized in four words. The government's vision has been privatization. It's been deregulation. It's been free trade. And it's been high taxes. That's their vision.

Well, has it brought us results? Here is the results. It has brought a huge deficit, unfair taxes, high unemployment, lost farms, out-migrations, and we have kids who can't go to school because the government does not fund our university and technical schools adequately and they have put on quotas. That's the result of this government's vision.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, where has all the money gone? Well the government's own statistics show us some rather interesting information. Since 1982 to 1990 government revenues have gone up by 61 per cent. Now that's not a small increase. It's not as if the government revenues have been declining or they've been frozen or they've flattened out. Government revenues since 1982 have increased by 61 per cent. That's a big increase. Inflation has gone up by 48 per cent, so revenues even increased at a faster rate than inflation.

But you know, Mr. Chairman, what the expenditures of this government have been? They've gone up by 89 per cent — 89 per cent. I say to the Minister of Finance, you need money to pay for GRIP and NISA. You need more money to pay for education. Take a look at where you're spending your money and cut out the waste and cut out the mismanagement and you'll find the money.

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

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — As my leader, the member from Riversdale so eloquently put it earlier today, the revenues of this government this year will be \$4.5 billion. That's what they're going to spend on a province with a population of less than one million people. And if this government can't manage well enough to live within that \$4.5 billion and within those means, then this government should call the election tomorrow. And we'll start it on Monday and they should step aside and let somebody sit on that side of the House who can manage that kind of money, Mr. Chairman.

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

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Because finally, Mr. Chairman, from the point of view of the economy of this province as well as other reasons, from the point of view of the economy of this province as well as many other reasons, there is nothing that this province needs more than an election.

And I know that some members opposite will say, oh well, you're the opposition, of course you'd want an election. That's not why I say that. But . . . don't smile, Mr. Chairman, because I think you should listen to what is about to be said, because you should be just as concerned about where this province is headed as I am or anybody else in this House. And you probably are. I think you are, sir.

We need an election because for a year now in this province some of the important economic decisions have not been made. We have stood still. We have stood still

because the government has been preoccupied solely with trying to stage an election campaign and time itself for an election, and has not made any of the major important and big decisions that we so desperately need, that we so desperately need, in order that we could get the economy rolling again.

And it's not only just the government, but when the private sector out there looks around and knows there's an election coming and does not get any clear signals from where the direction of the government is, the private sector will say — and they're saying — we're going to wait. We're not going to make any economic decisions. We're not going to make a decision on investments because we are going to wait for the election to take place and then we'll know how we're going to go about doing this.

And every week and every month that this government delays an election our economy grinds closer to a halt because of all of this indecisions. And we are in the midst of a recession and we need those decisions to get made so that we can create the jobs and create the wealth to get this province rolling again.

And instead of seriously considering the implications of their dithering about the election, instead of seriously considering their fear of the voters, instead of seriously considering what needs to be done, when that is an election, the government sits on his hands thinking that each month for every one of those members is yet another pay cheque.

And that's about the level of the judgement that's being made over there, Mr. Chairman, and I think that that's tragic. I think that's tragic, because there is more to government than that. There is more to government than that. Government is really the collective will of the people, where the people of any society elect people to a legislature to do things for them together what they individually cannot do for themselves.

The irony of it is, is that we have a government opposite that only cares about themselves personally. And because of that, Mr. Chairman, our economy continues to grind slower and slower and slower. And more people are out-migrating because there are no jobs for them, and more people are losing their homes because they're being laid off from their jobs.

And this Bill that we're talking about here today, Mr. Chairman, aggravates that situation even more because it is a tax that is going to cause the recession to go even deeper. It is a tax that's going to cause people to suffer even more. It is a tax that is going to eliminate 7,500 jobs when we should be trying to create jobs in Saskatchewan. It is a tax that does not have the approval of support of any people anywhere in Saskatchewan. It is a tax that is not wanted. It's not needed, and it should not proceed.

I know because the opposition has been restricted with a closure motion, therefore we will not be able to do any more because of the government's actions — at least in this debate. At least in this debate. But there is something that we will be able to do. And that's a choice the people will make come the next election. And that is, that if this

New Democratic Party is elected as the government with the member from Riversdale as the premier, at the next election, whenever it's called, this tax is gone.

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

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — This tax is gone. So, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I simply want to say that this government has failed on all the four counts which I have outlined here today. It has failed on all those four counts, and it will continue to fail because right now in the months or weeks ahead if it waits that long for an election, it will not think about the interest of the province. But those members opposite will only be preoccupied with the interest of the Conservative Party. And, Mr. Chairman, that's going to hurt the province even more.

Now I mentioned earlier about where has all the money gone? Has it gone to help people who need to get health care adequately? Of course not, because there's people in this province not getting adequate health care. Has it gone to provide the best possible education in Saskatchewan? Of course not, because from one end of this province, they're closing rural schools. And it's universities and technical schools. Students have quotas so that they cannot get to school even though they're qualified to go.

The government's answer to all of this lack of economic activity is what they call decentralization. But isn't it ironic that in the last few years . . .

(1645)

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order. Order. Pursuant to an order of this day, four hours was allotted for the committee consideration of Bill 61 and that 15 minutes before the expiration of that allotted time the chairman is required to intervene and put all questions necessary to dispose of every section of this Bill.

Three hours and 45 minutes have now expired and I'll put the question on clause 1.

Clause 1 agreed to on division.

Clauses 2 to 6 inclusive agreed to on division.

**Mr. Chairman:** — Call in the members. There will be a 10-minute bell on the vote.

The division bells rang from 4:48 p.m. until 4:58 p.m.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 28**

Devine	Martin
Schmidt	Neudorf
Klein	Gerich
Hodgins	Swenson
McLeod	Britton
Lane	Sauder
Hepworth	Toth
Meiklejohn	Duncan
Hardy	Gleim

Kopelchuk  
Petersen  
Wolfe  
Martens  
Hopfner

McLaren  
Baker  
Muirhead  
Johnson  
Gardner

**Nays — 16**

Romanow	Kowalsky
Shillington	Solomon
Lingenfelter	Atkinson
Tchorzewski	Hagel
Thompson	Pringle
Brockelbank	Calvert
Mitchell	Smart
Simard	Koenker

(1700)

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

**THIRD READINGS**

**Bill No. 61 — An Act to amend The Education and Health Tax Act (No. 2)**

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that this Bill be now read a third time and be passed under its title.

The division bells rang from 5:03 p.m. to 5:10 p.m.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 29**

Devine	Martin
Muller	Neudorf
Schmidt	Gerich
Klein	Swenson
Hodgins	Britton
McLeod	Sauder
Lane	Toth
Hepworth	Duncan
Meiklejohn	Gleim
Hardy	McLaren
Kopelchuk	Baker
Petersen	Muirhead
Wolfe	Johnson
Martens	Gardner
Hopfner	

**Nays — 21**

Romanow	Kowalsky
Prebble	Solomon
Shillington	Atkinson
Lingenfelter	Anguish
Tchorzewski	Hagel
Koskie	Pringle
Thompson	Calvert
Brockelbank	Lautermilch
Mitchell	Smart
Upshall	Koenker
Simard	

The Bill read a third time and passed under its title.

**ROYAL ASSENT**

At 5:29 p.m. Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor entered the Chamber, took her seat upon the throne, and gave Royal Assent to the following Bill:

Bill No. 61 — An Act to amend The Education and  
Health Tax Act (No.2)

Her Honour retired from the Chamber at 5:31 p.m.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:32 p.m.