

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Presenting Petitions

Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to present this petition on behalf of several residents in and outside Regina:

To the Hon. Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan in legislature assembled:

The petition of the undersigned citizens of the province of Saskatchewan humbly sheweth:

That back pain and highly prevalent neuro-musculo-skeletal disorders are extremely costly to the Canadian economy;

that scientific evidence clearly illustrates that chiropractic treatment is the most cost-effective and efficient therapy for such disorders;

that in the face of an ever-increasing pressure to adopt expensive new forms of high technology treatment, chiropractic care has proven to be a low technology, low cost, conservative, and safe form of treatment, consistent with the true “wellness” model of health care;

that the government publicly asserts it remains committed to the basic principles of medicare, namely universality, comprehensiveness, accessibility, portability, and public administration;

that the government is acting to destroy these principles as they apply to chiropractic patients;

and that the government’s proposed restrictions on this therapy will clearly cost more both in dollars and in patient disability.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to reverse its decision to eliminate full coverage and universal access to chiropractic treatment and that your Honourable Assembly withhold consent from any government proposal to discriminate against chiropractic patients by charging them fees not assessed for any other medical treatment.

And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

And the names on this petition include people like Donald Towne from Cardinal Crescent in Regina; Phyllis Benner from Southey, Saskatchewan; Mr. Cline from Pasqua Street in Regina; Chris Curry from Cherry Bay in Regina; Mrs. Larter from Probe Street in Regina; Ella Ulrich from Krauss Street in Regina; a gentleman from box 97, Edenwold, Saskatchewan; Miss Bourassa from

Athol Street in Regina; Mr. Adams from Clermont street; and the list goes on and on, in and outside of Regina, Mr. Speaker.

I submit these names.

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also have petitions this morning from people that take issue with the way that the government has been handling the chiropractic care process, and I’ll only read the last paragraph, Mr. Speaker, in deference to time:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to reverse its decision to eliminate full coverage and universal access to chiropractic treatment and that your Honourable Assembly withhold consent from any government proposal to discriminate against chiropractic patients by charging them fees not assessed for any other medical treatment.

And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Speaker, we have people on these petitions from Weyburn, Regina, Oungre, Creelman, Beaubier, Bengough, Yellow Grass, Regina, people from all over the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, who take issue with this.

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have petitions from people this morning, people that are not happy with the government from how they’re treating the people that use chiropractors’ services. As my colleagues have read parts — the member from Estevan read the whole petition, and the member from Thunder Creek read part of it — I won’t add anything to it, Mr. Speaker. I’ll just go through some of the towns that these are coming from.

These towns that representing in this petition, Mr. Speaker, well the first . . . are Saskatoon, and then at Bradwell, Allan, and there’s Outlook. These are some from my own constituency, Mr. Speaker: from Warman, Saskatchewan. There’s some down from the southern part of the province. These are from all over the province, Mr. Speaker: Weyburn, Fillmore, Tribune, Radville, Halbrite, Ogema, Pangman, Francis. And of course, Mr. Speaker, there’s always some from Regina, from Churchill Downs. It’s my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to . . .

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to present petitions as well, signed by people across this province. The petitions I have in my hand not only include names from Regina, but from Saskatoon and Prince Albert. And the people here are as well speaking out against the action by the government regarding chiropractic services. And their prayer is:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to reverse its decision to eliminate full coverage and universal access to chiropractic treatment and that your Honourable Assembly

withhold consent from any government proposal to discriminate against chiropractic patients by charging them fees not assessed for any other medical treatment.

And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

And as I indicated, Mr. Speaker, we've had signatures here from Holbein, Big River, Duck Lake, Prince Albert, Saskatoon and a number from Regina, and in fact many from Regina and the Saskatoon area. I so submit.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, I want to present some petitions from my constituency, and I believe I'll read one paragraph that says this:

that in the face of an ever-increasing pressure to adopt expensive new forms of high technology treatment, chiropractic care has proven to be a low technology, low cost, conservative, and safe form of treatment, consistent with the true "wellness" model of health care;

And I have people here from Morse, Swift Current, Kyle, Wapella, Webb, and also from Prince Albert, Big River, Weirdale and other places from across the province. And I submit these to the Assembly.

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I as well have some petitions dealing with chiropractic care in the province:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to reverse its decision to eliminate full coverage and universal access to chiropractic treatment and that your Honourable Assembly withhold consent from any government proposal to discriminate against chiropractic patients by charging them fees not assessed for any other medical treatment.

They are from primarily the Kyle area in the Rosetown-Elrose constituency and the second one is . . . most of the signatures are in the Saskatoon-Riversdale constituency, Mr. Speaker. I present these now.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too would like to present some petitions to the Assembly concerning the same matter of chiropractic care. And I believe the important part of the petition, Mr. Speaker, other than the names on it — which are the most important — but it's that the government not be allowed:

. . . to eliminate full coverage and universal access to chiropractic treatment and that your Honourable Assembly withhold consent from any government proposal to discriminate against chiropractic patients by charging them fees not assessed for any other medical treatments.

The names on this petition, Mr. Speaker, are mainly from Saskatoon and one from Bradwell, Saskatchewan. In fact one lady on here is a Mitchell. I don't know whether or not she's related to the Minister of Justice or . . .

The Speaker: — Order. I think the member knows full well he does not comment on petitions. Just give the location where the people are from if you wish, and submit your petition.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The people on this petition are mainly from Saskatoon and a good number of them from the riding of the Premier, Riversdale, Mr. Speaker. I now present this petition.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The petitions that have been presented by my colleagues also reflect the direction of the petitions that I wish to present to the Assembly for consideration today. I think the last paragraph though has to be reiterated for the consideration of those that are going to make these decisions. And it simply says:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that the Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to reverse its decision to eliminate full coverage and universal access to chiropractic . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. I will remind members that when petitions are being presented, they are not to interfere with those petitions.

Mr. Goohsen: — I will simply pick up in the middle of the paragraph so as to finish it: And:

. . . that your Honourable Assembly withhold consent from any government proposal to discriminate against chiropractic patients by charging them fees not assessed for any other medical treatment.

I note with concern, Mr. Speaker, that these petitions are coming from all over our province, and I'll just list the towns that are on this one. They start out with Ponteix, Gull Lake, Swift Current, Vanguard, Hodgeville, Climax, Cadillac, Beechy, Wymark, Rush Lake, Morse, and Cabri.

All of the people of south-west Saskatchewan seem to be very concerned about this issue, Mr. Speaker, and I now present this petition.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Clerk: — According to order, the following petitions have been reviewed pursuant to rule 11(7) and they are hereby read and received:

of citizens of the province of Saskatchewan humbly praying that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to restore the livestock cash advance program;

of citizens of the province of Saskatchewan humbly praying that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to restore the FeedGAP program;

and of citizens of the province of Saskatchewan humbly praying that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to

reverse its decision to eliminate full coverage and universal access to chiropractic treatment.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Farm Foreclosures in Drought Regions

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday I asked a question to the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Rural Development attempted to try to answer, and he didn't. So I am going to ask the question today, Mr. Speaker. It will be to the Minister of Agriculture.

As the minister knows, this is getting down to the last days where the heavy-handed government is trying to bring the GRIP (gross revenue insurance plan) Bill to a close here. And my question will be on this line. And he knows, Mr. Speaker, that through the province we have drought areas and we have a disaster with farm foreclosures all over the province.

Will the minister, Mr. Speaker, will the minister tell this House how many foreclosures are in place and how many are currently being put in place, and specifically the Agricultural Credit Corporation? And please try to also give us the numbers that are in the drought areas of this province.

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, I think the member opposite is aware that I don't carry that information about in my head. I can certainly find it out. But I think it's important to recognize as well that the income crisis of which the member opposite speaks is one that is based in fact on the farm program initiatives of the government previous and the federal government in Ottawa.

And I think it is exactly for those reasons that we have been pursuing with the federal government alternatives for support to farmers that is clearly inadequate, from the results that you yourself are referring to.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture should be ashamed of himself because he should carry those figures in his head at all times if he really cared about farmers.

Mr. Speaker, this 1992 GRIP program is an absolute disaster. When crop insurance came out in 1962, crop insurance was to cover farmers with a low cash flow and for drought areas. Now what's happening, the 1992 GRIP is for the farmers that have good crops. And there's nothing in place for additional revenue here for the people that have poor crops.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if he's even aware that there's thousands of farmers that have foreclosure notice hanging over their heads and the government is just . . . probably just waiting for this here session to conclude before it lowers . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Does the member have a question? Can the member put his question?

Mr. Muirhead: — I definitely have a question. Will the minister give the House the figures, tell us how many

farmers are in the process, and when do you plan to kick them off the land?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order, order. It's going to be a very difficult question period if this continues — on both sides.

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite has been referring to the income crisis for Saskatchewan farmers. There is no one that knows that better than I and the member opposite ought to be aware of it, from his time in government and in opposition.

The fact is that farmers in Saskatchewan have an income shortfall going back to 1990 and 1991 in excess of \$900 million that has nothing to do with any current programming initiatives, has everything to do with the time that the members opposite were in government.

The member opposite knows as well that we began immediately from the position where you had been ignoring, where the members opposite had been ignoring, the debt crisis in Saskatchewan, to begin co-operative discussions with the financial institutions through which a voluntary . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. If the opposition wish to have the question period taken up by the Speaker interrupting, that's fine with me. But I've just asked members not to interrupt and I heard two members in the opposition just constantly interrupting the minister.

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, the members opposite should have been aware that a co-operative discussion was engaged in through which the financial institutions provided a breathing space so a good discussion could take place. A very good, balanced program was the recommendation of that committee. We've prepared the legislation for that. And as soon as the members opposite stop their stalling of processes, that legislation can proceed so farmers can in fact be protected by the program they themselves have designed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Speaker, I've asked the Minister of Agriculture two questions, and he's never even come remotely close to answering the question. How many farmers are you kicking off the land, and how many foreclosures in the drought areas of this province? How many?

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite is fully aware that the provisions of the voluntary agreement and of the legislation that has been introduced in first reading in the House is legislation which in fact prevents the removal of farmers from their land and provides for them stability of tenure on their land.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think if the Minister of Agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan hasn't got a handle on the drought areas of this province and cannot tell us how many farmers are being foreclosed

upon in that area . . . should not be the Minister of Agriculture.

My question to you again: how many farmers are being foreclosed upon in the drought areas of this province?

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite delights in using oblique references to things I believe he does not understand. The member opposite is aware that in the legal process that they put in place and that they did not do anything about . . .

An Hon. Member: — How many? How many notices?

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — There is provision for notices to be sent out as the Leader of the Opposition interjects when he should ought to be listening. But the members opposite know that it is in fact the will to prevent the final action on those notices of foreclosure that cause us to provide the legislation through the joint committee that prevents farmers from being removed from the land — legislation, I might remind you, that you didn't . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. Next question.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Speaker, as you can see the minister is not answering my questions. How many farmers have had foreclosure notice in the province of Saskatchewan, and specifically in the drought areas?

The Speaker: — Order. I want to remind the member from Prince Albert Northcote — I've asked twice now — not to interrupt.

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the member opposite has now refined his question, upon instruction from the member opposite. Now he's talking about foreclosure notices.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know that number either exactly, how many foreclosure notices there are; it's a number that is readily available and I can give to you. You could phone my department probably and get it.

But the fact is, that what is significant is what have we done to maintain the stability of tenure for farmers. Mr. Speaker, the members opposite are aware that they did not have the courage to proceed with a . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. I think this is the third time I've asked the Leader of the Opposition not to interrupt. And I want to say to the Leader of the Opposition, the last time I'm warning you, not again.

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, the members opposite are aware that they did not have the courage to proceed with actions; that they did not have the will to bring together the co-operative spirit of the farmers and the financial institutions who recognize there's a crisis out there; instead of just playing with words in the legislature.

And, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite now pretend to be interested in the well-being of farmers while they hold up the legislation that is required to provide stability for our farmers in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The minister knows right well that the drought is going to add maybe thousands more of foreclosure notices to the farmers in this province. I've asked question after question and he's not really answering my question. But the last time he said that we could get it in a moment's notice. And I ask him finally, on this particular part of my questioning, will he commit that he will not come into this House again without always having those figures in his head and at his fingertips?

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite referred to the drought situation in Saskatchewan. Clearly that has been a concern in some areas. In some areas it's been alleviated by rain, continues to be a concern in some corners. There are other crop risks that are there.

Mr. Speaker, we are working with the federal government to look for avenues for address of that. And the member opposite is aware, as I have repeated twice now, that the current income crisis has everything to do with the design of farm support and protective legislation by your government. We are attempting to implement new legislation, and the members opposite need to be co-operative with us in putting that legislation forward to in fact provide the protection that the members opposite are suggesting we need.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Speaker, you can see that the minister just made a political speech and never even come close to answering me. Will he commit to bring those figures into this House and have them in his head at all times?

But, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to move on to a new question. Mr. Minister, the farmers who are about to be kicked off their land by your government at least deserve to know whether they might have been able to survive if the federal government's offer had been accepted by the province. You have broken your contract with them already in crop insurance, so surely they deserve at least this consideration.

My question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister is this: will the minister at least agree, will you at least agree to put all foreclosures on hold indefinitely until there's a final package worked out.

You yourself, Mr. Minister, said that you're working with the federal government. The door is open. So will you now put foreclosures on hold indefinitely until this package is worked out? Farmers need this breathing room before many more of them lose their land. Will you do that, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order, order.

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite asks a question, gets the answer, and somehow, whether I didn't communicate it clearly or whether he didn't listen

clearly, the fact is the member opposite is aware that the financial crisis that farmers are presently engaged in is a result of the programs put in place by the previous government. The results of the stretched-out payments on GRIP result in the fact that payments for programs farmers paid for a year ago have not yet been received, and so they are short of cash; that the third line of defence, negotiated theoretically by your members with the federal government, was not caused to be fulfilled, and we are short \$900-and-some million in income from 1990 and 1991.

That's the cause of the farm income crisis in Saskatchewan. And the member opposite knows it. And he talks . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Next question.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Speaker, new question to the minister. There's no sense going back when he hasn't answered the questions. He just makes political speeches. So I might as well just keep moving on and hoping that he'll answer one of my questions.

Mr. Minister. Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Your government has been told by the president of SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) that the province should co-operate with the federal government and get on with providing farmers, particularly in the drought area, with some money. Thousands of farmers' very existence could depend on this assistance, yet this government refuses to help them. You're refusing to help them.

This is serious, Mr. Minister. Will you get serious about my question to you? What are you going to say to the thousands of farmers that you are going to foreclose on? What are you going to say to them? Are you going to tell them it was their own fault, or are you going to tell them that it was their own fault, or are you going to tell them they just weren't worth trying to save? All you have to do is talk to the federal government.

Will you, Mr. Speaker, promise this Assembly that you'll talk to the federal government immediately about accepting that offer and working out the '92 GRIP along with this year's specific help? Will you do that, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, farmers in Saskatchewan, as a result of your policies, have a debt load in excess of \$5 billion — \$5 billion that we are attempting to address through a farm debt policy, through stability of access to their land, through legislation that the members opposite will now not allow to proceed.

The Farm Credit Corporation, directed by your friends in Ottawa, carries about 55 per cent of that debt load and are responsible for a significant number of threatened foreclosures the member opposite indicates. We have worked out a program co-operatively for the maintenance of tenure by farmers on their land.

And we intend to carry through with it because we've had

the co-operative discussion with the financial institutions of the farmers that are required, and they've committed themselves to a report that's resulted in legislation. And the member opposite ought to be co-operative with us in making sure the federal government co-operates fully with that program.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, to the minister: rural members must be telling the Minister of Agriculture to work with the federal government. They must be telling you this. All people are telling you this, and you're saying you're doing it.

Farmers don't want fighting; they want help. And they don't seem to understand that. In fact, Mr. Minister, you won't even write back to the chamber of commerce, like the Swift Current chamber when they sincerely asked you for information about GRIP.

My question: Mr. Speaker, some ministers over here must have a problem. The Minister of Agriculture must have a problem. Are you afraid that you actually might save some farmers? Is that what you're afraid of? Or do you not care? Can you tell us, do you want to save farmers or don't you, Mr. Minister? Do you want to save them or not?

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, as the member opposite says, farmers don't want to fight. They want co-operation. And I invite the members opposite to change their tune on support for the third line of defence initiatives we've called for. I call on the members opposite to support us in working with the federal government on implementing the debt legislation, and I look forward to the co-operative initiatives the member opposite is indicating.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Speaker, the minister opposite knows quite well the third line of defence, he threw it away when he threw the GRIP away. What you've been offered now, third line of defence goes evenly to farmers all over the province.

The Speaker: — Order, order. I'd just like to ask the member from Humboldt not to intervene.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Speaker, I wish this minister would get a grip on things. What are you telling us now? That thousands of farmers and their families don't count? Because that's what you're telling us. You're telling them that they will be sacrificed so you can have a political fight with Ottawa. That's actually what you're doing, is having a political fight with Ottawa.

My question now, Mr. Speaker, will be to the Deputy Premier. Does the Deputy Premier, who once made . . . sorry, Mr. Speaker. Does the Deputy Premier support his minister's treatment of thousands of farmers? Do you, Mr. Deputy Premier, also believe these farmers can be sacrificed over a battle with your government and Ottawa? Do you believe that . . .

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, there is no one in

Saskatchewan who wants a political fight less than I do here. The member opposite is aware that we followed the procedures of the Act laid out in past last year by your government in reviewing the program. The member opposite is aware that those . . . that we discussed those measures with the federal government and the games then started to be played.

The member opposite is aware that the farmers . . . that we have implemented the program around the noise you've created. And the member opposite is aware that the provisions of the new program are the correct ones, that we are sincere about support of farmers because we have redesigned our farm debt policy, which was inadequate in your government, and we've redesigned it co-operatively.

We've put in place a stress line so farmers who are experiencing these serious income shortfalls as a result of your policies have somebody to talk to when they're in crisis, and we continue . . . we offer to continue to work with the farmers and invite you to join us in that effort.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Speaker, my last question, and it's to the Deputy Premier and I'd ask him to please answer the question. Do you support your minister and your ministers in the treatment of thousands of farmers? Do you, Mr. Premier, believe that these farmers can be sacrificed as you do battle in Ottawa?

And if you cannot answer this question, please don't let the minister because I don't want to hear from him no more. Either you or not from him.

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, on behalf . . . Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Deputy Premier, I want to say that I believe he does support the measures. This government is a government that operates through legitimate processes, a claim that the previous government could not claim to make considering the disruptive kind of distracted way in which things were done; where announcements were made without consideration by anyone, on the spur of the moment when the spirit struck, that resulted in contracts and obligations that have destroyed the economic credibility of the province and destroyed the credibility, not only with financial institutions across the world but with your own partners in Ottawa.

We do do things by legitimate process and joint consensus and full discussion, and there is agreement by all of us about the things we do.

Provincial Funding for Agriculture

Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Last night when we were talking with the Minister of Finance, he confirmed that you have cut your agricultural budget from about \$315 million down to about \$265 million, or a 45 to \$50 million cut.

On top of that we see the fact that you've cut the Crop Insurance budget down from 198 million down to 181

million. So you have been saying because of the deficit, you are cutting your expenditures in Agriculture for farmers and cutting the expenditures in Crop Insurance.

Now, Mr. Minister, my question is this. You write farmers, in the light of those cuts in your budgets, and you say this: the province in spite of it's limited financial capacity, has taken on a dramatically increased role in providing income support to farmers. That's not true, Mr. Minister. That's not true. Your own . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. This is the second warning to the member from Humboldt. It's a second warning. Leader of the Opposition . . . I wish the Leader of the Opposition would put his question.

Mr. Devine: — I ask the minister, in light of the fact that your colleague, the Minister of Finance, admits that he's cut the agricultural budget by 45 to \$50 million and admits the Crop Insurance budget is down, and obviously . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I've asked the Leader of the Opposition to put his question. You've had over a minute. I ask the leader to put his question.

Mr. Devine: — Is your statement that you're providing increased financial assistance to farmers not absolutely false in the light of the evidence presented by the Minister of Finance yesterday?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, the opening statement of the member opposite is inaccurate. It's absolutely not true. With respect to the provisions of our budget this year, the member opposite is aware that many adjustments had to be made in the provincial budget — not because we enjoy the struggles of budget reductions, but because in order to provide stability and the ability to provide stability in the future, we have to have a provincial budget and a provincial budgeting process that can be sustained.

The member opposite is aware that we are at the edge of a debt crisis in Saskatchewan that puts at risk all of our programs. What is true, Mr. Speaker, is that the budget of Saskatchewan Agriculture continues to put forward 80 per cent of its dollars for farm support measures, and we need to maintain the stability of the province so that it can continue to provide that support for farmers and people in all other areas of the province through other programs. And there is no capacity to be spending money in a way that puts the province at risk.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Notice of Closure Motion

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. Last night your House Leader took an unprecedented action and gave notice of closure on an issue that had been debated for less than one day. Do you have knowledge of the shortest length of debates before using closure in the entire Commonwealth?

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to the members opposite and to the public and to the press that we've now had the House held up on the GRIP issue for 51 calendar days. It's unprecedented in the Assembly. I want to say as well that the budget for the province of Saskatchewan . . . There hasn't been a budget for close to two years. The fact that the former premier ran away from the House months before the election and didn't pass his budget.

They're now holding up the passage of this budget to where we haven't touched 25 estimates at least, haven't even touched them, and we're now 55 days into the session.

And what I'm saying to the members opposite, they have the rules of the Assembly that they can use to delay. We have rules that we can use in order to pass budgets. We haven't had a budget for two years. And the people are telling us it's high time to get on with the business of the . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order.

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker, I've listened to the answer presented by the House Leader. And certainly as I indicated, and my question was: has the government or the Premier ever been aware of closure being used anywhere in the Commonwealth on such short notice, on such short debate. And then the House Leader would indicate that we've had long-ranging debate and we have a number of issues to cover. And I would suggest to the House that many items of business in this Assembly have not been brought forward for us to discuss. It's been very difficult.

Mr. Speaker, it is unprecedented to have a closure motion passed at this time and allow this House to operate. And we find it very difficult for this House to work. I therefore move the House adjourn.

The Speaker: — Order.

The division bells rang from 10:39 a.m. until 10:49 a.m.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 6

Devine	Martens
Muirhead	Toth
Boyd	Goohsen

Nays — 28

Van Mulligen	Lautermilch
Thompson	Murray
Wiens	Hamilton
Simard	Johnson
Tchorzewski	Trew
Lingenfelter	Serby
Shillington	Scott
Koskie	McPherson
Goulet	Wormsbecker
Kowalsky	Stanger

Penner	Harper
Upshall	Keeping
Lyons	Kluz
Pringle	Renaud

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Farewell to Dale Eisler

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of this Assembly to discuss briefly a matter which is of little or no consequence to the people of Saskatchewan but something which should be said anyway.

Mr. Speaker, on August 31, 1908, the Montreal firm of Peter Lyall and Sons began construction of this Legislative Building. The next day, Dale Eisler was on the scene, writing a column about the NDP (New Democratic Party) and wealth creation. And now, 84 years later, this building still stands as beautiful as it ever was. Mr. Eisler, however, turns out to be less solidly rooted.

This will be the last day for at least a year that this Assembly will be graced with Mr. Eisler's presence, as he heads to the University of Toronto to study under a Southam's fellowship. Dale will be studying political economics at the University of Toronto. I firmly believe that Dale can fill all his gaps on understanding political economy in a one-year period.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Of course I also believe we're getting the province's debt under control. For many years — some would say too many years — an Eisler column has been a mainstay of the Saskatchewan political scene. There are also some of us, Mr. Speaker, who can remember when an Eisler column could be found on the sports page. It wasn't any more lucid, but it was certainly more relevant.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — But Dale decided to leave the world of sports reporting for political reporting. When you consider that the sports page in the jargon of journalists is called the toy department, and the Legislative Assembly is known as the play-pen, it's easy to see Mr. Eisler is regressing — which would explain why anyone would choose to leave Regina for Toronto.

Mr. Speaker, in the years to come history will judge the successes and the failures of the current government. But one accomplishment which nobody will be able to take from us is that we are the ones who finally drove Dale Eisler out.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I assure you that this government will not be reversing that action. We must remember however that Dale has left this province a

lasting legacy. Anyone who has read his columns over the past 15 or 30 years will know that we have absolute proof of the old saying that there is nothing new under the sun.

When Dale leaves here, he will be taking not only our best wishes but also the best income of any journalist this province has ever seen. And as a Minister of Finance, I will miss that income, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close on a very serious note, and that is by wishing Dale and his wife all the best in their sojourn in Toronto and by wishing him success in his academic pursuits.

I would have had this statement embossed, Mr. Speaker, but due to fiscal restraints I thought that that would be imprudent. So I will have to present this, if a page will come and do so, to Mr. Eisler, as it is. Thank you.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to join with the Minister of Finance in wishing Dale Eisler the very best. Obviously one of Dale's last columns in the province of Saskatchewan had as the headline, "Tory Opposition Doing Well." And apparently Mr. Eisler has finally come of age after his years and years of political writing.

Dale has been not only a provincial journalist but a national journalist, and has written in columns across the country, for **Maclean's** and for other magazines. And he has a rural editorial as well as urban, and people really enjoy the fact that he has expressed, with his considerable experience, something about Saskatchewan life — politics in Saskatchewan. And politics in our province is the blood sport. And moving from sports to politics had sort of a connection for Dale and I think he found it extremely interesting.

And as a result of his reward and . . . his scholarship to study political economy and to get into economics, and from my own background and some of the debates that we've been in, I think that he'll find it very interesting to study a little bit of economics and political economy.

I know that he has in this province ripped all political parties, and letters to the editors have all ripped Mr. Eisler. And I think that's a sign of somebody who has looked in a fair fashion at political life in the province and given beefs and bouquets when in fact they were deserved.

Dale will be going to the University of Toronto. We do appreciate the fact that he has added significantly to the assessment of political life in the province of Saskatchewan. We wish he and his wife and family the very best, and hopefully they'll return to the province of Saskatchewan. Good luck!

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ROYAL ASSENT

At 10:59 a.m. Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor entered the Chamber, took her seat upon the throne, and gave Royal Assent to the following Bills:

- Bill No. 13 — An Act to amend The Adoption Act
- Bill No. 14 — An Act to amend The Child and Family Services Act
- Bill No. 28 — An Act to amend The Revenue and Financial Services Act
- Bill No. 19 — An Act to amend The Contributory Negligence Act
- Bill No. 23 — An Act to amend The Summary Offences Procedure Act, 1990
- Bill No. 24 — An Act to amend The Queen's Printer Act
- Bill No. 25 — An Act to amend The Real Estate Brokers Act, 1987
- Bill No. 33 — An Act to amend The Land Titles Act
- Bill No. 34 — An Act to amend The Mentally Disordered Persons Act
- Bill No. 52 — An Act to amend The Senior Citizens' Heritage Program Act
- Bill No. 38 — An Act to amend The Pest Control Products (Saskatchewan) Act
- Bill No. 39 — An Act to amend The Pest Control Act and to enact a consequential amendment related to the enactment of this Act
- Bill No. 01 — An Act to provide for the incorporation of Ukrainian Catholic Parishes within Saskatchewan
- Bill No. 02 — An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Regina Agricultural and Industrial Exhibition Association, Limited
- Bill No. 03 — An Act to amend An Act to amend and consolidate An Act respecting Saskatchewan Co-operative Credit Society Limited and Saskatchewan Co-operative Financial Services Limited
- Bill No. 49 — An Act to amend The Mortgage Protection Act
- Bill No. 50 — An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act
- Bill No. 10 — An Act to amend The Crown Minerals Act and to make consequential amendments to certain other Acts resulting from the enactment of this Act
- Bill No. 35 — An Act respecting the Production, Supply, Distribution and Sale of Milk
- Bill No. 37 — An Act to amend The Automobile Accident Insurance Act
- Bill No. 32 — An Act to amend The Public Trustee Act
- Bill No. 42 — An Act to amend The Consumer Products Warranties Act
- Bill No. 7 — An Act to amend The Assessment Management Agency Act
- Bill No. 1 — An Act to amend The Clean Air Act
- Bill No. 2 — An Act to amend The Ozone-depleting Substances Control Act
- Bill No. 61 — An Act to amend The Residential Tenancies Act
- Bill No. 65 — An Act to amend The Homesteads Act, 1989

Her Honour: — In her Majesty's name I assent to these Bills.

Her Honour retired from the Chamber at 11:03 a.m.

BEFORE ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With leave of the Assembly, I'd like to have leave pertaining to a private members' Bill.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, on the issue, if we could have a brief outline of what the Bill is? We just don't know what we're giving leave to.

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite. This is a private members' Bill that came in from the bible school at Caronport asking for a name change. The town of Briercrest opposed this here name change because it had the name Briercrest in the name of the Caronport Bible School and also is called Briercrest School at Briercrest.

So with discussions with the member from Thunder Creek and myself, we've been able to get them to drop this Bill. So it's just to get the Bill dropped. I want to say a couple of things about that.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — For the record, it's to delete a Bill, not to introduce one. It's not clear, but my understanding is to delete a Bill.

Leave granted.

Mr. Muirhead: — Moved by myself and seconded by the member from Thunder Creek:

That the order for the referral of Bill 04, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Briercrest Bible College to the Standing Committee of Private Members' Bills be discharged and the Bill withdrawn.

And with your permission I'd just like to give an explanation.

Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to put it on the record how co-operation can work. We had a little dispute between the Caronport Bible College and the town of Briercrest, where a request came to the member from Thunder Creek that Briercrest town did not want their name, Briercrest, because it was a mix up in the two schools. There would be people going to Caronport thinking they were going to Briercrest School and vice versa going to the town of Briercrest.

And so this was getting to be just a little dissension, and when it came to the member of Thunder Creek and myself — because I'm a member of the board from Caronport Bible School — we discussed it with the people from Briercrest. I had many letters from Briercrest. I discussed it with a Mr. John Barkman; he's the president of Caronport Bible School, and he said he didn't want any problems, any bad feelings, so he would for this time have the Bill deleted . . . or pulled from the records.

Motion agreed to.

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, as it relates to the question put by members, question 48, I'm pleased to provide the answer to the Assembly at this time.

Vote to be Taken on First Reading of Bill

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate that at the conclusion of my remarks I intend to make a motion:

That, immediately following the adoption of this motion, the Assembly shall proceed with the vote on first reading of a Bill respecting amendments to Certain Farm Income Insurance Legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in the spring of 1991 the members opposite, in anticipation of an election, introduced a carelessly designed, thrown-together farm support program which did not meet the needs of farmers and which the taxpayers of Saskatchewan could not afford. Farmers expressed their serious concerns with the program through large rallies across the province, ending with 7,000 people gathering in Regina.

After the election we established the review process provided for in the Act which had been passed last year. The committee, consisting of farmers and representing farmers through the organizations who approved their appointments, delivered their report within the time frame provided in the Act passed last year. The program was announced and implemented and farmers have made their decisions on participation, and have based their farming decisions on the knowledge that the program would be implemented as described.

We have attempted to introduce this Bill into the . . . we did attempt to introduce this Bill into the legislature on June 10. The members opposite, while crying for more consultation, have denied legitimate debate on the program for the last 51 days on the pretence of caring for and about farmers. They have been playing politics on behalf of themselves and their federal cohorts.

The time for playing politics has ended. It's time to get on with working with farmers and for farmers in adapting and strengthening this important industry to the meet the changing needs of the '90s.

Mr. Speaker, I now move, seconded by the member from Canora:

That immediately following the adoption of this motion, the Assembly shall proceed with the vote on first reading of a Bill respecting amendments to Certain Farm Income Insurance Legislation.

I so move.

Mr. Martens: — Today, Mr. Speaker, begins the debate on a very, very historical motion and Bill.

It will be the first time, Mr. Speaker, that this Legislative Assembly will be asked to do something that will change evidence in a court of law before the province of Saskatchewan. And I think, Mr. Speaker, this historical debate has some significance. And I was going to make this observation about Dale Eisler's leaving, and it has some historical significance — a competitive political

analyst in a journalistic fashion would leave on a day that this historical debate begins.

And I want to point out there is significant difference between historical debates that have taken place in this Assembly on issues that related to philosophical differences between individuals, their philosophy in relation to politics, their philosophy in relation to economics, and their philosophy in relation to social justice and related items.

This today, Mr. Speaker, is a historic event. We will put into place in this Assembly an issue that I can't describe, in short a three-letter word, but it will make this Assembly do things in a legal fashion that I think are unethical, I think they're illegal, and I think they're immoral for the actions that are being taken by the Minister of Agriculture.

And therefore on this debate I want to bring to the attention of this Assembly some of the items that need to be thought about in relation to the process and the agenda that this government has placed itself in.

We have today just witnessed a time when Her Honour came in here and gave Royal Assent to, I would say, 15 to 25 Bills, indicating that this House has been working. It's disagreed, but it's been working. And, Mr. Speaker, that has been in spite of the insistence of the House Leader of the government to deal with issues that have upset us, that have been irregular to say the least.

It has been upset in a very serious way by a whole lot of changes that have been made to rules in this Assembly. And I want to point out to this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that that is also unprecedented — where this Assembly takes the opportunity with the massive majority on the part of the government to unilaterally change the rules, and I would say specifically to deal with an action that is not legal.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is a challenge on democracy. It's a challenge by this Assembly on democracy. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that as we go through this debate we will reiterate over and over the value that this Assembly is and the freedom to discuss being curtailed, whether it is directly in this Assembly or it is with our constituents in the constituencies that we serve.

So I say to the members of the Assembly that this is a historical debate. History is going to show that this Minister of Agriculture knowingly and deliberately made the decision to do what he is going to do in the introduction of this Bill. And I say he's going to jeopardize his own conscience in relation to this by the action he's taking.

There have been times when I have adamantly disagreed with the NDP party; there are times when I've agreed. But at this point in time, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that I've ever disagreed with actions taken as much as I do today. And the reason is because of this historical action taken by the Minister of Agriculture.

What I cannot understand is how the Minister of Justice, who is sworn as well as the Minister of Agriculture to honour Her Majesty and uphold the law, will take away

evidence in a court of law that if he as an individual would do that would have serious, serious implications in relation to the conduct that he would have. And that, Mr. Speaker, is the way the law works; however in this case, it is not the way it's going to be.

(1115)

The minister is going to deem to have done things that he never did. The minister is going to deem actions that he never did. He is going to say that history will record a pattern of events that took place in a process of time from the 1st of January this year. And systematically, day after day, history will show that certain events occurred.

And this minister, Mr. Speaker, in this Assembly is going to change all that, rearrange the days. And I only know of one person in history that ever changed or stopped time, but this minister is going to rearrange time by 15 or 20 days. And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what we're talking about in this kind of historical debate. And, Mr. Speaker, I find this very, very disturbing.

I came to this Assembly with a certain degree of awe and had a certain dignity to the individuals who represented the various parts of the province in this Assembly because they had been selected and chosen by the people from their constituencies. And what I have found here today, Mr. Speaker, is a slight . . . a very, very significant, pointed, deliberate change in that pattern.

And I'm going to say to all the members of the Assembly that if you have the courage to vote yes on this subject all the way through the system, you are in fact accomplices to this change in history in providing legal documents to a court of law that are going to change the historical events that occurred in that period of time. And that, Mr. Speaker, is very, very serious. In my mind it has significant impact, and I'm going to talk about that, Mr. Speaker.

This has a dynamic within this Assembly. It has a dynamic outside of this Assembly, and it has a dynamic in the court of law. It will make precedent to establish a law to change the order of events that occurred. History will be rewritten to define for the Minister of Agriculture that certain things happened. And in a court of law, Mr. Speaker, where facts are supposed to be facts and decisions are supposed to be based on fact, we will have those facts altered.

The court of law is here and the Minister of Justice is in this Assembly to protect truth, to protect individuals, to protect the innocent. And I say, Mr. Speaker, this court of law . . . or this court in this Assembly is going to tell the Minister of Justice and justice officials across the province and across Canada that they don't have to tell the truth. And, Mr. Speaker, that's perjury — that's perjury in the most serious sense of the word.

Mr. Speaker, there would be ample evidence provided by this minister if he would have done it right. He could have taken the opportunity to say, what are the time lines in all of this that I have to meet? And yet he neglected to do it. And now in order to correct that focus, we are finding out that he's going to change the historical events that occurred, and specifically the March 15 date line that he neglected.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is why this is a historical debate. We can talk about potash. One way or another people can have differences of opinion. We can talk about SaskEnergy and people can have differences of opinion, Mr. Speaker. We can talk about health care issues; we can talk about senior citizens and have different points of view.

But when we come down to this one, Mr. Speaker, this is historical because in this Assembly all of us are going to vote to change the order of events that occurred, and change it back so that history will say it didn't happen — or it did happen.

And I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I go through the details of the individuals who were on the committee that provided the introduction of the safety net program to the Minister of Agriculture, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Agriculture would tell them that they would be aligned with not telling the truth to a court of law, whether the Minister of Agriculture would get them to agree to signing the changes to the GRIP Bill.

Mr. Speaker, that's where we're at. And that's what this discussion is about. Would Barry Senft from the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, vice-president of the Sask Wheat Pool and the chairman of that committee say to this minister, you, sir, have my complete support in dealing with moving that historical . . . history in the making back to the 15th and rewriting that history?

Would he say that? Would he say to his deputy minister, who I know to be a very respectable person, his deputy minister, who I know to be a credible individual . . . he said in point 5 in a submission to the justice that he wrote:

I am aware and do verily believe, having been advised by the Hon. Mr. Wiens, that in addition, he intends to introduce legislative amendments in the current session of the legislature. These amendments will include a provision in which notice of the '92 changes will be deemed to have been given to producers by March 15, 1992 as required in their individual contracts.

Mr. Speaker, it will be deemed to have been done. I have a letter here sent out by the Minister of Agriculture. And let's move this deeming a little further down the road. And I would say that, Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Committee of Finance on interim supply we saw where the Department of Agriculture is being cut back \$47 million. Rural Development is being cut back, Crop Insurance is being cut back, Transportation is being pulled back.

All of this, and then the minister, with his deeming action, can have the clear opportunity to present the evidence as facts for the people of the province of Saskatchewan in a letter he sent to the farmers. And, Mr. Speaker, he didn't tell the truth there either.

And so he says to the province, the people of rural Saskatchewan:

The province, in spite of its limited financial capacity, has taken on a dramatically increased

role in providing income support to farmers.

That, Mr. Speaker, is another one of his deeming actions. He deems to have thought that he put more money in the budget to supply more benefits to farmers. He deems to have his actions being supported by rural Saskatchewan. He deems to have all of this action take place. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what we have this Minister of Agriculture doing.

It's a historical debate on that basis, Mr. Speaker, because we have had significant interference by this Assembly in the democratic role of procedure and involvement. We have had unprecedented in this Assembly, interference in many respects in our capacity to have the public become aware of this onerous legislation. And we feel that, Mr. Speaker, is also a part of this historical aspect of this Bill. And, Mr. Speaker, we are very, very serious about why the minister would do it.

Mr. Speaker, we have Roy Piper from Elrose, vice-president of United Grain Growers. Would he take the opportunity to stand behind this minister in a court of law, swear that the events that he's going to say in this Assembly are going to be deemed to have happened? Would Mr. Roy Piper from Elrose do that? And I would suggest to this minister that that is an honourable man. And he would not do that.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is what this issue is all about. Would an individual perjure himself to honour the Minister of Agriculture with his vote of approval? And that, Mr. Speaker, is what we're talking about in this historical debate.

Mr. Speaker, Jack Stabler from the University of Saskatchewan, would he stand in his place in a court of law when the judge says: Mr. Stabler, are you prepared to swear, like the Minister of Agriculture did, on the basis of his hand on the Bible, and say to Her Honour and this Assembly that he would honour her and uphold the law? And I would suggest to this Assembly, no he would not.

But you're asking, Mr. Minister, every one of these people to perjure themselves as well as everyone in this Assembly to perjure themselves in relation to this Bill to deal with it and get it off the record. And that is, Mr. Speaker, why this is a historical debate.

Mr. Speaker, Brett Meinert from Shaunavon stood in the Shaunavon Arena. When the member from Canora stood up to say a few words, 1,200 people in that arena and Brett Meinert was choked up. He said: if anybody wants to talk to me about why the changes were made, you come and see me.

When the member from Canora and the minister of Crop Insurance spoke, 400 of those people told everybody exactly what they thought — they walked out. They don't want to be a part of saying in a court of law: you have the authority to change the events that happen, that change the opportunity for justice and truth to prevail in the province of Saskatchewan in a court of law.

And, Mr. Speaker, Brett Meinert would have a whole lot of difficulty standing in a court of law and saying, when

the judge asks him after he's sworn on the Bible, saying: Mr. Meinert, have you on the basis of the sequence of events, are they as portrayed by the Minister of Agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan? And I doubt whether he would say yes.

He would not perjure himself or his reputation to do that. But what you are doing, sir, is you're asking members of this Assembly to do exactly that. And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly the truth.

And then I want to talk a little bit about Sinc Harrison. I want to talk about him because he told you, sir, that he was not in favour of doing what you're doing. He wrote a letter to you on February 10, I believe it was, and another one on the 16th or . . . in February anyway. He told you that SARM, as outlined by the options that were presented in the GRIP review panel's recommendations, that they were not in favour. They had five legitimate points that they were not going to be involved with, and they told you that. You didn't acknowledge that in any way, shape, or form, Mr. Minister. You didn't.

In fact he stood in the Agridome and read that letter to you so that people would clearly understand that SARM and people in the rural municipalities — representing rural municipalities — would not stand in a court of law and say yes, Mr. Minister, the change of events that occurred were as you described them and not as they really happened. And, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harrison would not do that.

(1130)

An Hon. Member: — They won't lie for you.

Mr. Martens: — And, Mr. Speaker, that is . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I would like to ask the Leader of the Opposition to please withdraw those words of saying that they would not lie for him. He knows that's unparliamentary, even from your chair. You cannot do from your chair what you can't do when you speak. So I ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw those words.

Mr. Devine: — I withdraw, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harrison would not do that. Mr. Speaker, he could go to jail for perjury — serious, serious criminal offence. And we in this Assembly are going to be talking about that. And I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that no one, absolutely no one, will have the courage to stand up and defend that except with a little word — yes — when this minister has the Bill brought before this Assembly. And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly why this is a historical debate.

Gordon Cresswell from Tisdale is now beginning to have second doubts about whether he should have supported it in the first place. And you know why? Because, Mr. Minister, all of the things that we have talked about in the province of Saskatchewan, when I went around this province and held meetings for close to 60 days with seven ministers of the government meeting 40 to 50,000 farmers, the incidence of this being said over and over

again was that when drought occurs, this will be the first time — the first time, Mr. Speaker — that we will have 100 per cent coverage on our average production, which we have never ever had before. And Mr. Cresswell today is beginning to find out what no rain can do in the Tisdale area of the province of Saskatchewan.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what I said at ministerial conferences across this country and what I said in this province, across this province, a little over a year ago.

And, Mr. Speaker, I believe that what you are asking individuals in this Assembly to do — as you are going to ask Mr. Cresswell to do — is perjure themselves when they go to that court of law and say did you recommend that the minister back date, change history, and deliver this mandate. Would these people stand up and say, Mr. Minister, you're right? Or would they say, Mr. Minister, you're wrong?

And I believe, Mr. Minister, they would say unequivocally you're wrong. I will not perjure myself as you are, sir, in delivering this Bill to this Assembly, breaking contracts to 50,000 contract holders in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, Leonard Kehrig from Bjorkdale, a very honourable person — I know him personally — wouldn't do this, wouldn't stand in a court of law and do that.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what I'm talking about, over and over again, reiterate that people in the province of Saskatchewan have been told that you have a contract, and therefore I can agree to that and I will hold myself to that.

I want to bring up an important point, Mr. Speaker — the contrast to this. What would this minister have done if he would have believed the facts as presented by history were accurate and were in his best interests? Would he have said to every one of the 50,000 contract holders in the province of Saskatchewan that you're wrong, if they would have broken the contract?

Would he have taken them to court to get every nickel, every cent, out of every contract, out of every farmer? Mr. Speaker, he would have had a legal right to do that. But did he in this instance, Mr. Speaker, have that legal right to do this? No, he did not.

Mr. Speaker, that is the reason why the options that we're discussing here today are historical. Because, Mr. Speaker, this member is doing something I believe that is absolutely against every action of a member of this Assembly, and the conduct that he is raising here today and what he's going to do is against every moral, legal, binding, ethical process that would enable him to deal with on a regular basis. And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly why this is a historical debate.

We don't have legal . . . lawyers on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, but they do on the other side. And I would like to ask every one of them to seriously consider when they took their oath before the bar whether they would be prepared to perjure themselves in this Assembly as well as outside of this Assembly.

We cannot be held legally accountable for suit for what we say in this Assembly. And, Mr. Speaker, when that minister steps out of this Assembly and says, I will say that history was not as I saw it happen, that I know what happened, and I will deem to have said what I didn't say, then this member and those members opposite will have to say in a court of law: that's what we did in the Assembly, therefore it is law, and that is right.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Pedersen from Cut Knife had other reasons why he disagreed with you, sir. And you made some statements in your opening remarks, saying that '91 GRIP did not meet the needs of rural Saskatchewan. And, Mr. Speaker, the second statement you made was the province could not afford what '91 GRIP did.

Now I want to ask you this question because it's a fundamental question to the GRIP and the philosophy of the '91 GRIP and '92 GRIP, the contrast. You said it didn't meet the needs. That's clearly what Mr. Pedersen said: it doesn't meet the needs.

You campaigned, and all of the people in the province of Saskatchewan who campaigned in rural Saskatchewan said, it's got to be the cost of production or nothing else. And that's what Mr. Gil Pedersen says, the cost of production should be registered as a part of the input costs in dealing with agriculture. And people should be paid accordingly.

And, Mr. Speaker, what we have here, as presented by the Minister of Agriculture, is a paradox. He says on the one hand, it didn't meet the needs. Mr. Pedersen says exactly the same thing. And if this minister would have had the courage to tell the Minister of Agriculture what Mr. Pedersen was going for, the Minister of Finance would have had a heart attack because it would not have been '91 GRIP at \$5.15 a bushel, 70 per cent, \$4.08; it could have been 8, 7, 6, in some cases, \$11 a cultivated acre.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is the reason why Mr. Pedersen didn't agree with you. He wanted more money, not less. He wanted more money for rural Saskatchewan, not less. And, Mr. Speaker, this minister and the Minister of Finance said you cannot have this money and therefore I have to cut the program.

So on the one hand, the minister says, oh yes, it's got to be different, you got to have cost of production in it; and on the other hand, he says we can't afford it. Now are you going to breathe in or breathe out? That's the choice.

It costs money to have the province support a cost-of-production focus in agriculture. And that, Mr. Speaker, and, Mr. Minister, is exactly what we're talking about when we talk about this GRIP Bill. And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what the members opposite have said over and over again — yes, but. And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what we're talking about here today, and that's why this is an historical debate.

Nettie Wiebe from Delisle — is she going to stand up in a court of law and say, Mr. Minister, you're right? Those events that occurred said . . . The events that occurred exactly as you said they were, did occur. Not in what you

saw really happen, but they occurred in accordance with what you deemed to have happened.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly the issue. You will ask and I'm sure the court will ask, members of this committee to stand up and say, did these events occur as recorded in history? Did these events occur? And I will say, Mr. Minister, that they will have to swear that they occurred as they were. But you, sir, in this Assembly are going to say no, they did not.

We have a sworn affidavit that your deputy minister said that these amendments will include a provision in which notice of the '92 changes will be deemed to have been given to producers before March 15, 1992. And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what we're talking about.

And are these people who sat on your GRIP review committee, are these people going to endorse that? I hardly think they will. And what you have done under . . . No, I'll say that different, Mr. Speaker. In this Assembly you cannot do indirectly what you can do directly. And that's a process of discussion and actions in this Assembly.

And, Mr. Speaker, this minister is going to do indirectly what he cannot do directly. And I believe it's against the principles of this House to do that. So I've outlined to you why this is a historical debate. Because we will for the first I believe in legislative history change the order of events that occurred in dealing with this issue. I'm not struck by that. I feel, Mr. Minister, that this committee has been betrayed. I feel that they have been let down. There was an agenda in the mind of the minister that was different than the agenda that was placed before these committee members. And that's why I believe this is a historical debate.

The people in the province of Saskatchewan listened throughout October to what these people were going to do. And I have quotes from the now Premier that we can govern this province and do it on the basis . . . we don't have to have any new taxes. We can provide more health care. We can get more jobs. We can increase education funding. We can increase all of these aspects. And yet what we've had here today, Mr. Speaker, and to date, is exactly opposite to that.

(1145)

In contrast, one of the things that the Premier said as late as February this year, is he said, I don't need any more money to raise . . . I don't need to raise taxes. In fact GRIP and NISA (net income stabilization account) won't cost any more because we don't need any more money to run that program. And, Mr. Speaker, what they've done is they've cut it.

The people in the province of Saskatchewan have registered this complaint to me over and over and over again, unsolicited, Mr. Speaker. I have had calls from people across this province, and I didn't go chasing them. But I have had calls from all over this province of individuals who have very, very serious concerns.

And I want to go into that and the reason why, because it

deals with the very essence of the GRIP, gross revenue insurance plan '91 and gross revenue insurance plan '92 — the difference and the variable between them.

They've talked to me about a number of things, Mr. Speaker. One of them is, I want my farm to be insured exclusively on my farm. I don't want to pay insurance on my neighbour's farm; I want to pay insurance on my farm.

Mr. Speaker, I'll give you an example of what this is. If you took a city block in the city of Regina and said to the insurance company that was going to supply fire insurance for this whole farm . . . or for this whole city block, and you would say SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) is going to cover this insurance and the average insurance that is being carried in this city block is \$100,000, you will have 50 per cent under that and 50 per cent over that. Some will be \$150,000 in their homes — they would like to have that insurance — some will be 50.

Now farmers said they didn't want to be treated that way any more because they had been treated like that for years. We want specific to my farm, we want it specific to my crops because I believe I fundamentally can do it better than anyone else.

Now is that wrong, Mr. Speaker? If you go to these . . . the city block and say to the owners of these houses in the city block, you're all going to have \$100,000 insurance. One guy's going to get his subsidized, the other is going to get penalized. Farmers said that to me over and over and over again across this province. They've said it in many, many ways, Mr. Speaker. They said it by phoning me, they said it in the meetings we had a little over a year ago. And, Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe they have not changed their mind.

And, Mr. Speaker, this minister has come to this Assembly with a complete reversal of all of those initiatives that were outlined in '91 GRIP versus '92. He came saying that he was going to do more and is providing less. He says he is going to provide more money but in essence he's providing less. He said he's going to do things right and yet he's doing it wrong. He's going to ask a court of law to deal with this, and he is going to do it on the basis that he thinks he's doing it right.

In the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, there were a couple of things that struck me. The Premier has indicated: my government is determined to restore the fundamental principles of democracy. Now that was in the throne speech delivered by Her Honour, in view of what the executive branch of this government was going to do — restore the fundamental principles of democracy. And that, Mr. Speaker . . . What is democracy?

It's a balance between what this Assembly does, it's a balance between that in the executive branch and the Department of Justice. And why this all hangs together, Mr. Speaker, is because this Assembly is taking the opportunity — wrongfully — and will provide to the court of law statements that will not have occurred. A sequence of events that will not have occurred. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that's absolutely, totally wrong.

Is that restoring the fundamentals and the principles of democracy? No, Mr. Speaker, that is licence. Where does this deeming go? I will deem to have given producers notice by March 15.

That, Mr. Speaker, has a whole lot of significance. That means, Mr. Speaker, that this House can deem anything. It can deem that the Minister of Justice provided an opportunity for people to vote in the province of Saskatchewan. I will deem that they had the opportunity to vote. I will deem that they had an opportunity for fair and honest assessment before a court of law. I will deem that they did, when they didn't. And this Assembly, on the process of that, will have that opportunity at any time to say that to the people of Saskatchewan.

And, Mr. Speaker, I think they're wrong. And that's why I say they are legally, morally, ethically wrong in what they're doing.

Now I wouldn't have had this substantive argument if the Minister of Agriculture had done it right. I wouldn't have had it. I could have disagreed on the basis of a philosophy. He believes that '92 is better than '91. We could have debated that, Mr. Speaker. But on this basis that we are being asked in this Assembly to provide changes to things that happened in a court of law in the province of Saskatchewan, I believe are absolutely totally wrong.

The Premier said he is going to establish principles for democracy in this session. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have had principles of democracy established, very, very stringent and unusual. We have had a Rules Committee that made unilateral changes in this Assembly — unilateral, Mr. Speaker. And it happened not once, Mr. Speaker; it happened at least three times.

This Assembly made changes unilaterally on the basis of a majority in the Rules Committee when that, Mr. Speaker, has not been done before. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that's wrong. I think it was wrong right from the very beginning.

And as these members across the way when they were in opposition said over and over again, and we have a variety of those kinds of speeches that they gave, that said the constitutional right of an individual to uphold democracy is there in my being able to speak to issues, but also be able to register my complaint, to have democracy speak from rural and urban Saskatchewan, from outside of this Assembly to the members of this Assembly.

And that, Mr. Speaker, has been curtailed by this Assembly, and I believe only and specifically to deal with the rules so that people in this Assembly could choose to vote to perjure themselves in a court of law. Mr. Speaker, they are going to deem items to have happened that didn't. And I say that that's wrong.

Legislation would be brought into place to have elections every six months . . . or every six months after a vacancy. Fine. That's already a law. No problem with that.

Second initiative will provide for the legislative and public consideration of the ward system in municipal

election. We've done that. Additional democratic reforms will be introduced in the spring session after public consultation.

Now what did the Premier have in mind? Did he have in mind that the opportunity for the bells to be struck from an opportunity to bring members to this Assembly? For opportunity for people in the province of Saskatchewan to recognize that the executive branch of government was overstepping their limit? That, Mr. Speaker, was provided on the basis of precedent; precedent was established to provide that opportunity.

It wasn't established by me. I didn't put it in. It was established by the historical events that have occurred in the passage of various kinds of legislation — very, very tough legislation.

Why have other jurisdictions done away with it, and what have they provided as an alternative? Mr. Speaker, in Ontario, after serious problems with their . . .

The Speaker: — Order. I hope the member can relate some of that to the Bill, as to why the motion before the Assembly is: that immediately after the adoption of the motion, the Assembly shall proceed with the vote on first reading of a Bill respecting amendments to Certain Farm Income Insurance Legislation. I fail to see how his argument of detailed changes to the Rules Committee either here or in Ontario has anything to do with the motion that is before us. So I ask the member to get back to the motion that is before the Assembly.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, we're talking about the reform of this Assembly in a relationship to deal with the process of making this legislature run better. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that from the very, very start it has been the focus of attention because the Minister of Agriculture made a mistake, that he would have to have changes in the rules in order to have his agenda brought before this Assembly. And those rules, Mr. Speaker, were changed.

And I believe it was only, it was only there to provide an opportunity for this minister who knew that he was not doing things legally. He did not have the moral backing from the people out in rural Saskatchewan, and on the basis of his own ethics didn't have the right to do it. So he chose to suggest to the House Leader they change the rules to make it happen.

And, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this province said, oh I'm going to make them better. Better for what? Democratic reforms for what? To have democracy be eroded — the fundamentals of this Assembly eroded so that this minister could bring forward his Bill that is going to illegally do things. He's going to perjure himself before the court.

And I would like to see this minister stand in a court of law and say that events occurred that did not occur. And I want to see him say that. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that he would not be able to do that.

The Speaker: — What's the member's point of order?

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I have listened for some time now to the member opposite speak about what is and isn't in the Bill and how he assumes the minister . . . not assumes, but is accusing the minister of perjuring himself. I'm surprised that he would do that, not having seen the Bill.

I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to make a ruling as to how the member opposite can make those kind of accusations against the minister and debate the Bill — what might or might not be in the Bill — when we haven't seen the Bill. And I just think it's totally inappropriate that he would be making those kind of, I believe to be, unparliamentary accusations against the minister when he hasn't got a shred of evidence to prove that, because there's no Bill before the House. That's the point of the debate.

(1200)

Mr. Swenson: — Mr. Speaker, what the Government House Leader says is absolutely not true at all. We have affidavits that have been presented in a court of law, which I understand, Mr. Speaker, are public, open to everyone, by the deputy minister of Agriculture stipulating that the legislation will contain certain things. One of them is that this deeming will have occurred. Now that is a sworn affidavit by the deputy minister of Agriculture in this province. And I would think that this legislature would respect that court affidavit.

The member from Morse is simply referring to that affidavit as sworn in the court of law. And I think that's quite appropriate for him to discuss that matter as evidence.

The Speaker: — I have listened to the points of order, and I have listened also very carefully to what the member has said. I've having a little bit of trouble with the words that he uses, in "perjuring". And I think if he looks up the definition of perjure, he will find some difficulty exactly with it also in what he just said to the Legislative Assembly: that you can't do indirectly what you can't do directly. I think those were his words. And by using the word perjuring — that the minister is perjuring himself — I think he's getting very, very close to being unparliamentary, and I think he knows that.

But speaking to the topic, I think the member has very carefully used evidence that has been used by the deputy minister and I've allowed that. If he gets into the details of the Bill, then I will rule the debate out of order. But I think on the generalities of the Bill, I think we simply can't avoid that in this debate. But if they get to the details of the Bill, I will rule them out of order.

Before I sit down, I do want to say to the member from Morse that I think he should heed his own words about what you can't do indirectly . . . or what you can't do directly, you can't do indirectly. And I think he knows what I'm referring to.

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The role as it relates to this motion that we have before us today, deals with a number of things, and I want to point them out to you, the members of this Assembly.

That this Assembly proceed with a vote on first reading of a Bill respecting amendments to certain farm income insurance legislation. And they have been established on a number of occasions by documents that have been presented to the court.

And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that as we go through this discussion . . . and I have tried to maintain it on the basis of the principles of this Assembly and the principles of law which we make to the people of the province of Saskatchewan, and how we are viewed in relation to that. That, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what I'm trying to point out to this Assembly.

Deeming action to have occurred when it didn't has serious, serious implications in this Assembly. If that is allowed to happen on a regular basis, and I will say this as a person who has a great deal of respect for this Assembly, that you cannot do that on a consistent basis and have democracy continue. You cannot, you cannot deny access to the courts, which in essence is what you're going to be doing. You cannot deny access to the court; the executive branch of this . . . of any government cannot deny access to the court. That is a constitutional right of individuals in the province of Saskatchewan and across this country.

And I, sir, Mr. Speaker, and members of this Assembly, would be seriously, seriously remiss if we did not speak out against deeming actions to have happened that didn't. We would be remiss if we didn't say that we were irritated by it. We would be remiss if we said we weren't angered by it.

Because you know what, Mr. Speaker? People have died in the province of Saskatchewan, fighting wars for those kinds of issues. And when I spoke the very first time to the president of SARM about the actions being taken by the Minister of Agriculture and the statement made by his deputy, those are exactly the words that he told me.

Mr. Kirwan said that people have died and gone to war to defend that opportunity before a court of law. And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what we're talking about. This Bill will be in the court the minute it's introduced here.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is also evidence that has been provided in the court in Yorkton. It was provided . . . the information was provided by the president and chief executive officer of the Crop Insurance Corporation. He said in a letter to the justice that he considered . . . he was considering that one of three items that he was going to bring to the court to prove that the farmers didn't have a case. And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what this whole thing is about.

This minister is going to take this Bill and say these things didn't happen. And I say to this Assembly and to the members of this Assembly that we have serious, serious problems with this. It isn't constitutionally right, Mr. Speaker. It isn't ethically right, legally right, or morally right. The constitutional basis by which he is going to impose this is the very fundamental rights that the Premier of Saskatchewan, when he was attorney general in 1981, agreed to, to have the constitution reinforce in a court of law the opportunity to never, ever disallow anyone from

the appearance in a court. And now, Mr. Speaker, he is the head of a government, of the executive branch of government, that is going to authorize the Minister of Agriculture to change facts in a court of law.

I find that, Mr. Speaker — well I can't use the word here — very, very serious. Mr. Speaker, it is serious to the place that the people of this province need to recognize that this minister and this Premier are doing that. And I don't believe it's right. I have never believed it's right to do that.

When law does not become a requirement of a Legislative Assembly to follow that pattern, then the law and democracy is at risk. I want to show you, Mr. Speaker, how serious this risk is. I read a book by Leon Jaworski who was the prosecutor in the Nixon Watergate scandal. And in that conclusion his remarks were this:

It doesn't make any difference who the individual is in a court of law in the United States, that individual will be tried on the basis of his right, number one, and his own consequences of not following the law and the Constitution.

And, Mr. Minister, Mr. Premier, you said that in the constitutional debate in 1980-81 and into 1982. You were the attorney general at that time and you said, we will base the fundamental rights of individuals to have their day in court.

And, Mr. Speaker, the members of this Assembly, who are here to defend the rights of individuals, are going to take that right and throw it in the garbage when this Bill is passed. And that, Mr. Speaker, in my mind, is absolutely, totally wrong. We have been dealing with, Mr. Speaker, with the individual rights in a court of law, that need to be addressed. And this Minister of Agriculture is not doing that. He is not allowing that free access, uninhibited by executive branch of government.

And that's a key in this point, Mr. Speaker. In the case where Mr. Nixon was tried for Watergate, the court had ultimate authority on a president of the United States. And as a Premier and as a Prime Minister and any premier in the province of Saskatchewan or any person . . . other than that should have that same right not only protected, but also enshrined. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan did in 1982 with the placement of the constitution, where rights of individuals were respected.

And we're going to take, Mr. Speaker, the law and the court and make the executive branch of this government superior to that by deeming to have done things that did not occur. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that's wrong. I have a serious distaste for what that means.

Mr. Speaker, there's two points I want to make in relation to that and why I feel so strongly about this. One of them deals with the history of my family, Mr. Speaker, where rights of individuals were not respected. In the history of my family, we came from where the majority of people from the province of Saskatchewan came from, and that's the southern part of the Ukraine and Russia. And, Mr. Speaker, my family came as many of the people in this Assembly parents have come, from that same part of the

Soviet Union, the former Soviet Union. And why did they come to this country, Mr. Speaker? You can basically pin it down to two things. One is the right to own land or property, and the other one was the freedom of religion. And they are encased in a constitutional right of individuals to appear without encumbrances before a court of law to be heard.

To defend that, to uphold that is the responsibility of this Assembly. And, Mr. Speaker, this Minister of Agriculture is going to deem before a court of law that history was not as it happened but as how he says it happened. And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly why we feel so strongly about this.

The second reason I want to point out to the members of this Assembly and why I feel so strongly about this, is that people from across this country were seriously threatened when people decided to take it in their own hands that they knew better than the court. They knew better than the constitutional right given to individuals, and we had serious encroachment on that during the Second World War by two individuals.

And I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, why those two individuals will stand out in history — and they're Mussolini and Hitler. And I want to point out to this Assembly that they were wrong.

And the reason I want to point out is simply this. I have a gentleman in the town of Morse; his name is Heinz Zilch. And he drove — Mr. Speaker, he told me this — he drove many of the commanders in the German army around during the Second World War. And he said, why did I do it? Why did I do it? He said, I'll tell you why — because, he said, I saw my friends suspended from the power poles for days on end. He said, I did it because I was afraid for my life. That's why.

Because someone had decided that he had more authority than the court; he had more authority than the Assembly. And the executive branch of this government is saying that to us today — we have more authority than the court. And I say no, sir. You should not ever have this Assembly have more authority than the court. Equal to the court, but never above.

(1215)

Mr. Speaker, the Premier, who was the minister of Justice and the attorney general at the time, said I want individual rights enshrined so that people can have their day in court. And, Mr. Speaker, what we've had and what we've seen here today is evidence that it will not happen.

Those two things, Mr. Speaker, stand out in my mind, and why I have a serious problem with how and what this government is doing in relation to this.

And we could stand here and talk about the differences between '91 and '92 GRIP and we could stand here and debate that a long time. The government would win and I would lose, but the farmers would lose too. However that's not what we're talking about here. We're talking about the availability of this Assembly and the capacity of this executive branch of government to pass a law saying things happened when they didn't. And that, Mr. Speaker,

is why I have a problem with this legislation.

And, Mr. Speaker, farmers from across this province have phoned me over and over again and said, I don't want to have this. Mr. Speaker, five of them decided to take this government to court. And when the judge ruled whether they had a prima facie case to place this before the court, she said yes they do — they do have a case.

And you know the interesting thing, Mr. Speaker? The government didn't put up a defence, because you know what? They didn't have one. They didn't have one until the deputy minister of Agriculture, under the instruction of the Minister of Agriculture and the executive branch of this government, said we will deem to have done it. And we will deem to have said what happened and sent out this information, when it didn't happen.

You know, I find this ironic. I really find this ironic. The people opposite have said that they are the defender for the little guy. They have said that they are the defender for all of those people who are pressured from society, who do not have the capacity to stand on their own. They said that over and over and over again.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, they're going to set a precedent in this Assembly that says the court will not hear the evidence as it happened. It will be as presented and laid out by this Minister of Agriculture through this Assembly. And all of you are going to have to vote for it or duck.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly why this side of the House has such a serious, serious problem. And that's why, Mr. Speaker, we had a serious problem with how the rules were changed. Because these two items are tied together as secure as the constitution and the Bill of Rights in the country of Canada. They are tied together.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly why we are against this legislation. The rules were changed to expedite the opportunity for this Minister of Agriculture to deem what he's going to do. And that is why we have such a serious problem with it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make another point dealing with this Assembly, that has significance to me. My family have worked in this building and for government for a long time. I've had members of my family who have been the engineers who worked in this building in the '50s. I wasn't in government then. I wasn't even old enough to vote. I had an uncle that was the engineer looking after this whole building. I've had aunts that worked in this government, and said, it is a legitimate right and it is a privilege to work for this government, whether it's Liberal, Conservative, or NDP. I have had family members that have worked under those conditions throughout this province, from La Ronge to Shaunavon, and all over.

And, Mr. Speaker, when I see this Minister of Agriculture stand in his place and say he is going to deem something to happen when it didn't, I have a great deal of difficulty with that, Mr. Speaker, because it flies in the face of the very roots of why my family came to this place in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, there are a whole lot of other things that I want to bring in here. And another point I want to make is that the deputy minister of Agriculture said this: I have been advised by the Minister of Agriculture and Food, the Hon. Mr. Wiens, that he has obtained the verbal agreement of the federal government and sufficient number of other provinces participating to amend the agreement and therefore to effect the changes to the '92 GRIP program.

And you know what, Mr. Speaker? The verbal agreement, as stated by Judge Hunter, said that has no value because that it not an agreement. And that, Mr. Speaker, comes from a person who knows. It comes from the court. It comes from the court. And the court is determining and is going to determine who in the long run is right.

The other thing that bothers me in this determination that the court is going to be involved, is that this minister is taking the issue and forcing people to sue. And that, Mr. Speaker, has an interesting connotation. There are 62,000 farmers in the province of Saskatchewan, according to the last census; and 50,000 contracts were there under the control of the Crop Insurance Corporation. Those 50,000 will have to sue for damages if this minister proceeds in the fashion that he's going to.

What a horrendous cost to the farmer, what a horrendous cost to this government, and what a horrendous cost to the taxpayers. And I say, Mr. Speaker, what a horrendous cost to the political life of this government.

When all is said and done, Mr. Speaker, and the judge says no, Mr. Minister, we won't allow that in a court of law, for you to change law, change events, what is the province going to do then? Will the province say to the farmers that have sued already, and said, \$27.30, I believe, an acre is what they projected their losses to be. They will say to the court, that is what you owe. And the judge will say whatever they want to. They will determine what that value is.

Mr. Speaker, in 1992 in the year under review, we have significant costs to this province if that judge finds out of order the Bill before us today. We have significant costs to this province.

And as outlined by the volume of dollars that were presented in the court as evidence, we have significant impact on the economics of this province. At \$30 a cultivated acre, Mr. Speaker, that has horrendous impact. Thirty million cultivated acres times \$30 an acre is \$900 million. And, Mr. Speaker, do you think the federal government is going to protect that investment?

Mr. Speaker, I think not. They're not bound by law to do it because they have shown over and over again that the people in the province of Saskatchewan and the Government of Saskatchewan are not acting responsibly in dealing with this issue. They will have a very, very difficult time, Mr. Speaker, selling to the people of Saskatchewan their loss of freedom in relation to this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the province of Saskatchewan were told that they were going to get a benefit of democratic reforms in this Assembly. We've had reforms,

Mr. Speaker. We've had curtailment of bells. And now we have a new reform, a deeming Bill, deeming things to happen that never happened.

Mr. Speaker, a code of ethics is going to be established in this Assembly, in this session, a code of ethics. Now doesn't that fly in the face of the Minister of Agriculture and the Premier bringing forward a Bill deeming things to have happened that didn't happen? A code of ethics. Are you going to bring that forward before you introduce this or after? Is it as a result of, or before? A code of ethics.

Mr. Speaker, a code of ethics that says: I will deem this to happen when it didn't. However, our code is going to be an establishment of a standard. Mr. Speaker, that standard — my question is — is it going to be before this Bill is dealt with or after? The code of ethics deals with a standard and where is that standard going to be in deeming events to have happened that didn't?

Oh well, Mr. Speaker, we can say, we have deemed to have sent out cheques for Social Services. We can deem to have sent out the opportunity for the province to have an election. A code of ethics established by the precedent established in this Assembly by the Minister of Agriculture deeming things to have happened that didn't. And, Mr. Speaker, I find that repulsive. That, Mr. Speaker, is absolutely totally wrong.

A code of ethics, a stringent conflict of interest guideline, a code of ethics with stringent guidelines — what does that say to me, Mr. Speaker? It says to me, Mr. Speaker, that the standard that is acceptable in the public is here and what we have this Minister of Agriculture doing is stooping right to the bottom in a stringent standard of a code of ethics. And that, Mr. Speaker, in my mind, is wrong. It has never been right.

And history will record that this Assembly during this period of time had a curtailment of the opportunity to speak; had a curtailment of an opportunity to register the complaint with the public of Saskatchewan; and will have registered that this minister flaunted the law.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier will also have to carry that. He — and this is what I find . . .

An Hon. Member: — Probably the Speaker too.

The Speaker: — Order. Order. I would ask the member from Kindersley to please withdraw those remarks stating that the Speaker also has flaunted . . . will be flaunting the law, or inferring that the Speaker also flaunted the law. I ask him to please withdraw those words.

Mr. Boyd: — I withdraw, Mr. Speaker.

(1230)

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, this statement, the statement that was made by the Lieutenant Governor in this Assembly at the beginning of this session said: my government has also initiated the development of a comprehensive code of ethics and stringent conflict of interest guidelines.

Where is the standard, Mr. Speaker? Where is the standard? Is the standard to get away with as much as I possibly can in order to deliver my political agenda in as expedient fashion as I possibly can? That is the lowest form of a standard you could ever want to have. The code of ethics — stringent, Mr. Speaker — as represented by the Minister of Agriculture and performed by the executive branch, the Premier being the head, are both bad.

And, Mr. Speaker, that is why we have a serious, serious problem. We have a contrast between what needs to be there and what is being delivered. And, Mr. Speaker, a code of ethics is a standard. It's a standard set by who? It's set by this Assembly. And there is an old, old proverb that says, more things are caught than are taught, Mr. Speaker. And what is important to understand in this Assembly and for the members of this Assembly is this: that what is caught by inference in the actions taken by the Minister of Agriculture in dealing with this item before us today is that more things are caught than taught.

When the standard that the Premier said in the Speech from the Throne was going to have a code of ethics and stringent guidelines for both elected representatives and public servants, I took it at face value, Mr. Speaker. I took it at face value.

And what have we had? We are going to have placed before this Assembly a Bill, a Bill that says I will have deemed to have done it. What's being taught, Mr. Speaker, what's being taught is that if the law is there, I can go to whatever length that the government goes to, I can go to. And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly right. That means when my dad speeds, I can speed. When my teacher speeds, I can speed. When my teacher steals, I can steal. That, Mr. Speaker, is the standard of the code of ethics. Code of ethics should be followed, not by what they're seeing happen here in the Assembly today.

That, Mr. Speaker, is what we are talking about today. We are caught in a role here today, Mr. Speaker, in describing the code of ethics and the problems in relation to what we are seeing here today. So what we are being taught, Mr. Speaker, is not what the standard is, as outlined by the Premier, but what it really is, as outlined by the Agriculture minister.

And that, Mr. Speaker, we are here discussing this motion. That's why it had to come to this, Mr. Speaker. It came to this not on the basis of whether we had a philosophical disagreement between members opposite. It's not here because we have an economic difference between the members opposite and ourselves, although that definitely would be argued.

But there is a legal problem here, Mr. Speaker, and this minister is going to demonstrate in this House that he is going to deliver that. The House Leader has said, we're going to do it. Yesterday on the news he said, we're going ahead with it, straight out. The news said: GRIP war on decks, PC's guns muzzled. Okay?

So that's democracy. You muzzle the opposition so they can't say anything when the very strength of democracy is in the . . . in the validity and the capacity of the opposition

to defend the democracy. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what we're doing here today. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, we have a serious, serious problem with how this is being dealt with.

The people in the province of Saskatchewan expect us to set a standard that is somewhat higher than is being set by the Minister of Agriculture. The Minister of Agriculture is setting a standard for people in the province of Saskatchewan, and more is caught by that than taught by what he sees in a class-room situation, and taking this Assembly as being leaders we should be teaching and following by example.

What's the significant difference between one who doesn't live by the standard that he says and does something different? What's the individual called, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, the individual is not living to the standard that he has set.

I have a great deal of problem with that from this Minister of Agriculture. On the one hand he says, I will uphold the law. And he swore that on the Bible when he became a minister and when he became a member of this Assembly. He swore that he would uphold the law.

And on the other hand, he crushes it. He will uphold the law and on the other hand he delivers this kind of a Bill for this Assembly to vote on. And that, Mr. Speaker, is wrong. It has always been wrong. It has always been the improper thing to do. And it is the role of this opposition and any opposition, if they would not bring to the attention of this Assembly that responsibility for that individual to maintain the law, it would be a pox of our houses.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly why we're raising this issue. That is why it's incumbent on us as an opposition to deal with it. It's incumbent for us as an opposition to have this Assembly hear the reasons why we are against the court of law being told what they have to do — and by the executive branch of this government.

Mr. Speaker, I find it really difficult in the framework of parliamentary language to express to the people of the province of Saskatchewan the negative anger that is in me about this. And I find it very difficult. And I'm not a person who uses vulgar language, Mr. Speaker. But it is very, very difficult for me to classify this, this action by the minister, in a way that isn't vulgar. And I'm not going to use them — those words, Mr. Speaker — don't worry about it. I'm not going to use them. But I find it very, very difficult. Because the conduct and the sensitivity of this issue is extremely important to this opposition.

It's important for a whole host of reasons. They are historic. They're historic in the context that I've talked about earlier about how the emphasis ought to be, the standard individuals expect of us, and the conduct of what it really is. And that, Mr. Speaker, is why this opposition is so much against it.

I want to raise a point that was quoted in the paper, and I want to talk about this a bit. The NDP establishes a review committee which fails to consult widely with farmers. The committee recommends some changes, warns Berny

Wiens about March 15 deadline problem at the time Wiens told committee, "We can get around it somehow." A quote from the *Leader-Post* on June 17, 1992.

We'll get around it somehow, he told the committee. Now I want to point out to this Assembly, did Barry Senft agree to getting around it somehow — to this somehow, as we are going to be presented in this Assembly by the Bill that we object to stringently? Is the deputy minister going to be a part of, "We can get around it somehow"? Is Roy Piper going to get around it somehow when he is asked in a court of law to say, I am going to get around it because the Minister of Agriculture said I should?

Am I going to get around it somehow? Is that what the professor at the University of Saskatchewan, Jack Stabler, is going to be saying to the court of law? — we're going to get around it somehow.

Why? The question, Mr. Speaker, is why does this Minister of Agriculture put this Assembly to this torture because of his incompetence? Why? We'll get around it somehow. Mr. Speaker, get around it somehow, for what?

The representation made by the Minister of Agriculture for Canada to the province of Saskatchewan said on the combination of \$94 million — province, farmer, and federal government — which would be equivalent to 23 or \$24 million by the province of Saskatchewan, this Minister of Agriculture, through his incompetence and how he handled the issue in the first place, he is going to get around it somehow when it will only take probably \$24 million, Mr. Speaker, to deliver that somehow in a very pragmatic way to the people of Saskatchewan. That is how he should be doing it, Mr. Speaker.

But what we have here today is the somehow that is absolutely, totally different than that. And it's disgusting because for all of the very same reasons that I presented earlier, for all of the historic things that are there, for all of the justice things that are there, for all of the ethical things that are there . . . He can take and say I have made a mistake, Mr. Speaker, I have made an error, and to the Assembly . . . and go to the Minister of Finance and say to the Minister of Finance, we made a mistake. And for \$23 million, I think the farmers would accept that.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly why we're here talking about it. Where in this whole Assembly does the individual right of that individual who is the minister and the member from Rosetown-Elrose, where does he have the right to say in this Assembly, somehow we'll deemed to have sent a letter out and then ask this Assembly to vote on something that is not the truth. That is, Mr. Speaker, why we're here today. We can argue about the value and the impact in an economic way, but you cannot argue the facts that have been presented to this Assembly aren't legitimate.

One of the things that stands out so significantly in this discussion is the time line in this discussion. It's extremely important to this debate. It has been relevant through the process of this session. But the time line on the information being provided to rural farmers is significant. I want to point out why that time line is there.

Mr. Speaker, a year ago the people in the province of Saskatchewan told me over and over again, we cannot defer making decisions to a point in time that is beyond the middle of March for coming to some conclusion as it relates to what we are going to do and what the government is going to do. So what did we do, Mr. Speaker? We said, according to their idea, that March 15 was a good time to have it.

And if the rural members in this Assembly would think back, they would probably understand the significance of March 15. March 15 has some significance in rural Saskatchewan, and it's this. People consider that if you were making financial arrangements to lease or be involved with a farm it was usually done before March 15. In my part of the world, March 15 was a standard date. You signed your agreements with leaseholders, and March 15 was the day that you did that.

So our conclusion, Mr. Speaker, as a part of this overall strategy to say we'll protect the farmers so that in the middle of seeding he doesn't have to make changes to what he's doing because of changes that were implemented by a government, we said the time line on the March 15 is a significant date.

(1245)

And what we have happen this past year, Mr. Speaker, is that it is exactly proven right. Changes have been made throughout the summer and the farmers tell me over and over again, it is not a responsible thing to do. March 15 has significance because the minister said on June 17, oh, we can get around it somehow. He told that to his committee. He told that to the people of the province of Saskatchewan. And when he gets around it, he's going to ask this Assembly to deem actions to have happened that didn't, in a court of law.

How do I get around it? Would he take the honourable thing to do and say, I will accept the offer made by the Minister of Agriculture for Canada that puts, even as an example of compromise, an item before this Assembly that deals consistently with what the producers of the province of Saskatchewan want.

Mr. Speaker, the member from Rosetown-Elrose changed his mind about tearing up gravel roads. He changed his mind about that, Mr. Speaker, because the people from Beechy said, we don't want to have that road torn up; we fought, Mr. Speaker, for years to have that road paved. And yes, Mr. Speaker, he changed his mind. He changed his mind, Mr. Speaker, and today we have him standing in this Assembly and saying, I am not going to change my mind; I'm going to get around it somehow.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is what we're talking about here today. Somehow we have tried to explain to this minister. We have given options on compromise. The federal minister has given options on compromise. But the single, solitary focus on this minister from Rosetown-Elrose is focused so intensely on this issue that he can't see the solution.

Mr. Speaker, we'll get around it somehow. And yet when it directly impacted in his constituency on tearing up

roads, he said, we'll get around it somehow. And he didn't . . . isn't going to do it.

The offer by the Minister of Agriculture for Canada stands, and every producer knows what that stand is. And you know what, Mr. Speaker? The Minister of Agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan sends out a letter too. He sends out a letter too. And in that letter he says well, we've had things tough in this province, really tough. And nobody denies that, Mr. Speaker. Nobody denies it — the province in spite of its limited financial capacity. Well we know that.

We tried yesterday, Mr. Speaker, to get the Minister of Finance to tell us what the difference was between what the cost of tearing up roads was and what it would have been if they were left. The difference in costs, plus or minus, what would it be? No idea of what was coming forward from the Minister of Finance. And yet the Minister of Agriculture could change his mind because he's the minister responsible for Highways. He could change his mind about that, but he cannot change his mind about the changes to the GRIP program.

And, Mr. Speaker, the economic impact of that changing his mind on those gravel roads was probably less than \$2 million. And the impact in Saskatchewan to him changing his mind about that is probably equivalent to that.

And yet we have him stand here and say, somehow I'm going to get around it. Somehow I'm going to ask members of this Assembly to say, somehow I'm going to deem to have done what I didn't do. Mr. Speaker, I find that repulsive, absolutely disgusting.

Mr. Speaker, in response to the offer made by the Minister of Agriculture from Canada, the minister in the province of Saskatchewan sends out a letter. The province, in spite of its limited financial capacity, has taken on a dramatically increased role in providing income support to farmers. Increased role? Here's where we had the deeming magic come back into play — deeming things to have happened that didn't happen, and farmers wished they had.

Mr. Minister, the federal offer is still on the table. Why don't you take it? Mr. Minister, the federal offer to offer an opportunity for you to compromise, to be a man, the honourable thing to do . . . and yet, Mr. Speaker, somehow — somehow, we will get around it. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what this is all about — somehow getting around it.

Mr. Speaker, we have had so many changes to the process in this evolution of what we have for GRIP '92. We have had so many changes in the dates — this is when you can do this; this is when you can't do this; this is when it's going to be the final day; and then this is going to be the final day; and then another date is selected for the final day.

And, Mr. Speaker, farmers are fed up with that. They are so fed up with that, Mr. Speaker, that the SARM said, get out of politics. Quit talking politics. Quit talking politics and let's get down to business.

An Hon. Member: — Your good friend Bernard.

Mr. Martens: — And, Mr. Speaker, the member from Humboldt says, our good friend Bernard. Yes, sir, Mr. Speaker. He's a friend of the farmer; he's a friend of rural Saskatchewan. And, Mr. Speaker, that is the reason why we're here to discuss this, is because somehow, somehow we're going to get around it. And, Mr. Speaker, that's why we're here talking about it.

Mr. Minister, the compromise is in your hand. The opportunity to have this Legislative Assembly reach a conclusion that is honourable, within the framework of the court of law, and acceptable to the people of the province of Saskatchewan, and you ignore it. Your Premier said in this House here the other day, he said, well it's the beginning of a negotiated position. And yet the legislative agenda keeps trucking down that same hard, absolutely stubborn path of no compromise at all.

Your leader said . . . Why don't you listen to him? Your leader said the other day that compromise . . . this was a question of negotiation between two parties on what it would be. And, Mr. Speaker, this government keeps trucking and trucking, hard-nosed, straight down this railroad track without any kind of compromise at all. People in the province of Saskatchewan are asking him for that compromise. The people of the province of Saskatchewan said, quit playing politics.

Mr. Minister, quit playing politics. You put compromise on the table in this Assembly and you will have the values established by the country when it was set up. Consensus and compromise are the two things that you, sir, need to do it. But you say, oh, I am going to get around it somehow. I'm going to get around it somehow. And that, Mr. Speaker, is why we are here today.

The president of the SARM says, Mr. Minister, we're here to have compromise. Allow us an opportunity to discuss this. Will you defer it to some later date? No, Mr. Speaker, as I say to this Assembly here today — and I'm going to say it across this province over and over again — this minister is doing things in this Assembly that breach all forms of democracy. They breach them. Because the court in the province of Saskatchewan, which defends my rights as an individual, are being jeopardized by a minister who has no feeling for that at all.

If he did, Mr. Speaker, if he did at any point in time want to say, I acknowledge that there is a better way to do this than to jeopardize the courts and jeopardize democracy, there is a better way to do it, Mr. Speaker, he would have had the opportunity presented to him last weekend to do that. His leader said yes, we should negotiate from that position. And what do we have? Straight-ahead focus on a minister who has absolutely no realization of what he's doing to, number one, democracy, and to the rural people of the province of Saskatchewan.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly the reason why we say to the people of Saskatchewan, this is the minister that does it. And I want to point out and I want to make the point absolutely clear. He is being led by the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan who undoubtedly, in my

mind, must be telling him that this is what he has to do. There is absolutely no doubt in my mind.

This is not a single-handed effort by the Minister of Agriculture. It's on the executive branch of this government and the Premier is the head of that. And that, Mr. Speaker, flies in the face of all of the kinds of things that he systematically said when he was attorney general, that he was going to uphold the law and that constitutional right of the individual will be upheld in the court on the basis of law.

And, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture is going to display for all of Canada and all of the Commonwealth to see that he is going to flaunt the law. Mr. Speaker, I find that repulsive.

Mr. Kirwan says, quit playing politics. They also said, Mr. Speaker, why don't you go send the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan and the Prime Minister out to take a look at how serious the problem is? That, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what we're asking this minister to do. Come from the Canadian principle, come from the depths of what makes Canada work. That's consensus and compromise. And, Mr. Speaker, neither one of them, neither one of them are being followed in any shape, fashion, or form in this Assembly here today. This is a unilateral, undemocratic process that the Minister of Agriculture is dealing with here today. And I say, Mr. Speaker, he is absolutely, totally wrong. That is what, Mr. Speaker, we have against what's going on here today.

The various people that have been invited to attend to see what the problem really is, Mr. Speaker, are Mr. Premier and Mr. Prime Minister. They've been asked to go out there. Would this minister defer making a decision on this issue until, Mr. Speaker, the opportunity is presented to itself for our Premier and for the Prime Minister to attend a meeting in the drought-stricken areas? Would he do that?

No, Mr. Speaker. We have him focused and bent specifically for dealing with an issue, Mr. Speaker, that is undemocratic and illegal. And that, Mr. Speaker, in my mind is not what hon. members in this Assembly should do. Hon. members have taken an oath of office to uphold Her Majesty and honour the law, and he is totally disregarding it in every shape and form that I have seen in this Assembly on this basis. And I say that's wrong.

I have said it is wrong right from the very start. In fact, Mr. Speaker, when this was brought to my attention, I said there is something the matter with this. And I have said consistently, and I have not deviated from that point from the 15th of March on, to say to this Assembly and to the people of the province of Saskatchewan that this is wrong. It's a breach of contract. It's an action that is illegal, immoral, unethical.

And I think that the Premier needs to take the offer made by the Minister of Agriculture for Canada and take it to the people of the province of Saskatchewan and say, would you be prepared to accept this in a basis of consensus and compromise? Would you be prepared to accept it? And you know what, Mr. Speaker? I believe, I honestly believe for \$24 million, this Minister of Agriculture could save some face and save democracy. I honestly believe that.

Take an opportunity, seize it, and go with it.

Mr. Speaker, in my mind the president of the SARM is absolutely right. Quit playing . . .

The Speaker: — Order. It now being 1 o'clock, this House stands adjourned until Monday at 2 p.m.

The Assembly adjourned at 1 p.m.
f