

May 14, 1992

## EVENING SITTING

## SPECIAL ORDER

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTION FOR COMMITTEE OF FINANCE  
(BUDGET DEBATE)

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski that the Assembly resolve itself into the Committee of Finance, and the amendment thereto moved by Mr. Toth.

**Mr. Harper:** — Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It certainly gives me a great deal of pleasure to carry on here this evening where I left off earlier this afternoon.

As you will recall, Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon in my remarks I mentioned that the fact that the Tory opposition do have two ears and one mouth. And, Mr. Speaker, because of the numbers in our House here, we the government having 55 members and the Tory opposition having a mere 10, the individual members in the opposition have the opportunity to speak more often than we in the government side of the House.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it saddens me in the fact that even though the Tories do have the opportunity to talk more, the unfortunate part of it all is that they don't say anything when they have that opportunity. That, Mr. Speaker, I think is very evident, particularly when it comes around to agriculture, and I wonder if the reality of understanding the ramifications of what they are doing and how it looks to the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

I am referring, Mr. Speaker, to the motion we amended on Tuesday, April 28, right here in these hallowed chambers, a motion that was moved by the Tories and amended to make it more favourable for our farmers. A motion that the Tories subsequently voted against — voted against, for Heaven's sakes — our farmers, Mr. Speaker. Why on earth would they stand here and say out of one side of their mouth that they are concerned about Saskatchewan farmers getting a fair shake and then vote against the very motion that would help the very farmers they say they are worried about.

I sure don't know what they're thinking, Mr. Speaker. I'm also sure that the people of Saskatchewan don't know what they're thinking. But you know, the reality of the matter here, Mr. Speaker, and what matters here is just specifically what do the farmers need to know to get the business of farming one more year.

As I said earlier in my speech, Mr. Speaker, much more needs to be done for the 1993 crop year. We want to put GRIP (gross revenue insurance program) into a more realistic cost of production formula, to increase Ottawa's share of the cost as they were supposed to do in the past and haven't done yet, and of course ideally, reduce the producers' premiums.

This area, Mr. Speaker, is a volatile one and there is no easy solutions. There are compromises though, and it

could certainly help everyone, including the banks and the federal government, if they would recognize that and get down to brass tacks and design something that is meaningful and significant, something that actually works and works well for farmers.

But let's not also lose sight of the other serious issue in the farming situation and that is the farm debt crisis. Farm debt is largely responsible as a result of external factors: the European Common Market; GATT (General Agreement of Tariffs and Trade) talks; the United States unfair subsidy program; and rapidly and wildly fluctuating market-place. But just because there are external factors doesn't mean we can't come face to face with our problems and make some headway in dealing with them.

I believe that measure of success, Mr. Speaker, is not whether you have a tough problem to deal with, but whether you have the same problem as last year. The farm debt crisis in the 1980s still plague us. It doesn't take a real rocket scientist to figure that out. Unfortunately that was something the Tories couldn't figure out.

From 1908 to 1986 the total outstanding farm debt more than doubled to a peak of \$6.1 billion. In the following five years the farm debt declined less than a billion dollars. Subsequently, realized net farm income has dropped \$378 million in 1991.

The result of this imbalance between farm debt and realized farm income is a very significant part of the farm debt will never be paid off. Clearly this cannot continue. It's just a plain and simple . . . Because if it does, and there is a market place turn-around, our farmers won't be able to respond because they'll be burdened with a crushing debt load.

But I believe we have the beginnings of a viable solution. I believe that the farm debt package we will be addressing during this session will make a difference to our farmers. The foundation of our program will be to introduce a leaseback program to give extended security of tenure, a six-year leaseback to farmers who transfer their land to lenders in settlement of debt.

From my point of view, Mr. Speaker, we have nowhere else to go but up and into the future. We have a golden opportunity to make a significant milestone because . . . And again we know what we need to do and we are working to make things better for our farmers — working to make better programs, better policy, better conditions to allow our farm families to survive and thrive.

It won't happen overnight, Mr. Speaker, but to borrow a line from the singer, Karen Carpenter, "We've Only Just Begun" . . .

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

**Mr. Harper:** — We are actively negotiating, discussing, arguing — counterpoint after counterpoint — answering questions, and considering alternative scenarios to find reasonable solutions to our mess. And we will keep working, Mr. Speaker, keep working to find the answers,

to find the way for our farmers to make it this year and for many more years to come.

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

**Mr. Harper:** — We have, Mr. Speaker, come a long way and may still have a piece to travel, but I do believe that we have managed to stay the course. And by demonstrating that we are serious about facing our economic woes, we will ultimately turn this province around and bring this province back to a province of prosperity and opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to add my support to this throne speech and budget speech. Thank you very much.

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

**Mr. Langford:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in the House today to speak in favour of the budget. I truly believe this budget marks a turning point in the province's future.

One reason for this, Mr. Speaker, is our commitment to open and honest and accountable government. Mr. Speaker, appointed . . . Mr. Speaker, my government appointed the Gass Commission to open the books, and let me tell you what they found was a mess. Nevertheless, we have acted on several of the commission recommendations so as to minimize the chances of this happening again.

Mr. Speaker, our commitments to open and honest government contrast sharply with the PC (Progressive Conservative) approach to government. Last year, when the heat was on, the Tory government shut down the legislature.

**An Hon. Member:** — No budget.

**Mr. Langford:** — No budget, right. Failing to pass their budget, they operated on special warrants and hid the books from the auditor.

**An Hon. Member:** — Shame.

**Mr. Langford:** — Shame is right. The Tories projected that the 1991 deficit was only \$265 million.

**An Hon. Member:** — Wrong.

**Mr. Langford:** — Wrong is right. That was before the election. After the election, we discovered that the deficit was 600 million more than what the Tories said it would be. This is not the first time that the people of Saskatchewan have been subjected to the twisted mathematics of the PC Party.

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

**Mr. Langford:** — In 1986 authority elected — another election year by the way — the Tories projected a \$389 million deficit. It turned out to be almost \$1.2 billion.

Mr. Speaker, how did the Tories get into this mess? They

gave big hand-outs to corporate friends like Cargill, Weyerhaeuser and Pocklington. They invested in public funds like crazy . . . schemes like GigaText, Joytec, Supercart.

And they spent money like it was going out of style. Thousands of dollars spent on liquor to the cabinet ministers — thousands of dollars spent to the cabinet ministers on liquor. There was \$1,000-a-night hotel bills and \$3,000-a-day consultants. Almost 2 million in salaries which were paid to the political staff of the premier's office . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Shame is right. Not surprisingly, their salaries were hidden in other departments and Crown corporations.

Mr. Speaker, this New Democratic government has already taken solid steps to eliminate this wasteful spending. Twenty-eight million was saved by reducing spending on supplies, advertising, and others; \$150,000 a year was saved by closing the Premier's office in Prince Albert; and nearly 200 million was saved by closing unnecessary trade offices in Hong Kong, Zürich and Minneapolis. These are just a few examples of the positive measures my government has taken. Much has been accomplished but there is still much more to be done.

Mr. Speaker, the privatization of ridiculous investments and general mismanagement practices by the Tories have brought our once proud public sector to its knees. The holding company for our Crowns, the Crown Investment Corporation called CIC, lost over 600 million in 1991 alone. This was the taxpayers' money. This was the result of 166 million lost on the sale of Cameco sales; a 64 million write-down on the Bi-Provincial upgrader; and a 50 million grant to the Meadow Lake pulp mill.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, our government has identified 875 million in CIC non-recoverable debt. Three hundred and sixty-one million was due to the PCs' privatization loss; 312 million went to pay dividends to the province; 118 million was due to SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation) losses; 36 million for STC (Saskatchewan Transportation Company) losses; 24 million for Sask Forest Products losses, and I could go on and on.

(1915)

Mr. Speaker, we will restore the finance state of CIC, but the former government's mismanagement of our Crown sector will require that this year's deficit be \$93 million. To ensure accountability, audited financial statements for CIC will be presented to this Assembly for public scrutiny every year — every year.

This New Democratic government will restore the health of our Crown corporation sector so we can get back to rebuilding Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the Tories left this province in a terrible financial state but, as the Gass Commission observed, we are going to restore the Saskatchewan government in the future.

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

**Mr. Langford:** — Our optimism, however, is not based on a wait and see or things we will work out on their own perspective. The people of Saskatchewan have to make difficult decisions and to make significant sacrifices in the near term if we are to see a bright future for our province.

To this end, my government has reduced the deficit to \$517 million. If we had done nothing, the deficit would have been approximately \$1.2 billion. Let me repeat. If we had not done anything the deficit would be \$1.2 billion.

We have reduced operating expenditures to 3 per cent from an average of 6 per cent over the last 10 years. Mr. Speaker, if it were not for the interest payments on this debt we would have had a surplus budget this year. Still, my government has taken big steps on the road to financial freedom. The government will overcome this financial crisis just as previous NDP (New Democratic Party) and CCF (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation) governments have done.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about protecting families in need in my constituency. The basic need of our children must be met. With the current financial state of this province, finding solutions to this problem is not easy. It requires work on everyone's part. I am very proud to say that this budget will increase funding for child hunger programs by 35 per cent. The Saskatchewan child tax reduction for low income families will be increased by 25 per cent — \$250 per child annually. And grants for child care centres will rise by 21 per cent. New Democrats will for ever be committed to fairness and compassion.

Mr. Speaker, we realize that the small businesses is our biggest employer. To this end, the budget has reduced the tax on small businesses by one percentage point. This will provide a much needed boost to that sector.

This budget will earmark \$20 million for new incentives like counselling service for expectant teenage mothers, community-based family planning programs, and measures to address the problem of family violence.

Greater funding will also be provided for the breast cancer screening program; child care facilities; the automatic enforcement of maintenance occurs . . . orders, I should say; the employment equity unit; and child care service in rural and northern Saskatchewan. In addition, the wellness model will be fully developed and implemented.

Mr. Speaker, there's new initiatives . . . new initiatives will have a very positive effect on my constituency. In particular, places like Shellbrook, Canwood, Meath Park, Choiceland, Smeaton, and I could name many other small centres.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn my attention to agriculture. This New Democratic government will not let the federal Tories off the hook. We will continue to press Ottawa for the promised 500 million of farm aid. We will have begun the long process of making improvements to the flawed farm support program, GRIP.

In particular, we will have made it more market progressive . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Right.

Recommendations of the Farm Debt Advisory Committee will be acted on. First, we will establish a six-year lease back program for farmers who have transferred land to the lenders. Second, we will develop a voluntary farm debt mediation process in order to resolve problems at an earlier stage.

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

**Mr. Langford:** — Third, we will enable farm families to add security access operations and other credit when they decide it is their best . . . when they decide it's in their best interests. And finally, we will examine alternate forms of financing such as a community-based land trust. As well, Mr. Speaker, our government will make sure that 78 per cent of all Agriculture department dollars go directly to the farm support program.

I will close, Mr. Speaker, by reaffirming my support for the budget. This is a wise budget because it deals with fiscal responsibility, public accountability, fairness, compassion, and economic reality. This budget is the first step in rebuilding Saskatchewan. Thank you.

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

**Mr. McPherson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm honoured to join into this budget speech this evening. I'd like to start by paying tribute to the Finance minister for bringing in such a good and wise budget.

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

**Mr. McPherson:** — Mr. Speaker, "This budget is founded on fiscal responsibility, public accountability, fairness, compassion, and economic reality," quoting from the budget speech.

Fiscal responsibility, because we are defining the road to recovery and working toward financial freedom. Public accountability, because we are laying a solid foundation to provide open and honest government. Fairness, because we are calling on our community to join us in rebuilding this great province. Compassion, because we'll protect those most vulnerable in our community. And economic reality, because stimulating economic opportunities and helping to create jobs is a vital part of rebuilding Saskatchewan.

This budget, Mr. Speaker, shows why we'll have the ability to live within our means. And we had that this year, Mr. Speaker. In this budget we had a \$243 million surplus, Mr. Speaker, \$243 million surplus, if we didn't have to pay on the interest on the debt, the Tory debt, caused by the members opposite.

This budget, Mr. Speaker, also deals with financial freedoms. The grim reality today is that those members opposite mortgaged our children's future. Because of them, Mr. Speaker, we can no longer pay for all the government services provided. Programs that we simply cannot afford will be eliminated. Other programs will be modified to ensure that we can continue during this

financial crisis. And also, Mr. Speaker, this budget deals with the debt, the debt which was created in nine years — nine long years of Tory government.

Saskatchewan families did not create this massive debt, Mr. Speaker. Saskatchewan's new government did not create this debt. Our children didn't create this debt — they're going to have to help pay for it now. Our community has inherited a legacy that will not be forgotten and cannot be ignored, to quote from the budget speech, Mr. Speaker.

But you wonder how this debt was created, how it got so out of hand, so out of control. Well let me tell you. The 1992 Saskatchewan provincial budget marks a solid step towards regaining our economic freedom from the whims of Wall Street, Mr. Speaker. I'm reading here from the Gass Commission report. I'll start with a few notes from that.

In 10 years, our Crown corporations have gone from being a major contributor to government revenues to being a major drain. The Gass Commission identified three main reasons for this amazing reversal. First, the losses on privatization initiatives, operating losses and write-offs of investments, subsidies of non-income-producing assets.

The losses on privatization initiatives, Mr. Speaker — the Devine administration sold the government's interest in a number of enterprises. The largest sales were Saskoil, the Potash Corporation and Cameco. The sale of PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan Inc.) and Cameco resulted in losses of \$527 million.

The Potash Corporation once paid hundreds of millions of dollars in dividends to the government. Then the members opposite were elected. PCS began to co-operate with private potash companies. Its market share dropped dramatically. Then the price of potash fell. PCS lost hundreds of millions of dollars. Now all but 9.4 per cent of PCS was sold at fire-sale prices. Total losses: \$361 million. Wouldn't that be nice now to have for the farmers that the member from Morse keeps referring to.

(1930)

Cameco, Mr. Speaker — in 1988 the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation merged with Eldorado Nuclear, a federal Crown, to form Cameco. Losses on the sale of Cameco shares: \$166 million, Mr. Speaker. Outrageous. Operating losses and write offs of investments: Rafferty, \$115 million: Sask Grain Car Corporation, 36 million; Westank, 28 million; Meadow Lake Pulp Ltd., 50 million; SEDCO, 14 million; Flexi-Coil, 12 million; Hunter's Manufacturing, 11 million; GigaText, 4.4 million; Canapharm, 4 million; Sask Diversification Corporation, three and a half million. After a while these millions, they just become numbing figures, don't they, Mr. Speaker?

Subsidies of non-income-producing assets: NewGrade, \$334 million; Saskferco, \$335 million. Man, couldn't we do a lot for the farmers with that money if the members opposite wouldn't have mismanaged so poorly? Weyerhaeuser, \$51 million; the Bi-Provincial upgrader,

\$177 million.

The Gass report shows that in light of the provincial financial situation, most of these loan guarantees are irresponsible. Decisions to increase the exposure to the taxpayers were made at a time when it would not be possible to raise revenue through taxation. These decisions were also made without review by the legislature.

And here's a few highlights, Mr. Speaker, from the Gass Commission report. The province has yet to receive any payments from the privatization of the Prince Albert pulp mill to U.S. (United States) based Weyerhaeuser corporation in 1986.

The Prince Albert pulp mill — \$236.6 million that they had in a promissory note and losses on deferred payments alone, to date, \$51 million.

**An Hon. Member:** — Never made a payment on the . . .

**Mr. McPherson:** — Not a dime. The Commission uncovered several examples where the former government entered into transactions or financial commitments without doing a full and complete financial analysis of the deal. The province's cost-share of the Rafferty-Alameda dam project has ballooned from its original estimated cost of 42.5 million to more than \$155 million, and the member of Morse knows that full well. A cost overrun of more than 200 per cent. That's quite the management you got.

The former government proceeded with the privatization of the Potash Corporation at a time when those share prices were low, contrary to the advice of its own outside expert advice. And this, Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on just with what was in the Gass Commission report, but I'll move on because we have so many reports that show why the situation we're in is due to the management of the members opposite.

And here I'm looking at the *Special Report by the Provincial Auditor*, "Payments to employees not working for employer organizations."

Organizations reported there were 130 employees who, for extended periods of time, did not work for the organizations paying their salaries.

Payments to these employees totalled approximately \$5,166,000 in the two years under review.

That's an enormous amount of money. Just in that amount of money alone, what could we do for the chiropractors, optometrists, farmers, the nurses that they referred to?

Section 2, "Payments to advertising agencies for goods/services not received." That doesn't sound up front to me.

Nine organizations reported that they made payments to advertising agencies for goods/services not received.

These payments totalled approximately \$439,000 in the two years under review.

Is that fraud? Well then I am ashamed, more ashamed of you than before.

Section 3, "Goods/services provided without charge to ministers." Did we have some former ministers over there?

The value of the goods/services totalled approximately \$42,000 in the two years under review."

Forty-two thousand.

"Goods/services provided without charge to other Government organizations."

The value of goods/services totalled approximately 1,755,000 for the two years under review.

This is quite a little booklet on these guys.

"Payments to advertising agencies for goods/services not received." They didn't even get the advertising out of it, eh?

Generally, the advertising expenditures reported below were initiated and approved for payment by the Office of the Executive Council. In these cases, the organizations that made the payments were unable to determine that the specific services were received by their organizations. Accordingly, these payments are not properly supported and we are unable to determine that these expenditures are for the purposes authorized by the Legislature.

That almost sounds fraudulent too, doesn't it?

And look at some of these figures here. Provincial Secretary payments totalled \$206,000. And of that Roberts & Poole Communications got 51,000. A full list. Pages of this. Fifty thousand. Sixty thousand. It's full of Tory mismanagement and waste. And it took so long for the Provincial Auditor to have to get these reports because the members opposite didn't supply the auditor with the information.

And I know I'm just a rookie MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly), Mr. Speaker, so I probably don't fully understand the benefits to some of these next expenditures. I know the members opposite. They argue on behalf of the farmers a lot.

**An Hon. Member:** — They're not sincere though.

**Mr. McPherson:** — No, they're not sincere. Because being a rookie MLA, I'd have to have one of the members opposite . . . You just go ahead and stop me if I hit on something that sounds like it was for agriculture here.

Seventeen thousand, four hundred and twenty-three

dollars were expenses run up by the premier's office at Regina's Hotel Saskatchewan in one year. Is that agriculture? Is that for those nurses? All the people that you claimed to defend in the last few days?

Nineteen thousand, three hundred and sixty-eight dollars, expenses run up by the premier's office at Regina's Ramada Renaissance Hotel. I thought he was at the Hotel Saskatchewan and here he's got a couple places on the go. A world traveller this guy.

Two hundred and thirty thousand dollars for the cost of buying and furnishing a new Regina condominium for the Lieutenant Governor.

Forty-five thousand paid to former PC member of parliament, Stan Korchinsky, to advise the Devine government on how to lobby the Mulroney government. Well that doesn't sound like an agriculture bill either. We'll get to one here sooner . . . You stop me when I do, okay?

Sixty-four thousand, two hundred and fifty-three dollars, payment to the British Merchant Bank, N.M. Rothschild & Sons Ltd. for two months of privatization consulting. Well it must be further down the list here. We'll get to it.

Nine million dollars, PC government's budget to celebrate Saskatchewan's 85th birthday in 1990 and promote the PC Party as an extra. They threw that in. A possible election year I guess.

**An Hon. Member:** — Getting close to agriculture yet?

**Mr. McPherson:** — Well I have so many here that . . . Surely we'll find some. A hundred and thirty-two thousand, five hundred and fourteen dollars was SaskTel's average monthly bill for out-of-province air travel by executives.

**An Hon. Member:** — For which department was this?

**Mr. McPherson:** — SaskTel's. So that doesn't sound like agriculture either. Our member from Morse . . . go ahead and stop me when I hit one. Forty-six thousand dollars annual lease payments for a new premier's office in Prince Albert. And we closed it. We closed it. Eighty-six thousand dollars is the cost of renovations to the premier's office in Prince Albert.

Seventy-three thousand, eight hundred and sixty dollars was the annual salary of Premier Devine's public relations advisor, Ron Shorvoyce. Twenty-two thousand six hundred and fifty dollars, the cost of a two-day retreat at Cypress Hills for political assistants.

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

**Mr. Martens:** — It's a common practice in this Assembly that members' constituencies are referred to, not the names of individuals as part of it. And I'd like to remind the member that that's a point of order.

**The Speaker:** — I think the member from Morse makes a good point. I believe the member fully realizes he's supposed to use the name of the constituency and not the

name of the individual.

**Mr. McPherson:** — Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize. I'm glad that the member from Morse is paying attention, because he was going to stop me when I hit on one of these agricultural ones and I . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Yes, we might be here a long time though.

**Mr. McPherson:** — One hundred forty-six thousand, four hundred and forty dollars was the annual additional salary cost of the four extra cabinet ministers that the former premier added to his cabinet in October 1989.

Eighty-six thousand, two hundred and ninety-five dollars annual additional salary costs of the 11 PC MLAs that the former premier appointed as legislative secretaries. One and a half million dollars in additional staff for these extra ministers.

Fifty thousand — oh, here's an agriculture one — fifty thousand dollars, the cost of a study on the production of oyster mushrooms in potash mines in Saskatchewan. That's probably as close as we'll get to agriculture.

One point three million dollars, the advertising and public relations bill for one eight-month period at SaskTel paid to Roberts and Poole, an advertising agency, associated to the PC Party it says here.

Two hundred and twelve thousand dollars, research grant to Supercart for the development of a plastic shopping cart which the company never produced.

One hundred and thirty-seven thousand, five hundred, cost of luxury Regina condominiums purchased for GigaText executive, Jean Pierre Paillet. A thousand and eighty-three dollars a month to lease a Mercedes-Benz for him. That's even more than the monthly lease that these guys were trying to make an issue out of 10 days ago.

Fifty-one thousand dollars annual salary of defeated PC cabinet minister, Jack Sandberg, who was given an executive position at SaskPower. That's over and above the 400-and-some thousand dollar salary of Mr. Hill; \$182,620 total salary and separation payment to the premier's deputy minister, Norman Riddell, who left Saskatchewan to work for Premier Bourassa in Quebec; 41,900 annual salary of defeated PC MLA Keith Parker, who was given an executive position at the Saskatchewan Liquor Board.

**An Hon. Member:** — Oh, he must have been this guy that supplied the \$17,000 worth of free booze.

**Mr. McPherson:** — I think so. Patronage was right out of control with these guys.

Five hundred and fifty thousand dollars annual salary and potential bonuses for Chuck Childers, the former premier's appointee as president of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. And you add in the bonuses and it's getting up around the \$740,000, I believe — the same amount they budgeted for hungry children that year, wasn't it?

Forty thousand dollars for the cost of a study on testicle size on yearling bulls. There we go, and the member from Morse missed it.

Twenty-two thousand five hundred, monthly operating expenses for PC government's trade office in London — we wonder why we're in debt. You know, I got pages of this stuff. If they weren't so interested I wouldn't go on with it.

Ninety-seven thousand dollars, the salary of the PC government's new Minneapolis trade commissioner, former cabinet minister, Bob Andrew. He also received 71,000 for resigning as an MLA.

(1945)

Ninety-seven thousand dollars, the salary of the PC government's new agent-general in Hong Kong, former cabinet minister, Graham Taylor. He also received a payment of \$65,000 for resigning as an MLA.

**An Hon. Member:** — He's the guy that gave his kid money for that game farm out there somewhere.

**Mr. McPherson:** — For the game farm, yes.

Twenty-six thousand eight hundred and eighty-nine, government payment to the PC Party's advertising company, Dome Advertising, for advertising costs related to a chamber of commerce conference in Saskatoon to promote free trade. I thought the federal government was promoting free trade.

Sixty-one thousand dollars, additional costs to the provincial government for the chamber of commerce free trade conference.

Twenty-two thousand dollar payment to Remail Investment for feasibility study for a hotel and convention centre proposed for Regina. They were gambling, eh? The project was ultimately built by Remail and the provincial government leased six floors. Could that be true?

Ninety-eight thousand dollars is the cost of polling for one eight-month period paid for by the Department of Health to the PC Party's polling company, Decima Research. That's just coincidence I think. And what was the answer? A hundred and forty thousand dollars, cost of printing the extravagant 1987 SaskTel Annual Report prepared by the minister responsible for SaskTel, Gary Lane. Four hundred and eighty-five thousand dollars paid to S.W. Warburg Consultants for a study on the privatization of Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation. Forty-two thousand . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — This is amounting to an awful lot of money.

**Mr. McPherson:** — It is amounting to a lot, but you notice I'm only doing every other one. Forty-two thousand dollars, annual salary of defeated PC cabinet minister Louie Domotor, who was given an executive position with the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation. We wonder why we have to address the

debt. Look at how they've run it up. Sixty-nine thousand dollars, cost of Grant Devine's month-long junket to China where he had visions . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. I would remind the member again, he is not to use the name of individual members in this House. He is to refer to them by their constituency or their position.

**Mr. McPherson:** — I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I meant to say the former premier. I just got a little carried away reading all these thousands and millions.

I've got a few pages here of patronage, defeated and retired PC MLAs: Eric Berntson, appointed to the Senate, salary \$71,000. And his severance too. I'm not sure how much that was; it was a lot. Larry Birkbeck received a \$48,000 contract through his company Venus Consulting in '88-89. He received a 10-year appointment to the Saskatchewan Municipal Board in 1990 at a yearly salary of \$57,820.

**An Hon. Member:** — Was he a Tory?

**Mr. McPherson:** — He was a Tory, yes. Gordon Dirks received \$30,000 contract from the Department of Education to do a study of private schools. Do we have that study? Did we use it? Sid Dutchak was appointed to interim president of the Saskatchewan Housing after the '86 provincial election. Tim Embury, Ralph Katzman, Miles Morin, head of occupational health at the Department of Labour. Keith Parker, February 21, 1989, appointed assistant to the chairman of the Liquor Board. Paul Rousseau, Saskatchewan agent-general in London. And I missed half of this other page. Jack Sandberg, customer relations with SaskPower. Paul Schoenhals, first-time paid chairman of the board of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan — another 100,000 bucks. Bud Smith, appointed to the Saskatchewan Gaming Commission. And as I mentioned before, Graham Taylor and Gary Lane — \$97,000 each. And the list goes on and on and on, Mr. Speaker. We wonder why we're in such a tremendous debt. You know, I'm just touching briefly on that. Nine years they carried on helping themselves and helping their friends.

But, Mr. Speaker, this budget changes the direction that the Tories were headed.

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

**Mr. McPherson:** — In this budget we had — as I said earlier — a \$243 million surplus when we didn't have to pay the interest on the Tory debt, \$243 million. If the members opposite, when they were in government, had \$243 million surplus in every year of the nine years, can you imagine the money we would have available for farm programs and health care programs.

As I stated earlier, Mr. Speaker, this budget has restraint, but it has compassion. Three hundred and twelve million dollars in additional revenue will be generated through a variety of increases to personal and consumer taxes. These were necessary due to the crippling legacy of debt left by the PC administration. All increases have been applied as fairly as possible, with the rich and the

corporate sector paying their fair share.

As well the most needy in our society will continue to be protected. And I'm going to name a few of the positive things that the budget does for those needy. Twenty-eight million dollars in additional funding for social assistance; child hunger funding increased 35 per cent — shows compassion, Mr. Speaker. Saskatchewan child tax credit increased 25 per cent to \$250 per child annually; grants for child care centres increased 21 per cent; income plan for low income seniors increased by \$120 annually; home care funding increased nearly 20 per cent to \$38 million; special allowance for disabled persons increased 25 per cent; northern food allowance doubled to \$50 a month; 4 million for northern jobs to improve water and sewer systems; \$20 million more for family support services like counselling for teen-age mothers and family violence programs.

Saskatchewan still has the third-lowest combined tax than other govern charges . . . rate in Canada. And, Mr. Speaker, restraint begins at the top. The province of Saskatchewan was founded on a spirit of community and working together for the good of all. That's why in our government efforts to fight that 14 billion or \$15 billion deficit crisis, we have asked no more of our community than we demand of ourselves. Saskatchewan residents are willing to do their part in tough times.

And I'm just going to read a few of the ways we're controlling government spending, Mr. Speaker. We had a 5 per cent salary cut for cabinet ministers; extra pay for legislative secretaries was eliminated; and the smallest cabinet in 20 years will save another \$1.4 million this year alone. Allowances for extra duties by government members have been reduced and eliminated; MLA communication allowances cut by 25 per cent; out-of-scope public service salaries frozen; department advertising budgets cut near 30 per cent; almost 40 boards and commissions dissolved or reduced to eliminate 500 government appointments.

And, Mr. Speaker, we've got government down-sizing as well; the Department of Social Services consolidating all equipment and training programs to eliminate duplication. The Crown corporations have been directed to reduce operating costs. Farm Ownership Board and Farm Land Security Board merged to reduce administration costs. And funding available to positions will be reduced — just some of the restraints on government spending and government down-sizing, Mr. Speaker.

And I look at this budget, Mr. Speaker, and I ask: will everyone support these initiatives? No. No they won't. The members opposite won't. And will everyone find this budget easy? No not everyone will. But are we going on the right course of direction and will we achieve our goal? You bet we will. And that, Mr. Speaker, is why I support fully the Minister of Finance and the budget that he has brought forward. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a pleasure to join in this budget debate, and I anticipate the

opportunity of participating in the estimates also.

As you recall, Mr. Speaker, this is a right which I and my colleagues were denied last session when the members opposite chose to hide from this side of the House and from the public. They didn't want to answer the many questions that we have.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, they chose to introduce a motion that suspended all rules of the Legislative Assembly; a motion that took away my rights as a member of this House. A motion introduced by the Minister of Finance allowed the NDP to dodge questions regarding their actions . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, they have short memories because this was just last December and they've already forgot. But naturally they would want to forget.

Mr. Speaker, it astounds me that this government, which claims to be concerned about financial accountability, would not allow budget discussion in this House. Instead, Mr. Speaker, instead they had the Minister of Finance up. They did get the Minister of Finance up who could not answer questions of . . . any department questions because he said he didn't know. He answered a few, but very, very few because he had the excuse, I haven't got the department officials here.

So what an excuse. And no wonder they want to forget that they had such a thing.

I am pleased seeing the government's finally got around to delivering the budget speech; that we will now know where the money is going, Mr. Speaker. We now know where the money is going. We hope they don't hide it. We hope that we'll know where it's going.

We all know where the money came from to run the province this month. We all know. Everyone in Saskatchewan knows where the money came from this month. It came from special warrants. That's right, Mr. Speaker, special warrants. Remember them?

Mr. Speaker, and I quote. The member from Saskatoon Eastview released a legal opinion that concluded it's illegal and unconstitutional to use special warrants for the sake of convenience. The opinion was provided by Merrilee Rasmussen, the former legislative law clerk.

I continue, Mr. Speaker:

Rasmussen's 22-page opinion (that she gave) found the government is abusing a section of The Financial Administration Act . . .

Special warrants are illegal when they are resorted to because it is more convenient for the executive (council) to use them than to call the legislature to give its approval . . .

She stated. *Leader-Post*, July 6, 1991.

I think the key word here, Mr. Speaker, is convenient. It was convenient for them to use special warrants. The NDP claimed they didn't have time to prepare their budgets because they were just elected. That was all right

to say that in November, but not in February, March and April.

Mr. Speaker, I think they were just buying time. Their British Columbia counterparts were elected the same time as the members opposite, yet they had time to prepare and present their budget on time. There's no problem out there.

The NDP had enough time, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is that they were buying time. They were buying time for political reasons. If this budget had been presented when it should have been, the NDP members would not have had enough time to devote to the massive witch-hunt of the civil service.

(2000)

Mr. Speaker, the member from Shaunavon made a lot of points and through my remarks tonight I'll be touching on quite a few of them because I don't agree, and you will hear where I don't agree.

They would not have had enough time to conduct their rehiring of their patronage appointments. Your want to talk about patronage — the member from Shaunavon will hear tonight about patronage appointments. He might hear about the whole 8 or 900 that I got here, we'll talk about.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP were buying time. They needed time to desensitize the public, to make them believe that Saskatchewan is in worse financial shape than they ever imagined. That's what they wanted to do — to try to convince the people that the province of Saskatchewan was in much worse shape than what they ever could imagine. They needed time to prepare the Saskatchewan taxpayers for the worst. They needed to use special warrants, something they said they'd never do.

I quote the member from Riversdale

"I think if we ever permit the government to fall into these kinds of sloppy disrespectful habits, then what the heck — it's ballgame over. You might as well forget about the concept of responsible, accountable government."

*Leader-Post*, April 9, 1991. Mr. Speaker, that came from the now Premier. Shame on him.

This article goes on, Mr. Speaker. It states, and I quote:

An NDP policy paper on democratic reforms states the budget should be delivered before March 31 of every year. (The member from Riversdale) . . . said this should be enshrined in legislation.

*Leader-Post*, April 9, 1991.

So what we have here, Mr. Speaker, is a government running on special warrants while the House is in session, a session which began April 27 — a full month later than the NDP budget deadline date. They're still running on special warrants. They still are, Mr. Speaker.



This government, Mr. Speaker, are contradicting themselves right, left and centre. In the process of delaying the budget a number of leaks occurred. They should never have delayed the budget, then they wouldn't have had all those leaks, although I know that they intentionally wanted some of them out. The Minister of Finance is a pretty shrewd man, Mr. Speaker. And I'm sure that he wanted a few of those leaks out, just to get opinions.

I wouldn't be surprised if the NDP had to reprint the entire budget to cover up their incompetence.

Can't you just hear the member from Regina Dewdney, oh, oh, another leak, quick, phone the printers. I'm sure that's what happened many times. Mr. Speaker, the days leading to this budget were a farce, a big farce, Mr. Speaker. The government could keep a lid on nothing.

Mr. Speaker, the member from Elphinstone would like me to speak up but my throat isn't that good so I can't talk very loud tonight. And I apologize to the member from Elphinstone if he can't hear me.

The first item leaked to the public was the fact that the NDP, the self-proclaimed saviours of medicare, Mr. Speaker, the self-proclaimed saviours of medicare. . .

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

**Mr. Muirhead:** — They were contemplating health care premiums. Mr. Speaker, they made sure that this leak got out — that health care premiums, deterrent fees. We know as I said in the throne speech they had no intentions. I wish they had've. It would have been a lot more fair than what they've done. It would have been their socialistic way of doing things — everybody pays. You'd think if they're going to go socialistic, that's the way they would have gone — everybody pays — instead of just picking on a few.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. I ask the members please, not to interrupt. I think some of you have had your opportunity to speak. Others chose not to speak. And some of you will still be speaking tonight. So I ask you please, let the member from Arm River have his say.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This information soon got out into NDP land, Mr. Speaker, about their premiums and deterrent fees, and all the things they were going to do. And boy, did they ever get a shake up. But they knew they were going to get it. But it was just a try to fool the people so they could bring all the taxes on. They got this from their own people. Their own people won't know the real facts. Their own constituency organizations were producing and handing out leaflets against the NDP government. The header reads: Defend medicare. Let me read on: Medicare is under attack according to news reports, the member from Saskatoon Riversdale. Government has approved measures that undermine the province's medicare system.

Imagine that, Mr. Speaker. Just imagine that. What all the

NDP supporters for ever and ever have done in this here province. When you wake up in the morning and you look in the mirror and you know if you're on the PC side there's 35 per cent of the people don't like you. And when they get up in the morning there's 35 per cent don't like them either. So they might as well face it that 35 per cent of the solid NDP support in this province went just wild when they heard about premiums and deterrent fees. And I can just imagine. I can just imagine.

The member from Rosetown-Elrose must have been swamped with calls for membership. Why, Mr. Speaker, why would he be? Because his NDP constituency organization initiated that flyer. I bet you it was pretty tough on him. I bet you every telephone call lost him the 50 votes that he won by. So he don't want any more elections in Rosetown-Elrose or he'll lose by thousands of votes.

Mr. Speaker, the people in Rosetown-Elrose are not that different from other folks. They're not different than the people in Arm River. I know people, NDP people, that never have supported me in my 14 years. They've been solid NDP. They've been saying so out in public, but they're ashamed of the members opposite. They can't hold their head up in the streets of Craik and Davidson. They're ashamed in the coffee rows. They don't even stay there very long. You only see our people there now, or the ones that said they're our people.

No one in the province believes the members opposite when they claim that health fees are necessary, necessary only because of the state of the books. The members opposite hope that people will believe them when they say, gee things were worse than we thought. They've said it so long that it's not flying any more. People every place is getting sick and tired of, gee I thought things were worse than I thought they were.

I mean they knew, Mr. Speaker. We've been through it over and over. And we on this side of the House said they knew and they said they didn't know. It's getting ridiculous. It's getting absolutely ridiculous.

But let's be grownup adults. We all knew that you knew. The member from Saskatoon Riversdale is not a novice politician. We know he had it well figured out. He knows how the government books are kept.

Now let's just go to the proof now, Mr. Speaker, that they knew. We have the proof, and it comes from them, Mr. Speaker. It comes from their man that they hired. I don't know what politics he is, but it's Mr. Gass, Mr. Gass. An individual appointed by the NDP members opposite confirmed this.

Now let's just quit the heckling and get down to just real serious thinking here, Mr. Speaker. Let's just have the people . . . I want the people that's watching on television land tonight to know that I'm hitting nerves when I mention what a Mr. Gass said. Because I'm telling the people in television land that they're laughing, and they come to attention every time I go to speak because they know I hit nerves.

And I'm going to tell the people out there in

Saskatchewan exactly what this man said. You've heard it over and over again, but you can't deny it. You can't deny this.

On CKCK-TV news, February 18, '92, Donald Gass confirmed that the member from Riversdale knew. Donald Gass said that the PC administration made no attempt to hide the province's financial position. Now how long are we going to carry this on in Saskatchewan, this carryings-on that we didn't know and that's the reason for this terrible budget.

If you want to know the reason for the terrible budget, because you're trying to get the pot full some place so you can buy yourself another election three and a half years from now. That's what you're doing.

You . . . I know how this . . . I been here long as anybody in here, longer than most, and I know exactly what the plan is. It's not hard to figure out the plan, Mr. Speaker. It's how to get elected three and a half years from now. It's how to get elected.

Oh we didn't know how to do the things that you're going to do. We didn't know how. It's easy to plan because you're a smart bunch of operators over there. They just . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I wonder, Mr. Speaker, where these people get the idea that the member from Arm River has anything to do with GRIP. Where do you get the idea? Where do you get that idea from, that this member from Arm River has anything to do with GRIP?

**An Hon. Member:** — You told me.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — I didn't tell anybody.

**An Hon. Member:** — You did so.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — I did not, and we'll get into that later. In fact, Mr. Gass said on CKCK news the following: the books were open all along to credit agencies or anyone else interested.

Now how can we keep on in this legislature for another 50 or 60 or 70 or 80 or 100 days until we get this cleared up between us all here? You've got to admit you knew. We know you knew because the panel said you knew and every time that the Minister of Agriculture gets up, the Minister of Health gets up — they're the two main ones that's been talking in question period these last few days . . . And I'm so sick and tired of listening to this . . . oh, this terrible shape that the Tories left us in, this terrible, terrible \$1.3 billion.

Well before the session's over, I'm going to be able to have it in writing. If they can't do it, then we're going to have to call an election because they can't show where there's \$1.2 billion worth of debt in this province that they took over.

**An Hon. Member:** — We can so.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — You can't show it.

**An Hon. Member:** — We did already.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — No you can't. In fact, Mr. Gass went on to say nothing was hidden. Why did you . . . You must be feeling bad that you hired this guy that was so truthful. You must feel terrible. This guy told the truth. You hired him; we didn't. It wasn't Dave Tkachuk saying this. It wasn't George Hill saying this. It wasn't Jack Messer saying this. It was Mr. Gass. . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I told you what he said. That you people knew and the books were open, and that's what they're going to do. They're going to, for the next . . . for about one more year they're going to try to hide under this, that the Tories left us in this shape.

You're not going to get away with it because we 10 people on this side will . . . we're pretty well got the province convinced now, they're pretty well convinced, because I know that you people all know that the member from Arm River knows how to sell politics and how to sell the truth. And I've made a good job. I've been into your seat — the member from Rosetown-Elrose.

Another thing that Donald Gass said, Mr. Speaker, that the government opposite would have to know the facts because it's the way governments always have kept their books. It was just the most governments keep . . . the way most governments keep their books, that's the exact quote, quoted by Mr. Gass. The accounting principles that were used under the Conservative government were the same as was followed by previous governments. So how do we get this here big story that from last summer till now that this great big new story about this mess?

Mr. Speaker, the member from Riversdale has been an MLA for a long time. He knows how the books are kept. There's no deceiving him. There's no deceiving the member from Riversdale, Mr. Speaker, because he knows, he knows exactly. And I know if I was talking to him man to man, alone, he would admit it to me exactly what the facts are. But you're trying to fool the public, but not any longer.

Do the NDP members across the floor really believe that there's anyone out there that's going to swallow this claim that you didn't know? It just isn't happening out there, Mr. Speaker. The former Education critic, the member that was shut out of cabinet, she knew, Mr. Speaker. She and the member from Saskatoon Riversdale knew. The whole time they were proclaiming that the education was a priority for the NDP Party and that there was not enough financial support for education, the whole time they were making these allegations, they knew the state of the government's books.

It's just unbelievable, this whole story that we've been going through and this whole situation about them not believing. It's just uncomprehensible, Mr. Speaker. It didn't matter what they promised. The promise is broken. I don't know . . . if there's a promise that they didn't break, it would be a group of people that they never met. That's the only people they haven't hurt in this province, is somebody they haven't met yet.

Mr. Speaker, the member from . . . the Minister of Agriculture said they didn't hurt me. I pay my tax off my cheques the same as you do, right here in this building. And I pay income tax the same as anybody else does. You

going to tell it didn't hurt? You going to tell me it didn't hurt when I . . . I'm a diabetic. I had to buy pills for diabetes. You going to tell me it didn't hurt me?

(2015)

Now come on now. Don't tell you haven't hurt everybody. Everybody is touched. But I can find myself another few dollars to pay for that. I'm not broke. But what about the poor people that are? You never considered them.

**An Hon. Member:** — Why don't you pay your power bill?

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Speaker, somebody from opposite over there said that why don't I pay my power bill? If anybody can ever find that I have got an unpaid power bill or ever had ever in the history of this province, I will resign my seat tonight! Now that's a terrible statement to come from that man.

The minister from Agriculture got personal here today. Now the member sitting beside the House Leader said, why don't I pay my power bill? How does he know whether I got my power bills paid or not?

Mr. Speaker, can I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if that man would apologize? On a point of order.

**The Speaker:** — The member, I know, from Arm River, is upset but he does not have a point of order. It's a debatable point and I think he knows that.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's too . . . I think it's kind of serious when somebody says loud enough for everybody to hear, why don't you pay your power bill?

**An Hon. Member:** — Go on Gerry.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Go on Gerry nothing.

**The Speaker:** — Order. Would the members please not interrupt. Let the member have his say and if you can't be quiet in the House why don't you go to the members' lounge.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm going to repeat it once more. If you want to get rid of the member from Arm River . . . I'm going to ask the minister responsible for SaskPower to go through the books of SaskPower since it came to my farm in 1958, and if there's ever been an unpaid power bill by Gerald Muirhead, the member from Arm River, he will resign his seat tomorrow. Now that's fair enough and that's the way it's going to be.

Mr. Speaker, no more business of getting into the civil service because you pack a political card. That's what the minister from Riversdale said, the Premier of this province. And he said, this is a quote that he said:

No more business of getting into the civil service because you pack a political card or access to government because you pack a particular political card and I'm absolutely firm on that at my stage in my political career.

The member from Riversdale said this on October 3, 1981, on the Harasen line. He said this during election, Mr. Speaker.

We want to talk about patronage, the members from Shaunavon. Who wants to talk about patronage? I have here, Mr. Speaker, OC (order in council) appointments here for 200 people, almost 200. I counted, I think there's about 180 or 90, that has gone through this government — OCs since October 21, 1991.

But it's in the throne speech:

My government has already appointed 580 people to government agencies, boards, and commissions of which 36 per cent are women and 6 per cent are of aboriginal ancestry.

Okay, talk about political patronage. If every one of them wasn't a political appointment, then why did you change the ones that were there? Why did anybody get moved if he doesn't believe in political patronage?

Maybe we should just . . . I've got a few highlighted here. If anybody out in television land thinks that these aren't political appointments, we can talk about Duane Adams; we can talk about Garry Aldridge, 1991 NDP life membership. We can talk about Gary Beatty, former NDP appointee, Manitoba; Gary Benson, NDP strategist; Pat Brown, former NDP appointee.

I don't know where they get the idea these are political appointments. Coincidence, I guess, that they all happen to be. John Chapman, former NDP MLA. Well I guess they probably, when they appointed John Chapman, they didn't know he was an MLA, an NDP MLA.

There's pages of them here. Tom Gitzel, lawyer in a law firm supporting NDP; Peter Glendinning, law partner in the Gates firm Regina . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . A brother-in-law of whom? Brother-in-law of the House Leader, Mr. Speaker. Political patronage, right in the family.

The member from Quill Lakes had his whole family. When he was sitting over here we used to say: who have you missed in your family for political appointments? Now this has even moved into the House Leader.

Reg Gross. Now, would Reg Gross by any chance be a political appointment . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Isn't that the former MLA?

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Yes, it says . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, he was — yes, he was defeated NDP MLA.

**An Hon. Member:** — Who was that?

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Reg Gross. Well, he got . . . And you know something, Mr. Speaker, you know something, Mr. Speaker? Reg Gross, he's on here for appointment . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Would the members please have some respect for this Chamber at least. We don't need this

yelling across the floor, not only to the member that is speaking, but to each other. We should have at least some respect for this Chamber.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Yes, Reg Gross, Mr. Speaker, is like many others in here. They got their salary as \$87,000, \$113,000, their salaries. But they got many — one, two, three, four, about eight on that, salary not revealed; order in council, salary not revealed; verbal, not revealed, not revealed; pages of them here — not revealed. Reg Gross, not revealed; Carla Hansen, not revealed.

So that's the way they're going to do it. If they don't want to tell you, they just won't reveal it or have the salary verbal.

Mr. Speaker, it goes on and on here about political patronage, but maybe we should talk a little about more serious matters. The member from Shaunavon wanted to talk tonight about Dome Advertising. Maybe we should just have a little chat, Mr. Speaker, about Service printers. That will put some of the . . . the older members here wouldn't know what I was talking about, about Service printers. They were exactly the same; they got all the NDP advertising; it's only small dollars in those days.

Service printers give out thousands of dollars worth of contracts when I was in opposition here from '78 to 1982. And these members know that all they've got to do is ask the former premier of this province, Allan Blakeney about political patronage. If you want to talk about political patronage ask him, he knows all about it. He came from . . . native of Nova Scotia in about 1951-52, the former premier Allan Blakeney, and he started a law practice in this province. In 1952 he got a job with the securities commission. In 1953 he became the chairman. In 1960 he became an MLA. In 1970 he became the leader of the NDP Party. In 1971 he became the premier of this province.

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

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I'll take you back a little farther because when I follow this through from '52 to 1970, if I had to pull *Hansard* we could tell you what his salary was all those years. And I could tell you it wasn't very much. It started out with about three, four thousand dollars a year in 1951. And it wasn't too much of a salary to become premier in 1971.

Go take a look in 1972-73 and then by '82, and take a look at the conflict of interest guidelines and then take a look about how much money went from Service printers and other services of the NDP went to that old law firm as high as \$275,000. Take that in 1992 dollars and see what you've got.

They want to talk about political patronage. We can talk all about it. I was four years in opposition. Now the front members across the row are very quiet. The only one chirping, Mr. Speaker, is the ones that weren't in the front row before. The member from Elphinstone's been very quiet. The member from . . . the Minister of Finance don't even look this way when I talk about Service printers and Allan Blakeney. He didn't even . . .

Anyway, I want you to realize, my friends, Mr. Speaker, that there's just about 200 appointments there. Now why do we have the people standing up here all week saying . . . talking about the past government and political patronage? Why do we? And then you turn around and I've never seen anything like political patronage in my life as what you people have done.

I could take you to some departments over here, and I can give no names because they'll be fired tomorrow, but I know some people that are at a wage class, class 2, class 3, and lots of people have been there 15, 20 years, 10 years and they just sit there and they're at a class 1 salary. Well now as soon as this government becomes . . . the NDP becomes government, what did they do to award their friends in the departments? They've also moved, now moved to a salary based on a class 2, class 3 with the same job.

Then they're trying to save money. They're going to let diabetics not be able to buy their drugs. They're going to let somebody that needs a chiropractor treatment, they're going to pay for all your drugs now, your complete drug bill has to be paid for.

Now they've had cut-backs to no end. What are those nurses going to say that got fired yesterday? What would they say, Mr. Speaker, if they knew that you've got people that you just raised them from a class 1 to a class 3 level of pay and you just take that right across the face of your government of all the political workers that you're awarding by moving them up the scale.

You talk about saving money. You talk about starving children in Regina. Go feed them with the money that you just fed your own political boys with, with raises in salary behind the scenes.

Mr. Speaker, I really thought this behaviour was no longer acceptable. I thought this would never happen. You used to hear about this when the NDP were in government before. This is what we went through from '78 to '82, this kind of behaviour. I thought it was gone for ever but it's right back there again. Or maybe they were just talking about other political parties when they said they wouldn't do it, that it shouldn't be done. Was the Minister of Finance saying that it is acceptable for their party alone to engage to blatant patronage? Did he mean their party or just other parties? It would seem so, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, this budget is bitter medicine to swallow. We all know that, Mr. Speaker. Bitter medicine. But not for me; I knew most of the budget from the leaks and knew what the NDP were up to. We on this side of the House knew but not the poor people in the province of Saskatchewan; they didn't know. But for the people of this province, Mr. Speaker, it's a bitter medicine to swallow.

Year after year after year the people of Saskatchewan heard how the NDP would get rid of the deficit, improve health care, improve education, improve agriculture, reintroduce a dental plan, reintroduce the old prescription drug plan, eliminate poverty.

That's all they heard from them for nine years. They heard

how the NDP would eliminate the deficit and the poverty — all the same time frame. They heard how the NDP could eliminate the harmonization of the E&H (education and health). How could they eliminate it? Because it was unnecessary. I would bet, Mr. Speaker, they are regretting this action daily. The NDP claimed that harmonization was regressive. They claimed it created job losses and wreaked havoc to the Saskatchewan economy.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder. I wonder if the people of Saskatchewan now that have been fired and lost their jobs . . . we'll just use a few items here. Seven cents on the price of a hamburger, which is a selective tax, you don't have to buy a hamburger. The member from Swift Current, when he was at the age of 15, 16, never thought of buying a hamburger. You had to get fed at home. That's pleasure to go do those things away from home. It's a selective tax.

I wonder if they . . . I wonder what people would rather do, Mr. Speaker, pay an extra 7 per cent on restaurant meals or pay an additional 30 per cent on their phone bill every month. Pay an extra 7 per cent on a new shirt or pay an additional 5 per cent on their SaskPower bill every month. Would people rather pay an extra 7 per cent on a paper roll novel or pay an additional 10 per cent when they renew their car plates this year? I wonder what they would rather do, Mr. Speaker. Would people rather pay a selective 7 per cent tax or pay an additional 4 per cent on their SaskEnergy bill every month?

If the 7 per cent on a hamburger was a regressive . . . and would create job losses, what is the increased percentage across the board going to do. The people who said harmonization was going to destroy the province increased E&H for everyone — the poor students and the elderly. Betrayed everybody.

(2030)

How do you call this progressive, Mr. Speaker. What people would say if they had a choice today. What would they say? When the NDP members were voted in on the promise to eliminate harmonization I wonder if people knew what they were in store for. I wonder if they knew what they were going to get? I think most people thought, just as the NDP wanted them to, that the E&H tax would be gone — not just harmonization. Fool people on the 7 per cent tax. There's NDP in my area and people that never voted NDP before, and floated over and voted for them, thinking that they promised to remove the 7 per cent PST (provincial sales tax) and didn't know that E&H were coming on. You forgot to tell them that.

You misrepresented them, Mr. Speaker. They were misrepresented that the PST would be gone. It didn't go any place. It just went up to 8 per cent. The PST . . . you go and pay a bill at a gas station or a store, they still got PST right on their cash, and it's got PST on there yet. You can call it E&H, but it's still a tax is a tax, don't make a difference what you call it. The member from Elphinstone can shake his head right off and there's no change in tax. It doesn't change it one bit. It's exactly 8 per cent, or 7, or 6. Now it's 8 in this province.

Mr. Speaker, there's something that this government did,

and I don't know whether the Minister of Finance has dealt with this or not, but I've been getting calls, Mr. Speaker, from construction workers, contractors that had made contracts over the winter, and they put in their contract, E&H, 7 per cent. And on the day after the budget, Mr. Speaker, they phoned the Department of Finance and said, what happens to the other 1 per cent? And they said, tough, you'll have to pay for it.

And that's terrible, Mr. Speaker. We have contractors out there that had their crews working just to break even this winter and will go in the hole over 1 per cent.

The one person that phoned me was only . . . He said he wanted his name mentioned in here. His name was Leonard Schmiedge from Davidson, a plumber. And he said, it's only \$450, but I'm only a small, little guy. I'm only a little contractor. And they said — he's the guy that phoned, the gentleman that phoned the Department of Finance — and he was informed: tough, you're stuck with that 1 per cent.

Now this hasn't really got to be known. The members around you, Mr. Minister of Finance, won't even know this yet. They won't even know this. This is just another one.

Mr. Speaker, it is so important for the Minister of Finance I'm going to repeat it because I hope he's got an answer for it tonight when he speaks. The contractors out there, people that make contracts of any kind, that happened to write in 7 per cent E&H — if they just wrote in "plus E&H," they're all right — but if they wrote the 7 per cent in and they phoned your department and said, what happens with the 8 per cent? Who gets stuck with it? And your department officials told Leonard Schmiedge from Davidson, tough, you're stuck with that 1 per cent. And it's costing him \$400-and-some.

Con's Construction building, the school in Kenaston, it's going to cost them about \$30,000. So I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we can have an answer on that one because it's very important, very important, because I think you fooled all your members around you that they didn't even think of that. But we hope that the Minister of Finance did think of that.

Why, Mr. Speaker, would this government, when they've promised and promised and promised that they would not ever put deterrent fees or whatever onto the drug plan or onto the health plan, and they went and touched the drugs and they touched ambulances, they touched the chiropractor, the optometrists, and the diabetics, now why did they do this?

And they're saying here today, the minister in the House today — of Health — said very clearly that the people in the province of Saskatchewan is behind them and endorsing of what they're doing.

Is that why, Mr. Speaker, that this article here in the *Leader-Post*, "Cuts said panic move," is that why the . . . I won't take time to read all this in here but it should be read to you; but they probably read it today where the nurses that were fired yesterday, and they said that the hospitals in Regina is at a long-time low, the morale in

those hospitals. The morale is down, down, down.

And they're responsible, Mr. Speaker. It's never been so bad. Out in the little town of Craik, we have a hospital out there. And they're even worried out there there'll be cut-backs and one or two will lose their jobs. They're so afraid of it. They're afraid of it all over this province, because there'll be cut-backs. And there'll be some farmer's wife that's working out there to try to support and keep that farm going that's going to be fired because of their cut-backs.

Your deficit surtax of 10 per cent that was announced in this budget gave Saskatchewan people the pleasure of being the highest taxed people in Canada. Now are we proud of that in Saskatchewan; that we're the highest taxed in all of Canada? People of our province pay the highest personal income tax and we have the fewest people.

The NDP are increasing everything. Not many people know this, Mr. Speaker, but the NDP have increased the cost of getting married. Did everybody in this Assembly know that if you want to buy a licence to get married, you even tax them some more? This was approved through an OC. They increased the cost to purchase a marriage licence. It used to cost \$10 back in 1982; now it costs \$50 to get married.

And I know what's going to happen and I'll predict, Mr. Speaker, that it's going to come back, what they did in the '70s. They're going to tax the dead. They're going to tax them when they're born; they're going to tax them when they get married; and they're going to tax them when they die. And that's coming, Mr. Speaker, because that was one of the reasons why they were heaved out in 1982, of all of these things.

Now they're doing in 1992 all the things they said they would never do. In fact, Mr. Speaker, they're doing all the things that they said that the Tories were going to do. They went out at election time and said, this is what the Tories are going to do to you. But they turned around and did it themselves. They stabbed everybody in the back.

I would expect that he and his colleagues are now explaining to their NDP political contributors the money they wasted, and that's all this money that I've been talking about. I'm sure you're having a hard time explaining to all your contributors out there, where did our promises go to.

From what I've heard, not to many folks watched the Premier's little show. Those who did watch made comment to me that it was more than a little dry. Maybe you didn't have enough colour in your charts. One of my constituents told me that the new government had a do-nothing chart. He felt that the knew-nothing title pretty much summed up the new government's progress to date. You guys might have coined yourselves a new nickname, the do-nothing-but-raise-taxes government.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan people do not need nor do they care to hear the NDP government continue to blame others for their problems. I've covered that many times tonight. But I'm going to be saying it for days and days and

days ahead until you get off this business of blaming other people. You're in government now — now govern! You're in government — do it and do it right, and don't tax the people to do it. It's never worked any place in North America or the world. Any province, state, or government or country that says, let's tax the people, you stop the country; you kill the country. You've got to get growth another way; you'll never get growth by taxing people.

That's what they did in England back in the early days. They went out with a . . . just like you people, they went out with a suit of armour on and a whip, and they went out to collect taxes — whoop, whoop, whoop. And that's exactly what you're going to do. Where's the socialist sickle going to strike again? Because I'll tell you that the socialist sickle hasn't even begun. These people are . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. One more comment out of the member from Regina Wascana, in that interruption I'll ask her to leave the chambers.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to refer to an article written by Sandra Mitchell. I think the members know who Sandra Mitchell is, the executive officer of the New Democratic Party of Canada. She states in her article that she is tired of hearing the Minister of Finance for Saskatchewan economic woes. She's getting tired of the Minister of Finance. She's disgusted with him. To put it simply, she's saying, get on with it. There is a problem, so start offering some solutions. So you're own people . . . she don't . . . but all you're doing is blaming somebody else.

Quit blaming somebody else and get at it and get some solutions other than taxing people, taxing the sick, firing people. That's all they can think of, is fire people, tax them. That's all they've got on their mind. We have to live up to that one main promise and that is balance that budget. And they're going to balance the budget at any cost.

Well I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, it's great if we can balance budgets, but the voters in Saskatchewan are really . . . when they used to go to all these meetings and listen to people on our side and your side talk about balanced budgets, balanced budgets, and they'd stand and cheer for the speaker that says balance the budget and on the way home they say to themselves, yes, they'd like to see them balance the budget but they'd better stay out of my pocket and do it. They better stay out of my pocket.

So the people will not come up and say what they really think. When you're going broke out there as a farmer or business man or whatever, you're only interested in balancing one budget and that's your own. So balance the budgets, I give you . . . I hope you do. I hope you have good luck in balancing budgets but be careful on whose backs you do it on. Be careful on whose backs.

We in the opposition benches have been asking what the NDP government's plans are for a long, long time. The NDP knew there was a deficit. They made reference to the deficit daily during the election. Mr. Speaker, the NDP government had ample time to devise some of the

positive economic strategies for this province, so for goodness sake get at it and do it.

Instead we have the Premier of this province going on television with a mess of charts. If anybody was watching him, they were doing so to hear what the NDP planned to do with the deficit, not to watch the NDP point fingers at the federal government and the previous administration. That isn't what they watched the Premier for. They watched to see what his plan was. But he had charts out there to show them who was to blame. They don't want to hear who was to blame. Everybody that has any good common-thinking sense knows that we got a economic problem clean across the nation, across North America and across Europe and all the third-world countries besides. So don't think little Saskatchewan is different than any place else.

It reminds me, Mr. Speaker, of the late Tommy Douglas who said he was the saviour of the farmers after the '30s and people followed that for years.

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

**Mr. Muirhead:** — I knew, Mr. Speaker, that would draw an applaud but I ask this question, Mr. Speaker, to all Saskatchewan. Who saved them in Alberta and Manitoba and North Dakota and South Dakota? Tommy Douglas? Because they improved after the '30s too. They improved after the '30s. Everybody did well. Tommy Douglas just happened to be here. But Tommy Douglas, if he was here today . . .

I tell you, poor Tommy Douglas was a good gentleman, an honourable man, the two of the best statements I ever knew.

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

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Tommy Douglas and John Diefenbaker were two of the best statesmen I ever knew. They believed, even though I was against his philosophy, he believed in what he was doing was right. He believed; but that was the CCF. You people are the New Democratic Party and don't connect yourself with Tommy Douglas.

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

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Tommy Douglas was a friend of my family's. My mother went to school with Tommy Douglas. She was very proud of him as a man. But I tell you we didn't believe in his philosophy but he wouldn't condone what you people are doing. He wouldn't be taxing the sick. He wouldn't let somebody like my youngest son's brother-in-law, has got diabetes and he gets \$785 salary and that's all he gets. So he gets \$785 salary every two weeks and he has to pay his rent, he pays his food and his wife has to have \$165 medicine for diabetes. Now you tell me how those kind of people . . . There's hundreds of them out there are suffering, and Tommy Douglas would not do that. He would never do it.

Mr. Speaker, in this next few weeks we'll see Bills come in from the government and they're going to be offering solutions. They're going to be offering solutions, but we on this side of the House are going to be offering many

solutions. We're going to be tabling Bills too. We will not simply sit back and demand the government continue to spend. We know what the situation is. We informed the NDP what the situation was. They just chose to ignore it. The problems cannot be solved through taxation. We've said that before tonight. Continuing tax increases of the middle class will simply drive people out of the province. And that's a fact. People are leaving this province and they'll leave daily now after this budget.

This side of the House will be willing to foot a bill, half of a bill with you to do a poll. We'll do a poll, and we'll ask people if they've lost their job or just ask people period if they lose their jobs, would you leave the province? We'll do a poll.

We should also . . . And also put in the poll, if you're fired, what would you do? Would you vote NDP again? I hope the NDP wellness model can do something about this particular ailment.

(2045)

There are just about two more points I want to make here then I'm through, Mr. Speaker. The Saskatchewan Pension Plan. I would rather see, for the sake of the people that took the Saskatchewan Pension Plan, that we as MLAs cancel our pension plan. We got some good pension plans.

Now why should we, as MLAs, and retire, be any more important to have a pension than the people in good faith that took this pension plan on, the people in this province. Why did you hit them? If it had have been your idea you never would have touched it. It's because if the Tories had done it, is why you said, get rid of it, get rid of it.

You know that it's not right, it's not morally right, Mr. Speaker. They all know that it's not right to take a pension plan away from anybody. It is wrong, wrong, wrong.

What about the people who bought homes in this province? And they're okay now because interest rates are down for the mortgage protection plan. But if interest rates go back up, it's gone. You took it off because you're thinking it will go back up.

Why did you, Mr. Speaker, why did the members opposite hit the farmers so hard when they took off this feed grain program? They eliminated it. Why did they pick on farmers? The Minister of Agriculture is sitting here. Why did he charge them another 60 cents a gallon to buy gasoline? Why is he going to break the feedlots in this province? Why did the lands branch . . . These questions I'm asking . . . The Minister of Rural Development responsible for lands branch is not here. But why was there foreclosure. . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. The member has twice now broken a rule of this House that you do not refer to the presence or absence of members in this House. And I ask him to refrain from doing so.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — I got so excited, Mr. Speaker, I didn't realize I did, but I apologize. I'm sorry, because I do know better.

But why did the member . . . the minister responsible for lands branch send out — in March, while the freeze was still on — almost 600 notices, in one week, of cancellation of leases.

Why did the minister endorse sending letters out to agents? Why does he not fire, Mr. Speaker, the man that wrote that letter for saying . . . well yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that man should be fired because he said if you speak out against this government, you broke your contract and it was not in that contract.

If that is right, then we as government should have fired all the people that was out in front of the legislature that spoke out against the government, said let's hang the premier of this province. Right out here last year. The people out here by the hundreds that lined up and had pictures of ropes hanging the premier and they had . . . They said don't take Fair Share Saskatchewan. They were moving all over Saskatchewan. How many people, Mr. Speaker, would be so happy to move to Yorkton or Tisdale tonight that lost their job? How happy would they be to be able to move?

Talk about don't take my mommy away from me, don't take my daddy away from me. That's what your union people done out here. We didn't fire them. But if an agent speaks out against this government their job's in jeopardy.

Now that's the worse thing I've ever heard and that's what I wanted to close on tonight is this here government. You can't speak out against the government; you'll lose your right. And this is going to haunt you till the next election because we on this side will never let the people in this province ever forget that you said in a letter . . . and the minister has endorsed it because he didn't do anything about it. He's endorsed that letter. Whoever wrote that letter and signed it should be out of job, whoever said that if you speak out against this government your job's in jeopardy.

Now that's got to be the worse thing I've ever heard ever happen from any government that I've ever heard of since I've been involved in politics — and before. It is terrible. Absolutely the worse thing I've ever heard of.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, did the Minister of Finance — just one more thing here — did he realize when he said we're going to put 3 cents tax increase on gasoline . . . Now that's all right if they've got to have that money. I'm not saying anything about that. But the farmers always had a rebate of the 10 cents tax that was there before . . . or sorry, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, that's not right. They automatically had it off at the pumps but now they have to pay it. It's 13 cents a litre, 59-point-some cents a gallon, and they've got to pay cash and they won't get their money till a year from now.

Now if you think that's helping farmers and you can say, oh . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, and then it's only a portion, Mr. Speaker. And you can say, oh everybody farms with diesel. Go on. There's people that I know in my constituency still hasn't got a diesel tractor. They're using gas. They bale. They run . . . their smaller tractors

are gasoline. Their trucks are gasoline. The majority of their trucks are cleaning seed today. The majority of trucks, probably 80 or 90 per cent, are trucks that burn gasoline that's cleaning seed to seed this crop. And they only make five miles to the gallon, the average truck in Saskatchewan.

Now if you think that isn't cash right out of their pocket. You, at least, could have said with that number, you don't pay. But you stole their money for one year. That's what you've done. And then give them a rebate back a year from now. It's the worst thing I've ever heard of. In this budget, Mr. Speaker, there wasn't one thing for farmers. Some things they had you took away and it's serious. And that, Mr. Speaker, has to be the worst thing that's ever happened to a government that promised to save farmers. And I'm going to close on this note from the Premier, from the now Premier who said at election time and he said it over and over again that, I promise to balance the budget, lower taxes, save the farmers, go to Ottawa and get them some money. And he's going to break them all except balance the budget but on the backs of who? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — Thank you, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's actually with some relief that I have this opportunity to enter the budget debate. Mr. Speaker, in some ways it's a treat to follow the member from Arm River in any debate. Without question he is one of the most entertaining members in the House and we can even overlook his infrequent brushes with the truth for the entertainment value, Mr. Speaker. But I have to say tonight, Mr. Speaker, I have to say this, I have never in my life saw a windmill that runs on water.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, the member from Arm River covered a great deal of territory in his remarks, very few subjects passed his attention tonight, except I noted that he did not in that lengthy entry into the budget debate make any reference at all to the April 21, 1992 *Special Report by the Provincial Auditor* in Saskatchewan. I heard no mention of that document and this is unfortunate because I know that the member from Arm River is a member with some good conscience in some ways and will sometimes tell the truth. I thought perhaps in his remarks he might want to explain to members of the legislature some questions that are left outstanding from this report from the special auditor.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, on page 19 of the Auditor's special report he indicates to the public of Saskatchewan, to the members of the Assembly, that the Centre of the Arts here in Regina, the Centre of the Arts here in Regina, while those gentlemen opposite were in government, the Centre reported that a private viewing suite over at the Centre of the Arts was used a total of 17 times by three ministers. Now I thought perhaps the member from Arm River might tonight disclose to the House which three ministers.

This auditor's report also indicates to the public of Saskatchewan, that over the last two years before the



change in government, the Saskatchewan Government Insurance company reported that it paid taxi fares — taxi fares — of \$682 for various ministers and their staff. And I don't need to remind you, Mr. Speaker, and members of the legislature, each of those ministers are equipped with an automobile and yet SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) was paying taxi-cab fares for them and some of their staff. I'm wondering which ministers that was, Mr. Speaker.

Now I note here, and this is of some interest to me because my wife and I are regular attenders at the Big Valley at Craven in the summer, and I note that the Provincial Auditor and . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — I'll bet you pay your way, too.

**Mr. Calvert:** — As a member says, we bet we pay our way. We sure do; we sure do. Now the Provincial Auditor in this special report says here that the Saskatchewan Liquor Board — get this, Mr. Speaker — the Saskatchewan Liquor Board reported that it paid expenses totalling \$16,162 for ministers to attend Big Valley.

I thought in debate tonight the member from Arm River might indicate to the House which ministers were at Big Valley last year costing the taxpayers \$16,162. Mr. Speaker, this special auditor's report prepared and delivered in April of this year indicates: "The Liquor Board reported (that) approximately \$19,285 worth of liquor was supplied (free) to ministers' offices." Mr. Speaker, the member from Arm River didn't address the question to which ministers was this \$19,000 worth of free booze delivered.

My good friend and colleague from Prince Albert, Mr. Speaker, just perhaps made the most appropriate comment I've heard in the House in the last hour. He asks and says: they got the booze; the people got the hangover.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take a long time on this debate tonight. We're drawing very near to the end of the budget debate, and I know there are other members who want to share some of their comment on the budget. So therefore I won't take a lengthy time tonight.

Somehow tonight, Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of President Harry Truman. You'll remember President Truman, president of the United States during those difficult war years, a president who on occasion had to take some very unpopular stands, and yet a president much beloved by the American people. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that it was President Truman that had on his desk, in the oval office, that famous plaque which read: the buck stops here.

Mr. Speaker, in light of this budget and in light of the commitment of this government, it would be my suggestion that over the life of the first term of this government, the Premier of Saskatchewan and perhaps every member of this government ought to have a plaque

on their desk which reads: the debt stops here.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, the budget we debate tonight and will later vote on tonight marks a turning point — a turning point in the history of Saskatchewan, a turning point from fiscal irresponsibility to fiscal responsibility. This budget marks the end of ten years of ever-increasing debt, of uncontrolled deficits which now threaten the very existence of our province.

Mr. Speaker, this budget, as hard a budget as it is — and, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it's unlikely any other budget in provincial history has been as tough as this budget, Mr. Speaker — as hard as this budget is, it is the turning point. And the debt, Mr. Speaker, the debt stops here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I listened yesterday with some interest to the former premier, the current member from Estevan participate in this debate and he shared with this House the record of his government. I was surprised that he so willingly shared with this House the record of his government. Mr. Speaker, I quote from *Hansard* yesterday remarks made by the current member from Estevan, the former premier. He said to the House yesterday, this is what he said:

The deficit in 1982 (first year he was government) was 227; in 1983 it was 331; in 1984 it was 379; and in 1985 it was 584; in 1986 (this is the member from Estevan reviewing the record of his government) in 1986 (he said) it was 1.235 billion; in '87 it was 568; and in '88 it was 328; 377 in '89; 358 in 1990.

And what he didn't tell us, of course, was that in 1991 his deficit was \$960 million.

The member from Estevan and the former government created, like a train that's out of control, a debt on our province. And he was the chief engineer. And he came into the House yesterday and reviewed it for us. But he didn't, of course, say that in each and every one of those years he was government, his final deficit figure was a far shot from the prediction — from what they told the people the deficit would be — in any one of those given years.

(2100)

And I note the year 1986 an election year. We were told, we the people of Saskatchewan were told by the member for Estevan's government, that the deficit that year would be \$400 million. After the election was over, the truth of that year's deficit, as the member from Estevan told us yesterday, the deficit was \$1.235 billion. \$800 million out.

Now we come to 1991 — 1991, another election year. The member from Estevan, the Minister of Finance at that time, Lorne Hepworth, tells us that the deficit is going to be in the neighbourhood of \$250 million, confirms as much in the middle of the election campaign with a letter. What did the deficit turn out to be after the election? Nine hundred and sixty million dollars.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's the record of the government opposite. A record of deficit after deficit, debt after debt. And then you combine that with the give-away of our assets. You combine that with all the waste and the mismanagement, the payments for trips to Big Valley, and the thousand-dollar hotel rooms, and the flights all over the world, and the free cars. Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that we're in the mess that we're in?

The one other comment that I did not hear tonight from the member from Arm River, and it's a comment that I have not heard from any member of the Conservative opposition in this debate since it begun, was the very short and simple comment that I expected to hear from at least one of them — I'm sorry. Not one. Not one hint of regret in that caucus for the mountain of debt that they have put on the people of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you may very well have read the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* on the evening of May 6. I want to quote some of the editor's comment in the May 6 editorial from the *Star-Phoenix*. The editorial that night was titled "Tories to blame". And it reads . . . and I won't read all of it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I want to quote some significant parts: "THE ISSUE: (says the editor) Provincial Deficit. THE SOLUTION: Tories must accept responsibility."

The editor goes on to say:

Saskatchewan taxpayers can only come to the conclusion that the provincial Tories are unable to tell right from wrong.

They appear to operate without a conscience or any moral guide posts. Otherwise, (and I'm quoting, Mr. Deputy Speaker) how could deputy Conservative leader Rick Swenson and Tory house leader Bill Neudorf accuse the NDP of lying about the deficit during the election campaign?

During the past few months, (I'm continuing to quote from the editorial) the Gass commission and the provincial auditor's report have unveiled a litany of Tory extravagances and ill-conceived expenditures, all of which contributed to the province's staggering debt load.

The editor concludes:

Despite the reports' overwhelming indictment of the Tories' fiscal mismanagement, Neudorf and Swenson had the audacity to claim that, during the election campaign, Premier Roy Romanow pretended not to know the Tories were lying about the provincial deficit. The absurdity (Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is the final sentence of the editorial. The absurdity) of this situation and the complete moral bankruptcy of the Tories is not lost on Saskatchewan taxpayers and that's obviously why they're in opposition.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, we're in a mess. The people

of Saskatchewan know we're in a mess. You know, just yesterday — and once in a while the truth slips out — just yesterday in question period when the Minister of Health was pointing out to members opposite the kind of mess they've put this province in, a voice from the back bench, and I won't name which member I think it was because I'm not sure, but a voice from the back bench came out here as clear as anything for all to hear in the House saying that it's your mess now.

Well at last there is some sense of admission that we've got a mess. It's our mess, you're right. Member opposite, you're right. It's our mess now; we'll deal with it. The people of Saskatchewan will deal with it but at least one has admitted there's a mess. There's a mess.

You know, I started off just moments ago talking about President Harry Truman. People are aware of that plaque which said, the buck stops here. But President Truman had two plaques on his desk, the other a quote from Mark Twain. Harry Truman had on his desk this quote as well: always do right; this will gratify some people and astonish the rest.

As difficult, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as this budget is, as tough as the choices have been, I believe it is the right budget. I believe it sets the right direction for our time in history.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we had options here, we had options. We could have left things alone. We could have run up the debt. We could have, as the former premier used to do, say, well don't you worry because next year the price of wheat's going to sky-rocket, the price of oil's going up and the price of potash is going up and everything is going to boom and, oh boy, you can afford to mismanage and still break even. Give her snooze.

I mean we could have taken that approach, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We could have said, we could have said, well we can't do this or we can't touch this area because it will be politically unpopular. We could have done that. We could have taken the easy route. We could have chosen those options, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but we did not. We've chosen the route of responsibility.

Now across the way there they tell us now and again this budget is the beginning of our defeat, that we'll be a one-term government. Well I'll tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'll tell you, I'd sooner be defeated having done what is right than to get re-elected having perpetrated a fraud on the people of Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — And furthermore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this budget is not the beginning of our defeat. It's the beginning of a new era for Saskatchewan. It's the beginning of fiscal freedom for our province. It's the beginning of release from the bondage to the bankers and the financiers in New York and Toronto and Geneva and Tokyo. It's the beginning of security for those things which we have and those things which we all desire.

It's a tough budget, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Let no one suggest otherwise. Let no one suggest otherwise. It's

tough, it's tough, and let me say, Mr. Speaker, there is no joy in the introduction of this kind of budget. No joy in reducing heritage grants, no joy in cutting pension plans.

There's no joy in putting needed capital construction on hold. There's no joy in reducing farm support programs. There's no joy, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in having to raise the deductible of the drug plan. Mr. Speaker, there's no joy in any of this.

But there is responsibility. And there is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, hope. There is hope for the future because tough decisions not taken today would spell disastrous consequence for our province and our people in the very near future, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We've had to make some tough decisions about the drug plan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if those tough decisions aren't made today in two or three years we won't have a drug plan. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we would be joining the seven other Canadian provinces who do not have a drug plan for the general public.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you know the anguish that must have gone into the preparation of this budget. Programs like the drug plan, pioneered and developed by New Democratic governments . . . It's not, it's not easy, and there is no joy in some of these choices.

But there's hope. There is hope. Because in these choices we set new directions.

I want to say just a few words about some of those new directions that are set out in this budget. There is reflected in this budget a new direction in taxation. This budget re-establishes the principle of progressivity. This budget asks others to begin to pay more of their fair share of the tax load. This budget raises the income tax rate on large corporations by 6.25 per cent. Banks and trust companies, financial institutions, excluding credit unions, will have a tax increase of 8.3 per cent. And the corporate capital tax surcharge on large resource corporations is increasing by 50 per cent, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

This budget asks others to begin to pay more of their fair share. If, and I heard tonight the member from Arm River again talk about the 7 cents on the hamburger . . . He's not just quite accurate, even in that figure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because by now, if the PC plan for harmonization of the tax . . . it would have been 14 cents on every dollar that we spend in a good or a service across the piece. A 14 per cent sales tax on every good and service we purchase, that was the PC plan.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that plan of theirs would have garnered revenues . . . taken revenues out of the pockets of consumers in Saskatchewan of \$440 million. Four hundred and forty million dollars would have come right out of the pockets of consumers in Saskatchewan. The revenue to government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would have been \$180 million.

Well now how does this work? They take \$440 million in new tax by applying a 14 per cent sales tax on every good and service. But government, to fund health and

education, highways, social services, education, and so on, would only realize a benefit of \$180 million.

Well a little slippage indeed says the member. A little slippage indeed. What happened you see, Mr. Speaker, under their plan, was to take \$260 million and rebate that to their business friends — not primarily to small business, no, no, no — to the large corporations in our province. They would have been the massive beneficiary of that PC harmonized sales tax; not government, not the people, but their large friends in the corporate sector. Four hundred and forty million dollars taken straight out of consumers' pockets — that was their plan.

In this budget, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the increase in the personal income tax, the deficit surtax, plus the 1 per cent increase in sales tax will take a total of \$125 million out of the hands of ordinary workers and consumers and people in our province, based, based on ability to pay, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And that's what's so fundamental — based on ability to pay.

This budget, Mr. Speaker, re-establishes the principle of progressivity, and there's so much more in the area of taxation that needs to be done. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I heard my colleague from Saskatoon Broadway suggest that we perhaps need an entire review of our taxation system here in Saskatchewan and indeed across Canada. I am fully supportive of her suggestion. In this budget we have at least moved the direction back to progressivity. In this budget, Mr. Speaker, we also set us, again, in the direction of financial independence. Not only are we getting a grip on the debt and deficit, this budget introduces perhaps the most long-term, significant announcement we've heard in many years in Saskatchewan and that's the introduction of the Saskatchewan savings bond.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — Through that initiative, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Saskatchewan people will have the opportunity to invest in Saskatchewan, to invest in our future and our children's future and will regain for us a sense of financial . . . of independence.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to note also that this budget sets us in a direction for which I rejoice. It's a direction of, again, recognizing those who are most in need in our society.

Mr. Speaker, in the times in which we live, I think we're all going to have to make that separation again between that which we want for our society and that which we need. We all want, Mr. Deputy Speaker — there's no mistake about that — we all want . . . I know in economics they taught me a long time ago, they you used to teach us, you know, in economics that demand is insatiable. It will always grow. We all want, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And sometimes, you know, I think the more we have, the more we want.

So as a friend of mine says, perhaps in these times we need to begin to redefine affluence. We have to begin to define what makes for the good life. And for sure in these times, in terms of our society and our community, we

have to begin to separate what we want and what we need, and for sure need must come before greed.

(2115)

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, this budget takes us back in that direction. It provides a small amount of money for our lowest income seniors. This budget provides new initiatives for northern Saskatchewan. This budget provides child tax reduction for low income families, by 25 per cent. This budget provides \$20 million for family support initiatives. And this budget provides a 35 per cent increase for child hunger programs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to come to a conclusion by referring to an article that appeared in last night's *Leader-Post* by the noted columnist, Dale Eisler. Mr. Eisler, in his column last night, leaves us with this headline saying: "Most have little to complain about." And he says:

For people who feel hard done by in the provincial budget, it would be good therapy to drop by the Albert-Scott Community Centre (here in Regina) at noon on any Monday, Wednesday or Friday.

A lot of things get put into perspective at the Chili For Children hot-lunch program. Most notably, the fact that the majority of us have very little to complain about.

Somehow a one-per-cent increase in the sales tax, a three-cent-a-litre hike in the gas tax and even a 10-per-cent deficit surtax on income doesn't seem all that unbearable (when, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we compare it with the need of some of our neighbours).

Mr. Eisler concludes his article by saying this, and I'm going to quote:

In its budget last week, the new conservative government of Roy Romanow (conservative small c) tried to acknowledge the problem of child hunger. In spite of its fiscal restraint policy, additional funding of \$260,000 for community-based hunger programs — bringing the total to \$1 million — was announced. The plan is to expand efforts into rural areas where child hunger has been identified as an emerging problem.

Obviously it won't be enough to effectively deal with such a pervasive problem, but at least it's a step in the right direction.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will support this budget tonight because it is a step in the right direction. It is a step to fiscal responsibility. It is a step towards financial freedom for our province. It is a step towards meeting the needs of those who need the most.

And I want to close, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with a quote from Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the people of America 1937. He said: I see one-third of a nation ill-housed,

ill-clad, ill-nourished. The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have little.

Mr. Speaker, when all the politics are set aside, this too will be the test of our government and our society. Not whether we have added much to those who have in abundance but whether we have met the needs of those who have little. Because this budget sets us again in that direction, later tonight, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will support the budget.

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

**Mr. Johnson:** — Mr. Speaker, in following the two speakers from this side of the House, the first one from Shaunavon who put into perspective some of the reasons why to your left is the remnants of the last government, and then the member from Moose Jaw Wakamow who presented a vision and recognized where we are having to go because of what had taken place under the previous administration, I think are two very good speeches and I, myself, will not take quite as long as either one of them.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the Gass Commission report on financial review, there is one item that I want to bring to everyone's attention. And I want to do so in two ways — one, by reading what it says and secondly, by telling of a little problem that I had as a MLA.

On page 110 it says that:

During the Commission's brief existence, we found evidence of frustration among not only the general public, but also public servants, that they no longer can readily link the delivery responsibility for various programs and services to specific departments and agencies. The communications system within the Government seems unable to keep up with the changes and therefore, individual public servants are often unable to assist the public in finding the appropriate agency to service their specific needs.

And, Mr. Speaker, that's basically where the former government found itself. They were so mixed up, either deliberately hiding things or unable to put things together in an orderly manner that the public couldn't even determine where to look for what was available.

And Gass goes on to say that:

We feel that a fundamental component of public accountability is that the general public should have a clear understanding of the structure of government and how services are (being) delivered within that structure.

And, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this budget and the activities behind it are going to bring about that particular change so at least the public can understand what's going on.

Now the second item I'd like to bring up is a small item that refers to the mismanagement that was going on under

the previous administration — the waste. And it's not a very big item but I think that it demonstrates in a manner what was taking place.

In the Turtleford constituency there was a rural service centre that was opened in the community of Turtleford. Not a major expenditure by any means; it was part of the municipal building in Turtleford. But this building had three official programs carried about with it. The first one was when the sod turning took place. And the premier was out there with part of the program that took place.

**An Hon. Member:** — The former premier.

**Mr. Johnson:** — The former premier, that's correct. Followed then, when it was completed, there was an official opening and again the premier was in the town of Turtleford at the official opening. And it seemed as if that would be the end of it. The amount being spent on the opening was probably as much as the whole building by then.

But there was a need for the former premier to come back into the Turtleford constituency and they had done so little in that constituency that they had to dedicate the same building, and they had the whole thing set up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you could account for all the costs in those three media activities, I think that they would probably have cost more than the building itself. The member for Shaunavon has detailed a large number of those particular type of examples.

But I'd also like to talk about one item that occurred at relatively the same time, and that was a project that drained Englishman River, or the lake at Turtleford, the Englishman Lake down the Englishman River. And for the last three years the river has been dry — first time in the memory of the people around there that the river didn't flow — and the reason for that is that the whole water system has been disturbed by the project that occurred there.

Now the premier was there with the Governor of Kansas in making this development and bringing about the opening of this . . . or the start of this project. But I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there was no premier there to look at the salt flat that occurred when it was drained off, a fiasco just opposite to what has occurred at Rafferty.

And, Mr. Speaker, both those items, although small, indicate what the problems were. And, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the motion on the budget and because there are other members that might like to speak, I will take my seat.

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

**Mr. Draper:** — Mr. Speaker, it looks as though I'm going to get the last word in this debate and I have to say that it causes me great distress to rise and speak in support of this budget. Frankly, I don't like it. And I don't think any of my colleagues find it palatable. And I know that the Minister of Finance and the cabinet find it equally distasteful.

Our distress is only exceeded by the anger we feel at

being forced into bringing down a budget like this. Our anger is at the opposition, who when in government, caused a disastrous situation that we find ourselves in today. Many of them crawled into the bushes before the election was held. A fortunate few were able to get lucrative jobs as payments for their infamy. The rump that is left are gritting their teeth, awaiting their Senate seats or other sinecures. Then they can safely leave the opposition in the hands of the member for Saskatoon Greystone, their lady-in-waiting, sir.

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

**Mr. Draper:** — We're getting a lot of complaints about sacking members of the civil service. But sir, we're over a barrel. We just can't win. Everybody shouts and screams that the bureaucracy is out of control, that government is bloated. We could save millions by cutting down on our feather-bedded staff. You must have heard that many times, we all have. So we do, sir. We cut back and do we get any thanks? No, sir, we don't. We're accused of being heartless, snatching the bread out of the mouths of a man, his wife and his 2.4 children.

It's a catch 22 situation, sir. And the crocodile tears that are shed by the opposition, it makes me think of the time when they sacked all the school-based dental hygienists, sir. That was maybe different. What was it — 400? Who cares now. They've all left the province anyway. And do you remember, sir, the road maintenance crews. They were not fired but just given the opportunity to join the private sector. What mellifluous phrases they gave us then.

In 1982, sir, the PCs' campaign was the promise to eliminate the education and health tax and to reduce income tax by 10 per cent. They had to raise both, sir, because they frittered away the province's wealth. The odd thing is, sir, is that we are having to raise both the same taxes and for exactly the same reason. Because the PCs have frittered away our inheritance. What a coincidence, don't you think. Otherwise we're going to end up in the hands of the loan sharks for ever if we keep on the way that they did.

You know what a loan shark is, sir. I've experience from my own. I won't go into the story now, but eventually what happens is you end up paying no capital on your debt because you have in today's province, a cash flow problem. So you just pay off the interest, then something on to what . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order.

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

**The Speaker:** — I wish to bring to the attention of the hon. members, rule 14(3), which reads as follows:

On the fifth day of the said days, at thirty minutes before the ordinary time of daily adjournment, unless the debate be previously concluded, the Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings and, after allowing twenty minutes for the mover of the Budget motion to exercise his right to close the debate, shall forthwith put every question

necessary to dispose of the main motion.

I have thus interrupted the debate, and I call upon the Minister of Finance.

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

(2130)

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my honour and privilege to close the debate on this budget address. I say it's my honour, Mr. Speaker, because it is a budget which I can say shows leadership and sets direction for the future security of this province.

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

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — It is my privilege because the constituents of Regina Dewdney gave me this opportunity to do this by supporting me in the election last October.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I found this debate very informative and very instructive. I listened to all the members on the government side of the House, the New Democratic Party members. And I heard the members on the government speak with vision, with conviction, with a determination to do the kinds of things that happened in this province in 1944. To show the leadership and the courage that it's going to take and that it's taking to take a province that is on the verge of bankruptcy, created by the members opposite, and provide some hope and opportunity for the future generations of this province that are yet to come.

And then I listened to the members of the opposition — the Liberal and the Conservatives. And, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to say much about what the Liberal member had to say because the Liberal member, other than saying a lot of words, simply showed a new transformation to becoming a partisan politician. But that's about all. I listened to the Conservative members, Mr. Speaker, and I want to spend a little while rebutting some of what they had to say.

This evening I listened to the member from Arm River and he was talking about on whose back is bringing the recovery of this province taking place. And I'm proud to say, Mr. Speaker, that this budget does a lot of things that are important but one of the important things that it does is that it makes sure that it's fair, it's equitable, and everybody in all sectors of our society has to share in what we have to do here today.

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

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — But I can tell the member from Arm River, or I wish he could tell this House and the public of Saskatchewan, on who's back their \$15 billion debt is resting, Mr. Speaker. Their \$15 billion debt which they created, most of it in the last 10 years, is resting on every man, woman, and child of Saskatchewan today and for years to come and those yet who have not been born.

And I want to tell the member from Arm River that he better get used to something. I hear him complaining about us reminding the members opposite what they did

to this province for the last 10 years. And in case he has any doubt let me tell him this, that he will hear that day after day after day because the people of Saskatchewan know what they did to this province and even when we stop talking about it they will remember for years and years to come and the Conservative Party will never see the sight of power in Saskatchewan for more years than most of us have yet to live on this earth.

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

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Why can't Saskatchewan do today, why can't this government do today some of the things that we all would like to see done? Well it can't be done, Mr. Speaker, because the member from Rosthern and the member from Thunder Creek and the member from Estevan and the member from Arm River came to power in 1982 and they inherited a prosperous province with a surplus, Mr. Speaker, of \$139 million. And they took that \$139 million surplus, Mr. Speaker, and in 10 years, with waste and mismanagement, converted it into a \$15 billion debt. That's why there are some restrictions that we have today, Mr. Speaker, on the things that we would like to do.

Now I've spent the last six months, Mr. Speaker, as all of my colleagues have, looking at all of the things that happened in that decade. And I spent that time trying to figure out what it was that motivated that government in the '80s, the government of the member from Estevan, the former premier. What motivated them to create deficit after deficit after deficit? What motivated them to spend each and every year more than they had in revenues?

Well as I listen to this debate, Mr. Speaker, and heard what they had to say, it became obvious that they never had a vision. That they were not motivated by any kind of vision about what the future of this province ought to look like. Instead, Mr. Speaker, they looked at every little issue, every little problem that came along, and they decided that the only way to solve it was to throw money at it.

And what's the result? Well it's obvious. The thing that to note, Mr. Speaker, is that it wasn't their money. They were looking after themselves and they were looking after their friends. And it was easy to do because it wasn't their money. It was the money that belonged to the people of Saskatchewan and all that their interests were, were for a short time — use it to benefit themselves and benefit their friends, not caring about the future of this province.

All it took is somebody to come along with a brief-case and open it up and ask for money and they filled it. The member from Regina Victoria said it was a 10-year Monopoly game, and I think that's a pretty good description because it was just a game for the members opposite. It wasn't a sense of responsibility. It was a good time for a short time without any regard for what the future holds.

Oh yes, you know, there was the Bob Andrews and the Graham Taylors and the Mr. Berntsons and the George Hills and the Gary Lanes and all of the others. They benefitted from all this money being spent. The people involved in GigaText, they ran away with millions, or the Joytects or the Supercarts. They just came and they asked

for money and they had a proposal and the members opposite gave them the money.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the public interest and the taxpayers' interest was never, at any time, of any importance under that system. They were irresponsible, and now we have the burden that we have to look after because of that.

Mr. Speaker, six months ago the public said that their mismanagement, which they created, had to come to an end and there was a devastating defeat for the Conservative Party in that election. But have they learned? Have they learned from that? Have they learned from that?

That's the other instructive thing about debate, Mr. Speaker. They have not learned one single thing because in this debate, time after time and hour after hour, all they did was stand up and defend all that mismanagement and everything else that they did during those 10 years.

Now the more interesting thing that I heard, Mr. Speaker, in question period and in the debate, was the members admit that they created the mess. I heard the member from Thunder Creek admit that they created this financial mess.

And then the interesting thing of even more irony was that they had a complaint. And their complaint was that the opposition of the day should have known about it. And somehow the financial crisis that we face is the fault of the opposition of the day because we didn't stop them. Now, Mr. Speaker, that says a lot about the members opposite when they were in government.

Well who knew about it, Mr. Speaker? The Provincial Auditor said a few years ago, 1988, March 31, in his report, he said that he could not account for 50 per cent of the public spending because the members opposite wouldn't provide that information to him. The Ernst & Young commission which reported on the Crown Management Board said, that the members opposite hid \$312 million of their deficit by forcing the Crown corporations to borrow the money even when they didn't have any net income so that they could pay a dividend to the treasury, so they would hide their deficit.

The Gass Commission said, Mr. Speaker, I made a whole list of all of the transactions which were wrong and created even a greater financial crisis in Saskatchewan. They admitted that they created the financial mess, Mr. Speaker. And what's their solution? Their proposals? More of the same. They say, spend more, don't get any more revenues, borrow more money. And somehow that is going to solve our problem.

Now they claim, Mr. Speaker, that they have an interest and are the defenders of agriculture . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, listen to that, Mr. Speaker. I listened to the member from Arm River and other members, but the one thing that comes back time and time again, is when that they had the opportunity to show their commitment and support for agriculture and vote for the motion in this House to urge the federal government to come through with their commitment for the \$500 million of third line of defence which they promised, they

stood up in their place and they voted against that motion.

That is not a commitment, Mr. Speaker. Nothing has been learned. The lesson of a massive election defeat and the rejection has not taught them nothing. It seems to me it takes a very special kind of arrogance to defend their actions in the face of what happened in that last October.

Now, a journalist, Mr. Speaker, said it very well, Mr. Eisler wrote on May 2 in 1992 when he too, as well as others, listened to the comments of the members opposite, and he said the following:

It is deeply offensive to hear the Opposition Tories attempt to deflect attention from the scandalous way they treated the public purse during almost a decade in power.

They seem not the slightest bit contrite over the fiscal mess that the province now finds itself. It's as if they had nothing to be ashamed about, or repentant for.

Such a defence is unacceptable on political, fiscal and — more importantly — moral grounds. The facts are that while the Devine Tories were in power people in government engaged in practices with public funds that at times were despicable and, in some cases, perhaps criminal.

Mr. Speaker, that's the legacy that during this debate the members opposite defended for the last five days. They have learned nothing. I won't repeat the comments made by my colleagues in the House today about the *Special Report of the Provincial Auditor*, April 21, 1992.

The list goes on and on about the mis-expenditure of funds, about people hired and paid for but nobody knows what they were doing. About people that the former government had in the premier's office and spent about \$5 million on their salaries, working out of other departments when in fact working for the premier but paid for the other departments.

I want to contrast, Mr. Speaker, that kind of an approach to government with the approach of this government which is reflected in this budget. Because this budget indicated that rather than serving themselves, as the members opposite did, this government is setting an example. And that's why cabinet ministers' salaries have been cut by 5 per cent. And that's why extra pay for legislative secretary positions has been eliminated. And that's why allowances for government members with extra duties have been reduced. And that's why communication allowances for MLAs have been cut by 25 per cent, and the out-of-scope employees of the government salaries have been frozen, Mr. Speaker.

Advertising has been cut by 30 per cent because we no longer . . . the members opposite rewarded one or two advertising agencies. And whether advertising was needed or not, they pushed money towards them because they were Tory advertising agencies. And the list goes on.

Now I ask the public of Saskatchewan to contrast that kind of example, Mr. Speaker, with the example that is set

out in the report, special report of the Provincial Auditor of April 21, 1992, Mr. Speaker. And I'm sure that everyone will admit that things have indeed changed in Saskatchewan.

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

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Speaker, this budget is here for all to see. And as members have said on this side of the House, yes, there are some tough decisions that have been made. But it's a turning point in the history of this province. It's a turning point away from waste and mismanagement, and it's turning to honesty, to openness, and to accountability in government.

The choices we had to make were made necessary because of what the members opposite did to this province. But I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that one day soon we will be able to tell our children and our grandchildren how we joined together and we made the tough decisions, and we secured their future in the province for them, Mr. Speaker.

(2145)

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

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — And they will be the most important judges, I am convinced, of this budget and the future budgets of this government.

But there are some people who are passing judgement today, Mr. Speaker. I met today with the investment dealers of Canada, and they left with me their economic outlook for Saskatchewan. And you know what they said? And this is since the budget, Mr. Speaker. They said that after a decade of set-backs, prospects for Saskatchewan are now brightening.

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

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — After a decade of set-backs, prospects for Saskatchewan are now brightening. Mr. Speaker, this budget is being recognized by the people of Saskatchewan as a budget that corrects all of the errors and mistakes and mismanagement of the members opposite, and begins to turn this province around to economic prosperity so that we once again can rebuild Saskatchewan away from the destructive policies that the members opposite had instituted.

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

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — I listened to the member from Thunder Creek, who was the first one to speak in this debate, and he spoke about economic development. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to comment about economic development. And let me just quote from the Gass Commission, the report to the Saskatchewan Financial Management Review Commission which was provided in February. And here is what he had to say about this government's approach to economic development and public spending. And he said the following:

We identified transactions where members of the cabinet were involved directly in the negotiations

did not appear to have received or have requested detailed analysis of the alternatives that were being discussed. And because they are custodians of the public purse, all members of the government have a responsibility to the taxpayers to ensure that financial decisions are being made in a prudent and responsible manner.

That kind of an approach, Mr. Speaker, is what led us to where we are today. That wasn't economic development. That was waste. That was mismanagement. That was rewarding a few who were close to the Conservative Party at the expense of existing people in Saskatchewan and at the expense of future generations. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, we have rejected that approach and the policies of this government are and will be in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan.

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

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Speaker, this budget is founded on fiscal responsibility, on public accountability, on fairness, compassion, and economic reality. It begins the process back to recovery and back to rebuilding Saskatchewan. But I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that we can look forward to the day when we can tell our children that though we entered the 1990s plagued by financial crisis, we made the difficult decisions. We turned a new page in our history and put this province firmly on the path to prosperity.

That's why I'm proud of the members of the New Democratic Party who spoke in this debate because they support that approach. And that's why I'm proud of being able to not only have introduced this budget but today stand up in this place at my chair and say that I will support the budget because it's the right thing to do for the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

**Mr. Swenson:** — Mr. Speaker, during the Finance minister's delivery to the House tonight, he quoted from a document delivered by the investments dealers of Canada to him today. And I wondered if he would table that document in the House because he did quote from it in his financial analysis.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Speaker, I would be more than pleased to table that document. It was made public today by the investment dealers and for the benefit of the member so he can learn from it, I will table it in the House.

**The Speaker:** — Order.

Amendment negatived.

The division bells rang from 9:52 p.m. until 9:59 p.m.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 39**

Van Mulligen

Hamilton



Thompson	Johnson
Wiens	Trew
Simard	Draper
Tchorzewski	Serby
Lingenfelter	Sonntag
Teichrob	Flavel
Shillington	Cline
Koskie	McPherson
Goulet	Wormsbecker
Solomon	Kujawa
Kowalsky	Crofford
Penner	Stanger
Cunningham	Knezacek
Upshall	Harper
Bradley	Keeping
Koenker	Renaud
Lorje	Langford
Lautermilch	Jess
Calvert	

**Nays — 9**

Muirhead	Britton
Neudorf	Toth
Swenson	Goohsen
Boyd	D'Autremont
Martens	

**COMMITTEE OF FINANCE**

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:05 p.m.