

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Gerich: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, through you and to members of the legislature, on behalf of my colleague, Mr. Sauder from Nipawin, I would like to introduce a group of 11 students, grades 5 to 9, from the Pasqua Hills Christian School at Carrot River, Saskatchewan. They are situated in the Speaker's gallery.

They are accompanied by their teachers Miss Lenore Megli, Miss Lorna Reimer, and chaperons Gladwin and Pauline Loewen, John and Alice Boese. I'd like to ask the members to please welcome Mr. Sauder's guests.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Martin: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In my role as minister responsible for the Public Service Commission, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to all members of the House, 32 government employees, Mr. Speaker, sitting in your gallery. We have Highways and Transportation, nine representatives; one from Justice; five from Finance; two from Rural Development; three Social Services; four from Agriculture, and eight from SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation), Mr. Speaker.

This is part of the process for the government employees' legislative tour where they have an opportunity to go through the Legislative Building and get the official tour; at the same time, come and spend some time in the House and see what goes on during this question period. I'm sure they hear about it often but now they can see it live and wild, as it often is.

So welcome, Mr. Speaker, to the public service employees from the members for the civil service in your gallery today, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to introduce to you, and through you to members of the legislature, Mr. Robert Kott who is the Consul General of the United States to Canada. Mr. Kott is visiting; he's in the Speaker's gallery. He's been here for some time, but this will be his last visit because he's being reassigned to Africa, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Kott has been very, very helpful in terms of trade relations, in terms of various kinds of problems that we have faced with respect to our biggest trading partner, and has been a strong supporter of Saskatchewan and of western Canada. And I certainly want to wish him the best and to say to Mr. Kott, and indeed to his country, we hope the positive relations continue. And I'll look forward to having coffee with you after question period.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to join with the Premier in also extending my best wishes to Mr. Kott. The Premier's remarks are very appropriate.

And I want to say that on my meetings with Mr. Kott I have found him to be knowledgeable in a number of areas but especially an area which is bedevilling Canadians yet again: federalism and interprovincial relationships, and Canada and western Canada. And it is — I shouldn't say surprising but this is the word that comes to my mind — surprising the depth of knowledge and interest that Mr. Kott has in this very important province.

And I wish him and his family the best in the new posting, which is an exciting new posting. We've enjoyed a good relationship with him as well. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Petersen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct your attention to the west gallery where I have a couple of guests today — Mr. Jim Friesen and Mr. Erwin Siemens, representing the Saskatchewan trucking industry. We've been having some discussions today on the importance of trucking to our province — transportation in general. And I'd ask all members to help me welcome these two gentlemen.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Potential Nurses' Strike

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. Mr. Minister, your government's nine-year record of underfunding, cut-backs, and a tax on our health-care system is coming to roost this week. Nurses across this province are poised to walk off the job to protest your lack of funding to the health-care system, and unfair working conditions.

Mr. Minister, you have less than 48 hours to prevent this from happening. Are you going to do something about it, or are you going to continue to turn your back on our health-care system?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member raises issues of turning our back on the health-care system. Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. The health-care system in this province has an increase in this budget which is now being considered in the legislature. The increase, while a modest one, has been difficult for hospitals; I agree with that. That's the case in every jurisdiction in this country. It's not a thing that's unique to Saskatchewan.

The hon. member is raising sort of political rhetoric in a time of a collective bargaining process ongoing. I would say to the hon. member, and I think it's a legitimate

question . . . she says are you going to continue to turn your back? I say I'm not turning my back. I say I'm taking a hands-off approach to the collective bargaining process which is legitimate, which is a legitimate process. I should not be involved.

The legitimate question to the hon. member is: what money would she put in? Would she say the increase should be 15 per cent? 20 per cent? — give in to whatever demands anyone has in a process? The process must go on. The process can go on, Mr. Speaker, and I'm confident that a reasonable resolution can come if common sense comes to the fore.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I'd like to ask the minister to keep his replies within reason as far as length is concerned, and also the questioner who asks.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, the public see our nurses as caring, concerned health-care professionals who have had enough of understaffing, job cut-backs, and bed closures in this province as well as unfair working conditions.

Mr. Minister, a strike will affect patients and their families as well as nurses, Mr. Minister. Nurses and the public are concerned about patient care, Mr. Minister. Why aren't you?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, to characterize the Department of Health and this Minister of Health and the government as not caring about the care for our patients and citizens across the province is absolutely ridiculous, frankly. We have a difficult circumstance with nurses and the health-care association and with SASCH (Saskatchewan Association of Special Care Homes) working on an agreement. We're hopeful that they can come to an agreement at both tables.

Mr. Speaker, the circumstance is the following. In the time that this government has been in power, there have been 1,200 new nursing positions added across the system in this province with basically the same population. And even with the adjustments of this budget that have resulted . . . as a result of the way in which medical services are delivered and more day surgery and all of those kinds of things that take place because of the change, there's a net increase of a thousand more nurses — a thousand more nursing positions in the hospitals and across the health-care system now than there were when we took office in 1982 with basically the same population, Mr. Speaker. That's a commitment to health care. There is consternation . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, many of the nursing positions did not see the light of day and you have just cut 400 jobs in the health-care area in the last few weeks. Many of these are nurses.

We know what the problem is here, Mr. Minister. Your government is wasting millions of dollars on GigaText and other ridiculous schemes. You're rushing around without a plan, promising to spend health-care dollars on building facilities without providing the funds to adequately staff and operate these facilities, Mr. Minister.

In view of this, in view of the fact that when it sinks in that you can't operate these facilities, Mr. Minister, you fire nurses and close beds, in view of the fact you've created this situation, what is your plan to try and head off this latest health-care crisis, Mr. Minister? What is your plan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I have outlined to the hon. member and I've said to the hon. member — and I believe this sincerely — this is not a circumstance that's been created by the government of the day. That's not the case. Mr. Speaker, this circumstance that the hon. member stands in her political rhetoric and says, you've created this; in her partisan way says, you've created this problem.

Mr. Speaker, as I've said in my earlier answer, the difficulties in a changing health-care system are everywhere in this country, every single jurisdiction. Today on the news, on CBC (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation) news this very afternoon, Toronto-area hospitals will be closing 2,600 beds — 2,600 beds in Toronto area. That's not something to gloat about, Mr. Speaker, that's the facts of life in the health-care system of Canada as the medical services changed. Those are the circumstances there. Don't let the hon. member, Mr. Speaker . . . I will not allow her to stand and say, you created the circumstance in all over Canada, all over the Western world. I didn't.

I am as the Minister of Health responsibly trying to cope with a difficult and changing circumstance, and the taxpayers of this province are increasingly aware of the expensive — very expensive, very complex — health-care system that we have in this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I am going to once more bring to the attention of the Minister of Health that his replies are moving into the area of debate, not just answering the question. I'm going to have to take the necessary action.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's obvious the minister has no plan to try and avert the strike.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — And we all know why that is, Mr. Speaker. Instead of spending time trying to avert the strike or putting health-care dollars where we need them most, he and his colleagues on that side of the House instead are strategizing how to make this a political issue for them, to their political advantage.

Mr. Minister, I accuse you of having forced our nurses into a strike position in an attempt to create an election issue which you feel might give you some advantage.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, I accuse the minister of having put the needs of cardiac patients and cancer patients and children and seniors ahead of his political agenda. And I accuse you of betraying the people of this province as you indulge in your political games.

My question, Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister is, will you answer . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I think that we get into this game of who is talking longer and who isn't and it's really not relevant to the everyday question period. I'd just like to ask all members to co-operate, and we don't get into this business of who is giving a longer question and who is giving a longer answer. Let's just co-operate.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister is: why is he putting the political plans of himself and his government ahead of the people of Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says we didn't have a plan. I say to the hon. member and have shown for a long time that they have no plan.

I say to the hon. member very clearly, Mr. Speaker, and to every member of this House, there is no accurate accusation that can be made that this Minister of Health, this government, this Premier, or anybody on this side of the House is using in any way, shape or form the difficult circumstance of this collective bargaining process for political purposes. There's no evidence of that. The hon. member, as she will always do, will revert to only, only partisan politics. And yet she stands in front of the public of Saskatchewan and says: here I am, a government in waiting, and I'm a Health minister in waiting. Mr. Speaker, that's absolutely despicable that she talks about politics and somebody's political party in the face of this crisis circumstance for the public and the taxpayers and the patients of our province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Northern Lights Game Farm

Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Economic Diversification and Trade. Mr. Minister, according to news reports, the Northern Lights game farm that your government was involved with has closed up shop and they've left a number of local businesses holding thousands of dollars of debt.

The local residents, Mr. Minister, are asking for an inquiry into the operations of this project. And I'm asking you: why are you refusing their request? Is there any particular reason you're avoiding an inquiry into this whole affair? What are you uncomfortable about? Are you afraid of what it might show?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to inform the member that the particular business in question have repaid their loan to SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation) 100 per cent.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Well I have another question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. I wasn't talking about a SEDCO loan.

Mr. Minister, firstly your government changed the laws to allow this business to operate. Secondly, one of your former cabinet colleagues, Graham Taylor, lobbied the federal minister of the western diversification fund for some money for an operation in which his son was involved. You did loan the money through SEDCO while Mr. Taylor's son was involved.

Your government's fingerprints are all over this operation, and now that its closed, leaving a bunch of small-business people holding the bag and people out of work, I want . . . you just stand there and say so what. Mr. Minister, you may avoid the question, but you can't avoid your responsibility. What are you trying to hide that involvement from that inquiry? Why don't you call an inquiry so those people can be satisfied?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, maybe it's because I'm a lawyer and understand the law, but I understand that there is no jurisdiction or legal basis for an inquiry into other people's business when it's none of the government's business. That's the first answer, Mr. Speaker.

Secondly, Mr. Taylor's son I understand was an employee there several years ago and this is not Mr. Taylor's son's business. This is local business. You've been advised that they've paid their loan to the government.

It is unfortunate that this business has fallen into difficult times but it does not reflect badly on the game farming industry in Saskatchewan, which is growing, which is sound, in which there is now an interest to open a slaughtering facility so that there will be markets for these products in the future. And the members opposite have nothing better to do than wallow in sleaze because they are sleazy politicians.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order. Would the hon. member for Regina Elphinstone refrain. The hon. member for Melville has just made a statement referring to hon. members opposite as sleazy politicians. I don't believe that that's language we want to use and I'd ask him to rise and apologize.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, I apologize for calling him that.

The Speaker: — Thank you.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I have another question for that same minister. Mr. Minister, if there's one thing that's going to mark your government's nine years of error, it's going to be what's in the minds of the people of Saskatchewan and it's going to be your unfaltering ability to get involved in bad business deals. Mr. Minister, all too often these investments leave either the taxpayers, the creditors, or the investors, or all of the above holding the bag.

Mr. Minister, the Northern Lights game farm is not just a figment of the imagination, it's the rule rather than the exception with you people. When are you going to start to take some responsibility for failed business ventures that you get involved with, Mr. Minister? When are you going to start speaking for the taxpayers, the small-business people of this province who lose money because you people get involved in stupid games?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, it's reported in today's *Leader-Post* that the NDP's (New Democratic Party) record is shabby with respect to economic development and the creation of wealth.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, that is something that I recognized in 1976 when I quit that party when the Leader of the Opposition bought holes in the ground. That's something the people of Saskatchewan are recognizing. We have encouraged business and the creation of wealth in this province, Mr. Speaker.

There will not be a 100 per cent success ratio but there are factories popping up in every town in Saskatchewan and the members opposite have no way of defending against that. They have a shabby record and they have no policy.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Government Contribution to International Aid

Mr. Calvert: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier, the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Premier, on a daily basis we're hearing the reports of the suffering of the Kurdish peoples, the famine in the Horn of Africa, and now the terrible human suffering in Bangladesh. Mr. Premier, across Saskatchewan people are responding to their churches' aid organizations and as individuals. Obviously Saskatchewan families and households are able to repriorize their budgets to include the suffering of the world.

Mr. Premier, in your budget you've cut funding to international aid from \$425,000 to \$200,000. You've cut disaster relief from 50,000 to \$11,000 for disaster relief. Mr. Premier, will you reorganize the priorities of your budget to include the suffering?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — It was our initiative that increased and established the emergency fund for SCIC (Saskatchewan Council for International Co-operation). And under very unique conditions we are prepared to revisit what we can do with other governments, certainly with the federal government, with farm organizations.

In the past, as you probably know, we have raised something in the neighbourhood of several millions of dollars, tens of millions of dollars, in grain that we would take from Saskatchewan and deliver it in terms of relief. We've put together other packages with other provinces, and indeed, the federal government.

So I respect the hon. member's question with respect to the problems in the Middle East, but also the severe problems that we see now in Bangladesh and problems in Africa. So we've been hit with three or four different kinds of circumstances and we work very closely — other jurisdictions know this — with church groups, with other organizations, and with the agriculture community to make sure that we can do what we can, Mr. Speaker, with the United Nations and others.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the Premier. Mr. Premier, will you put your actions where your words are? You're saying some very nice things. Will you put some actions to your words this afternoon?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I say with great respect, we worked closely with the United Nations, the federal government, and other jurisdictions in putting a package together, and that's always important. We have co-operated and we have donated a great deal of money in the past.

We face three separate challenges now, Mr. Speaker. And we will continue to give it a great deal of attention and we take it very seriously. And, Mr. Speaker, we have always been there in a time of need and particularly when we face some of the very severe circumstances we see world-wide.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, new question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, your rhetoric and your comments are very nice. Mr. Minister, I ask you then, Mr. Premier, I ask you then, why is it since you became responsible for international aid in this province, that funding has gone from over \$2 million a year down to \$200,000 a year?

Mr. Premier, at the same time individuals and organizations in Saskatchewan have consistently raised more and more. You betray the generosity of the people of Saskatchewan. You betray the spirit of Saskatchewan in these drastic cuts to international aid. Mr. Premier, when can we expect a government in this province that's as good as the people?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I went through this in estimates a year ago and I'll be glad to go through it again. I'm sure I'll have the opportunity when I get into my Agriculture estimates to go through it in some detail when I have all the information here.

But we have increased funding in many areas of aid, Mr. Speaker, and not just tied to one particular organization. And we have made very sure, Mr. Speaker, that our contribution in total has been very, very significant, and we will continue to do that.

At the same time, I'll say to the hon. member that we have had, as he knows and he admits . . . and we've had this discussion in the past with the kind of problems we've had with some of the politics raised by the NDP. And, Mr. Speaker, it's been embarrassing for the country; it's been embarrassing for Saskatchewan people.

And, Mr. Speaker, when I've gone through it in some time in estimates previous to this, we had to make sure that the money was going to help people and not, Mr. Speaker, for political organizations backed by the NDP.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, again to the Premier. With all due respect, sir, for this budget in which you cut 200,000 and more out of funding for international aid, you also spent I'm told over \$200,000 in the political propaganda that went with this budget. Mr. Minister, again I ask you: when will you get your priorities straight?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, the priorities are, priorities of this side of the House, is to create economic activity and create wealth so in fact we have some money to spend. The priorities of the other side, Mr. Speaker, as we see in Ontario, is not to create wealth, it is just spend, spend, spend.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that the people want to see diversification. They want to see building. They want to see help to farmers. We have a plan to do that, Mr. Speaker. The members opposite have no plan. The critic for Finance yesterday said, well he's going to harmonize, he's going to have the sales tax, he's going to have the GST (goods and services tax), and on top of that he's now going to raise income tax, Mr. Speaker, and he still says it's criminal the amount of money that we put into agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, they have no plan. Their problem is they are ashamed of the fact that they don't have a plan . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

User Fees at Provincial Parks

Mr. Thompson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources. Mr. Minister, will you confirm that as part of your government's sharing of the burden for the massive deficit you have created in this province, you have now implemented a new user fee at provincial

parks, and that you are now charging school children, who overnight in parks, who are there to study all that nature and the outdoors offer, a fee of \$1 per night, which has not been charged in this province in the past to our school children. Would you confirm that, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Kopelchuk: — Mr. Speaker, as part of this government's choices that were made in the budget of this year, we made some wise choices, I feel, and the Minister of Finance has, in that we accented the need for extra funding in education in health and agriculture.

And as part of those initiatives, revenue has to be raised and a small fee has been charged to the use of parks and that fee is, I think, very reasonable. It's a fair share. I think you can compare it, Mr. Speaker, to one small coke, or it's the same type of fee that's charged in many other provinces, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — New question, Mr. Speaker, to the same minister. Mr. Minister, you call this a small fee, yet Weyerhaeuser who owes this province \$236 million has not paid 1 cent since 1986. You've now got children using your savings to pay your government a user fee for a school outing. How money grubbing can you get, Mr. Minister?

You won't cut your own advertising budget. You won't cut back on extra salaries for cabinet ministers and legislative secretaries. You won't cut back on policies and costs. You've made no attempt . . . Instead you've chosen to have children fight your deficit, children who use our public parks for educational trips to advance their knowledge of nature and the outdoors, Mr. Minister. Will you put a stop to this policy immediately?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Kopelchuk: — Mr. Speaker, I feel . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. Order, order. Order. The member for Parks.

Hon. Mr. Kopelchuk: — Mr. Speaker, we feel that this charge is very fair and reasonable. School children pay fees for all kinds of events that they attend . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order, order. I'm going to allow the minister to answer with a minimum of interference. And I'd like to ask all members to allow the member for Parks and Renewable Resources to reply to the question.

Hon. Mr. Kopelchuk: — Mr. Speaker, I'll just repeat and say that we feel a charge of \$1 is fair and reasonable. It's a charge that's been levied to many other school activities . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Apparently some hon. members don't wish to allow the minister to reply, which is unfortunate. But let us try it again.

Hon. Mr. Kopelchuk: — In summary, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that every citizen of Saskatchewan that has children attending school functions such as these would find the charge of \$1 very fair and reasonable, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order. Well if we can get the Minister of Justice and the member from Quill Lakes to co-operate, then perhaps we can move to the next order of business. Would they co-operate? Okay, let's go to ministerial statements.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 75 — An Act to amend The Municipal Revenue Sharing Act (No. 2)

Hon. Mr. Wolfe: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of an Act to . . .

The Speaker: — Quite frankly, I don't know what the hon. minister moved because I couldn't hear him. I couldn't hear him. I ask the hon. members to allow him to speak so he can be heard.

Hon. Mr. Wolfe: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Municipal Revenue Sharing Act.

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

Bill No. 76 — An Act to amend The Coroners Act

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Coroners Act.

The Speaker: — Order. I'm going to ask the hon. members to come to order. The member for Qu'Appelle, for Quill Lakes. And the Minister of Justice I believe you are being most rude, to be honest. To be quite honest I believe you members are being rude by continually not stopping talking. And I believe that you should reflect on that occasionally.

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

Bill No. 77 — An Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act (No. 2)

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Queen's Bench Act (No. 2).

The Speaker: — If the members are ready to carry on, I'm more than willing, but quite frankly I'm not going to try to yell members. I've already drawn your attention to it two times and if hon. members don't wish to co-operate I guess it's up to you.

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

Bill No. 78 — An Act to amend The Surrogate Court Act

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Surrogate Court Act.

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

TABLING OF REPORTS

The Speaker: — Prior to orders of the day, I have a communication from the Ombudsman which reads as follows:

Dear Mr. Speaker: It is my duty and privilege to submit to you and to the Legislature, the eighteenth Annual Report of the Saskatchewan Ombudsman, submitted in accordance with the provisions of subsection (1) of section 30 of The Ombudsman Act. Yours sincerely, Gerald P. McLellan, Ombudsman.

I now table the Ombudsman's report.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Time Allocation Respecting Interim Supply

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise today following a couple of days ago providing notice to this Assembly that on today's date I would be moving a motion of time allocation respecting the issue of interim supply or the issue of . . . that is well known to be the Appropriation Bill.

And I must say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that this motion follows what is clearly an unprecedented amount of time spent on the interim supply — an unprecedented amount of time spent on the interim supply — following a full five days of budget debate.

And, Mr. Speaker, I say to you clearly today that this is not the first nor the only time that this Legislative Assembly in the province of Saskatchewan that has seen an opposition who is bent on stalling, delaying, obstructing the normal proceedings and normal course of business of this Assembly.

And, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this motion that I am tabling today deals with the fundamental principle not only of the right to speak but, Mr. Speaker, also of the right to govern — the right of a duly elected government to bring forth to this legislature and have dealt with in a reasonable amount of time . . . what the people of Saskatchewan would suggest to me is an appropriate forum and an appropriate time to deal with interim supply.

And, Mr. Speaker, I say that the members opposite in recent months have shown clearly to me, to this House, and to the people of Saskatchewan an attitude of disrespect, an attitude of arrogance — arrogance by using such words as: this legislation will never pass.

I recall only a number of months ago, Mr. Speaker, words

from the opposition such as: we are proud to be radicals. I've noticed words from the opposition saying we want to make this province ungovernable. I haven't heard those exact words today, Mr. Speaker. They have quieted themselves with the words, but in their actions it is clear, Mr. Speaker, that they still have that mind-set.

And, Mr. Speaker, today this motion that I move deals with interim supply. Some members will say: well what is a normal amount of time, what is an accurate amount of time? I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that rule number 15 of this Assembly, rule number 15 in the rules and proceedings of this Assembly gives me the indication that the required amount of time on this is about a single day.

And I can go back in history, Mr. Speaker, and tell you how long it has taken for interim supply in other years. Mr. Speaker, I will quote back to 1988. There were three interim supply Bills passed in 1988. They were passed on April 14, May 16, and June 28. The length of time in each of these debates was a single day, Mr. Speaker.

I'd say, Mr. Speaker, if we also look at the year 1989, interim supply Bill number 1 passed on April 12 after a single day; Bill number 2 on May 10, two days of debate; interim supply Bill in 1989 on June 14 passed after a couple of days.

Mr. Speaker, clearly the opposition has made statements that we would be here till May 30, is one date I heard; May 24 is another date. And, Mr. Speaker, this is on interim supply after five days of budget debate, after a debate that normally takes one or two days. It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that the opposition is on a mind-set of obstruction of the due processes of this legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that fair and reasonable people throughout the province of Saskatchewan who familiarized themselves with the rules of this Assembly, the traditions of this Assembly, and the business of this Assembly, would say that the opposition is not being fair, the opposition is not being reasonable, the opposition is being truly obstructionistic.

And, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan that I know would say no to such actions and no to such oppositions. And I believe that they would fully support, absolutely fully support — most reasonable men and women — fully support this motion that I bring to this Assembly today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1445)

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Mr. Speaker, what does this interim supply mean to the people of Saskatchewan? It means the legitimate, ordinary, non-statutory payments that go out to individuals can happen.

I'll quote some specifics, Mr. Speaker. Today in this Assembly, we saw opposition members stand and talk reverently and sanctimoniously about health care. Well, Mr. Speaker, these payments go to hospitals; these payments go to nursing-home boards; these payments go to home-care boards and institutions.

And to me, Mr. Speaker, those people deserve due respect from this Assembly. Those people deserve business-like procedures in this Assembly, and those people deserve not an opposition who would threaten and actually act to hold up their cheques to nursing-home boards, home-care boards, and hospitals and the like.

Mr. Speaker, these payments also go to legal aid recipients, the poor that cannot afford to hire their own legal solicitors out of their own moneys. Mr. Speaker, and I challenge the opposition, I challenge the opposition to be forthright. They talk so sanctimoniously about being the protectors of the little guy, the protectors of the folks who can't afford such things as legal aid.

Mr. Speaker, these payments that will go out also will go to schools, family income payments, and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, members opposite would make the case, well we can wait to the end of the month. That is clearly not the case. Their research has not been done accurately. This Appropriation Bill must pass in short order in order for cheques to be processed and payments to individuals be sent.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the opposition is, for whatever reason, for whatever political dark day politics or rationale or reasoning . . . it is beyond my comprehension, Mr. Speaker, the reason and the rationale. But, Mr. Speaker, I cannot control what goes on in the minds of the opposition. But, Mr. Speaker, I do intend to control, as a government can and as a government will, a Bill such as this.

And, Mr. Speaker, I move this Bill of time allocation on appropriation not having taken the decision lightly . . .

An Hon. Member: — Is it a Bill?

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — I'll correct that, Mr. Speaker. It is a motion, for the benefit of the opposition. It is a motion to limit the debate, limit the further debate.

We've had four days; we've had 18 hours. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, it is subjective when enough is enough. But, Mr. Speaker, clearly this government intends on running things in a more business-like manner. I believe we've made a fair case. I believe the Minister of Finance has gone above and beyond the call of duty in answering questions in a fair and reasonable way.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move this motion. It is seconded by the member from Weyburn, the Minister of Finance, and the motion is as follows. That I move, seconded by my colleague, the member from Weyburn:

That notwithstanding any rule of the Assembly, a maximum of one hour shall be allocated to the consideration of the interim supply resolutions in Committee of Finance, the first of which was moved on May 1, 1991, and that at 15 minutes before the expiration of the allocated time, the chairperson shall interrupt the proceedings and shall put every question necessary to dispose of the resolutions and report them to the House, and

that a maximum of one hour shall be allocated to the proceedings on the resolutions when they are reported to the House together with subsequent consideration of all stages of the Appropriation Bill based on those resolutions, and that at 15 minutes before the expiration of the allocated time, the Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings and shall put every question necessary to dispose of the Bill.

And I so move, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support and to second the motion put forward by the House Leader.

And I would firstly say, Mr. Speaker, is this interim supply that has been put to this House and to the committee, is it somehow something extraordinary or something abnormal or something unusual that is being done on this second interim supply, Mr. Speaker, as a second interim supply? And the answer to that question is no. And why do I say that?

Well I say that, Mr. Speaker, because every year at this time or even earlier often, very often late April, quite frankly, a minister of Finance brings forward these resolutions and this Bill so that on an interim basis, until there's been detailed examination of each department's estimates by the committee, so that the ordinary operations of government can go on and that the bills can be paid.

Are we asking for something more than is usually asked for in this appropriation on an interim basis, Mr. Speaker? The answer is, once again, no. It's the usual two-twelfths. Yes, there are some adjustments to provide for more than two-twelfths — for example, the case of school boards. And I know opposition members on other occasions have asked for that so we get as much money in their hands as quickly as possible so they don't have to borrow and pay interest on borrowings as opposed to using the money to educate our children.

So to answer the first question, is this something extraordinary or unusual, the answer is no; it's two-twelfths with some variations, example of which I gave, Mr. Chairman.

Moreover, did we try to surprise the opposition? Clearly no, once again, Mr. Speaker. In fact, an advance copy was provided to them as soon as debate opened on the first resolution, which I am led to believe and understand and am advised that that has been not a usual practice, but certainly we want to make sure they had all the information as we went through the resolutions as to precisely what we were asking the committee to supply on an interim base to the various departments and agencies.

The second question that I would like to address, Mr. Speaker, is that has the government somehow tried to cut debate if we're appropriating a normal or asking a normal interim supply here. Are we being somehow unfair by cutting off debate? Are we trying to circumvent democracy? Once again I would say the answer there is

clearly no.

I have been in this legislature now for I think something in the order of nine years, Mr. Speaker. And this interim supply debate — Minister of Finance now for the last two budgets — and this interim supply debate has gone on longer than any I can remember, Mr. Speaker. Longer than any I can remember. And I think if one checks back in the records, as the House Leader suggested, you will find that this debate has been unprecedented in nature in terms of its length. It is extraordinarily long.

The point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that there has been given more than usual, way more than usual, time for questions to be put and debate to go on, Mr. Speaker. So I think the answers once again to the question: are we cutting debate short; are we somehow circumventing democracy? The answer there is once again, no.

In fact, I would even go on to suggest, as the House Leader did, that the members of this legislature, the past members, the members of legislature of long . . . for the many years that we've had the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, contemplated this when the rule 15 was framed, Mr. Speaker, because it does refer, and does make reference to certain time allocations in rule 15 as it relates to The Appropriation Bill. And the language in there talks about . . . well, I'll just quote it from our rule book, The Appropriation Bill, rule 15, section (1):

The proceedings on the Orders of the Day for resuming debate on the motion "That the Appropriation Bill be now read the second and third time", and on any amendments proposed thereto, shall not exceed one day.

That is relative to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. And I would suggest that the resolutions, the same spirit was intended there, that it did contemplate expeditious, albeit effective, and certainly examination by the opposition even though all we're asking for — and I don't want to minimize the word "even" or "all" — but this is an interim . . . some interim moneys that we're asking to be advanced until complete scrutiny can take place, Mr. Speaker.

So I would argue once again that the members of the legislature of all political stripes, of past administrations, contemplated this when that rule was being put in place.

The other issue I'd like to address is that somehow are we being unreasonable in the questions that are being put and the debate that's gone on in terms of the latitude of the debate, Mr. Speaker. I would say once again no. We have tried where possible — in fact I would argue as a minister in answering questions — I have tried to within the spirit of this legislature . . . has been demonstrated in previous years too even though questions may be more specifically better put to departments and their ministers in detailed exam of the estimates, where possible we would attempt to answer these questions as part of the resolutions and the interim supply. There has been a lot of latitude allowed. I think the Chair has allowed a great deal of latitude.

But I would point out that on several occasions — six or seven or eight, quite frankly I haven't counted them — on

many occasions some because of points of order being raised and some raised by the Chair voluntarily, it's been brought to the members' attention in the opposition that they are going beyond the scope of what's intended by interim supply. And certainly there's been a number of points of order where the Chair has ruled in favour and ruled that the point of order was well found because it was going far beyond the scope of interim supply.

So once again I think clearly, Mr. Speaker, the Chair has ruled several times that we have been very generous in the latitude that was allowed, in fact overly generous I think one could make a point.

As I said earlier, where questions have been put and we could answer, we have. Where they're more appropriately put to departments, we have referred them there. In fact I would make the additional point, Mr. Speaker, in some instances where questions have been put by members singly they've been put together, put time and time again. Now that's fair enough, Mr. Speaker, because some members might have not been in on day 1 of the debate and they might have been there day 2. But when you've answered the same questions several times I would suggest there's some other motive at stake here, Mr. Chairman.

The final point I would like to raise is why do we have interim supply in the first place. I think the legislators of the past wisely considered in the democratic process that we have here, that yes it might require some good long time to examine in detail the estimates this year of spending about \$4.8 billion. But they also knew that government had to continue to operate and that bills had to be paid, so they wisely put in place a mechanism to allow on an interim — that's the key word — an interim basis that bills could be paid. Not that you could go and ask for twelve-twelfths or the entire appropriation, but reasonable appropriations, Mr. Speaker, to carry on the essential and efficient good government. And that's what's going on here.

And what are we asking for? Well what's in jeopardy immediately? We're asking, as I said earlier, for the most part, for two-twelfths to cover May and June. But what's particularly in jeopardy — and why the clock, having run on for some several days now, a very unusual and extraordinary nature — is that there are payments that have to be in the hands of the payee by the middle of the month, May 15. Some of those the House Leader referred to but I want to re-emphasize them.

One of those, Mr. Speaker, is payments to welfare individuals, welfare clients, Mr. Speaker. A mid-month payment due May 15. Special-care homes, hospitals, home care, doctors and legal aid, all of those, Mr. Speaker, we have mid-month obligations, not to mention schools and universities, the government payroll. And the list could go on and on by way of the kinds of things you would have to pay through May and June.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, that this motion stands the acid test by whatever measure is put to it, given what legislators have always intended interim supply to be for.

So then why is it that the opposition have held it up and

held it up and held it up and held it up and now this is the fifth day we are dealing with it. I think I have stood in my place and answered questions for something in the order of sixteen and a half hours if my calculations serve me right — sixteen and a half hours of continuous debate on interim supply.

So then we ask ourselves, why is it that the NDP are holding this up, Mr. Speaker? What is the motive? If indeed all the issues of normal requirements, more latitude than usual in terms of time to debate it, why is it that they choose to hold it up, Mr. Speaker?

I would suggest that they are choosing to hold it up because they are prepared to put their narrow political interests, their narrow partisan interest, that's heated up obviously in the face of an election, they're prepared to put that interest ahead of the interest of those who may be waiting for their cheques: welfare clients; ahead of the interests of those who operate our hospitals and those who are in our hospitals; ahead of those who are in our nursing homes and those who operate our nursing homes; ahead of those who serve our clients on lower and more modest incomes who may find themselves in need of legal aid, Mr. Speaker; ahead of the schools and hospitals and universities, Mr. Speaker, who provide that very valuable public service.

The NDP have chosen, because of their narrow political and partisan interest, to put that ahead of the larger public interest. And I think that's shameful, Mr. Speaker. And for that reason, I would urge all members to support the motion and as well, that we expeditiously and effectively deal with all of the resolutions that are before the committee and The Appropriation Bill, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1500)

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to enter this debate on the motion to invoke closure here in the Assembly in Saskatchewan for only the second time in the history of the province.

I want to say as well, Mr. Speaker, that the only time closure has been used in this Assembly has been by this government and this Premier who — I think it's ironic — this session chose to label their session as the new open government of Saskatchewan, that they would choose on the first major motion that we deal with in the House, having been here only a few weeks, to use closure to jam through the motion.

Mr. Speaker, the public and the press, I believe, will not let this government get away with this kind of hypocrisy. They simply will not allow it. They can't allow it. Because what we're talking about here, Mr. Speaker, is not a game . . . or the Government House Leader stands up and in order to protect the Finance minister from answering questions simply jams through a motion to move closure on a very, very important Bill — the spending of the public's money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how much money are we talking about? Is it insignificant? Is it a small amount of money?

Well I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that including the special warrants, which were issued by this government just before the session started, we're talking about \$1.17 billion. That's what we're talking about — \$1.17 billion.

Now it's true we've spent a number of hours debating this Bill. But one would ask how many millions of dollars or billions of dollars does this government have to waste before the public, before the press, before the people of this province have the right to the answers that they should have in order to make a decision?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, this doesn't start here today. This debate over answering questions doesn't start with this debate on The Appropriation Bill, interim supply.

I have here a document prepared by the Legislative Assembly Office that deals with questions that have gone unanswered, and I want to take time . . . I'll table this and I'll share it with the press and with the members opposite. But a list of questions that have gone unanswered, not from this committee but long term, that we have asked and have never gotten answers to, to prove to the minister and to prove to the public and the press that this is not a new problem for the opposition but it's a symbol of why we have a \$14 billion debt in this province. The public has simply been hoodwinked when they've asked important questions about where the money has gone.

For example, in question period today we outlined to the government how the funding of SCIC (Saskatchewan Council for International Co-operation) has been cut from 2 million to \$200,000. Now that may not seem like much, but you'd think that when you're cutting in that area, that there would be a cost benefit to the public of Saskatchewan, that the debt would go down, the taxes would be cut.

But none of that. We've seen taxes rise at a rate unprecedented anywhere in Canada — I'd say anywhere in North America — and even more taxes now before us with Bill 61. We've seen programs being cut — dental plan, programs like the home-care program where programs are being hacked out of that very excellent health program, and at the same time, the debt going from 3 billion to 14 billion.

Now these are the reasons that we're asking the questions. And I want to go over this list. This goes back five years, Mr. Speaker. These aren't questions asked yesterday or the day before. These questions are ordered by the legislature of the government. They're not frivolous questions. They're ordered by the legislature of this government. They go back five years.

I want to start out from the '86-87 session. Return no. 196, industrial incentives programs, payments paid under this program. We asked the questions. No answer. And the people say, where is the money?

No. 197, free trade commission costs. What did it cost for the free trade commission for the Government of Saskatchewan? Now we know that the public in

Saskatchewan overall was opposed to the free trade commission. We come here and ask how much the government spent. This is five years ago. Not a word, nothing. It's not the public's right, according to the Minister of Finance and the Government House Leader that we should have the answers.

Return no. 207, D-Mail, a contract from April 1, 1986. This is Mr. Tkachuk, a former principal secretary to the Premier, a former employee of the Premier. Did we get an answer to that question asked five years ago? No, this is unimportant, they say. It's none of your business, is basically . . . Not to us. It may be none of our business, but I'll tell you the people who pay the bills, the taxpayers, have every right to know what the former employee of the Premier makes in doing direct mails for this government.

We asked again, no. 208, D-Mail Services, contracts during 1985-86. No answer.

In the next section, 1988-89 we asked for executive aircraft, the list of flights. No answer. It's still on the books; it's here unanswered.

Now this is the area where Mr. Garner, the then minister of Highways, lost his job when the Premier fired him for misuse of the aircraft. So what do they do now, in order to protect ministers and the misuse of aircraft? They don't answer the questions.

And the minister, the Government House Leader, uses his power — I agree he has the power . . . but you're misusing your power when you refuse to answer questions about the spending priorities of this government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Then we have return no. 11 from 1988-89. This is three years ago, the purchase of executive motor vehicles — no answer.

Then in the next session, return no. 1, Saskatchewan student loans. Number 2, provincial budget, the cost of printing — no answer. Number 3, executive aircraft again, flights taken in that year — no answer.

Now my colleague from Regina North West spent some time yesterday going over the long litany of flights taken by the government members. But the government won't give us the information about their own use of their own aircraft. You know why? Because it would be so embarrassing to this government, that not unlike Jim Garner, I believe a number of the ministers would have to resign because of the misuse of the government aircraft. That's why they're hiding it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — And I say to the member opposite who introduced this motion that he should come clean with use of executive aircraft. He should produce the executive aircraft list so we could see what his flights were, where they were taken to, and let the public judge whether that money was spent in the appropriate manner, instead of hiding behind your power and behind closure when it comes to the spending priorities of this

government.

Then we have return no. 5 from that same session. Again, D-Mail contracts, good old Dave Tkachuk. For the next year, for the next year, they're not giving the answer to that.

Then we have no. 6, the advertising firms. No list of the advertising firms and how much money they got out of that.

Then we have no. 8, the public opinion polls in marketing research projects. The number of projects — no answer.

Then we have no. 10, the commercial airlines, the amounts paid to commercial airlines — no answer.

Now the Minister of Finance, he gets the Government House Leader to introduce this motion, to cover up his tracks. They have a cabinet meeting. They say look, we're under a lot of heat here. The press is saying, why don't they answer the questions. And the Minister of Finance talks the Government House Leader into introducing closures.

And they sit in their desks and laugh. They sit in their desks and laugh. They laugh about the spending priorities and the \$14 billion debt. Well I'll tell you, the public is not laughing when you introduce a major tax Bill in order to pay for your mistakes.

Then we have others that aren't answered. No. 11, minister of the government out-of-province trips. I wonder why they're not releasing that. And then we have the minister of government personal expense contracts. That's where you would show up how much they've spent on alcohol in restaurants around the province, how much they've spent on hotel rooms. They won't show; they won't show that.

Why not? If every one of those bills was legitimate, why wouldn't they bring them here and table them as the legislature has called on them to do?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — And no. 15, Terry Leier — payments to Mr. Terry Leier.

Then the next one is interesting, Mr. Ken Waschuk. You remember Ken Waschuk who was involved with Guy Montpetit and the GigaText scandal. That Ken Waschuk. And accusations of money changing hands on golf courses. You remember that. And when we ask the questions about how much money was paid to Mr. Waschuk, do you know what? No answers.

And you wonder why this government invokes closure on these questions that we're asking today. I'll tell you why. Because the embarrassment would drive them from office. That's why they're invoking closure.

Then we have Tanka resources — payments made to Tanka resources. This is the company owned by Ken Waschuk, the Tory pollster. How much money did the taxpayers . . . how much were they forced to pay to Tanka

resources?

And then we have no. 18. Here again an interesting question. Trips taken on any aircraft owned by Guy Montpetit. You remember Guy Montpetit and the scandal surrounding the translation of the statutes and laws of Saskatchewan from English to French.

Now Mr. Guy Montpetit was the one who took off with between 5 and \$6 million of taxpayers' money. He had a bunch of old, used computers in a company in Montreal. And he flew out to Regina in his jet and he brought them to the Premier and he said look, we need to sell these computers because they don't work down in Montreal. Can we cut a deal? What can you do for me?

And so Mr. Guy Montpetit offered some flights to the government ministers and they flew out to Winnipeg and they flew around the country. And these are not our words. These are court documents out of Montreal — court documents.

And the Premier went to Montreal to visit with Mr. Guy Montpetit and Guy Montpetit picked him up in a limousine at the airport. And they drove around in Montreal, and when we asked them the trips taken on any aircraft taken by Guy Montpetit, do you know what they say, Mr. Deputy Speaker? You know what they say? They don't say a word. Do you know why? Do you know why? Because they don't want to tell us about the flights that were taken with Mr. Guy Montpetit. They want everybody to forget about that. They want to forget about it. They want to talk about open government this session. Yes, we're going to talk about open government. But what's their first act that they do on a major issue? They invoke closure. Now I'll tell you, this kind of hypocrisy, if it goes unnoticed by the public I will be very surprised.

And I want to go down this list. This is orders for return no. 2, public opinion polls and research projects ordered by the legislature — no answer. This is in the session 1990-91.

No. 3, advertising firms, again no answer. No. 4, executive motor vehicles purchased — no answer. Number 5, ministers of the government and their personal expenses, no answers again. So we've got all these bills building up, building up as part of the \$14 billion deficit, and no answers being given.

This is why the public is saying: open up the books and let's see where the money has gone. And they're saying no way to the Tory way. That's what they're saying very clearly. And it goes on.

Once again, D-Mail. This is the third year in a row we've asked for Mr. Dave Tkachuk's expenditures and how much money was paid. Again, charter aircrafts, how much money was paid for charter aircrafts. No answers.

And people ask: where are you going to get the money from to solve the debt problem? I'll tell you right here. In this list, in this list will be a large part of the waste that has occurred, that if it's cleaned up will help solve the debt problem of Saskatchewan.

And we've asked for the trade office properties, you know, the offices in Hong Kong and Minneapolis, where your buddy Bob Andrew and Graham Taylor took their retirement packages. We asked how much that's costing the taxpayers — no answer. And we asked for the annual operational budget of these trade offices, and no answers.

I'm going to table this document because I think it's important that the government take some time and look through it. And maybe next day after they search their soul as to whether or not this is information that should be shared with the legislature, with the press, and the public . . .

An Hon. Member: — It might even show up in the newspaper maybe.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — And it may show up in a newspaper or it may show up on TV, because it's hundreds of thousands if not millions of dollars we're talking about, and is a very important part of this debate on closure and why we're asking the questions.

I want to talk for a moment about honesty and the honesty of the Government House Leader, when he talks about how we could arrange to get the information and to wrap up interim supply. It is now a quarter after 3. I want the press to know and I want the public to know that I wrote a letter to that minister today and I offered him a proposal, which he didn't refer to in his comments, that would have wrapped up this debate. And I want to explain it to you, and I want to take some time to read into the letter a couple of letters that were exchanged.

This morning I received a letter from the minister who introduced this motion. And in the letter he indicates that he would like to wrap up this debate by 4 o'clock. This is the deal that he's trying to make. He indicates that he would not introduce this motion if we agreed to wrap up by 4 o'clock. That's what he said in a letter; his signature's on it and I'll table the letter. He indicated that if we made the commitment by 4 o'clock, he would not introduce the motion.

(1515)

I wrote a letter back to him. And I'd like to take some time to read into the record what I indicated. I said:

I am writing in response to your letter of earlier today, regarding the Interim Supply motions and Appropriation Bill.

To date, the Minister of Finance has refused to answer questions about the government's spending plans . . .

That's why I laid out all the areas for the last five years where we've had difficulty in getting answers to make the point.

. . . and specifically the government's spending plans with respect to the \$834 million it is asking the Legislature to approve at this time and the government's revenue projections.

The public has a right to know the answers to these questions, and the Opposition intends to continue pursuing them. That has been our position (from the outset of this debate) . . .

And I clearly indicated on day one of this debate, in front of the cameras, out of the legislature and in, that we could wrap this up in a matter of an hour if you would agree to answer the questions. And I still hold that view.

So in the letter I said:

If you will provide (us) your assurance that this afternoon the Minister will provide full and complete answers to those questions which are attached, (and I'll table these as well when I complete) I am confident that the Interim Supply measures can then be disposed of quickly. If the Minister continues to avoid full and complete answers to those questions, the Opposition will continue to pursue them.

Now they had a choice. They had a choice. They had a choice of answering these questions — very simple, very straightforward questions that the public of Saskatchewan, I argue, has the right to know. They have the right to know the answer. They had a choice.

Now I want to read into the record the questions to see whether or not the public or the press would think these are unfair questions to be answered about the spending priorities of this government, if these are questions that should get the government so upset that they invoke closure. We'll just see whether the public agrees that closure is the way you should have acted today.

The questions were . . . it's not a long list, but they're very important questions: for each department, what has been the expenditure to date of this fiscal year on polling? And in each case, what is the name of the polling firm and what was the subject matter of the poll and what was the cost? Now this goes back to Ken Waschuk, the Tory pollster.

Because the public would be very interested to know how much the government is spending on polling. It's their money; it's their tax dollar. Why wouldn't the public have the right to know how much money of this money is being spent on polling? Is there any reason why the public shouldn't know that?

The next question was: for each department what expenditure is planned for May and June for polling, and in each case what polling firm has been commissioned? What is the subject matter of each poll and what is the estimated cost of each poll?

Now why would the government . . . weren't asking about, not the Tory Party's expenditures on polling but government spending where you take taxpayers' money, for example the new PST (provincial sales tax), the 200 million you're talking about or whatever you end up getting out of that tax. What portion of this is being spent on polling?

Now the reason of course that we're asking that is

because there are many people accusing the government right now, this very day, of spending hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money on polling leading up to the election. I don't know whether that's true or not. But I'll tell you, there's more polls going on in this province right now paid for by this government, paid for by the taxpayers to try to help re-elect the Premier and his members, than has ever been seen in the history of the province.

And many of the public, when this comes out as why they're using closure when we're asking about polling, the public will then know for sure the reason why closure is being invoked is because the government is covering up how much taxpayers' money is being spent on polling. That's what's happening there.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — The next question: for each department, what has been the expenditure to date on advertising and in each case what has been the nature of the advertising?

Everybody in the province, when I go around they say, how much are you paying Don Adams for the ads on tourism. You know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the tourism ads that talk about and I say make a mockery of Saskatchewan tourism. And where are they spending the money advertising? Are they spending it in Montana, Manitoba, or Alberta to attract people here to Saskatchewan? They're spending it in Saskatchewan.

Now can that be anything other than political advertising leading up to an election? Everybody in the province knows what's going on here. The total expenditure, we believe, on advertising — this is including the Don Adams advertising — is 2 million a month.

These are the choices this government makes. When they've got the chance of saving the \$2 million a month and reappropriating, redirecting it to health care and keep nurses in the hospitals, what do they choose? What do they choose? They choose to cut health care, force the nurses out on strike, and spend the money on self-serving political advertising. That's what they do. Now why wouldn't they want to answer that question?

The next question: for each department, what has been the expenditure to date on the political image consulting, including Nancy McLean? Now Nancy McLean's company is that company from Toronto that comes in and advises the Premier on how long to wear his hair, what colour of tie to wear, whether or not he's wearing the right colour of suits or not.

And I say, looking across, they're all well colour-co-ordinated, every one of them. Some things they can't do much about, but when it comes to the colour of their suits and ties, member from Shaunavon, they all have very, very nice colourful ties and coats. And I'm sure if you looked in the best-dressed books from Toronto or New York, you'd find many of the same suits in that . . . same suits as they're wearing over there. They're very well colour-co-ordinated, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there's no doubt about that.

The question is, who's paying? Who's paying the consultant to advise them? The taxpayers are. Now our question is: how much are you paying Nancy McLean? That seems like a fair question.

Everyone knows she comes here and advises the government. Does she advise the opposition? Well I might say, look at the members here. But I won't say that. But what I will say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it's bloody unfair that the taxpayers pay for an image consultant for the government while programs are being cut. That's very unfair.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — The next question: for each department, what expenditure is planned for May and June on political image consultants, including Nancy McLean? Because we believe that in the period leading up to the election, that Nancy McLean won't only be here dealing with images and how people dress, but also in determining what their campaign will look like — colour combinations for sets, on tours, colour combinations for vehicles that the Premier will be using. Many people are saying that that's what Nancy McLean will be doing here over the next couple of months.

Our only interest is, when it comes to the taxpayers and the \$14 billion in debt and the new tax being introduced by Bill 61, what amount is being paid to Nancy McLean? Why won't we get the answer?

The next question: with respect to the government's revenue estimate for 1990-91, what were the specific sources of the 310 million from Crown Investments Corporation? That seems like a straightforward question.

The next question: with respect to government revenue estimates for 1991-92, what are the specific sources for the 250 million from Crown Investment? That's not a tough question.

And then we asked the question: what studies and analysis have been done by the government with respect to the imposition of the new provincial GST? And specifically, first — studies on the overall impact on Saskatchewan economy, that seems to make sense. If they're done share them with the public so we know.

Studies on the overall impact of inflation, disposable income and consumer spending, that seems reasonable. Studies on the impact on retail trade; studies on the impact on tourism and hospitality; and finally, studies on the impact on small business and communities within 100-mile radius of the border.

That's the list of questions. That's what we asked. We indicated to the government . . . and I'll table this document because the minister knows that these were the questions we needed answers to. And we said that we would wrap this up this afternoon if we got those answers.

Now you have to ask yourself, Mr. Deputy Speaker, why would a government that was given a list of questions . . . very straightforward questions that would have taken one

of their employees, and they have thousands, about half an hour to compile. So it would have happened.

Why would they choose to invoke closure? We're now at 3:30. Had we asked these questions and got the answers, we would now be off interim supply. Right now we would be finished. Why would the government choose to invoke closure? Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it seems clear, it seems absolutely clear that the only reason we are dealing with a closure motion today is because we have a government that is continuing on down the road of being secretive and wasting and yes, I say squandering like drunken sailors, the taxpayers' dollars of this province. That's why we have closure here today.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that in dealing with this closure motion it's an embarrassment for the government that their first act of this session is to introduce a motion that forces off debate, and not forces off debate, but covers their tracks when it comes to the spending priorities and the spending habits of this government.

Now if you think about what issues they're not giving answers to, are they answers about the legitimate spending of government when it comes to the amount in welfare, the amount in health? No, they give us those answers. When it comes to other issues of substance, do we get answers? Yes we do.

But on what area do we not get answers? It's the areas where the government is personally involved — personally involved. Their trips around the world, flights to Honolulu, flights to Vienna. It's these areas of personal spending habits where there is no answer being given. What else? When it comes to the polling habits of this government, no answer is being given. When it comes to the advertising, no answer is being given.

I tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the area of Sask Property Management, where the spending has gone from about 50 million to 200 million since this government took over, I want to say very, very clearly that this government is secretive to an extent that has never been seen before. And I make the argument, Mr. Speaker, sadly, that that is why we have closure here today.

This is not an argument about saving money that the legislature is paying out to members to come here and debate. It's got nothing to do with that. What it has to do with covering up. It has to do with covering up the tracks of this government. And I want to say that we have a very, very difficult problem understanding why this government would choose this time to invoke closure.

I want to say that the Government House Leader, if he would pay attention to the debate, I say personally should be embarrassed about making the choice legitimately when he could have done the honourable thing and that is not cover up the tracks of his colleague, the member for Weyburn, the Minister of Finance. And instead he chose to cover up and invoke closure . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well the member from Wilkie shouts from his seat that we have no business asking the questions. Well I want to tell you that when we send this out to Wilkie, your vote — and we'll be marking your vote on this one and put it in the Wilkie newspaper — that you choose to cover up the

spending.

An Hon. Member: — That's right.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Yes, and he says, we choose to cover up. We choose to cover up. I want to say to you very clearly that the members opposite should realize that when we announce in your weekly newspapers that you chose to cover this up, I'll tell you this will not be a proud day for the Conservative Party and the Conservative caucus.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I say with regret that I will not be supporting the motion. I think it's a very, very hard hit on the democratic process here in Saskatchewan, especially at a time when we have a government that hypocritically talks about openness and open government and says that we should be telling people how we spend money, that when it comes to the issues of polling, of Nancy McLean spending here in the province, when it comes to the issues of what studies were done in terms of implementing the provincial GST that the government chooses to invoke closure rather than give the answers.

(1530)

Mr. Pringle: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am pleased to make comments on this motion; I'm not pleased about this motion as are none of our members on this side of this House.

I want to commend our House Leader for making some very, very significant and important comments in this debate. Mr. Speaker, what we've seen today is one last desperate attempt by a desperate government to run and hide, Mr. Speaker, and they're not going to get away with it. This government has set new rules in this session where they claim that their focus is democratic reform, new openness, new accountabilities, or new realities, as the Premier says. The first desperate act, Mr. Speaker, is to invoke closure.

What they're saying is look, we've changed the rules. The rules in this Assembly are that we don't have to answer any questions. That's what they've done. That's what they've done, Mr. Speaker. That's exactly what they've done. What this government has done . . . in 86 years we've been a province, Mr. Speaker, 86 years, this is the second time only that closure has been invoked.

This legislature of this province has a proud history and a proud tradition of democratic debate, open debate, partnership with the public of Saskatchewan in sharing financial information and good economic planning, except for 50 years ago when these people were in power. Fifty years ago when these people were in power, we saw the same kind of behaviour, the same arrogant attitude, the same disdain for the public, and the same debt, the same legacy of debt as we see this government is going to leave for the next government, Mr. Speaker. It took 16 years to pay off the Tory debt the last time they were in, and it's going to take two or three generations to do it this time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think what we've seen today in question

period — a legitimate question about the game farm, a legitimate question about the expenditure of public funds by the game farm, and questionable activities by this government and by the minister involved and some of his family members. And what does the Minister of Economic Development and Trade do? Well he resorts to the practice of the Premier and members opposite. What he does is he resorts to negative attacks on the opposition. And I won't repeat the word because the Minister of Trade and Economic Development had to get up and apologize for it, Mr. Speaker.

But that's what they do when you ask legitimate questions that relate to public business that the public have a right to know — they start attacking opposition members as individuals. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would say that that is, besides being unethical, that is highly undemocratic because we are legitimately elected by our constituents to ask legitimate questions and to hold that government to scrutiny.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these questions that our House Leader talked about not being answered, as he said, go back quite some time. And one only has to look at the *Star-Phoenix* editorial of April 22, 1991, where they quote the auditor — this is in the auditor's report — as saying:

The sale of the provincial government SaskPower's gas business was illegal.

He goes on further to say:

The provincial auditor has been unable to discharge his duties because the government has failed to produce a report on the Saskatchewan Transportation Company.

In other words, they're withholding information. The editorial goes on to say:

Hundred of millions of dollars (this is quoting the auditor's report) are improperly accounted for by the Saskatchewan Crown corporations without adequate . . . scrutiny (Mr. Speaker).

Now many of the questions that my colleague just referred to were questions relating to the auditor's report, legitimate questions about where this government has spent money in the past and what are its expenditure plans during this period that they're asking for this appropriation.

And the article goes on to say:

There is much more. These points are but a sampling of what is in the annual report of the provincial auditor (mentioned) . . . a week or so ago.

The government brushed off most of the auditor's points as nothing more than "disputes between lawyers."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think this editorial says it all. This editorial shows the disregard, as this motion does, as the

minister was not willing to answer the questions. This behaviour shows a disregard for public accountability and for access to information that the public has a right to know. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the public wants answers to where all the money has gone?

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the face of this, in the face of not answering those questions, not just over the last few days but over the last two or three years, in the face of the government's freedom of information Bill and their amendments to the Bill amending The Provincial Auditor Act and Tabling of Documents Act, and so on, all of this façade is extremely hypocritical, Mr. Speaker.

The minister talked today about holding up welfare cheques. Well this is the government that has beat up on welfare recipients for the last four and a half years. When it's convenient they use holding up welfare cheques.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the government that kept us out of the legislature for nine and a half months. That's how concerned they were about getting cheques out. They only came back into the legislature when the boundaries fiasco blew up in their face. Because, Mr. Speaker, they can't even manage a boundaries gerrymander. That's how incompetent this government is. And that's the perception of 85 per cent of the constituents that I represent, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this minister in this budget . . . we were asking legitimate questions about this budget. He says that there is no new tax increases. Mr. Speaker, this is the largest tax grab in the history of the province. The largest tax grab in the history of the province at four years and seven months of their mandate. Some democratic government. Some government concerned about accountability, Mr. Speaker.

At four years, seven months of their mandate — where four constituencies representing some 45,000 voters I would estimate, have not had representation here. They're past their mandate. They refuse to call by-elections for well over a year, going on close to a year and a half. And they refuse to answer questions, questions that they're ordered to answer by the Legislative Assembly.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance says well, those aren't the appropriate questions for this forum, for interim supply Bill. They're not relevant. They're too detailed. Ask them in Crown Corporations Committee.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they refuse to call a Crown Corporations Committee meetings. Because they have also stifled democracy and they've stifled the legitimate scrutiny of their expenditures by refusing to support that committee meeting on a regular basis, and then refusing to answer the questions there.

They've sabotaged the public accounts process, Mr. Speaker. And so they're not co-operating in the other forums either. This is not just the New Democratic Party saying this, and the opposition — the auditor is giving a condemnation of their mismanagement and their lack of co-operation.

Mr. Speaker, the minister refused to answer legitimate questions regarding their plans on economic activity. I saw him on TV the other night throwing out a bunch of rhetoric about small businesses supporting the PST, and how good it's going to be for Saskatchewan communities and small-business people. I saw the Premier even as late as Friday misquote, and I don't say deliberately, but saying the Federated Co-ops supports the PST, which is not true; saying that the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool supports the PST, which is not true. We have clarified that today, Mr. Speaker.

So they say anything. And that's a sense of how dishonest these people are, Mr. Speaker. They say anything, whether it's true or not.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we have a legitimate right to know about some of the polling money that's going in the *Get Smart* ads. We have a legitimate right to know about what secret deals this government has signed with the multinationals and with the Weyerhaeusers and the Pocklingtons and the Cargills. They're not sharing that information.

Mr. Speaker, in this province historically . . . You know, I have to go back to the PC (Progressive Conservative) record of 50 years, but the last nine years, apart from these PC years, this province and this House has been run with some honour, with some integrity, where there was a certain level of trust and unwritten rules, because of parliamentary tradition, were respected.

But not with this government. You never know when you come in one day whether they're going to change the agenda that very moment, which they did about two weeks ago, after agreeing to the House business being something else. We seldom know by noon what's going to be the House business in that given day. And they talk about efficiency in this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, we've got a proud record in this province up until 1982 of developing a partnership, an honest and trusting and open communication network with the public of Saskatchewan and their governments. Even the Thatcher government of the 1960s looked good compared to this government. We've got a proud history, historically, except during Tory years, of good, sound, economic, community-based development with our co-ops and our credit unions and our small businesses.

The small-business people in my constituency . . . and any one of those members can go to those businesses — 80 per cent, 85 per cent of the small businesses in Saskatoon Eastview, and there are 21,000 voters there, have the PST position on their . . . the petitions on their counter, Mr. Speaker. And I've got some 5 or 6,000 of those names to present in very short order.

Now that's how small-business people in my constituency feel about the PST. And they believe that this government has no mandate at four years and seven months to bring in the PST. And the minister wouldn't even have the decency to table the study that he says he's basing his approach on, that this is going to be a boom, economic activity across the province.

So we've got a proud history up until Tory times of seeking Saskatchewan solutions to Saskatchewan problems, of taking care of each other in this province through a good health-care system, a good educational system, and progressive social programs, Mr. Speaker.

And given that there are hospital bed closures, teacher lay-offs, massive increases in tuition fees, and where the university is looking at having to make major decisions in terms of laying off 40 or 50 University of Saskatchewan . . . laying off 40 or 50 staff members, we have a right to ask questions about their allocation of funds to the Don Smart ads when they could be allocating those funds to education, Mr. Speaker.

In this we have a legitimate right to ask where that \$600,000 has gone from the family budget. Has that gone to the Don Smart ads? The minister has not answered those questions, Mr. Speaker. The highest rate of family poverty in all of Canada and we take that \$600,000 from hungry families and we give it to advertising, for purely political purposes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in 1944 the CCF (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation) inherited a debt which was the largest per capita debt in all of Canada. And we got rid of it. Sixteen years it took us though. In 1991 a New Democratic government is going to inherit a \$14 billion debt or maybe higher, who knows, because this government won't answer the books, the minister won't answer the questions. So we don't know how high it is. Well I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, having made 1,500 constituency calls — door-to-door — the public knows that it's much worse than this government is pretending.

And, Mr. Speaker, here we have the deception of this budget, where the Minister of Finance . . . I mean, in the face of all the evidence to the contrary, says that there are no new tax increases in this budget. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the largest tax grab for average families . . . tax bite for average families in the history of the province.

So it's a deception. It's dishonest, Mr. Speaker, to rob money from the Crown corporations, 250 or so million more than they make, to apply it to the Consolidated Fund to make the Consolidated Fund and their operating budget deficit look better, is dishonest. All it is doing is adding to the debt of the Crown corporations and it's adding to the debt of our children and our grandchildren, Mr. Speaker.

It's fundamentally dishonest, and that's a concern with the public of Saskatchewan, is the dishonesty and the deceitfulness of this government, Mr. Speaker. It's a very serious charge. I'm aware of that. But that's what the public is concerned with, that's what people tell me.

It's hard to engage the public when you go door to door in a discussion of the issues. All they want to know is when is the election going to be called. And how are you going to clean up the mess? How are you going to clean up the financial mess?

This government, Mr. Speaker, has brought us to the point of having the highest per capita debt in all of Canada. We are paying a staggering \$550 million a year just on the

interest payments, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, no wonder. No wonder the public is concerned about the lack of accountability by this government. That's why we want answers to those questions that our House Leader read into the record today that have been . . . the answers have been outstanding for some time, Mr. Speaker.

(1545)

This government in nine years, in nine years has racked up a higher debt than in the previous 77 years of this province's history, Mr. Speaker. Now that says something about the way these people run government.

This is not the first time in 77 years, 86 years, that we've had hard times in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time. This government blew by over \$2 billion on their forecast, just on their forecasts. They were over \$2 billion out on their forecast, Mr. Speaker — over \$2 billion. Well, Mr. Speaker, that alone is grounds to resign as a government, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder that the people want to know where has all the money gone. Well the minister didn't answer the questions in the last two or three days.

Mr. Speaker, for a province that has the highest per capita debt in Canada, we've got the highest rate of family poverty in Canada. We had the worst job creation record last year in all of Canada.

That's a matter of public record, a matter of public record, Mr. Speaker. And the government talks about the opposition having no plan. They didn't even have a plan, they didn't even have a throne speech. That's what a great plan they have, Mr. Speaker. They couldn't even come up with a throne speech.

They've given \$9 billion away in assets over the last nine years, \$1 billion per year on average. We've got the highest per capita debt. We've got the highest rate of income tax in all of Canada and the highest rate of family poverty, and the people want to know where on earth has all the money gone?

Why won't they open the books? Why won't the Minister of Finance answer the questions? Instead what they do, they decide well this is not a forum to answer questions. And the Minister of Justice said on TV not too long ago that the legislature doesn't work. It's easier to make — he didn't say this — but it's easier to make cabinet decisions and get on with solving problems outside the legislature.

Well that's an indication of their disdain for the Legislative Assembly, for the forum of the people of Saskatchewan, and for their need to be scrutinized, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the concerns I raise today are concerns not of the opposition only, they're concerns of the auditor, they're concerns of the public of Saskatchewan. And we ask legitimate questions, as my colleague from Regina Elphinstone put on the record today. These are very reasonable questions, and if this government was serious

about making this Assembly work, the minister, the House Leader could have provided an answer to those questions quite easily.

But, Mr. Speaker, they're not prepared to provide answers to those questions because what those answers would reveal is that this is a government filled with patronage and corruption and waste and mismanagement and they just weren't prepared to subject their record to that kind of scrutiny, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this government at the last ditch effort, at quarter to midnight in their mandate is trying to create this façade of democratic reform — a fresh, open, accountable face to their party and their government, Mr. Speaker.

But look at their behaviour, Mr. Speaker, as typified by this closure motion, only the second time in 86 years. Now I think the member from Melfort will, when he loses the next election and he reflects back on his accomplishments, will be very . . . you know, will not like to see that on his record — for the second time only, bringing in a closure motion.

His buddies in Ottawa have done the same thing. Every time the opposition ask legitimate questions to legitimate issues, what they do is they bring in closure, and the federal government has been no different than this government, as my friend from Moose Jaw North says. All it says is that a Tory is a Tory is a Tory, Mr. Speaker.

But this government has brought in Bill No. 5 in '86 which allows them to organize and reorganize departments and Crown corporations over the cabinet table, very difficult to track expenditures from one year to the next. In fact the department of trade and economic development, or whatever it's called, now organizes two or three times in any given year, Mr. Speaker. And there are now 13 or 14 points of entry to that department to the point that business people and others don't know who to go to — don't know who to go to.

And the minister of trade and economic development goes to Saskatoon and meets with city council and says to city council in Saskatoon, look, get your act together. He says to the public of Saskatchewan, look, you're 40 years behind the times. Now get in tune with the rest of the world.

I mean that's offensive — that's offensive. That's a sense of arrogance that people are concerned about with this government, Mr. Speaker. They withhold information, they make secret deals, they don't share the information. The minister wasn't answering the questions on those deals. They attack the auditor. They are hiding behind Crown corporations.

Saskatchewan Property Management is a good example — some 250, 60 million dollars that they've transferred from government departments that had the scrutiny of this legislature over to Crown Corporations. And then they don't call the Crown Corporations Committee to meet, Mr. Speaker. Well how can you scrutinize those expenditures? Apart from that, of course, they're only giving annual reports that have become skimpier every

year. And so it's hard to get an accurate picture anyway, Mr. Speaker.

But their level of intolerance by this government is seen in this motion. The level of arrogance is seen in this motion, Mr. Speaker, to stifle legitimate questions. It is a long, long record of undemocratic behaviour. You're well aware of that, Mr. Speaker.

But for the minister to say that our questions are not relevant or they're too detailed or they're not appropriate or I don't have to answer them, is an indication of the disdain that this minister and this government has for the public of Saskatchewan. It's little wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the public does not have any confidence and the auditor does not have any confidence in the numbers as presented by this government.

So, Mr. Speaker, this closure motion is designed clearly to get the Minister of Finance out of a bind. It's clearly designed to take the pressure off this government in terms of their trips to Hong Kong and all the other places that our colleague from Regina North West referred to yesterday. This is the second time in only 86 years, and it says something about how a government conducts its business, Mr. Speaker.

So all I can say is that the democratic reforms that talk about openness are nothing but words. The true picture of this government, its true nature comes out on this motion which they could have shortened to one or two days had they answered legitimate questions.

When this government says, this Minister of Finance says, the House Leader, the Premier, that the expenditure of \$1.1 billion is a routine matter or a housekeeping matter, in the face of them being out some 200 billion-plus in their forecasts, is an offence, an affront to the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. They're clearly out of step with the public of Saskatchewan on this issue. Their record on waste and mismanagement is the biggest issue in the minds of the public of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

So to invoke closure is a sign of desperation by this PC government. It's been a sign of desperation by their PC friends in Ottawa. Brian Mulroney and this Premier are two peas in a pod. They operate the same way. They were together on Meech Lake; they were together on free trade; they were together on phasing out the interest-free cash advances to farmers; they are together on privatization, on deregulation; and they're together on getting rid of two-price wheat; they're together on dismantling the Wheat Board. There's no difference between this Premier and Prime Minister Brian Mulroney.

And I suspect that the Prime Minister will have some cushy job for him after he gets soundly rejected by the public of Saskatchewan when he . . . well he would call the election maybe, Mr. Speaker. But he's brought the province not only to the largest debt of any province in Canada, to the largest per capita debt of any province, to the largest per capita debt in our history, he's also brought us to a constitutional crisis, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, had they answered the questions, this closure motion would not be necessary. We would have

. . . those 7 or 8, 9 or 10 questions was all we wanted answers to, but what they've chosen to do is to stifle the public of Saskatchewan and to hide behind this desperate and undemocratic action. And, Mr. Speaker, they won't get away with it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The division bells rang from 3:55 p.m. until 4:19 p.m.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 31

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

Nays — 25

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

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Motions for Interim Supply (continued)

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, this entire session has been all about covering up.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — We have said, Mr. Minister, that the high taxes which you have imposed aren't necessary. We've asked for your study and you have said nothing in return. Mr. Minister, we have said the public will not accept these high taxes; in fact they're not accepting them. They're shopping south and they're going west to shop. We've said, have you got any studies? You just

ignore the question.

This entire session, Mr. Minister, has been all about giving us no information — all about giving us no information.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — It is just incredible, Mr. Minister, that we would have the largest tax increase in the history of the province, we would have the public in what is very close, Mr. Minister, to being a tax revolt, and you have no studies, no information, and no answers.

This, Mr. Minister, is now our fifth day in interim supply. But, Mr. Minister, you have given us no answers to any of the questions. From one end of this province to the other, from Meadow Lake to Carnduff, from Cadillac to Nipawin, the public want to know, where has the money gone?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, you don't want to answer the questions. You don't want to tell us, Mr. Minister, you don't want to tell us what you're spending on polling. You don't want to tell us, Mr. Minister, what you're spending on image consultants. You don't want to tell us, Mr. Minister, where you're spending the money. You just want to get us out of here and out of your hair. All you want, Mr. Minister, is for this session to come to an end, and that's why we have closure today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, we began with a budget announcement on February 20, designed to avoid scrutiny — the largest tax increase in the history of the province, Mr. Minister, done without any legislative sanction.

And then when you found out, Mr. Minister, because you never could play by the rules, because you had to break the rules, Mr. Minister, then you found out, Mr. Minister, that there was going to be a session. Then Mr. Minister, when you found out you had to have a session, every conceivable effort was directed towards keeping the session as short as possible and providing as little information as possible. Well, Mr. Minister, I can tell you, it isn't going to work.

One thing we can assure you, Mr. Minister, is that there is going to be a full accounting of your stewardship in this province. You may be able to outlast us. You may be able to decide, Mr. Minister, that you don't need to answer questions. But I can tell you, Mr. Minister, after the election there is going to be an accounting. Mr. Minister, we are going to open the books.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, one way or another, one way or another, Mr. Minister, before the next session starts you are going to answer these questions. Mr. Minister, if you don't answer them before the election — and it looks as if you're not going to answer them before the election — then I can assure you, Mr. Minister, there's

going to be an inquiry after the election and you're going to have some tough questions.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, we are going to get an accounting of your travel. We are going to get an accounting of your use of the aircraft. Mr. Minister, for years we have been asking for details about government travel on airplanes, and you don't want to give it to us. You pass it, but then never bring it back.

The rules of this Assembly were never designed to deal with the kind of . . .

An Hon. Member: — Shenanigans.

Mr. Shillington: — Shenanigans. I was going to use stronger language, but I see the chairman is at least interested.

The rules of this legislature were never designed to deal with the kind of shenanigans which we have seen in the last few years. They were never designed for a government which would pass an order for return and then ignore it. They were never designed, Mr. Minister, for governments which would give an undertaking in the House to bring back information and then never do it.

You said, Mr. Minister, we should ask about polling, about image consultants, in estimates. The problem, Mr. Minister, is you never bring back the answers; you never answer them.

The rules, Mr. Minister, were designed on the assumption that people who get elected to this Assembly are honourable and honest. They were never designed to deal with the kind of tactics which we have seen in the last nine years.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1630)

Mr. Shillington: — You wonder, Mr. Minister, why some of the proceedings that you have seen in this last session are without precedent. It's because your behaviour is without precedent. Your behaviour, Mr. Minister . . . The rules of this Assembly were never designed to deal with the kind of behaviour which you have foisted upon us.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — It assumes, Mr. Minister, that right or wrong, right or wrong, Mr. Minister, you answer the questions that were put to you. What do you think this legislature is? This is not a congress; this is a parliament. A parliament is an opportunity for the members of the Assembly to ask questions and to call the government to account. What do you think this Assembly is here for?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — It is here for this very question so that we may come on behalf of our constituents and put to you the kind of questions which our constituents are putting to

us. And what are they asking us? Mr. Minister, they are asking us where has all the money gone?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — They are saying, Mr. Minister, how can it be that our taxes have gone through the ceiling, the roads have gone to pot — I won't put it any stronger than that but everybody else is — the dental plan is gone, the hospitals . . . Mr. Minister, the hospitals haven't got enough to operate on, and that is becoming critical.

Mr. Minister, the public want to know how it can be that their taxes have gone up, the services have deteriorated. They want some answers. And if there's one thing that the public say to me when I'm in my constituency or I'm in a store or I'm on the street: go back there and ask those questions. Where has the money gone?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — And your response, Mr. Minister, is to tell us that that's not efficient, that you have the right to govern. You have the right to govern, Mr. Minister, in a democratic fashion. You do not have the right to govern without being accountable to this legislature, which is what you apparently want to do.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — We asked, Mr. Minister, some fairly simple questions. We asked, for instance, the amount spent on commercial airlines by ministers — asked that two years ago. Where's the answer? Never came back. And the legislature ordered that. The legislature ordered the question on the salaries and the numbers and the names of personal assistants to ministers. Always been given. In 1989, never answered.

We asked about payments to such Conservative supporters as Ken Waschuk. We asked about Terry Leier. In fact we asked what are the details of the contracts under which these people work in ever increasing numbers . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh they didn't. Well the member from Esterhazy ought to attend the Assembly because that was ordered in 1989 and still isn't here.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — I don't know whether members opposite are ignorant of what has gone on here over the last nine years or whether they don't care. I suspect it's very much the latter. I suspect that there is one thing on the minds of members opposite, and that is the election. And it appears that democracy is getting in the way of an election and your survival.

And so they used closure in a fashion in which it has never been used before. One thing that is fundamental to parliaments and has been so for the last 800 years is grievance before supply. That, Mr. Minister, and that, members opposite, has been the case for centuries.

It is true closure has been used with respect to Bills once in Saskatchewan by this government, but it has never

been used with respect to financial estimates, to interim supply.

In fact John Diefenbaker was propelled into the highest office in this country because he had the courage to say to the Liberal government of the day: we have the right to ask some questions.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — John Diefenbaker took the stand. The Liberals sat, as the Tory members do opposite, and sneered. C.D. Howe sneered at him. And what happened? He was propelled into the highest office in the country.

I tell you people opposite, if your attitude is the same as the Liberals of the era, then your fate is going to be the same. Your fate is going to be the same.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — The minister says the procedures have been unusual. Well I'll say there's something unusual about this session. The session began with a budget announcement on February 20 for which there's never been any adequate explanation given. The largest increase in the history of the province, the largest tax increase comes by a press release.

And then a few days before the session starts, pass some special warrants. Was it a million dollars? Was it 50 million? Was it 100 million? Was it 200 million? Was it 300 million? Three hundred and forty-five million dollars. A few days before the legislature starts.

There's only one explanation. There's only one explanation for special warrants of that magnitude a few days before the session — because you didn't want to have to answer questions on it in this legislature.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Because if the members opposite had waited three days with those special warrants, then we would have had the right to ask you why.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — We would have the right to say to you, why \$345 million? And you people don't want to answer. You don't want to answer the question. Always beware of the question. Always beware of the dreaded question.

Well I say to members opposite, you may be able to bring closure on this interim supply, and my guess is, given the impatience and outright stark fear which I see in members opposite, that we may see closure again before this government is confined to the dustbins of history as it's certainly going to be. When you people decide that you haven't time, when you people decide you haven't time for the niceties of democracy, the public will decide they cannot afford a government of that ilk.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — I say to members opposite, every question which has been put to you is legitimate. And every question which has been put to you has been put to us by our constituents.

This is not something we have dreamt up to keep you here in some sort of a torture chamber, although I realize you find this Legislative Assembly a very torturous place to be. Why do you find it unpleasant? Why do you find it unpleasant? Because of all the difficult questions. Because of accountability. That's why you find this place uncomfortable. That's why there was no throne speech. That's why there's closure. And that's why I say that we should fear closure again, because it may well come again.

Every time you people feel a little uncomfortable with some questioning, you've got to choke it off with closure. Well I say to members opposite, you may think that's a solution to your problem, that may be a solution in a temporary sense, but the public are going to be very, very intolerant of a government which does not want to answer legitimate questions put to it in the forum which has been provided for those questions.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — This session, Mr. Chairman, is all about giving as little information as possible. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, why is it that Public Accounts has begun its work but Crown Corporations has not? I'll tell you why. Because the chairman of the Public Accounts sits on the opposition benches; the chairman of Crown Corporations sits on government benches and you won't call the Crown Corporations.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take a few moments to relate our frustration with Public Accounts. And for the benefit of anyone opposite who may not know, or anyone who may be listening to this who may not know, Crown corporations are important to this province. The total revenue of the Crown corporations is somewhere in the same neighbourhood as the total expenditures of the government. They are large and they're important.

They bring us electricity. They bring us telephone service. They bring us insurance services. Crown corporations look after problems that is related to water and water management . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well for some time at least into the future. They bring us transportation, although members opposite seem intent on consigning STC (Saskatchewan Transportation Company) to the dustbins of history.

They have a plan, we are told. They have a plan. Their plan is privatizing the unprofitable routes. Their plan is they're going to sell off the routes which make money and the rest are going to be gone.

Well I'll tell you, Mr. Minister, you say you've got a plan? Well the public say no way to your way, Mr. Minister.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, we want to ask some questions about those very vital Crown corporations. And

we have asked members opposite, in the four weeks that this session has been in progress, we've asked you to call Crown Corporations, and there's been no response. And my colleague from Regina North West has asked the chairman, the member from Pelly, repeatedly to call the Crown Corporations. He gets no response. We are now four weeks into the session and no response.

I say, Mr. Chairman, this is my 16th year in the Assembly, and never before have we gone four weeks without the Crown Corporations being called. That is one of the things that is without precedent.

So my colleague from Regina North West writes the member from Pelly. And he says — and I won't read the entire letter for you; I could — but the first sentence sums up the letter:

I write to ask you to convene as soon as possible the Crown Corporations Committee. As you know, I have made this request verbally on two previous occasions, April 12th in the Assembly and April 30th in the Assembly.

What is not stated in the letter is he's made the request *ad nauseam* in a private way.

In addition, the Public Accounts has been in session since April 23rd. Opposition members have raised questions on behalf of taxpayers concerning certain aspects of Crown corporations in question period, and inevitably government ministers answer in a tired and patronizing voice, that's a proper question for Crown Corporations.

So we want the Crown Corporations to ask some of these about the privatization of STC, a vital service in rural Saskatchewan . . . (inaudible) . . . STC goes — and I hope it doesn't because I think you're going to run out of time before you get there; I think your mandate's going to expire. But if it does the real loser's going to be rural Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1645)

Mr. Shillington: — There will always be bus service from Moose Jaw to Regina and there will always be bus service from Regina to Saskatoon. But without STC, there is not going to be bus service from Regina to Coronach or to Rockglen or to Big Beaver or to Sturgis or to Preeceville. It is going to be rural Saskatchewan which is going to lose and we want to ask those questions of ministers. And we say so.

What do we get back? A long, verbal letter which says nothing. My colleague, the member from Regina North West, gets a letter back dated May 8, 1991 — again from the member from Pelly. He begins by thanking him for his letter. He says: thank you for your letter of May 8. However, regarding the convening of Crown Corporations Committee, I recall we discussed this once in the Assembly . . . and on the letter goes for five paragraphs. And when you get to the end, the last letter says: and I look forward to your early reply. No response and no undertaking to convene the Crown Corporations.

I say, Mr. Minister, this entire session is all about getting out of here as quickly as you can, giving as little information as you can. Well I will say from my feet, if you people have nothing to hide, then answer the questions which are put to you legitimately.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — You know what they're saying out on the streets? They're saying, if they weren't scoundrels they'd answer your questions. That's what they're saying.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — So we come into the Assembly and we ask you questions and you won't answer them. You may forgive them if they conclude that indeed they were right about being scoundrels. You may indeed forgive them. And that is the attitude they have. And can you blame them?

When you won't tell us how much you spend on government advertising, a figure that I don't think it would take those learned gentlemen sitting on either side of you five minutes to find, I don't think . . .

An Hon. Member: — They're good employees; they know.

Mr. Shillington: — They might well know it although I impute nothing to them. I simply say that they're learned, able gentlemen who could find the information in five minutes. They could find the information before 5 o'clock. Equally, they could find — if there were any, and I'm coming to the conclusion there isn't any . . . but if there were a study done on the impact of the GST. And this has become a very serious problem for the business community in this province.

The public, Mr. Minister, unable to vote on your mandate, are voting with their feet. They are going elsewhere. They are just saying, we ain't going to pay your tax.

You, Mr. Minister, have a real, big problem with that tax, and it's high time you faced it. Yes, you've got a real problem with that tax.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — I'll tell you, Mr. Minister, if you think you haven't got a problem with the tax, then all I can say is you call an election here and now and you'll see a problem like you've never seen before.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — If you think, Mr. Minister, that somebody else has got a problem with the tax, if you think I've got a problem or somebody over here has got a problem, then just call an election and we'll soon see who's got a problem.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — And you know what's going to happen with all that bravado over there? The election is going to be held at the last possible moment. That's what's going to happen.

The reason you're not going to call an election, you're not going to call an election, Mr. Minister — because you know full well the public judgement of you.

The public judgement of you are that you . . . I wish that all the public were saying about you is that you lack the courage of your convictions. Because they are saying that, but they're saying a great deal worse. The public are saying, if you had nothing to hide, you'd tell us. If you had nothing to hide, you would give us the information which we've requested — legitimate request for information.

What are you spending on polling? What are you spending on Nancy McLean? What are you spending on the contract services? What are you spending on Maxwell Smart? A parody, a parody of what a good advertising program should be. A good advertising program should portray a province as a place where people want to visit.

Now I don't know about the folks down in Oklahoma and Texas and California, but I doubt they want to come to a place where somebody talks into his shoe. I don't think that's what they want to . . . I don't think that's what they want to drive 3,000 people and pay 15 . . . pay 14 per cent to have someone . . . to watch someone talk into a shoe.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — My impression has been, talking to the folks, they think they've got some home-grown pikes who talk into their shoes. They don't need to drive 3,000 miles to talk.

An Hon. Member: — Right over there.

Mr. Shillington: — There are some people opposite who may well have telephones in their shoes; I'm not sure if that's the case.

Members opposite have got to start answering some questions, and the functions of this legislature are not going to proceed until you do. You need to tell us what you're going to be . . . where you're getting your money from. You need to justify the PST. You need to tell us what you think the true cost is going to be to consumers. You need to tell us what you're going to do about the public who say they aren't going to pay it.

So I say, Mr. Minister, you have got to start giving us some answers. And it is well the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . One of the members opposite says, sit down. The problem has been that when we sit down, what do we get? The minister stands up. In a patronizing, which I resent, and a tired voice, which I can understand, the minister says: I'm not going to answer the question.

An Hon. Member: — You put it in writing — what do they say?

Mr. Shillington: — So we put the questions in writing. What do we get? We get a letter back which goes on for

five paragraphs and says nothing.

What happens when the minister's patience begins to wear a bit thin? They use, apart from the fact that they start trying to yell you down, they also use a procedure which I say is not legitimate with respect to estimates. He does exist with respect to Bills, but it is not a legitimate procedure with respect to estimates. And this is estimates. This is not a Bill. This is not a law. We are not saying that people have to stop at a stop-light.

This is something very different. This is your right to spend money and it is inherent in the British system of justice. It is inherent in the British parliamentary system. We have the right to have our questions answered before you put this forward.

I say to members opposite, I realize that members opposite, your entire bent during the last six months has been to avoid this session, so it's not a session you expected to have to go through. But now that you are, you've decided that you ain't going to tell anybody anything, and that's been your approach. That's been your approach in question period when legitimate questions . . . you respond with long, windy replies which have nothing to do with the subject. It truly is an outrage that you should think that parliament is a place to avoid your responsibility. And that's what you think this is — you think this is a game.

We ask you questions in interim supply. The first opportunity we've had. I mean, this is not day 70; this is not day 80; this is day 19, 20, I'm not sure. This is day 19 and 20, and already you want us out of here.

An Hon. Member: — It's day 15.

Mr. Shillington: — It's day 15 — you introduce closure on estimates. The minister talks outside the House about introducing closure on another tax Bill, already, after two hours of debate.

Well I say to the members opposite, your patience is getting a little too thin. But the public patience with you people is also getting pretty thin.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — We have the right to put questions to you. We have the right to ask you why you think charging school children who go into parks on educational tours ought to be charged for it. We have the right to ask you to justify that. Members opposite do not govern by divine right. You govern with a consensus of the public, and I say you haven't got it. If you had anything approaching public support we wouldn't have had this session. You would have called an election. The very fact that we are in the fifth year of your mandate means you know that you don't have public support. You know you don't have any consensus. And you're desperately hanging on to office until the last possible moment.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Well I say to members opposite the last possible moment is drawing nigh. It may be that

members opposite may be flippant about the upcoming election, but I will say to members opposite, members opposite are not very jovial when the subject of an election comes up for real. They're not too jocular when you actually have to face the music. Because you may be able to avoid the accounting in this Assembly, you may be able to stand in your places and give long, silly, windy replies.

We asked a legitimate question of the minister on Wednesday. We asked him if he had any sort of an analysis of the goods and services tax. Was the transborder shopping — which has become a disaster — was the transborder problem expected? Not expected? Do you have a plan? Do you have any plan to deal with it?

What did we get? Virtually an hour-long speech from the minister which touched upon every conceivable subject, I think including the original sin, but certainly not analysis — certainly never strayed anywhere near the question of an analysis of the goods and services tax. You were on every other conceivable subject, Mr. Minister, but not the one I asked.

So I say to you, Mr. Minister, we want some answers. We want to know where the public money is going. We want to know, Mr. Minister, before the clock ticks out, we want to know — or tomorrow — we want studies. And this is really key, Mr. Minister, to your whole fiscal approach.

We want to know what you're going to do about the disaster you have brought on yourself with the provincial sales tax. It is clearly not acceptable. It isn't working. It is not going to raise the money that you say it is. We want to know, Mr. Minister, how you're going to dig yourself out of this impossible mess. We want your analysis, Mr. Minister. We want, Mr. Minister, we want . . . Mr. Minister, we want to know what your analysis is of the effect of the PST on inflation.

For heaven's sake, the goods and services tax — the federal goods and services tax — was debated vigorously in the House of Commons for months. And they argued about whether or not the government study was accurate. What would have happened if the federal minister had stood up and said, I got no studies? He would have been defeated. The government would have been defeated in Ottawa.

But there isn't enough integrity in members opposite to do the only right thing. There isn't enough integrity in members opposite to ask the minister to do what you know ought to be done. You know you should be answering these questions, you know you should be telling us, but the members opposite are simply decided that we aren't going to get the responses.

We've asked you about the studies on retail trade. If you ask the retail merchants, they'd tell you it's devastating. It's absolutely devastating. And it is certainly true that the further south you go, the more devastating it is. I don't know the extent to which it's a problem in Prince Albert and Nipawin. I expect it's a problem. But I know it's a problem in Regina, and it is a critical problem as you go further south in the Coronachs, in the Rockglens, in the Cadillacs, in the Shaunavons, the south country, it is a

critical problem. And you people . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .
I wonder if the . . . The member is confused about the location of
his golf membership and the location of the chamber of
commerce.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, you may have your golf
membership in the Minot golf club, but you are answerable to the
city of Regina and the Regina Chamber of Commerce. And the
Regina Chamber of Commerce do not want this tax. What they
want you to do, Mr. Minister, is to cut the waste and
mismanagement, and everybody is saying that from one end of
this province to the other.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — I say to you, Mr. Minister, that as long as
you remain . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Being near 5 o'clock, the committee
will rise and report progress.

The Speaker: — Order, order, please. Order. Could we have
order, please.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:02 p.m.