

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. Romanow: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of some residents of the province of Saskatchewan.

These petitioners are urging the government to reverse its decision to impose the 7 per cent provincial GST (goods and services tax). These petitioners are from a number of communities like Bengough, Weyburn, and Regina, and Coronach, to name a few. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I may . . . (inaudible) . . . and yes, I've signed it, Mr. Speaker, my name and the constituency, if that's okay. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prebble: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of residents of Saskatchewan. These petitioners, Mr. Speaker, are urging the provincial government to reverse its position with respect to the imposition of the 7 per cent provincial GST.

These petitioners are opposed to this major tax increase, Mr. Speaker, and the petitioners are primarily from Saskatoon, and many of them include residents of my own constituency in Saskatoon University, Mr. Speaker. I'm very pleased to present this petition to the Legislative Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present petitions from many residents of Saskatchewan. These people who have signed the petition are opposed to the imposition of the provincial GST, the 7 per cent tax that will take place, or has taken place, and some more will take place later on.

These people that have signed this petition, Mr. Speaker, are mainly from Prince Albert, and they have voiced their opinion against the tax.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I too rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a number of petitions to the Assembly on behalf of a number of residents, and looking at the names on this list, I would imagine that there would be something like 20, 25 names of people, individuals from the city of Prince Albert. These people have obviously signed the petition in opposition to the implementation of the 7 per cent provincial GST.

And I know, Mr. Speaker, in talking to my colleagues from Prince Albert, the reasons are obvious and I would like now, on behalf of these people, to present to the legislature on their behalf this petition.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I too would like to present a petition with 25 names of people from the city of Moose Jaw who are opposed to the imposition of the 7 per cent provincial GST. These petitioners urge the Government of Saskatchewan to reverse its decision to impose this new tax. And it gives me great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to lay this petition on the Table at this time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And even under the new map released yesterday, it would be Saskatoon Fairview.

I also rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of about 20 residents of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are urging the government to reverse its decision to impose the 7 per cent provincial GST. These petitioners are in the main from Prince Albert, although some small communities near Prince Albert are also the addresses of some of them, such as Waskesiu, Spruce Home, Shellbrook, and Meath Park.

And on their behalf I would like to file this petition, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of several residents of this province. The petitioners are urging the government to reverse its decision to impose the 7 per cent provincial GST. These people come from many areas of the province, including Regina, Kelvington, Lintlaw, Preeceville, Archerwill, Montmartre, Windthorst, Sedley, Pilot Butte, and Wilcox.

I present this petition on behalf of those people, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of a number of residents of Saskatchewan, who indicate in the petition, Mr. Speaker, that the provincial government does not have a mandate to impose the provincial GST. These individuals are from the community of Moose Jaw and, as I indicated, have expressed the fact that they are urging the government to remove the Bill which will impose the unfair provincial GST.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition on behalf of several residents of Saskatchewan. These residents come from the districts of Tuxford, Moose Jaw, Pense, amongst others, and they are all asking that I present this petition on their behalf, in opposition to the major tax increase that will result from the proposed provincial GST.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Solomon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule 11, to present a petition on behalf of some people in my constituency, Mr. Speaker. These petitioners are urging that the provincial government reconsider its predicament with respect to imposing the major tax increase which would result from its proposed provincial GST.

I'm very pleased to present this petition, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of many constituents in the constituency of Regina North West. I present this petition now, sir.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of 20 residents of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are urging the Government of Saskatchewan to reverse its decision to impose the 7 per cent provincial goods and services tax.

These petitioners are from some communities, namely the city of Regina, the town of Lebret, the town of Balcarres, and the city of Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker. As noted, these people are opposed to the provincial goods and services tax, and they want to register their opposition with the government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to rule 11 of this Legislative Assembly and I rise to represent people in their ancient, historic right to petition this Assembly.

And in this particular case they have asked this Assembly to assist them with the remedy, in that the provincial government does not have a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan to impose the major tax increase which would result from its proposed provincial goods and services tax.

This petition, Mr. Speaker, is signed by residents of the city of Saskatoon and the village of Candle Lake. And I present it here to you this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pringle: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to join my colleagues today. I rise pursuant to section 11 as well, to present many petition names, Mr. Speaker, from the communities of Saskatoon, Kamsack, and Wishart.

These petitioners, Mr. Speaker, oppose the provincial goods and services tax. They would urge that the provincial government reverse this decision. And it is my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to present these names, in this very democratic process, on their behalf.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Speaker, I join with my colleagues this afternoon to rise pursuant to rule 11 to present to your honourable Assembly a petition. And I would like to read a bit of the preamble. In fact it's underlined. It says: the petitioners humbly pray that your honourable Assembly may be pleased to urge the provincial government to stop the provincial GST, until the people of the province have an opportunity to pass judgement on it in a provincial election.

Mr. Speaker, that sentiment comes from, in this particular petition, from citizens of the fine city of Moose Jaw, and I'd like to lay that on the Table at this time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Calvert: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As part of my responsibilities to my constituents, and pursuant to rule no. 11, I rise to present a petition to this Assembly on behalf of residents of our province. The petitioners here are urging the government opposite to reverse its decision to impose the 7 per cent provincial GST. Mr. Speaker, all of the names on this petition were signed . . . are from the city which I represent, the city of Moose Jaw.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I too rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to this Assembly on behalf of a number of Saskatchewan residents, mostly from the northern part of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, these people are asking this government not to impose the provincial goods and services tax on them before they have a chance to go to the polls and decide that during an election.

These people are from communities like Melfort, Tisdale, Star City, Leask, and my home community of Prince Albert. As well, Mr. Speaker, there are some people that have signed from Porcupine Plain, Pathlow, Beatty, and St. Louis.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I join my colleagues in rising pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of residents of various parts of Saskatchewan. These petitioners, Mr. Speaker, are urging the government to reverse its decision to impose the 7 per cent provincial goods and services tax.

The petitioners that I have here are from a number of communities, certainly some from my constituency in Regina North, but in addition, Mr. Speaker, there's signatures from people from Sintaluta, from Wynyard, Kamsack, Creelman, and Francis. Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me on behalf of these people to present this petition.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you for recognizing me, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I too rise pursuant to rule 11 of the Legislative Assembly to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of residents of Saskatchewan. And these petitioners are urging the government to reverse its

decision to impose the 7 per cent provincial GST.

And these petitioners seem to be from . . . yes, they're all from the city of Regina, in fact they're all from the 600 . . . or mostly from the 600 block Arthur Street, which members will know is in the constituency of Regina Elphinstone. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koenker: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of residents of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are urging the government to reverse its decision to impose the 7 per cent provincial goods and services tax.

These petitioners are from a number . . . actually are not from a number of communities. These petitioners are from the community of Choiceland. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prebble: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Legislative Assembly on behalf of residents of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, these residents are saying in their petition that the provincial government does not have a mandate from the public to impose the major tax increase represented by the provincial GST. And these petitioners are from Saskatoon — the majority of them are from Saskatoon. But they are also from Bradwell, Allan, Shellbrook, and Meota. And on behalf of these residents I'm very pleased to present this petition to the Legislative Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 again to present some more petitions from people who are opposed to the provincial GST tax that this government wishes to introduce. These people that have signed this particular petition, Mr. Speaker, are from Viscount, Saskatchewan; from Drake, Saskatchewan; and from Saskatoon. These people are very concerned about the tax. They've asked me to present this petition to the Assembly on their behalf. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I rise again to submit to the Legislative Assembly, under rule 11 in the rules and proceedings of the Assembly, a number of names from I think the community of Saskatoon, in fact the Nutana area of Saskatoon.

Mr. Speaker, these people are petitioning the members of the legislature and the legislature that the government not proceed with the implementation of the Bill that would collect an additional 7 per cent on a number of items. In fact it would put great hardship on a number of families in this area of Saskatoon. I'd like to submit this list to the legislature.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, once again I rise pursuant to rule no. 11 to present a petition to this Assembly, sir, on behalf of a number of residents of the province of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are praying that the provincial government does not have a mandate with respect to its proposed tax increase on the provincial GST. The signatories come from, in this instance, primarily two communities, Preeceville and Sturgis. And it gives me a great deal of pleasure to table these petitions.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I've . . .

The Speaker: — Order.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise once more, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule no. 11, to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of residents of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are urging the government to reverse its decision to impose a 7 per cent provincial GST. It is also . . . the final words of the petition, Mr. Speaker, read — and this is in the interest of the people of Saskatchewan — they don't want this tax imposed until they have an opportunity to pass judgement on it in a provincial election. That's what the petitioners have signed, Mr. Speaker. These petitioners . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — These petitioners on this particular petition are all from the city of Prince Albert. I believe there's a couple of exceptions of rural areas around Prince Albert. It might be interesting to note one of them, Mr. Speaker, lives on Olive Diefenbaker Drive in Prince Albert. And I'll be glad to submit this petition, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of residents of Prince Albert, for the most part, although also included are a resident of Meath Park, of Big River, and Kinistino. These petitioners are urging the government to reverse its decision to impose the 7 per cent provincial GST. And on behalf of these petitioners, I would like to lay this petition before the House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition on behalf of several people from the province of Saskatchewan — people who are urging the provincial government to, before they put through this tax, get a new mandate, and then people can decide whether or not they will proceed.

These petitioners who asked me to stop the provincial GST are from Prince Albert, Duck Lake, Little Red, Montreal Lake, and the rest of them I believe are from the city of Prince Albert. I respectfully submit these petitioners to the Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to this Assembly as signed by a number of people from Saskatchewan, in particular from Moose Jaw and Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker. These petitioners are urging the government to reverse its decision to impose the 7 per cent provincial GST and indicate that the government does not have a mandate to impose this hurtful tax. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to rule 11 to represent several people from my own constituency in Prince Albert and as well people from Saskatoon and rural Prince Albert who have signed a petition urging that the government does not impose this major tax increase which would result from the proposed provincial GST. And I am pleased here to sign and submit this petition.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Solomon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise also pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition, on behalf of a number of residents of Saskatchewan, to this Assembly. These petitioners are urging the provincial government to reverse its decision to impose the 7 per cent GST. These petitioners are from the communities of Yorkton and Arcola, which is in the south-east, and various parts of Regina.

It's my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to present these to the Assembly today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of several residents of the province of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are urging the government to reverse its decision to impose the unfair provincial goods and services tax.

These petitioners, Mr. Speaker, are urging the provincial government to stop the provincial goods and services tax, because they believe the government does not have a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan to impose this major tax.

These petitioners, Mr. Speaker, are from a number of communities in the province of Saskatchewan, including the town of Cupar, Fort Qu'Appelle, Regina, Riceton, and the city of Moose Jaw, Mr. Speaker.

I'd like to present this petition to the members opposite.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11. I rise on behalf of Saskatchewan residents who have sought their ancient and historic right to present this Legislative Assembly with a petition. They seek a remedy because of the fact that the provincial government does

not have a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan to impose the major tax increase which would result from its proposed provincial goods and services tax, and I present that petition here today, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pringle: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise as well pursuant to rule 11. I present many names of Saskatchewan citizens from the communities of Shellbrook, Muskeg Lake, Leask, Spiritwood, Aberdeen, Debden, Shellbrook, P.A. These citizens of Saskatchewan oppose the 7 per cent proposed provincial GST, and they are concerned that this government has no mandate to impose such a tax. And it is my pleasure to present the names on their behalf and I thank them as citizens of the province for their input, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I join again with my colleagues in rising today pursuant to rule 11 to place before the Assembly a petition which says, in part, that the provincial government does not have a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan to impose the major tax increase which would result from its proposed provincial GST.

Mr. Speaker, these petitioners are from the city of Moose Jaw, and they urge the provincial government to stop the provincial GST until the people of Saskatchewan have an opportunity to pass judgement on it in a provincial election. And I would lay this before the Table at this time, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Calvert: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again pursuant to rule 11, I lay on the Table a number of signatures on petition urging the provincial government to stop the provincial GST until the people of the province have had an opportunity to pass judgement on it in a provincial election. And, Mr. Speaker, again these signatures are all from the city of Moose Jaw, and because I know some of those who have signed the petition, I see that some of them live north of the CNR (Canadian National Railway) tracks in Moose Jaw.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to present this petition on behalf of those citizens of the province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I too rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition on behalf of a number of Saskatchewan citizens who have exercised their democratic right to petition this Assembly. And they're asking in their petition, Mr. Speaker, that the government take this new GST, this new provincial GST, before the people in the form of an election before a decision is made.

These people are from numerous communities throughout our province — from Saskatoon, from White Fox. I see signatures here from people in Choiceland, Garrick, and other communities throughout the province.

It's my privilege to table this document.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you again, Mr. Speaker, for recognizing me. Mr. Speaker, I rise again pursuant to rule 11 to present another petition to the Assembly on behalf of residents of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are urging the government to stop, to reverse its decision to impose this 7 per cent provincial sales tax, or provincial GST as it's known. And the petitioners on this petition seem to be . . . yes, I think they all are from the city of Moose Jaw.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koenker: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise again pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of residents of Saskatchewan.

These petitioners are urging the government to reverse its decision to impose the 7 per cent provincial GST. The petitioners are from . . . again they're entirely from the community of Choceland. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prebble: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 to represent residents of my constituency by way of presenting a petition on their behalf to the Legislative Assembly.

These petitioners, Mr. Speaker, are opposed to the 7 per cent provincial GST. They want to see the 7 per cent provincial GST stopped, and they would like to have the opportunity to pass judgement on this tax in a general election.

Mr. Speaker, these petitioners are from the Brevoort Park neighbourhood in Saskatoon. And on their behalf, I'm very pleased to present these petitions to the Legislative Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present some signatures of petitioners who are opposed to the provincial GST. And on their behalf I am very pleased to present these names.

They've asked me on their behalf to make sure that names are presented so that the government can take that into consideration and withdraw the Bill from the legislature. Mr. Speaker, the names that I am presenting today are from the city of Regina.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I again rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to this Legislative Assembly on behalf of a number of residents of the province of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are saying in the petition that the government opposite does not have a mandate to impose the major tax increase as a result of the proposed provincial GST. And it urges the provincial government opposite to stop the provincial GST until the people of the

province have had opportunity to pass judgement on it in a provincial election.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this particular petition involves signatories from the communities . . . well I guess it's basically all Young, Saskatchewan, with the exception of some representation from the fine community of Allan. On behalf of these people, Mr. Speaker, I would seek to file this petition.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I rise once more to exercise the time-honoured rule of petition under rule 11 in this Assembly, to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of the residents of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are urging the government to reverse its decision to impose a 7 per cent provincial GST. These residents on this particular petition, Mr. Speaker, come entirely from the city of Moose Jaw, and it's my pleasure to table this petition on their behalf.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of residents of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are urging the government to reverse its decision to impose the 7 per cent provincial GST. These petitioners are from Prince Albert, Candle Lake, and Waskesiu, and it is my honour to present this petition to the Assembly on their behalf.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly. This petition has been signed by people from Tisdale, Prince Albert, Shellbrook, and the majority I guess are from Prince Albert. These people are voicing their opinion, telling the government they have no mandate to implement this tax, and are asking that this provincial goods and services tax not proceed. On behalf of these people, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit their names on this petition.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise once again pursuant to rule 11 to table a further petition to the Assembly on behalf of residents of Saskatchewan from the city of Moose Jaw. These petitioners are saying, Mr. Speaker, that the provincial government does not have a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan to impose the major tax increase which would result from its provincial goods and services tax.

These petitioners indicate the tax will cause a severe hardship on them and their communities, and they would like the government to reverse their decision and to listen to the people on this issue. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today pursuant to rule 11 on behalf of several people from Prince Albert, who are exercising their democratic right

through petition to ask the government to reverse its position on the proposed provincial PST (provincial sales tax). And they are indicating that the government does not have a mandate to do this. I hereby present this petition, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Solomon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise also pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to this Assembly on behalf of several residents of the province of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are urging the provincial government not to impose this major tax increase which would result from its proposed provincial GST legislation, and they indicate that the government does not have a mandate to do so.

These petitioners, Mr. Speaker, are from several communities, including Big River in northern Saskatchewan; Muenster in central Saskatchewan; Martensville, north of Saskatoon; Regina residents, Saskatoon residents, and residents from the western part of the province in Maple Creek. I am pleased to present this petition on their behalf.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of residents of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are urging the government to reverse its decision to impose the 7 per cent provincial goods and services tax.

These petitioners believe that the Government of Saskatchewan does not have a mandate from the electorate to impose this major tax, and they are asking the government to stop the provincial goods and services tax from being passed. All of these petitioners, Mr. Speaker, are from the city of Moose Jaw.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to rule 11 of this Legislative Assembly. I rise on behalf of a number of residents of the province of Saskatchewan who have exercised their ancient and historic right to petition this Assembly to find a remedy, or ask us to find a remedy, to the government's actions. Specifically they say that the province . . . the provincial government, pardon me, does not have a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan to impose the major tax increase which would result from its proposed provincial goods and services tax, and I present that petition to you here today, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1445)

Mr. Pringle: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present many names, petition names of Saskatchewan residents who are concerned about the impact on their families to the proposed 7 per cent provincial goods and services tax. And they're concerned specifically that, as the petition says, that the government has no mandate to impose such

a tax without a provincial election.

Mr. Speaker, these residents are from the communities of Shell Lake, Shellbrook, Blaine Lake, Prince Albert, Regina, and Parkside. And it is my pleasure to present these names on their behalf, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 to lay before this Assembly a petition, which reads in part that the provincial government does not have a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan to impose the major tax increase which would result from its proposed provincial GST.

The petitioners included in this petition, Mr. Speaker, come from primarily the city of Prince Albert, and they urge the provincial government to stop the provincial GST until the people of the province have an opportunity to pass judgement on it in a provincial election. And I would like to lay that petition before the Assembly at this time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you once again, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to rule 11 of the rules of this Assembly to petition on behalf of a number of Saskatchewan residents. These residents are from the community of Montmartre, Mr. Speaker, and they're urging this provincial government to stop the provincial goods and services tax, until the people of Saskatchewan, of the province, have the opportunity to pass judgement on this in a provincial election.

I will table this now, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for again recognizing me. Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Legislative Assembly on behalf of the residents of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are urging the government to reverse its decision to impose the 7 per cent provincial education and health tax, or provincial sales tax, or what is more commonly known as the provincial goods and services tax, provincial GST. And these petitioners are all from the city of Regina, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koenker: — Mr. Speaker, I rise again pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of residents of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are urging the government to reverse its decision to impose the 7 per cent provincial goods and services tax. And the petitioners this time are entirely from the community of Smeaton, with the exception of one individual from Choiceland and one individual from Weirdale.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prebble: — Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition, on behalf of residents from various

parts of Saskatchewan, to the Assembly. These petitioners, Mr. Speaker, are opposed to the 7 per cent provincial GST, and they are asking in this petition for a general election to be held before this major tax increase is allowed to remain in effect. Mr. Speaker, the petitioners are from Yorkton, Loreburn, and the rest of the group of petitioners are from Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker.

And on their behalf I'm very pleased to present this petition to the legislature.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of a number of residents from the province of Saskatchewan. These particular petitioners are very concerned about the implementation of a provincial GST and the adverse effects it will have on their particular lives.

These petitioners request of the government to withdraw the Bill and to not impose this tax on them. These people are mainly from the city of Prince Albert, but I notice also, Mr. Speaker, that there are a number of them from the rural areas surrounding the city of Prince Albert. And on their behalf I wish to present this petition to the Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the time-honoured right to petition under rule 11, I want to present this petition to the Assembly on behalf of residents of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are urging the government to reverse its decision to impose a 7 per cent provincial GST and to give the public the opportunity to pass judgement on that particular issue.

These residents, Mr. Speaker, are entirely from the city of Moose Jaw, and it is with a great deal of pleasure that I lay their petition on the Table this afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of residents of the province of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are urging the government to reverse its decision to impose the 7 per cent GST.

These petitions, Mr. Speaker, are from a number of communities, chiefly from Prince Albert, but also from Birch Hills and from Christopher Lake. And on their behalf it is my honour to file this petition with the Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present to the Assembly a petition delivered from several people of this province, urging the provincial government to stop the provincial GST, mainly because they have no mandate to proceed with this unfair tax.

These people who signed this petition come from places

like Prince Albert, Domremy, Birch Hills, and Holbein. These people have asked that we present this petition to the Assembly on their behalf, protesting this unfair tax. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too rise pursuant to rule 11 to table a petition urging the government to reverse its policy with respect to imposing the major tax increase, the provincial goods and services tax, on the grounds that the government does not have a mandate to impose that tax; and also of course, Mr. Speaker, that it would impose hardship on individuals, businesses, and communities. The petitioners who have signed this petition, Mr. Speaker, are from the city of Moose Jaw in the province of Saskatchewan. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of people who have signed the petition because of their feelings that this tax will be imposing a hardship on businesses and on individuals, I present this petition. The petition asks that the government reverse its decision to impose this major tax increase, that is, the provincial GST. It's my honour to present this petition, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Solomon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to rule 11, along with my colleagues, to present a petition to the Legislative Assembly on behalf of several residents in the province of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are urging the Government of Saskatchewan to reverse its decision to impose the 7 per cent provincial GST. The petitioners signed on this petition believe that the government does not have the mandate at this time to impose such an unfair tax. They are the communities of Yorkton and Arcola, and many from Regina and Balgonie. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I too rise pursuant to rule 11 to lay on the Table a petition to the Assembly on behalf of the residents of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are urging the government to reverse its decision to impose the 7 per cent provincial goods and services tax. These petitioners are from the city of Moose Jaw as well as surrounding area, Mr. Speaker. These petitioners believe that the Government of Saskatchewan does not have a mandate from the electorate to introduce this major tax increase, and are demanding that the Government of Saskatchewan stop the provincial goods and services tax.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — I rise pursuant to rule 11 of this Assembly. I rise on behalf of a number of Saskatchewan residents who have exercised their ancient and historic right to petition this Legislative Assembly. And they have, in particular, petitioned this Assembly to help them in finding a solution, because the provincial government does not have a mandate from the people of

Saskatchewan to impose the major tax increase which would result from its proposed provincial goods and services tax. And I lay this petition on the Table here today, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pringle: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues pursuant to rule 11 to present a number of petition names of Saskatchewan citizens who oppose the 7 per cent provincial GST. And the petition says, in part, that these residents feel that the province does not have a mandate to impose this tax without the provincial election.

The communities, Mr. Speaker, that these citizens are from are Shellbrook, La Loche up north where I used to live — glad to see that — Meadow Lake, Parkside, and Prince Albert, Mr. Speaker. And it is my pleasure to present these names on their behalf.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon pursuant to rule 11 of this Legislative Assembly to place before you a petition that urges the provincial government to stop the provincial GST, until the people of the province have an opportunity to pass judgement on it in a provincial election.

The reasons they give, Mr. Speaker, is that the provincial government does not have a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan to impose a major tax increase, which will result from this proposed provincial goods and services tax.

And, Mr. Speaker, this . . . the petitioners are all from the city of Moose Jaw, and more particularly they're all from the 600 block of Athabasca Street West in the city of Moose Jaw.

I would like to lay this on the Table before you at this time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1500)

Mr. Lautermilch: — Once again, Mr. Speaker, I rise again pursuant to rule 11 to petition this Assembly on behalf of a number of Saskatchewan residents — a petition that urges this government to stop the imposition of what they feel is an unfair tax, the 7 per cent goods and services tax. They're asking that this government wait until people can pass judgement on the tax during a provincial election.

Mr. Speaker, the petitioners on this particular petition are once again from the community of Montmartre, and it is clear that the people of Montmartre have very strong feelings with respect to this tax. So on their behalf, sir, I table this petition.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. Again I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Legislative Assembly on behalf of the residents of

Saskatchewan. This is, as I indicated, pursuant to a rule of the Legislative Assembly. These petitioners are urging the government to reverse its decision to impose the provincial goods and services tax, provincial GST, of 7 per cent on top of goods and services here in Saskatchewan.

And the petition I have, Mr. Speaker, is signed by . . . it would appear to be about 16 individuals from the fine city of Moose Jaw, sir. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koenker: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my privilege, Mr. Speaker, to rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of residents of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are urging the Government of Saskatchewan to reverse its decision to impose the 7 per cent provincial goods and services tax otherwise known as the PST. These particular petitioners come entirely from the community of Odessa.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prebble: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise this afternoon pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition on behalf of Saskatchewan residents. Mr. Speaker, these residents are expressing their opposition to the provincial GST, and asking that a provincial election be held before the government can be declared to have a mandate to implement this tax. Mr. Speaker, these residents are from a variety of Saskatoon neighbourhoods, Mr. Speaker, both on the east and west side of the river in Saskatoon. And on their behalf I present these petitions to the Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 on behalf of a number of residents of the province of Saskatchewan, who have expressed their concern about the provincial GST which the government is attempting to implement. And by signing this petition, they are voicing their opposition to that tax and have asked me to present on their behalf this petition in the Assembly. And on their behalf I am doing so.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, in the interest of establishing a consensus, a number of people have presented a petition to me which I now under rule 11 table in this Assembly. These people are residents of Saskatchewan. They're concerned about the imposition of the 7 per cent provincial GST and want the government to submit the issue to a provincial election. These people by and large are from the city of Saskatoon, but I see people on here also from Kerrobert, Dinsmore as well, and Regina. It is therefore my great pleasure to submit their petition to you, Mr. Speaker, and I hereby sign the petition.

Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of residents of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are urging the government to reverse its decision to impose the 7 per

cent provincial GST.

The people who have signed the petition that I am presenting are from Prince Albert, La Ronge, and Debden. And I have the honour to lay their petition before the Assembly.

Mr. Upshall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of several people in the province of Saskatchewan who have signed this petition, asking that it be taken to this Assembly to protest this government's imposition of an unfair 7 per cent GST without a mandate.

These people come from Prince Albert. In fact, most of these people come from Prince Albert, from one or two streets in Prince Albert, with the exception of one being from Hudson Bay, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of these people who are asking this government to stop this unfair tax, I respectfully submit this petition.

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise again pursuant to rule 11 to file further petitions signed by residents of Saskatoon, Regina, and Moose Jaw, protesting the government's imposition of the provincial goods and services tax on the grounds that the government has no mandate to implement that tax.

These individuals are hoping that this Bill will not in effect go through the legislature and the provincial GST will not become law.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition on behalf of several residents from Saskatchewan. These people hail from Shellbrook, and Brewster's trailer court in Prince Albert, and Duck Lake. And they all have signed this petition because they believe that the government has no right to tax without a mandate. Mr. Speaker, I hereby present this petition.

Mr. Solomon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise again pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Legislative Assembly on behalf of several residents from the province of Saskatchewan. These petitioners do not believe that the government has a mandate from the taxpayers to impose this major tax increase, which would result in a harmonized provincial GST. They are undertaking their right to request the members on this side to present on their behalf the petition to the Assembly and that the government would reconsider its position.

I am pleased on their behalf, Mr. Speaker, to present the petition. And if I had a pen that I could borrow from somebody, I'd sign it. Thank you.

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of residents of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are urging the government to reverse its decision to impose the 7 per cent provincial goods and services tax.

These petitioners come from the city of Prince Albert and area, as well as the Paddockwood area, Mr. Speaker.

These petitioners are indicating that the government does not have a mandate to impose this particular major tax increase, and that the Government of Saskatchewan should stop the provincial goods and services tax.

I'm pleased to be able to lay these signatures on the Table. Thank you.

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 of the Legislative Assembly. I rise to present a petition signed by residents of the province of Saskatchewan. And they are protesting, asking for the Assembly to find a solution to their concern with the government, of imposing a cruel and harsh tax of 7 per cent — more commonly known as the provincial goods and services tax — after nine years of waste and mismanagement by this government. Specifically they ask this Assembly that the provincial government does not have a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan to impose the major tax increase which would result from its proposed provincial goods and services tax. And I lay this petition before you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Pringle: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a number of petition names of Saskatchewan citizens, Mr. Speaker, from northern Saskatchewan — La Ronge and other parts of the North — who were opposed to the 7 per cent provincial goods and services tax and who recognize, I think, the high rate of family poverty in the North and just feel that they can't absorb any more taxes. And they're asking that the provincial government reconsider this decision, Mr. Speaker.

And I'm pleased to, on their behalf, present their concerns in this regard. Thank you very much.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 to place before the Assembly a petition that urges the provincial government to stop the provincial goods and services tax, until the people of the province have an opportunity to pass judgement on it, the government, in the provincial election. And the reason they give, Mr. Speaker, is that the provincial government does not have a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan to impose the major tax increase, which would result from its proposed provincial GST.

Mr. Speaker, the petitioners on this petition, while mainly from the city of Moose Jaw, also include the community of Bushell Park, which is the air base of which all Saskatchewan residents are particularly proud, as well as the communities of Colonsay in Saskatchewan and Pilot Butte.

I would like to place this petition before the legislature at this time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule 11, I would place on the Table this day a petition from residents — people who make their home in the communities of Melville, Ituna, Regina, Lebret, Neudorf, Balcarres — who are petitioning their provincial government to stop its plans for a provincial goods and services tax, Mr.

Speaker. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1515)

Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise once again to present on behalf of a number of Saskatchewan residents, a petition pursuant to rule 11. This petition, sir, is asking the provincial government to stop the imposition of the provincial goods and services tax, until they have held an election and people have had the opportunity to pass judgement on what they feel is a very unfair and perhaps unnecessary tax, sir. I lay before you this petition.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly, on behalf of residents of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are urging the government to reverse its decision to impose the 7 per cent provincial GST. And all these petitioners, sir, are from the city of Moose Jaw and it's my pleasure to submit these here today. Thank you.

Mr. Koenker: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to rise today pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of residents of the city of Saskatoon, my home community. These petitioners are urging the government to reverse its decision to impose the 7 per cent provincial goods and services tax. And it's my pleasure to lay this petition before you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prebble: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition in the Legislative Assembly. This petition is from petitioners who are wishing to express their opposition to the 7 per cent provincial GST, are asking for that tax to be stopped, and are asking for a provincial election, Mr. Speaker, before any decision is made about the implementation of the tax. Mr. Speaker, these petitioners are from Spinks Drive and Britnell Crescent in Saskatoon in my constituency. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Rolfes: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present names of residents of Saskatchewan who are expressing their concern about the provincial GST which the government is attempting to implement in the province of Saskatchewan.

These petitioners, who come from various communities such as Emma Lake, Prince Albert, and Shellbrook, are asking that the provincial government take heed of their concerns and not implement the 7 per cent GST in the legislature. On their behalf, Mr. Speaker, I present this petition.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I have a petition in my hand that establishes the concern of a number of people from Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan. Therefore under rule 11, I want to present this petition to the Assembly on behalf of these residents. They are urging that the government reverse its decision to impose the 7 per cent provincial GST, and I take pleasure in submitting this petition of theirs to you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much. I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of a number of residents of the province of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are urging the government to reverse its decision to impose the 7 per cent provincial GST.

These petitioners come from the communities of Briercrest, Chaplin, Central Butte, Avonlea, and Moose Jaw. And on their behalf, Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to present this petition to the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Upshall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again I rise pursuant to rule 11 on behalf of several people from the province of Saskatchewan who, by signing this petition, are asking that the government stop the provincial GST, this tax that they have no mandate to proceed with, after legacy they have left here. They have asked us to bring it and present it to the legislature.

They are from . . . I believe they are from Prince Albert, Mr. Speaker. It's all pretty well all on one street from Prince Albert. On behalf of the people from Prince Albert, I respect their wishes and present this petition to the Assembly to oppose the government's action of imposing this unfair tax.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to file a petition under rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures*, Mr. Speaker, that speaks to the proposed provincial goods and services tax, and states that the provincial government, four and a half years into its mandate, long past when a government ordinarily would call an election, simply has no mandate from the people of Saskatchewan to impose the tax.

These petitioners hope that this tax will not be imposed, Mr. Speaker, before a provincial election, because they want the right to indicate their position with respect to the tax. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present the petition on behalf of several residents of Saskatchewan. They are exercising their democratic right to petition the government and asking that the government not impose a major tax increase which would result as a . . . with the imposition of the provincial GST. And they ask that the province . . . that they have an opportunity to pass judgement through an election before this is done.

I see, Mr. Speaker, that these residents who have signed this petition are from the town of Yorkton, most of them on Walker Street, and also from the town of Biggar and Kamsack.

Mr. Solomon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition on behalf of several residents in the province of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are urging the provincial government, considering their mandate having expired, not to impose the major tax increase which would result from this proposed provincial GST legislation, in particular Bill 61.

These residents, Mr. Speaker, are from Regina Beach, which is in the Qu'Appelle-Lumsden constituency, and Regina — from a number of constituencies in the city here.

It's my pleasure on their behalf to present this petition to the government and to the Legislative Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of residents of the province of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are urging the government to reverse its imposition of the 7 per cent provincial goods and services tax.

These petitioners, Mr. Speaker, come from the city of Moose Jaw and it appears as though they live in a senior citizen high-rise on High Street, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, these citizens will be affected by this tax. They believe the Government of Saskatchewan does not have a mandate to fulfil or impose this tax. And they are asking — they are urging — the members opposite to please stop the legislation to impose the provincial goods and services tax, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to rule 11 of this Assembly. I rise to present a petition. The residents of Saskatchewan that have signed this have exercised their ancient and historic right to petition this Assembly. In this particular case, that the provincial government does not have a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan to impose the major tax increase which would result from its proposed provincial goods and services tax. The people who have signed this petition feel it is cruel and unusual to impose such a tax after nine years of waste and mismanagement by this government. Mr. Speaker, I present this petition here today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pringle: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise pursuant to rule 11 to present many names of Saskatchewan residents who are opposed to this proposed goods and services tax, and who urge the government, Mr. Speaker, to reverse this tax, feeling, as the petition says in part, that the government has no mandate at this stage to impose this tax.

And these Saskatchewan citizens, Mr. Speaker, are from Saskatoon, the community of Carlyle in the south-east part of the province, North Battleford, and Stanley Mission in the North. And it is my pleasure to present this request on their behalf, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon pursuant to rule 11 to present before the Legislative Assembly a petition which says and urges the provincial government to stop the provincial goods and services tax, until the people of the province have an opportunity to pass judgement on it — and I presume that's the government — in a provincial election. The reason that they give, Mr. Speaker, is that the provincial government does not enjoy a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan to impose this major tax increase which results from the proposed provincial goods and services tax.

And, Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by residents of Prince Albert, Saskatchewan; of Choiceland, of Shellbrook, and I note, Mr. Speaker, that one of the petitioners in fact has made his status as a senior citizen clear on this petition. And like all those people in the province who oppose the provincial GST, Mr. Speaker, I would lay this petition on the Table before the legislature at this time.

(1530)

Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule 11, I rise to present a petition, to lay a petition on the Table, of certain residents of our province who are opposed to the government opposite's plans to introduce a provincial goods and services tax.

These residents, Mr. Speaker, come from Stony Beach, from Chaplin, and many of them from my own community of Moose Jaw. Mr. Speaker, as I look at this list I recognize again some of the names from Moose Jaw, and they are both young people and senior citizens from the community of Moose Jaw. It is my privilege on their behalf to lay this petition on the Table today.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to rule 11 of this Assembly to present on behalf of a number of Saskatchewan citizens a petition that is urging this government to stop the imposition of the provincial goods and services tax. Mr. Speaker, the people who have signed this petition are concerned that the tax is unfair. They would ask this government as well in the petition to bring this before the people of Saskatchewan in a general election, before imposing what they feel to be a very unfair tax. Mr. Speaker, these residents for the most part are from the community of Moose Jaw . . .

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

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Under rule 11(3) of the rules of this Assembly, the rule reads:

On the presentation of a petition no debate on or in relation to the same shall be allowed.

The member opposite was entering into debate and I would ask that you, Mr. Speaker, rule on this particular

point of order and caution the members opposite to follow the rules.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, not to delay the proceedings at all, but I just want to make the point that I've been listening very carefully to my colleagues present petitions, and while the members say I haven't been in here, and I make a point that while I wasn't in here for a certain length of time, I was watching on the monitor.

And I want to say clearly that the members are not taking any amount of time to present the petitions and I want to disagree with him totally that there is some sort of debate taking on, as members get up and take less than a minute, probably in the area of 15, 20, 50 seconds to present a petition.

If he's calling that debate and trying to cut off that as debate, then I think he's highly out of order in calling that a debate that lasts less than a minute.

The Speaker: — I've listened to the hon. member's point of order and the remarks of the member for Regina Elphinstone. And by and large I have been listening — not by and large, but I in fact have been listening to all petitions — and I would say that by and large the members have not been presenting the petitions in such a way that it would provoke debate.

However that was not the point of order. The point of order was in specific reference, the way I understood it, to the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake, and perhaps he was verging on that. However, by and large as I say, the members have been presenting the petitions in a proper manner in that regard and I just bring that to the attention of everybody in the House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you very much for your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and I do understand the procedure. But I would just want to then table this document, this petition on behalf of the residents of Moose Jaw who are very concerned with the imposition of this provincial goods and services tax.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 of the Legislative Assembly to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of residents of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are urging the government to reverse its decision to impose the provincial GST, until the people of the province have had an opportunity to pass judgement on it in a provincial election.

And these petitioners are from the city of Moose Jaw and the community of Parkbeg, Mr. Speaker, and it's my pleasure to present this petition here today on behalf of these fine citizens of Saskatchewan. Thank you.

Mr. Koenker: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of residents of Saskatoon. These petitioners are urging the government

to reverse its decision regarding the provincial goods and services tax. And the petitioners all come from Saskatoon, and I even know one of the petitioners myself.

The Speaker: — Order. I wish to make a statement on the proceedings of the House.

The ordinary business of the Assembly has been delayed by the process of presenting petitions under routine proceedings for somewhat over one and a half hours today. It is evident to me, and I'm sure to all members, that what we have been witnessing here is not merely a process to present petitions.

All of the petitions, all being on the very same subject, could have been presented together at one time. Also, rule 11(1) provides that members may present petitions to the House by filing them with the Clerk at any time during the sitting.

Given that there are simpler and quicker means to present these very important petitions from the public to the Assembly, I can only conclude that the purpose of presenting petitions in such a way as to take up hours of House time, is to delay or possibly prevent the House from dealing with other business on the order paper.

Members have the right to present petitions. Members have the right to use legitimate tactics to delay decisions. The House as a whole, has the undoubted right and responsibility to deal with the business before it.

In order to strike the proper balance between the rights described above, it is my intention to invoke Rule 1 of our *Rules and Procedures* which reads as follows:

In all cases not provided for in these Rules or by sessional or by other orders, the usages and customs of the House of Commons of Canada, as in force at the time, shall be followed, so far as they may be applicable to this Assembly.

Pursuant to this rule, I now invoke a usage of the House of Commons which is contained in Beauchesne's *Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, 6th edition, page 281, citation 1043 as follows:

A Member wishing to present petitions will be recognized only once during routine proceedings for that purpose.

In the House of Commons, this precedent was established by a Speaker's ruling at a time when petitions were being used to obstruct the House. The effect of this ruling will be to limit the number of times in one day that a member may rise to present a petition.

It is important to note however, that the member's right to present petitions and the right of the public to petition the House, are in no way infringed by this limitation.

Members may still present their petitions to the Table under rule 11(1) or they may present all like petitions at one time, or they may present their petitions on other sitting days.

Since all members wishing to present petitions have done so at least once in this sitting, and some as many as six times, I now call the next order of business under routine proceedings which is reading and receiving petitions.

Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, with great respect and with due deference, I would like to present an argument with respect to the ruling that you've just made to the House. And I assume that a ruling like this, going as it does to the fundamental privileges of this House, is a ruling that is subject to debate and that you will listen to argument on it and be prepared to alter your ruling in the event that it is shown.

The Speaker: — Order, order. The Speaker's ruling under our rules would clearly state that these rulings are not subject to debate, and therefore I am not able to get into a debate on this ruling.

Mr. Brockelbank: — May I request that you give some thought to this small point. In all — you read the rule — in all cases not provided for in these rules, the rules of this House provide for the presenting of petitions; it's a long-established practice of this House.

Therefore it's not necessary, Mr. Speaker, to go to the House of Commons rules if the procedures and practices of this House are clearly established. I submit to you, sir, they are clearly established.

The Speaker: — As I indicated, I don't intend to get into a debate and I will respond to that particular issue. But then we will go on to the next order of business.

The rules of the House do not . . . there isn't a rule in the House on how frequently members can rise. There's a rule in the House which allows you to present petitions. I have read this. I have read to you in my statement that you are permitted to present petitions — you are permitted. That right is not being taken away from any member in the House.

I have also gone on to indicate a rule in the House of Commons which, under a situation where the Speaker felt that petitions were being used to obstruct the business of the House, he invoked the rule that they may only rise once, as I have read to you earlier on.

Or if you wish I can reread the whole issue. I can do that for you, but I don't intend to debate. I can do that. If you wish me to reread it, I'll reread it but I won't debate. Okay? I'll reread it to you so that everybody is clear. And then I want you to understand, ladies and gentlemen, that we will move to the next order of business without any further delay.

Order, order, order. I am reading my ruling. No interruptions.

The ordinary business of the Assembly has been delayed by the process of presenting petitions under routine proceedings for somewhat over one and a half hours today. It is evident to me, and I'm sure to all members . . . order, order. It is evident to me, and I'm sure to all members, what we have been witnessing here is not merely a process to present petitions.

All of the petitions, all being on the very same subject, could have been presented together at one time. Also rule 11(1) provides that members may present petitions to the House by filing them with the Clerk at any time during the sitting.

Given that there are simpler and quicker means to present these very important petitions from the public to the Assembly, I can only conclude that the purpose of presenting petitions in such a way as to take up hours of House time is to delay or possibly prevent the House from dealing with other business on the order paper.

Members have the right to present petitions. Members have the right to use legitimate tactics to delay decisions. The House as a whole has the undoubted right and responsibility to deal with the business before it.

(1545)

In order to strike the proper balance between the rights described above, it is my intention to invoke rule 1 of our *Rules and Procedures*, which reads as follows:

In all cases not provided for in these Rules or by sessional or by other orders, the usages and customs of the House of Commons of Canada, as in force at the time, shall be followed, so far as they may be applicable to this Assembly.

Pursuant to this rule, I now invoke a usage of the House of Commons which is contained in Beauchesne's *Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, 6th Edition, page 281, citation 1043 as follows:

A Member wishing to present petitions will be recognized only once during routine proceedings for that purpose.

In the House of Commons this precedent was established by a Speaker's ruling at a time when petitions were being used to obstruct the House. The effect of this ruling will be to limit the number of times in one day that a member may rise to present a petition.

It is important to note, however, that the member's right to present petitions and the right of the public to petition the House are in no way infringed by this limitation. Members may still present their petitions to the Table under rule 11(1), or they may present all like petitions at one time, or they may present their petitions on other sitting days.

Since all members wishing to present petitions have done so at least once in this sitting, and some up to six times, I now call the next order of business under routine proceedings, which is reading and receiving petitions.

An Hon. Member: — Point of order, Mr. Speaker . . .

The Speaker: — There is no point of order on the Speaker's ruling. The hon. member who sat in this Chair is aware of it.

Order! If the hon. member is not addressing the issue I

have just raised, he cannot raise a point of order until some subsequent business has taken place.

Order. Presenting reports by standing, select and special committees. There is no point of order. There is no point of order. There is no point of order, no.

An Hon. Member: — Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

The Speaker: — Is your point of order regarding the ruling? Is it regarding the ruling?

An Hon. Member: — Mr. Speaker, I want to ask you . . .

The Speaker: — No. I cannot allow point of order under ruling I have made. I am bringing that to your attention and I will trust that that is not your point of order.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I am referring to rule 11 which covers the presentation of petitions in this House, and I want to find from you, Mr. Speaker, whether that rule is in force, whether rule no. 11 in our rule book here in Saskatchewan is now in force.

The Speaker: — I have read the rule. The rule clearly indicates that no member's right is infringed upon to present petitions, and as I said earlier, we will now move on to notices of motions and questions. Order, order. Notices of motions and questions.

An Hon. Member: — What are you doing? He's standing up.

The Speaker: — I'm sorry . . . Order, order. Order, order. I am more than willing to listen to the members . . .

An Hon. Member: — You better be.

The Speaker: — I beg your pardon? The hon. member for Regina Elphinstone has threatened the Chair. He has said, "you better be." Will the hon. member rise and apologize.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I rise and apologize.

An Hon. Member: — That is absolutely ridiculous.

The Speaker: — No, it's not ridiculous, sir.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

Mr. Prebble: — Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return showing:

The total amount paid by the Department of Agriculture, include ordinary, for the period April 1, 1990 to the date this return was ordered, to Dome Advertising, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Rolfes: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return showing:

The total amount paid by the Department of Finance for the period April 1, 1990 to the date the

return was ordered, to Dome Advertising.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Monday move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return showing:

That for the period June 19, 1990 to the date of this return was ordered, the number of public opinion polls and market research projects ordered, performed, commissioned by the Department of Agriculture and . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. The member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster, I ask you not to interfere.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to if I could, start the motion from the beginning. I would move:

That for the period June 19, 1990 to the date this return was ordered, the number of public opinion polls and market research projects ordered, performed, and commissioned by the Department of Agriculture and Food, ordinary, including in each case: (1) a brief description of the purpose of the poll or project; (2) the total cost of the poll or project; and (3) the method by which the work was awarded; and (4) the names of the individuals or companies who performed the work.

Mr. Speaker, this is dated Regina, May 16, 1991.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that on Monday next I will move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return showing:

For the period May 2, 1990 to the date this return was ordered: (1) a list of all advertising firms employed by the department of Executive Council; and (2) the total amount paid to each firm over the same period.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to . . . I give notice that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue showing:

For the period June 19, 1990 to the date this return was ordered, a detailed list of the aircrafts chartered by the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs, including: (1) the purpose of the charter and the minister who authorized it; (2) the name of the individual or company who provided the charter service; (3) the total cost of the charter and the name of the department, agency, or Crown corporation to which it was charged; (4) the date of the flight; (5) all destinations on the flight; (6) the names of each MLA or government employee on the flight; and (7) the number of family members of MLAs on each flight.

Here do I submit.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

With respect to Strategic Direct Marketing, the total amount paid to them from May 2, 1990 to the date this return was ordered, by the Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

For the period of June 19, 1990 to the date this return was ordered, a detailed list of the aircrafts chartered by the Department of Agriculture and Food — ordinary, including: (1) the purpose of the charter and the minister who authorized it; (2) the name of the individual or company who provided that charter service; (3) the total cost of the charter and the name of the department, agency, or Crown corporation to which it was charged; (4) the date of the flight; (5) all destinations on the flight; (6) the names of each MLA or government employee on the flight; and (7) the number of family members of MLAs on each flight.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

With respect to Strategic Direct Marketing, the total amount paid to them from May 2, 1990, to the date this return was ordered, by the Department of Telephones.

Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I hereby give notice that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

The total amount paid by the Department of Culture, Multiculturalism and Recreation for the period April 1, 1990, to the date this return was ordered to Roberts & Poole Communications, dated on May 16, 1990.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Solomon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to present a notice of motion for return, debatable. I give notice that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

With respect to Strategic Direct Marketing the total amount paid to them from May 2, 1990, to the date this return was ordered, by the Department of Agriculture and Food — ordinary.

(1600)

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

The total amount paid by Saskatchewan Government Insurance for the period April 1, 1990 to the date this return was ordered, to Dome Media Buying Services, Mr. Speaker.

And it's dated in Regina, May 16.

Mr. Pringle: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

The total amount paid by SaskEnergy for the period April 1, 1990 to the date this return was ordered, to Dome Media Buying Services.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have a notice of motion for a return, and it's debatable. Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Monday next, May 21, move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

The total amount paid by the department of the Public Service Commission for the period April 1, 1990 to the date this return was ordered, to Dome Media Buying Services.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, I have a notice of motion for a return, debatable. I give notice that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue a return showing:

The total amount paid by the Department of Health for the period April 1, 1990 to the date this return was ordered, to Dome Media Buying Services.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have here a notice of motion for a return, debatable. And I give notice that on Monday next I shall move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

With respect to Strategic Direct Marketing, the total amount paid to them from May 2, 1990 to the date this return was ordered, by the Department of Health.

And this is dated May 16, 1991.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I

shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return, debatable, showing the following:

The total amount paid by the department of Executive Council for the period April 1, 1990 to the date this return was ordered, to Roberts & Poole Communications.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for recognizing me. Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Monday, May 20, 1991, move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

The total amount paid by the Department of Health for the period April 1, 1990, to the date this return was ordered, to Roberts & Poole Communications.

Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koenker: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to give notice of motion for return, debatable. I give notice that I shall on Monday, May 20, 1991, move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

The total amount paid by the Department of Urban Affairs for the period April 1, 1990, to the date this return was ordered, to Roberts & Poole Communications.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prebble: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a notice of motion for return. I give notice that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

The total amount paid by the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs for the period April 1, 1990, to the date this return was ordered to Dome Advertising.

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

The total amount paid by the Department of Health for the period April 1, 1990, to the date this return was ordered to Dome Advertising.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

For the period of June 19, 1990, to the date this return was ordered, the number of public opinion polls and market research projects ordered, performed, and commissioned by the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs including in each case: (1) a brief description of the purpose of

the poll or project; (2) the total cost of the poll or project; (3) the method by which the work was awarded; and (4) the names of individuals or companies who performed the work.

And this is dated Regina, May 16, 1991.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that on next Monday I will move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing as follows:

For the period May 2, 1990, to the date this return was ordered: (1) a list of all advertising firms employed by the Department of Environment and Public Safety; and (2) the total amount paid to each firm over the said period.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, thank you. I give notice that on Monday next I shall move an order of the Assembly do issue for return showing:

For the period June 19, 1990, to the date this return was ordered, a detailed list of aircrafts chartered by the Department of Culture, Multiculturalism and Recreation including: (1) the purpose of the charter and the minister who authorized it; (2) the name of the individual or company who provided the charter service; (3) the total cost of the charter and the name of the department, agency, or Crown corporation to which it was charged; (4) the date of the flight; (5) all destinations on the flight; (6) the name of each MLA or government employee on the flight; and (7) the number of family members of MLAs on each flight.

Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

With respect to Strategic Direct Marketing, the total amount paid to them from May 2, 1990, to the date this return was ordered by the Department of Justice.

Mr. Upshall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I give notice that on Monday next I will move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing, debatable:

For the period June 19, 1990, to the date this return was ordered, a detailed list of the aircrafts chartered by the Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat including: (1) the purpose of the charter and the minister who authorized it; (2) the name of the individual or company who provided the charter service; (3) the total cost of the charter and the name of the department, agency, or Crown corporation to which it was charged; (4) the date of the flight; (5) all destinations on the flight; (6) the names of each MLA or government employee on the flight; and (7) the number of family members of MLAs on each flight.

(1615)

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a notice of motion for a return here that's debatable. And I give

notice that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

With respect to Strategic Direct Marketing, the total amount paid to them from May 2, 1990, to the date this return was ordered by the Department of Urban Affairs.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a notice of motion for return, debatable. I give notice that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue a return showing:

With respect to Strategic Direct Marketing, the total amount paid to them from May 2, 1990, to the date this return was ordered by the Saskatchewan Gaming Commission.

Dated in Regina, May 16, 1991.

Mr. Solomon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to present a notice of motion for a return, debatable. I give notice that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

With respect to Strategic Direct Marketing, the total amount paid to them from May 2, 1990, to the date this return was ordered by the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs.

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

The total amount paid by the Saskatchewan Pension Plan for the period April 1, 1990, to the date this return was ordered to Dome Media Buying Services.

Mr. Pringle: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

The total amount paid by the Department of Telephones for the period April 1, 1990, to the date this return was ordered to Dome Media Buying Services.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I've several notices of motion here. The first is a notice of motion for a return, debatable, and I would like to give notice to the Assembly that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

The total amount paid by the Department of Rural Development for the period April 1, 1990, to the return this date was ordered to Dome Media Buying Services.

Mr. Calvert: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a notice of motion for return, debatable. I give notice that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

The total amount paid by the Department of Highways and Transportation for the period April 1, 1990, to the date this return was ordered to Dome Media Buying Services.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have before me a notice of motion for return, debatable. And I give notice that I shall on Monday move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

With respect to Strategic Direct Marketing, the total amount paid to them from May 2, 1990, to the date this return was ordered by the Department of Highways and Transportation.

This dated Regina, May 16, 1991.

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice of a motion for return, debatable. I give this notice that I shall on Monday next, Mr. Speaker, move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing the following:

With respect to Strategic Direct Marketing, the total amount paid to them from May 2, 1990, to the date this return was ordered by the Department of Executive Council.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Monday, May 20, 1991, move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

The total amount paid by the Department of Human Resources, Labour and Employment for the period April 1, 1990, to the date that this return was ordered, to Roberts & Poole Communications.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Koenker: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have here a motion for return, debatable. I give notice that I shall on Monday, May 20, 1991, move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

The total amount paid by the Women's Secretariat for the period June 1, 1990, to the date this return was ordered, to Roberts & Poole Communications.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Prebble: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

The total amount paid by the Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat for the period April 1, 1990, to the date this return was ordered, to Dome Advertising.

Mr. Rolfes: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a notice of motion for return. Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

The total amount paid by the Department of Culture, Multiculturalism and Recreation for the period April 1, 1990, to the date this return was ordered, to Dome Advertising.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice of a motion for a return, I suppose debatable, to move for an order of the Assembly for a return showing:

For the period June 19, 1990, to the date this return was ordered, the number of public opinion polls and market research projects, especially the latest one, ordered, performed, commissioned by the Department of Culture, Multiculturalism and Recreation, including, Mr. Speaker, in each case: (1) a brief description of the purpose of the poll or project; (2) the total cost of the poll or project; (3) the method by which the work was awarded; and (4) the names of the individuals or companies who performed the work.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Monday move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

For the period June 19, 1990, to the date this return was ordered, the number of public opinion polls and market research projects ordered, performed, and commissioned by the Department of Economic Diversification and Trade, including in each case: (1) a brief description of the purpose of the poll or project — that's so we can tell what the polling was done for; (2) the total cost of the poll or project — to see what kind of polls that the taxpayers are paying for; (3) the method by which the work was awarded — Mr. Speaker — whether it was tendered or not, and whether the high bidder was awarded the tender; and (4) the names of the individuals or companies who performed the work.

And in that way, Mr. Speaker, the public would know who got the work.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1630)

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

For the period May 2, 1990, to the date that this return was ordered: (1) a list of all advertising firms employed by the Department of Energy and Mines; and (2) the total amount paid to each firm over the same period.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, thank you. I give notice

that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue showing:

For the period June 19, 1990, to the date this return was ordered, a detailed list of aircrafts chartered by the Department of Economic Diversification and Trade including: (1) the purpose of the charter and the minister who authorized it; (2) the name of the individual or company who provided the charter service; (3) the total cost of the charter and the name of the department, agency, or Crown corporation to which it was charged; (4) the date of the flight; (5) all destinations on the flight; (6) the names of each MLA or government employee on the flight; and (7) the number of family members of MLAs on each flight.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

With respect to Strategic Direct Marketing, the total amount paid to them from May 2, 1990 to the date this return was ordered by the New Careers Corporation.

Mr. Upshall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Monday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing, debatable:

For the period of June 19, 1990 to the date this return was ordered, a detailed list of the aircrafts chartered by the Department of Justice including: (1) the purpose of the charter and the minister who authorized it; (2) the name of the individual or company who provided that charter service; (3) the total cost of the charter and the name of the department, agency, or Crown corporation to which it was charged; (4) the date of the flight; (5) all destinations on the flight; (6) the names of each MLA or government employee on the flight; and (7) the number of family members of MLAs on each flight.

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have here a notice of motion for a return that's debatable. And I give notice that I shall on Monday next move:

That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing with respect to Strategic Direct Marketing the total amount paid to them from May 2, 1990, to the date this return was ordered by the Women's Secretariat.

Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order, order. Oral notices of motion have been submitted for going on to near an hour. I would like to read to the Assembly a statement by Mr. Speaker on Friday, March 21, 1986.

All members will be aware that oral notices of

motions and questions have long been permitted in this House under routine proceedings. However, I want to point out to the member for Canora, and to all members, that this has been a courtesy extended to members and is not a required part of the notice procedure. Also, oral notice, by itself, is not sufficient to constitute official notice. I refer all members to rule 38 in our *Rules and Procedures* which reads as follows:

Forty-eight hours' notice shall be given of a motion for first reading of a bill, resolution, or address, for the appointment of any committee or for placing a question on the Order Paper; but this shall not apply to public bills, after their introduction, or to private bills, or to the times of meeting or adjournment of the Assembly. Such notice shall be laid on the Table and be printed in the *Votes and Proceedings* of that day.

It is clear from this that the rules provide only for written notice. There is no provision for oral notice. As I said earlier, oral notice is a long-standing practice of this House, but is permitted only as a courtesy to members.

I also want to refer members to *Beauchesne's Rules and Forms*, Fifth Edition, page 143, citation 395 as follows:

Oral notices for future proceedings do not generally exist in the House of Commons. It is useless for a member to say: "Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will move a certain motion tomorrow." This would not give him any precedence on the next day and he would not thereby acquire the right to speak on the matters not standing on the *Order Paper*.

To go on at great length in reading oral notices into the record, when this is not necessary to effectively give notice, appears to me to be an abuse of a courtesy traditionally extended to members. A practice that is permitted as a courtesy only should not be permitted to obstruct the regular business of the House.

I therefore direct the member for Canora to submit any notices he wishes to give by laying them on the Table as provided in rule 38. This in no way interferes with the member's rights to place items on the order paper. It is not my intention to prohibit the reading of oral notices in the future, but only to remind members that oral notices are permitted as a courtesy and cannot be permitted to be used as a means of obstructing the regular business of the House.

Therefore I ask hon. members if they have any more oral notices, to submit them in writing, and we will move to question period.

An Hon. Member: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order . . .

The Speaker: — Sir, there is no point of order on the

ruling. There is no point of order. There is no point of order, sir. Order! This is no point of order. I have clearly read the statement to the House. I have clearly read a statement to the House, clearly, on a situation which occurred on a prior day and I am certainly invoking that same ruling.

An Hon. Member: — Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on a point of order.

The Speaker: — Okay, sir, I will listen to your point of order but I will remind you as I reminded you earlier, that if your point of order is challenging my ruling, I can't enter into any debate with you or the ruling can't be challenged. So I will listen to your point of order but if it's on the ruling, I must have to interfere.

Mr. Brockelbank: — On this point of order, Mr. Speaker, I want to rise to the defence of the member from Canora. The member for Canora or any other member of this House — this is my point of order — has a right by established practice since I've been in this House 25 years ago, Mr. Speaker, to rise, to read out a notice of motion . . .

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

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — As I indicated to the hon. member, I have clearly read a statement to the House of a previous similar situation. And the House dealt with it in the manner indicated, and I'm simply invoking that.

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to raise a point of order which is not part of your ruling but is not unconnected either.

The rules are the view of many members here changing rather rapidly. I'm not complaining about that. What I am complaining about . . . My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that the way it's being done with your Speaker's rulings you have no opportunity for our input before it's done.

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order, order. In every instance on both rulings I have followed proper procedure. I have followed proper procedure. I have indicated where the sources for my reasoning have come from.

There is no rule in our rulings to challenge the Speaker's rulings or the method that he has come to a particular ruling — this one in this case. And I'm sorry I will not enter into any debate. That is not a point of order.

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of order. I was wondering if you could give me the precedent in the parliamentary democracy. Since when are rulings made without argument being presented on both sides?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Well, madam, I appreciate your concern. Speakers, I suppose since this legislature . . . perhaps not since this legislature has been established —

but we have passed a rule in this legislature that Speakers bring in rulings, bring in rulings. That is their job. Their job is to bring in rulings. The Speaker doesn't sit down with the opposition or the government side and discuss what the ruling will be. His job is to come in with a ruling, and Speakers before me have done that. That is the way the process works.

(1645)

An Hon. Member: — A question of privilege. A question of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — Well there aren't any questions of personal privilege.

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to Beauchesne's *Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, the 6th Edition, which has in fact been used today to make a ruling in this House.

And my question of privilege is this: that I do have items that I wish to present on behalf of my constituents that I find myself unable to present, Mr. Speaker.

And I refer to Beauchesne's, 6th Edition, on page no. 5, citation no. 11, and I'd like to just go through that citation just briefly, Mr. Speaker, if you'd allow me the time to do that. And I quote:

Behind the written rules and filling in the gaps, lies the vast quantity of precedent. Although the House normally assumes that a ruling is binding for the future, Speakers have used the flexibility available to them to develop procedure regardless of conflicting precedents in the past. Changes in Standing Orders from time to time also give ample opportunity for the House to adjust the interpretation of its precedents and tradition in the light of changing circumstances. It is impossible to estimate the extent of this body of traditional parliamentary law. In Canada, not only is there more than a century of native practice, but also Standing Order 1 adopts for Canada parliamentary tradition in other jurisdictions so far as they may be applicable to the House. Custom and precedent are basic to the parliamentary system. Parliament, and the manner in which it works, has developed over centuries and the written rules are relative newcomers to the procedural field. Indeed, increasingly, the written rules are being used, not to codify existing practice, but rather to trim and adjust historic traditions to modern needs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to the point of the question of privilege that I raise, I have been accustomed, as a former member of parliament and as a Member of the Legislative Assembly in this House, to certain traditions that have developed over a number of years. I maintain to you, Mr. Speaker, that Beauchesne says to me, when I read the citation that I have just read to the House through you, Mr. Speaker, that if that tradition is to change in any dramatic way, it should be done by standing orders and not by interpretations.

So I am in a position, Mr. Speaker, that I can no longer proceed in this Assembly by what I have known is my ancient and historic right to represent the views of my constituents, Mr. Speaker. And I maintain that my rights as a Member of the Legislative Assembly are violated in that there should be standing orders to change these long-standing, ancient and historic precedents and customs that have been built up over the years since 1905, when we joined Confederation — in fact before that, Mr. Speaker.

So I would ask you to review the record on my question of privilege because I feel that the actions today of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, have in fact been violated to the extent that I cannot forward and present the views of my constituents as they have directed me to do, sir. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — If I understand your question of privilege you're relating to the two rulings that I made today. Is that correct?

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, I wasn't intending to question your rulings. That has already passed. You've made the rulings.

What I am saying is because of actions that have happened in this House today, that I maintain should have been done by standing order and not by an independent ruling, that my ability to act as a Member of the Legislative Assembly has in fact been violated.

The Speaker: — You in fact are referring to the rulings indicating that changes have been made, changes have been made.

Let me just say this, that in rulings, custom and practice are basic to the parliamentary system. Both rulings are based on rules in existence and custom and practice.

Nobody's right — to repeat, just to repeat — nobody's right in this Assembly to present petitions is being taken away. Nobody's.

Order. Order, order! The member from The Battlefords may sit down. I will not enter into a debate with him.

Nobody's right to present petitions has been taken away. They may either present them to the Clerk directly or present them another day. Nobody's right . . . Order, order, order. Order, order! Order, order, order.

As far as all notices are concerned, the reality is that virtually all oral notices are simply handed in. And I have given you considerable length of time to present oral notices. I'm sure you will agree.

So I don't believe you have a point of personal privilege.

Do you have a new issue?

An Hon. Member: — I have a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — A new, quick question of privilege? I'm asking you a direct question. And as a member, you know, in a spirit of co-operation, if you have a new question of privilege, I am more than happy to listen to it.

An Hon. Member: — Citation 11 of Beauchesne's, 6th Edition, Mr. Speaker. Citation 11 of Beauchesne's, 6th Edition.

The Speaker: — I have ruled on that question of privilege.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of order. First of all, let me say that I'm not going to debate the ruling that you made. I'm asking for some clarification.

I see, Mr. Speaker, on page 3 of the *Rules* . . .

The Speaker: — Sir, as I said earlier, I will not enter into debate on rulings I have made, and you're asking for clarification on my rulings. You're out of order. You're out of order if you're asking for clarification on my ruling.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Speaker, under 8(2), which pertains to the routine business of the House, 8(2) says: "The ordinary daily routine proceedings in the Assembly shall be as follows:" and it lays out an agenda.

An Hon. Member: — Shall be.

Mr. Lyons: — Shall be. I want to stress that, Mr. Speaker, that it's obligatory as opposed to non-obligatory. The first point in that says, "Presenting Petitions." Not singular, Mr. Speaker, but plural, but plural.

Then it says, "Reading and Receiving Petitions." Again, Mr. Speaker, I point out that the word "petitions" is plural.

Then "Presenting Reports by Standing, Select and Special Committees." Then it says, "Notices" — and I again emphasize, Mr. Speaker, in the plural — "Notices of Motions and Questions."

Now my point of order is this, Mr. Speaker: in light of your previous ruling, has the business of the Assembly under 8(2) been changed where the plural has been changed to the singular or, Mr. Speaker, in terms of . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Nothing has been changed. Routine proceedings are the same, and, as I have said, the rulings I have brought down I have backed them up with arguments.

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a new question of privilege, and I refer this time not to the 6th Edition of Beauchesne's, but I refer to the 5th Edition of Beauchesne's on page 11, citation no. 16. And if you'd permit me to put that on the record, I quote:

Parliamentary privilege is the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by each House collectively as a constituent part of the High Court of Parliament, and by Members of each House individually, without which they could not discharge their functions and which exceed those possessed by other bodies or individuals. Thus, privilege,

though part of the law of the land, is to a certain extent an exemption from the ordinary law.

The distinctive mark of a privilege is its ancillary character. The privileges of Parliament are rights which are "absolutely necessary for the due execution of its powers". They are enjoyed by individual Members, because the House cannot perform its function without unimpeded use of the services of its Members; and by each House for the protection of its members and the vindication of its own authority and dignity. Sir Erskine May, *Treatise on the Law, Privileges, Proceedings, and Usage of Parliament* (19th ed., 1976)

Mr. Speaker, in regard to today, I have a second petition. As I understood the ruling of this House, I can only present a petition once. That's what I heard the ruling to be. If I, on this day, have two petitions to present — one from my constituents concerning the cruel and unusual goods and services tax wanted to be imposed by this particular government, and another one for constituents seeking their ancient and historic remedy through petition to this legislature where they may want another cause brought to the attention of the legislature — to find a remedy because of something imposed by a cruel and unusual action of a government — how could I present both of those petitions in one day, Mr. Speaker, even though they're on two different topics?

So I maintain to you that my rights as an individual member of this Legislative Assembly have been violated and interfered with to the point where I cannot adequately perform the duties that are called upon me to serve by the constituents I represent in my constituency, Mr. Speaker.

I do not know how we find a remedy to this problem, other than through the recognition of citation 16 in Beauchesne's 5th Edition, Mr. Speaker, and by looking at citation 11 on page no. 5 of Beauchesne's 6th Edition, Mr. Speaker.

And I maintain to you that the only way we can find a remedy to this is to honour the historic and ancient right of members of the legislature and members of parliament to go by their tradition and practice that has taken place over many, many years. And this government should be chastised for violating that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, how I think that there could be a remedy found to the question of privilege that I raise here today, is to make these changes through standing orders of the parliamentary system we have observed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — The member's question of privilege is similar to his prior one. And he specifically raises in this one the argument that he is unable to present petitions which are of importance, which are of importance.

There are three options open to the hon. member. He will

be able to rise in the House to present the petition. He will be able to present the petition directly to the Clerk. He will be able to bring back the petition on a subsequent day. So he has many avenues to follow.

He certainly has every right, and I support that right, to present petitions. These are the options open to him.

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I too rise on a point of personal privilege. And the reason that I rise on the point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker, is based on Beauchesne's 5th Edition. And, Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne's 5th Edition refers to the right to petition, and I want to quote:

The right of petitioning the Crown and Parliament for redress of grievances is acknowledged as a fundamental principle of the constitution and has been exercised without interruption since 1867.

Mr. Speaker, without interruption.

I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that this right to petition can only occur, Mr. Speaker, through the elected representatives of the people of this province and the people of this country.

(1700)

This particular right to petition goes on, Mr. Speaker, and it goes on to say that:

Although the House of Commons is a representative institution, it only considers questions submitted by its elected Members. Therefore the ordinary citizen has no right to appear personally before the House of Commons. If he has a grievance he may present a written petition through a Member within the conditions laid down in the Standing Orders of the House.

I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that I have been trying to present petitions on behalf of constituents through this House and I would say, Mr. Speaker, that today my right to provide or present petitions on behalf of my constituents has been severely limited, Mr. Speaker. And I would ask you to rule on my point of privilege.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I've listened to the hon. member's point. And I must agree with the hon. member that it is important that the right to present petitions be upheld. That right has without question been upheld. And your right to present petitions has been unquestionably upheld.

If you noted in my ruling today, all the petitions — all petitions submitted were of a similar nature — all. So you have the right. You have three options. Let me go over them once more. You have three options.

You may rise on any given day and submit a petition which has 1 or 3 names under it or 300 or 3,000. That's up to you. You may rise on one occasion to submit a petition.

Secondly, you may come back on a subsequent day, if

you have more petitions on different issues, and submit them. And thirdly, you may go directly to the Clerk.

It being past 5 o'clock, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m.

I am informed that I cannot adjourn the House on my own decision and therefore we must come back at 7 o'clock tonight.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.