

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise today on a point of order and the point of order follows yesterday's business, and I do know that a point of order must be raised immediately after the event transpires. I did not have that opportunity last night because I also know that the rules say that you may not raise a point of order on a motion to adjourn.

So today, Mr. Speaker, I rise on the point of order with respect to adjournments of this legislature. I know, Mr. Speaker, that our rule book is very straightforward and very simple, and it says that a motion to adjourn the House is always in order. I present the argument to you, though, Mr. Speaker, that I do not believe that the intent of that simple rule was ever for people to be able to stand up at any time and just adjourn the House because they were dissatisfied with what was going on or had run out of things to do or to simply abuse the system.

And I refer, Mr. Speaker, to Beauchesne's parliamentary guide, the 6th Edition. And here, Mr. Speaker, is where more detailed rules and procedures and practices have been established. I refer you, Mr. Speaker, to page 112 of this edition, item no. 378 that refers to the standing order 30(4)(b) in the House of Commons that "requires the House to finish with Introduction of Government Bills before adjourning."

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the intent of that is that we should finish work in the Assembly before we go home for the day. As one of my colleagues mentioned to me this morning, he has some hired men back home, and he said that his hired men finish the job before they quit work. I think most Saskatchewan people would agree with that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — I would also, Mr. Speaker, like to refer to item no. 379 that says: "The adjournment of the House cannot be moved during Question Period." Here too in past days, this has happened. I would make a third and final argument, Mr. Speaker, that under item no. 384, it says that: "There must be some question before the House for a Member to move a motion to adjourn the House."

Now as I understand it, there was no motion before the House. There was simply petitions.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the continual adjournments of this House are at the height of the abuse of this system. On a scale of 1 to 10, I would put them at a 10 in abusing the privileges of this House. That is, Mr. Speaker, we are here to work. We are here to do business at the legislature's call. And I believe that calling motions to adjourn the House in the way that it has been done are, if not contrary to our rule, absolutely contrary to the intent and the spirit of us as elected members and the rules that our forefathers

set down.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to the point of order put to the Assembly by the Government House Leader. Mr. Speaker, it's clear to members of the opposition that adjournment motions as laid out in our rule book, the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan*, is absolutely and unequivocally clear about adjournment motions.

One can argue about adjournment motions in other jurisdictions or in other forums or in other meetings, but I think one thing that is clear is that adjournment motions have been and continue to be, by the rules of this Assembly, in order at all times. And to that end, if the member was to look at page 2 of the rules, point 4, under adjournment motions, it clearly says:

A motion to adjourn the Assembly shall always be in order, but no second motion to the same effect shall be made until after some intermediate proceeding has taken place.

Mr. Speaker, there's reason for that and there's also precedent as to how adjournment motions have been moved in this House on a number of occasions, not only during this debate but during other historic debates here in the Assembly.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to the issue of why we are at this impasse in terms of adjourning the House, in terms of presenting petitions.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that in many ways this Assembly has changed over the last 10 years, that the world has changed over the last 10 years — whether it's in eastern Europe or whether it's in Canada; whether it's in any jurisdiction — that the idea of majority governments coming to the Assembly and jamming through unpopular Bills is coming to an end.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, far from being apologetic for the manoeuvres and tactics and the stalling tactics we have on Bill 61, far from being apologetic, the people of this province are saying to us — some Reform Party people, many of them Conservative people, a large number NDP (New Democratic Party), and Liberals — are saying that at last they have some say during a four year mandate of a majority government. At last they have some say.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, so they should. That the day of a majority government coming to this Assembly and for four years acting in a dictatorial way, that whatever they want to do, whether it's privatization of SaskEnergy when they promised not to do it, whether it's the issue of this Bill being put to the Assembly, Bill 61 . . .

An Hon. Member: — Without a mandate.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Without a mandate, with the vast majority of people being opposed to it, that that day is coming to an end and this opposition is going to be part of making that change and including people in the decision making in this Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, on the idea of petitions, we have had a hundred thousand petitions given to our office to present here. And this is what the point of order is about.

The Speaker: — Order, order. I do want to give the hon. member an opportunity to express his views. At the same time I don't want this particular point of order, which is on the adjournment of the House — and I know it ties into other areas; I realize that — but I don't want it to become a wide-ranging debate.

So I'm asking you to speak to the point of order as directly as possible, and don't enter into a wide-ranging debate which will take away from the actual point of order.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I appreciate your ruling, Mr. Speaker. And what I'm talking to here is the adjournment motion but also the reference that the Government House Leader made to the petitions being presented here in the Assembly. And I'm sure that Mr. Speaker wasn't attempting to . . . saying about petitions.

But I say that this Assembly has changed in the last 10 years. Some would argue, I would say a minority, that it doesn't function. The vast majority of people that I talk to are saying that the actions of the opposition in stopping this unpopular Bill are perfectly within the rules of the Assembly. And they're asking us not to quit carrying on our protest against this Bill but are actually signing the petitions that the member opposite refers to by the tens of thousands.

That is not an obstruction of the legislative process. I say it's encouraging that we have over a hundred thousand people petitioning the members of this Assembly to stop an unpopular tax Bill.

My final point, Mr. Speaker, is this — is that when I first came to this Assembly back in 1978, petitions were virtually unheard of. The members of the population didn't know that they had even the right to present petitions. Now we have people becoming involved on many, many issues wanting us to present petitions. I don't think that's bad for democracy. Mr. Speaker, I say this is good for democracy.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was not intending to speak to the point of order but I listened with some deep concern to the remarks just made by the Opposition House Leader.

And I think we have to put this in perspective, Mr. Speaker, in that we should keep in mind a fundamental political issue here. And that is that we do have the statements of the opposition that when this Bill was

tabled, prior to the tabling of this Bill, that they said they were going to filibuster and stop it, that they had no intention at the outset ever to debate this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

That obviously goes to the very heart and the basis of parliament, Mr. Speaker — parliament being the right to speak. We have moved, Mr. Speaker, from a pride of debate in this Assembly to a pride of delay, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that that is contrary to the fundamental basis and existence of parliament.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — But the more controversial statement just made, and I say damning to a democracy and ending . . . if accepted as the principle, ending the British parliamentary form of government, is the statement by the hon. member, the Leader of the . . . the Opposition House Leader where he says, the days that a majority government can bring in controversial legislation will end and are ending for ever, Mr. Speaker. That is totally contrary to the British parliamentary system. When majority governments are elected by whatever percentage they may have, they are still a majority government, Mr. Speaker, and that has not changed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — What the hon. member is saying is that a majority government . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. Order, order, order. Order! Order. I realize this is an emotion that . . . or rather an issue that stirs emotions. It's an important issue before the House. And because of that I would like the hon. members to try to co-operate somewhat more than normal; that each side has an opportunity to speak to the point of order. And I'm going to give each side that opportunity.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On one thing we can agree and that is that the House has changed. Some may say for the worse; others may say for the better. And I would suspect that all hon. members would also agree that in today's society, issues are increasingly complex, answers may not be simple, solutions may not be simplistic. And I suggest to the hon. member to bring forth a proposal that, in a very complex age and in a complex environment, that a majority government can no longer bring forward controversial legislation, that it is the right of the opposition to stop a majority government from being a majority government, it's the end, Mr. Speaker, of the British parliamentary system.

And they have no mandate, no right, no prerogative, and no law or rule giving them that right, Mr. Speaker. That is what's being taken away. That is what is being challenged. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that that is terribly wrong. As I say, when the right to delay ends the right to debate, it is the end, Mr. Speaker, of the British parliamentary system.

That is not a mandate given to the opposition. It's not a mandate given to the government, Mr. Speaker. It is not a mandate given by the people of this province to stop

parliament and stop the right to debate, Mr. Speaker. It's time to get on with the business of the people of this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to respond to this point of order briefly. And I first of all want to respond by commenting on the remarks by the Minister of Justice who has once again in his usual way taken the debate and twisted the facts and misinterpreted the facts in order to try to get some kind of a statement out there which has got nothing to do with what the issue is involved and what has been said in the past, Mr. Speaker.

He talked about the fundamental issue. I want to talk about the fundamental issue which this point of order addresses itself to. The Minister of Justice said that it was said by the opposition that there would not be any debate on this Bill. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is what was said, what is it then that compelled the government to feel that it had to use closure to stop the debate?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I say to the Minister of Justice, listen carefully to what he is saying. He even in his own words is contradicting what he is saying in his attempt to twist what the facts are, Mr. Speaker.

He wonders whether we need to change the rules of this House and the whole process of government, which this point of order tries to address. Yes, we do. We most certainly do. And that is why the New Democratic Party, the official opposition, has made available to the government and to the public and to this House, a democratic reform paper which would in fact increase the amount of involvement and participation in the debate by the public on very important and fundamental issues to them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — And that's what this process is all about. This process is about allowing the public an opportunity to become involved in this debate which so dramatically affects and impacts on them.

If the members of the opposition are not able to adjourn the House from time to time, as we have done, the public is telling us they will not have the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to get their petitions here so that they can be presented and so that they can be heard.

That is therefore, Mr. Speaker, a legitimate process so that the public in fact can be heard and therefore their views can be made known before this kind of legislation is rammed through the House, which is another part of this argument. If the member opposite gets away with his point of order, this legislation the government will ram through the House without the public having an opportunity to be part of the debate, and that would be wrong, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pringle: — Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I'd like to speak to this point of order, Mr. Speaker. Three years ago . . .

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

Hon. Mr. Kopelchuk: — Mr. Speaker, with leave I'd like to introduce some guests.

The Speaker: — The member has asked for leave to introduce guests. Is leave granted? And once more, as on previous occasions, may I ask leave for the benefit of all members who may wish to introduce guests.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Kopelchuk: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. These students are on a schedule and I feel honoured in introducing them.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure this morning . . . it's rather a unique experience because I have the pleasure on behalf of myself and the hon. member from Pelly to introduce three schools from the Yorkdale School Division. These schools are from Ebenezer, Dunleath, and Rhein. They are 46 grade 4, 5, and 6 students. They are accompanied today by Mrs. Jackie Adam, Mr. Martin Philips, and Mr. Ed Machushek, all teachers in these schools.

They are in Regina for the day, and I invite them to join me for a photo session at 10:30 as well as refreshments in our caucus room following that. So I'd like all members of this legislature to welcome students from Yorkdale School Division.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Calvert: — It is my privilege today to introduce to you and to all members of the House, 11 adult students from the SIAST (Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology) Palliser Campus in Moose Jaw who are visiting the House today, Mr. Speaker. They're seated in your gallery.

They are accompanied by their instructor Linda Paice — Lidia Paice. Sorry, Lidia — and I'm thankful that they're here today to witness this important debate that's happening in the House this morning.

I look forward to meeting with the students from SIAST later today, about 11:00, and I hope they enjoy their time here at the Legislative Assembly. I ask all members to welcome them please.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gleim: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to the Assembly here today, 37 grade 7 to 9 students from the school of Frontier, which is my . . . I am their neighbour.

Accompanying them today are teachers Murray Legge — I'm not sure if I'm pronouncing that right, Murray — Mike

Puszkas and Ruth Armstrong. The chairpersons today that are here helping look after them is Aggie Howell, Rose Ham, Loretta Vasseur, Jackie Popick. And the most important ones, I guess, are the people that brought him here, are the bus drivers, Danny Lavik and Norm Baker.

I just hope you enjoy the proceedings here today and see what's going on and I will be meeting with you for pictures and drinks at 10:30 and we can talk about what is happening here and ask questions. So I would like everybody here in the Assembly today to help me welcome the students from Frontier here to the Assembly.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prebble: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this morning through you to introduce to all members of the Assembly, some distinguished guests from South Africa and their Saskatchewan friends who are accompanying them. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to draw your attention to three guests in the gallery facing me. I wonder if they would rise, please. I would like to introduce Mlungisi Hlongwane, Steven Sondiyazi, and Bafo Nyanga, all from South Africa. And they are accompanied by Barb Byers, the president of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, and Bill Robb who is one of two workers on the Saskatchewan international labour project, who I'd also like to have stand.

Mr. Speaker, these guests are indeed distinguished guests. Both Mlungisi and Steven are members of a South African union delegation and Bafo is the South African Congress of Trade Union's Canadian representative here in Canada, and they are going to be visiting in Saskatchewan for the next few days. Their itinerary includes work at labour conventions, participation in labour schools, work-place tours, meetings with labour locals, and public meetings in all of the western provinces in Canada, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to say a word about our two guests who are visiting from South Africa because they have both played a leading role in the struggle against apartheid in that country, Mr. Speaker, and I want to have that role recognized.

Mlungisi is the general secretary of the Post & Telecommunications Workers Association. He lives in Soweto and he's been involved in the formation of street committees and is an active member of the African National Congress. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that he was detained for six months under the Internal Security Act in South Africa as he suffered from apartheid.

And likewise, Steven has played a major role in the trade union movement in South Africa, being regional chairperson in the Orange Free State for the Food & Allied Workers Union.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Assembly would join me in giving a special welcome to these guests from South Africa and their Saskatchewan counterparts.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS (continued)

Mr. Pringle: — Mr. Speaker, as I was beginning to say, three years ago when I was elected, to my knowledge, for the first time in history a leader of an opposition appointed someone as a critic for democratic reform. Now the Leader of the Opposition recognized that this legislature had changed over the years and that there were a number of changes required to make it function more effectively in a more accountable way and to look for ways to ensure greater public access of the Assembly and greater participation and openness by citizens of the province.

Now that was a serious attempt to try in a responsible way bring forth recommendations to achieve those principles, Mr. Speaker. We took that review very seriously. As you know, sir, we have released two reports related to a number of democratic reform initiatives and in fact have gone further. This is . . . I'm coming to the point, Mr. Speaker . . . have gone further in that we have . . .

The House Leader and the Minister of Justice talks about democracy, Mr. Speaker. We have a private members' Bill which calls for by-elections within six months of the vacancy because 45,000 residents of this province have no representation in this Assembly. That's how concerned they are about democracy, Mr. Speaker.

And the House Leader said earlier that these . . . the way we're occupying the House here are merely petitions. Mr. Speaker, in the last four and a half years, on three occasions, there have been over a hundred thousand petition names tabled in this legislature which says something to me, Mr. Speaker, about the way this government does business and views the public of Saskatchewan, because they have not . . . they've backed off on one of those only.

Now here they are at four years and seven months into their mandate, when the moral, ethical mandate is four months in this province and in the British parliamentary system. Only two times in our 19 elections have we gone over four years, Mr. Speaker; that's the history of this province — twice by this PC (Progressive Conservative) government. Well that's undemocratic, Mr. Speaker.

And this major tax grab that they wanted to . . . they indicated they were going to bring in closure on after only two of their members had spoken, only three of our members had spoken. That is not correct. I resent the fact, Mr. Speaker, that I represent 21,000 voters, was not going to get an opportunity on behalf of those voters to speak to this largest tax grab in the history of the province. That is undemocratic, Mr. Speaker. That is undemocratic.

The Minister of Justice who got up so sanctimoniously a few minutes ago — he's the person that I heard on CBC (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation) radio that the legislature doesn't work, that's why we didn't call the members back for nine and a half months. That is undemocratic, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that to say that the petition names — that the residents of Saskatchewan are asking this government to withdraw this Bill, to reverse its decision, that they have no mandate to collect this tax at

this point in time — to say to the people of Saskatchewan that those are merely names, that they're not important in this Legislative Assembly, is an affront to democracy, and that government should be embarrassed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, first question to be asked is what is happening here. What is happening in the legislature of Saskatchewan that is unusual from what has happened in democratic legislatures throughout the world?

And I would say the first thing that is happening — and I will outline my arguments in more detail as to what is happening — but what is happening is that the NDP in effect are doing what they have no mandate to do, and that is to effectively abolish this legislature as a functioning institution in the province of Saskatchewan. This government has a five-year mandate to govern, and the members of the opposition are trying to abolish that mandate before there is an election.

Now there will be an election within about six months in this province, and the people will have their ultimate rights and democracy to choose a government. The question, when that happens, Mr. Speaker, is if the rules of this legislature are not such that they can have a functioning legislature, will the people of Saskatchewan actually have the right to elect a functioning government? That choice will be in the hands of the people.

The Speaker: — Order, order, order, order, order. We could go on this way and interrupt the hon. member, but we won't really be speaking to the point of order and paying close attention, considering the points of view of all members. Therefore I ask the hon. members to co-operate.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, when the people exercise their democratic right to vote within five years, the maximum being five years, they are entitled to believe . . . and have the right to elect a legislature that can function and will function according to the democratic rules that have been developed over a period of years.

Let me say that nine years ago when I was elected to this Assembly, I came in here as a lawyer, a courtroom lawyer, who had many years experience in court, and it was very familiar for me to step into this legislature. People ask me: what is it like being a member of the legislature? I said it is similar to court. There is a man, the chairman like the judge, but we call him the Speaker, and he has robes just like a judge. And it is his duty to preside over the legislature. That is your role, Mr. Speaker.

I said the only difference I had noticed, and that was nine years ago, is that the similarities end because in court there are rules but I couldn't detect that there were rules in the legislature. In any event, none that were effectively followed and applied so that the institution could function in a democratic way.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there's a similarity between courts and this legislature. They are part of our system of government. The legislature is part of the system; the

Executive Council is part of the system; the courts are part of the system — the three elements of our government.

The courts, Mr. Speaker, have rules which allow them to function. They are called the rules of court. The first thing that you should note, Mr. Speaker, is that in the courts, the rules of court are drawn up by the judges. In effect, the similarity here is that in the legislature the rules would be drawn up by the Speaker and that is the case, Mr. Speaker. Over at least 800 years, Speakers have made rulings. Speakers make rulings so that the legislature can continue to function. There are times when the legislators will write those rulings down into rules of procedure.

However, as in the courts, the rules cannot cover every eventuality. And in the courts, the judges make rulings on procedure. For over 1500 years, judges have done that so that the courts could continue to function. And the rules were changed from time to time to meet the practicality of the rulings that the judges have made over hundreds of years. The same has applied in the legislature, Mr. Speaker. And I submit that you have a duty like a judge in a court to ensure that the rules are interpreted so that the court, or in this case the legislature, can function in a manner that was intended by our constitution and by our ancestors when they developed the principles of democracy.

What point are we at here, Mr. Speaker? I started this argument and I said that the NDP are effectively trying to abolish the legislature by obstruction. We have the member opposite state an unbelievable statement, and he says: there is an end coming to the day when governments can bring in controversial legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the courts deal with controversial cases every day. And I can assure you that lawyers are as obstructionist as any opposition ever has been. And I can assure you that lawyers dilly-dally, try to delay, seek adjournment, but there comes a time when a judge in a court or a Speaker in a legislature has to make a ruling so that the court . . . or so that the legislature can continue to function.

I submit in conclusion, Mr. Speaker: it is the role of Speakers everywhere to make rulings so that their Assembly can continue to function. In this case, a point of order has been raised asking you, Mr. Speaker, to make a ruling so that this Assembly can continue to function. That is what we are asking today. It is something that has been asked of Speakers and judges for up to 2,000 years. Judges are appointed judges to make decisions based on judgement, not based on rules chiselled in stone or written on papyrus or written on paper made in Saskatchewan at Weyerhaeuser. Judges are to judge and use their judgement.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the role of the Speaker is the same — that when all else fails, the Speaker is the person in charge. It is the duty of the Speaker to take charge and to ensure that the Assembly the Speaker is in charge of can function, and that is the point of order we are raising, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prebble: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this point of order, and I want to put in it context, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — The hon. member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake wishes to bring something forward.

Mr. Lautermilch: — I'd ask for leave to introduce guests.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure this morning to introduce members of the newly formed Independent Auto Dealers and Suppliers Coalition to stop the PST (provincial sales tax). These guests, Mr. Speaker, are sitting in the east gallery. They are representative of business men and women throughout this province who are dealing with used automobiles, sir.

I would like to recognize them. There are people from Regina. We have people from other areas of this province who are concerned as well. And they are here today to make their views with respect to the provincial goods and services tax known and to ask this government to reconsider their decision to ram this Bill through the legislature.

I ask all guests . . . or all members to welcome these guests, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS (continued)

Mr. Prebble: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this point of order. And what I want to say first is that I want to question the motives of the government in moving the point of order. I want to ask the question . . . I'm asking the question myself, Mr. Speaker: what are the motives? Are the motives to ensure the functioning of the Assembly and respect for democracy or are the . . . I believe they are not, Mr. Speaker. I believe the motives are one very simple thing. The motives are that the government wants to end debate on the PST Bill and put the Bill behind them, Mr. Speaker, because everyone knows now that more than 80 per cent of the Saskatchewan public oppose this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

And what this government is doing is using another procedural antic to bring debate on the Bill to a close. I believe that's the motive behind the point of order, Mr. Speaker. If I believed the motive was one of concern for democracy, I would feel very differently about the point of order.

But I want to say why I don't believe why the motive is one of concern for democracy. Mr. Speaker, the reason I don't believe the motive is one of concern for democracy is that there has been nothing democratic from the very beginning about the way the government has handled the introduction of the expanded PST in the province of Saskatchewan.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, we had the government bring the tax into effect without ever referring anything to this legislature. The tax was brought into effect by press release without a budget even being presented in this Assembly. Now if that is not a violation of democratic rights, Mr. Speaker, of the people of the province, I don't know what is.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prebble: — Then, Mr. Speaker, almost a month after the government brought the tax into effect and people were already paying it, the government finally got up the nerve to introduce a Bill to retroactively authorize the tax into this Assembly. And what did they do, Mr. Speaker? They allowed no more than five of our members to speak to the tax Bill and then they introduced a closure motion, Mr. Speaker, limiting the rest of the debate to five hours and in effect guaranteeing that the vast majority of members of this Assembly could never speak to the tax Bill. And if that isn't a violation of democracy, I don't know what is, sir. And so I say, Mr. Speaker, that that gets at the motives behind the current point of order by the Government House Leader.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice says that members on this side of the house don't want to debate the Bill. That is not true, sir. Members on this side of the House do want to debate the Bill. We are being denied our right to debate the Bill. And in the face of being denied that right, we are using the last democratic mechanism that we have, Mr. Speaker, to stop the Bill, and that is the presentation of petitions. That is our only vehicle for bringing public opinion and public opposition against this tax to bear on this government, Mr. Speaker.

The presentation of petitions, Mr. Speaker, is the only mechanism we have left to bring public opinion to bear, to let this government know that this tax is unfair and unjustified. That's what we've been attempting to do. And what we are expressing our concern about with respect to this point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that we are saying that the government should not be allowed to ram this tax Bill through without consultation with the public and without debate, Mr. Speaker. That's what we are saying. And, Mr. Speaker, this government is attempting to do that time and time again. And we are going to do everything we can to prevent them from ramming this Bill through without consultation and without debate in this Assembly. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I am going to recognize the Minister of Labour and Employment. Then I will recognize one or two others. And then I think it will be time for us to draw the points of view on the point of order to a conclusion.

(1045)

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to speak to the point of order because in my home town, my city of Regina, there's been much discussion by my constituents and the people in Regina as well as throughout the rest of the province concerning the

impasse that this legislature is in.

And clearly, whether it's Bill 61 or the Appropriation Bill or whatever, Mr. Speaker, is a part of our role as a duly elected government. It's part of the budget. And clearly there are two opinions that we have here — the government's and the opposition. And clearly the legislature is set up to debate those two positions.

Now they say about jamming or ramming unpopular Bills; they say about motives and all the rest of it. Mr. Speaker, they miss one important thing. The radical bunch over there miss one important thing about democracy. It is up to the people to judge, not for them to judge.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Klein: — The election will be called by our Premier who indeed has the responsibility to call that election.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Fully, Mr. Speaker, the opposition, and they don't want to hear this — the election will be called in due course. They know that. And it's not up to them to call it. It's not up to them to call it. The mandate is clear. It's five years. It's up to the Premier to call it. It will be called. And we are prepared, Mr. Speaker, to have the people judge us, not them.

Having said that, what the people are looking for, Mr. Speaker, is a good . . .

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

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm just delighted that they say election and debate. They have to understand something. There is not a closure motion before the House, Mr. Speaker; there's a time allocation motion, and there's a significant difference.

We have sat in this Assembly. The Leader of the Opposition, who is a skilled orator and has no problem with a debate, will get up and debate. But the people of this province, my constituents, don't expect those members to get up and talk for four or five hours on the Alamo or on Greek history or on any other thing that they want to talk about. They want to talk about the Bill.

We have now offered the opposition, Mr. Speaker, five days, which is the equivalent of one hour each in good, honest debate — one hour. Now if they can't make their point in one hour, then they don't possess the skills that they should have to stand in this legislature and debate that Bill, and allow the people to judge on how the debate goes. Either they are right or we are right, and the winner will prevail.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is our right and our responsibility and our duty to operate this government in the . . .

The Speaker: — Hold it, hold it, excuse me. Now as I have mentioned earlier, it isn't fair when an hon. member is on his feet speaking with the views that he holds dear, to, as it were, shout him down. It doesn't matter who the member is, on which side of the House.

So I'm asking the hon. members to allow the Minister of Labour and Employment to conclude his remarks and the next member will be given the same opportunity.

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Now there's been a lot of remarks made from the other side of the floor from the members in their seats. But if they are prepared to debate this Bill and if they are prepared to take the five days that was offered by our government and speak for an hour each over there in their turn, that offer will be there, and let's have some good, honest debate.

The Speaker: — Order. I'm going to take a couple more. Order. I'll take a couple of more. I'll take the member from The Battlefords and one more, and then I believe we'll have to move on from there.

Mr. Anguish: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for giving me the opportunity to enter into the debate on this point of order.

The hole in the member's argument who just spoke is, if he wants the people to decide, why hasn't his government, Mr. Speaker, called by-elections for 18 months in some of the seats that are vacant?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, it goes back to the days of the Magna Carta — that you don't have taxation without representation. They've allowed four seats vacant in this province, some as long as 18 months, without any representation. And they want to impose new taxes by press release on the people of the province of Saskatchewan. I say yes, let the people decide.

Mr. Speaker, the real crux of the problem here is that we have a government that any time they don't like something that somebody else says they try and banish them and keep them quiet.

Even going back to the great philosopher Voltaire, the French philosopher, the leading light in the age of enlightenment in the 18th century, he said, on the principles of democracy: I may disagree profusely with what you say but I will defend to the death your right to say it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — But this government, Mr. Speaker, doesn't want anybody who will say anything against them to be heard anywhere in the province of Saskatchewan. They try and spread fear and intimidation instead of letting democracy work.

One of the greatest functions of this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, outside of setting laws and changing laws, is the budgetary process and beyond that is the preservation of

democracy. Because without the people's voices being allowed to be heard in this Assembly, there virtually is no democracy except on election day, Mr. Speaker. And that's what we've come to now. We've seen this government put other people into uncomfortable positions.

I think that we have to look, Mr. Speaker, very closely at what they are doing in this Legislative Assembly. What they are doing is that they are forcing you, sir, as the rule setter of this place, to make unpopular decisions instead of them making the hard decisions themselves to allow debate and to allow the people of Saskatchewan to decide over this government, who has gone long too far into a mandate that they can only superficially hold up, because there is no traditional mandate that goes to the end of five years unless there's war in the country or insurrection or some serious problem.

If you look at the average length of time of elections in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, before this government came into place in 1982, it was almost to the day. Four years was the traditional historical average of elections. This government has totally ignored that.

They have no mandate and the people in Saskatchewan feel they have no mandate to bring in a tax like this. They brought it in by press release. They don't want it debated in the Legislative Assembly and I believe, Mr. Speaker, people have the historic right and the ancient right to petition this Assembly to get this government to come to their senses. They have no mandate to impose this tax. They have no mandate to bring in closure on such a debate.

And I say yes — as the member from Regina South said — let the people decide. Let this debate continue or else go to the people of the province of Saskatchewan. Let them decide, sir. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Hon. members indicate they wish to speak on it. I certainly don't want to cut off anybody from expressing their views. So I'll, you know, carry on after the hon. member for Rosthern, the Minister of Social Services, expresses his views.

Hon. Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much for protecting my rights to speak in this House, Mr. Speaker. And I think that's the fundamental gist of what this motion is all about. And I would like to bring some reasonableness back into the arguments that have been put forth.

And I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that points of order are raised based on rules. And what I have been hearing and listening to from members opposite is a lot of rhetoric and very little substance. And I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that we get back to the fundamental of what this issue is all about, the fundamentals, as my House Leader so succinctly put at the beginning of this debate when he used citations out of Beauchesne's, which of course is the recognized authority when it comes to parliamentary rules and procedures. And he used citation, and I would just like to reiterate for you, Mr.

Speaker, from Beauchesne's, page 112, citation 377, 378, 379, and 384 numbers (1) to (4), to substantiate the arguments that he was forthcoming with.

Now I would like to respond to the heckling across the floor by the Opposition House Leader when he says, what about my point. The point that he raised very selectively was from the Saskatchewan *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly*. And that is the substantial argument that he has and that is the end of the argument that he had.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that the function of this legislature is for members to work, for members to be heard, for members to be allowed to speak. That fundamental right has been denied over the last number of days by the members opposite. They have entered this legislature with the avowed purpose of making this Legislative Assembly unworkable. That was their avowed purpose.

And I have to admit, Mr. Speaker, that they have done an excellent job in that because they have ground the wheels to a halt in the Saskatchewan Legislative Assembly. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that is a shame. It is a shame that they are unwilling to put their points forth in argument, to put their points forth in debate. They've had the opportunity. Twenty members, if you check *Hansard*, Mr. Speaker, have already had the opportunity to ask questions or make points about Bill 61 — 20 members opposite. I'm not talking about our members; I'm talking about their members, through the various legitimate forms that this Legislative Assembly offers to them. And I think, Mr. Speaker, it augurs very, very ill for this Saskatchewan Legislative Assembly when they will hide from debate.

Yesterday we had a typical example of the right for them to, on behalf of the citizens of the province, to give forth with petitions. And we support that. Citizens of Saskatchewan should have the right to petition the government. That's a fundamental right that shall not be denied.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if you check in the history of this province you will notice that there have been massive numbers — and I admit that — there have been massive numbers of petitions submitted; 40,000, 50,000 names were submitted. How long did that take, Mr. Speaker? — 10 minutes, 15 minutes, and it was done in a very forthright, upright parliamentary traditional procedure.

Now we have had very limited number of petitions being presented in how many days, tying up the House in a number of days. Yesterday, when the only procedure that the opposition could use to forestall the proceedings of this House was in the format of petitions — and at 10 minutes after seven, yesterday, Mr. Speaker, we had two hours and 50 minutes left in the House — they ran out of petitions. They had no more to present and so they moved adjournment of this House. I think that is pathetic. I think that is pathetic, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, the fundamental issue that we have to get back to in this point of order is that the opposition is saying we, as a duly elected majority government, do not

have the right to bring forth controversial legislation. Mr. Speaker, that is something we cannot buy. We are a duly elected, majority government that is saying we believe this particular thing has to go. Let's debate it. Let's discuss it. And I challenge the opposition: they can also bring forth alternatives during this period of time. We have heard nothing. We have had no opportunity to debate.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the fundamental issue that we have to get back to, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in your role as presiding officer, I think — I know — that you will do what is right in getting this House back into a functioning, reasonable Legislative Assembly where we can get on with the people's business. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that and I recognize that you're anxious to proceed, and I won't take any more time than I have to.

I do however want to respond to some of the comments that have been made, perhaps in reverse order. The member from Rosthern referred to petitions being presented. That's true. A hundred thousand petitions were presented on the health care cuts in 1987 within a couple of hours. What happened? You ignored them. You just blissfully ignored them as if public opinion didn't count.

I say to members opposite, and to Mr. Speaker, the day of governing in such an autocratic fashion is coming to an end. The public have said they're not going to tolerate it.

I won't repeat the arguments so eloquently put by my seat mate and by the member from Saskatoon Eastview with respect to the changing nature of public expectations of the legislature. The gravamen of the complaint by the member from Melfort is that the opposition is obstructing.

The position we take, and is being shared by an increasing of parties, is if that's the only means the public have of bringing their views to bear on the issues of the day, then the public are prepared to accept that. What the public are not prepared to accept is a government which gets elected and then flouts public opinion for four years, for five in this case. The public in Canada, and in Saskatchewan in particular, are saying that style of government must go.

And thus in Ontario you have the reverse. The actors are changed, but the opposition Conservatives and, to a lesser, Liberals are obstructing the NDP government with the full consent and support of the Ontario electorate. The style of government which members opposite are engaging in is gone. The member from The Battlefords quoted Voltaire . . .

(1100)

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. The member for . . . Order. The member from Moose Jaw North and the Minister of Social Services are interrupting the debate, and I'd ask them to refrain from that.

Mr. Shillington: — The member from The Battlefords

quoted Voltaire. I want to quote a more recent authority, a Canadian, a Conservative appointment to the Senate, a confidant of Liberal prime ministers, and one who worked closely with the League for Social Reconstruction in the '30s, generally regarded as the predecessor of the CCF (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation). This is a man who has touched all bases and then respected by all parties — Eugene Forsey.

Eugene Forsey wrote a short but interesting book on the pipe line debate — *Constitutional Aspects of the Canadian Pipe Line Debate*. He said with respect to obstructionism, and this is on page 2 actually of this document:

Secondly, the Opposition has threatened obstruction. So it had . . . a perfect right to threaten it, and a perfect right to engage in it.

There was a widespread impression in Canada that obstruction is something new and vicious. It is neither. It is certainly not new. The Liberals used it in 1881 on the C.P.R. (Canadian Pacific Railway) charter, and again in 1896 on the Remedial Bill, and again in 1913 on the Naval Bill. The Conservatives used it in 1911 on the Reciprocity Agreement, and (of course) again in 1955 (by the late John Diefenbaker on the pipe line debate) . . .

He went on to say — and I'll end with this quotation, end this part of my comments with this quotation:

Used, as it should be, and (as it) almost always has been in Canada, only for the gravest reasons, it is a legitimate and indeed essential part of the parliamentary system; in the last resort, with the Government's power of dissolution, (it is) the only way of keeping Parliament responsible to the people.

It just cannot be said better than that. It cannot be said better than Eugene Forsey said it.

I want to respond before I take my seat to the comments of the member from Melville, with respect. He commented about a court. It is true that both our institutions of government . . . (inaudible) . . . but the similarity ends just about there.

A court is an institution to bring abstract rules to bear on tangible subjects, on people. The legislature is an institution whose function is designed to bring public opinion to bear on government issues of the day. They have totally different functions and different methods of operating.

I want to say as well with . . . members opposite, more than one member opposite has stood and complained about us interfering with their right to speak. Now in the 16 years I've been here, I have heard some convoluted arguments but that really does walk away with the cake.

I say to members opposite this whole problem began because of the premature use of closure. You brought in closure after only four or five opposition speakers had spoken and that's why we're in the muddle we're in.

That's why we're in the muddle we're in.

And if you want to speak on this Bill, the solution lies with the Government House Leader. He can withdraw the time allocation. The solution lies with him.

If you want to debate something else, the solution lies with the Government House Leader. He can go on to something else. The solution is in your own hands.

Finally, I want to say with respect to the member from Melville, to the member from Rosthern, and particularly the member from Melfort, you created the problem. In the dying days of your government, without a proper mandate and with absolutely no moral authority whatsoever, you sought to ram through this legislature, a Bill which is monstrously unpopular. You created the problem. And it is improper of you to ask the Speaker to get you out of it. Because that's what you're asking the Speaker to do. I think that's improper.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — I think it is improper to ask the Speaker to bail you out. The institution of Speaker is too important to be sacrificed by a government which got itself into a problem. You get in; you get out.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I've listened to arguments on both sides, arguments well put and arguments felt sincerely by members. Having done that, the arguments I have heard today on the point of order, I've heard this morning raised, are part of the issue that the House is facing. Therefore, I will reserve my ruling on this particular issue. And we will carry on.

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Mr. Speaker, I very much accept your ruling. I would think some time to consider that would certainly be satisfactory to all members. I must say, Mr. Speaker, in light of . . .

The Speaker: — I do need to know why the member is on his feet. We don't have provisions for . . .

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Mr. Speaker, I am on my feet to make a motion just as the members last night made a motion in the middle of petitions; they made a motion to adjourn the House. I stand here today in like proceedings, in a like manner, and I now make a motion:

That this House move to question period.

Same principle, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — The motion that the hon. member raises is again the type of motion that I am considering, the type that I am considering, that is being considered. And because of that I'm not prepared to accept the motion at this time. That is the issue that we're . . . That is one of the issues, I should say, not the issue, but one of the issues, one of the points of order that are under advisement.

Mr. Hopfner: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to raise my point of order, referring to rule 44 of

our handbook, where I'll read into the record:

When the Speaker is of the opinion that a motion offered to the Assembly is contrary to the Rules and Privileges of the Legislature, he shall apprise the Assembly thereof immediately, before putting the question thereon, and quote the authority applicable to the case.

Mr. Speaker, there is a motion before this Assembly that you are dealing with, and I want to draw your attention to that particular rule, sir, because I do feel as a private member of this Assembly that what is going on is contrary to my privileges of this Assembly.

Mr. Shillington: — I say with respect to the points from the member from Cut Knife-Lloyd, if one takes a narrow literal interpretation of this section, then the Speaker's role is absolutely impossible to discharge. There are some things which a Speaker can rule upon quickly. They are simple and straightforward. But throughout in any House in the British Commonwealth — and there's hundreds of them — Speakers take an opportunity to consider more complex matters, and if they don't have that opportunity it's going to descend into chaos.

You simply cannot . . . if you were to accept such a narrow, literal interpretation of that section, then you make the job of the Speaker impossible. Many of the issues which come before a Speaker are too complex and, I add not coincidentally, far too important to make a quick off-the-hip decision.

The Speaker in Ontario, faced with somewhat the same issue we have here, has given himself two weeks to consider the matter — said a couple of weeks ago that he's going to give his decision on May 27 — a perfectly rational approach to a complex problem.

This is not simple; this is complex. Complex problems deserve careful consideration. And if you take a literal, narrow interpretation of that section, you make your own job impossible.

The Speaker: — I have listened to the hon. member's point of order and I will take it under advisement.

Mr. Pringle: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you for allowing me my right to continue presenting petitions on behalf of residents.

The Speaker: — If you don't mind, I don't think that I've officially had an opportunity to read "presenting petitions", just to make sure that everything is accurate. Now we have been having points of order raised, etc., and I haven't actually called "presenting petitions". I will do so now.

Mr. Pringle: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm proud today to rise to present petitions, a number of petitions on behalf of citizens of Saskatchewan pursuant to rule 11, who are concerned that the government is implementing the goods and services tax, or proposing to, and who feel, Mr. Speaker, that the government has no mandate to bring in this tax at this time. And the petitioners urge the government of Saskatchewan to

reverse its decision on this Bill.

It is my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in fact it is my duty, to present a petition on behalf of the constituents of Saskatoon Eastview. And this petition indicates what I have just referred to.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize some of these names. These are senior citizens. These are young people. These are neighbours. And they are asking that I present this petition on their behalf with the concerns as I had expressed them. So I do that with pleasure, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have another petition here which again speaks to the same three points which I will not repeat. But these petitioners, Mr. Speaker, are also urging the government to reverse its decision on this particular tax. Mr. Speaker, these people are from places like Waseca, Allan, Leask, and Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker. And I wish to present this petition on behalf of these 20 residents of the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I have another petition here that is somewhat unique as well, in that it again is signed by residents of Saskatoon Eastview. There are many, many seniors in Saskatoon Eastview, in fact a very high percentage of my constituents are seniors because of all the seniors' complexes there. And many, many seniors have signed this petition.

But, Mr. Speaker, this petition was signed by a number of residents who specifically live in the Scott and Forget Towers in Saskatoon Eastview. Again these are residents who are feeling that they cannot absorb this tax and I'm pleased to present it on their behalf — group of seniors.

Mr. Speaker, I have another petition here which looks something like an atlas as well in terms of going around the province. This is a petition that initiated from the community of Shellbrook, in northern Saskatchewan, again with the same prayer urging that this tax not be allowed to proceed, and reversed. Residents here are from Shellbrook, Canwood, Christopher Lake, Paddockwood, Emma Lake, and Spruce Home.

That's seven communities represented on this petition, Mr. Speaker, from rural Saskatchewan again, who wish to ask the government to take note of their concerns, and I'm proud to present this petition on their behalf as well, Mr. Speaker.

(1115)

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education says that's a joke for me to be up here presenting these petitions, and I take exception to that. I think that's not how the people that I presented petitions on behalf of have felt about me presenting petitions on their behalf. I don't think they view that as a joke, and I think that's an affront to the people who have signed these petitions, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Education would say that presenting petitions is a joke. I think that's an offence.

Mr. Speaker, I have another petition here that I am very pleased to present on behalf of Saskatchewan citizens. Mr. Speaker, this is a petition that comes . . . these

petitioners come from the communities of Windthorst, down in the south-east corner of the province which I'm very familiar with, also come from Viscount, from Allan, North Battleford again, from a variety of Saskatchewan residents who are saying that they are concerned about this petition and want us to present these on their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I have another petition here that's all from one community. The names of these people are from Spruce Home, Saskatchewan. And these are about 12 or 13 petitioners. Spruce Home is not a big place, but the views of the Spruce Home residents is very important. They are asking that the government reverse its decision on this tax, and I'm pleased to present this on behalf of those people in their communities. I present this petition at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I have another petition that again is from a specific community. Mr. Speaker, this petition, again with the same intent and message of the other petitions that I presented, this petition is from the community of Choiceland, and also Smeaton — there's one person from Smeaton — but the residents of Choiceland, some 20 residents here are making it clear that they do not support this tax and they are urging their government, who they feel has no mandate, to reverse the decision on this important tax. So I'm pleased to present this petition on behalf of residents of Choiceland and Smeaton, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have another petition here from the constituency of Saskatoon Eastview. Again as I would . . . I would suggest that I have an obligation on their behalf to present these petition names. They too oppose this 7 per cent provincial sales tax and urge their government to reverse its decision because they have no mandate to bring in this tax, Mr. Speaker.

Again I recognize a number of these names and I know that they would not have signed this petition lightly, Mr. Speaker. I also recognize some business people on there, a senior citizen, and I know that these people are from all political persuasions. This is not a partisan issue. And I'm pleased to present the petition on their behalf, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, again I have another petition here that I believe is important because all of the petitioners here again are from one community, a community in rural Saskatchewan, the community of Holbein. And these are people who are again expressing their concerns about this petition, or about this government's actions in this regard.

And these are 20 names that are part of the many, many thousands who have very consciously and very deliberately put their signature to participate in the democratic process of signalling their views and their opinions to their government. And I am honoured, Mr. Speaker, to present these petition names on behalf of the residents of Holbein, Saskatchewan. There are 20 names there from Holbein.

Mr. Speaker, I have another important petition from Saskatoon and this petition is from . . . there are some residents in my constituency. There's a resident from the

senior Scott-Forget complex. There's a resident from another seniors' complex, the Cosmopolitan Courts complex in Saskatoon. There are people here, some from a variety of constituencies because St. Albert's, Adams Crescent. They're not in Eastview but that doesn't matter. These are residents from across the city of Saskatoon. Again I recognize two or three names and I know that these people would have very consciously thought about their decision to put their names to this petition, and it is my pleasure to present this petition on their behalf.

I just have two or three more, Mr. Speaker, and then I will sit down. But the next petition I have again is from a variety of people across Saskatchewan. I know that this petition was located in one of the business establishments in Saskatoon Eastview because it has my name on the bottom to return to me. And most of the petitions are . . . some, by the way, some 7,400 petitioners from Saskatoon Eastview so far, Mr. Speaker. And that is about 33 per cent of all the voters in my constituency who have signed names to this petition. But this petition was . . . this form was housed in one of the businesses in my riding.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are Saskatchewan citizens who have signed this petition, not only from Saskatoon, but from Colonsay, from Wadena, from Lanigan, from Viscount, from Warman, from Birch Hills, Saskatchewan, and from Prince Albert, Mr. Speaker. So on this name of 20 petitions there are eight communities represented all urging the government the same thing, that is, to listen to their views with regard to this particular proposed goods and services tax and to reverse its decision, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have another petition and I think it's important to present this one because it again is urging the province to stop the provincial GST (goods and services tax). But these petitioners are from the community of Drake, and I'm not aware that there have been other petition names from the town of Drake — again not a large town but an important town and important citizens of the province of Saskatchewan. And I'm very pleased to present on behalf of the citizens of Drake — and I might add there's a citizen from Leask here as well — I'm pleased to present this petition on behalf of people from Drake and Leask, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the final petition that I will present today is again the same prayer, which I will not repeat. But these are petitioners, Mr. Speaker, a number of them from the community of Melfort, Saskatchewan. Community members from Melfort are concerned about the government's intentions to proceed with passing the provincial goods and services tax. Not only Melfort — but there are several from Melfort — there are also members of the public from the community of Humboldt, from Hanley, from Lanigan, from Edam, from Hague, and from Loreburn. Sort of in a sense another atlas of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, but rural residents — and again I repeat, several from Melfort — who are expressing their concern that the government is proceeding with the provincial PST and are asking them in a very serious way to reverse this decision. And it's my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to present this petition on behalf of residents of Saskatchewan, from rural Saskatchewan. Thank you very much.

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to rule 11, Mr. Speaker, to present a petition to the Assembly on behalf of residents, as you will be finding out, from all across this great province of ours. And these petitioners are urging the provincial government to withdraw the passage of the provincial GST.

The petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Saskatchewan humbly sheweth:

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.

Wherefore your 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 had an opportunity to pass judgement on it in a provincial election.

Mr. Speaker, the petition I am presenting has signatories from Walsh Acres, the area of Regina that I live in. There's a signature here from Moose Jaw, Saskatoon, another one from Swift Current, one from the Coronation Park area of Regina, Uplands in my constituency. Here's a signature from the south end of Regina, another one from Saskatoon, one from Briercrest out in the Thunder Creek constituency. Another one from Saskatoon, Regina, McLean — just east of Regina — a signature from Meadow Lake, North Battleford, one from Yorkton, one from Francis, and then back into the constituency of Regina Albert North.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this petition won't be ruled out of order because there's room for 20 signatures and there is in fact an additional signature below it. But I trust that it will be in order. I table the petition.

I have another petition, Mr. Speaker, with the same prayer, so I won't repeat that. This petition is signed exclusively by people on Rink Avenue in the constituency of Regina Albert North. And of course, they're opposed to the provincial GST being passed. And it is my honour and my privilege to present this petition in the Legislative Assembly.

An Hon. Member: — You mean the new constituency of Regina Albert North.

(1130)

Mr. Trew: — Yes, with the boundaries dispute, Mr. Speaker, there's some concern as to which constituency it is in.

I have a petition here, this one from a block over from Rink Avenue, Bannister Avenue, again in Walsh Acres. I recognize a good number of these names, as exclusively every signature is within three blocks of where I live, and I'm very, very pleased to present this petition on their behalf urging the government to withdraw the . . . stop the passage of the provincial GST. I table that petition.

Mr. Speaker, I have a petition again from the old riding of Regina North West, new Regina Albert North, potentially the new. I believe it's called Sherwood Park . . . Regina

Sherwood. At any case, these people are most assuredly on the same vein as the previous petitions I have presented urging the government not to proceed.

These signatures are, as I mentioned, from Walsh Acres, primarily the Tremaine Avenue area, and I notice a Dryburgh Crescent signature. I know that individual quite well and I recognize a good number of other names. It is my duty and of course my privilege to present this petition today.

I have a petition, Mr. Speaker, this time from the constituency of Regina North or the constituency of Regina Albert North or potentially Regina Churchill Downs if the five-day old boundaries are the ultimate that are used. The signatories on this petition are all from the Uplands area of Regina. An area, as their MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly) I recognize a great number of the names, and I'm very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to table this list of some 24 names. I'm pleased to table this in the Legislative Assembly.

I have another petition with the same prayer. This one also from the Uplands area in the constituency of Regina North or Regina Albert North or Churchill Downs depending again on what the boundaries decision is — same prayer opposing the provincial GST. These signatories come . . . I see a number on Weekes Crescent, Chalmers Street, Kleisinger Crescent, which is not in Uplands but just north of 9th Avenue North — there's a series of apartments there. A signature on Broad Street North but primarily, Mr. Speaker, from the Uplands area. It is my duty, pleasure, and honour to present this petition.

The next petition that I have, Mr. Speaker, is from residents of Fairview Road in Uplands in Regina, Rodenbush Drive, from Catherwood Crescent, Jordan Bay. There's one here from Nollet Avenue which is over in Normanview, and then back to Rodenbush Drive. So as near as I can see, with the exception of one signature from the Normanview area of Regina, all of these signatories on this petition are from the Uplands area of Regina. Again it is my privilege and duty to table this petition.

Mr. Speaker, I have another petition also urging the provincial government to stop the provincial GST until the election. This time the signatories are from again Rodenbush Drive, 12th Avenue North in Uplands, Upland Drive. There's a signature from, I recognize, the west end of the city on Sherwood Drive, the 5000 block of Sherwood Drive, Upland Drive, and Fairview Road, primarily in the north-east part of Regina. I table that petition.

Mr. Speaker, the next petition that I have has . . . again with the same prayer. This time the petitioners are from Tisdale, Melfort, Birch Hills, and Hudson Bay, and one from Quinton, Saskatchewan. From Hudson Bay there is six signatures, quite a number of them from Tisdale, and a couple from Melfort, one from Birch Hills, and one from Quinton. But again on behalf of the six signatories from Hudson Bay, the multitude from the other places mentioned, I am honoured to present this petition today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — Mr. Speaker, I have a petition here that was signed in the Argyle Park area in a place of business, actually in a pizzeria there. So the signatures . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. I'm trying to allow the member to present his petitions but if we start describing the locations and what they look like and everything else, that certainly isn't the normal way of presenting petitions.

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. These signatories are from, of course, Argyle Park. I recognize some neighbours of mine in Walsh Acres and further to the west of the city. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table this petition.

I have a petition, Mr. Speaker, from the Uplands area of Regina — Norwood Crescent, primarily Norwood Crescent, but a few from Fairview Road. Some 24 signatories on this petition, Mr. Speaker, and they're urging the provincial government stop the provincial GST. It is my duty, pleasure, and honour to table this petition with 24 signatures from the Uplands area of Regina to the Legislative Assembly.

I have a petition again from the Uplands area — Norwood Crescent, Fairview Road, Upland Drive, and a couple of box numbers. I don't know whether that's because they choose to pick up their mail at the post office or whether they're in fact Regina rural. In any case, just two signatures. The rest of the 24 signatures are clearly from the Uplands area of Regina.

As their current MLA and I guess potentially, depending on the boundaries that are ultimately used, potentially a candidate for the next election and hopefully MLA for these people, I am duty-bound to present this petition and I do so with a great deal of pride.

I have a petition, Mr. Speaker, from Argyle Park, from the extreme north-west portion of the city; some from Uplands; and some signatories I recognize as the addresses being the very south end of Regina. But in any case, Mr. Speaker, all the signatures I believe are from Regina in this instance, scattered throughout the city. It is my privilege and pleasure to table this petition urging the government to stop the provincial GST until after an election. I'm pleased to table this petition.

I have a petition, Mr. Speaker, from the Coronation Park area of Regina, and a few of these signatures are from the Argyle Park and further north-west in the member for the current Regina North West's constituency. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present this petition urging the provincial government to stop the GST until after the election. I'm delighted to table this petition.

I have a petition, Mr. Speaker, from the Saskatoon area. Fortunately I lived in Saskatoon for a total of a year of my life, so I recognize some of these addresses. And in addition to the signatories from Saskatoon there are two signatories from Warman, the town of Warman. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to present this petition, as my colleagues have, from all around Saskatchewan, urging the government to not proceed with the provincial goods and services tax until after the provincial election is

called. So on behalf of the 20 petitioners that have signed this, it's my pleasure to table the petition.

Mr. Speaker, I have a petition here from many addresses in Regina — quite a number from the Argyle Park area, and I recognize some also from the Uplands area, again some 20 signatures. Oh, and there's some from the Coronation Park area too.

Mr. Speaker, these people are adamantly opposed to the provincial GST, which is being rammed down our throats, and they're urging that the government not proceed with this unfair tax until after the people have had a chance to voice their opinion in a public general election right across the province so they can turf the government out. It's my pleasure to table that petition.

I have a petition, Mr. Speaker, from Saskatoon and from Clavet and a signature from a Watrous address. These people are opposed to the provincial GST and urging the government to not proceed with it until after a provincial election. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 20 people from Clavet, Watrous, and Saskatoon, it is my duty and my honour to table this petition.

Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from a number of addresses — Argyle Park, I recognize an Uplands signature, some to the west of Walsh Acres area in the extreme north-west part of the city. Again, Mr. Speaker, some 20 signatures collected at a place of business that I cannot describe, according to your former ruling. It's my duty and pleasure to present those 20 signatures.

I have a petition, Mr. Speaker, this time with . . . It's interesting, sometimes the size of the spacing changes. This time there is 24 signatures from the Uplands area of Regina. Of course I recognize a fair number of these people, having been on their doorstep and having talked with them over various issues over the years.

They are obviously supportive of what the opposition is doing in that they too join us, or we join them in urging the provincial government to stop the provincial GST until after there's been a provincial election, so that the people of communities such as Uplands have an opportunity to voice their opinion on what is arguably the largest tax grab in Saskatchewan's history. I am pleased to present that petition.

I have a petition, Mr. Speaker, from Melfort and from Saskatoon. This time not 24, but 20 names on this petition, also urging the provincial government to stop the provincial GST until the people have had time to voice their judgement in a provincial election.

That's the common thread of all of these petitions — is people are saying: not until after the next election. So on behalf of these 20 people from Melfort and Saskatoon, I am pleased to table this petition. Thank you.

(1145)

I have a petition, Mr. Speaker, from the Uplands area of Regina . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member for Regina Centre, thank you for listening with interest. The Uplands area have tabled a huge number of petitions

from that area today, and I'm far from done.

Again the common thread with all of these people in the Uplands portion of Regina is they want the provincial GST . . . the government to stop ramming it through, to call an election so that they can voice their concerns and decide whether they re-elect the Conservatives and the GST gets rammed down their throats, or whether they can elect a New Democratic Party government and move to more fair taxation. Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to table this petition on behalf of my constituents in Uplands.

I have a petition primarily from the Argyle Park area. In fact I would have to say . . . Oh, there is one from Coronation Park and one from down in the Rosemont area, but with those two exceptions exclusively from the Argyle Park area.

Residents of Argyle Park have been telling me for some time now, they too want the GST stopped until after a provincial election, where they will have had a chance in the democratic process to simply say yea or nay by who they cast their ballot for. So, Mr. Speaker, I'm again pleased and duty bound to table this petition from the residents of primarily Argyle Park, with the two exceptions from other areas of the city.

I have a petition, Mr. Speaker, from again primarily the Argyle Park area. But also, I'm pleased to say, some from Walsh Acres. These people are adamantly opposed to what is going on with the ramming of the provincial GST. These people are asking for a provincial election before the GST is rammed down the throats and forced on the people of Saskatchewan. I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to table this petition on behalf of those residents of Argyle Park and Walsh Acres.

I have a petition, Mr. Speaker, from the Walsh Acres area, again very near to where I live. These people are urging 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. These people are very concerned with what is happening in our province. And I won't repeat the prayer of this petition, Mr. Speaker, but as you are well aware, this petition mirrors the hundreds and thousands of other petitions that have been presented by I and my colleagues in this Legislative Assembly. I am delighted on behalf of these people in the Walsh Acres area to table this petition opposing the provincial GST.

Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from people in the Uplands area. I am delighted to be able to table this petition. And the reason I said, delighted to be able to table it, is if people didn't sign the petition, if people didn't actively go out door-to-door collecting signatures, we would very quickly run out of petitions to hand in. But since the people are responding, people are actively going out with petitions, actively getting people to sign it and turning them in, that allows us to continue, and it allows me to present this petition from the people of the Uplands area of Regina. So I present this petition, Mr. Speaker.

I have a petition, Mr. Speaker — I'll take this one — I see there are signatures on this petition from Christopher Lake, from . . . it says Wiggins. I'm assuming that's

Wiggins, yes, in Saskatoon. Because there's also Dufferin Avenue, McKinnon, Reindeer Road — Reindeer Road up in the north-east portion of the city of Saskatoon. I actually know that area fairly well, my parents having lived there for a few years. And there's some signatures here from the east side of the city as well. Twenty signatures this time, Mr. Speaker, and I'm duty-bound and honoured to present this petition on behalf of these 20 people.

I have a petition primarily from the Argyle Park area of the Regina city. Argyle Park, interestingly enough, is in Regina North, in Regina Albert North, or in Regina North Albert. It's in all three, so it matters not . . . These people will be part of one of those constituencies when the boundaries dispute is finally resolved.

An Hon. Member: — And are likely to be well represented in this legislature.

Mr. Trew: — And I thank my colleague from Regina Centre for saying they are likely to be well represented in the legislature. If they're willing, I'm certainly willing to run. I hope they're willing to vote for me.

Mr. Speaker, there's 20 names from Argyle Park, some from Walsh Acres I notice, and some from Uplands but primarily Argyle Park. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to present these 20 signatures on their behalf.

I have a petition, Mr. Speaker, from the Upland Drive, Elmview, and a signature here from Sifton, which would be of I think some interest to the Speaker of this Legislative Assembly, that being in his constituency — Last Mountain-Touchwood. These people, Mr. Speaker, are just vehemently opposed to this GST that is being rammed down their throat with the use of closure in this legislature.

These people are asking the provincial government to stop this madness, stop the GST until after they've had their democratic right to vote in an election and to say yes or no to the antics of the government and indeed to pass judgement on all of the goings-on. These people, primarily from the Uplands area, are obviously opposed to the GST. And it's my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to present these petitions on their behalf.

I have a petition, Mr. Speaker, from Saskatoon, and I recognize many of the addresses. I would describe it as the south-east side of the river primarily, and I apologize to anyone on the other side of the river that may have signed it, but primarily the south-east side of Saskatoon. Again a full petition, 20 signatures, urging the provincial government to stop the provincial GST.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. The member is entering into debate. I'd ask him not to enter into debate. The Speaker has ruled on that earlier — that there's no debate on the presenting of petitions. The prayer will be read once and then the petitions can be presented.

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will try and abide by your ruling. These 20 people from Saskatoon are in the same vein as the number of other petitions presented today — the same prayer and the same issue, that being

the GST.

It is my . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. I've warned the member once and if he does it again, I will go to the next speaker.

Mr. Trew: — I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I gather it's the last three letters that was a concern in what I just said. Is it proper for me ask that of you? I'm uncertain . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — The member is on his feet presenting petitions. He is allowed to read the prayer and present the petitions. He has read the prayer once; now he can continue to present the petitions with no comments.

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of these 20 people from Saskatoon, it is my pleasure to present this petition.

Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from the Uplands area in the constituency of Regina North — Elmview Road, Upland Drive, Oakview Drive, and that general area. It is my duty and my honour and my privilege to present this petition on their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from the Uplands area of Regina, Oakview Bay this time, from primarily Oakview Bay. I see there is a signature from Dalgliesh Drive, which is obviously not in Uplands, for any of you familiar with Regina geography; it is in Regina North West. And it is my duty, privilege, pleasure to present this petition on their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a petition from again Regina North West, from the Walsh Acres area, Argyle Park, Coronation Park; indeed it seems to be quite representative of Regina. This petition came from an indescribable pizzeria in Argyle Park, and it is my honour to present this petition on behalf of the 20 signatures in that area.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a petition from people from Wishart, from Regina. Indeed a good number of these are in the south-east part of Regina. This petition — and some from rural Regina — this petition is in the same vein as the other petitions I have presented today. And it is my privilege and honour and duty to table this petition in the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I have a petition, this time from Saskatoon — varied addresses in Saskatoon and one from . . . it looks like Tugaskie to me — with the exception of the one signature from Tugaskie, 19 others from Saskatoon. It is my pleasure to table this petition to join the thousands of other petitions that have been presented by my colleagues and I in the Legislative Assembly.

I have a petition, Mr. Speaker, from Saskatoon, Unity and then back to Saskatoon, 20 signatures on a petition with the same prayer as the other petitions that I have presented in the Legislative Assembly this day. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased on behalf of these 20 people to add their names to the ever-growing list of people that are petitioning this Legislative Assembly respecting what

these petitions are all about, the prayer of which I read earlier.

A petition, Mr. Speaker, I'm nearing . . . I've a couple more that I wish to present. This petition is from the Uplands area, Oakview Drive, Spruceview Road, and I mentioned Oakview Drive already. These signatures, these people are joining, as I mentioned, the ever-growing list of people that are signing the petition that we are tabling in the Legislative Assembly on their behalf. And it is my pleasure and privilege to present this petition.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to present my last petition for this day of here people having signed from again the Uplands area, Coronation Park, and on Angus Road, a signature from the south-east portion of the city of Regina in the constituency of Regina Wascana, signatures from Regina North West, a signature from Moose Jaw. And I know that will be of particular interest to my two colleagues from Moose Jaw.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure today to table a number of the petitions that we have respecting this petition. I want to abide by your ruling. It's been my pleasure to add many hundreds of names in total to the growing list of people who are petitioning this government, urging it to stop passage of the GST until after the election.

(1200)

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you for recognizing me, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise pursuant to rule 11 of the Legislative Assembly which provides for the tabling of petitions to the Legislative Assembly.

In this case the petitions I wish to table today are virtually, yes, are identical in terms of what it is that the petitioners are saying. And these petitioners are concerned that the Government of Saskatchewan does not have a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan to impose a major tax increase which would result from the proposed provincial GST. And therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they are petitioning the Legislative Assembly with the following:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to urge the Provincial Government to stop the provincial GST until the people of Saskatchewan have had an opportunity to pass judgement on it in a provincial election. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

And I should just point out, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that these are petitions from people of Saskatchewan to the Legislative Assembly to all of the members of the Legislative Assembly asking the Legislative Assembly to urge the provincial government to stop the GST.

So they are asking us as members to put pressure on the government to do something. And this petition I have here before me, Mr. Speaker, there's about 10 names or so — they're all from the city of Moose Jaw. There are no addresses on here, but the names are clearly printed, so

there can be no doubt as to who these people are, and they're clearly from the city of Moose Jaw. Oh no, there's one here from Saskatoon as well, Mr. Speaker. And it's my pleasure to lay that petition on the Table.

Mr. Speaker, this next petition I have — a group of names, there's 20 names in all — may again seem to be from the city of Moose Jaw. There's one here from Bushell Park which is just outside of Moose Jaw I understand. And there's also one name here from Yorkton. I assume that person was visiting someone in Moose Jaw when the petition was being passed around and being signed by people. And again all the names are clearly printed. And I've signed the petition, Mr. Speaker, to ensure, as per rule 11, that the petition is in order. And it's my pleasure to lay that one on the Table, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the next petition I have, as near as I can determine, the names are all from the city of Regina: Knowles Crescent, Garnet Street, La Verendrye Way. No, there's some names here from Saskatoon as well, Mr. Speaker. The names are all clearly printed, and it's my pleasure to lay these six names before the Legislative Assembly.

This next petition, Mr. Speaker, has three names on it, one being from Quincy Drive in Regina, the other two being from Parker Avenue in Regina which is in the south end, I believe in the constituency of the member for Regina South, so that he will be pleased to know that there are people in his constituency who are expressing their concerns in petition form to the Legislative Assembly, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

These next three names are all from Darke Crescent in Regina, Mr. Speaker, and it's my pleasure as well to lay their names before the Legislative Assembly. The petition form has been signed by myself so as to assure the Legislative Assembly that the petition is in order as far as I can ascertain, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

This next group of names, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are all from Regina, Uhrich Avenue, 29th Avenue, L'Arche Crescent. Unless I'm mistaken, those are also from the constituency of Regina South and would be a matter of interest to the member for Regina South. And it's my pleasure to lay those names on the Table.

As is the case with the next three names which are from Knowles Crescent and 24th Avenue in Regina. And I believe all these names are in order, Mr. Speaker, and I'll sign my name to them.

This next group again seems to be from the south end of the city of Regina, Mr. Speaker, petitions from Saskatchewan residents who are expressing their concerns from King Street and from L'Arche Crescent, Shaw Street, Portnall Avenue, I believe it is, and L'Arche Crescent here in the city of Regina. And it's my pleasure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to convey their concerns to the Legislative Assembly so that in turn the Legislative Assembly, in this fashion, may convey the concerns of these people of Saskatchewan to the government of the day, Mr. Speaker.

This next group of names I have, Mr. Speaker, almost all

seem to be from the city of Saskatoon, although there is one name here from the town of Bradwell, I believe it is. It's a nice little town. I'm not quite clear where it is but I believe it's close to Saskatoon. And it's my pleasure to also put these names before the Legislative Assembly today, Mr. Speaker.

This next group of names, Mr. Speaker, would seem to be primarily from people of Moose Jaw but not exclusively so. There are some exceptions to this. Here's one from Claybank, Saskatchewan. Here's a name from Spring Valley, Saskatchewan, which I believe is to the south of Moose Jaw close to the Avonlea area of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. And all the rest seem to be from Moose Jaw — 7th Avenue North East, Coteau Street West, River Street East — and of course we're all familiar with River Street — Athabasca. And it's my pleasure to present those names to the Legislative Assembly, Mr. Speaker.

This next group of names, Mr. Speaker, are all from the city of Prince Albert. And it is clear that the people of Prince Albert, these 20 people here, also have concerns similar to those that have been expressed by other petitioners, and wish to have their concerns conveyed to the government through the medium of this rule 11 provision through the Legislative Assembly. And it's my pleasure to present their names on their behalf, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the next group of names I have are also primarily from Prince Albert, although there are a couple of names from La Ronge, Saskatchewan, just to show you that we've had petitioners from the South and now we have them from the North, which I think indicates that there are people from all over Saskatchewan who are expressing their concerns and wanting to have their concerns conveyed to the Legislative Assembly, Mr. Speaker. And it's my pleasure to present this petition on behalf of the very many petitioners to the Legislative Assembly, Mr. Speaker.

This next group of names, Mr. Speaker . . . I'm going to make some assumptions here that most of these names are from the city of Saskatoon — East Place, Albert Avenue, Clare Crescent, Ruth Street — yes, Ruth Street is in Saskatoon — Arlington Avenue. Here's one, 102nd Street in Saskatoon, Calder Crescent. I believe that all . . . No, there's one here from La Ronge, Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, but all the rest would appear to be from the city of Saskatoon. All have printed their names on the form, they've signed them, indicated their addresses. It's quite clear that this petition is very much in order pursuant to rule 11 and I've signed it to indicate that, and it's my privilege to lay this petition on the Table today, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this next petition that I have is from 2501 Louise Street which is an apartment block. I believe it's the Scott-Forget Towers in Saskatoon. And I would not be surprised if that were a senior citizens complex in the city of Saskatoon, although I stand to be corrected on that. But in any event, Mr. Speaker, some 21 residents of Scott-Forget Towers have printed their names and have signed their names, given their address, and are joining with many others to convey their concerns to the Legislative Assembly so that in turn that these might be

passed on to the government.

And I'm very pleased and honoured to present their names to the Legislative Assembly today. And I've signed the petition on behalf of the residents of Scott-Forget Towers in Saskatoon. I've signed the petition to make clear that these names are all in order, Mr. Speaker. And it's my pleasure to present these names today.

The next group of names I have, Mr. Speaker, are all . . . seem to be from . . . or most seem to be from 1319 Rae Street in Regina. And I would not be surprised, Mr. Speaker, although I stand to be corrected in saying this, that this again is another senior citizens' development in this case, in Regina. There's one further signature here from someone on Rochdale Boulevard, no doubt visiting people at 1319 Rae Street. Again I stand to be corrected but I believe that is a senior citizens' development in the constituency of Regina Elphinstone, I believe it is, Mr. Speaker.

And I'm pleased that the people in that complex found the time to express their concerns to the members of the Legislative Assembly and to make their feelings known in this way by clearly printing their names and then signing their names as well, and clearly indicating their address. This is a wonderful exercise in democracy, Mr. Speaker, and I'm just delighted to present their names today to the members of the Legislative Assembly gathered here on their behalf, Mr. Speaker.

This next group of names, Mr. Speaker, are primarily from Regina, from Queen Street and from Montague Street and from the Glen Elm Trailer Court here in Regina, Mr. Speaker. But there are also a couple of names from Leross, Saskatchewan, just to the north of Saskatchewan and it's my pleasure to also submit these names to the members of the Legislative Assembly today, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have 20 names here signed and most are printed clearly as well. They seem to be residents of Prince Albert, although there are some names here from St. Louis, Saskatchewan, just south of Prince Albert by the river there, Mr. Speaker.

(1215)

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. The member seems to be taking a great deal of time giving us a lesson in geography of Saskatchewan which I don't think is necessary during the tabling of the petitions — order, order, the member for Regina Centre.

I don't think the member has the right to drag out the proceedings by giving us lessons in geography on Saskatchewan. I'd ask the member to continue to place his petitions on the Table without extra comments.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I certainly respect your ruling in that regard. I was only trying to indicate to members where some of these names came from and . . . But I'll certainly respect your ruling. I would just simply say that in addition to the people of Prince Albert, Saskatchewan who have signed this form, there's also one signature here from Crystal Springs, Mr. Speaker. And it's my pleasure to lay these

names before the Legislative Assembly.

Now this next one I have, Mr. Speaker, it . . . I'm hoping that this one will be sufficient. The original petition form has 20 names on it and I've signed that, but someone has added to that with another separate sheet of paper and they've affixed it, and I'm satisfied that all these names are in order, Mr. Speaker.

All of the names seem to be from . . . or almost all of the names seem to be from one apartment building in Saskatoon at 2602 Taylor Street. And I'm not familiar with the building itself but it looks like someone went to a lot of effort to get signatures of many if not all of the residents of 2602 Taylor Street in Saskatoon.

And I might say that I applaud their initiative in making do with the one form and adding your own, and that it's my very great pleasure to present these names to the Legislative Assembly on behalf of a group of people in Saskatchewan who are obviously very concerned about the issue of this petition. And it's my pleasure to lay this one on the Table today, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the next group of names I have are from Regina and Findlater, Saskatchewan, and there's one here from the . . . it looks like they're from business people at the Galleria here in Regina. Another name from Bond Street, which is in the constituency of Regina Victoria, Mr. Speaker. But in the main these are names from residents of Regina, Saskatchewan, who want their concerns conveyed to the Legislative Assembly, concerns in keeping with the prayer of petition that I read earlier to the members today, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I might say that it's my very great pleasure to lay these names of residents of Regina and Findlater on the Table, to present these today, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the next group of names I have all seem to be from the constituency of Regina Elphinstone, addresses such as Cameron Street and 600 block Athol Street. And it looks like someone was going door to door getting people to sign up here. I want to applaud them for taking advantage of the rules of the Assembly to make their concerns known, concerns in keeping with the prayer of petition that I mentioned earlier, and to convey their concerns in this way. And it's my very great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to lay this particular petition — these 15, 16 names — on the Table today, Mr. Speaker.

This next group of names, Mr. Speaker . . . I recognize the first name on the form. And it looks like he's taken it around and gotten 20 signatures or so — 20 signatures of residents of Regina. I'm very pleased to lay these before the Assembly. I might say that all the names are, or almost all the names, are printed clearly and the signatures seem to be okay. I'm pleased to sign the form and to attest personally that I think they're in order, and to lay these names on the Table today, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this next group of names I have I believe are all from the fine city of Moose Jaw. Although I stand to be corrected again. But yes, it appears that all these names are from Moose Jaw, from Stadacona Street West, Grandview, Cartier Avenue, Albert Street — I believe there's an Albert Street in Moose Jaw — Vaughan

Street West, King Crescent. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's my pleasure to add this list of 21 names on top of the hundreds if not thousands of names that have already been presented to the Legislative Assembly, in the matter of the prayer that I earlier read out to the Legislative Assembly and the preamble which I had indicated in the subject area. And it's my pleasure to also lay their names on the Table before you today, sir.

This next group of names I have here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, all seem to be from the city of Regina. Oh, there's one here from Pense, Saskatchewan. But there's addresses here from Academy Park Road, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which as you know is in Regina South, in the constituency of Regina South, a hotbed of NDP support in the city.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. Order. The member is entering into debate. I will warn him once and then I will go to the next speaker if he continues to do that.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I appreciate your ruling, but the member for Regina South . . . I know in debate you can respond to heckling, but in this case . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Next speaker. Next speaker.

Ms. Smart: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I rise also under rule 11 to exercise my democratic right as a member of the legislature to present petitions to this legislature on behalf of the people of the province.

I have this petition and it's regarding the goods and services tax, the legislation that is being brought in here under the threat of closure. And so this petition . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — The member can read the prayer on the petition and present the petition to the House without going into debate. It's clear in rule 11: "On the presentation of petition no debate on or in relation to the same shall be allowed."

Ms. Smart: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, in this petition the petitioners are humbly praying

. . . that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to urge 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 the people who have signed this petition come from the city of Saskatoon, which I'm pleased to represent in here in the legislature. They come from a number of areas of the city — McKinnon Avenue, 5th Street East, Main Street, Tait Crescent, Coy Avenue, Moxon Crescent, Arlington Avenue, Begg Crescent, Lansdowne Avenue, and a number of other streets in Saskatoon. I have signed this petition and I'm pleased to present it to the legislature on their behalf.

Another petition on the same subject, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this one also from Saskatoon, from areas like Main Street, 10th Street, Zeman Court, Wilson Crescent, Anglin Place, Morgan Avenue, and there is a signature on

here from Allan, Saskatchewan. And I am pleased to present this on behalf of the petitioners. I have signed it; it looks in good order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, another petition from the city of Saskatoon on the same topic, this one coming from a number of streets. It may have been one of the petitions that we collected in front of Midtown Plaza, because the people are coming from . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. The member is not to get into debate. The member has read the prayer, can now present the petitions, lay the petitions on the Table.

Ms. Smart: — These petitions come from Spinks Drive, 8th Street, 10th Street, Dufferin Avenue, Broadway Avenue, Acadia Drive, Delaronde Road, 9th Street East, Forest Drive, Victoria Avenue, 8th Street, Munroe Avenue, and Wilson Street. I am pleased to present these petitions. They look in order and I've signed them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, another petition on the same subject from the city of Saskatoon, from Broadway Avenue, Avenue E North, 28th Street West, Brown Crescent, 8th Avenue North, 12th Street East, Canora Street in Warman, Clover Street in Dalmeny, Saskatchewan; Saskatoon, 11th Street, 12th Street, 5th Street, 4th Street; two signatures on here from Big River, Saskatchewan; the others from Main Street, 4th Street, and Avenue I North. They look in order, and I've signed this petition and present them on behalf of the people.

Another petition on the same subject, Mr. Deputy Speaker, also from the city of Saskatoon — from people on Broadway Avenue, Clinkskill Drive, Idylwyld Crescent, Heritage Way, 10th Street, 25th Street, Simpson Crescent, Lorne Avenue, 2nd Avenue North, and University Drive. It looks in order and I've signed it and present it on behalf of the people of Saskatoon.

And another petition on the same subject, Mr. Deputy Speaker, again from the city of Saskatoon, with one signature from Beauval, Saskatchewan. The others come from Saskatoon, again from across the city — McPherson Avenue, Dufferin, 8th Street East, 13th Street East, Broadway, Lancaster, Lorne Avenue, Saguenay Drive, Bateman Crescent, Eastlake, 6th Street East. And I present this full petition of 20 signatures, also written and printed, and I present it on behalf of the people in Saskatoon who've asked me to do so. Thank you.

Another petition on the same subject, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Most of the signatures on here are also from Saskatoon. There is a signature here from Hepburn, one from Hafford, and the others from areas in Saskatoon. I've signed this and I present it on behalf of the people of the city.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are presenting these petitions. Another one I have on the same subject, and I present it here in the Legislative Assembly so that the members opposite and the people here — all of us as the Legislative Assembly — will have a chance to see them. They come from Saskatoon — Temperance Street, Adilman Drive, Montreal Avenue, Tobin Crescent, 8th Street East, McCormack Road, 105th Street East, from Eastview, from

4th Avenue North, 5th Avenue North, 10th Street East, 7th Street East, Avenue H North, Spadina Crescent, and Diefenbaker Drive. All signatures from Saskatoon, all in order, and I've signed this petition presented on behalf of those people.

(1230)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is another petition on the same subject also from the city of Saskatoon. The people in this petition come from a number of areas of the city. It looks like 33rd Street West, Avenue X, Avenue O, Grey Place, Avenue P, Avenue D, Avenue H South, and Highway Place and Pendygrasse Road. I present this petition on behalf of those people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Smart: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, another petition from the city of Saskatoon, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This petition has 12 signatures on it from the city of Saskatoon, and I have signed it and I present it on behalf of those people. It's on the same topic as the other petitions.

Another petition with 12 signatures on it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, again from the city of Saskatoon on the same topic as the other petitions that we have been presenting. The people from this petition live on Avenue H North, Avenue I, 33rd Street, Avenue X, Avenue N South, Diefenbaker Drive, Clarence South, 24th Street West, 21st Street East, 5th Avenue North and 21st Street East, and there is one signature from Grandora, Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition on behalf of 20 people who come from the town of Watrous, Saskatchewan. They too are concerned about the same topic as the other petitioners. And this is a full petition of 20 signatures from the town of Watrous. They have written their names. They have written their signatures, printed their names, and indicated where they're from. And I have signed this petition and present it to the Assembly on behalf of 20 petitioners from Watrous.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this petition that I am now presenting also has 20 signatures on it. And a number of the people on this petition on the same topic, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as the other petitions, have asked me to present this petition on their behalf.

And these are people from the town of Watrous. There are two signatures here from the town of Shellbrook. There are signatures from Young, Saskatchewan, and two from Regina, so petitions from across the province. And I'm pleased to present these on behalf of the petitioners to the Legislative Assembly for our consideration. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Smart: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, another petition, again with 20 signatures, on the same topic as the others that we have presented. The people on this petition also live in Watrous, Saskatchewan. There is a signature here from Grayson, Saskatchewan, and there is a signature here from Viscount, Saskatchewan. All the others are from Watrous, all signed and printed, a full 20 signatures. And I'm proud to present them and it is my duty to present

them to the Legislative Assembly for our consideration. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this next petition comes again from the city of Saskatoon and contains the signatures and the printed names of people who come from a number of places in the city. There is a signature from 22nd Street, from 3rd Avenue South, from Avenue H South, Avenue P South, Fisher Crescent, Avenue T South, Avenue O South, Leif Erickson Place, Avenue J North, 23rd Street West, Avenue I South, Avenue R South, and Avenue S South. And I'm pleased to present this petition with my signature on it as well for consideration of the Legislative Assembly.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, another petition from Saskatoon, this one 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12 names on it. This petition has a signature from R.R. 6 outside Saskatoon, from Ste. Cecelia Street in Saskatoon, 5th Street, Junor Avenue, and one from Clavet, Saskatchewan. But the others are from Saskatoon, Langevin Crescent, Main Street East, Avenue S South, and 6th Avenue North. And I'm pleased to present these petitions on behalf of these petitioners to the Legislative Assembly.

The next petition that I have also on this same subject, Mr. Speaker, I'm presenting on behalf of petitioners from Saskatoon, but also from other communities. There's a signature here from Hepburn, Saskatchewan, from Martensville, from Vanscoy, from Blaine Lake, from 25th Street West in Saskatoon, Avenue T North in Saskatoon, Avenue R North in Saskatoon, and two that indicate that they are in Saskatoon but that is the extent of the declaration as to where these signatures come from. But I am pleased to present them with my signature for the consideration of the Legislative Assembly.

Another petition, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the same subject again. And as a member of the legislature, I'm pleased to present it on behalf of the petitioners. There are 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 signatures on this petition — most of them from Saskatoon, but there's a signature from Martensville and one from Vanscoy. And I'm pleased to present these petitions, as it is my duty to do so, to the Legislative Assembly for our consideration, and I present them to us today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Smart: — I have another petition again on the same subject; on the same subject 20 people have signed this petition. In fact some have doubled up so there's more than 20 on this petition, and they have printed their names and written their signatures. And they indicate on this petition that they come from Raymore, Saskatchewan; from Wiseton, Saskatchewan. There are some from Saskatoon, a number from Watrous again, and one from Colonsay, Saskatchewan — two actually from Colonsay. And I have signed this petition and present it to the Assembly on behalf of the petitioners for our consideration.

This petition that I have to present now is also on the same subject, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and it contains the full 20 signatures, also printed. And the people on this petition come from Watrous, Saskatchewan again, one from Simpson, Saskatchewan, but all the others are from

Watrous. And on their behalf as petitioners to the Assembly, I present this petition for our consideration today.

And I have now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a petition again on the same subject; a full petition of 20 signatures printed with their names and with their signatures and where they come from, and they indicate on this petition that they are people living in Watrous, someone from Outlook, someone from Melville, and someone from Young . . . two signatures from Young, Saskatchewan, and one from Yorkton. A full 20 petitioners who ask that their voices be heard by this Legislative Assembly and so I present this petition on their behalf.

And again a petition on the same subject, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This petition is also full — 20 names printed and signed — and an indication that they come from Watrous, Saskatchewan; Nokomis, Saskatchewan; Simpson, Saskatchewan; Young, Saskatchewan; and a number from Watrous on this petition on the same subject urging that we accept this petition to the Legislative Assembly today. And I present it on their behalf.

Turning now, Mr. Speaker, to a petition again on the same subject. This petition contains signatures from the city of Saskatoon. And I present on their behalf signatures and names from people who live on Dufferin Avenue, 6th Avenue North, 5th Avenue North, 11th Street West, and it looks like 4th Street East. I present this petition on their behalf.

On this petition, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which is on the same topic, there are three signatures. Three is the minimum number that can be presented on a petition, so I have signed this petition because there are three names. They are printed and with a signature, and they all come from the city of Saskatoon. It's on the same topic. And I present them for the consideration of this Assembly as it is my duty to do as a member of this Legislative Assembly. I do so today with pleasure.

And again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, another petition with three signatures from Spadina Crescent in Saskatoon and 5th Street East in Saskatoon. As I've said, three is the minimum on a petition, but this petition seems in order with the printed name, the written name, and the address. And so I've signed them, and I am pleased to present them on behalf of the petitioners from Saskatoon.

Another petition, Mr. Deputy Speaker, from the city of Saskatoon, again with the names printed and signed, and an indication that the petitioners on this petition on the same topic as we've been considering the petitions that I've presented already. This one comes from people living on Columbia Drive, Cumberland Avenue South, 8th Street East, Confederation Drive, 2nd Street East, and Brightsand Way in Saskatoon. And I am pleased to present this petition on behalf of the petitioners concerned about the topic we've been mentioning. I present it to the Assembly today for your consideration.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Smart: — This petition that I have to present is again on the same subject. It contains two, four, six, seven

signatures — all from Saskatoon, all printed and signed as appropriate. And I've signed them and I present them for our consideration today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the petition that I have now to present is also on the same topic. It comes from people in Saskatoon. And there's a signature here from Biggar, Saskatchewan. All on the same topic as I said. And it is my duty and pleasure as a member of the legislature to present this to the Assembly today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have another petition on the same subject. And this one also from Saskatoon, from people living on 11th Street East, Highlands Court, and 8th Street East, signed appropriately, and so I have signed it appropriately. And as it is my duty as a member of the legislature, I present this petition for our consideration today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1245)

Ms. Smart: — And finally, Mr. Speaker, another petition. This is the last one that I have to present today, but this one is on the same topic.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Smart: — It contains signatures from Hilliard Street East and Dominion Crescent in Saskatoon, and there's a name here from the community of Martensville.

And so I am pleased on behalf of those petitioners to present this petition to the Legislative Assembly, along with all the others that I presented today, for our consideration as members of the legislature. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I rise today pursuant to rule 11 to present petitions to the Assembly on behalf of the residents of Saskatchewan. And the petitioners that I have here humbly pray:

That we the undersigned support the Saskatchewan Alliance Against Tax on Reading in opposition to tax on books, magazines, and newspapers. We believe that a tax on reading is a tax on knowledge and information, and is detrimental to our society. Traditionally books, magazines, and newspapers in Canada have been exempt from sales taxes because Canadians have recognized the cultural, social, educational values of the written word. The proposed provincial tax on reading will be the only one of its kind in Canada. The Saskatchewan government's proposal to add a 7% provincial tax on top of the new 7% GST on books and periodicals will mean that readers in Saskatchewan will be among the highest taxed in the world.

And the petitioners that I have here today, they urge the Government of Saskatchewan to repeal this tax. And the petitioners on this petition, Mr. Deputy Speaker, come

from such communities as Ituna, Hubbard, and Hendon. I now lay this on the Table, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I have a number of petitioners also on this petition, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and they are also opposed to the tax on reading material. And they come . . .

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

Mr. Hopfner: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to draw a point of order in the repetitious petitions that we . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. The member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake, I'd ask him to quit interfering with the debate so that the Chair has a chance to hear what's going on.

Mr. Hopfner: — Drawing to the point of order, in regards to the privilege as me as a private member here in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, and because of that privilege . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — The member for Regina Centre now is trying to interfere with the debate, and I'd ask him to refrain from that also.

Mr. Hopfner: — Because of that privilege taken away from me as a member, Mr. Speaker, I rise here and I'd like to quote rule (9) in our handbook, Mr. Speaker, that:

No petition can be received which prays for any expenditure, grant or charge on the public revenue, whether payable out of the Consolidated Fund or out of moneys to be provided by the Assembly.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to draw upon this that because of the petitions and their pertaining to . . . what could pertain to be direct expenditures from the Consolidated Fund are out of order. I'd like to give an indication here, Mr. Speaker, and draw some points to why I believe that these funds will be directly related at one particular time to the Consolidated Fund.

I want to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that I have listened to members opposite with their prayer. And what they are saying here, Mr. Speaker, is that those particular . . . that the government is supposed to or should withdraw a Bill that pertains to the administration of government here in the province of Saskatchewan. It, Mr. Speaker, relates to the point . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Well members opposite, if they'd listen and let me make my points, I'll listen and let them make theirs. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I give you an instance of cheques that were drawn from the Consolidated Fund that have been sent out to low-income families across this province in excess of \$7 million. Mr. Speaker, those dollars are related directly to Bill 61.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. The question before the Assembly now is the presentation of petitions, not — order — not the Bill. The point of order you're making is on the presentation of petitions. I'd like the member to stay on that subject on his point of order.

Mr. Hopfner: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With that point, Mr. Speaker, the petition itself is dealing with I believe Bill 61. I guess I'm not allowed to ask you to get into the debate but could you clarify how far I could go to draw my remarks regarding this. Because the way I relate to it, Mr. Speaker, is that the prayer that they're reciting on those petitions have a direct impact on the funds of the Consolidated Fund, and it's very difficult to relate to that petition prayer if you're not allowed to give an example.

And I don't know how far I can go because I don't know when you're going to call me to order. So if you allow me the opportunity to speak, and if you'd like to call me to order, I will accept your ruling.

I think probably, when you look at the moneys that — under rule 9 here — that are given the nod for expenditure out of the Consolidated Fund, it's on rule . . . which it says in rule 11, subsection (9), it definitely has an impact on Bill 61. And that prayer there is asking the Government of Saskatchewan to withdraw Bill 61 where funds have already been withdrawn from the Consolidated Fund and given to the people of Saskatchewan.

I am under the understanding then, sir, that members of the opposition of the NDP are soliciting the Government of Saskatchewan to withdraw Bill 61 under that . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. Bill 61 is not on the debate. Your point of order is on the presentation of the petitions. And I would ask you to stay on the presentation of petitions, not the legislation.

Mr. Hopfner: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the presentation of Bill 61, the . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. The petition is what's before the . . . The point of order is on the petition.

Mr. Hopfner: — Yes, on the — I forgot the word there — on the presentation of the petition for the removal of Bill 61, sir, has a direct impact then on those funds that had been distributed through the Consolidated Fund. And by that petition, the petition is requesting that Bill . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. Bill 61 is not before the House at this time. The petitions and the presentation of the petitions is what you're making your point of order on. I ask the member for the last time to keep his comments on the point of order.

Mr. Hopfner: — Okay. The petition, the petition is to the Government of Saskatchewan about the Bill, about Bill . . . Okay, Mr. Speaker, I guess I'm not understanding what you're saying and I have that right to get an understanding from what you're saying.

I'm referring to the prayer of the petition. They are tabling petitions in this Assembly referring to Bill 61. Now I have a right to know if they are referring to Bill 61 and I have a right to know if they are referring . . . if that petition is referring to rule 11(9).

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Okay, I want to speak directly to the point of order as contained in rule 11(9) and I want to congratulate the member

opposite for the ingenuity in terms of this point of order. But I would like to . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. The member's remarks should be to the point of order directly.

Mr. Lyons: — Well thank you, Mr. Speaker, I was extending the courtesy but . . . directly on the point of order 11(9) says:

No petition can be received which prays for any expenditure, grant or charge on the public revenue, whether payable out of the Consolidated Fund or out of moneys to be provided by the Assembly.

It's my understanding, and I've listened to a great many petitions presented here to the House over the last little while, that none of the petitions pray for any expenditure, grant or charge on the public revenue. In fact it does the exact opposite. It deals with revenue that has not yet entered into the Consolidated Fund. So I would ask that the Speaker rule the member out of order, and once again I want to congratulate the member on that ingenuity for his point.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. I find the point of order not well taken. It's a petition of grievance against the proposed tax, and the petitions are in order.

And being near 1 o'clock, the House will stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday.

The Assembly adjourned at 1 p.m.