

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Upshall:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure today to introduce some guests from Norway. They are accompanied by their hosts, one from Humboldt, Egill Buschman, and Andrea Bergerman from Prince Albert. The guests from Norway are seated in your gallery, and they are Lillian and Arne Helga and their sons Hakon and Garry. I would hope that they have a good visit to Canada, and hope they enjoy the proceedings here today.

I would ask all members to give them a warm welcome.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to this Assembly, seated in your gallery today, the mayor of Buffalo Narrows, Dennis Shatilla, the deputy mayor of Buffalo Narrows, Richard Petit and Keith Coombs the housing consultant for Buffalo Narrows. They are here today to discuss with me progress in their welfare reform project under Saskatchewan Works, for \$380,000 which has been spent on fire suppression in La Loche, Buffalo Narrows and Ile-a-la-Crosse. And I understand they have made a success of this project.

I will be meeting with them at 2:30. I ask everyone to welcome them here today.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Drought Relief Program

**Mr. Upshall:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, Mr. Premier, it has been reported in the media today that wheat board minister, Charlie Mayer, in Manitoba told the Manitoba government that until it agrees to pony up for its share of the drought relief program the province will only get a partial payment. It is also reported by officials that Mayer said the governments of Saskatchewan, Alberta, and Ontario have agreed to contribute to the program.

Mr. Minister, considering that you denied time and time again that the Government of Saskatchewan was contributing to the program, will you explain how your position and Mr. Mayer's position square?

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

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will say to the hon. member that I believe that there has been an agreement struck between Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Ontario and the federal government on two things: on crop insurance and funding a new and a

stronger crop insurance mechanism, and some contribution by the provinces to the drought program.

I've said at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that I would be prepared to entertain the possibilities of sharing in the drought payment, but I wanted first and foremost a brand-new crop insurance mechanism. So we will see when the Agriculture ministers meet here on Sunday and Monday and Tuesday and Wednesday in Prince Albert, if in fact all of that's been put together. I haven't talked to Manitoba or Alberta or Ontario, but I understand the federal minister has, and if he's got all that information, I'm sure he will be sharing it with us, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Upshall:** — Mr. Minister, your participation and lack of co-operation in this program has been a fiasco since day one. There was never any talk at the beginning of the program about it being cost shared, or at least no talk that you were willing to share with the people of Saskatchewan. It would seem, Mr. Minister, that the information you presented in this House does not stand with the information that we're receiving today.

Mr. Minister, how do you get off by telling farmers one thing by completely reversing your stand in private with the federal government, and how do you explain to the farmers that it was your fault that the delay in the drought payment has been so long?

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

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I have certainly talked to the media many times about the negotiations that were going on and said our number one objective was to get a stronger crop insurance, and they know that. And I said also we would entertain the possibility of helping out on the drought program if in fact we could get the kind of crop insurance mechanism that worked. I said I would entertain that; I couldn't speak for Alberta or Manitoba.

Now evidently the federal minister has also had good discussion and constructive discussions with Manitoba and Alberta and Ontario, and he will be telling us what those are. I suspect what you'll see is a brand-new crop insurance funded so that we can have a better mechanism for farmers.

And this year, as the hon. member knows, that if you're looking at agriculture here in Saskatchewan, you can insure up to \$150 an acre for the first time in Saskatchewan's history. Now you combine that with 480 to \$500 million on a drought payment, Mr. Speaker, which is an awful lot of cash; we get most of that cash. Then if we have new crop insurance and a stronger crop insurance, if we have 450 to \$500 million cash injected into the province of Saskatchewan — and I've been part of negotiating that — I'm quite prepared to accept the responsibility, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Upshall:** — New question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister,

the facts are this: the drought payment should have been in the hands of the Saskatchewan farmers before spring seeding; you said that you weren't going to put anything into it; the delay has been because the negotiations have taken so long, and who have suffered no more but the farmers of this province.

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

**Mr. Upshall:** — Mr. Minister, I think that you owe an explanation to the farmers of this province and to the people of this province why you were responsible . . . and I will not sit idle till you answer this: why you did not make the negotiations go fast; why the money was not in the hands of Saskatchewan farmers prior to seeding? Can you explain why that didn't happen?

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

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, the federal government announced last fall that it would spend in the neighbourhood of \$1 billion to farmers and it would make it in two payments during the crop year of 1988-89 — now it said that — we'll have an initial payment and we'll have a final payment as if you had a whole crop, and when you market your crop you market it in the crop year which goes up until the end of July. So they've got a billion dollars there. They said they'd make the payment.

They made the first payment initially early in 1989 and will make the last payment before the end of the crop year. Now that's exactly what they said they were going to do.

The hon. member says, well a billion dollars isn't enough — fair enough — maybe we should have more than a billion. He said they should have paid it all earlier rather than two payments. They said at the outset, Mr. Speaker, it would be two payments, an initial one and a final one, just like you get when you market your wheat. Well we got exactly what they said they would deliver, Mr. Speaker, and if we take credit for the billion dollar payment because we negotiated for it, Mr. Speaker, I think that's fair ball.

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

#### **Barber Commission on SaskEnergy — Conflict of Interest**

**Mr. Solomon:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Deputy Premier and it concerns your government's very strange idea of what an unbiased panel is. It's reported today in the *Leader-Post* that the well-known Tory front group, the Institute for Saskatchewan Enterprise is going to make a presentation to the Barber panel on the privatization of our natural gas utility.

Since it is an established fact that Lloyd Barber is a board member of this front organization, and since the institute's support for privatization is well known, how could you possibly say that this is not a conflict of interest situation for Dr. Barber?

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

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. The member has been asked a question and already he isn't being given the opportunity to answer it. Let us do that.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't think anybody would accuse Dr. Barber of being a particularly active Tory. I know that members opposite take great delight in casting aspersions on this particular individual, Mr. Speaker. They have suggested that he couldn't run a university and therefore he shouldn't be qualified to sit on this panel. If we take their argument, Mr. Speaker, to its logical conclusion, I suppose they would deny the university of making a presentation to the Barber Commissions as well. I think Dr. Barber has excellent credentials; I think that they are beyond question. I'm quite prepared to live with the result of the Barber Commission report, Mr. Speaker, and I think the members opposite do themselves no good service at all by casting aspersions on Dr. Barber.

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

**Mr. Solomon:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Deputy Premier. While it's our view, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this is a conflict of interest, Lloyd Barber is a member of the board of directors of the Institute for Saskatchewan Enterprise, and unless he expressly disavows and publicly disavows the report, than he is by his position in the institute supporting it.

My question is: has Dr. Barber informed you that he differs with his institute on this report, and if not, why haven't you removed him from the panel?

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

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm told that the dean of commerce at the University of Saskatchewan is a member of the institute; I'm told that the president and CEO (chief executive officer) of Dairy Producers Co-op is a member of the institute; I'm told that, Mr. Speaker, I'm told, Mr. Speaker, that the members of the institute cover a broad spectrum of the Saskatchewan business and academic community, Mr. Speaker. Would those members deny all of those people access to the Barber Commission? I think that's just a preposterous situation that they set out, Mr. Speaker.

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

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Before we move to the next series of questions and answers, I would once more ask for the co-operation of members on all sides of the House that those asking the questions be allowed to and those answering the questions be allowed to as well.

**Mr. Solomon:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Deputy Premier. Dr. Barber is a member of this institute, he's a member of the panel, and entertaining a report from his own institute, which he is a major player in, is like the song, 'I'm going to sit right down and write myself a letter,' Mr. Deputy Premier. And this panel from the start has been weighted against any independent thought. It is stacked with Tories, Mr. Speaker, for Tories, to try and put the best possible face on your plans to sell off the gas utility, and in short it's a whitewash. But even for you

people opposite, it's the height of cynicism to have a report favouring privatization presented to Dr. Barber by Dr. Barber's group and then say he's in a position to pass independent judgement on the report.

My question is: if you are not prepared to do the honourable thing, Minister, and remove Dr. Barber from the panel, would you at least have the decency to put all the facts before the people of this province and call the panel a whitewash rather than to continue to maintain this illusion that it is somehow supposed to be making independent judgement for the people of this province.

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

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, because there's a Dr. Brennan, an academic from the University of Saskatchewan, as a member of the institute, members opposite would deny any member of the world of academia the opportunity to make a presentation to the Barber Commission. Because, Mr. Speaker, Gunnar Pedersen, the CEO of the Dairy Producers Co-op is a member of the institute, they would deny all co-op members access, Mr. Speaker, to an opportunity to make a presentation to the Barber Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I think Dr. Barber's credentials are well known to all people in Saskatchewan. And they take delight, Mr. Speaker, they take delight in casting aspersions on Dr. Barber's character. I think, quite frankly, they do themselves a disservice in doing that. I think the people of Saskatchewan will endorse the fact that Dr. Barber will be an excellent commission member, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Lyons:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on the same topic, but to the Premier of the province, Mr. Premier, the last time Dr. Barber tried to dispose of the assets of the people of Saskatchewan, it was the library at the University of Regina. It took the intervention of Brian Mulroney to step in and to pass a Bill to allow . . . to make sure that educational institutions couldn't be privatized.

Mr. Premier, I'm wondering: could we look at the same kind of intervention by Mr. Mulroney in this case, either by passing legislation to stop your insanity of privatization, or by working with other members of your caucus who are trying to dump you in order to line up a new leadership so that the people of Saskatchewan have the pleasure of dealing with yourself and Dr. Barber through a new election. Will you do the decent thing and resign?

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

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, if the members opposite are so confident about the politics of SaskEnergy, why don't they just vote, Mr. Speaker? Why don't they just stand in their place and vote? Just let them vote . . .

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

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — We'll bring it back; we'll cancel the hearings, Mr. Speaker.

But they don't have the courage. You look at them. They don't have the courage to vote on that. They know it on potash, they know it on energy, they know it on the public participation — they do not have the courage to vote in democracy and let this legislature work, Mr. Speaker.

They say, call a by-election, call a general election. We've called general elections and won. We've called by-elections and won. If they had the courage to vote in here, Mr. Speaker, we'll call the next election, Mr. Speaker, and they will find the people will decide, if they have the courage to sit in here and vote.

When it comes to Dr. Barber, Dr. Barber is head of the university; he has had land entitlement hearings across the province of Saskatchewan; respected by the native people; respected by Northerners; respected by academics; respected by people across this country and international. And the member from Regina Rosemont stands up and casts aspersions on the president of the University of Regina. It won't do him any good in Rosemont and won't do the NDP any good any place across Canada, Mr. Speaker.

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

### Additional Nursing Positions

**Ms. Simard:** — My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Health.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Would the **Hon. Members** come to order.

**Ms. Simard:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** — Order. I'm going to once more . . . I'm going to once more ask the hon. members to give the member for Regina Lakeview — and there is more than one member, unfortunately, interfering with her, and I'd ask all members to allow her to speak.

**Ms. Simard:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, I see from an article in the *Leader-Post* that you've been stalling on your promise to provide many of the new nursing positions that you had promised in your budget, to staff our critically understaffed hospitals, Mr. Minister. I notice that your associate deputy minister has indicated that some of these positions may not be filled until September, and others may not be filled till December, Mr. Minister.

Now when you announced these positions, you did not tell the province that it may take you some eight months to fill them. Mr. Minister, why the delay in filling these positions when we have understaffed hospitals, overworked nursing staff, and patient care that's being jeopardized?

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

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — The hon. member indicates that

she noticed in an article in the *Leader-Post*, I believe were her words. That is a step forward . . . Mr. Speaker, that's a step forward in terms of research and in terms of information, although I don't say that it's necessarily the final word on anything.

Mr. Speaker, the article that the member refers to spoke of the 370 nursing positions that were announced in the budget, in this year's budget. One hundred and seventy of those nursing positions were for the new beds which are opening at St. Paul's Hospital, a major new expansion at St. Paul's; 200 of those positions are involved in a funding review.

And the article was very clear. I say to the hon. member and to you, Mr. Speaker, it was very clear that there is a funding review going on to identify exactly where the 200 positions will go in. The funding review is not one that's being done by myself or my officials alone, it's being done by representatives of the SHA (Saskatchewan Health-Care Association), of all the regional hospitals, of all of the large, tertiary care hospitals — they're all involved in it.

Mr. Speaker, that funding review is something we do not apologize for because those nursing positions when they are installed in the hospitals, must be — must be, I emphasize — placed in the areas of greatest concern. And those areas are in critical care, in out-patient clinics and day surgery, those new areas that are moving very, very quickly.

So, Mr. Speaker, we do not apologize for funding review to that member or to anyone else.

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

**Ms. Simard:** — New question, Mr. Speaker. The minister talks about a funding review. Well the minister of course is aware of the fact that studies have been done with respect to nursing and patient ratios before which have not been used, and which is clearly set out in a brief by the Saskatchewan Union of Nurses to your health care commission, that staffing levels have not been met in the hospitals.

Now, Mr. Minister, you are doing yet another study. Are you going to table that study when it is completed, and are you going to meet its recommendations, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, let me be very clear and let the member listen carefully to this. I didn't say that a study was under way; I said we announced in our budget speech, I have said in the past, and all the people in the hospitals know that there are 200 positions which are to be allocated. Those 200 positions are real and they're in this budget and they are to be allocated. All the hospitals are involved in the funding review which will determine . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. You know, hon. members are going to have to somehow control themselves. When the hon. member of Meadow Lake, the Minister of Health is trying to answer the question, he's being interrupted. And the same thing happened when somebody's asking the question.

Now somehow you're going to have to contain yourselves to allow some semblance of decorum in this Assembly. We just can't have constant interruptions from both sides of the House. It just doesn't work.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Let me just briefly summarize, Mr. Speaker. The funding review is there and is being conducted — it's not a study; it's not as the member tries to suggest — is being there for the proper allocation of 200 positions which will be real positions, 200 positions, and that's by agreement with the hospitals.

The hospitals said to us, we have these positions; we're thankful for them in this budget. And all of them have said that. That's true. The members over here will laugh but it's absolutely the case. They're thankful for the positions. The 200 positions will be there plus the 170 at St. Paul's for the major expansion which is opening.

And, Mr. Speaker, the areas, the first areas of this funding review are in the area of critical care, out-patient clinics, such as diabetic and renal clinics, and in the day surgery area, those three areas in our larger hospitals. Mr. Speaker, the hospitals know the positions are coming. The hon. member doesn't choose to believe it, but she likes to play politics with the hospitals of the province. I don't choose to do that.

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

**Ms. Simard:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, you can quibble about words if you like. If you'd rather call it a review than a study, well that's your prerogative, but it's all the same thing.

According to a brief submitted by the Saskatchewan Union of Nurses to the health care commission, Mr. Minister, there was an indication that all provinces except British Columbia and Prince Edward Island have a higher average of paid hours per bed for nursing staff than does Saskatchewan. In fact, the brief indicates we are about half the national average.

Now, Mr. Minister, wouldn't you say that's a good argument for putting these positions in immediately rather than stalling with yet another review?

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

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member well knows, and she chooses not to — at least I believe she well knows — that the circumstance in Saskatchewan with the number of rural hospital beds that we have, and so the averages that she refers to by provincial comparisons is not totally valid. And that was brought forward very clearly at the Murray commission hearings. That was brought forward very clearly by members of the commission in those hearings.

But, Mr. Speaker, I say this very clearly, the members of the opposition will choose to raise these kinds of questions and say that . . . and I think the words she used was 'stalling.' Mr. Speaker, this is clearly not a stall. There is no stalling going on. This is going on very quickly. And this review done by the SHA and the base

hospital, the regional hospitals, will be completed by September 1, and the 200 positions will be implemented by then.

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

### Lottery Kiosk Posters

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — I have a question to the Minister of Finance. Mr. Minister, I have here in my hand a copy of a notice which you sent out, a copy of a poster you sent out to all lottery kiosks in the province, and it asks that it be displayed prominently. And in this notice it indicates that all revenues collected will be going to hospitals, and it indicates the hospitals that are going to get money in Saskatoon, St. Paul's, and Leoville. It indicates that there's going to be some high-tech equipment acquisition — I hope you don't mean Guy Montpetit.

My question, Mr. Minister, is this. You've sent out this notice. You know there's nothing in the Act that directs that this money has to go to hospitals. In fact the Act says opposite. It's earmarked for general revenues. Have you ever heard of truth in advertising, Mr. Minister?

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

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — We will need, Mr. Speaker, the most advanced technology to determine the intellect behind that question, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question for the minister. The 800-million-dollar man would have received a letter written in with a reply which will have had the following message. It says, and I quote:

To whom it may concern: Please don't send me any more of your advertising. You are destroying the lottery system, and in particular my business. I will not put your notice in a prominent place, and you can put this where the prominent sun does not shine. Sincerely.

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

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Well that may well be a quote from the letter. However, I will just remind the hon. member to be very careful what he quotes in this House. One might be vague, but certain phrases . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Order, order. The hon. member for Regina Rosemont is once more challenging the authority of the Chair. I have said many times that this is not acceptable, and I say it now, and I will now ask him to rise and apologize for his challenge of the Chair.

The hon. member from Regina Rosemont, I'm asking the hon. member to rise. He has a choice.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Well thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I certainly apologize for whatever it was I did.

**The Speaker:** — Well the hon. member for Regina Rosemont . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Order, order. The hon. member from Rosemont, to use his exact words, said the following: 'Don't you start writing new rules.' Now I'm going to ask the hon. member to rise in his place,

to apologize in a dignified manner, and he cannot for ever be challenging the authority of the Chair.

**Mr. Lyons:** — I'm very, very sorry, Mr. Speaker, if you were offended by the remarks.

**The Speaker:** — Member from Quill Lakes is also challenging the Chair, and he will rise also and apologize.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I am sorry for the sensitivity of the Speaker. I apologize.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. The member from Quill Lakes I am once more asking to apologize in a reasonable manner . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And I would also like to remind the hon. member from Prince Albert to be careful of the phrase he uses.

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The comments of the letter-writer aside, then, Mr. Minister, you know that this is nothing more than political posturing and political advertising. Will you ask the PC Party to pay for this ad?

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

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Speaker, I have little doubt, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps the hon. member himself wrote the letter. I hope he paid the stamp, Mr. Speaker. We've had so much information, so-called, Mr. Speaker, from the opposition that has been less than accurate, has been far removed from any sense, Mr. Speaker, of accuracy during this session, and I would attribute that information in the same category as what we've been getting from the NDP all session.

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

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

#### Hours of Sitting

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure today to introduce this motion and speak on this motion, Mr. Speaker. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, at the outset, that in my opinion this debate itself should not, with all sense of the word, Mr. Speaker, be a long, extended debate on the subject that I'm going to speak.

Mr. Speaker, I want you to know, I want members of the Legislative Assembly to know, that I will be rather brief today. But while I will be brief, Mr. Speaker, I do have some very serious issues to raise before this Legislative Assembly today, and I take note, Mr. Speaker, that today is the 84th day of this session. I take note, Mr. Speaker, that if you add 17 days onto that, 84 plus 17 — 91 days.

**An Hon. Member:** — A hundred and one days.

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — One hundred and one, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I will correct my mathematics and I will let you know that I did not major in accounting, but I did graduate with a degree in business

administration. Mr. Speaker, as I said, I have some very serious points to raise this afternoon, and, Mr. Speaker, I would humbly ask the respect of this Assembly to address a very important issue on this day number 101.

Mr. Speaker, members opposite may laugh, members opposite may obstruct, members opposite may jest about the seriousness and the importance of the issue of which I am speaking, but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is no laughing matter. I want, Mr. Speaker, to cut through, to cut through a whole lot of talk and get right to the bare bones facts of the following debate, Mr. Speaker.

Last Wednesday, Mr. Speaker, I gave notice of this motion . . . or last Friday, I'm sorry, I gave notice of this motion that it is now time, Mr. Speaker, that this Assembly, both the opposition and the government, agree to sit extended hours. I say, Mr. Speaker, that is not without precedent, and I will refer to precedents in history in a few moments from now.

But I say, Mr. Speaker, on this 101st day, that this motion is dealing with sitting down and getting to work. This motion deals, Mr. Speaker, with management of this Assembly. Mr. Speaker, this motion deals with management of the people's business. This motion, Mr. Speaker, deals with management of the affairs of this great province of Saskatchewan. And fundamentally, Mr. Speaker, what this motion deals with is rights and responsibilities.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and I pose this question to the opposition or any person in Saskatchewan: does a duly elected government have the right to govern a province? I say, Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is yes. I say, Mr. Speaker, that motion, or that notion, may be somewhat in contradiction to some statements that we have heard in this province of Saskatchewan over the past months. I don't want to resurrect a long debate on some of those statements, but I will quickly quote one statement that has a great deal of significance.

That statement was made before we walked into this session more than 101 sitting days, and that statement, Mr. Speaker, was made by Barb Byers, one of the union leaders in this province. It was endorsed by members of the NDP, and the statement was: 'We, in concert with the NDP, will work to make this province ungovernable.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, on the surface some may say: well, that was just a partisan statement; it really didn't have any fundamental basis in fact. But I ask the question, Mr. Speaker, today I ask the question: was there some real seriousness about that statement? I believe the answer is yes.

But, Mr. Speaker, I say to you that a government indeed does have the duty, does have the responsibility, and does have the right to govern the affairs of the province. Mr. Speaker, that is why we have elections every four years.

Alternatively, Mr. Speaker, the question may be asked: does the opposition have the right to oppose, the right to speak in a free and an open and a democratic society? Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously the answer to that question

is yes, the opposition does have that right to speak; it does have that right to oppose. But, Mr. Speaker, does the opposition have a responsibility, a responsibility to oppose in a responsible way? Well yes, Mr. Speaker, I think every living soul . . .

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

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — I think every living soul with common sense in this province of ours would say, yes indeed they do have that responsibility to oppose in a responsible manner.

Today, Mr. Speaker, after 101 sitting days, after being here more than four months, I believe that those rights and those responsibilities and those principles — if you wanted to sum up, if you wanted to sum up those statement of affairs in this Legislative Assembly — those rights and responsibilities and principles are in conflict today.

There is an impasse in this legislature, Mr. Speaker, and I'm here today to speak on that impasse. And I'm here today, Mr. Speaker, to suggest to this Assembly, with every force that I can muster, that it is time that we get back to work. It is time that we manage affairs, the affairs of this province, with responsibility and with some dignity, I might add.

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

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — I say, Mr. Speaker, that there has to be a balance. I think that that is fair and that is reasonable. When you look back in history not all that long ago Mr. Speaker — just two years ago, slightly more — this government was elected. This government was elected. This government was elected with a majority, a majority of members in this legislature.

And when you look at that, Mr. Speaker, you would say, well, what is part and part of this government's mandate? What is part and parcel of this government's philosophy and similar thinking people's philosophy? I don't think there's any question, Mr. Speaker, that the issue of state ownership comes to the forefront.

I think if you look over history, Mr. Speaker, Conservative-minded people, Liberal-minded people of days gone by have thought that state ownership should be limited. Very much in contradiction to that, you have New Democratic people, socialist-minded people, that say no, we should have more state ownership. Well, Mr. Speaker, that debate has gone on for 20 years. That debate has gone on for 20 years, and it is here fundamentally with us today. If you cut away all of the obstruction, if you cut away all the games, if you cut away all of the talk, the facts are, Mr. Speaker, that that issue is with us today.

Mr. Speaker, if there is one item, one item under that state ownership or control issue that probably has surfaced more than any others in the past 20 years, it is the issue of nationalization of the potash industry. That, Mr. Speaker, was a debate that was a historic debate in this province. I did not sit in the legislature, Mr. Speaker, at the time, but even as a young man at that time I had some keen interest in that debate. And I know doing research, Mr. Speaker, and I know from experience, it was a historic debate, and

it was a lengthy debate, and it was a hard fought debate on both sides that still today carries some very strong feelings.

And, Mr. Speaker, the issue today is not so much the debate on Bill No. 20, but the specific issue, getting right down to the fundamental question or facts, is the process. What is a fair, what is a reasonable, what is a responsible process under which that debate shall be conducted, and is a very, very key and fundamental question. What is the process under which that debate shall take place?

When you have a government that has been duly elected by the people of the province of Saskatchewan; when you have an opposition that has openly stated that the Bill will not pass; when you have an opposition that said we will be here until Christmas or later, Mr. Speaker, what is a fair length of time? What is the process? What is the fair length of time, Mr. Speaker?

Well I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, if you look at it in the context of the 101st sitting day of the session, the longest session in the history of this province.

**An Hon. Member:** — That's not true.

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — You add up the days, Mr. Speaker, and the 101st day today, add on any number of days at all, it will be the longest session in the history of this province. When you add on, Mr. Speaker, the fact we have been here for four months, Mr. Speaker; when you add on the fact, Mr. Speaker, that this debate has been ongoing now I think it has been called forward some 20 times . . .

The number of hours, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, if we want to get into the game, and I might as well bring up the issue because the opposition will. We might as well bring up the issue of how many months, how many days, how many hours, how many speakers. It has been referred to by members in the legislature here within the past number of days.

I think if you check the record, Mr. Speaker, you will look back and see members opposite standing in their place and talking about the potash nationalization debate taking place over a period of probably two months. This debate has taken already four months. You will hear members opposite talk about total number of hours, and let's talk about total number of hours. Somewhere in the neighbourhood of a hundred hours. I believe the member for Regina North West referred to 105 hours. I have not gone back. And I don't know if anybody kept precise hours to the minute, but I would say that it's a fair estimate, around a hundred hours of debate took place over the nationalization issue.

(1445)

It's a fair . . . Taking a fair look at it, Mr. Speaker, you will find that that debate did take place over a period of two months. And furthermore, fundamentally, Mr. Speaker, you will find that that debate took place with extended sitting hours. And, Mr. Speaker, in doing a little research in doing a little research, I have determined that under the

nationalization debate in days gone by, extended hours took place from 10 o'clock in the morning till 12:30 p.m. January 6, January 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28.

Mr. Speaker, extended hours were called for; extended hours were given. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to you that that is what this motion is about, is about sitting extended hours; getting back to work and facing the issues of the day; having the courage to stand in your place, speak your mind, make your points as vehemently and as strongly as you may. But, Mr. Speaker, what we're asking for here today is not unfair; it is not unreasonable; it is not unprecedented; and it will provide to members of the opposition plenty of time to make their debate, plenty of time to have that debate and take responsibility for what they were elected to do.

And so I say to you, Mr. Speaker, I am now calling, calling on the opposition. And I say once again, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this shall not be a long, extended debate, and it is, Mr. Speaker, in fact, it is a sad day when we even have to sit here and debate for any length whether or not we shall sit extended hours at this stage of the game.

So I'm calling on all members of the Legislative Assembly. And I have asked the member for Redberry, the whip of this Assembly, to second this motion and assist this government in managing the affairs of this Assembly, in managing the affairs of this province and sitting extended hours.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, there will be two members from this side of the House that will speak. My speech has been rather limited. The member from Redberry will only have a five minute or so speech.

And, Mr. Speaker, I therefore move, seconded by the member for Redberry:

That notwithstanding rule 3, this Assembly shall on each sitting day following the adoption of this motion, meet from 8 o'clock a.m. until 11 o'clock a.m., from 1 o'clock p.m. until 11 o'clock p.m., with orders of the day being called at 8 o'clock a.m., and routine proceedings being called at 1 o'clock p.m. each day.

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

**Mr. Gerich:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm the Government Whip here on this side of the government, and I take my job very seriously on behalf of my colleagues. My job as the whip is the same as the member from Quill Lakes as the Opposition Whip — to ensure that all MLAs are in the House to debate and hear debate. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in seconding the motion of my hon. colleague. Because of this motion and what it says to the members opposite, if you are sincere in what you want, an extended opportunity to debate, well here it is and let's get at it.

I have one misgiving about the second of this motion, Mr. Speaker, and one only. And that misgiving is, is that the opposition is not in fact sincere about wanting to debate

this motion. It does not want to debate it at all, but to obstruct. The opposition, the NDP, desires to govern by obstruction.

The member for Riversdale is a constitutional lawyer, Mr. Speaker, and he better than anyone should know that this is not an American system of government. There are no vetoes allowed in our parliamentary form, and he's trying to exercise a veto that he has no constitutional or legal right to do so.

So the government once again is offering a compromising solution. The government is proposing that we sit extended hours to allow the NDP the opportunity they claim to need to debate, and this is what the motion does. Now, Mr. Speaker, the question of debate is central to this motion, and the efforts of the opposition relate directly to this motion. Because of that direct relationship, it is in order that I briefly survey for the Assembly the opposition's motives when they have stated publicly that they oppose this motion.

Their motives are amplified by the member from Regina Centre, Mr. Speaker. On July 12 the member from Regina Centre debated this Bill; then on July 14 the member from Regina Centre debated the Bill; then on July 17 the member from Regina Centre debated the Bill; July 20 the member for Regina debated this Bill. Well you see how it's going here, Mr. Speaker. This one member occupied five days and six debating sessions with repetition and otherwise poor remarks, repetition. In this kind of activity it is central to the needs of the member from Regina Centre and cohorts . . . then the motion we are now debating will provide them with additional time needed.

The member from Regina Centre is not alone here, Mr. Speaker. The member for blackmailing chambers of commerce . . . well pardon me, the member from Battlefords debated this Bill for over two days, or over four days. And the member who likes to talk about the Ku Klux Klan, from Quill Lakes, he debated it for over two days. And the member who's proud to be a radical, from Regina Victoria, he debated it for two days. The member from Cumberland, he debated for three days. And the Regina member from Regina North, he was three days. And it goes on and on.

The opposition has stated in the media that their great concern is that all of the members have the opportunity to debate. Well, Mr. Speaker, as whip I have a suggestion for them. If they could control their members who get up, to keep their speeches to a reasonable length, then every single one of them across the way could have spoken by now.

Yet the government is sensitive to that stated concern, and so this motion before us will increase time available to the members opposite.

I will find it interesting indeed, Mr. Speaker, to hear the excuses today offered by the NDP, why they should not have to work a few hours extra when it is their own members who are consuming the entire day with nonsense.

I have done a bit of research and found that something in over 200 points of points of order, points of privilege, and frivolous demands for emergency debates — over 200 instances of this kind by wasting time by the members opposite. And they shout out that we're wasting time, as well as the hours that we want to extend.

It is a sad day indeed for this Assembly when the Leader of the Opposition tells the people that if the government acts to facilitate public business as it's going and doing with this motion, then the party he leads will find other meaningful ways to stop the Legislative Assembly — and I call them dirty ways, Mr. Speaker. It'll be messy, says the opposition House Leader. Well it will be messy. What an attitude. What a deplorable attitude.

We are proposing this motion to provide extra time that the NDP say they need, and they're opposed to extra time. It's a situation where they can't have their cake and eat it too, Mr. Speaker.

Are they serious about more time? And if so, will they support this motion? And if not, then let the Assembly vote on the Bills before us. I don't want to be part of an NDP obstruction and continue on for ever and ever. So let me say I'm proud to second the motion, and by their actions ye shall know them, and let's see whether or not they really and sincerely want to get on with the business of the House. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to the motion that has been put forward by the minister in charge of Highways, and I want to say at the outset that it's interesting to listen to the debate that has gone on here today. I've been watching the clock, and I think the debate that has gone on here by these two members is about 26 minutes, which is the total debate that that government has done on the potash Bill of the 40 hours — that's the truth.

The minister who introduced the Bill spent 20 minutes — 20 minutes; the Deputy Premier spent 6 minutes, for a total of 26. This is the kind of debate that they have put into the potash Bill, the Bill that would privatize the potash corporation.

I want to say as well, Mr. Speaker, at the outset — at the outset — that we will agree to the motion with one small amendment. And I intend to move the following amendment at the conclusion of my remarks. And this would, in fact, stop you from hiding what you're attempting to do here today and that is from avoiding the committee work of this legislature.

The amendment that I will move will be that following the words . . . that be added to the motion:

Except that the Assembly will not meet Tuesdays and Thursdays between 8 o'clock a.m. and 11 o'clock a.m., in order to permit public accounts and Crown corporations to sit.

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



**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — So we're picking up your challenge, Mr. Minister. Far from not wanting to work and accepting your hours, we will, and we'll add to them the amount of work that this Assembly does. That's what we'll do.

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — I also take it that in picking up your offer and accepting to support your motion, supporting your motion by the end of today, I also give that commitment, if you agree to this amendment, small amendment that would actually increase the amount of work, if you're sincere in your motion.

**An Hon. Member:** — So move your motion.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — I will as soon as I complete my remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That if you agree to that, also we would expect, not demanding of you, that closure will not be invoked, that you will give us the privilege to speak as long as we want on the new hours. That's the commitment I hear you giving today. That's the commitment. That's the commitment. That's what I hear.

And I say to you that I will move this amendment. The amendment is, is that we not sit Tuesday and Thursday so we can deal with public accounts and Crown corporations. And we'll be testing, we'll be testing to see whether you're really committed to working during this period. I don't think you are. I think what you're trying to do is hide the report of Crown investments corporation, which public accounts was supposed to deal with tomorrow, and issues like GigaText, which was dealt with the last couple of days in Crown corporations.

That's what's happening here. And the press will know who sat in Crown corporations and watched the minister in charge of SEDCO stonewall day after day for two full days on every question relating to GigaText and the waste of over \$5 million.

Now this is a government that says they don't want to waste the few thousand dollars that it costs to run this legislature, the democracy, run the democracy. They don't want to waste time and . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I'd like to ask the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster to allow the member to continue.

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — I say what's happening here is a cover-up for that minister of SEDCO in Crown corporations, and for the department and the Crown corporation of the Crown investments corporation in public accounts. That's what you people are doing, and everyone knows it.

Everyone agrees that you people are hiding the facts from them on important issues. GigaText, for example, if you were concerned, if in fact you were concerned about the cost of running the legislature, you certainly wouldn't have run up a deficit in the province of \$14 billion. You wouldn't have done that. The few thousand dollars that it costs to have a democratic system in this province —that

is, debate — should be encouraged.

For you to say that because we're at day 83 or 84, that we, the government, are going to decide to end the session, is like the government in China saying to the students: you've been in the square long enough; you're wasting the money of the people of China; we're going to come in with the tanks and remove you because it's costing too much money. That is not the reason that you're moving this motion, any more than it was the Chinese government bringing the tanks into Tiananmen Square. The reason they did it is because the students were embarrassing them and their popularity was going down. That's the reason.

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — And I make the commitment here today that on extended hours we will be here for a long time, not to embarrass the government — that may be an outcropping or an outcome of a long, protracted debate on potash. That's not the reason we're going to stay a long time. The reason we're going to stay a long time is because the majority of the people in the province have rejected privatization, Progressive Conservative style, out of hand in this province. That's what they've done.

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

(1500)

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — And the Premier yells from his seat, well vote on SaskEnergy. He is the individual who hasn't even got it before the House. Well we can't vote on it if we haven't debated it. You pulled the Bill; you pulled the Bill. We didn't pull the Bill; you pulled it. So I say to you, any time you want to bring it back in, any time you want to bring the Bill back in on SaskEnergy, you can do it.

The agreement that you broke — and I say here today, with the introduction of this motion — you broke; it's finished. It doesn't exist any more. And I tell you that you can bring SaskEnergy back in today. You can bring it back in today. I say to you, Mr. Minister, that when you want to bring SaskEnergy, when you want to bring the SaskEnergy Bills back in, you can do it — you can do it.

And I say to you that having introduced this motion today, obviously you have broken the deal which stated you would not extend hours without the request of the opposition. You made that commitment and that promise. The deputy leader of the government made that commitment. He made that commitment and he broke the deal.

Now I understand why the Deputy House Leader would be allowed to break that deal because that minister is on his way out. He will be fired along with the member from Rosetown in the near future, and I believe, along with the minister from Kindersley and the minister from Maple Creek, that they will be gone . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I don't think the Minister of Health will be gone. He was not involved in GigaText; he wasn't involved in Rafferty; he wasn't involved in the attack on the auditor.

What we see here is a government that is in a great deal of

trouble. Now there's one word of advice that the Premier of this province gave that he didn't follow in this case. He's well-known for saying the old adage, 'Don't say whoa in a mud hole.' Well I say on privatization he's in that mud hole, and he's stopped by the people of this province. He's stopped dead in his tracks!

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — I want to say that this is indeed a sad day for the province of Saskatchewan and for the legislature. It's sad. It's unprecedented what we are doing here today. I say again this is what governments do when they are in deep political trouble.

There's another reason why obviously the members opposite want to get out of here is because the per diems have run out. They want to get out quickly, that's why they want to get out. Tories without per diems are an anxious lot to end the session. That's what it is.

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** And the Premier has this problem. He's at 25 per cent in the polls, personally. He knows it. His back-benchers are antsy. They're at him every day in caucus saying either get this thing out of the mud hole or we've got to look for a new leader. We've got to do something to get unstuck. That's what he's saying.

So the Premier says, how do I get the members back out in the country so they're not after my hide. How do we do that? Well what he says, well we've got to get out of the session. And Nancy McLean advises him the same thing — get out of session and turn the thing around, because the polls continue to slide for you. And the back-benchers are saying, we're out of our per diem and we want you to either get us out of this House or get us up in the polls.

So what he's doing is getting not his House Leader, because he's on the way out, he gets his Deputy House Leader to introduce a motion which everyone knows is inconsistent with what has gone on here in the past.

Now they have referred to motions that have been introduced before, that have amended rule 3 that would have extended hours. And I go back to the potash debate — back in 1975 and '76 — and I go to the record of the Assembly, which was misquoted and misled by the member who introduced the motion. Monday, December 22, 1975 — you want to hear the real story, the truth about extended hours, not the mistruths which you just quoted — I want to read:

That notwithstanding Rule 3, this Assembly shall meet at 10:00 o'clock a.m. on Tuesday, January 6, 1976, and on each Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday thereafter.

Now you may wonder why we're concerned about the fact that we're sitting in the mornings. Obviously at that time they didn't have committees going. In that session there were no committees going. It was a special session and there were no committees sitting.

And at every instance, when hours have been extended in

the past, it was routine — I remember many times sitting on the government side — the then Government House Leader getting up and extending hours the days after the committees were completed, as it was during the potash debate. There were no committees sitting.

And did we meet at 8 o'clock on Monday morning? No, Monday morning there was consideration given to the opposition for driving back into town or preparing for the week. Did we meet on Fridays till 11 p.m.? Did we meet till 11 p.m. on Fridays? Obviously not. So the hypocrisy of this government stands out in glaring contrast to what the truth and reality really is.

Now to really find out the truth of this government when it comes to hours of sitting, there was a committee that was established two years ago that dealt with the issue of sitting and hours of sitting. What was their opinion then? Did they believe at that time we should sit at nights from 7 o'clock to 11? No, not that government, because at that time, it was politically expedient to not sit at nights. It was democratic principle to not sit at nights to avoid debate at night.

I want to read to you what the hours of sitting that were recommended by Tories of that day, the same crew. It was after the last election so all the people, with the exception of the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, are the same. What hours did they want to sit then when it was politically expedient not to sit long hours?

Well at that time they wanted to sit on Monday, not from 8 in the morning, but from 2 until 6, a total of four hours; and on Tuesdays they wanted to sit from 11 to 1 and 2 till 6; and on Wednesday they wanted to sit from 2 till 6; and from Thursday they wanted to sit from 11 till 1 and 2 to 6; and Fridays they wanted to sit from 10 until 1. What they wanted to do at that time was reduce the number of hours we sat in a week from 24 hours to 23.

**An Hon. Member:** — No reduction, same hours.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — No, add them up. Here again, it's no wonder you're \$14 billion in the hole — add them up, add them up.

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — When it was politically expedient not to sit long hours and not to sit at night, quite a different set of rules are being proposed by Conservative members. And they're here; they're in writing. This is really what they want; this is really what they want. They don't want to sit any nights.

Well now what do they want to do? Now they want to extend hours in the name of democracy and the principles of the legislature. Well everyone knows that's a phoney argument. The reason that they want to sit longer hours is because they're embarrassed about privatization.

They're into a struggle of their life, and they want to get out of here because their pollster, Ken Waschuk, the guy under police investigation, is advising them to get out. Nancy McLean is advising them to get out of here because it's bad for their image. And what Nancy McLean

is saying, look, if you stay any longer and these polls stay at 25 per cent — between 25 and 30 per cent — you won't be able to recover in time to win the next election.

That is the great principle that your motion, Mr. Minister, deals with — popularity and winning the next election. And you ought to be embarrassed; you're a disgrace to the House for moving that motion.

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Minister, and Mr. Speaker, I want to say as well that when we began this session, this whole debate over privatization was to be the PC Party's Alamo. They were going to beat up on the opposition. They wanted it to be brought in the first day and to be debated for ever because they thought it was politically popular to debate privatization. You remember the comment of the Premier when he was in a brave mood at the beginning of the session. That's when the polls were still, relatively still, even before he dropped the 15 or 20 per cent that he's dropped during this infamous session for the Progressive Conservative Party.

He said at that time that this would be the Alamo, that he wanted to debate potash as long and at every opportunity. Well we've come a long way in 80-some days, we've come a very, very long way for the Conservative Party. The Premier himself has dropped in popularity about 15 points; he runs and hides on the issue of privatization. He can't wait to get out of here and end the potash debate, to the extent that he has his Deputy House Leader move a motion that would have us sit 55 hours a week.

Well I say to the members opposite, we intend to sit 55 hours a week and debate potash. And we'll do that at the end of the day if you agree to our amendment.

**An Hon. Member:** — Can you send us a copy of it?

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — We'll certainly send a copy to the members opposite. And I also say to you that what we want to do is not only work the length and hours with the exclusion of Tuesday and Thursday, but we want to do the committee work as well. And we intend to find out, for example, where the money went that was spent on GigaText and Rafferty and all those boondoggles that you people have been involved in.

Now you may try to sell the case that the opposition is somehow filibustering or not doing their job in holding up unpopular legislation. This is an interesting comment by members who hold themselves up as parliamentarians, that an opposition role isn't to try to stop unpopular legislation. I thought that was what opposition was all about; I thought that was the principle on which democracy lived and died, was the principle of debate.

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Now it may be that the public is concerned about our lengthy debates; it may be. I don't find it in any of the comments or phone calls that I get. I've not had one letter that argues from my constituents saying, will you please get out of the legislature; we don't want you there doing the work for us. That could be.

Or it could be that the member from Morse is getting a lot of calls saying, why aren't you out on holidays; you should be out on holidays instead of working in the legislature. He may be able to produce letters that argue that he should be out farming, changing his irrigation system, or that he should be doing something else, maybe holidaying in the Cypress Hills. Maybe your constituents are arguing that you should do that, but ours aren't. You really have different type of constituents if that's what the argument is, because our constituents are arguing that we're doing a good job. I can guarantee you that, and I could bring in literally hundreds of letters of commendation, not for myself but for my colleagues who, I believe, are doing a superb job.

Now you in the government and some members of the press may say this is the most unproductive session in the history of the province, but that does not reflect the mood of the public. It doesn't reflect the mood of the public. What the public is saying is this: you have exposed Rafferty, the boondoggle; you've exposed the member from Kindersley in his attack on the auditor, unwarranted and personal attack on the auditor; you've exposed the deputy leader and the minister in charge of SEDCO in the GigaText scandal and the flights around the country and down to San Francisco. They say that you've done a good job on that. You've documented, from a court case in Montreal, the Premier using the limousine of Guy Montpetit when he's in Montreal as a personal friend, and then that individual bilking the people of the province for 5 million. And they make a connection between Grant Devine's use of the limousine and . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. The hon. member is referring to another member by name, and I'm sure he realizes that's not permissible.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — I apologize for that. I want to refer to the Premier. We exposed the Premier as using the limousine of Guy Montpetit, during this session, in exchange for \$5 million unaccounted for. And the public are concerned about waste and mismanagement. I'll guarantee you that they are.

But you're not going to convince anyone that debating in this House is waste and mismanagement. It can't be done. The people don't believe it. You're trying to sell a pig in a poke. You're trying to make a silk purse out of a pig's ear. It simply can't be done. Your pollster must be able to tell you that, that trying to convince the people of the province that Roy Romanow on giving a speech on potash is wasting . . .

(1515)

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I know the hon. member's into his speech, but he's just committed the same offence, and I bring that to his attention.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — I'll refer to the Leader of the Opposition giving a speech on potash as being . . . there is no person in this province who, when the Leader of the Opposition rises to give a speech on potash, says this is waste and mismanagement. They just don't think that way. People in a democracy don't think that way.

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Even the people in Russia with an extreme form of government don't believe that debate is a form of waste and mismanagement. I'll tell you the countries in the world that do believe debate is waste and mismanagement. China, when it comes to the square and the students, believe that that kind of form of demonstration and protest shouldn't be allowed — yes, they're radicals. I want to say that in Chile, debate is not accepted as a legitimate form, that it's waste and mismanagement and shouldn't be allowed. South Africa, allowing Blacks to debate in their legislature or their forum is waste and mismanagement and shouldn't be allowed.

I say to you people that you will not be able to convince the people of this province that our debating at length the potash corporation's privatization, the sell-off to foreign governments, is waste and mismanagement; they won't believe it. They won't believe that our trying to stop the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan being sold to the government of China, India, and other countries is waste and mismanagement. That's what they want us to be doing.

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — But I say as well that the members opposite have a reason for not wanting us to be sitting the regular hours as instructed in the rules under rule 3 of the rules of this legislature. I mean, they're your rules. You've been in government for seven years. They're not our rules; they're your rules. They're the rules of the Assembly. They're Mr. Speaker's rules. They're all of our rules that we sat down and negotiated out.

You can't make the people believe that these are not acceptable rules, that you're a lazy bunch over there who sat down and planned rules that would allow you to be lazy. I don't believe it. Obviously the people of the province know that this place involves more than just sitting in the House for 15 hours a day; that in the morning we have committee work to do; that from time to time the member from Lloydminster would have to be in his constituency to do constituency work. But I say to you . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — You never know.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Well I maybe used the wrong example, given the editorials in the Lloydminster paper which talk about that minister's . . . or that member's action in his constituency. But I say there are reasons why they don't want to be out and about or sitting regular hours. One I've alluded to, and that is the committees that will be avoided by extending the hours.

The second reason, obviously, is so that members on this side cannot be out and around during summer events, because it's been bothering you people a great deal that the Leader of the Opposition and other members, in terms of being in the House, are here a great deal, but are also out doing their chores in constituencies of meeting with constituents.

And I know, having gone to Melfort a few times in the last month, meeting with the mayor and the councillors up there, they appreciate very much the work that we're doing in fighting for fertilizer plants that would be decentralized — will be decentralized.

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — And the minister opposite who introduced the motion knows that this will in many ways stop that outreach that the members of the opposition have been involved in. It may, in his case, save his seat. That's another small part of the motion.

Another reason, of course, is simply to try to hide the facts from the public; that is, is to get the debate over with as quickly as possible and to get out of this session because that's what their pollster and their adviser from Toronto is advising them to do.

Well I say to the members opposite that it simply won't work. Maybe the pressure is coming from the member from Rosthern to get out of here because he's not getting a per diem. I don't know that. Maybe it is, and maybe the member from Shaunavon wants to be back at the farm for harvest. Maybe that's the reason.

But I say to you that the public is not interested in your personal agendas; they're not interested in whether you're getting per diem or not. What they are interested in is whether or not . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Once more I ask the members to allow the member from Regina Elphinstone to continue, and a constant interruption, of course, is not permitted. Let us co-operate.

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to talk at length on this debate, on the motion that would amend rule 3, because I agree with the minister on one point, that we want to get into the potash debate, which will be lengthy and will go on at length. And I agree with you that closure is not a good idea, and I appreciate that you're not going to be moving closure and will allow us as long as we would like to debate this motion. That's part of this agreement and understanding.

Mr. Speaker, the arrogance of this government is unbelievable when it comes to democracy. They define, after day 84 or 85, whatever we're at, that the debate should end. They decide that, unilaterally, no negotiation.

I'm not going to argue that the member opposite, the member from Melfort, should have come to our caucus with a proposal and said, look, here are some hour changes; maybe we could negotiate a deal. He wouldn't do it. Not once did he come across with a proposal to change the hours — not once. Not once with a list of the hours — not once. All he did is stand up in the House, arrogantly, and say, I move that we extend hours. That is arrogance; that is arrogance. It won't work.

In an opposition's role, a government that tries to jam

things at an opposition will always lose, and I'm surprised that this government hasn't learned that after this session; that the reality is, is that concurrence is the way to go in a Legislative Assembly.

When you changed the rules on bell-ringing — and I'm surprised at the government, because on bell-ringing they got themselves into the same jam. They didn't consult; they just introduced a motion. And then after some weeks of debate they had to face the embarrassment of withdrawing it and moving it to the committee where it should have been to start with.

I would like to quote briefly, Mr. Speaker, from a great parliamentarian who has studied . . . not a parliamentarian but an educator who's studied parliament, Josef Redlich, the authority from his book, *The Procedure of the House of Commons*, and what he says about concurrence. He demonstrates that in the nations that have democratic and representative government, that concurrence is in fact a fundamental of making the system work. I want to read what he says, and I quote:

In all modern civilized states, one of the main ends served by parliaments is the public establishment of this concurrence; and a parliament, as its name implies, is an institution for public speaking.

There is one common characteristic of all modern constitutional systems of government. In all such systems the only constitutional forum of ascertaining the will of the state is that of going through a process of speech and reply in parliament, so as to discover what most nearly corresponds to the wish of all. Speech is therefore the element which give life and action to the parliamentary body.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you will know, and the public will know, that extending hours to 55 hours a week is in fact a form of closure and an attempt to end the debate on potash. We all know that, and we all know why they want to do it. It's not to get potash through *per se*, it's to get it through to avoid the embarrassment and the slide the Premier finds himself on.

That's why the Premier directed the Government Deputy House Leader to move the motion, and that's why the House Leader didn't introduce the motion — for two reasons. I think the House Leader was embarrassed, as well as the fact that he's on the way out.

I want to say as well that in looking at this amendment that I will be moving, I think that this may give some reason to the extended hours. I don't agree with them, but in order to get our position put in the committees, we will agree to it if you agree to our amendment. And I'll send a copy across at this time to give an opportunity for members to have a look at it.

I want to say, as well, that while the members opposite have given lip service to democracy, and talk about democracy, they simply do not give any examples of how they would make it work.

Instead, you see the bullying of the government, not only the members of the opposition, because we're big enough, we have a forum. If they extend hours to 24 hours a day, we can speak for months. We have a very talented caucus — I want to say that publicly — probably the most talented opposition that I can ever remember being in this House. You can extend hours to 55 hours a week, to a hundred hours a week; that will not stifle the opposition's ability to debate this Bill.

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — But I say again that it's not the opposition that realizes the brunt of this bullying. It's the kiosk operators that was brought up in the House today, were sent a letter from the Minister of Finance saying, look, you people put up this political bulletin on your kiosks.

**An Hon. Member:** — Or else.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — He doesn't add the 'or else,' but they know full well. But some of them stand up to the minister and fight back, even in light of the fact that the minister has the ultimate power to do a lot of damage to those kiosk operators.

It's the environmentalists who live in the Estevan area, in fact across the province, who stand up to the minister in charge of the power corporation, government employees who stand up to them, who face the brunt and run the risk of losing their jobs.

It's the welfare recipients who I get literally hundreds of calls from. All the time my phone is ringing — people who are being forced out of their homes; having their power cut off; people living on less than 200 a month in the constituency of Elphinstone; and members opposite laugh. And I'm sure the member from Assiniboia will laugh when we have constituents who are literally going hungry, literally going hungry. And the member laughs and shouts from his seat, and I really believe if he were to come to my constituency and walk for one day up and down some of the streets of those people who are forced to live on welfare because there are no jobs, and they can't afford to get out of the constituency — I'll tell you, they're not fortunate enough to leave the province as many others are — that you would not be laughing. I believe that firmly, that you would not laugh about the plight of welfare recipients in my constituency.

Well I tell you that the member from Lloydminster shouts from his seat. But I want to say as well that the people of this province, the people of this province are concerned, are concerned about the bullying of this government. And I say again, it doesn't matter whether it's the auditor, whether it's the Ombudsman, whether it's the Law Clerk, whether it's the environmentalists, whether it's the kiosk operators, whether it's the 10,000 farmers who have received foreclosure notice, all of them feel bullied by this government and are tired of it.

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote now from one authority on the parliamentary system. I

would very much like to quote from an English author and statesman, Herbert Morrison, who states the following:

If the opposition is genuinely convinced that the government has no mandate for controversial measures, and that they are not urgent (that the issues aren't urgent) it has a moral justification for a sustained opposition.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that we feel that way about the issue of privatization. I think we have not only a responsibility but a moral obligation to fight privatization. I feel very strongly about it. I believe the public of Saskatchewan were given the commitment by this government, by the Premier, that he would not privatize any utilities, would not privatize any of SaskPower. That trust has been broken. That trust has been broken with the people of the province. There is no way of having good will between the government and the opposition under those circumstances.

The only cleansing that will happen . . . What is attempted here is to remove some key ministers to cleanse the government in that way, to get rid of the minister responsible for the boondoggle of Rafferty. I'm sure he wants to get back to his family and all of those reasons, but everyone knows the real reason is, is that he made a mess of Rafferty.

Everyone will know when the minister in charge of Justice leaves to go back to his family that it's really because he attacked the auditor and was found wanting in that responsibility.

(1530)

And when the minister, the deputy leader, and the minister in charge of SEDCO leave to go back to their families and do personal things, when they do that the public will know it is because of GigaText.

That isn't the cleansing that is needed here. The cleansing that is needed here to straighten out this whole mess is a provincial election, and that's the only thing that will . . .

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I believe that with all my heart that what we have to do here today is agree, get on with the potash debate. It will be a historic debate. I hope that in the end the government comes to its senses, either because of the will of the people is overwhelming, or simply that even they read their own polls and find that they can't win the next election on privatization. And if they do that they may win the next election. But if we save SaskPower and the potash corporation, I believe it's important enough. Even if we lose the election as a result of them backing away from it, we will continue the debate.

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, if it's necessary I will read the amendment that I would propose:

That the following words be added to the motion:

Except that the Assembly shall not meet on Tuesdays and Thursdays between 8 o'clock a.m. and 11 o'clock a.m. in order to permit the Public Accounts and Crown Corporations Committees to sit.

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

**Mr. Pringle:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise today and to second this and support this amendment to this motion as put forward by my colleague from Regina Elphinstone. And I would like to commend him for the very thoughtful comments that he made about the very undemocratic actions by this government, and also for putting forth such a reasoned amendment. And I am sure that the back-benchers on the government side will see fit to support this amendment.

Before I begin my comments, I would like to have two or three reactions to some comments that were made by the Deputy House Leader. As I listened to him, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it became clear to me that this is a government that's so out of touch that they don't even realize that the public of Saskatchewan is holding them accountable for the situation we find ourselves in today, that the public is holding them responsible for their incompetence. And in fact, the public trust has been broken, which is clear to me as I speak to the people of Saskatoon Eastview.

It's the government that is responsible for the business of this Assembly, not the opposition. It's not the fault of Barb Byers that this province is in a mess. It's the fault of this government, of this Premier, but they like to blame others for the situation they find themselves in.

Like another point that's worth making is the deception that was evident again in the Deputy House Leader's comments where he said that we spent 20 days debating potash. Well we've spent part of 20 days. For example, the evening I spoke, I spoke for about 40 minutes because the government's been tacking on a half an hour, an hour a day. So they're giving the impression that it's been 20 days; it's really been about 20 or 30 hours. And so it's another example of deception that the people of this province are becoming used to and see through.

Mr. Speaker, little did I realize last February when the Leader of the Opposition made me the critic for democratic reform and I would have to speak so many times in this session about the undemocratic actions of this government. We see again today another example of this government's attempt to unilaterally, in an unparalleled way, which is their usual practice in these breaches, but to unilaterally change the manner of operation in this House.

This has been done so many times during this session: the unilateral attempt to change the rule on bell-ringing, primarily because we prevented the government, the people of the province prevented the government from doing something that the public didn't want them to do in the first place; the unparalleled attack, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on your official, the Provincial Auditor, because he expressed concerns about this government's waste and mismanagement, about this government's lack of

co-operation and, indeed, about this government's violation of its own laws. Anybody or any group who gets in the way of this government, as my colleague from Regina Elphinstone says, is bullied so that the government can proceed with its own agenda.

This motion is clearly designed to squelch the opposition. This government isn't putting forth any arguments to support their potash initiatives. They aren't even participating in the debate. This is a government that sees itself as above accountability. They see themselves as above scrutiny, and the attack on the Provincial Auditor is a very good example of this. The attack, incidentally, two years in a row, the attack was more intense this year because the report was much more critical, and rightly so.

Now how does the Deputy House Leader, when he's talking about us being undemocratic, feel about his Justice minister attacking the Provincial Auditor? Surely that has some impact on the bitterness and the lack of trust and respect that's evident in the Assembly. So he's not willing to accept any responsibility on the part of the government for the atmosphere which is evident in this Assembly.'

But it's not only the attack on the Provincial Auditor which we see as an undemocratic act, it's the trying to get around the process on Rafferty; it's the Securities Commission violations, and the SaskEnergy ads. We're doing something illegally. Well, we'll make it legal; we'll just change the law. It's the underfunding of the watch-dog agencies in the province. These are examples of a government that perceives itself as being above accountability in the province.

One of the real fears that I have is that this government has run roughshod over so many groups, and it continues to do that. A number of the examples were identified by my colleague from Regina Elphinstone: small NGOs (non-governmental organization), threatening them that if they don't go to the symposium they'll be in trouble; native organizations, small businesses, and this legislature, which ultimately means the people of the province.

This government does not accept the legitimate role of the official opposition on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan. And I think that I have a right to be here and to participate in this Assembly, and my constituents find it offensive that the government does not provide information to the Assembly, does not answer questions, and sabotages the public accounts and Crown corporations process.

And the important question that people are asking, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is where will this end? Where will it all end? The government has not answered questions in this legislature. They have tabled late annual reports. They have given first reading to a number of Bills before they were printed and not available for us to see. They've been engaged in the blatant gerrymandering of constituency boundaries, and they've sabotaged the public accounts and Crown corporations process.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is becoming very difficult for the opposition to do its job in this Assembly. We can't

access timely information. They don't answer questions. And now these extended sitting hours, this unilateral move, the scrutiny of the government performance and expenditures of these two committees, effective tomorrow, will halt unless the government members support this amendment.

This is a disregard, in my view, for the taxpayers' rights to know where their money has been spent. And I am beginning to think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this is more than coincidental. Given what the auditor has said in his report, and given our experience in the Assembly since March 8, this government is becoming clear that this government does not want the public to see what's been happening in Crown corporations and in public accounts.

The public has a right to know, the public has a right to know about secret privatization deals, which still weren't made available the last time I was in the public accounts meeting.

So Mr. Deputy Speaker, here we are 100 days into the sitting with very little business accomplished . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . 84 days. It took until day 72 . . . the Deputy House Leader's concerned that we've been holding up business. It took until day 72, Mr. Deputy Speaker, before this government introduced a Bill to try and support small businesses, even though small businesses are at a record bankruptcy rate in the province.

It took over 70 days before this government introduced any Bills to deal with agriculture. That wasn't the fault of the opposition; we don't control when Bills are introduced. It took over 80 days before the agriculture Bills were introduced. Still no drought payments to the farmers of Saskatchewan; still no real attempt to deal with the real issues facing people.

And this is not because of the opposition, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This is because this government is so disorganized, it is so caught up in GigaText and other questionable deals, so busy putting out fires that they have not been capable of managing the agenda and the affairs in this Assembly.

Bills aren't printed; we never know what the agenda is from one day to the next here.

**An Hon. Member:** — Contrary to their agreement.

**Mr. Pringle:** — And contrary to their agreement, my colleague says, this is simply a government adrift, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, as they always do, the government is blaming the opposition for no business being accomplished in the Assembly. I can't think of one example in the last four months were the Premier of this province or any ministers of his government have taken on any responsibility for what has happened, either in the Assembly or in the province.

They have not taken on any responsibility for the atmosphere that pervades this Assembly. They've not taken any responsibility for the difficulties that agriculture finds themselves in, or for their economic and social

programs that are not working. They've not taken any responsibility for small-business bankruptcies or for record out-migration. They're still blaming the previous administration for the problems that we find ourselves in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the people of the province do not accept this. They simply see this as a government that's not willing to accept responsibility for its own behaviour. So the people of the province do not accept that. This government is responsible for the state of affairs that we find ourselves in, and that state of affairs, I'm sad to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is very concerning to the people of the province.

The people of this province, the people of Saskatoon Eastview, are telling me every day that they expect their government to be open, to be honest, to be up front with them, and to keep their promises — at least some of them. This government has kept virtually no promises they've made. Something this government has not done, whether it's in health care or education or in taxes or privatization, this government has not kept its promises. The Premier has not kept his promises.

The people of Saskatoon Eastview feel offended that a year ago we split off SaskEnergy, but saying, well we're not splitting it off to sell it, we're just splitting it off to make the billing process easier. And now of course we say that we're just privatizing SaskEnergy, not SaskPower. It's just the distributing outlet. But people of Saskatchewan see through that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and they're offended about that.

So as I said, this is a government that's adrift. Every time they made a decision — and it will happen here — every time they make a decision it backfires. It gets them deeper into a hole, as my colleague from Regina Elphinstone has said, and they need to blame someone else.

They use bullying tactics. Mr. Deputy Speaker, you know what happens to bullies — eventually they get rejected. It's exactly what's been happening to this government and is exactly the path that they're going down, and the people of the province are going to reject them.

I do not support the government motion. It's another bullying action, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Like most of their other tyrannical actions, the public will see through this one as well. They will see this as a government that is dishonest, discredited, and desperate.

(1545)

The Minister of Justice said on March 17 that he has never seen so much bitterness in this Assembly. I would say to him that then he proceeded to attack the Provincial Auditor in the next breath. Well it's the action like this, like that attack; it's an action like this unilateral move of extending sitting hours so we can't debate and expose the government's record in public accounts and Crown corporations; it's a withholding of information from this Assembly that's saying one thing and doing the other which has contributed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the state of paralysis and bitterness that we find in the Assembly that the government is supposedly so concerned about. Their actions certainly don't indicate that they're

concerned about this atmosphere. The government's 1987 promise and the agreement of just last month not to make rule changes unless by agreement is just why such an atmosphere pervades this Assembly, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I would ask the government on behalf of my constituents to be open, to be honest, not to bully not only the opposition but other minority groups and other people in the province, and to have a sense of fair play, and that they may find by doing that that the level of respect and trust will indeed be enhanced in this Assembly.

Let's honour and respect past traditions. This is something that has not been the practice of this government. Let's honour the democratic practices and previous practices of this Assembly. It's the government's job as well to preserve and enhance and to be fair to the minorities which people have come to expect. This government hasn't earned this respect, and I urge them to do it, to begin doing it today. I urge them to begin to show a sense of fair play by supporting the amendment put forward by my colleague from Regina Elphinstone.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we must ensure, all of us must ensure that the business of government, which is to say the business of the people of the province of Saskatchewan, is always conducted in an open and above-board manner. If we cannot make our government institutions more open and accessible, and if we cannot restore public faith in our legislators, then the loss of this province, the loss to this province runs deeper than whatever losses might be experienced by a particular government of a particular day or a particular opposition.

With those comments, Mr. Speaker, I proudly second the amendment as put forward by my colleague from Regina Elphinstone, and support this amendment. And I urge government members to be fair and reasonable and to support this amendment as well. Thank you very much.

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

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I will be exceedingly brief. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the amendment reads:

... except that the Assembly shall not meet on Tuesdays and Thursdays between 8 o'clock a.m. and 11 o'clock a.m. in order to permit the Public Accounts and Crown Corporations Committees to sit.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to advise you, and I want to advise members opposite, that this amendment is fair, this amendment is reasonable, and the government's position is that we will certainly be most in favour of the amendment in order to let those committees which, I might add, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have been bogged down, just like this legislature. But this amendment will permit those committees to continue to function; it will permit the committees to continue to function.

And I have one concluding comment, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Speaker, you will know that the government will certainly agree to this amendment, but you will also



know that any conditions referred to by any members are not part and parcel of this amendment, but we are . . . And quite frankly the rules will tell you, Mr. Chairman, that there cannot be — there cannot be — any conditional types of motions.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I once again say, to conclude this debate, that the government is happy to accept the amendment as written.

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

**Mr. Solomon:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the motion to restrict the hours . . . or to increase the hours of the Assembly and to support the amendment that has been put forward by the opposition House Leader, the member from Elphinstone.

I want to just say a very few brief remarks. I won't take very long. I think some of the things have to go on record and be corrected, from what the members opposite have already commented on.

For example, the Government House Leader has said, Mr. Speaker, that they have been co-operative and they have made a decision with the agreement of the opposition, and that's just not true. The decision with regard to increasing the hours of this Assembly is a unilateral decision, and they have not sought the co-operation of the opposition in any regular practice that's been followed in the past, and we feel that that is not the way that this Assembly should be run.

I want to also say that the member, the House Leader, got up and he commented about the opposition wanting to make this province ungovernable. Well I don't think that that's the issue here. I don't think that's the way it's been happening in this province. What the minister failed to recognize is that he and his colleagues and the Premier of this province have made the province ungovernable by their actions, or lack of actions.

And I can give you some examples of that, Mr. Speaker. They've made this province ungovernable by coming from a surplus budget situation to where we're now \$4 billion in debt on an operating basis, and where we have a \$9 billion Crown corporation debt as well. They, when you look at the economic indicators, have really been influential in setting the economy on its ear.

When you look at the number of bankruptcies of small business and business enterprises in this province, the seven years of the Conservative rule, the number of bankruptcies in this province have averaged over 340 bankruptcies per year. When you compare that to the last seven years of the NDP government, there was less than 94 bankruptcies each year. They have increased the number of bankruptcies in this province by over 360 per cent on an annual basis for a seven-year term.

And you think you can govern a province when you've got that many bankruptcies and families that are going out of work in this province, coupled with the fact we've had the record numbers of people leaving this province — over 13,000 people net loss to Saskatchewan's population in the first six months of this year — and yet

they say that we are making this province ungovernable. The people of this province have left in record numbers as a result of not having a government that's responsible for their own actions, or responsible for putting the economy plan back together.

He talked about . . . the House Leader of this government talked about being responsible. They are not a responsible government. They spend money like drunken sailors, except drunken sailors have more credibility. At least drunken sailors spend their own money. These guys opposite spend money like it's going out of style, and it's the money of the taxpayers of this province that's being spent, Mr. Speaker, without much accountability.

This session has been an unholy political disaster for the Conservative government. They are very anxious to get out; they want to accelerate the hours; they want to accelerate the fashion in which we deal with legislation. They don't want to sit through normal sitting hours, or even normal extended hours, so that the opposition can review the legislation that is necessary to be reviewed.

They've had a disaster after disaster. They are the ones who have made this legislature and this province ungovernable with their massive deficits. Their budget they introduced this session was a disaster from square one, with the increase of taxes at the gas pumps, the lottery tax which is probably one of their goofiest mistakes in years. They've made many goofy mistakes every year, but that stands out as one of the goofiest.

The auditor's report condemned the government for breaking 46 of their own laws last year alone, that they could find, out of half of the expenditures that they were allowed to review — the other half they were not — 46 occasions in which they broke the law. They haven't answered to that through the Public Accounts Committee.

We've talked about, in this House, another disaster of this government where the member from Kindersley, the Minister of Justice, ruined his career by attacking an officer of this Assembly, and we went on for days debating a prima facie case of breach of privilege — he ruined his career.

The Minister of Finance ruined his career with the miscalculation of his deficit.

We heard about the Rafferty boondoggles. The minister from Souris-Cannington, the Deputy Premier, basically finished off his career — it was well on to being ruined at that point, but he fumbled the ball on that one and hoisted himself on his own petard. The Rafferty boondoggle is history.

Then the SaskEnergy sale-off. The Deputy Premier didn't think that was good enough. He brought that one forward and slashed his fingers off on that issue with respect to handling it in a proper fashion.

We've seen the GigaText scandal; we've seen the Cargill initiatives of this government. They have mismanaged this province. They have made this province

ungovernable, in my view, Mr. Speaker.

I want to just summarize and finish my remarks by saying that, as the opposition co-ordinator for the Crown Corporations Committee, I feel that the amendment to this motion is very important; that we must continue to review the expenditures of the Crown corporations. And I want to say that the Deputy House or the House Leader, Acting House Leader for the government, the member from Melfort, Minister of Highways, just got up from his chair and he said he'll support that motion, but he says that we're bogged down in Crown corporations.

Well I want to refute that remark, Mr. Speaker, and say that we are not bogged down in Crown corporations. The government's co-ordinator of Crown corporations has refused to bring forward, and the government has refused to bring forward, major corporations in this province — the corporations of note.

We have been sitting for 84 days now. There are 25 Crown corporations to be reviewed, Mr. Speaker. In the first 84 days we've reviewed not 25 or 20 or 18 or 15 of these Crown corporations, we have reviewed 10 of the 24 corporations, Mr. Speaker, and they are the following corporations, the corporations which they feel are a high priority to be reviewed.

We've had the ag credit corporation; we've had the Municipal Financing Corporation; we've had the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Corporation; we've had the Saskatchewan development fund; we've had Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation; we've had the Saskatchewan Grain Car Corporation; we've had Sask Minerals, which was sold; we've had the Saskatchewan Transportation Company; we've had the Saskatchewan Water Corporation and the New Careers Corporation.

We've asked them time and time again to bring on the major corporations. They have cancelled the Crown Corporations Committee on three or four occasions until further notice over the last 84 days, Mr. Speaker.

The purpose of the Crown corporations is to hold this government accountable in the handling of taxpayers' money through the Crown corporations sector. We haven't seen, for example, the Crown investments corporation. We called for them to table that report time after time. They abused the law once again, Mr. Speaker, by waiting and waiting and waiting.

And finally on June 21 of this year, which was about two months beyond the deadline for filing that annual report, I sent a letter to the Deputy Premier who's minister in charge of the Crown investments corporation, and I quote as follows:

Dear Sir: I write with respect to the annual report of the Crown investments corporation of Saskatchewan for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1988. As you will know, this report has not as yet been tabled in the legislature.

I have received a legal opinion on this matter which clearly states that the minister responsible

for the Crown investments corporation of Saskatchewan appears at present to be in violation of the law as it relates to tabling its annual report.

When I requested, Mr. Speaker, for this member to table a report — we delivered the letter; we got it that evening — they'd broken the law once again by failing to table the report of the Crown investments corporation.

And what that means is that we cannot, on the Crown Corporations Committee, review line by line the Crown investments or the Crown investments corporation or any other major corporation that is controlled by this government unless we have the annual report tabled in this House.

And the auditor referred to 46 occasions where they broke the law. Here's another one this year where they've broken the law, that they can't even follow. The report was ready weeks and weeks before that, and they failed to table it to be obstructionist, in my view. Mr. Speaker. They are the ones who have made this province ungovernable. They are the ones who are the obstructionist people in this House. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, when the election is called, that the people of this province will deal with them in like manner.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we have a number of major corporations that have to be called. And I look forward as a member of the opposition and a member of the Crown Corporations Committee to have these corporations come before the committee, to have the ministers responsible to come before the committee, and to have their officials to appear before the committee to answer the questions that have to be raised, and to provide the answers which have to be provided so that the people of this province can figure out what they've done with the taxpayers' money and how they've gotten the people of this province into over \$8 billion in Crown corporation capital debt.

(1600)

Mr. Speaker, it's my view that this amendment should pass. I support this amendment, and I would just make one final comment. The member from Redberry stood in this House and spoke for five or six minutes, and I quote him; he says:

The government has made frivolous demands for emergency debate on many occasions.

And that's the quote that he gave. And I want to respond to that, Mr. Speaker, because for the record it's very important.

He refers to us — in this opposition — making requests to debate issues which we believe are important. And we raised those issues he calls frivolous. We raised the issue of farm foreclosures — over 10,000 foreclosure notices sent to farmers in this province. He did not believe that was important. The member from Redberry believed it was frivolous and he denied that request to debate that.

We raised in this House the prima facie case of breach of privilege of the member from Kindersley on an official of

this Assembly, and he calls that frivolous.

We raised as well, in view of the harsh number of bankruptcies and harsh climate for businesses and families in this province, the matter of interest rates. We asked them to debate that, Mr. Speaker, and they thought it was frivolous and declined.

I end by saying, Mr. Speaker, that in Crown Corporations Committee it's taken them 84 days to deal with 10 minor Crown corporations. The ministers have stonewalled on issues. We've brought SEDCO forward; they've stonewalled. They haven't finished a review of that corporation.

And it's been the ministers opposite, in our view, Mr. Speaker, who have been obstructionist, and they've been partly to blame in a very significant way for the length of this session. And we ask all members of this House to support this amendment and get on with the business of the people of Saskatchewan.

Thank you.

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

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to have your undivided attention, even if I have something less than the attention of government members in this matter.

It is they after all, it is they after all, it's the Minister of Health and all of his colleagues in the cabinet that have decided that this Assembly will sit for 11 hours a day as opposed to six hours a day in order to complete the business which has fallen behind. It's the Minister of Justice and others who have made that decision to extend those sitting hours.

The fact that sitting hours will be extended doesn't phase us, Mr. Speaker, even if there are some minor concerns about that — and I'll get to those in a minute. There may also be some concerns with the public. Those who prefer to watch the home-shopping network might feel somewhat ripped off by having to take the legislative channel instead.

Those who prefer to watch the legislative channel, Mr. Speaker, will be pleased to know that they'll have 11 hours of viewing every day as opposed to six hours. And those who watch those proceedings, Mr. Speaker, might be forgiven if they assumed that the only work we do is to make speeches about Bills and budgets, because that's all they see when they watch us on television. I want to make it clear, however, that the duties and obligations of members of the Legislative Assembly extend to matters simply beyond the Chamber itself.

We have responsibilities in two areas: one is the area of legislative review, and the other one is the responsibility of fiscal scrutiny of examining the government's books. And those activities, Mr. Speaker, some take place inside this Chamber, some take place outside the Chamber and are not necessarily seen by those who might watch the Chamber on the legislative channel, and are not necessarily understood by the great majority of the public

because those are issues that are not often reported on for the public, and therefore it may not be that well informed.

I just want to run through some of those duties and obligations. First of all, we have a legislative responsibility. This is something that takes place primarily in the House. We have the government that introduces Bills in the House for first reading; proceed to second reading. We have second reading debates inside the House. We have these Bills dealt with in committee where the minister comes in with his officials, and we have an opportunity as an opposition to question the minister on the legislation before us, to satisfy ourselves on a number of questions we have. When that's finished, the Bill is then given third reading inside the House.

Now most of that does take place inside this Assembly — inside this Assembly. There are other legislatures, and of course the parliament, where some of that work, at least the committee work, is done outside of the House and is done by committees of the House. But in the case of Saskatchewan, a great deal of that work is done inside this Chamber.

There are, however, aspects of the legislative process which take place outside the Chamber, and as an example I would mention the Non-controversial Bills Committee. There are, from time to time, Bills which are proposed by the government, and this may be a surprise to those who watch the Legislative Assembly, because the thing that will stand out in their minds is of course the debates that take place about Bills where there is a divided opinion about Bills, and the stronger the opinions, the more apt they are to remember those debates. They're likely to remember SaskEnergy, that even on first reading we had disagreement. They're likely to remember for some time potash because there's a very significant debate taking place on second reading on that particular Bill.

They may remember amendments last year to The Urban Municipality Act when there was great debate in Committee of the Whole, when we examined the Bill in committee, and we had a great number of questions. And they're not likely to remember a number of Bills which have been passed by the Legislative Assembly, which were Bills that were introduced by the government and about which there was no debate at all.

And for this reason, the Legislative Assembly has a Non-controversial Bills Committee so that when there are Bills about which there is no controversy and to which all members can agree, those Bills are sent to the Non-controversial Bills Committee, a committee which, I might add, is made up of a majority of members of the opposition, and the chairperson of which is a member of the opposition, so as to ensure that the government cannot use this committee to get through something, or to sneak something through the Non-controversial Bills Committee. This committee has been set up so that it can examine these Bills in some details and satisfy themselves that in fact the amendments are of a housekeeping or technical nature and are in fact non-controversial.

Now one has to ask, in view of the fact that the Assembly will be sitting from 8 o'clock in the morning to 11 o'clock,

and recognizing that most members have to attend caucus meetings, at least on our side, from probably about 11 o'clock till probably 12:30, leaving them half an hour to have lunch and to return any phone calls that they might have and to attend to matters in their offices, and then to meet again from 1 till 5, and then again from 7 p.m. until 11 p.m. — one might well ask: how is it going to be possible for a committee such as a Non-controversial Bills Committee to meet, unless there is time set aside for committees to meet?

And therefore I'm pleased to see that the motion is before us, or the amendment is before us, which will allow for committees to meet. And even if the amendment itself refers to the Public Accounts and Crown Corporations Committees, it will make it possible for the Non-controversial Bills Committee to meet and to assist the House in getting through with some of the legislation that's before us. Now this is a short-sightedness on the part of the government to move a motion without taking that into account. Frankly, I'm not surprised by a short-sightedness on the part of the government, Mr. Speaker. Short-sightedness on the part of the government is something that we in the opposition see a lot of these days, and we're no stranger to that because we see it lots.

The other aspect of our responsibilities, duties, as members of the Legislative Assembly — and I think as distinct from members of the government — is the whole question of fiscal accountability, and that is to hold the government accountable for all the moneys that they spend, all the taxpayers' dollars that they spend. And we have to recognize that a government cannot pass Bills by itself.

It cannot simply say one day, well, we want to have the people of the province do this or do that. What is demanded of them is that they come to the Legislative Assembly and to obtain approval for the legislation that they put before us. And equally it is with their spending plans. The government cannot spend money without approval of the Legislative Assembly. They cannot spend money unless it's approved by all of the members, both opposition and government, inside this Chamber. That's the system of governing that we have.

Yes, you elect a majority party to form a government; but no, that government cannot pass laws unless it's approved here by all of the members; and no, they can't spend money unless there's an opportunity for scrutiny for all of the members to take place, so that all of the members of the Legislative Assembly can hold the government accountable throughout the course of its term. And what happens is the government presents a budget to the House, presents a budget, and there's time set aside for a debate to ensue on that budget. It's called a budget debate.

Subsequent to that, the government puts forward detailed spending estimates for each of its departments, and those are debated inside the House, in this Chamber, even if in some other legislatures and in parliament some of that review of detailed spending and detailed estimates might take place in committees outside the Chamber. Here in Saskatchewan that takes place inside the House.

We also have a system whereby if the government needs money prior to the passage of its budget, and that is to say prior to a completion of all of the detailed reviews of spending estimates, the government can come to the House for something called interim supply to obtain the money it needs to meet its obligations before the budget is passed. And that again is something that's done inside this Chamber.

And I guess the point that I'm making, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that this Chamber has a role and a responsibility in so far as fiscal accountability is concerned. That is to say, the government cannot spend money without this Assembly giving its approval.

There are, of course, some exceptions in terms of special warrants. The government can spend money if necessary by special warrant with money that's not necessarily in the budget. We saw a couple of years ago where the government attempted to spend a great deal of money by special warrants, and there were some concerns raised about whether this might be in fact outside of the law and whether it was legal of them to do that. But that provision does exist. But in the main, the government cannot spend money unless it's approved by the Legislative Assembly.

Now the government must also account for the money once it has spent that money. And we have a system set up where, in the main, that kind of accountability — and I appreciate that there's interjection from government members because they don't really understand that word accountability — but that accountability and that kind of scrutiny takes place in the main, in the main, Mr. Speaker, in two committees of the Legislative Assembly. One is the Crown Corporations Committee; the other one is the Public Accounts Committee.

And the Crown Corporations Committee takes the annual reports of the Crown corporations and asks questions of ministers and officials about how they can account for the money that they spent, the taxpayers' dollars that they spent, and to give an accounting of that so that members of the Legislative Assembly know how the taxpayers' dollars have been spent and then can report back to their constituents, either directly or through the media, they can report back as to whether or not that money has been spent wisely.

And without getting into a great deal of detail, there has been much concern about that in recent years because we in Saskatchewan have never seen a series of successive deficits like we have seen in the last few years with this government. We have never seen the likes of that in Saskatchewan, and certainly no one in Saskatchewan would ever have imagined six or seven years ago that we would see a total accumulated deficit approaching \$4 billion, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

(1615)

So there's a great deal of concern and I think a great deal of interest in how this government has spent the taxpayers' dollars. I mentioned the Public Accounts Committee, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to explain to people that in addition to the Crown Corporations Committee, there is a Public Accounts Committee which

takes the spending of government departments, as opposed to Crown corporations, and reviews that spending in detail.

It also reviews the report by a person called the Provincial Auditor. And that auditor examines the books of the government and examines how departmental officials have been doing in terms of whether or not the spending that took place is in accordance with the vote that took place in the legislature, whether they've got procedures in place to make sure that the taxpayers' dollars are not being misspent, that there's no dishonesty taking place. That's the Provincial Auditor, and he provides a report which is also examined by the Public Accounts Committee.

Now that committee and of course the Crown Corporations Committee meet outside of the Chamber. Their activities take place outside of the Chamber and members must, you know, spend hours in those committees doing their job for all of the members of the Legislative Assembly, outside this Chamber. And that's not something that's readily apparent. And therefore when the motion is put forward to extend the sitting hours without any cognizance and without any recognition of the function of those committees and the very important roles and jobs they fulfil, that that might be lost on the public who doesn't necessarily understand those things.

And it's no surprise to me that the government would put forward a motion without any recognition of the roles of those two committees, and the very important function that members of the Legislative Assembly have to hold the government accountable for how it spends its money, and that they would ignore that.

You know, the government's record on accountability, Mr. Speaker, you know, how they spend the taxpayers' dollars, is something else again. They have had a very abysmal record, and the fact that they would ignore, ignore any mention in their motion while trying to extend the sitting hours to limit the ability of members to hold them accountable for how the money is spent, comes as no surprise when you look at that record.

You look at the public accounts for 1986 and '87 being held up by the Minister of Finance for no apparent reason other than mischief and making it impossible for members of the opposition to examine and scrutinize those public accounts in a timely way, no other reason — mischief and trying to hold up the legitimate work of the Legislative Assembly.

And we look at the auditor's report for 1986-87 where the auditor reports that for the first time ever, a lack of co-operation from departmental and government officials in terms of him trying to be able to do his job. We see the auditor's report for the year ended March 31, '88, a report which was tabled in this Legislative Assembly a few months ago, where the auditor reports for the first time that he was 'interfered with in the execution of my duties' — and that's a quote from his report — and how the government majority in the Public Accounts Committee has, in the last few months, used its power to stifle consideration of key chapters of that auditor's report.

Here we have for the first time in history, for the first time, an auditor, responsible to the Legislative Assembly and ultimately to the taxpayers of the province, saying that he's been interfered with; and a government using its majority on a committee to make it difficult, if not impossible, for those committee members to deal with those comments. It's just unheard of, and it would be unheard of in any other jurisdiction in Canada, but this government has used its clout and its power to make that kind of consideration very difficult.

And I would note that the main example of what the auditor was talking about in so far as interference is concerned, is the Crown investments corporation. And of course we are very concerned because the Crown investments corporation is scheduled to appear before the Public Accounts Committee tomorrow morning, and we are very concerned that the government might use this opportunity of extending sitting hours to make it impossible for the members of the Legislative Assembly to hold the Crown investments corporation officials accountable for their actions in so far as the report of the auditor that he has been interfered with in the execution of his duties.

And of course when it comes to accountability, we cannot forget, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the very cowardly and gutless attack by the Minister of Justice on the auditor when the auditor presented his report; for him to launch a personal vindictive attack on the auditor, calling into question that person's integrity. And as, you know, the public witnessed later on that there was nothing to his attacks, and they were baseless and groundless, but serving to again to cast doubt and to cast a shadow on the Provincial Auditor and not giving him any real opportunity to respond. And I think all of the people of Saskatchewan would hold that his actions were cowardly. Certainly we on our side of the House would hold that his actions were cowardly.

And I mentioned at that time and I say it again, that that's a man who has a yellow stripe a mile wide down his back . . .

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order. I want to bring it to the attention of the member for Regina Victoria that that kind of language in this House is not acceptable. Order. I'd ask the member from The Battlefords to refrain from speaking when the Speaker is on his feet, and the member for Quill Lakes. I would ask the member from Regina Victoria from now on to refrain from the use of language that is unparliamentary.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — I'll certainly do that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'll certainly do that.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order, order. I'd ask the member from Moose Jaw North not to cast reflections on the Chair. Order. The member from Moose Jaw North is casting reflections on the Chair and I would ask him to refrain from that. If the member has a point of order, he certainly can rise and state his point of order. He is not to speak to the Chair from his seat.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I appreciate

your comments, but please recognize that from time to time colourful language is used in this Assembly. And it certainly is no secret that the Minister of Justice does have a stripe, a yellow stripe a mile wide . . .

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order. I'd ask the member to rise and apologize for that last remark.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — I'm not sure what I should apologize for. Like is the word 'yellow' unparliamentary . . .

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order. In the context that that is used, yes it is unparliamentary, and I would ask the member to rise and apologize.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Certainly the Minister of Justice is cowardly . . .

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order. I will just ask you once more, I would ask you once more to rise and apologize for using the word 'cowardly.' I would ask the member to rise . . . Order. And the member from Saskatoon South keeps speaking from his seat, and I would ask him to refrain from that. And I'd ask the member for Regina Victoria to rise and apologize to the House.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — I apologize, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think the point that I wanted to make is that this government's record when it comes to accountability, this government's record when it comes to the scrutiny of taxpayers' dollars is certainly the most abysmal record anywhere that we can see in the Dominion of Canada, is certainly the most abysmal record anywhere that we can see in Canada.

Questions related to the public accounts of this province make it to the front pages of *The Globe and Mail*. We're lucky if consideration of public accounts makes it to the obituary pages, Mr. Speaker, because there's just such lack of interest in that kind of financial arcanery in many cases. But in the case of Saskatchewan, to the shame, to the shame of Saskatchewan citizens, to have questions raised by a provincial auditor make it to the front pages of national newspapers is just not acceptable to us, and I think serves to indicate this government's record.

And it's very little wonder, little wonder, that given an attitude such as that, given an attitude of arrogance, absolute arrogance about how taxpayers' dollars are spent, absolute arrogance that we would have a deficit approaching \$4 billion. No accident at all, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm not surprised that the government would move a motion that would make it impossible for the committees to meet and to do their job of holding the government accountable. Public accountability is certainly the last thing on their agenda, and that's why we moved the amendment. It was just necessary to do that.

And it recognizes two jobs here, Mr. Speaker, not just one of legislative scrutiny that they want to get through and that they want to use closure on to ram their privatization legislation through the House, but it also recognizes that there's a job to do in terms of continuing the scrutiny on

them as to how they spend taxpayers' dollars.

We're not opposed to longer hours, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We would, however, in return, given the fact that there are more hours available now for debate, we would like to see the government members participate for a change. We would like to see the government members stand in their place and to account for their actions in terms of the legislation that's before us. We would like to see them explain to the people of Saskatchewan why some of the legislation they have before us is so important.

We would like to see them do that, Mr. Speaker, because certainly the members on this side of the House have been making speeches. And the members on this side of the House have been doing the research necessary in order to be able to contribute to debate inside this Chamber. They've been doing that work outside the Chamber to be able to make that kind of contribution inside the Chamber.

The government members, notwithstanding that, have sat silent. We've had nearly 40 hours of debate on the potash Bill, Mr. Speaker, 40 hours of debate. And people out there might say, well so what? But I tell you, for every hour that you spend on your feet talking about things inside this legislature, you spend an equal amount of time outside the legislature preparing for those remarks, if not more. And we would like for once to see, now that the hours are going to be extended, to see the government members, instead of sitting silently, also get up on their feet, make their speeches, contribute, and for once, earn your living as MLAs.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I want to make a few comments in respect to the position of the government in what we are witnessing today. I want to indicate clearly to the public of Saskatchewan that we as New Democrats are not afraid of work.

In fact, from 1982 to 1986 there were eight New Democrats that sat on this side of the House and fought 56 Tories. And I'll tell you, in the last election we came out with more votes than the 56 Tories did. So let us be perfectly clear that New Democrats are not afraid to debate. We are not afraid to debate, and we will debate.

But what is really happening here is, take a look at the hours that had been set forward in this resolution. And what they are asking the members of this House is to sit a total of 15 hours a day, including preparing for the House and going to a caucus meeting; including that, they say 15 hours a day. They aren't looking for debate, Mr. Deputy Speaker. What they are doing really is a form of closure. That's what they are imposing in the House here.

But I'll tell you, they won't get away with it because New Democrats on this side are prepared to debate and to debate on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan, and we will debate.

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

**Mr. Koskie:** — Never have I seen a House in such disarray

as this House during this session. Never have I seen a government without a captain, without a House Leader, without any direction whatsoever.

I have sat in this House since 1975, and from '71 to '75 I was in the premier's office and I watched how the House was conducted. And I'll tell you, there has been a disintegration of this House under this government, the like of which has never been seen anywhere else in Canada.

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

(1630)

**Mr. Koskie:** — What we see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what we see is a government that is disintegrating. This is a government that has been exposed. During this session this government has been exposed for its extravagance, its waste, its mismanagement, its patronage, and its corruption. That has been exposed during this session. And I say, this government is disintegrating before the people of this province, and the people of the province have lost all confidence, whatever they had in that government.

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

**Mr. Koskie:** — And I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that desperate governments will do desperate things because they have nowhere to turn. They have absolutely ignored any orderly running of the House and/or the review by the Crown corporation and public accounts.

I want to go back and indicate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how this House was run during the '70s up till '82. And I'll tell you there was order, and the opposition were given a week notice of any business that was going to be transpired during that week.

I'll tell you that Crown corporations and public accounts were the first items that were dealt with as soon as the House convened. And as soon as those public accounts were out of the way, all of them reviewed, and the Crown corporations and public accounts — both of them had been reviewed — then and only then would we go to the opposition at that time to consider sitting longer hours.

But what we have seen here in this session, absolute chaos from the government side — absolute chaos. As I said, desperate governments will do desperate things, and this government is disintegrating. And as others have mentioned, take a look at the conduct of the Justice minister in respect to the auditor's report. Take a look at that. Take a look at what the auditor had to write about this government.

And you say that they are standing up here and fighting for the people of Saskatchewan when their conduct is contrary in every single effort that you look at. How can you say that opposition and the Deputy House Leader has any concern for the people of Saskatchewan when his own colleague in the front bench was before this House on a point of privilege approved by this House in respect to his comments of criticizing the auditor?

Mr. Speaker, ever since we came back here this government has been obsessed with privatization. And when the opposition took a legal, according to the rules of the House, and let the bells ring on the privatization of SaskEnergy, when we came back, guess what they, this government that wanted to get on with the government's business, or the people's business, did. Well they sat here and they put a motion before the House that there would be no bell-ringing more than one hour. That's what they set before this House. And for 13 days we debated on whether or not we were going to have bell-ringing.

Never before in the history of this House, never before have we seen a government want to unilaterally change the rules of this legislature. As I say, this government has lost touch with the people of Saskatchewan. They are sick with their arrogance.

And I want to take a look, as I said, of the history of this House in 1982. And absolutely there was a turnaround of the decorum and the respect for this institution in 1982. I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, I sat here and I remember the leader, the former premier of this province, Mr. Allan Blakeney, who whether in defeat or otherwise, had the respect of the people of this province and does to this day.

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

**Mr. Koskie:** — And I can remember when he stood up in this House to debate, and others of us, and there were only eight in 56, opposition, that's when the House started to deteriorate and it has continued to deteriorate ever since.

I can remember the former premier standing to debate the throne speech or the budget debate, and I'll tell you at that time what we referred to them — they would send over their noise gang, their goon squad. And when the premier, the Leader of the Opposition rather, the former premier stood up to debate, there was nothing but heckling and shouting and interference. And I'll tell you there was no order in this House, and it has continued this way because that outfit can't operate within the rules of an organized legislature.

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

**Mr. Koskie:** — I want to say that, you know, this is a transformation by the Tories opposite. Funny thing, you know, in Ottawa when the Tories federally were standing up for the oil companies, they rang the bells for two weeks to fight for the oil companies. Well I'll tell you I'm proud that we used a legitimate rule of the House to stand up and fight in respect to the rights of the people of this province in fighting to save SaskEnergy.

I'm proud to be a part of that opposition, because it was within the legitimate rules. And I'll tell you why I'm proud — because moving to privatize SaskEnergy was a total breach of promise by the Premier of this province and by the Deputy Premier of this province.

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

**Mr. Koskie:** — I want to say, Mr. Speaker, when the people of this province can no longer trust the word of the

Premier, when he stands and says that no utility will ever be privatized, when the Deputy Premier stands in this legislature here, when he subdivided SaskPower into four separate companies, one of which is called SaskEnergy . . . And in this House we asked the Deputy Premier whether it was a prelude or a preparation for privatization of a portion of SaskPower. And he gave us the answer no, no, there will be no privatization; this has nothing to do with privatization. That's what he said.

This House has stooped so low by the conduct of the members opposite; by the Tory government, it is held in disrespect, in my view. When we can no longer depend upon the answers of the Deputy Premier and the commitment of the Premier of this province, then I say to you that debate and the rules of this House no longer count, and accountability to the people of this province is no longer a priority in the minds of the people opposite.

I want to say that this government's attitude has been that way ever since it assumed government. Let us take after the election. They came in here and they waited and they waited and they spent money, taxpayers' money, on special warrants, and they never brought a budget in until June. Never before in the history of this province had such arrogance been demonstrated, and unaccountability.

They brought in a budget before the 1986 election, and you know what the word of the Minister of Finance in his financial budget report said? This is a reduced deficit. That's what he said. And then he ran up about a billion dollars, not 389 million as he indicated, but \$1 billion of debt to get the Tories elected. And he said, I have no regrets to this; after all we are politicians.

Take a look at their attitudes in respect to the employees of Crown corporations and departments of government, how they took it upon themselves to intimidate and to throw people out of jobs without any preparation for other employment. Take a look at their list of patronage. They have every defeated Tory that ever ran in this province for them, other than the exception of a couple, on the payroll of the public purse.

And I say to you, I say to you, here is a government that stands up and says government is bad; we want less government; we believe in the private sector. What hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker, what hypocrisy. Half of them are on the public purse.

Name them. They have the former member from Rosthern — Katzman, running around this province. They won't even disclose in this House how much they are paying him. They say somewhere around 48 to \$50,000, but they won't indicate how much expenses that he's given. Well \$48,000, I'll tell you, he couldn't find a good job in the private sector to pay him that amount; that's why he's on the public purse.

And take the list, and then you got John Gormley, defeated in the last federal election when we won 10 out of 14 seats. And he's working now for the provincial government on privatization. And the other day he just happened to be taking on the . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Point of order.

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

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** — State your point of order.

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that the motion before the Assembly is a very specific motion respecting, respecting hours of sitting, and the member opposite is for . . . well point number one, filibustering a motion that has already been agreed and an amendment agreed to by both sides; point number two, totally irrelevant.

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

**The Speaker:** — I've listened to the member's point of order and read the motion, and I must say that in this particular motion we have been giving quite wide latitude to hon. members. And I must say that while hon. members might find it difficult to see the direct relationship, I must allow the member to continue.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Well if the hon. member would listen, he'd see the relationship, because what I am talking about is the attitude of arrogance and stupidity by the government opposite in . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. The hon. member, I know, likes to use strong statements at times. However referring to a . . . of a government as stupid is not really in keeping with the parliamentary procedure, and I'd ask him to indicate that he didn't mean that government members were stupid. Perhaps you might disagree with some policies, but to refer to hon. members as stupid, we don't accept that.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I apologize if it's unparliamentary. I didn't refer to the members individually. The attitude of the government as being stupid as it relates to the representing the people of Saskatchewan — that's what I was referring to.

And as I was indicating, Mr. Speaker, what we have to know is whether or not this outfit across the way are genuine, or whether it's an escape from the dilemma that they're in. And never before has a government had such a dilemma on its hands as this government.

As I indicated to you, this has been, I suspect, the worst possible session that any government has been inflicted with. And I want to say in closing, Mr. Speaker, that as the opposition, and as the Deputy House Leader indicated that we in the opposition have the right to stand up for important issues that we believe in and in which the people of Saskatchewan have asked us to stand up in.

(1645)

And I want to say that when the Premier of this province and the Deputy Premier of this province breaks a promise, and their word cannot be trusted in respect to SaskEnergy, the people of Saskatchewan have supported us in our actions. And we took legitimate action on behalf



of the people of Saskatchewan. And what is happening now is clear. This government is in disarray; their public support is dwindling; they're sitting at something like 25 per cent in the polls. The public is refusing to accept their massive privatization, and as long as the public of Saskatchewan ask us to fight on their behalf to retain the assets of this province for them and for their children and their children, I'll tell you, we will debate and continue to debate.

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

**Mr. Koskie:** — I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that throughout this province the word is out, what will there be left when this outfit is finished, when this government is thrown out of office? That is the concern of the people of Saskatchewan. Those are the words that are echoed by people on the main street of Saskatchewan. They are saying, can't you stop them; there will be nothing left for our children and their children; there will be no future for the people of Saskatchewan if they go on giving away the assets which all of the people of Saskatchewan own.

People of Saskatchewan know assets because we have an agricultural community. And our farmers have a great love for the ownership of land, and have an appreciation of the value of owning assets, and I can only say that what has confounded and what has turned this here session into a disaster for the government is not the opposition, certainly not. It is their single-mindedness to go with privatization against the will of the people of this province. That's what has turned this session into chaos for the government opposite.

And so I say, Mr. Speaker, that we are prepared to work, as I said. There are 26 of us in the opposition and we're prepared to sit the 15 hours that they are asking, which is a form of their method of closure. They think that 15 hours will deter us in our resolve. But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the people of Saskatchewan, that we in the New Democratic Party give one commitment: that we are going to stand up to protect the assets that you the people of Saskatchewan own; we're going to fight privatization to the last straw. We're going to fight it because the people say they don't want it and because the privatization, PC-style, has been of no benefit to the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, any reasonable government would have discussed with the House Leader on this side an arrangement in respect to modifying the hours, but that's not the case here because this government, as I said, is totally out of touch. It's a desperate government, and therefore they're prepared to take any desperate step in order to achieve their end. There's only one possible salvation for this government — possible salvation — and that is to get out of this session as soon as possible before more harm is inflicted on their wounds that exist at the present time.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that we were able to get the government to come to their senses, at least to take a look at sitting and dealing with the Crown corporations and public accounts, because the public accounts, as someone indicated here today, is not only of a concern to the people of Saskatchewan, but was also a national story

in respect to the denial of the information to the Provincial Auditor.

And so in that regard, having said that, Mr. Speaker, I want to support the amendment, and we are certainly prepared to proceed with a determination to continue to fight for the people of this province, and fight we will.

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

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

## SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Hon. Mr. Lane that **Bill No. 20 — An Act respecting the Reorganization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan** be now read a second time.

**Mr. Mitchell:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to rise to applause from both sides of the House in order to carry on the remarks, the rather brief remarks that I've been making with respect to Bill No. 20. And I had made a number of points, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to summarize, but in the interests of . . . or having regard to the amount of time left to us today, I should get right directly to the next point that I wanted to make.

The point, Mr. Speaker, that I want to make concerns an argument that you often hear, and occasionally read about on editorial pages. And the point is that the privatization, or the sell-off of public assets, particularly with respect to a resource company, is not really a big problem because you will be able to receive the same kind of revenue in the coffers of the province from royalties and taxes as you do from running the resource, from running the corporation and profiting from the exploitation of the resource through a Crown corporation. Now that's an argument that we've heard many, many times over the years, and that we have read in editorial columns with specific reference to this Bill to privatize the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Now that's an interesting argument, and it sent me back to the books to try and determine whether or not there was any merit to the argument. Particularly that was an interesting question in the light of the 1988 report of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, which showed a revenue for PCS of \$108 million on its 1988 operations. Now that's a lot of money, Mr. Speaker, and that's a lot of taxes, and it's a lot of royalties. And if we expect our royalty and taxation revenues to be able to compensate . . .

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

**Mr. Goulet:** — Yes, I'd like to ask leave to introduce some guests.

Leave granted.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Goulet:** — I'd like to introduce to you and through you, Mr. Speaker, and to the members of the House, Liz and Les Hurlburt. Liz is originally from Beauval, and Les . . . They were both teaching up in northern Saskatchewan for quite a few years. And also their children: Christina, Mark, Jordan, and Alexandria. We'd like to give them all a warm welcome.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### SECOND READINGS

#### Bill No. 20 (continued)

**Mr. Mitchell:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was saying that the 1988 profit for PCS was \$108 million, and if the editorial writers and the speakers are correct, that we can realize the same revenue from royalties and taxes in this province, then that would be . . . Well that's an interesting proposition.

And I thought it interesting enough to do some research on the question. And I have to offer for the House a number of figures as to what our experience has been in collecting royalties and taxes from the potash industry in this province, because obviously if we're going to lose the revenue of \$108 million from PCS, as we will when that corporation is privatized, we have to ask ourself very carefully whether we're going to have in place the kind of royalty and taxation regime that will recover that kind of money from the potash industry.

Now I offer to the House the following figures, Mr. Speaker, and I offer them as my own, and if there is any error with respect to them, I would appreciate being corrected by the minister or by some official in the Department of Finance. But I want to give you my numbers, Mr. Speaker. These are royalties and taxes that have come into the coffers of the province of Saskatchewan, into the general revenue of the province — royalties and taxes from the potash industry.

And I'll start with 1976 where my figures show \$1.1 million in royalties and taxes coming in; in 1977, \$16.3 million; in 1978, just over 35 million; in 1978, just over 58 million; in 1980, 89.5 million — these are royalties and taxes being brought in to the general revenue of the province from the potash industry — and in 1981, \$70.8 million, nearly \$71 million. Now in 1982, Mr. Speaker, the provincial revenue from royalties and taxes dropped to 15 million. Now remember that in 1981 the royalties and taxes had been almost 71 million, and in 1980 they had been almost 90 million. But in 1982 they're 15 million, and in 1983 royalties and taxes are almost 11 million, and in 1984 they're 17.7 million; 1985, nearly 11 million; 1986, just over 13 million; 1987, just short of 13 million; and in 1988, a banner year in the industry, only about \$20 million that came in. Now compare those figures, Mr. Speaker, to 1980 where it was

nearly \$90 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I've just started to make that point, and I still have two or three more points to make in this debate, and I would like to move that the debate on Bill 20 be adjourned for this day.

Motion negatived.

**Mr. Mitchell:** — Mr. Speaker, I will continue to speak. I was making the . . .

**The Speaker:** — It being 5 o'clock, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m. New hours — tomorrow at 1 p.m.

The Assembly adjourned at 5 p.m.

**CORRIGENDUM**

On page 2880 of *Hansard* No. 83A Tuesday, July 25, 1989, right-hand column, fourth paragraph down, the name of Mr. Tchorzewski should read Mr. Rolfes.

We apologize for this error.

**[NOTE: The online version has been corrected.]**