

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Saxinger:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, some guests seated in your gallery, two students from the University of Munich, West Germany. They are here as last year's industrial engineers. They would like to learn some of our technology here in Saskatchewan. And with your permission I would like to welcome them in German.

(The hon. member spoke for a time in German.)

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the members to welcome these two fellows from Germany.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wolfe:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to all members of the Assembly, some special visitors from the United States. Mr. and Mrs. Gary Olsen are here from Bozeman in our neighbouring state of Montana. They are seated in the Speaker's gallery, I believe.

As a result of an expressed interest in the visit of their royal highnesses, the Duke and Duchess of York, an invitation was extended by the Prime Minister of Canada to Gary and Lauri Olsen to attend the federal picnic in Swift Current in honour of the royal couple. The Premier also invited Mr. and Mrs. Olsen to the western barbecue in Saskatoon honouring the royal couple, which they attended last evening.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the fact that Gary and Lauri Olsen joined with Saskatchewan people in greeting the Duke and Duchess of York is symbolic of the friendship that exists between Canada and the United States. As I understand it, Gary's great uncle, William Phillips was the first American Ambassador to the Dominion of Canada. He was appointed in 1927.

I ask the Assembly to welcome Mr. and Mrs. Gary Olsen to Saskatchewan.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Report on GigaText

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Premier and of the Deputy Premier, I will address my question to the Acting Premier, I will address my question to the Acting Premier. And I would like to know . . . Mr. Minister, it's long past the deadline of June 17 for the assessment of Gigamess, and the Minister of Justice is now past his self-imposed deadline of last Friday to comment on the RCMP investigation, it seems that this government has now made a political decision to try and avoid the issue until the session is over and you're out

from the legislative scrutiny. I want to say that's not a tact that a responsible government would take.

Will you today set deadlines that by the end of this week you will present all of the relevant information on Gigamess so that the people of this province can judge; and failing that, would you offer the resignation of the Deputy Premier because of his incompetence in this matter?

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

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Speaker, I'll take notice of that rather stupid question.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I'd just like to bring to the hon. member's attention that those kinds of remarks really don't add to question period. I'd like to ask him to keep that in mind.

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — New question, Mr. Minister. We've already seen that your colleague, the member from Rosetown, is chased out of politics because of his mishandling of the Rafferty mess, and we want to see the Deputy Premier take the same route when he finally admits that he's messed up on Gigamess.

Mr. Minister, the Deputy Premier hired these experts, and surely, as the employer, he can tell them when to report and he can tell them when they should be bringing this report to the people of this province. His expertise in cutting these deals is pretty clear, I think, by now. If he's foolish enough to hire these experts to evaluate the company, knowing full well these experts would take off out of the country, that tells us just how . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Does the member have a question, or is he making a speech? Would you get to the question now.

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — My question is: while we're waiting for these experts to report, why won't he take these reports that he knows he's got and show the people of this province that he's not trying to hide anything?

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

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Speaker, hon. members have been serving in this Assembly since 1905 and they have decided to not serve longer for different reasons. They run from, in some cases, in most cases, the wishes of the public to their own personal reasons.

The hon. member wants to attack the member from Rosetown-Elrose. That's his choice. I think that indicates, as the people of Prince Albert fully know, of the type of member that they elected, and many of them are now having regrets. So having said that, Mr. Speaker, again I classify the ultimate question he got to, after much debate, Mr. Speaker, as just as foolish as the first one.

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

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — New question to the same minister. Mr. Minister, recently in Saskatoon, in the Saskatoon

*Star-Phoenix*, the vice-president of SEDCO and GigaText board member, Leo Larsen, is quoted as saying that by the end of that week — that's the beginning of July — GigaText board would meet to determine its future and that he expected that funds would go on for several months more. If that's the case, can you tell this House that you have not yet made a decision on GigaText's future? What's the status of it, Mr. Minister?

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

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Speaker, I believe that the minister responsible has indicated that there is some review, and I'll take notice of the question, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — New question to the same minister. Mr. Minister, Mr. Larsen also stated — and you might want to take notice of this as well — but he said it's quite possible that further capital spending could be involved, and I want to quote. He says they might need another piece of software . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. If the member continues the line of questioning that he is, he is seeking further information. They are not new questions and the minister had indicated he's taken notice. If you wish him to come back with further information, state that, and there are no preambles allowed, no preambles allowed. Just state the required information you require.

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — Well new question. Mr. Speaker, my question is . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. A new question because you say so, sir, doesn't make it a new question. The minister has taken notice. Any further questions related to that, you are seeking further information, and I'd like you to couch it in those terms.

#### Funding for GigaText

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Finance, a new question. I will ask if he would give this House the assurance that today you won't put one more government dollar into this company until it's proven its worth, and not just to your political satisfaction and to serve your political needs. Will you give this House a commitment that you won't put another nickel into GigaText until it's proven that it's a viable operation?

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

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Speaker, I believe that the minister responsible has indicated that the review is going on and that it would take some time. I can't give any more information than that. And as to how long a time that review will be, Mr. Speaker, I've already indicated my position on this. I do indicate to the hon. member that any losses, if there are any on GigaText, will be considerably less than your foray into Nabu where you dumped Saskatchewan's money into an Ottawa company with your eyes open, with your so-called economic geniuses that ran your government, putting money, Mr. Speaker, into a company that had no relationship to Saskatchewan whatsoever except for the New Democratic Party. So I suggest to the hon. member as to the time for review that

I've already answered now, I think on three occasions, that the hon. member, minister responsible would take it, and I would take notice.

**The Speaker:** — Order. The member from North Battleford is sitting in his desk and is questioning the authority of the Chair. We have discussed this before and it is not acceptable. I ask the member for The Battlefords to arise and apologize.

**Mr. Anguish:** — I apologize.

**The Speaker:** — That's very good.

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — A new question to the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance talks about fiscal responsibility, the minister who misled the people of this province by \$800 million when he delivered a budget, a pre-election budget to this House. Mr. Minister of Finance, I want to know how long the people of this province have to go on paying and listening to your feeble, stupid excuses while you do everything you can to avoid taking . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. We're not off to a very good start today. I have just brought to the attention of the Minister of Finance earlier that those types of remarks, personal remarks, stupid questions, stupid excuses, are not acceptable, and they're not parliamentary, and now I'm bringing it to your attention. And certainly the hon. members will adhere to those very basic rules.

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — My question, Mr. Speaker, is pretty clear to the Minister of Finance, the minister who misled this House by \$800 million, who misled the people of this province by \$800 million prior to a budget. And my question is this: I want to know how long you're going to expect the people of this province to go on watching you throw money foolishly into a ridiculous situation where you've already lost all of \$5 million of taxpayers' money on the Gigamess scandal. How long do they have to watch you continue this, Mr. Minister?

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

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — The question, of course, Mr. Speaker, is not different than the original ones, and again the appropriate ministers have indicated as to the review, and I'll take notice, Mr. Speaker.

#### Proposed Federal Sales Tax

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the Premier, the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Consumer Affairs, and I suppose, given . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. The member for Regina Centre, of course, who's been in this House for some time and knows that what he is doing is against the rules of the House, and I would like — order, order — and I'd like to ask him to acknowledge that as he puts his question.

**Mr. Shillington:** — To the Minister of Finance then who is present, I will . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order, order. I'd like the member for Regina Centre to acknowledge that the preamble to his original question was out of order.

**Mr. Shillington:** — I acknowledge that the preamble to my question violated the rules, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister of Finance, who . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No I acknowledge, Mr. Minister, that you are present and my question is to you, Mr. Minister, it has to do with the ever-widening circle of people who are protesting the federal sales tax. To consumers, farmers and business people, we now add the voice of economists who described the effect of the tax on inflation as an inflationary shock. They talk about two or three percentage points being added to the inflation rate in this country.

Mr. Minister, to date you and the Premier have gone to great lengths to avoid taking any stand on the issue of the federal sales tax. I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you'd like to avoid being the last person in the province to protest it, if you'd like to now add your voice to the others if you'd like to stand up for Saskatchewan and tell the federal government that this federal sales tax should not proceed.

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

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Well to the hon. member, and in the absence of the Leader of the Opposition, the deputy leader of the opposition, the member from . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order, order. I think the Minister of Finance should do the same, acknowledge that he's breaking the rules of the House, and I think we should get down to question period. And we're not off to a good start, and perhaps we can start here.

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — I apologize. And in the absence, Mr. Speaker, of a new question from the hon. member on this particular matter, I just restate: our position hasn't changed.

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

**Mr. Shillington:** — The difficulty, Mr. Minister, is that you've never stated your position, Mr. Minister, that's what we're asking you to do, is to take a strongly worded message to Ottawa that this federal sales tax is going to cause very serious problems in Saskatchewan.

Will you, Mr. Minister, take that message to Ottawa?

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

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, we've stated the position of the government before, and we have very, very serious concerns about several aspects of the national sales tax or the goods and services tax. We've indicated that on several different occasions.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the government's position on this, and we are awaiting the detailed paper, we do note and the public has begun to note the position of the New Democratic Party of being in favour of the national sales tax; that if there is to be a national sales tax, make sure that there be one tax.

So the NDP are taking a rather strange position on this, Mr. Speaker, saying if there be a tax there be one tax. In other words, they want to hop right into bed with the goods and services tax and have only one tax in the province. I suggest to the hon. member that he would be wise to accept the government's position that we will await the details of the tax.

**Mr. Shillington:** — New question, Mr. Minister, your statement that the government has some concerns about some aspects of the tax falls well short of a condemnation of this tax which the public of Saskatchewan would like to see emanating from this government.

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

**Mr. Shillington:** — And the clear suggestion is, Mr. Minister, that you ought to climb out of the hip pocket of Brian Mulroney and make a definitive statement on this tax. Will you do that, Mr. Minister? Will you make a clear, unequivocal statement that this tax should not proceed?

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

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Speaker, I think that the wise course of governing is to await the details of the tax. For the hon. member to say that all Saskatchewan people are opposed to the tax is not at all accurate, Mr. Speaker. I've met with the retail council, and it's interesting that the hon. member when he called for one tax was talking about the support for the goods and the services tax from the Retail Council of Canada. I suggest that what the Consumers' Association of Canada says, Mr. Speaker, which is that if there is to be a goods and services tax that it be very, very broadly based.

And, Mr. Speaker, for him to take the absolute position that everybody is opposed to it is not . . . wrong. We've indicated some sectors of the Saskatchewan economy do benefit by the change in the tax — the resource sector benefits, the manufacturing sector benefits. So to say that everybody is hurt is not quite correct.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, for the information of the hon. member, that any other jurisdiction that has brought in a value added or an equivalent to a value added tax the inflationary period has been one of approximately six months, and I gather that has been uniform in virtually every jurisdiction. So it certainly would be a factor, Mr. Speaker, of such a tax.

#### Accreditation of Private Schools

**The Speaker:** — Order, order.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education. Mr. Minister, I'm sure that you are aware that another private school in Saskatoon, the Victory Manor Training Centre, has come under fire for providing inadequate education. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the newspapers report that this particular school has no class-rooms, it doesn't have any offices, there's no organization, they only have one textbook, and, Mr. Minister, it has been accredited by your department.

Mr. Minister, my question to you is this: what criteria do you use in accrediting these private schools so that our students, particularly those, Mr. Minister, who cannot even read or write, are not going to be ripped off by these people? Would you mind telling this Assembly what criteria you use for accrediting these schools?

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

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has raised an unfortunate issue surrounding Victory Manor Training school. He asks about what criteria we use to accredit these schools. The reality is, schools such as Victory Manor Training school are classified as private religious schools, Mr. Speaker, and as such are not monitored by any provincial agency. And that may well be a loophole in our regulations that we want to look at, and indeed officials in the department are looking at it.

The more correct observation about this school is that it is designated for student loans, and that's based on criterion that are set out under the Canada student loans program, Mr. Speaker.

Of course the dilemma here once again is we have a lot of very fine private religious schools, and I could talk about schools like Briercrest Bible College that fall in that category that have been designated, I think even perhaps when your administration was in government, Mr. Speaker, who are very worthy institutions and whose students probably deserve to have the opportunity to apply for a student loan.

Certainly we're well aware of the school that you raise and the problem that exists there. For whatever reason, there are no regulations that cover private religious schools, but it's something that my officials have turned their heads to, Mr. Speaker, so that no students . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — New question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, it is simply a shocking statement that you're making that you have no criteria laid down for these schools. Now you say they are religious schools and therefore there might be a loophole. Bridge City College was not a religious school and you gave over a million dollars through your department and the federal student loans — over a million dollars to Bridge City College. That was not a religious school and yet a lot of our students were ripped off.

Mr. Minister, my question to you is, today, how much money, how many student loans . . . how much student loan money has gone to Victory Manor Training Centre through student aids. Because you have had no guide-lines, these students receive no education, but the school has received student loans. Can you tell the House today how much, how much student loan have gone to Victory Manor training school today?

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Speaker, the institutions, this institution does not receive the student loan, nor does it receive operating grants from this government. The more correct statement would be that students receive the

student loans, and I think there has been something in the order of seven students that have received student loans there, Mr. Speaker.

Having said all that, I don't know whether it matters whether the number is seven or 700. If there are some regulatory loopholes here, Mr. Speaker, that need to be addressed; we're prepared to address them.

And I think the hon. member would be doing a disservice to the public and to private vocational schools and to private religious schools to lump Bridge City in the same category as Victory Manor because they are quite two separate categories, Mr. Speaker. I would want to make that point clear.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Mr. Minister, you were the one that said that there was a loophole for religious schools. Yet when we did your estimates, there seemed to be a loophole on Bridge City College. That's not a religious school. What I'm trying to tell you is that your guide-lines simply do not protect these students. They are taken into these schools; you give the students loans for these schools and Bridge City College to the tune of \$1 million.

I say this is just the tip of the iceberg. Is that maybe the reason why the student aid annual report has not been tabled? Because we have all this money going to these private schools and you cannot justify that this money is given to these private schools? Mr. Minister, will you give assurance today to this House that you will no longer accredit any more private schools until you have a set of guide-lines in place so that our students will not be ripped off? Will you do that today?

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

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member didn't hear what I said earlier; we do not accredit private religious schools to start with. If there is a case to be made for perhaps some accreditation process or regulatory process, I've already stated that my officials are looking at that, Mr. Speaker.

Secondly, there are . . . I think last year there were something in the order of 17,000 student loans — 300 per cent more than what was given under the NDP administration — because we want to help students all across Saskatchewan have a post-secondary . . . opportunity of post-secondary education, Mr. Speaker. I'm not suggesting for a moment that we . . . I mean, there's a reason that we have an audit section is because probably there are some loans there that deserve some special attention. I don't like it any better than any student or any parent across this province when students have unfair or improper treatment. We have officials in place to act on those, and acting on them they are, Mr. Speaker.

### Help to Tornado Victims

**Mr. Anguish:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question through you to the Minister of Finance. And the Minister of Finance will know that it's been over two weeks now since the disaster in the Cut Knife-Poundmaker area of a tornado, and it's been more than a week since disaster struck the Peebles area. And

we've got headlines that say: Devine pledges help for Cut Knife area; storm payments could be in millions; farmers will be compensated; quick relief vital to victims. And this is turning into just like your drought payment that you announced, and a year later there's still no payment to farmers.

Can you tell us today when you intend to announce your plans as to how you're actually going to help the tornado victims and not just do more grandstanding for photo opportunities?

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

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Let me remind the member from The Battlefords something that the farmers of Saskatchewan have not forgotten — and it's not a matter of grandstanding, Mr. Speaker — the payments from the federal government have been made to date and the drought payment has been promised for July, and I gather we will get it in July or early August. I gather the latest date, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers of this province know that they have received far more money from Conservative governments than they ever did from NDP government, Mr. Speaker, and they're far more optimistic that they will get those payments. The only thing that they are beginning to remember and remember very, very clearly, Mr. Speaker . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I believe the minster's off the topic.

**Mr. Anguish:** — I have a new question to the same minister. Now it's very clear that the media reports there should be contributions up to \$5,000 which the member from Cut Knife-Lloyd says they're too low. So I wonder if the local MLAs have been consulted in this. We think that not just the member from Rosetown-Elrose should be resigning, other members are involved in GigaText and agriculture and the lack of payments should also be resigning from a government that's gone astray with people's tax dollars.

The question to you is; you've made an announcement that you're going to help the tornado victims; we'd like to know when you're going to help the tornado victims, in what amount, what guide-lines do you have so people know whether or not, Mr. Speaker, they're going to receive disaster assistance in these very trying times after suffering a disaster in those areas?

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

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Speaker, just so that the hon. member may recall, the guide-lines were established some several years back and they've already been communicated to the municipalities, and I believe five municipalities have now been ruled eligible for the disaster assistance, and we expect application from a couple of others.

But when the hon. member talks about resigning, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see him put himself up to a vote of his own chamber of commerce in his own city that have rejected him, Mr. Speaker, as being the one who drives businesses away from his own home town, Mr. Speaker.

The member from North Battleford has driven more businesses away from his own home town, more jobs away, Mr. Speaker, and we know what the people of North Battleford think about the member from the Battlefords.

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

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### MOTION UNDER RULE 16

#### Disregard for the Principles of Parliamentary Democracy

**Ms. Simard:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, on the conclusion of my remarks I will be moving the following motion:

That this Assembly condemns the Government of Saskatchewan for its blatant disregard for the principles of parliamentary democracy, particularly with respect to its treatment of the Provincial Auditor and other officers of the legislature; its approach to changing the rules of the Legislative Assembly; its proposed constituency boundary changes; its failure to table documents in a timely way; its SPMC security service; and its pursuit of a privatization agenda without a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan.

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

**Ms. Simard:** — Mr. Speaker, this government has broken faith and has broken trust with Saskatchewan people. We have witnessed the government repeatedly breaking promises that it made during the 1986 election and on other occasions.

In 1986, Mr. Speaker, this government was granted a majority: it was granted majority power to make decisions on behalf of all people in the province of Saskatchewan in a fair and democratic way, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of all people in the province. The majority government is a privilege of trust, and this trust, Mr. Speaker, has been breached. And this government has not made decisions in a fair way and in a democratic way. They have abused the privilege of trust. They have abused the privilege of trust that was put in them by the people of the province of Saskatchewan in 1986 when they were elected to govern on behalf of the people, for the benefit of the people in a fair and democratic way.

We have witnessed this government repeatedly being unable to tolerate any dissent with respect to their objectives or their opinions or their agenda. They are in effect, Mr. Speaker, drunk with their own power.

They have their own agenda and it is not the agenda of the people of Saskatchewan. It is their own agenda, Mr. Speaker, and it has nothing to do with what they said during the 1986 election. It has nothing to do with the people of the province and does not benefit the people of the province. And their agenda, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is their right-wing ideology, an ideology that's gone wild

and that they want to implement at any expense, including the sell-off of our heritage and the heritage of our children and our grandchildren.

They are so desperate to maintain power, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to maintain power and control, that they are prepared to do anything. But a majority government has a moral obligation to use its power in a way that represents and is for the benefit of all groups within the province and within the population. They must consider the needs of people, and they must tailor their policies to meet the needs of people and to support them.

But instead, what we've seen them implement is a "might makes right" philosophy. They show no concern or regard for people that disagree with their ideas, and we have seen repeated examples of that.

We only have to hearken back to how the Ombudsman was treated, to how the Legislative Counsel was treated, and most recently in this session, as to how the Provincial Auditor was treated, just to show you a few small examples of how this government cannot tolerate people who do not agree with their ideas or people who are critical of them.

It is a might-makes-right philosophy that this government is engaged in and that this government follows in governing the province of Saskatchewan. And that is totally alien to the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Deputy Speaker — totally alien, because Saskatchewan people have worked in a co-operative manner throughout history. They have worked together to build this great province, and it hasn't been a tyranny of government in the past, Mr. Speaker.

They show no regard, as I indicated, for people that disagree with their ideas. I pointed to the Ombudsman, the Legislative Counsel, the attack — the unprecedented attack — on the Provincial Auditor.

And the reason why they're prepared to go to these extremes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is because they have their own agenda, and it is not the agenda of the people. It is not the agenda of a democratic government. It is not the agenda of co-operation, working together to build a province for the benefit of all. Instead, it's a right-wing ideological agenda that is abusive and runs roughshod over the people of Saskatchewan, and it is getting more and more difficult as they try to continue to maintain their agenda. And they hurt more and more people.

And let's just take a look, for example, at their proposed changes to electoral boundaries. This government, rather than going with a totally independent body that was already enshrined in legislation, they chose to remove the independence of their electoral boundaries commission, and they restricted the mandate of the commission, Mr. Speaker, by legislating a restriction on the number of allowed seats per region, regardless of population.

In order to enforce the required number of seats, they needed to increase the allowed variation between constituencies from 15 to 25 per cent. In other words, it could be a total of 50 per cent, but from 15 to 25 per cent, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

These proposed changes, are they going to benefit the people of the province of Saskatchewan? No, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they are for the benefit and only for the benefit of the PC Party, and they do not improve representation; they only put into law a political advantage in their favour, to maintain power.

And we've seen this government become amazingly unpopular in this province because of their policies and their practices. What is their plan? Amazingly unpopular. One of the members over there shakes his head. Well obviously he hasn't been reading the polls of late or talking to the people in the country and in the cities.

So what is their plan? Is their plan to rethink their policies, rethink their practices? No, Mr. Deputy Speaker, not to rethink these policies that made them so unpopular to begin with. Oh, no. Their way to fix the situation is to legislate a gerrymander so they can win an election in spite of their unpopular practices. And with the gerrymander, they continue to force their own agenda on this province without having to be concerned about public opinion and how the people feel and what's good for the people.

And now with their gerrymander they feel they will be free to represent their own interests as opposed to representing the interests of the people of this province. This is not a democracy when governments engage in this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it becomes a tyranny.

And let's take a look at privatization and their agenda with respect to privatization. This government is continuing the forceful privatization of all provincial assets, and they have no mandate from the people of this province to privatize. Mr. Deputy Speaker, no mandate whatsoever. But none the less they continue on their privatization agenda regardless of what the people are saying to them, and regardless of the fact that the majority of people in this province do not wish them to be continuing on this privatization agenda in the manner in which they are doing.

And they've tried to limit public debate on the issue, and we only have to look at the Barber Commission, for example. The process with respect to the Barber Commission makes it almost impossible for an ordinary person to come forward and make a presentation to the Barber Commission. First of all, they had to be aware of the deadlines with respect to getting in a brief. Secondly, they have to be able to prepare a written brief, according to my understanding, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and that, as you know, and as any right-thinking person knows, precludes many people from coming forward and expressing their opinion.

They are not above, with respect to the privatization agenda, in engaging in illegal activities such as SaskEnergy offering shares without a prospectus. In spite of the fact that that's illegal, they are so bent on their privatization ideological agenda that they are prepared to engage in illegal activities. They refuse to listen to any arguments against privatization, and yet they are unwilling to submit any evidence to support their ideas, Mr. Speaker. They've not provided any positive evidence

that proves that privatization will accomplish any of the claims they say it will.

They are rushing into decisions without careful analysis of the consequences, and in their haste they are not making good decisions. They are privatizing as a matter of principle, solely as a matter of principle, Mr. Deputy Speaker, instead of honestly evaluating each case on an individual basis to determine both advantages and disadvantages.

And if they were truly concerned with the well-being of the people of Saskatchewan, why are they forcing privatization on us in the face of such overwhelming public opposition? Why the rush, Mr. Deputy Speaker? Well, the only possible explanation is that they don't want to publicly debate this issue fairly because it will not withstand close scrutiny and because they will then be side-tracked in their right-wing agenda to further their own interests and the interests of their friends, the interests of the Tory friends.

With respect to public documents, let's just examine what's happened in that regard. Amidst this push for privatization, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's more important than ever for the government to be prompt and forthcoming with all the information possible. How can reasonable judgements be made of a company's worth and of any advantages or disadvantages to selling if the proper information is withheld?

Further, how can it be fairly determined whether the government is making good economic decisions if they continually delay the release of public documents, and if once they are released they prevent the opposition from discussing their contents. But this is what has been happening, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This is what has been happening in this province.

And if they are proud of their spending record, Mr. Deputy Speaker, why don't they . . . why are they afraid to discuss it, and why don't they put this information forward before the public instead of withholding annual reports, for example. Why? I can only conclude that privatization and this withholding of information are related, because if they released the proper information, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they have no case at all for their right-wing ideology, for their privatization push and for their ideology which . . . their privatization agenda which they are prepared to enforce regardless of whether or not it is economically sound.

(1445)

And let's take a look at the Provincial Auditor scandal that occurred during this session, Mr. Speaker. In order to maintain power and in order to push through their privatization agenda, they found it necessary to avoid disclosing important expenditure information. And the auditor, being a conscientious protector of the public interest, criticized the government for withholding information, and the government responds with outrageous and unfounded attacks on the character and integrity of the public servant.

He's rewarded for his conscientious efforts by public

slander by this government. And that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is why I wished, along with many reasons that I have not had an opportunity to go into in this legislature this afternoon, but that is why I move:

That this Assembly condemns the Government of Saskatchewan for its blatant disregard for the principles of parliamentary democracy, particularly with respect to its treatment of the Provincial Auditor and other officers of the Legislature; its approach to changing the rules of the Legislative Assembly; its proposed constituency boundary changes; its failure to table documents in a timely way; its SPMC security service; and its pursuit of a privatization agenda without a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan.

Seconded by the member from Saskatoon Eastview.

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

**Mr. Pringle:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm pleased to second and to speak to this important motion as moved by my colleague from Regina Lakeview, and I commend her on her very thoughtful comments and on her very accurate comments as it relates to the erosion of democracy and democratic principles by this government in this Legislative Assembly.

My colleague from Regina Lakeview made some very significant points regarding this government's very scary record — very scary record. This record, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is becoming of increasing concern to many people in the province of Saskatchewan today. This government's broken trust with the people of Saskatchewan is of serious concern right across the province of Saskatchewan.

I wish to take a few minutes to briefly convey some of the concerns for this erosion of democracy in the province. And Mr. Speaker, there are so many examples to draw on that it is hard to limit the comments to a few minutes. But I suppose that the attack by the Minister of Justice on the Office of the Provincial Auditor stands in my mind as one of the greatest attacks on democracy, certainly that I've witnessed in the year and a half that I've been here.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are other actions that I will make some comment on as well that almost parallel this attack on the Provincial Auditor. Of course, as we know, the Minister of Justice has attacked the Provincial Auditor before. Every time the Provincial Auditor releases a report about the expenditures and the waste and mismanagement by this government, the attack by the government gets worse. And so this isn't the first time.

But the Provincial Auditor identified a number of very serious concerns, as you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And I'll just relate a couple of examples that I think are important to mention. One is the lack of co-operation by members of cabinet, by members of the Executive Council and senior executives with the Provincial Auditor's office. The Provincial Auditor highlights that.

Also, the withholding of information from the Provincial Auditor that he needed to do his job. Now the taxpayers of Saskatchewan expect the Provincial Auditor to monitor the expenditures of government, and there was information that the Provincial Auditor says that he was not able to access.

Another example, the dental equipment. Some of it was sold. The Provincial Auditor is not sure how much of it was, or where the money went, or where the remaining equipment was that wasn't sold.

SaskEnergy's refusal to release details on the sale of natural gas properties to Saskoil is another example that the Provincial Auditor expressed some concerns about, and rightly so.

But these are just a few examples, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And as you know, the report is a couple of hundred pages long, much of it focusing on the examples of waste and mismanagement, lack of co-operation by this government. But this is the tip of the iceberg.

And I suppose two statements that the Provincial Auditor makes that are extremely serious and critical, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where he says that the Government of Saskatchewan is standing in the way of him being able to do his job. Now that's a pretty serious allegation as perceived by the taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

And secondly, the Provincial Auditor says that the Government of Saskatchewan is breaking its own laws. Again this is an extremely serious situation where the Provincial Auditor would make that statement in writing.

So this report is unparalleled in its criticism of government expenditures, of government waste, of government mismanagement, and the lack of co-operation by the government. And perhaps more importantly, and I would suggest more importantly, the public personal attacks by the Minister of Justice, of all people, with the support of the Premier, I might add. And it's important to emphasize that, that the Premier only asked the ministers to co-operate after this issue became a political problem for him.

Well it's still a political problem for the Premier, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and this political problem, this lack of credibility on this particular issue will not go away for the Premier. The Saskatchewan citizens will not tolerate this kind of arrogance and deception, and they will not accept this kind of attack on the democratic office, on an office that reports to this Assembly. They will not accept this kind of attack, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The taxpayers of Saskatchewan expect their ministers, they expect their Premier and their government to spend their money wisely, and they expect the Provincial Auditor to be allowed to do his job.

Now this is the same government that attacked the provincial Ombudsman, as well, when his report was critical of the government. It's the "kill the messenger" or "fire the employee" mentality that's often employed by this government.

This government takes the view, and there are many

examples of this, that they are above scrutiny in this province. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would suggest that they are running out of time and that this is why there's a raft . . . there'll be a raft of our colleagues opposite not running next time, not seeking re-election, because I know that many back-benchers over there have too much integrity to be part of this kind of deceptive performance, and they simply are not going to continue to be part of a government that attacks the integrity of the democratic legislature in Saskatchewan.

Well the attack on the Provincial Auditor is just the tip of the iceberg, Mr. Deputy Speaker. There are many other undemocratic actions by this Premier's government and they deserve, as the motion says, the condemnation of this Assembly. As my colleague from Regina Lakeview mentioned, the sabotaging of the electoral boundaries process, the unilateral move to limit bell-ringing, a unilateral change to the rules of this House where again the government violated past traditions of rule changes being made by an all-party committee — this is the first time in Saskatchewan that a government has done this, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Their extending of sitting hours. Again, unilaterally extending sitting hours — another example of tyranny of the majority over the minority. In fact, this government has now contravened the agreement that we recently reached regarding rule changes by this unilateral move to extend sitting hours.

Another democratic action by this government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is a continuing late tabling of *Public Accounts* documents, the sabotaging of the public accounts process in committee — again unparalleled in this province. All these examples of erosions of democracy are unparalleled, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And that's the part that concerns the people of the province.

Secret privatization deals — Sask Minerals, the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation, WESTBRIDGE Computer, to mention three.

Another concern that I've had since coming to the legislature is virtually no notice of government business in the Assembly. Makes it very difficult for the legislature to be efficient, and it contributes to the lack of trust in the Assembly that the Minister of Justice said back on May 17 that was so important to restore in this House.

Another example, the blatant attacks on minority groups. A government's role, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is to protect the rights of minorities, not to lead the attack on discriminatory and racist comments.

Scandal after scandal, another example. Refusal of this government to provide answers to written questions in the legislature, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The very serious violation of democracy of saying one thing, as my colleague from Regina Lakeview pointed out — and there are many examples of this in privatization and health care and education — and then doing something else. So it's a litany of broken promises by this government.



It's no wonder that there is so very little integrity left by this government as it relates to the people of Saskatchewan. They have been blindly privatizing with no mandate to do so.

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

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

**Mr. Hopfner:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. At the end of my remarks I will be moving the following amendment:

That this Assembly urge the opposition, the NDP opposition, to return to the democratic traditions of this Legislative Assembly and cease the obstructionist anti-democratic tactics that subvert the fundamental principles necessary for the effective functioning of our democratic system.

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

**Mr. Hopfner:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. members across the floor should pay close attention to my speech today because the truth is going to be told. This motion gives me the opportunity to clear up the distortions being put forth by the members opposite. It is ironic that the member from Regina Lakeview should want to speak on parliamentary democracy when it was her party that for 17 days, Mr. Deputy Speaker, showed such blatant disregard for a democratically elected legislature.

I shouldn't be so lenient to say 17 days, when this same disregard is evident to this day in the House as we can see it from day to day as the procedures begin. I am referring, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the shouts and yells from the opposition members from their seats where they make personal attacks on government members and have to be countlessly brought to order from the Speaker, the Chair, and asked to apologize to this Assembly.

I am also referring to the filibustering and the name-calling escapades of the member from Quill Lakes who made the statement that all PCs were loyal to the Ku Klux Klan. That kind of statement is what is very common to the floor of this legislature, Mr. Speaker. I also remember an incident, Mr. Speaker, in which one of the members opposite was calling the government members Nazis.

It is the intent and the will of members opposite to obstruct all proceedings in this House. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I would at this time like to address the issue of the Provincial Auditor that the member was speaking to, the member of the opposition was speaking to, an issue which has been entirely cleared up.

It is not by my standards that I make this statement; it is by the Provincial Auditor's statement from which I draw this conclusion. I would like to quote from the minutes of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, the Provincial Auditor's statement. I am a member of that committee, Mr. Speaker. Quote:

(1500)

On June 8, 1989 I received a copy of a memorandum from the Premier to all cabinet ministers, directing that all departments and agencies provide the Provincial Auditor with all necessary co-operation to permit him to fulfil his duties . . .

I am confident that this memorandum will correct matters included in paragraphs 208 to 257 in my report as they pertain to access to information and to co-operation.

In that quote, the Provincial Auditor is stating that the problem is solved. End of story, Mr. Speaker. I see no need to go into the matter any further when the Provincial Auditor himself has said that the matter is resolved.

The opposition takes no recognizable notice of anything that goes on in this Assembly these days. They are too busy organizing, Mr. Speaker — and I quote the member from Regina Rosemont — “organizing that a climate of political revolt in this province.”

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, this is not surprising, because the member has stated this time and time again. I think they perhaps should take the time to quell that revolt going on within their own ranks, Mr. Speaker, a revolt which may have been started when this government proposed the new electoral boundaries in Saskatchewan.

And I want to talk to you about the new boundaries, Mr. Speaker, which they themselves have accepted. They just can't decide who should run in where though. To be fair, the members from Regina Lakeview and Regina Centre have decided. They already sent out letters informing their constituents of where they intend to run. So it seems odd to me that this rule 16 condemns the new electoral boundaries when the members opposite have already accepted them, sir.

But nothing surprises me more than the member from Regina Lakeview's inclusion of rule changes to this Assembly in this motion. The rule change proposed is to limit the time of bell-ringing, a tactic that the opposition engaged in the shut-down of a democratically elected legislature. The members opposite chose to ring the bells rather than debate the Bill in the House as is done within a democracy. They chose to stop the democratic process for their own political purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the government withdrew the motion limiting bell-ringing and has referred it to an all-party committee. From this rule 16, I can only derive that the member from Regina Lakeview is against the all-party committee, and if that is the case, Mr. Speaker, I am sure arrangements can be made with the opposition to instead bring the motion back to the House. I think, but as we all know, arrangements are made in this Assembly only to be broken by the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, the member from Regina Lakeview speaks of mandates. We do have a mandate from the people of this province, Mr. Speaker. We received that mandate when we were elected in 1986. We received that mandate to govern this province, Mr. Speaker, and we are

looking out after the citizens' best interests in the province here.

And the opposition, Mr. Speaker, is only interested in creating a political revolt; cheap words from members, and words do come cheap for political gains, Mr. Speaker. They do not have to be responsible to no one. Then can say anything on the floor of this legislature without being held accountable. Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to you that it is a blatant, blatant disregard for the rules of the legislature coming from the radicals of the NDP.

Note, Mr. Speaker, they are not interested in democracy, as this motion suggests, but political revolt. They stand in this House and state that they are proud to be radicals, Mr. Speaker. They promised to make the province ungovernable, Mr. Speaker. They go out on strike against the people of Saskatchewan and then they have the audacity to mouth words of support for the very institution they have sworn to destroy. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, it is inexcusable, and therefore I will be moving, as I had indicated, the motion that I had read earlier.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that when I look at members opposite and look at the types of question periods and the types of motions that they try to pass through various different rules — rule 39, rule 16, rule this, rule that — I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is a blatant disregard, a disregard for an institution that once had some integrity. They talk . . . they stand in their righteous way on the floor and try to turn and twist and make people believe that we have tried to ram through this, ram through that.

And I give you that great display from the public accounts, when they walked out on public accounts twice this year already, Mr. Speaker. And I want to indicate that is nothing new. They keep threatening about walking out. They keep threatening with their radical innuendoes. And Mr. Speaker, I therefore want to take this very opportunity now in moving this motion:

That this Assembly urge the opposition to return to the democratic traditions of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan and cease the obstructionist anti-democratic tactics that subvert the fundamental principles necessary for the effective functioning of our democratic system.

I so move, sir. Thank you.

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

**The Speaker:** — Does the member have a seconder?

**Mr. Hopfner:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker. I just have to get the amendment sent up to me and I'll be signing it, and it's seconded by the member from Redberry, sir.

**The Speaker:** — Order. I'm directing my remarks to the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster. Your seconder is out of order; you must have someone in the House.

**Mr. Hopfner:** — Mr. Speaker, I'll let the member from Kelsey-Tisdale second the motion.

**The Speaker:** — The alleged amendment that the hon. member has moved is not in the form of a proper amendment; it's in the form of a substantive motion, therefore the amendment is out of order.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to enter the debate on the motion brought this afternoon to the House by the member from Regina Lakeview, and seconded by my colleague from the Saskatoon Eastview. And if I may just say, Mr. Speaker, the amendment that was attempted in the House this afternoon was out of order for more reasons than one.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, I do consider it a privilege to participate in this debate on this motion because this is a motion that talks about the principles of parliamentary democracy. And surely, Mr. Speaker, all of we who sit in this House must be equally concerned about those very principles, for it is by those principles that democracy in our province and in our nation is maintained, and the defence of those principles, Mr. Speaker, must be uppermost in the mind of all members.

And it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that when we serve our time in public life — and we all will serve a limited time, some longer, some shorter — at the end of our time in public life, Mr. Speaker, hopefully it could be the inheritance of each one of us that the principles, the principles by which our democracy functioned and exists, surely, Mr. Speaker, we would desire as our inheritance that those principles be strengthened for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, because of the limited time available in this rule 16 debate, I want to focus my remarks particularly on the last clause of the motion. It is a motion which condemns the government opposite for its "disregard of the principles of parliamentary democracy," and the motion discusses in its last clause, as example of that disregard, the pursuit of a privatization agenda without a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, in a functioning parliamentary democracy, political parties are given the opportunity to govern, having gone to the people of their jurisdiction, in this case the people of Saskatchewan, indicating to that electorate, to those people, its policy, its platform, and its philosophy. Having indicated policy and platform and philosophy, the electorate then choose — choose who shall govern their jurisdiction. In this case, in 1986 the people of Saskatchewan chose the Progressive Conservative Party and members opposite to govern.

Mr. Speaker, in our system, as you well know, once in government, then the political party is responsible to exercise those policies and platforms which have been presented to the people, and then when the time comes the people of the jurisdiction again will have an opportunity to judge that government on their policies and on their performance at that time.

But, Mr. Speaker, when a political party, and when the

leadership of that political party says one thing before an election and then once having gained power does precisely the opposite, Mr. Speaker, then that makes a sham of parliamentary democracy. When a political party goes to the people before an election and says one thing, and then having won the election, after the election turns and does just the opposite, Mr. Speaker, that makes a sham of parliamentary democracy. And there can be no better example of this, Mr. Speaker, than the privatization agenda of this government, the agenda which is being inflicted on the people of Saskatchewan by a government that has no mandate to do so. And I argue that, Mr. Speaker, because of commitments, because of statements made prior to the 1986 election.

Mr. Speaker, I want to draw to your attention today, and to the attention of members of this House, remarks that were made to my constituents, to the people of my city by the then minister of Finance, the member from Kindersley, the current minister of economic trade and development and the Minister of Justice. This is in 1985, Mr. Speaker, one year before the last election — just a year before the election. Remarks he made to my constituents in the community I represent generated an article in our local newspaper with a headline that said, and I quote, Mr. Speaker, “Crown corporations aren’t for sale.” The gist of his remarks in my community before the election generated a headline which said, and I quote: “Crown corporations aren’t for sale.”

(1515)

Mr. Speaker, I wish to report to the House today what the minister of Finance at that time, the member from Kindersley, was saying before the 1986 election. He said, and I quote from the article from the *Moose Jaw Times-Herald*, Tuesday, January 29, 1985, he said, and I quote:

Selling off some Crown corporations isn’t a viable option for government, although privatization was recommended by the Conservative Party delegates at last year’s annual convention.

Mr. Speaker, the current member from Kindersley, before the last election said very clearly to the people of Saskatchewan and the people of my constituency, “Selling off some Crown corporations isn’t a viable option . . .” Further in the same article, the journalist writes:

Some party members (referring to the Conservative Party) see the sale of Crowns as a method of raising capital for a cash-starved government currently facing a billion dollar cumulative deficit.

But again, and I’m quoting, Mr. Speaker: “But Andrew doesn’t agree.” Now listen to what he said, Mr. Speaker. He said: “Privatization is yesterday’s theory.” That’s what this minister, now of Justice, was saying before the last election — privatization is yesterday’s theory. Further on he said:

To debate whether or not Crown corporations should exist at all is an archaic question. It doesn’t make sense for one government to build those

things and for the next one to come and sell it all off.

That’s what the leadership of the Progressive Conservative Party was saying prior to the last election: privatization is yesterday’s theory; it just doesn’t make any sense for one government to build and for another government to sell them off.

Mr. Speaker, another minister, a former minister, now defeated, Mr. Sid Dutchak, was responsible at that time for SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation); he was a little more frank, Mr. Speaker. He said at that same time that “the department is currently looking at methods of giving people more control over Crown corporations.” But he was careful to add that he doesn’t want any out-of-province speculators honing in on the action.

So we have, Mr. Speaker, before the 1986 election, the leadership of the current government, Progressive Conservative Party in Saskatchewan: Crown corporations aren’t for sale; privatization is yesterday’s theory; the debate whether to privatize Crown corporations is an archaic question, and it doesn’t make sense for one government to sell off what another government has built.

This government is then re-elected in 1986, and what have we seen? Mr. Speaker, we have seen the most massive privatization agenda, I would argue, anywhere in the western world, perhaps with the exception of Great Britain. And this session, Mr. Speaker, has been characterized by that agenda, so that the first piece of legislation we deal with in this session is Bill 1, to establish the department of privatization. Then we deal with legislation to privatize SaskPower, the natural gas side of SaskPower. Now we deal with legislation to privatize the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

We’ve seen the privatization of Saskoil; we’ve seen the privatization of Sask Minerals; we’ve seen the privatization of SaskCOMP — all of this from a government, from a political party that before the election said that privatization was yesterday’s theory; that it doesn’t make any sense to be privatizing and selling off what a former government has built.

Mr. Speaker, when a political party says one thing before an election, and then having won the election on the basis of those policies and platforms and statements, when that party then is given power and turns around and does just the opposite, Mr. Speaker, that makes a sham of parliamentary democracy. And that’s precisely what this government has done.

Mr. Speaker, is there any wonder that such scepticism exists among the people of our province when they view the political process? Is there any wonder that people are so sceptical of those who serve in public life and what they say?

Mr. Speaker, it’s time in this province for a change. It’s time for a government who will say what it means and mean what it says. It’s time for a change in this province when we can have a government again that will before an

election announce its policy and its platform, and once that election is won, that government can be trusted to carry out that policy and platform.

What we have seen, Mr. Speaker, with this government, is a government that says one thing . . .

**The Speaker:** — Time has elapsed.

**Mr. Gerich:** — Mr. Speaker, it is with some anger that I join in this debate this afternoon — anger, Mr. Speaker, because I've never seen the height of hypocrisy that the opposition displays with their puerile efforts here that's represented in this motion.

Mr. Speaker, this session has been and has seen some historic firsts that relate directly to the motion. It is the first time in history, Mr. Speaker, that an elected MLA in this province has publicly declared that the purpose of his political party was to "create a climate of political revolt in this province."

And that's precisely what the member from Rosemont stated on March 19, 1989, *Globe and Mail*. And it's the first time that a chairman of a Public Accounts Committee, much less a member, has stated, "I'm proud to be a radical," as the member from Regina Victoria did in this very House on July 18.

It's the first time a union boss, one Barb Byers, has declared, "It's going to be guerrilla warfare against the government."

Or the NDP MLA that's joined with the same union boss in declaring his party's goal is to "make this province ungovernable."

Mr. Speaker, it's also the first time in the history of our province and perhaps in the Commonwealth that a supposedly loyal opposition has gone on strike against the people of the province because they do not have the majority in the Assembly and don't like the fact.

It's the first time that any opposition has stated that the result of a democratically conducted election is meaningless, and it is useless they get their way in the governments of the province, and they will bring the business of the Assembly to a complete halt.

Mr. Speaker, this is an outrage — an outrage against democracy, an outrage against the honourable Assembly. And you cannot claim, Mr. Speaker, that all hon. members, when they are those that shout from their seats, that are duly elected members in this legislature, are Nazis, or that the Saskatchewan people who support the Conservative Party here belong to the Ku Klux Klan, as did the member from Quill Lakes.

I invite any one of those members to give up their protection of immunity and call me a Nazi outside the House, or invite the member from Quill Lakes to screw up a little bit of his courage that he might have and make a claim about the Ku Klux Klan outside this Assembly. And we'll see what we can make of his outrage against the institution.

Mr. Speaker, this cowardly, hypocritical motion that we are dealing with today, it is a motion from those that declared they are proud to wear the badge of a radical, and make the government ungovernable. It is a motion of people that are so frustrated that they don't have power that they've sworn to do anything, anything, Mr. Speaker, including political revolt, to gain power. The opposition, Mr. Speaker, by their own words care nothing for democracy. They care nothing for the traditions of this place, they care nothing for power, or they care only for power and power alone. And as they've stated, including the member from Riversdale, and they have stated that they will use every tactic and every trick that they can get the power that they so desperately want.

Mr. Speaker, I have news for them. The sons and daughters of the two World Wars are not about to give power to those that say that they're radicals. Mr. Speaker, this power, the PC party which has championed the evolution and the growth of democracy in this country, the party of John Diefenbaker, and the Bill of Rights, the party that supported human freedom since the Magna Carta, this party is not about to let radicals take power away from the people of the province.

Mr. Speaker, there is something the member from Riversdale absolutely must understand, that elections do matter, and elections really do matter, Mr. Speaker. When you lose an election you do not have a mandate for political revolt, you have a mandate for reasonable and loyal opposition. The key word, Mr. Speaker, is loyal. Loyal doesn't include making the province ungovernable; it doesn't include the excesses of radicalism; and it doesn't include political revolt.

Mr. Speaker, the role of the loyal opposition is to criticize and propose change, not to stop the functioning of this very Assembly that they're supposed to be loyal to. What we have witnessed in this province is a political party, the NDP party, that has nothing to propose, no ideas, and no policy. In the absence of ideas, and in the absence of any policy suggestions, and in the absence of constructive criticism, the NDP have found itself in a vacuum, and it's decided to fill this with political revolt.

Mr. Speaker, they continue to attack upon our democratic institution and they continue to say that elections mean nothing, but they will not and must not be allowed to have their way. And that is why I suggest and indeed insist that members support the amendment and oppose the main motion.

Mr. Speaker, I move this amendment, seconded by the member from Morse:

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

Urge the opposition to return to the democratic traditions of the Legislative Assembly in Saskatchewan and cease the obstructionist, anti-democratic tactics that subvert the fundamental principles necessary for the effective functioning of our democratic system.

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

**Mr. Martens:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I viewed this motion today with some disgust. As I went through it, I took a look at some of the items that were identified, items that said that it condemned “the Government of Saskatchewan for its blatant disregard for the principles of parliamentary democracy . . .”

Mr. Speaker, we have been confronted today, and through the past 82 or 83 days, of some of the most ridiculous parliamentary rule adjustments made by the members of the opposition that I’ve ever seen in the seven years that I’ve been a member of this Assembly. Every time the government wanted to proceed with any kind of a motion — it didn’t matter what it was — the members of the opposition would find a way to obstruct.

Obstruction has been their motive. Obstruction has been their general principle, their philosophy since coming into this past session. And nowhere, Mr. Speaker, have we had a bigger demonstration of that than in the bell-ringing issue that was demonstrated here earlier this year — obstruction of the first order. Everywhere we’ve gone we’ve had obstruction.

Now it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if we would recollect back to 1986 at what we saw as a provincial election, we came to the conclusion, and the people of the province came to the conclusion, that they would have a Tory government to rule them for the next four or five years. And that, Mr. Speaker, has never . . . the impact has never seemed to have sunk in to the members of the opposition.

We did in fact win more seats than they did. But in each case, as we’ve gone along, they’ve tried to obstruct the democratic process, the process that was established. The question can be raised, and it has been raised, is why now suddenly do the things in the process get obstructed more than they did in previous years?

(1530)

Let’s go back to 1978 or ‘77 when the potash debate was in its primary focus, when the then government, the members of the opposition, decided to take the potash over, Mr. Speaker, there wasn’t a decision on the part of the members at that time to walk out for 17 days. They didn’t decide that they were going to take strike action and go out and vote. No. They came here and they talked about it. They discussed it in this Assembly with the majority of that front bench being present on this side of the House at the time. And that, Mr. Speaker, is the way that democratic process, the parliamentary process, is best handled.

When you have strike action as typified by the people in opposition, then I think, Mr. Speaker, you get the kinds of results in dealing with the issues that we’ve had since we’ve come to this session since March of 1989. And that, Mr. Speaker, is why I support the amendment to this motion rather than the motion itself. I believe that the disregard for the democratic process is evident by those people opposite. It’s not us who are doing that, it’s the people opposite who are.

Now they continue on, and particularly with respect to the Provincial Auditor I want to point out a number of things that I think they ought to recall. The one is that the Provincial Auditor himself said that he no longer anticipated any problem in dealing with different departments and Crown corporations. He said that himself. He has a letter from the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan outlining the kinds of conditions that he is expecting the departments and the ministers to comply with, and I believe they will. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what he said in the Public Accounts Committee, and that, I believe, is his interpretation of what the role of the auditor is.

We can go on and on in other things that have been said and done, but I’m not going to confuse the issue of the Provincial Auditor in dealing with those kinds of fundamental things. He indicated that he was . . . he regretted saying some of the things he did to the Public Accounts Committee on the public forum in newspapers. He apologized for that, and I believe we as a Public Accounts Committee accepted that and we will just leave it there.

I will also say to the members of the Assembly that in dealing with issues as it relates to the rules of parliamentary democracy, parliamentary democracy is a process of custom and precedent establishing the rules and changes in rules.

We have dealt with rule changes, and let’s deal with one as basic as ringing the bells. Ringing the bells, Mr. Speaker, was meant to call members into the Assembly. Time was not an issue at the time when this was established because people in the far reaches of the province had a long way to come to get to the Assembly to vote on matters of the issues of the day. And that, Mr. Speaker, was why the bells were allowed to ring. It was not to defer a vote; it was to hold the attention of the Assembly until members could come here, and that was done at a time when the horse and the buggy and the train and that sort of thing were the way that the people came to this Assembly.

And that, Mr. Speaker, was why it was done was call people to vote. It was not to defer a vote and hold the parliamentary democracy at ransom. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what members of the opposition did. And I don’t believe that that is a custom or a precedent that should be established.

I believe that today we have the kinds of things available to us that we can vote. We need to fundamentally change that rule in order to have the parliamentary democracy continue and continue on in a format that it is meant to.

I believe there are other changes that need to be made and we have suggested establishing a committee to deal with that — rules that will provide a better service to the people in this Assembly, members of this Assembly. And there are many suggestions that could be made as to that. There are changes that could be made as it relates to the service for the people of my constituency in relation to the kinds of services that are already provided and those that could be provided by better rules in relation to the Assembly and the members here.

Now you have to deal with it in the context of individuals; you have to deal with it in the context of the larger community and that is the province of Saskatchewan. You can't deal with it in isolation. I think probably the best example that you could use, Mr. Speaker, and members opposite, some at least have served on municipal councils and city councils, if we were to take the democratic process and allow the bell-ringing in its context to be dealt with in the context that it was dealt with here, if we dealt with that in a municipal council or in a town council, we would in fact, Mr. Speaker, have had R.M.s and town councils have their total capacity as councils disrupted by the very fact that they would not be allowed to vote. If two members would walk out and say, we're not going to go vote, then the whole council would be stymied.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what they did here. This council of the Assembly of Saskatchewan was held at ransom by those people walking out on the Assembly. If that would have happened in the time when I was a reeve of the R.M. of Saskatchewan Landing, that would have not been allowed. They could have walked out, fine, but we would have continued the business as it was.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what those people did. The member from Regina Victoria, who served on the city council here in Regina, should understand that if he decided to leave because he didn't agree with the policy, that he had to stand there and debate it. He had to debate it, to have the other members of council deal with the issues as they were practical in relation to the mandate of the council. He could not do it any other way.

**The Speaker:** — Time has elapsed.

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

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to participate in the debate on this motion with respect to the adherence of the democratic principles in this legislature, to which the members of the government have moved an amendment.

Before I get into the substance of the portion that I want to deal with, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to some of the remarks mentioned earlier, by the earlier speakers, particularly the member from Redberry and the member from Morse who has just been seated. I sensed, particularly from the member of Redberry, a sense of anger — I believe he used that word. He felt that he was angry about what was happening in the legislature. I do believe that, coming from that member, that would be a genuine feeling. I want to spend some time dealing with some of the issues that he dealt with.

The member is frustrated, and I suppose his frustration would stem with his government's inability to get anything done in this particular session. The member would quite likely feel a lot better about the session if this session had proceeded so that the government members were not led astray by the front-benchers in doing nothing but privatization, and trying to set up an agenda which is certainly not favoured by the people of Saskatchewan and I know is not favoured by a goodly number of the

back-benchers opposite — the bank-benchers, that is those back-benchers that are keeping in touch with their constituents. And it's quite understandable that he would feel angry and that he would feel frustrated in their inability to get anything done.

Let me indicate, Mr. Speaker, very briefly about what I mean by the government not being able to get anything done. A quick reference to the records being kept by the Clerks of the Assembly will show you just how much has been done and how much has not been done here in — I believe it's 83 — 83 days that we are now into in this particular sitting.

If you look at what the job of the members opposite, the government members should be, and that is to conduct the affairs of the province, to pass a budget, and to pass those laws which they fought a campaign on and which will make for the good government of the province. And when you look at what parts of the budget have been passed, it's easy to see that only half or less than half of the budget estimates have been considered to date.

And quite specifically, some of the big ones have not even been touched yet. And I read directly from the record, and we can see that Agriculture hasn't been dealt with; Economic Development and Tourism has not been completed; Health has not been dealt with — hasn't even been started; Justice hasn't been done; the item of voting regarding legislation hasn't been done; Parks, Recreation and Culture is perhaps half done; the Provincial Secretary hasn't been dealt with; Social Services hasn't even been touched.

These things are time consuming, but they certainly could have been done in 80 days, in 83 days. They always have been done up until this time. The reason that they haven't been done is because the government has chosen to go off on its own agenda, which is not . . . for which they had not received the mandate of the people of Saskatchewan for, and for which they deserve royal criticism, royal criticism and outright criticism on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan by Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition.

The member opposite indicated and used the word "loyal opposition." I think he should take a good look at what the opposition is doing and why they're doing it, ask the people of Saskatchewan before he comes out and starts giving out advice as to how an opposition should behave. He would be well advised to give his government front-benchers and that cabinet some advice as to how his government members should behave, and matters would go on a lot smoother in this particular House.

It's interesting that the member from Morse, in his remarks, indicated that he believed that some of the rules have to be changed, and he even indicated that there's a committee established dealing with the rules of the democratic principles of this institution. It's interesting that he was able to stand up and say that. I wonder if the member is aware of what those that run his government are actually doing.

We had a member of his . . . his House Leader who brought in . . . a member of his government who brought in a Bill to change the time of bell-ringing unilaterally,

without using the democratic principles — without using the democratic principles of going to committee, having a two-party committee formed from the legislature, set up the motion, debate it, bring forth a recommendation to the House.

That's something that the committee is mandated to do now. And it wasn't until after the members on this side, the members of the opposition, brought them back to their senses and said, look, you just don't do things that way in a democratic institution. A very important example. How he ever got it twisted around that this side wasn't democratic, is beyond me.

Another case in point, when we're talking about the rules of the House, the rules of this institution have been developed over years, tens of years. The hours of sitting of this legislature developed over tradition and by mutual agreement. That's our democratic process, where everybody is consulted. Because the purpose of this very institution is to make sure that debate is heard, not that debate is not heard. That's the purpose of this institution.

And what do we have? A notice of motion brought in last week by the Government House Leader . . . or Acting House Leader, a notice of motion which I have in my hand here which reads that the sitting times of the House shall be changed. The government wants to use its majority to unilaterally change the times, without agreement of members on both sides. For what purpose? Well certainly not for any democratic purpose; for some expedient purpose of pushing through their privatization agenda for which they have no mandate — no mandate.

If you had a mandate, people would be knocking down the doors of the opposition members, and they would be saying to the opposition members, let them go ahead and privatize SaskPower; let them go ahead and privatize potash. That's what they would be telling us.

(1545)

And you know, I walk many streets and I shake a lot of hands over the summer and I haven't had anybody tell me that. I haven't had anybody come up to me and say, gee, you know, you really should go ahead and go back and let them privatize SaskPower; it's probably a good thing. I haven't had anybody say that — not a one, not a one.

And I suggest that you probably have to go a long ways before you members —beyond your executive — before you hear anybody say anything of that type, hardly will you.

The member opposite, the member from Morse also indicated, and he drew a comparison about town councils. Well, what a comparison, what a comparison. The member talks about if town councils walked out and decided to ring bells. Well for a member that sat in this House for coming close to three years, possibly more, three years, not to understand that this system here is completely different from a town council system, that we specifically have set up a system and a legislature here in Saskatchewan and every province of Saskatchewan, and in the House of Commons, that we specifically use this forum for debate with assigning people to be in the

opposition, which is completely different. There is no such thing as somebody sitting down and being called the official opposition in any town council or municipality that I know of. A completely erroneous argument, completely erroneous.

I want to also refer to a remark made by one of the members previous and indicating what type of licence they take with quotations used in the House. The member opposite indicated that the members on this side, or certain members on this side were, and I believe the words he was trying to use was, considered themselves as radicals . . .

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

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

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I just want to deal with a couple of items. First of all, the matter raised by the member from Morse where he's somehow trying to draw a parallel between this body and parliament, and town councils, municipal councils. And I say to him that if he wants to carry that one further, then have him make the suggestion in this House and to the executive cabinet, to the government, that we should do something that all municipal councils can do, and that is to take items on which there is great debate and to submit them to the electorate so that the people can decide. And let them decide in this instance whether they want their power company sold off. Let's do that. Make that argument if you will.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to go back to a comment made by the member for . . . I believe it was Turtleford, or Redberry. And he was somehow trying to give the impression that this side of the House — and this is a favourite thing of theirs now — to say that we're all radicals. And he's trying to go back, to take out of context the words of the member from Regina Rosemont, and then stood up and said that I had indicated to the House that I was proud to be a radical.

And indeed I had, Mr. Speaker. Indeed I had. But those words are only part of a sentence that I used in this House, and I want to again, for the record, make it clear for him, and for anyone that might be following this debate, just what was said. And what I said, Mr. Speaker, on July 18, a week ago today, was the following:

Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't want you to get sensitive about the word radicals, because if being opposed to the sell-off of SaskPower and if being opposed to discrimination in government programs makes you a radical, then I'm proud to be a radical.

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

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Mr. Speaker, that was the definition that was used that day. That was the definition that was used that day. And if the member from Redberry sees something unsavoury in that and wants to draw conclusions or unsavoury conclusions about the use of the word radicals — and again I want to remind him that I defined that to be someone opposed to the sell-off of SaskPower — and if that's the case, then he's saying that

70 per cent of the people in Saskatchewan who oppose you in the sell-off of SaskPower are also radicals. And I am very proud to associate with that 70 per cent of the population.

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

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Very proud, Mr. Speaker, to associate myself with the 70 per cent of people in Saskatchewan who oppose this government and what they have been trying to do; oppose this government in trying to sell off SaskPower; oppose this government in trying to stifle the Provincial Auditor; who oppose this government in so many ways. And therefore I am very pleased to support the motion before us and urge the members to vote against the amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Trew:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too want to urge government members to vote for the motion as was originally presented and against this foolish attempt to change it with an amendment that completely changes the meaning of the original motion. The people of Saskatchewan . . .

**The Speaker:** — Time has elapsed.

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

## MOTIONS

### Resolution No. 29 — Forestry in the Meadow Lake Area

**Mr. Muller:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure today to move a motion:

That this Assembly commends the government, the town of Meadow Lake and the associated Indian Bands, for their decision to return to the people of Meadow Lake and area the forestry industry with which they can build a secure and prosperous future.

Certainly being as close to the forest industry as I am up in Shellbrook-Torch River, I have an understanding for the people at the saw mill of Meadow Lake, the Indian bands, and all the people that are involved in this venture.

The pulp and paper industry that will certainly come out of this is going to be a great move for Meadow Lake and the area, and for this reason . . . I mean, if you go back in history and look at what happened years ago when the pulp industry tried to expand into Meadow Lake, and certainly those people on the other side were all against it. They even ploughed down the Dore Lake pulp mill after it was started, and spent, I think it was \$4 million spent up there, and they buried it rather than see it go ahead.

Now we've got some people at Meadow Lake that are taking the initiative, taking it in their own hands and going to move forward in a forest industry that certainly is going to promote that area, certainly promote small business and industry around Meadow Lake which is something that everyone is wanting to see in northern Saskatchewan.

And to involve the Indian bands in that area is something that we've always wanted to do — make them so they're self-sufficient instead of ignoring them like the people across the way did when they were in government. They thought if they put them a way up north and just gave them money and never tried to create any industry that would help them, they thought that they'd always vote for them and they could just forget about them — just keep feeding them money. But I think it's a responsibility of government to make sure that they have an industry that's going to support them and support themselves and certainly support their children.

And for this reason, Mr. Speaker, I really commend the Government of Saskatchewan for looking ahead and involving the Indian bands in the saw mill, and certainly they'll be involved in the whole forest industry, reforestation, the rejuvenation of the whole forest industry in northern Saskatchewan. And I think that this will be an example for other areas of the province to look at Meadow Lake and what's happening there.

The forest industry — and of course we're all aware of it in a big way because if you just look across Manitoba and Saskatchewan today with all the fires that are going on, and it needs far better management. The northern forest just hasn't been really taken care of, and it brings it to our attention now, with a forest fire in Manitoba that's as large as Prince Edward Island — just imagine, as large as Prince Edward Island! And that the money that's being wasted there, not only in the fighting of that fire, or those fires, but the money that's being wasted there in the timber that's being lost. And if this forest is managed properly, those kinds of fires won't exist in the future, because if we properly manage the forest and cut fire-guards, those are the places that we'll be able to stop major fires like this — like has happened in Prince Albert here two years ago.

Par Industries, which those people were against, going out and cutting fire-guards to protect the residential areas north of Prince Albert. They just got the fire-guard cut and there was a major fire that broke out. And that's where the fire-fighters stopped, right at that fire-guard that was cut by the people that were working for Par Industries. And that certainly is a major step forward to manage this forest to make sure that it doesn't . . . that fires don't get into our residential areas. And I think that these people at Meadow Lake taking the initiative to move in this direction is certainly a positive and major step forward. And I certainly look forward to what they're doing . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. By previous agreement, in order to accommodate the royal visit and to give hon. members the opportunity to participate, this House now stands recessed until 8 p.m.

The Assembly recessed until 8 p.m.