

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to take this opportunity to introduce to you and through you to members of the legislature, 10 students seated in the Speaker's gallery from Midale Central School. The teacher is Garth Holman and the bus driver is Sandra Holman.

Mr. Speaker, I'll be meeting with the students later so that I can have the opportunity to talk with them. I hope that all the members welcome them to the legislature. And I do hope in fact that they enjoy the session today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce through you to the Assembly some 26 grade 4 students from the White City School. They're in the west gallery, Mr. Speaker. They're accompanied by Mrs. Darlene Soeder and Mrs. Sylvia Sanderson. I look forward to meeting with the students after question period for refreshments and pictures. I hope all hon. members will join with me in welcoming the students from White City.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tusa: — It is my pleasure also to introduce a group of students. These students are grade 6 and 7 students from the town of Nokomis. They are here this afternoon visiting our Legislative Building and are accompanied by their teacher, Keith Hassman, as well as Joyce Braun, Judy Harley, and Doug Edwards. Would you welcome these students to our Assembly.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Costs of Decentralization

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to direct my question to the minister in charge of decentralization. Mr. Minister, the \$2.2 million under the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation budget for decentralization refers only to the head office, and the individual departments must find the money in their budgets to pay for their own decentralization. You have a department like Highways which has already had a cut of 10 per cent in its budget this year. Where are they supposed to come up with an extra \$12 million which is the real cost to finance your political strategy? Are they supposed to cut services even further, Mr. Minister, or are they supposed to increase the deficit? Which one of those is it?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member

begins his question from the premise that he's been operating on all along, and that is that as these decentralization moves are announced, they're announced out over a period of three to four years. And in each case that's been the case, over a period of three to four years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asks his questions based on the premise that all of the expenditure would be in the current budget year and in the current calendar year. Obviously that won't be the case. The hon. member knows that, but he likes to cloud the issue for his own purposes obviously. That's fair ball. That's the political nature of the debate that he likes to enter into. Mr. Speaker, the costs of each move, the range of costs for each individual move that have been announced, are there and have been reported in each case.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — A new question to the same minister, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, a cost is a cost. Whether it is three years or three months, the taxpayers are going to have to pay \$12 million for your announcement that you made yesterday with no visible return whatsoever, Mr. Minister.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — What we have in today's announcement is that your decentralization plans in your estimates will cost \$10 million in phoney Tory promises, but in real dollars is going to cost now \$50 million. And since you claim that the departments are already as lean as they can be, just where is this money supposed to come from? And more to the point, Mr. Minister, can you point out where, in any departmental budget, that money is to be found? Can you point that out, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, the numbers that we have announced in each case are based on the experience that we have had. He once again begins from the premise that there's no experience with decentralization. There is a significant experience with decentralization in the province. We've moved significant corporations from Regina to the communities of Melville and Swift Current and other places. We have seen from that what the costs are of moving X number of employees and so much per employee or per position. Those numbers, Mr. Speaker, are there and they have been our experience. It's upon that experience that these numbers are based. That makes eminent sense, Mr. Speaker. And it's there for all to see.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, that is a variable in this is the experience of what are the lease costs in communities outside of the capital cities compared to the lease costs inside the capital city. All of those are variables. Then that's why, because there are some variables involved, is why there's a range in each move as they are announced. There's a range of costs, and we stand by what those costs will be.

Mr. Speaker, they're announced, and as other announcements go forward those costs will be laid out as these have been.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — A new question to the same minister, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, your experience, so called, is one thing, but your estimates by your own department have said that the cost of this is going to be \$12 million for the Department of Highways, and will have an incremental, annual increase in the cost of operating of \$5 million and that can't be justified.

Now I'm going to go back to the \$2.2 million which you budgeted in the SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation) budget, Mr. Minister. Since it's there not to move employees, we would like to know how it's going to be divided.

So if you listen, Mr. Minister, I want to ask you this question. What is the cost of the Watrous office and the cost of the office here in downtown Regina? You've got two. What is the salary being paid to Mr. Art Battiste, your decentralization guru located in downtown Regina? And how much has gone for advertising this political program? Would you provide these costs breakdown, Mr. Minister, so that you could further justify what you're doing.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, as I've said, the costs that we have outlined are the costs . . . expenditures that we believe that this program will take.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member stands in the House again today, expresses his concerns and his opposition to Fair Share Saskatchewan and decentralizing to the regions of Saskatchewan. That member expresses his . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order, order, order. I'm going to ask the hon. member for Quill Lakes to refrain from intervening. I know there are from time to time others as well, but the hon. member from Quill Lakes has been keeping it up constantly and I ask him to refrain.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — He uses an example, Mr. Speaker, of a report that came purportedly from someone in the Department of Highways. And in that report there was a number, \$12 million. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that that number included in the Highways' submission that was developed for the government a long number of months ago, that included a whole new computer systems that the Highways department have been after.

The hon. member, a former Finance minister, knows how these requests come forward to treasury board. Whole new computer systems for the department. Except that the hon. member says that the department in that submission, in that particular submission, were including whole new computer systems that they have been after, regardless of whether they moved anywhere or whether they were staying in Humford House.

Mr. Speaker, the costs of this program are the costs of this

program, of the moves. And that's what takes place. The costs of so much, so much per employee, so much for lease space — Mr. Speaker, that member says he's against it.

I just have one more point, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister responsible for the Environment and Public Safety. Mr. Minister, I have here in my hand a copy of the news release of today which announces the uprooting and relocation of your department. Within the news release, Mr. Minister, if we could believe your figures — and that's hard — you indicate that this is going to cost somewhere between 1 and \$1.6 million.

Mr. Minister, my questions to you are these. Of that much money, would you tell the people of Saskatchewan today how much you intend to spend on relocating staff; how much is to be spent on the leasing or purchasing of new accommodation; how much is to be spent on breaking office leases here in Regina; how much is to be spent buying new communications equipment; how much is to be spent moving office equipment, moving communication equipment; how much is to be spent hooking your computers up to a new communication network. And finally, Mr. Minister, how much is set aside to provide your travel to and fro?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, once again we have a member of the NDP (New Democratic Party) here in Regina standing up and expressing his opposition to the decentralization program. It must be noted . . . another member too now, first of all the member who's the critic in this area, the former member for Humboldt and Watrous, who's now centralized to Regina, then the member from Moose Jaw — two NDP members stand up and express their opposition to decentralization; other members across there have expressed their intentions to carry on with decentralization when they're outside of Regina, out in the province.

I have here a copy of the *Tisdale Recorder*, June 10, in there, and let me just quote, Mr. Speaker: "For the PC's to say that we would cancel Fair Share is an outright lie."

An Hon. Member: — Who said?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Romanow said. The Leader of the NDP said, oh we won't cancel Fair Share, we're for Fair Share, when he's in Tisdale. But his people here stand in the House and they say, we're against Fair Share; we're against stabilizing rural Saskatchewan; we're against those communities out there.

Mr. Speaker, we say the same thing in Regina, difficult as that might be, as we say outside of Regina, because we believe strongly in what we're doing to stabilize rural Saskatchewan, whether it's this program, the farm safety nets, community bonds. We believe in rural Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Calvert: — The fact that the minister responsible for the Department of Environment and Public Safety would not get on his feet to answer the question, the fact that the minister for Fair Share will not answer the questions, is proof, Mr. Speaker, proof that there is no cost/benefit analysis, proof that they haven't done the work, and proof, Mr. Speaker, that this whole scheme is nothing but politics, nothing but a desperate attempt to divide our province to get their government re-elected, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister responsible for the Department of the Environment to provide us the exact cost breakdown of the cost for this decentralization.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, the announced costs of relocation are there in each case . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Excuse me, excuse me. I'd ask the hon. members to allow the minister to continue without undue interruption.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — The announced costs are there, as they were this morning, for the Department of Environment and Public Safety, other departments. Those costs are there and they're based on the experience that we have with other moves, other decentralizations, other cases where the NDP (New Democratic Party) said it couldn't work — other cases where members of that caucus said, Crop Insurance can't operate from Melville. They said Crop Insurance can't operate from Melville. Crop Insurance operates very, very well for farmers all across this province from Melville. That's what they said then.

Mr. Speaker, now they rise, and here's the member from Moose Jaw rising to express his opposition to this, just as he expressed in Regina his opposition to the fertilizer plant near his own city. But when he's in Moose Jaw, I'm all for the fertilizer plant, he says. The same thing in town as in the country, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Highways and Transportation. Mr. Minister, yesterday your department announced it would decentralize 250 jobs to the Yorkton area at a cost of \$3.6 million. Now, Mr. Minister, I'm sure that you are intimate with the details of this decentralization and will be able to provide me with the cost, Mr. Minister.

Of this amount of 3.6 million, could you tell this Assembly how much is spent on relocation costs for staff; how much is spent on leasing or purchasing new accommodations; how much is to be spent buffering employees against real estate fluctuations and prices; how much for vacant or breaking leases in Regina; how much on purchasing new equipment — communications equipment; how much to be spent moving offices and

communication equipment; and how much is spent in hooking up computers and other equipment to the communications network.

And finally, Mr. Minister, from your details of this decentralization, how much has been set aside for ministerial and staff travel?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, the case yesterday, as it was today, the announced cost of the move of the Department of Highways and Transportation to Yorkton and east-central Saskatchewan was based on the experience that I outlined earlier in this question period, the experience we have had.

The specifics the hon. member raises, whether it be computers' hook-up, whether it be the lease costs, all of those things were taken into consideration, these costs. The differential between lease costs there and lease costs here, all were taken into consideration. Mr. Speaker, the experience we have had with Crop Insurance in Melville, with Agricultural Credit Corporation in Swift Current — both organizations which are very highly computerized — all of those costs are there, Mr. Speaker.

I say to the hon. member, and as I did to his colleague from Moose Jaw a few moments ago, here's another NDP member who's up here and on the record as being against Fair Share Saskatchewan when his leader, while in Tisdale, which is convenient for Tisdale . . .

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

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I must hasten to assure the minister in charge of decentralization that what I'm against here is this Tory decentralization plan. That's what I'm against.

I would like to, Mr. Speaker, direct this question to . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. Both sides of the House, order.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I would like to be able to direct this question to the Minister of Highways and Transportation, but it appears that he's mute today and cannot respond.

In the absence of an answer from the Minister of Highways and Transportation, I'd like to hear from the minister in charge of decentralization.

Mr. Minister, the Department of Highways and Transportation people are telling the media internal studies show that the cost per job will be in the range of \$50,000 — not \$10,000 per job as you're estimating in your news releases, Mr. Minister. With this kind of discrepancy, Mr. Minister, have you a full breakdown of the cost to defend your position? If not, why are you hiding the cost of this Tory decentralization program from the people of Saskatchewan? Who's going to pay the cost of this, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, now we have it. Now the veteran member of the NDP over there says it's the Tory decentralization plan. That's what he says. His candidate yesterday, 24 hours ago in Yorkton, said we're for this. His candidate, their candidate — we're for this decentralization in Yorkton.

The person sitting two seats over to his right from the Quill Lakes, when he's in Wynyard and in Watson — we're for this; we're for this program. This is a good program for the rural communities. This is what these communities need. That's what he says, his other brother behind him over here, the Agriculture critic. He says, oh we're for this when we're in Humboldt.

In fact the member from Humboldt said and I quote, on the CBC (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation) radio, and I quote: the voters here may even reward the Tories, he says. I mean the guy . . . every one of their members when they leave Regina, take on a different view, whether it's this issue, the Weyerhaeuser paper mill, the Gainers plant, the fertilizer plant, every diversification project. They're against every one of them in Regina; they're for every one of them in the community affected.

Mr. Speaker, this province is an entire entity. This province must be governed as an entire entity. We believe in the stabilization of this province's economy, the rural economy, and they are not for that. So, Mr. Speaker, let them have a plan and what . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — The member from Regina North East — yes, you can wave your arm — and some others, hollering at the Chair is absolutely unparliamentary. I'm drawing it to your attention. Nobody's guiltless in this House to be hollering at other people and I ask the hon. members to remember that. That is no way to act in this House. It is most unparliamentary.

Next question. That's enough of that.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, the minister of decentralization talks about his experience with respect to calculating costs for decentralization. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you what our experience is. Our experience and the experience of the people of the province of Saskatchewan, is that prior to the election in 1986, this government said the deficit was one thing, and after the election they told us they miscalculated it by \$800 million.

My question is to the Minister of Health. Last week your department announced it would decentralize 30 jobs from the drug plan to Davidson at a cost of 350,000. Mr. Minister, of that amount, would you please tell this Assembly how much is to be spent on relocation costs for these 30 jobs for the staff; how much is to be spent on leasing or purchasing new accommodations for the 30 families; how much is to be spent providing employees with a buffer against real estate prices; how much is to be spent on breaking leases in Regina; how much is to be spent on purchasing new communications equipment; how much is to be spent moving office and communications equipment; how much is to be . . .

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

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Now here's a perfect example of why we have problems in question period. The minister is answering the question over here much longer than they should. And here we have a question, quite frankly, which would take a long, long time if it was totally answered, and we're not at the end of it yet. So what we need is co-operation on both sides, not accusations.

Now I'm going to ask the hon. member for Lakeview to complete her question, and for the minister to answer in a reasonable length of time. I'm going to ask that.

Hold it, the hon. member for Regina Elphinstone, are you challenging the Chair? I will conduct this House as I think is right and not a member from this House. The member from Regina Elphinstone, you're going to rise, sir, and you're going to apologize for blatantly interfering with the Chair.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I apologize, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, how much is going to be set aside for ministerial and staff travel; how much for hooking up computers to a communications network? Mr. Minister, where is your cost analysis? Will you table it today?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, the announcement as it related to the drug plan, it will be located in Davidson, midway between Saskatoon and Regina — a reasonable location for the drug plan to be operating from, a drug plan which serves the whole province.

Mr. Speaker, the costs that were announced at the time of the drug plan move was announced, are the costs that it will take to make that move — 350,000, in that range.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, you're minister of decentralization. You should have these costs at your fingertips and a detailed analysis. Your reluctance to produce them means only one thing, and that's because you know your analysis will not stand up to public scrutiny.

Mr. Minister, where do you get the nerve to make announcements about a policy decision, when we have a \$5 billion deficit in this province, attaching costs to it that you know won't stand up to public scrutiny?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says, where do you get the nerve to deal with a policy like this — decentralization. That's what she says, the member for Regina. The member for Regina who once understood the nature . . .

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

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — We have the member from Regina Lakeview who once understood the nature of rural Saskatchewan saying: where do you get the nerve to try to serve and stabilize rural Saskatchewan?

Mr. Speaker, we must stand up for rural Saskatchewan. She makes reference to the economy of the province and difficult budget circumstances. She makes reference to all those things. The very economy that dictates the difficulty in the budget is the same economy that dictates the need to stabilize rural Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. If they'd ever make that connection, they would all be on the same side on this issue. Here we have people standing up against Fair Share Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Opposition to Decentralization

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. Mr. Premier, if we ever needed proof the decentralization plan of yours is simply a series of political announcements, today is in fact the day. Mr. Premier, you won't tell us where the money's coming for to pay for this ill-conceived program. You won't tell us how it's going to be spent. And you won't even tell us what all is involved in fact in the spending of these tens of millions of dollars.

I have here today, Mr. Premier, a quote from the *Edmonton Journal* which clearly outlines that the Alberta government is backing away from decentralization as a result of the outcry from Saskatchewan citizens. The quote, Mr. Speaker, is: the Saskatchewan government has taken a torrent of abuse about its decentralization program which has relocated more than 650 workers to rural communities.

My question to you, Mr. Premier, is this: how is it that the Premier of Alberta is more responsive to the workers of Saskatchewan than you are? How is it that Don Getty has more care for Saskatchewan workers than the Premier of Saskatchewan? How does that work?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the hon. member that he never is really very happy when I refer to Ontario NDP. He says, why don't you talk about Saskatchewan stuff? So I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that now he's looking for some place else to grab on to some sort of corner-stone in Fair Share, so he's over in PC (Progressive Conservative) Alberta.

I'll say to him, Mr. Speaker, that right here in Saskatchewan, right here in Saskatchewan, the former president of the University of Saskatchewan, a great guy, Mr. Speaker, who believes in rural Saskatchewan, has said, this is the right thing to do, to move the Department of Agriculture, including the deputy minister and all of Agriculture, to Humboldt and area.

It's supported by the NDP member from Humboldt, Mr. Speaker. He said he wouldn't change it. And, Mr.

Speaker, in Tisdale the NDP leader in the province of Saskatchewan has said:

"For the PC's to say that we would cancel Fair Share is an outright lie," Romanow added.

Now he's for it in the country; he's for in Humboldt; he's for it all over the province, Mr. Speaker, and he's against . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

POINTS OF ORDER

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, during the question period today the minister in charge of decentralization referred to an internal document in the Department of Highways.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that document has been tabled in the legislature. And pursuant to the rules of *Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms* on page 115, "Documents Cited," rule 327(1), I think it refers clearly to the fact that when documents are referred to or cited from, that that document has to be tabled.

And I wondered, Mr. Speaker, if you would make a ruling that in fact if the minister . . . I suppose I would ask him to table the document — if he refuses, whether the legislature would require him to do that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, during the question period today, the hon. member says that I referred to a document. I referred to that there were series of documents that came to treasury board.

Mr. Speaker, the rule as I understand it, is if I was quoting directly from a document. And I didn't cite or quote from the document, Mr. Speaker; I made reference to the document.

The Speaker: — Order. I listened to the hon. member's point of order. And in the point of order he raised, he indicated that the minister referred to the document. And Beauchesne's citation 327(3) reads as follows:

A public document referred to but not cited or quoted by a Minister need not be tabled.

The hon. member in a point of order indicated, the way I recall, that the minister referred to the document. However that's the way we call your point of order, that you said referred to — referred to.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I noticed that during question period the minister cited a document during his answer that dealt with an internal document from the Department of Highways. Having cited the document, I wonder if we could require that that document be tabled.

The Speaker: — Well based on your present point of order, you appreciate I can't make a ruling on it at this point. I'll have to take it under advisement and I'll have to

look at the verbatim.

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Before orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, you will recall that last Thursday evening on a point of privilege when the demonstrators had come to the legislature, the member from Regina Centre had asked you to table the document that you were reading when you gave your ruling on the procedure that is used in this legislature when we have demonstrations and rallies outside of the doors.

Mr. Speaker, it is now Tuesday. We've been waiting I believe three sitting days for the tabling of the document that you read, for the answers to the questions that the member from Regina Centre asked of you. And I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, when will we receive your response to the questions that were asked by the member from Regina Centre.

The Speaker: — I'll be pleased to answer that question to the hon. member. I'm taking some time, of course, because I want a complete answer to the question. And you may be sure that the answer — with relevant document — I almost have it ready and it will be very, very soon that the hon. members will receive it. Very soon.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTIONS

Resolution No. 7 — Encouragement of Small Business

Mr. Saxinger: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, at the end of my remarks I will be moving a motion to be seconded by my colleague, the member from Wilkie.

Mr. Speaker, small business plays a very important part in the economy of our province. It is the largest creator of new jobs in Saskatchewan and is a major force behind the diversification force that will see us move away from being so dependent on agriculture.

Agriculture has faced the problems of drought along with low prices, and this had serious effect on our whole province. I have seen many families around the province and I've heard from many farmers in my constituency who are really hurting because of this situation in agriculture. When the farmer's short on cash, everybody suffers.

This is why it is so very important that small business be given the opportunity to succeed in Saskatchewan, because it is the small-business sector that will broaden our economic base and provide a source of hope for the future. This is why it is so important to look to newer ways to stimulate small-business sectors — something that this government has done very well.

To prepare for our future we must make sure that the people who want to start or continue small business are given every possible chance to do so, small-business sector jobs, jobs for now and jobs for the future. It diversifies our economy, and many times brings in innovative ideas and improvements to existing products and service. For this reason alone, we must continue to

encourage small-business people and business venture in this province.

As our economic base begins to shift away from a total dependence on agriculture sector, it has become more important that we look to other means of making our economy strong. This is especially true in the rural towns and villages which are effected so mostly by these changes.

The people who live in these small communities around the province are really concerned with the changes taking place across the province and around the world that affects the stability of the town. And many of them are taking charge of developing small business right at home by using programs like the community bonds. They know they can't depend on farming alone to make our province strong.

They know that to see our communities strive and prosper, in order to see them continue on, there are two main things that must be taken care of before. First of all, we must continue to start behind the farmers of this province, to stay behind the farmers of this province. The long-term safety net GRIP (gross revenue insurance plan) and NISA (net income stabilization account) go a long ways toward this goal.

And, Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to say that in my constituency, the GRIP, the sign-up, the percentage of signing up in GRIP program, is over 95 per cent — over 95 per cent, Mr. Speaker. That just prove that finally the farmer have a guaranteed income plan, the first time in history. NISA to me, I think it's just like a retirement savings which everybody in this province have. Finally the farmer has the same opportunity.

And secondly, we must work with the people across the province to find new and different ways for them to develop economically. Since 1982, manufacturing investment is up by almost 700 per cent — Mr. Speaker, nearly 700 per cent. Mr. Speaker, this is even more impressive when you consider that the growth occurred during some of the most difficult economic times this province has ever faced.

Tourism and the area which is one of the fastest growing industry in our province has expanded record-breaking growth since 1988. That's the year tourism inquiries reached an all-time high of more than 178,000 — an increase of 72 per cent since 1988. Throughout this province, tourism gives jobs to about 23,000 people and brings in over \$750 million a year into our communities.

Mr. Speaker, and we have been involved in other efforts that supported Saskatchewan business, like the Buy Saskatchewan Agencies.

Buy Saskatchewan Agencies was started up in 1987 by this government. It is an agency that truly benefitted Saskatchewan businesses and is an effort that we can all be proud of. It has developed our business sector, hundreds of millions of new contractors and joint ventures opportunities. The agency has encouraged hospitals, school boards, local government and businesses to buy from Saskatchewan suppliers

whenever possible.

And there's evidence of their success of these agencies, Mr. Speaker. Buy Saskatchewan negotiate with the NewGrade upgrader to create the contracts so that Saskatchewan firms would have a chance to bid on them. That meant business for Saskatchewan companies. Buy Saskatchewan worked with 13 agriculture implement firms to supply structural steel for the upgrader. This meant business for those 13 firms — 7 million worth of contracts, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, SaskPower buys 90 per cent of everything it needs right here at home. That meant over \$283 million for Saskatchewan business last year alone. Business from all over the province have benefitted from the work that Buy Saskatchewan Agency has in the past. And that will continue in the future.

I talked very briefly about agriculture earlier. And I would like to say now that farming will always be a major role in the economy of this province. The future of this province lies in promoting those ventures and backing those people who will help make our province strong through diversifying our economy.

The government has shown its commitment to supporting small business as a means to their future, Mr. Speaker. With that in mind I hereby move the following:

That this Assembly commends the Government of Saskatchewan for its support of small business, for its recognition of the important role this sector plays in the Saskatchewan economy and for its many programs and measures taken by the Department of Economic Development and Tourism, the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation, the Saskatchewan government growth fund, and Buy Saskatchewan Agency and its other departments and agencies to assist small business.

I hereby make this motion, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1445)

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the motion before us today is the most important motion we will debate here this season — this session I should have said. And I say this because the motion recognizes two very important facts. First that this administration has followed strict spending policies which will make government as efficient and effective as possible.

And second, that these . . .

The Speaker: — I think the hon. member for Quill Lakes . . . just refrain. He has interfered many times today, and quite frankly I'm tired of hearing his interferences even after I call him to order. I'm asking him once more not to interfere.

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And second, Mr. Speaker, that these restraints must continue so that we

can provide the services and protection that Saskatchewan needs to face the challenges ahead.

Unlike the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, the government has a plan for Saskatchewan. First, we are protecting and stabilizing agriculture and the rural economy through agricultural assistance payments, GRIP and NISA, Fair Share Saskatchewan, and community bonds, participating loans and a host of other programs.

Mr. Speaker, next we are helping Saskatchewan people to diversify and build an industry throughout the province. Already, Mr. Speaker, we have increased manufacturing in Saskatchewan by \$700 million. We're making paper, gasoline, cable, recreation vehicles, fertilizer, natural gas, and export hundreds of other products and services that have never been before done in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. Those are here and that was done by this government. We have just as many resources here as anywhere else in Canada. And under this government, resources are being used to build industry, jobs, and the future, Mr. Speaker.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the government is introducing democratic reforms to make government more in tune with what the people have been telling us, Mr. Speaker. Times change, and the democratic system must change with it. So in this session, Mr. Speaker, we are introducing freedom of information legislation, plebiscites and referendums, an elected Speaker — you yourself, Mr. Speaker, are evidence of that — and more power for the Provincial Auditor.

Now all of these things we are doing, Mr. Speaker, are not possible unless we continue to exercise sensible fiscal restraint measures. If we squander our money on big, inefficient government, then there will be no money to stabilize and protect rural Saskatchewan and to diversify and build our industries.

If we take the attitude of the members opposite and try to buy the next election with promises we cannot afford, then there would be no future for Saskatchewan. But we have not squandered the money on ridiculous promises, Mr. Speaker. Instead we have set out a clear, rational, fiscal plan that will provide efficient, effective government and the resources we need to continue to keep on building and protecting the province. We have done that.

Streamlining government payrolls has been a big part of this success, and the process. Since 1982 the government has reduced the size of the civil service by over 2,300 positions. And on this year's budget we have eliminated another 352. Cabinet ministers and legislative secretary salaries have been held at the 1989 level. All severance pay are gone and the MLAs (Member of the Legislative Assembly) will not get a salary increase until the budget is balanced, Mr. Speaker.

Those are some of the measures we are taking. Government travel has been restricted, as has office equipment purchases, and nine departments have been eliminated. Public sector wages have been set at reasonable levels, as have operating grants, Mr. Speaker.

We are also working to improve financial relations with the federal government so that in the future we can avoid or at least reduce the off-loading of financial responsibilities that Ottawa has engaged for in the past few years. By using . . .

The Speaker: — Excuse me. Order, order. The hon. member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake wishes to . . .

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if I could have the indulgence of the House to introduce a guest.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and through you to members of the Legislative Assembly, a gentleman from the riding of Kinistino, Mr. Armand Roy.

Mr. Roy has decided to seek the nomination for the New Democratic Party and was successful in that venture, and I am assuming all members of this House will agree has a very good chance of being the next member from Kinistino.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Resolution No. 7 — Encouragement of Small Business (continued)

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, by using this strategy the province of Saskatchewan will see a balanced budget in 1993. And I want to say that it will be a truly balanced budget, Mr. Speaker. There will be no hidden deficit like there was in 1982 when the members opposite were in power. There will be no \$4.9 billion hidden away like there was when the NDP left government, Mr. Speaker.

This financial plan will make it possible to carry out the overall plan for Saskatchewan that I explained earlier, Mr. Speaker. These fiscal restraints will allow us to continue to protect and stabilize rural Saskatchewan and promote diversification and growth throughout the province.

Now the members opposite of course don't agree with the measures we've taken. They complain when we reduce the size of the public sector and when we put restraints on wage increases. But at the same time they complain about the deficit. As usual the members opposite are flip-flopping on the issues, trying to have it both ways.

So, Mr. Speaker, we ask what is their plan? I don't hear any plans, Mr. Speaker. Well as I pointed out in my budget speech, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite don't have a plan. Shades of Ontario. What they have is a string of cruel and empty promises no government could ever keep or honour, Mr. Speaker. They offer carrots to the people of Saskatchewan in an attempt to buy the election.

Mr. Speaker, they have written a blank cheque that will cost the people of this province over \$3 billion in extra taxes each year. Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how can the

members opposite continue to protect Saskatchewan people from low prices, droughts, and high interest rates when they have bankrupt the province?

Now how can they diversify and build the economy when they have a \$3 billion deficit? Well the answer of course, Mr. Speaker, is they can't do it. The NDP have no solutions for Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. They have no idea at all what to do about the problems we face. At a time when every province in the country is cutting back, the members opposite are promising a \$3 billion deficit per year, Mr. Speaker. At a time when people want sensible alternatives, the NDP are avoiding the issues and trying to buy votes with the promises they can never, never keep. They can't be kept.

This province, this government offers the sort of sensible solutions Saskatchewan people are demanding. By following the fiscal restraint plan that we have laid out, the deficit will be steadily reduced. In the coming year the deficit will be \$265 million, \$100 million lower than last year's. In 1992-93 the deficit will be decreased again, Mr. Speaker, to \$150 million. And in 1993-94 Saskatchewan will have a balanced budget.

That is the goal of the fiscal restraints the government has followed for the past several years, Mr. Speaker, to balance the budget in 1993. And of course, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite scoff at it and laugh at it. But we do have a plan. We have a goal. We have an object. We have something we want to do. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, they would rather us promise another \$3 billion of spending like they're doing — promises you can't keep. But if you look at this government's fiscal record with an unbiased eye, Mr. Speaker, you will see that we have done very well.

For almost 10 years the province has suffered repeated droughts, low grain, uranium, potash, and oil prices, and very high interest rates. Mr. Speaker, we did not sit idly by and let Saskatchewan be ruined. We put the treasury on the line, Mr. Speaker, and that was to protect farmers, business people, home owners, health care, education, and the Saskatchewan way of life. Yes we did. We put the treasury on the line. The Premier said he would and he did.

Mr. Speaker, after all that, Saskatchewan's debt per person is still the fourth lowest in Canada. Now they laugh, Mr. Speaker. The facts are there, the fourth lowest in Canada, and this is after 10 years of very tough going, Mr. Speaker. I'll tell you what. Only Prince Edward Island, British Columbia, and Alberta have done a better job of balancing the books. That is an incredible achievement, Mr. Speaker — incredible.

By following a sensible fiscal plan from the very beginning, we have kept our level of debt per person the fourth lowest in Canada — fourth lowest. Mr. Speaker, we knew we had to protect Saskatchewan people and help them build the province, but we also knew we had to keep a tight hold on the debt.

Mr. Speaker, in 1987 the civil service was reduced by 2,000 positions. Employee wages were frozen at 1986-87 levels for two years. A hundred and four programs were

ended and another 72 down-sized, and 14 government departments were given no increase in the budget.

In 1988-89, spending was reduced in 11 departments and agencies.

In 1989-90, 12 government departments were held to a zero per cent increase or had their budgets reduced. And as I mentioned earlier, cabinet minister and legislative secretaries were frozen.

In 1990-91, four departments were combined into one and three others were eliminated. Funding for 21 government departments was frozen or reduced, and several programs like the home program and the fuel rebate program were either eliminated or reduced, Mr. Speaker.

And now of course we have the spending restraints introduced in the present budget, which I have already gone over.

None of these choices were easy to make, Mr. Speaker. Spending cuts are never easy to make, never popular with the people. But if we did not have the courage to make these changes, Saskatchewan would be in a very, very bad shape today. We would not have the fourth lowest level of net debt per person in Canada; we would probably have the highest. And we could not continue to plan to protect and build Saskatchewan either, Mr. Speaker.

Now I know the government's plan for Saskatchewan has been described many times and . . . already in the House many times. But I'm going to say it again so that the members opposite can catch a glimpse of what a plan looks like. Perhaps they could come up with one or two of their own. I very much doubt if they will, Mr. Speaker, because they have yet to present Saskatchewan people with a single, viable alternative for the challenges we face.

First, Mr. Speaker, the government is committed to protecting agriculture. In one way or another, agriculture influences almost every job in the province. Without farmers Saskatchewan would have no economy.

(1500)

Second, we are committed to stabilizing rural Saskatchewan as a whole. Through programs like Fair Share, agricultural assistance, and community bonds, we are helping Saskatchewan people to protect their towns and villages throughout the province.

Third, we are stimulating investment, innovation, and economic growth in all of our industries across the province. SEDCO, participating loans and small business loans associations, community bonds, Buy Saskatchewan, and many other programs have indeed helped increase manufacturing investment in the province by over 700 per cent.

Through Buy Saskatchewan we have helped Saskatchewan business secure over 253 million in contracts. Through SEDCO alone we have created over

2,600 jobs and maintained 3,600 more. Through the youth entrepreneurial program, we have created 460 new jobs.

And what is really exciting about this increased investment and these new jobs is that they are happening in industries that are new to Saskatchewan — new industries that are helping us move away from our heavy reliance on simply exporting natural resources — goods jobs with a solid future, making paper, gasoline, or processing food or making fertilizer.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the government's plan for Saskatchewan includes reforming our democratic system. We are making changes like referendums and plebiscites that will bring government closer to the people — reforms that are changing with the people of Saskatchewan so that our government system continues to serve their needs and expectations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, none of these measures I have described would be possible without the careful fiscal restraint plan the government has followed. Without money, we cannot do the things that must be done to protect our future. We cannot protect health care or education as we have done in the past, and we cannot protect and stabilize rural Saskatchewan and promote economic diversification and growth.

The spending restraints the government has followed up until now and the added restraints contained within the budget are not easy choices to make, Mr. Speaker. But they are necessary. And I congratulate the Minister of Finance on his courage and dedication to Saskatchewan's future. With these economic restraints and with the government's plan for all Saskatchewan, the province will continue to grow and prosper for years to come.

Unlike the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, the government offers Saskatchewan a plan that would work, a plan that will secure the future for themselves and their children.

Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to second the motion and I thank you for your time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate at the outset of my remarks that I intend to move an amendment to this motion. It will be seconded by the member from The Battlefords. And I will read that into the record at the conclusion of my remarks, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I'm a little in awe after hearing the member from Wilkie, having watched closely what's happened in this province since 1982, since this government took over. And I just want to talk a little bit about the effects on small business, the effects on working people. But first of all, sir, I want to recap what the member from Wilkie spoke to, or what he was speaking about.

I heard phrases when he was referring and describing his government, like, spending restraint and fiscal restraint

and strict spending policies, squandering money — that they weren't doing. Well, Mr. Speaker, the record of this government, sir, is that those phrases are not in fact what this government has done since 1982. Because we haven't seen fiscal restraint. We haven't seen spending restraint. But we have indeed, sir, seen an awful lot of squandering of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, this government has raised the level of per capita debt to something in the neighbourhood of \$15,000 for each man, woman, and child in our province. And this member, sir, has the gall to stand before members of this legislature, televised throughout this province, and tell the people that they have delivered responsible government. Well, Mr. Speaker, there isn't a document, there isn't a record, there isn't one economic indicator that would show that to be the case.

And I challenge that member, Mr. Speaker, if he can produce a document to show that this PC government has been delivering sound, fiscal management, I'd like to see him table it because you see, sir, when I look at the annual budget reports and the forecasted deficits, it tells me that that is not in fact the case. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to come back to this, but I want to move on to some of the other comments made by the member from Wilkie.

He talks about democratic reform, and he talks about the introduction of freedom of information legislation, and so let's review the record. At a time when he talks about more open government and freedom of information, we've sat in this legislature for weeks — for weeks, sir, where this government will not call the Crown Corporations Committee where we can review the expenditures of Crown corporations in which this government has amassed a debt of some \$9 billion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if this is openness and if this is freedom of information, why then do members on that side of the House refuse to call Crown Corporations? Why do they refuse to call Crown Corporations so that we can review the expenditures, Mr. Speaker? Why is this happening?

Mr. Speaker, at a time when they're going to the people of this province and of the business community of Saskatchewan and asking for an increased tax load of \$440 million, a Bill that they just passed that will allow that to happen, and asking those people to pay that, they won't become accountable for the \$9 billion debt that they've built in Crown corporations.

Mr. Speaker, the history of this legislature under the former administration was that Crown corporation estimates ran concurrent with the sitting of this legislature. I've been here since 1986, and I say to you, Mr. Speaker, it hasn't happened one year since I've been here.

We have goaded and pleaded and written letters and asked the chairman of that Crown Corporations Committee every year that I've been here. We have had to ask them to call Crown Corporations. And they've been refusing and dragging their feet, and this member from Wilkie stands up and applauds his government for introducing freedom of information legislation. Mr.

Speaker, what hypocrisy. It doesn't ring true with the facts.

The facts are, sir, that the Provincial Auditor of this province has not had the chance to review in detail a vast majority of the expenditures of this government every year and has complained publicly about it.

And this member stands in his place and expects the people of this province to believe that in fact they are pursuing more open government. What a joke. What a joke, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition just finished tabling a few days ago, petitions asking this government to pull back their decision to implement the provincial goods and services tax.

This member today stands and talks about democratic reform and about plebiscites and how they are so open to having the people, through plebiscite, determine the direction of government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, how many thousands of people would have to sign these petitions to make this government listen? Are 123,000 names not enough? Over 10 per cent of our population, sir, indicated in no uncertain terms that they opposed the imposition of the provincial goods and services tax — 123,000 citizens, sir. And this member stands in his place and talks about plebiscites and this new open PC government led by this Premier.

In the dying days of this government, this government lays in its death throes, this member stands before the people of Saskatchewan asking them to believe that now they've repented and they're listening, when just short days ago they ignored the names of 123,000 people who were opposing a tax that will destroy many small businesses in our province.

Mr. Speaker, I say shame on that member from Wilkie. I say shame on him. He should be honest with the people of Saskatchewan. He should be honest with members of this legislature. And he should tell them what the real truth is.

He should say that in spite of the fact that a number of caucus members on our side of the House didn't support the imposition of the provincial goods and services tax, we're continuing on course. Because the Finance minister told us that's how it's happening, the Premier told us that's how it's happening, and the House Leader, the Government House Leader told us that's what's going to happen.

In spite of the fact that they know it's the most politically destructive thing that could happen to them as members of the legislature, in spite of that, sir, they chose to ignore 123,000 names on those petitions. And at the same time he stands here and talks about plebiscites and how they're listening now. What folly.

Mr. Speaker, this government has clearly demonstrated itself to be one of the most deceitful governments, sir, that has ever been elected to any legislature in this country, and the speech by the member from Wilkie proves it. It confirms it for every person in this province, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the member talks about balanced budgets legislation. Can you imagine, can you just imagine this member who stood in his place and has for nine years voted on every government motion with the government, who has supported every deficit budget, and there's been 10 of them now — this man has the audacity, the unmitigated gall to stand before the people of this province and talk, even mouth the words, balanced budget.

This sanctimonious member from Wilkie that stands before the people of this province and indicates that he favours balanced budgets and balanced budget legislation, after what his Premier, what his cabinet, and what his caucus have done to the people of this province, I say, Mr. Speaker, shame on that member, shame on that cabinet, and shame on that Premier. They should be thrown out of office.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, we're looking at a total provincial debt of over \$14 billion — the majority of it, the vast majority of it caused by mismanagement and caused by what many people in this province feel is a very corrupt government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that the people of this province see through this member. They see right through the member from Wilkie; they see through his Premier. They see them for what they are, sir. The height of hypocrisy that this member who has been part and parcel of building the highest per capita debt that the people of this province have ever seen, and he stands in here and even has the gall to mouth the words, balanced budget.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's why this government has no credibility with small business or with farmers or with working men and women. That's why they've got no credibility with the aboriginal community. That's why, sir, rural and urban Saskatchewan are going to band together to get rid of this government whenever they call the next election.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1515)

Mr. Lautermilch: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to continue on with some of the remarks and I want to respond to some of the remarks by the member from Wilkie. He accuses members of the opposition for attempting to buy this election. Well, Mr. Speaker, what have members of the opposition said? What have we said?

Let me just give you a quick condensation, sir. We've said that this government has over doubled their revenue since 1982. And we've said that government has to live within their limits, within their means. And we've said that you don't need the new provincial goods and services tax, that \$4.5 billion, which is what the revenue will be for this year, we understand, is enough to run this province and we're committed to that, sir.

And if that's an election promise and if that's trying to buy

the people of this province's votes, well then I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I'll support it because we say they've been taxed enough. And enough is enough and we're not going to do it any more. We're not going to allow you to do it any more.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — And, Mr. Speaker, how else have members on this side of the House tried to buy votes? How have we tried to buy the votes of the business community in Saskatchewan? Do you know how we've tried to buy their vote? We've offered them fair and open tendering which is what they haven't seen since 1982. And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, we don't feel bad about buying votes in that manner. We don't feel the least little embarrassed about offering open and fair tendering where all Saskatchewan business people have a chance to participate. We don't apologize for that.

And I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, members on that side of the House can stand up and rave and rant and chant as much as they want, but I tell you those kinds of things to buy people's votes will never embarrass members on this side of the House. I want to tell you that, and I want to tell members of this House that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — What else have we promised them, Mr. Speaker? We've promised them some competent government, which is something that they haven't seen. We've made a commitment that we will stop wasting money as this government, this administration, has done through patronage. We've promised, sir, that we will start making government accountable so that people in this province know exactly how their tax dollars are spent, by opening the books as soon as we're elected.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, if the member from Wilkie feels that that's buying votes, well let me tell you, sir, I would suggest to you that what the members of the New Democratic Party have to sell will be bought by the vast majority of the people of this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — And I'm telling you, Mr. Speaker, members on this side of the House haven't tried to buy their votes by creating a split between urban and rural Saskatchewan. What we've promised and how we've tried to buy the hearts and the votes of the people of this province is by promising all people of this province fairness.

And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, if fair government and honest government is buying votes, well then count me in. And I tell you what, Mr. Speaker, count in the vast majority of the small-business community, count in the vast majority of the aboriginal people in this province, count in the vast majority of the tradespeople in this province, and count in, sir, the vast majority of the farmers in rural Saskatchewan who have had enough of this government's hypocrisy, enough of this incompetence, and enough of the waste and mismanagement that's gone on.

People of this province want for an election promise and the way you can buy their votes — and I tell members on this side — on that side of the House is to be fair with the people of Saskatchewan, unite them behind a fair, honest government as opposed to what this Premier's been delivering since 1982. That's how you buy votes in this province and that's how you buy votes in the next election, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to what the member from Wilkie referred to as a hidden debt that was inherited by this government in 1982. There's no doubt that this government owed money. We did owe some money. We owed a couple of billion dollars, a little more. But you want to know something, Mr. Speaker? That was self-liquidating debt. That was debt that would have and could have been paid back by the Crowns if the administration of this province had been competent, which it hasn't been since 1982. That debt would have looked after itself. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, in reference to debt that the member from Wilkie referred to, that they've taken that small debt and they've built it to over \$14 billion, almost \$15,000 for every man, woman, and child in Saskatchewan.

But, sir, is that debt a self-liquidating debt, one that will be paid off by the profits from Crown corporations? Well at one time prior to this government, this administration, that could have happened. But I tell you it can't now. Because this government has sold or broken apart or destroyed every Crown corporation that had the ability to return revenue to this province.

Mr. Speaker, that's the legacy that the member from Wilkie and his cohorts have left the people of Saskatchewan. That's what they've left. That's the fair share that the people of Saskatchewan got, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to talk about fair share we can go through the list of who got a fair share and who didn't get a fair share prior to the election promises now that this government is making.

I'll tell you, Chuck Childers, the chairman of the Potash Corporation, got his fair share. He got his fair share and a little more — \$745,000 a year in a no-cut contract, a contract that can't be broken for almost any reason.

And I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, who else got his fair share. The small-business community never did. But I tell you, George Hill, the chairman of the Power Corporation of Saskatchewan, got his fair share in the last nine years.

And I want to tell you, Main Street businesses in Humboldt and Watrous and Kinistino and Tisdale and every other community that you can name never got their fair share. But I'll tell you who your friends did. Your friends Weyerhaeuser and your friends Cargill got their fair share, Mr. Speaker.

And every member on that side of the House, every PC member, supported every move that the government made. Not one of them, sir, had the courage to stand up

and say this isn't right. They never had the courage to say, support my neighbours and support my constituents over the wishes and the wills of the Weyerhaeusers of this world.

And I want to make a prediction today, Mr. Speaker, speaking of Weyerhaeuser. I'm going to make you a prediction, sir, that Weyerhaeuser has no intention of ever paying the people of this province \$239 million on the principal of that pulp mill. And you can send it, Mr. Minister. Mr. Minister, you send it. You send it, Mr. Member. You send it and I'll tell you what, I'll mail it back to you in a few months because I'll prove it to be true.

But what they did, sir, they ignored their friends and their neighbours. They ignored their constituents, the business community of Saskatchewan, in favour of George Weyerhaeuser of Tacoma, Washington. That's the legacy that they have left, sir, and that's the fair share.

They've got almost \$400 million to put at risk for Cargill Grain corporation, Mr. Speaker. But what have they got for the hoteliers in rural Saskatchewan who are going bankrupt? And I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, a major hotel in the Premier's own riding, I understand, closed its doors yesterday. One in a long list of a number. And what kind of help has this government delivered?

An Hon. Member: — Why?

Mr. Lautermilch: — The member opposite says, why. I'll tell you why, sir. Because you've done nothing with respect to cross-border shopping. You've done nothing for the people, the business community, to keep them buying here in Saskatchewan. What you've done is you've sent Eric Berntson to Ottawa to support the federal goods and services tax, which is putting a lot of them out of business, and then, sir, you compounded that with the provincial goods and services tax that you've just passed. That's what you've done. That's where you're coming from.

And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, members on that side of the House will pay and they will pay dearly when an election comes. Mr. Speaker, this government is led blindly, I say, by a Premier who is so out of touch with Saskatchewan people that the polls are indicating clearly that the vast majority of people in this province could not and would not support him.

And the member from Wilkie, in spite of the fact that Decima releases a poll the other day indicating that 63 per cent of the people of this province support the New Democratic Party, and the Conservative Party in Saskatchewan is down at the bottom of the barrel, will they change their direction, Mr. Speaker? The answer is no, and it's confirmed by the speech from the member from Wilkie.

The answer is they're not listening and they don't care. Because in spite of the fact that everyone in this province knows that there has been a litany of mismanagement, and that there hasn't been fiscal restraint, and that there has been loose spending policies, and that this government has been squandering money, the member from Wilkie indicates that that just hasn't been the case.

And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, with the odd exception of the members of this legislature and a few of their close, political hacks, nobody believes them. Nobody believes them, sir.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to the reasons I'm proposing an amendment to the motion. This government has no right, they have no right, sir, to approve the things that they've done and to pat themselves on the back for the destruction of many small-business men and women in Saskatchewan. They have no right. The people of this province know that, Mr. Speaker. And as I said, other than with the exception of a few members on that side of the House, no one believes them.

You ask the business community in Saskatchewan what's happened with respect to their input costs since 1982, and you're going to get a uniform answer, Mr. Speaker, because there is only one answer. They've increased to the point where the bottom line has disappeared for many of those business people. You ask them, sir, whether municipal taxes have increased because of revenue down-loading or revenue cut-backs to municipal governments. You ask any business person in urban or rural Saskatchewan whether their taxes have increased dramatically since 1982. And, Mr. Speaker, the answer invariably will be yes.

You ask them, Mr. Speaker, if their power and if their gas bills have increased, and the answer will be yes. And, Mr. Speaker, if you want to talk about fiscal responsibility and squandering money, ask the business men and women of Saskatchewan how they feel when they receive every month two envelopes, two invoices sent by two different bureaucracies to tell them, sir, how much their power bill is. And you ask them, sir, if that's fiscal restraint and if that's sound economics that this government should be sending two invoices, two letters, two bills, by two separate entities for one particular service.

Mr. Speaker, two-bill Hill has done his job. He's padded his pocket, embarked upon a move to privatize one of our best Crown corporations, I would suggest, the Sask Power Corporation. And in the process, sir, he couldn't ram it through this legislature because the people of Saskatchewan stopped it. The people of Saskatchewan supported the New Democrats when we rang the bells for 17 days and walked out and said enough is enough and it's not going to happen.

Two-bill Hill, George Hill, Mr. Speaker, was half-way through splitting this corporation. And the business people in Saskatchewan know the fiscal folly of receiving those two bills every month. They know the increased costs, and they know that that's added to the costs of their power bills, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, they know that the imposition of the federal goods and services tax, that the former deputy premier of this province went to Ottawa to support, has chased many customers from their places of business. They know that, sir. Because you see, they see that — they see that in every month end when they go to their accountant, or if they're doing their own and they're small businesses, they see how much their gross has decreased.

You see, Mr. Speaker, that's why there's no longer in the business community support for this government. And that's one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, this government is going to be so soundly defeated after the next election.

And, Mr. Speaker, they know . . .

Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Speaker, I would ask for leave to introduce some guests that have just arrived in your gallery.

Leave granted.

(1530)

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. McLaren: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and to all members of the Assembly, a group of 49 grade 4 students from Dr. Brass School in Yorkton, and we welcome them to the Assembly today. We hope you enjoy your visit and your tour of the Assembly in Regina. And we hope that what you will see over the next few minutes will be educational and informative as well.

I'll be meeting with you shortly after to have photos taken and to have some refreshments with you, and hopefully to answer any questions that you may have about what you've seen here in the Assembly today.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask all members of the Assembly to please welcome these students from Dr. Brass School in Yorkton.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to welcome the students to the legislature. We always enjoy having young people in the gallery to watch the proceedings. This is their building. This is their legislature, and hopefully some of them will be joining their fellow students in this legislature, governing this province in some future date.

Resolution No. 7 — Encouragement of Small Business (continued)

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I have a few more comments to make with respect to this motion and to indicate why I suggest that this motion is inappropriate and why this government has no right to condone their actions. I just want to refer to what's happened in Saskatchewan in 1990.

The total bankruptcies, Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan in 1990 were some 1,957 bankruptcies, up 329 per cent from the year before. And of those 1,957 bankruptcies there were casualties of around 616 businesses, and that's an increase of 280 per cent from the year before. So I say to you, Mr. Speaker, the member from Wilkie has done a hypocritical act by standing in this legislature and condoning the waste and mismanagement of a wasteful government.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, there are other economic indicators that show this government doesn't deserve to

be in place any longer. Last year we saw a decrease in retail sales of 1.6 per cent. Now, Mr. Speaker, the business community in this province know that that's the case because, as I said, when they go to their accountants and when they do their income tax they know what's happened to their bottom line.

And, Mr. Speaker, this isn't just urban Saskatchewan; it's rural Saskatchewan. And there's more. We've seen the closure of 60 rural post offices in the last while which is going to destroy these towns. And I say, when they've done nothing to stop that, when they've done nothing to disallow Brian Mulroney from closing post offices in these rural communities, and then they embark upon the decentralization of jobs from Regina, I say those are the acts of a hypocritical government.

On one hand they say nothing. When rural towns are looking at the closure of their post offices which may in fact destroy them, they're saying nothing.

And on the other hand, they start their pre-election hype. And Fair Share Saskatchewan is nothing more, sir, than pre-election hype, because I don't believe that they intend to carry through with it if they do form government, Mr. Speaker.

And I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this government has no right to talk about their record of fiscal responsibility because they haven't got a record of fiscal responsibility. They have no right to talk about openness of government because that's not been their record and that's not been their litany.

They have no right to talk about freedom of information legislation when they sit on half of the expenditures and disallow the Provincial Auditor from looking into the books of this province. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, they have no right. They have no right to govern. And the people of this province, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, support me in that.

Mr. Speaker, they have no right to speak about balanced budget legislation. I mean can you believe it? Can you believe a government that has delivered 10 consecutive deficit budgets, that has the audacity to present the idea of introducing legislation that would prohibit balanced budgets. I mean does it make any sense, Mr. Speaker?

Where have members of this legislature been? What do you think the IQ of the people of this province is? I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and members opposite, that the people know better. They know what you are. They know who you are. And they know why you have to be defeated. They know all of that.

And it matters no longer what you do to try and cover your hides. It's not going to happen. You people have bared the real PC party. You have bared to the people of Saskatchewan the true right wing agenda. People of Saskatchewan not only know that you're incompetent, they not only know that you're incompetent, sir, they know what's in your hearts with respect to the future of this province.

And I say to you, go to the people of Saskatchewan. The

member from Kelvington-Wadena asks if we have a plan, and I just outlined the plan if he'd been listening a while earlier. The plan is fairness, competence, spending within the four and a half billion dollars that is raised in this province every year — that's part of the plan.

And you, sir, I'm sorry, will have to wait for explicit details in other areas because of time constraints. I want some of my other colleagues to say a few words today.

But I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, if the member from Kelvington-Wadena wants to see the plan, what he should do is walk to the front and centre and ask the Premier of this province to call an election. Because I tell you, Mr. Member, you'll see a plan. You'll see a plan that's built around the wishes and the desires of the people of this province, that's built on fairness, that's built on competence, and that's built on the realization that we've got to work together in this province, urban and rural, if we're going to have a future in this province. That's what you'll see, Mr. Member.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I indicated earlier that there were other members who would like to speak to this motion. And I know my seconder, the member from The Battlefords, is quite interested in getting into the debate on this particular motion. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to read in . . . firstly I think it would be fair to read the motion so that people will understand the motion, and then I will read my amendment.

That this Assembly commends the Government of Saskatchewan (this is the motion) for its support of small business, for its recognition of the important role this sector plays in the Saskatchewan economy, and for its many programs and measures taken by the Department of Economic Development and Tourism, the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation, the Saskatchewan government growth fund, the Buy Saskatchewan Agency, and its other departments and agencies to assist small business.

Well, sir, I'm moving an amendment and the amendment is as follows:

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

condemns the government for failing to support small business and for imposing an immense tax burden on Saskatchewan consumers which has resulted in a dramatic decline in retail sales and an unprecedented number of small-business bankruptcies.

Mr. Speaker, I think that that amendment more accurately reflects what has transpired in Saskatchewan since 1982. And I know that my colleague, the member from The Battlefords, agrees with me, as he has agreed to second this motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to add a few words to my seconding of the amendment by the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake and that the Assembly condemn the government for its failing to support small business and for imposing an immense tax burden on Saskatchewan consumers which has resulted in a dramatic decline in retail sales and unprecedented number of small-business bankruptcies.

And before I speak to the motion and the amendment — and I'll be speaking to those concurrent — I'd like to respond to some of the comments made by the government members opposite who have added some comments that are maybe not on track, but nevertheless made those comments, and I want to respond to them.

And one of those has to do with Fair Share Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. There were some comments by the member from Kinistino and also the member from Wilkie in regard to the good job that Fair Share Saskatchewan is doing for Saskatchewan people and for the rural economy of Saskatchewan, therefore to small businesses as well I would suppose, Mr. Speaker.

What I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this is not decentralization. Fair Share Saskatchewan should not be supported and is not supported by the majority of Saskatchewan people I would submit to you. Fair Share Saskatchewan is not decentralization. What Fair Share Saskatchewan is, is forced relocation of hundreds of public employees in the province of Saskatchewan. It has nothing to do with decentralization. The member from Rosthern asked, am I against Fair Share Saskatchewan? Yes, I am opposed to Fair Share Saskatchewan.

The Tory style Fair Share Saskatchewan should be condemned in all corners of the province because, as I said, it is not decentralization; it is forced relocation. It would be no different than sending people to salt mines in Siberia than what this government is doing to some of their employees. It would be no different than putting the people of dominated countries of the world, forcing them to labour in places where they do not wish to labour, Mr. Speaker.

Did the NDP support decentralization? Yes, the NDP has always supported decentralization in the province of Saskatchewan.

Let me give you some examples of that, Mr. Speaker, where it was good for small business in Saskatchewan, it was good for Saskatchewan people — examples like the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. Was the Department of Northern Saskatchewan an example of decentralization? Yes it was. Yes it was an example of decentralization, Mr. Speaker.

Hundreds of people in northern Saskatchewan had economic benefit from the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. Many northern native people had benefits from the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. People worked. People had economic opportunity. There were examples of great economic diversification and decentralization in northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

There was a minister from the North that was the minister

in charge of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. That's an example of decentralization, Mr. Speaker, and it was much fairer than what they call Fair Share Saskatchewan today, their forced relocation of sending people to places they don't want to go and deceiving Saskatchewan people by thinking they're going to get jobs from government departments in their home communities.

But there are no jobs that go with Fair Share Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. There are no jobs that go with Fair Share Saskatchewan. It's a dislocation, a relocation of employees from one area of the province to another area of the province, Mr. Speaker.

And if the member from Rosthern . . .

(1545)

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. Order, order. Order, order. The member from Rosthern, that's enough. And I would ask the hon. member from Battlefords not to refer to other members using the term he just did. That is far from proper decorum and far from the proper language we wish to use in this House.

Order. The member from Quill Lakes, and I am telling you this for the last time, you are once more interfering with the Chair. Quite frankly I don't know if you deserve, after the many times I've had to interfere and call you to order, if you deserve the opportunity to apologize. But I'm going to give you the opportunity to apologize for interfering with the Chair, and if you don't, you will be named.

An Hon. Member: — I apologize, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — Order, order. I am not speaking to you, sir. I am not speaking to you, sir.

Order, order. Order, order. Order, order, order. Order. There are members at different times who intervene and it's not acceptable.

I spoke to the hon. member from Quill Lakes earlier today. I'm going to give him the opportunity to apologize.

Mr. Koskie: — I apologize, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — Thank you.

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Now the member from Saskatoon South, you neither have the right to interfere with the conduct of the Chair. And I am telling you, sir, that I am now giving you the opportunity to apologize.

An Hon. Member: — Sure, I'll apologize to you any time, but be fair.

The Speaker: — Order. I am going to give you the opportunity . . . I am telling you that if you are challenging the Chair from your desk, you will be named. You will be named. Now I'm going to give you that opportunity to apologize.

Mr. Rolfes: — I apologize to you, sir.

Mr. Anguish: — Are we under way again, Mr. Speaker?

The Speaker: — I hope so, sir.

Mr. Anguish: — And thank you, sir.

Mr. Speaker, I've given the example of a reasonable decentralization. That was the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

I want to give you another example, Mr. Speaker, of where the New Democrats support decentralization. I can give the example of Saskatchewan Forest Products in Prince Albert. What did this government do with Saskatchewan Forest Products in Prince Albert? They shut it down, sent the employees away, and now they say they're sending employees back to rural Saskatchewan.

What a cruel and unusual punishment they try and inflict upon the people of Saskatchewan, saying that Fair Share Saskatchewan is decentralization. It's no such thing. Fair Share Saskatchewan is a disintegration of the Saskatchewan community.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Saskatchewan Forest Products made sense in Prince Albert, Mr. Speaker. No one had to be dislocated; no one had to be relocated. And the forestry industry was centred out of Prince Albert to a large extent, Mr. Speaker. That type of decentralization makes sense. It makes sense.

What about the dental program, Mr. Speaker? There were hundreds of dental therapists spread out through virtually every community and at least serviced every school in the province of Saskatchewan. That was decentralization, Mr. Speaker. No one had to be relocated. There wasn't dislocation of families and employees. That was decentralization. There were new opportunities for Saskatchewan people and Saskatchewan communities.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — And new services that had not been offered in many, many of those communities before, Mr. Speaker.

And what do we have? We have a government that wants to rip up people's roots, bust up their families, and inflict a false message to other communities in Saskatchewan to think they're getting something but they really aren't. They really aren't getting anything, Mr. Speaker. It's not happening. It's the political agenda of this cruel and unusual government that we have before the Saskatchewan people. And they'll have to come to account for that, Mr. Speaker.

What did they do with the dental program in Saskatchewan, that decentralized program, Mr. Speaker? They abolished it. They removed all those people from Saskatchewan communities. And now they say they're going to relocate other departments and agencies out in

rural Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

At what cost? At what cost to relocate all these government departments and agencies? At what cost to abolish a dental program of which these people still have dental equipment sitting in warehouses, Mr. Speaker, sitting there to collect rust and mould and moss on the dental equipment. And that service is no longer provided to those Saskatchewan communities.

Shame on this government. Shame on this punishment they inflict on Saskatchewan people. Higher taxation to move forward with their political agenda. What a cruel and unusual thing they do, Mr. Speaker, to the Saskatchewan community.

You want more examples of decentralization? What about the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker? One of the greatest moves of decentralization with a large economic clout to it. Potash mines all over the potash belt that belonged to Saskatchewan people, that brought in revenue to the province of Saskatchewan, run by Saskatchewan men and women trained in the province of Saskatchewan in the way of life that we appreciated and they appreciated.

The head office in Saskatoon. The president of the Potash Corporation born in Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan pride, Mr. Speaker, in a sense of Saskatchewan community for Saskatchewan people. To give consideration to the creation of wealth so that programs could be delivered in a responsible manner, Mr. Speaker, with due regard for the economy and due regard for the taxpayers' dollars.

What about the examples of decentralization in smaller Saskatchewan communities? What about the Water Corporation office in the town of Watrous? What happened to the Water Corporation office in the town of Watrous? You know what they did? They closed it down, Mr. Speaker. They centralized the Water Corporation, Mr. Speaker. They closed down new offices in different places in the province and centralized the Water Corporation, Mr. Speaker, is what they did. They removed employees from those little communities in Saskatchewan.

And now what do they say? We want you to have your fair share. What deceit and deception that this government would wreak havoc over Saskatchewan people by telling them, oh we're giving you decentralization now. It's not decentralization, it's forced relocation as I mentioned earlier. And they're deceiving the Saskatchewan people, trying to buy their vote at election time.

And do we know the cost of this? Nobody knows the cost of it. Department of Highways says it costs \$50,000 a job. The minister stands in the House and says it's going to be \$10,000 a job. Lay some paper on the Table. Lay some paper on the Table to tell us what the cost is going to be. You don't give Saskatchewan people, especially in rural Saskatchewan, the respect which they deserve for the intelligence they have in reading through what this Tory broken government is trying to inflict upon them.

What is the cost, member from Moosomin? Show us the cost. Show us the cost/benefit analysis that's been done of

your relocation plan. I think what should be done is that the members of the Legislative Assembly that represent the Tory Party should be decentralized out of the city of Regina.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — And that'll be taken care of right after the next provincial election when almost every one of these Tory MLAs are decentralized from the Saskatchewan legislature, Mr. Speaker, and put back out into their home communities to explain what it is they've done to Saskatchewan people — what it is they've done to Saskatchewan people.

And what about Humboldt, Mr. Speaker, where this government says they're moving the Department of Agriculture to Humboldt. Moving the Department of Agriculture to Humboldt, uprooting all the employees, some that have spent two decades and more living in one location, serving the people and serving the programs to agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan. They threaten to rip them out of their homes and their families and relocate them in Humboldt. That's not decentralization, Mr. Speaker, that's forced relocation.

I'll give you an example of decentralization to Humboldt, Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. Do you remember the Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute, Mr. Speaker, a joint project of three prairie provinces located in the town of Humboldt? PAMI (Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute) it was referred to. That was decentralization. It wasn't placed in Edmonton or Winnipeg or Regina or Saskatoon. A New Democrat government saw the need to decentralize things that could be reasonably decentralized into rural Saskatchewan. And I know the member from Humboldt appreciates PAMI being located in Humboldt. I know that a facility like that could be expanded to make reasonable sense to employ more people.

Mr. Speaker, there is support for decentralization from the New Democrats. There has always been support for decentralization by New Democrats. The beauty of the rural communities where people do want to live by their choice, and they did want to live in rural Saskatchewan whether it was DNS (Department of Northern Saskatchewan) or Sask Forest Products or the dental program or the Potash Corporation or the Water Corporation or the Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute.

And, Mr. Speaker, there's many more examples even in your own constituency, the beautiful constituency of Last Mountain-Touchwood. But don't force people like this — to inflict your own political will upon the people of Saskatchewan to save the questionable hide of this government.

Mr. Speaker, it's cruel what is happening in Saskatchewan today. It's cruel and it's unusual. And I don't know how any member of this government could go out in Saskatchewan and talk about the good job they've done, because it's non-existent. It is non-existent.

Mr. Speaker, as I travel throughout Saskatchewan,

whether it's urban or rural, there's one question which keeps recurring: when is the election going to be?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — When is this government going to muster the courage to call an election when they've gone beyond their traditional mandate? And in the dying days of this cruel and ruthless government, they inflict a perception on some communities that it's going to be wealthy and create wealth. It won't create wealth, Mr. Speaker.

In the long run this government in their unplanned and uncompromising, unlistening way, that they bring down the final cut and the final cut is the deepest. And that final cut, Mr. Speaker, will be just like cutting their own throats when the Saskatchewan people have the opportunity to express their democratic wishes in an election campaign.

And it's not for those members in the government to stand up and say, we're saving rural Saskatchewan. They can't maintain that, Mr. Speaker. They are the ones who've destroyed rural Saskatchewan.

And when the Saskatchewan people speak, Mr. Speaker, they'll speak with the force of the Saskatchewan community behind them — that community that they've loved, that community that they've cultured, that community that they've created, that community that they have passion for, Mr. Speaker. And that passion will be translated into a ballot-box, and that ballot-box will reveal that this government has done too much harm to Saskatchewan people. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1600)

Mr. Hopfner: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to take up too much time. The previous speakers from our side of the House have put the argument very extensively and very proper to what the motion is actually pertaining to.

I'd like to just bring a couple of realities, I think, to the members opposite as to what has been happening in Saskatchewan here. And I heard now members of the opposition indicating that this government is responsible for the Canadian economy as well as the economy of the world in the picture that it had . . . actually the dilemma that agriculture had to be faced with here in the last, I guess, maybe six, seven years, as farmers well know.

I don't believe truly that the member from The Battlefords actually believes a lot of what he says as well, Mr. Speaker, because farmers themselves actually realize that the problem in agriculture was not of the Saskatchewan Progressive Conservative government. It wasn't caused by this government and the people in Saskatchewan recognize that fact as well, Mr. Speaker.

I want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that the members opposite talked about small business, and small business probably is what I've always referred to in this legislature as big business. Small business across not only Saskatchewan but across Canada, Mr. Speaker, employ

the largest percentage of people across the province and across the country. And nobody denies that. You can have all the . . . I guess probably all the large businesses you want, but it does take that comparable amount in the small businesses to carry on with the services within areas, Mr. Speaker.

I want to indicate, though, that members opposite, I believe in the last couple few days now have become, I would think, more sincere in their argument of being opposed to decentralization in this province, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: — No, no. Fair Share.

Mr. Hopfner: — Or as a member says, Fair Share.

And I think probably if the members opposite would stop to think about what this program means to rural Saskatchewan, I think that they would probably tend to maybe watch what they say, Mr. Speaker. We've got members opposite arguing against Fair Share and then we've got the Leader of the Opposition made a statement, Mr. Speaker, in Tisdale to the Tisdale media. It said Romanow stated:

"For the PC's to say that we would cancel Fair Share is an outright lie," Romanow added.

Well, Mr. Speaker, here we have an NDP opposition wanting to have it both ways in this particular argument and presentation.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the small-business people in all the small communities that have already had the announcements on Fair Share decentralization in the province is that, Mr. Speaker, all the people in the positions that are coming to those communities are being welcomed with open arms. And I would hope that the members opposite would see it more like that instead of arguing on the political side of things, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I just wanted to make a couple of those points. And with that I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Mr. Speaker, with leave I move that we proceed to government orders.

Leave granted.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I wonder if it's possible, this being private members' day, in order to facilitate moving to government business, if the Government House Leader would outline what business we intend to go to.

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What I'd like to move to is Bill No. 55, The Agricultural Safety Net Bill and proceed on later in the day to do committee work on those two agricultural Bills, with leave on one of them from the opposition; and later perhaps get into some adjourned debates on referendums and plebiscites as well as The Medical Profession Act.

But right now to move straight to Bill No. 55 under

adjourned debates.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 55

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Martens that **Bill No. 55 — An Act respecting Programs to Stabilize the Income of Agricultural Producers** be now read a second time.

Mr. Upshall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have much to say on this Bill and I would just like to take a little bit more time to sum up some of the points that we see as problems with this program.

The first thing, Mr. Speaker, is that under current price scenarios this program will offer a declining support price over a period of time. And this was one point that this government failed to do. In fact it was very obvious by its absence, the fact that throughout the whole process — and I outlined this process that they went through, of meetings and confusion — throughout this whole process there was never an analysis or different price scenarios put forward so that the people of this province could work out what the future might have in store for them.

They should have, Mr. Speaker, put forward two or three or four or half a dozen assumed prices and what the prices would do to the program over a period of years. For example, if prices stayed low, what the payment would be; if prices went high, what the payment would be; if prices fluctuated up and down, what the result of the payments would be.

And, Mr. Speaker, this was never done because this government knew that there was the possibility that any increase in price, very marginal increase, or even the price holding its own, as you move forward from this year into future years, that the return from this program would be greatly reduced.

So that point, Mr. Speaker, has to be made that the government never put forward, as we've seen time and time again with this government, not putting forward their analysis of a program that they want to see put in place. So the declining support price is one bad feature.

Mr. Speaker, another point that I would like to make is that over a period of years, the GRIP program does not provide full cash costs. There's no cost of production formula. And I've already made this, and I want to make that point one more time, that if this government wanted to put forward a long-term program and not potentially another short-term *ad hoc* program, they would have put in the formula a cost of production mechanism that entitled farmers to plug in their costs and get a return from that by paying a premium.

They chose not to do that, to go to the 15-year averaging formula. And, Mr. Speaker, we've gone through what that will do as we move off the high prices from the mid '70s

and move further into the potentially low prices for the early '90s. Then the capability of this program to provide benefits to farmers is greatly reduced. In fact in four or five years this program could actually pay nothing to the farm community even though the prices are still low.

Another point, Mr. Speaker, is the removal of spot-loss hail from GRIP. Now the members opposite will argue that well you don't need spot-loss hail, don't need spot-loss hail because this GRIP program is going to compensate you for the losses that you would've incurred from spot-loss hail. Well that is true, Mr. Speaker, only if you are getting a return from the program. But if we move into the future, four or five years down the road, and the program returns are cut — in fact many farmers may not get their premium back or get no pay-out — then they have to add out of their pocket the spot-loss hail to get hail coverage.

That, Mr. Speaker, I think is a direct harm to the farmers of this province because, although right now it would appear that it's not necessary, I'll tell you under very many scenarios in the future you're going to have to be paying spot-loss hail out of your pocket in order to get the coverage that you would've had.

And the Premier, Mr. Speaker, talks about this program. He is running around this province, waving his arms in the air, saying this is a bankable program. You can go to the bank with it. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not true. For board grains it is true. For board grains it is true . . . for the most part it is true, I should say.

But let's look at the example of open-market grains. Because of the average price for the year, if I am a farmer who harvests my crop — my canola for example — and I sell my canola for \$4 a bushel immediately off the field because I have to have the income to pay the bills, the pressure of bills from creditors, and the average price though for the year is, let's say, a dollar more. Well that, Mr. Speaker, the difference between the average price and what I have sold my canola for, I lose.

But if I'm a wealthy farmer or if I can afford to hang on to my grain for a period of time and try to work on the markets and try to get the best . . . the maximum return, then I sell my grain for a dollar more. Well I gain the difference between the average price and what I sell my grain for. This program is not bankable because if you are forced into selling low, you're going to lose.

And, Mr. Speaker, the other point I'd like to make here is that two-thirds . . . statistics show two-thirds of the open-market grain is sold below the average price. So what we're saying is two-thirds of the farmers are going to take a loss under this program.

And I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, this is a very good argument to put forward for including all grains under the Canadian Wheat Board. Because under the Canadian Wheat Board, you know what your average price for the year is going to be, and you're getting that price in the end.

Mr. Speaker, these people think that farmers should be playing the market. I heard the Premier saying, well, just think, you could hang onto your grain; you could sit on it

and wait till the price goes up, and you can get the benefit from the GRIP program and you can also sell your grain at a high price.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I tell you that that is a scenario for very few people in this province. But it tells you something. It tells you how the minister thinks. It tells you the terms in which the Premier of this province thinks about the farm community.

He is saying that everybody is so well off they can just afford to sit on their grain and wait until the price goes up, sell it, get the benefit of not only the average price but the difference between the average price and what they sold their grain for. Well I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, for the majority of people in this province, that is not true. Besides the fact, as I said, that two-thirds of this grain is sold under the average price.

Mr. Speaker, the next point I want to make in summary is the fact that there is no cap on this program. This program, and I've heard of people . . . people have called me, saying, you know that there's somebody going around in a certain area; they're buying or renting up all the land they can rent from any institution they can get their hands on, because there's no cap. So they can run around and get 50 or 60 or 100 quarters of land, farm it the way it should not be farmed, by putting very few input costs into it, and then farm the program.

That's another problem with this government, Mr. Speaker, is that they think that it's survival of the fittest out there. If somebody can get in there and farm this program, well they're a good operator; they're smart cookies. But that's an attitude problem that this government has. They're not governing for everybody in this province. They're governing for people like themselves who try to take advantage of every system and every opportunity at the public trough that they can to benefit themselves.

(1615)

And that, Mr. Speaker, is deplorable. And I think, Mr. Speaker, any changes that should be made, this is a very important change, that there be a cap on this program.

The last point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the farm groups who helped put this program together in the beginning had a very well-principled program. Principles were fine. But as of October last year the farm groups had little or no input into the development of this program.

The government people have taken this program and destroyed it because now it is not a national program, it's a patchwork program, because Alberta's going to have certain requirements that they think they need, Manitoba's going to have certain requirements they think they need. And because there's so much emphasis and so much off-loading from the federal government, the provinces say, well we're paying part of this bill now; we're going to have some say in how it works.

It's not a national program. And you look at any other program around the world, farm agricultural programs, and the key to the success of that program is that it's a national program, administered and delivered by the

national government. The United States is that way; the European community is that way; Australia is that way.

And, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that that works around the world, the members opposite, the Premier of this province, the Minister of Agriculture, doesn't have enough gall to stand up to the Prime Minister and say, no that's wrong; we think that it's a national responsibility. He won't do that because he's in the throes of an election and he's trying to salvage his hide.

Mr. Speaker, this program, the way it stands right now, will benefit in the short term. The problem is short-term program, basically another *ad hoc* if things continue the same. No cost of production, no cap, and the bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that there must be changes made to this program.

As I sit on this side of the House, I tell people that this government had an opportunity to create a good program. Mind you it was eight, nine years late, but they had the opportunity. They had the farm groups in; they had everybody working with them. And what did they do? They destroyed it. They destroyed it because they don't have the will to create a farm program that's going to have the long-term benefit to the farmers of this province.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by saying that this Bill will in the short term help. And for that reason I will not oppose it. But I'll tell you the people of this province want a government in power that will improve the delivery of this type of services to the farmers. And I think that we will provide that service.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to relate briefly a little bit of a review of the tremendous pressures and problems that we have encountered in agriculture in the province, with low commodity prices and crop failures in many instances, international subsidies, massive farm debt in Saskatchewan and throughout Canada.

And this government opposite has indicated that it has done so much for agriculture. And I want to say that, Mr. Speaker, that that is far from the truth. Throughout the years, their programs were directly related to the various elections. Their programs were *ad hoc* programs. We saw the first infusion of money into the agriculture as the Premier was in the midst of an election — on the verge of losing — who phones the Prime Minister and says, I'm losing; I need some help. That was the agricultural policy of the Tory Party opposite.

In 1988 we got another version of the federal election. And the Tories again, in desperate . . . they trying to sustain their support in the West, devised again yet another *ad hoc* program, deceiving the farmers that they were going to get \$45 an acre. And the farmers realized far less.

In 1985, the Premier said we need a long-term agricultural policy. And out of this came the GRIP program. And while it took him from 1985 until this last

winter to come forward with a long-term program, he forced it upon the farmers in a very limited time — didn't give them an opportunity to in fact digest the program or properly assess it.

And they're saying that now they've got a safety net for farmers. They're going to save all the farmers, that this is the panacea for the problems of agriculture.

And do you realize that in order to get farmers to enrol in this program so they can go into the election and announce that it's a great success and that some 53,000 farmers had signed up, the federal government had to — in fact in respect to the NISA program — pump money into an account for each of the farmers without any sign-up or any participation of the farmer. And in order to get them to sign up for the GRIP program, they've had to bribe them, in essence, with paying a part of the revenue insurance premium.

Now farmers have concerns with the program. They're concerned that there is no assurance that this program is sustainable over any length of time. I talked to farmers throughout the province and farmers that went to the various meetings throughout this province held by the government. And they said, well may have pretty fair pay-out for the first couple of years, but after that you'd better watch it, because on the basis of the way it's calculated it could well decrease. So first of all, the farmers say that there's no assurance that the program is sustainable over a length of time to give them protection. And secondly, they said it's very costly to enrol in the program. And I agree with that.

Remember the Premier that was standing here last spring in this legislature — and we were delaying and delaying any assistance to Saskatchewan farmers — said he had a commitment out of federal government. But he was not going to concede that the province was going to put up any money for a program that would give assistance to the farmers. And the federal government, on the other hand, was requesting that the provincial government put in a portion of the funding. And he held up and he said . . . the problem, he said, is international, is caused by the Europeans subsidizing their farmers and by the U.S., and he said therefore it should be a national solution to this problem, not on the provincial governments and the taxpayers of the province.

And what has happened when it comes to financing of this program? The Premier suddenly lost contact with the reality that he was propounding here last spring. And if you take a look at this program, one of the significant things that you find is the off-loading of responsibility of funding for agriculture assistance by the federal government, and a further placing of the burden on the taxpayers of Saskatchewan and the producers. That's what has happened.

If you take a look at . . . Since we have a Tory government in Ottawa and a Tory government sitting opposite, what has happened in respect to crop insurance? Previously it was producers, 50 per cent; federal government, 50 per cent. Province paid the administration. And what did the Premier allow and what did the Associate Minister of Agriculture allow the federal government to do? To

off-load. And you know what happens in respect to production insurance: 50 per cent, producer; 25 per cent, federal; 25 per cent, provincial. Off-loading — federal government decreasing the responsibility in the support of agriculture.

And then with revenue insurance: producers, thirty-three and a third per cent; federal, forty-one and two-thirds; provincial, 25. Administration, 50/50. Total program, total program: 40 per cent, producer; 35 per cent, federal; provincial, 25 per cent.

Now that's off-loading to the provincial. And one of the basic problems in respect to the low prices is caused by the international situation both in Europe and support in the United States. And what we're asking the farmers and the producers to do is to take on the federal treasury of the United States and the federal treasuries of European Economic Community and allowing the federal government to off-load onto the provinces.

And if you take a look at comparisons, it shows further, Mr. Speaker, how the federal government has significantly cut back their support for agriculture. Even on their limited basis of analysis, current safety nets, that's the ones we had in place prior to these programs that are going to save agriculture — the western grain stabilization, crop insurance levy — and the federal government cost 268 million; provincial, all it cost was \$42 million under the old programs; producer, 229 million. Total, 540.

Well we got new safety nets now. And you know what? The federal government doesn't sustain it by \$268 million; they cut theirs back to 246.7 million. The province picks up not 42 million under the old programs, but 165 million. And the producer goes from 229 million to 248 million. Clearly, a clear indication that this government opposite has allowed the federal government to off-load the responsibility of helping agriculture onto the producer and onto the provincial treasury.

And this was the Premier that last spring said, oh we can't have an agreement until we have that proper ratio of 8:1. And he sets up a program here in desperation for an election.

And so the federal government, sure they came along and they said, we'll sweeten it up a little bit because we're off the hook. Take a look, in one year — 268, 246 — quite a good saving for us. And that's for perpetuity from here on in. And so we can afford to throw in a little . . . few bucks to get people to sign up for the program. And that's what they did.

So that's what has happened. It's a Premier that delayed getting any long-term agricultural policy together. He spoke of it in '85. Now it's election time and he's saying sign up, this is the solution, we have the safety net that's going to protect the farmers. But I say, what he has done is let Brian Mulroney and the Prime Minister and the federal Tories off the hook.

As I said, there was a considerable amount of confusion with the program, because as the ministers and members

of the office of the government went around explaining it, different answers were given at different meetings. And as a consequence there was a tremendous amount of hurry to get people to sign up before they had the full details.

I want also to say that here is a party that says they want to preserve rural Saskatchewan, and that a recent report says that what has happened is that the debt has risen both in Saskatchewan and in agriculture over the past year — from 22 billion to 24 billion. And we know it's up to 24 billion, my friends, agriculture across Canada, from 22 billion.

(1630)

Saskatchewan is up. The debt is up substantially only because it's not 6 billion as it was when you guys . . . at the peak, because obviously the banks have repossessed a lot of land, a million acres of land. And of course that debt is no longer recorded as debt owing. It's written off. But don't ever tell me that the debt of the farmers has not increased.

And what is wrong with the policies next, of the members opposite? What is wrong, Mr. Speaker, is that out there in their own admissions, there are 10,000 farmers who have lost their land or are on the verge of losing their land or have legal proceedings to lose their land — and not one single recognition of that problem in so far as debt restructuring.

Commitment to agriculture! Your commitment is that those who can survive out there — the bigger they are, the better you like it. That's your agricultural policy. Reward success, they say. They don't analyse it and see that there is a section of young farmers that are in trouble and then address it. No, no. What you want to have is a universal program to reward success, as the Premier said.

Well you aren't going to save a great number of farmers. And I'll tell you, the farmers that haven't been able to sign up are those that couldn't afford the costly premiums. That's the problem. And many of them are going to be losing their farms, and these programs are not going to save those. And this government has refused to address or put in place any debt restructuring.

They say they have a program here with GRIP and NISA that's a safety net, and over and above that there's a third line of defence. The problem is, Mr. Speaker, that there is no third line of defence. That's a myth that's been perpetrated again on the farmers of Saskatchewan.

In my concluding remarks, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in respect to NISA, I talked to the young farmers out there that are struggling with heavy debt, and they don't support putting into place the program NISA. The young farmers are saying, ha, if I was in a position to the extent that I can put money into . . . for savings, it would be fine. But why wouldn't you certainly address those young farmers that are losing their land and get them going before you start assisting those that have money to put aside?

I'm not against the principle. Debt restructuring you need. Over two-thirds of the debt is held either by . . . by

government, and it can be restructured. Why not save those farmers? That's the question. And the people of Saskatchewan and the farmers are asking that.

So I want to say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that there's no doubt that the GRIP program will give some protection. I agree with that. I don't think it goes far enough, as my colleague has said. And as the farmers have said, it should have been tied closer to the cost of production.

And the federal government obviously should be paying more. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the other aspect that should be dealt with is those that need assistance in restructuring of debt. We have indicated that as part of our platform. We have urged you to do that. And to this date, no steps have been taken.

As my colleague indicated, that we're prepared to give support to the GRIP program, very reluctantly to NISA at this stage of the game, because while it has a place, it's a very, very rich program. And if you have that kind of money for those who are well enough to use it, why don't you help out those that need help? That's the thing.

I don't think you need a millionaire farmer that's well-to-do needing to get subsidy on interest rates. Yes, sir. What we need is a program that will keep people on the land, not a Tory program that will only help those who don't need help. We need a program that will help the small farmer, the young farmer that's in debt.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — And so I close, Mr. Speaker, and say agriculture has not been addressed by this government. And what is more regrettable is that they have allowed the federal government to off-load any cost of programs onto the provincial government and onto the producer.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a few comments today respecting this GRIP Bill that is before the legislature today. Mr. Speaker, what we have is an attempt to tie this GRIP-NISA Bill to the provincial sales tax by the government who said they needed that provincial sales tax desperately to pay for this Bill, the GRIP-NISA program for farmers.

And I want to clearly tell government members that urban people don't buy it. Farmers don't buy it. What we have is your blatant attempt to try and blame farmers for your Conservative government mismanagement over the last nine years. Farmers don't buy it. Urban people don't buy it. You're trying to divide and conquer and it doesn't work.

This Bill is part of the government agenda. The motivation for the GRIP-NISA Bill is purely electoral, purely political. By way of making my case, Mr. Speaker, if the government opposite was sincere about setting up a long-term stabilization program for farmers, why would you wait until four years and eight months into your dying term? Why wait until you've been everything but forced to call an immediate election? Why did it take more than

nine years to develop any kind of a program that would provide any meaningful help to farmers?

And you can't blame your cousins in Ottawa either because you've had seven years of majority Conservative government in Ottawa and in Saskatchewan, seven and nine years respectively of majority Conservative governments, and not a long-term stabilization program for Saskatchewan farmers at a time when it is desperately needed. Instead you practise this divide and conquer, this let's blame the farmers for your mismanagement, for your deficit.

We've got a new tax, the provincial sales tax that is going to hit all consumers of this province, going to extract more than \$400 million in new money. And it has nothing to do with the Bill before us today, and it has everything to do with covering up your waste, your mismanagement. Farmers won't have it, as I've said before, nor will we.

Family farms, Mr. Speaker, are being forced into bankruptcy because of the inaction of Conservative governments provincially and federally. Any action that there has been, including the major portion of this GRIP Bill, is designed, if you think about it, not with the idea of keeping farmers that are marginal on the land. This Bill is designed to put money into the relatively few very well off farmers, the most well established farmers, put some extra money into their pocket. But it's also more fundamentally designed to protect the lending institutions, the friends of the Conservatives federally and provincially. This program is designed for the banks and not for Saskatchewan farmers. That's part of the major flaw in this Bill.

I am hearing stories, Mr. Speaker, from my rural friends about GRIP assignments to the lending institutions, GRIP assignments to the banks. And what's happening? It's forcing farmers to go locally for their fuel, locally for their chemicals, locally for their seed and other inputs — all done locally. But when the banks foreclose, because the banks have the assignment on the GRIP payment, who's left holding the bag but the local supplier. The local suppliers will be left with the debt and the banks will be fully protected. The small local businesses will be left with the debt; the family farmers will be removed from the land; and the banks will be fully covered thanks to your government policies — Conservatives federally and provincially — designed to protect the banks and leave the small suppliers unprotected.

And that's a shame because those small suppliers of fuel and seed and fertilizer and chemicals, those small suppliers, they are desperately in need of business. They're part of the community, they're proud of it, and as they have every right to be proud of it. And this Bill doesn't do anything for them other than they allow the farmer to get a little bit further into debt and cover the banks so that they can foreclose when it's advantageous to the banks.

My colleagues from Humboldt and Quill Lakes, Mr. Speaker, have outlined our many concerns with these Bills. I felt compelled to outline some of my concerns with the GRIP, NISA Bill. It's by no means a comprehensive list of my concerns, but those were a few of the major

concerns I have with it.

I will reluctantly be supporting this Bill. But I want the government to know that they're not fooling farmers and they're not fooling urban people. This government's actions are purely and simply an attempt to blame farmers for their mismanagement, the government's mismanagement and the government's bungling of the province's finances, and nobody is buying any of that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The division bells rang from 4:43 p.m. until 4:47 p.m.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 42

Devine	Gleim
Muller	McLaren
Schmidt	Baker
Klein	Swan
Hodgins	Johnson
McLeod	Saxinger
Lane	Romanow
Meiklejohn	Prebble
Hardy	Rolfes
Kopelchuk	Lingenfelter
Petersen	Tchorzewski
Wolfe	Koskie
Martens	Brockelbank
Hopfner	Mitchell
Martin	Upshall
Neudorf	Kowalsky
Gerich	Solomon
Swenson	Anguish
Britton	Lautermilch
Toth	Trew
Duncan	Smart

Nays — 00

The Bill read a second time and, by leave of the Assembly, referred to a Committee of the Whole later this day.

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

The Speaker: — Before I leave the Chair, in response to an earlier question during orders of the day, the member from Saskatoon Nutana was inquiring about when the information regarding the questions raised by the hon. member for Regina Centre last Thursday would be forthcoming, and I indicated to her at that time that it would be very, very soon. I'm pleased that I now have the information, and I table the information.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.