

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**PRESENTING PETITIONS**

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to present the following petition on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan:

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 other 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.

These petitioners, Mr. Speaker, are mainly from the Regina area, and I present two petitions. Thank you.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have also petitions from the city of Regina and from the town of Pense with regards to the same topic, so I won't go into the reading of the entire thing. I'll simply ask the people to

come and collect them and — the pages — and we will hand them in and have them tabled for the purpose of the government to consider.

**Mr. Boyd:** — Mr. Speaker, I, as well, have petitions with respect to chiropractic care in this 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.

Mr. Speaker, this petition is from the North Battleford area, Meota, some more North Battleford folks, Cochin, Unity, and Hafford. The second one, the people are from primarily the Saskatoon area.

**Mr. Martens:** — I too, Mr. Speaker, have petitions here dealing with chiropractic care and praying that the Assembly would present them to the minister, and that these petitioners are from the Regina area and I will provide them to the Assembly now.

**Mr. Britton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have a couple of petitions I would like to lay on the Table, Mr. Speaker. It's to do with chiropractic treatment. And as my colleagues have read the petition, I will not go through the whole prayer.

Mr. Speaker, these petitions are broadly from Regina city. I'll not go into the addresses, but they're, I would say, 90 per cent from the city of Saskatoon. Thank you.

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I as well would like to lay some petitions on the Table for consideration by the Assembly and by the government — petitions that have been signed by many people throughout the city, in this particular case, of Regina, asking the government to reconsider their chiropractic care and to give the same emphasis to health care that they have indicated they would in their speech and in the election, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have petitions again today that I'd like to lay upon the Table. My colleagues have pretty well covered the reading so I won't take any more time to read that. The petitions today, Mr. Speaker, the first one is nearly all Yorkton and Yorkton area — Bredenbury, Foam Lake — but most of them are from the city of Yorkton, Mr. Speaker.

The other one is mostly Regina. There's two on here from Gull Lake and the rest are Regina. And by the addresses I'm quite sure they're all Churchill Downs.

**The Speaker:** — Order.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have some petitions I would like to lay on the table for consideration for the Minister of Health and the government. And I think

part of the prayer deserves to be re-read to emphasize the point that these petitioners are asking the government for:

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 a "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.

Mr. Speaker, I notice that the names on the petitions that I am presenting today are largely from Regina. And I notice also a signature on the very same street that I live on, on Harvey Street in Regina here.

**Mr. Devine:** — I too am going to join my colleagues in presenting this petition with respect to chiropractic care in the province of Saskatchewan. And I'll just go through the last sentence of this petition:

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.

People on this petition are from Regina, Holdfast, Southey, various southern communities, Grenfell, people from Vibank, Glenavon, Balgonie, Edenwold, Rocanville, and more addresses from the city of Regina. I do now table these.

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have two sets of petitions today to table, one to deal with the chiropractors and the other one to deal with GRIP (gross revenue insurance program). I'll only read the last paragraph of the chiropractic one, Mr. Speaker:

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.

There are individuals here, Mr. Speaker, from North Battleford, Cut Knife, Yorkton, Bredenbury, Churchbridge — people from all over the province of Saskatchewan.

And secondly, Mr. Speaker, I have petitions here concerning the issue of GRIP, and I'll once again only read the last paragraph because the petition has been read into the record many times:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to:

1.) allow the 1991 GRIP program to stand for this year,

2.) start working with the federal government and farmers to design a program that will be a true "revenue insurance" program by the end of this calendar year, and

3.) to make sure that the individual cost-of-production to return ratio is there instead of a risk area formula.

There are people here from Prince Albert, Paddockwood, Henribourg, Meath Park, Prince Albert city — generally the north-central part of the province, Mr. Speaker.

## READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

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

Of farmers and citizens of the province of Saskatchewan humbly praying that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to allow the 1991 GRIP program to stand for this year;

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.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my privilege to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly two individuals who are seated in your east gallery, and I ask them to rise please, Robin and Hazel Bellamy. Robin is the executive director of the Friendship Inn, and both of them have worked very hard in the community of Saskatoon to enhance the lives of people there. So I ask you to warmly welcome them here today.

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

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to rise today to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly four young people in your gallery up top there. One of them is my nephew, David Cunningham, and his friends Ingrid Fernandez, Amanda Fayant, and Stacey Fayant. And I notice he was looking around, having a hard time recognizing his uncle with a tie on, but I think he finally picked me out. Welcome them to the Assembly, please.

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

**Mr. Goulet:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to other members of the House, a person from Cumberland constituency, Earl Cook who is at the west gallery. Mr. Cook has been involved in the field of education for many years. He served as the director for the northern teacher education program which is quite famous in the province of Saskatchewan and in Canada on teacher education, Mr. Speaker, as well as now working for the Northern Lights School Division as a consultant in the field of education. Please welcome Mr. Cook.

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Complaint Against Crop Insurance Board Member

**Mr. Boyd:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister responsible for Crop Insurance. Mr. Minister, the board of the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance is made up of people whom you appointed to set and carry out policy with respect to the GRIP and Crop Insurance programs. This board is appointed by yourself.

Mr. Minister, you said one of the main reasons for changing the 1991 GRIP program was moral hazard. Will the minister of Crop Insurance admit that this was one of the main reasons for introducing the 1992 GRIP program? And will he tell us whether he would expect Crop Insurance board members to not only live up to the letter of the law, but the spirit and the terms of the Crop Insurance contract?

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

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Mr. Speaker, moral hazard is not the term that I would use to describe the reason for changes to the GRIP program. The changes to the GRIP program were one that would make it more market responsive, would make the farmers grow crops that were the proper crops for the market, and the conditions that would result in cheaper premiums in the future for farmers and for both levels of government. And if you say to a farmer, if you grow lentils I'll guarantee you \$200 an acre no matter what happens to the price of lentils and no matter what happens to the price of lentils, and no matter what happens to your crop; if you grow barley, I'll guarantee you \$90 an acre no matter what happens to the price of barley or no matter what happens to the crop, I don't think the moral hazard is with the farmer, the moral hazard is with the program. And that's the reason the programs were changed.

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

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you. Mr. Minister, Mr. Minister, would you please tell us in the Assembly today whether you would expect board members to live up to the terms and the spirit of the Crop Insurance contract.

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

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Mr. Speaker, we expect everybody to live up to the terms of their contract.

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you. Will the minister tell us what he believes the moral hazards are, associated with farming in this province.

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Mr. Speaker, the moral hazards are that somebody will write a program that doesn't fit the conditions in Saskatchewan and will lead us, not only the farmers but the taxpayers, into oblivion as we try to pay higher and higher premiums from a program that doesn't respond to market and gives the wrong market signals to farmers. That's the moral hazard that's involved with the GRIP program.

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

**Mr. Boyd:** — Mr. Minister, the only real moral hazard the farmers of this province have to worry about is this government. Every time the NDP (New Democratic Party) government turns around, farmers have to check their pockets to find out if their wallets are still there.

Livestock cash advances, gone. FeedGAP (feed grain adjustment program) program, gone. Fuel rebates, gone. Rural hospitals, gone. Rural schools and even, yes, their highways, gone. And meanwhile the government accuses farmers of . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. I've listened to about a half a dozen government members interrupting while the member is trying to ask his question. I heard no interruption when the minister was answering. I don't want any interruption when the member's asking his question.

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The government seems very high on shoving its version of moral hazards down the throats, and morals down the throats, of the people of Saskatchewan. All you have to do is look at the recent Liquor Board announcements in the past days.

Mr. Minister, if one of the board members for your Crop Insurance board — a board which, I remind you, you appointed — if we were to find one of those members abused the GRIP program, and you found that they abused the GRIP program, what action would you take, Mr. Minister?

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

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Mr. Speaker, the members opposite again continue to read questions and not listen to the answer, I think. They seem to have the GRIP program on the brain here. They've tried to link it to rural

hospitals and to lingerie shows. I don't know the relevance there, but I think if somebody's in violation of their contract, I would certainly like to know that. Because as in any case, we expect people to live up to their contract.

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

**Mr. Boyd:** — Mr. Minister, I have a letter here from a gentleman that has written to the board, the chairman of the board of Saskatchewan Crop Insurance. The minister knows full well about that letter. The letter is a complaint against one of the members of the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance board.

Will the minister confirm that the complaint was that Mr. Greg Marshall of your board has not only admitted, not only admitted to abusing the program, but he is also counselling other farmers to do the same?

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

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Mr. Speaker, again you get back to the comments that I made at the beginning. If a program gives the wrong signals and farmers follow the wrong signals, I do not blame the farmers for being morally wrong or breaking contracts. If farmers are following the signals that are given by the program, that is management decisions. And those decisions need to be based on what's best for the province and for the taxpayers and for the farmers themselves, and not on a program that leads them to make decisions that are not economically sound. And that's what the old program did and that's why we changed it.

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

**Mr. Boyd:** — Mr. Minister, would you then confirm that you just said that you condone the action of Mr. Marshall of abusing the program and counselling other farmers to do the same?

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

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Mr. Speaker, we don't tell any farmer how to farm his land and we don't tell Mr. Marshall how to farm his land. And that is why we changed the program, because the program was telling people how to farm their land and that's not the way we want this province to operate.

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

**Mr. Boyd:** — Mr. Minister, in an earlier question you suggested that everyone should live up to the terms of the agreement, even board members, Mr. Minister. Will you confirm for this House that you believe the actions of Mr. Marshall of abusing the program are acceptable?

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Mr. Speaker, again we have allegations. Day after day after day members stand up on the opposite side of the House and make allegations against people — misleading and deliberately slanderous allegations. If you have evidence that Mr. Marshall was illegal and did something illegal or in contradiction to his contract, if he broke his contract, he committed fraud or

in any way abused . . . in any way was in violation of his contract, step outside the House and say that. And don't come into the House and use your cover in the House here to make slanderous allegations against individuals day after day after day.

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

**Mr. Boyd:** — Mr. Minister, you have had possession of the letter since February, the letter of complaint against Mr. Marshall. Mr. Marshall, it alleges, is abusing the program. Have you taken the time to go through the complaint and look into it to see whether indeed the allegations are correct?

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

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Mr. Speaker, I have no evidence that Mr. Marshall was in violation of his contract, that he did anything unlawful or wrong. And if I have evidence of that . . . if the member opposite has that evidence, please table it.

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

**Mr. Boyd:** — Mr. Minister, the complaint in possession of yourself and in possession of myself indicates the board member in question is apparently recommending to other farmers to maximize their profits from the GRIP program by knowingly eliminating inputs. Will the minister at least . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I ask the Minister of Health not to intervene and that I also ask the member from Wilkie not to intervene . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I don't need your help, sir.

**Mr. Boyd:** — Mr. Minister, will you at least survey Mr. Marshall's neighbour in investigation so that the information can all be viewed by the public of Saskatchewan?

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

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Mr. Speaker, we have looked at that complaint. There is no evidence of wrongdoing. If there is evidence of wrongdoing, I want to see it. And I don't think that the member opposite should be standing there, accusing somebody of wrongdoing, using his privilege in the House to do what would outside this House be slander and unlawful.

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

**Mr. Boyd:** — Mr. Minister, not only do you have the letter, I have the letter. And I will table it this afternoon. Mr. Minister, would you confirm that Mr. Marshall has, like other appointments, like the Liquor Board, been a contributor to the NDP Party, and that qualified him for a membership on the board of directors of Saskatchewan Crop Insurance?

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

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Again, Mr. Marshall is very competent. He farms. He has a background in farming.

He has a background in insurance. And he is a very competent and qualified person to be a member of the Crop Insurance. And I again say that to make allegations and slanders in the House against somebody is . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order. I want to remind the members in the opposition, I don't think there was very much interruption when the member from Kindersley asked his question. And I've heard three or four of you people interrupting.

Now I think the Minister of Health ought to be ashamed too. When the Speaker is on his feet, you know you don't interrupt . . . And that goes for the member from Rosthern too. You people don't want to ask questions, fine with me. I can stand here as long as you want me to.

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Mr. Speaker, the letter that was tabled here — and I have seen the letter — is not . . . does have no proof, has no evidence of wrongdoing in that letter that was tabled here. I've read the letter. I've looked into the allegation. There is no proof of any wrongdoing. And I think for the members to suggest in this House that there was wrongdoing and that somebody has acted immorally or illegally on the basis of a letter that does not even say that, I think that, Mr. Speaker, is wrong.

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

**Mr. Boyd:** — Mr. Minister, Mr. Marshall has admitted as a farm business man it is not his job to grow wheat but to make money. He admitted to growing wheat on stubble with no fertilizer. He was asked if that would be considered an acceptable practice by experts in agriculture. And he admitted that that probably was not so.

The minister has a signed complaint from a citizen of our province, and you're trying to tell this House that you have acted. This is shameful. This is the same type of action that your took with respect to drought: fly over it. That's your kind of action.

Once again the minister is . . . We would ask the minister to take the time to thoroughly review this complaint and examine the farming practices of your NDP appointment. If there is any perception of wrongdoing, will the minister do the honourable thing and ask for Mr. Marshall's\* resignation?

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

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Mr. Speaker, would the members opposite have me investigate the farm practices of every person in Saskatchewan? Should I check . . . Mr. Speaker, are they asking me to check every farmer that didn't use fertilizer, who didn't use an adequate level of fertilizer, and pass judgement on whether or not that was a good farming practice?

Is that the kind of government that the members opposite are asking for — when we send inspectors around to check farmers' practices and see if they delivered enough fertilizer or put enough chemical on? Who's going to make that judgement?

What we did was change the program so that farmers can respond to the market-place and make the decisions based on market.

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

### Government Commitment to Democratic Reforms

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Deputy Premier. Mr. Minister, during your nine and a half years in opposition, you frequently demanded legislative reform from the government of the day. In your first throne speech, you stated that your main objective, and I quote, was to restore public respect for this legislature.

By the evidence of rule changes and abuses of power by your government to stifle debate and usurp democratic processes, it suggests that you in fact have abandoned this commitment. What reforms are your government prepared to put forward to restore public respect for this legislature?

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to that. As the member opposite knows by her presence at Rules Committee meetings and by the first 50 days of the session, we had brought in some meaningful democratic reform here in the Assembly that included private members' statements; it allowed the Leader of the Liberal Party to move motions without seconders.

Those rule changes we agree with and we believe the Leader of the Liberal Party should have the opportunity to move motions without seconders. And as she will know, the official opposition would not allow those rules to remain in place. However, I'm sure with your support and your encouragement of your other members of the opposition, that those kind of changes can take place that will make the legislature work better for the people who elected us.

So those kind of changes are being studied. The Rules Committee is in place. We're looking at other ways to make the legislature and public involvement more relevant to the political process. And ideas that you have and members of the opposition have, I'm sure we'd be very interested in hearing.

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

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you. Mr. Minister, indeed I was part of the Rules and Procedures Committee. Mr. Minister, indeed I was part of the Rules and Procedures Committee. And I sat on the committee on which your government made a decision to unilaterally use its majority on the committee to undermine all of our work that we did do to arrive at what had been instigated for 50 days, so don't talk to me about who changed the rules and began to I think go on a slippery slope right down into oblivion as far as democratic reform is concerned.

You were the people who said that you were going to defend democratic reform when you got into government. You told this to people during the campaign. And now your government is in the position to do something, to actually restore public trust and actually reform this Assembly.

I want you to tell the people of this province when you're going to stop manipulating rules to fulfil your own political agenda and actually institute reform in this legislature.

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — The member will know that the rule changes that we had in place were supported by all members of the Rules Committee. And it was brought into the Assembly and the government members supported it and members of the opposition supported it. And after 50 days, when we wanted to extend those rules, it wasn't possible because members of the opposition voted against it.

Now I want to talk about the issue of bell-ringing, the issue of bell-ringing, the issue that you raise here and take such a strong stand on. You will know that the public in Saskatchewan, by many, many expressions, are opposed to lengthy bell-ringing and wanted that changed. And the government acted on that.

The member opposite will know, who raises the question, that you felt so strongly about that change that when the vote came in the House, you sat on your hands and didn't even vote. So to raise that issue today and say, I felt so strongly about this rule change that I wanted it to go this way or that way, we are still waiting patiently for you to tell us how you do feel about it, because when the vote came, you refused to vote on it. So today raising . . .

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

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

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, this is not about me. I voted according to my principle and everybody in this place knows it. They know exactly. I, like the members . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. Order. I wonder which member in the government is going to be answering. Or are you anticipating the question already and answering?

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't have to defend a principled position and everyone knows what it is. The NDP, since you've come into power, has legislated by-election reform.

Will you commit to take a step further and give people the confidence that anyone who declares intention to seek a federal political nomination will be asked to step down upon filing those nomination papers, or remove him or herself from the taxpayers' payroll while campaigning for the nomination?

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting that when the Leader of the Liberal Party, Mr. Ralph Goodale, who sat in that exact position, ran for the nomination in Regina South, collected his salary as an MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly), even though he was out actively, very seldom showing up in the Assembly, that he worked very diligently for the Liberal Party, working on a nomination.

I wonder at what point the Liberal Party changed their

mind as it comes to federal candidates and their relationship as MLAs in the legislature. When did you make that change in the Liberal Party? Was it today in the Assembly? Or was it at the previous convention of the Liberal Party? When did you make that change?

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

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't speak on behalf of Ralph Goodale. I speak on behalf of myself. And two wrongs do not make a . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. Just to remind the member to direct her questions through the Chair rather than to the member opposite.

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, when will the minister confirm or deny that the member from Regina North West has indeed filed his nomination papers, and would he be in a conflict of interest if he continued to be paid a salary and allowances as a provincial MLA as any person previously would have been doing in this House, and will be in the future while campaigning for a nomination?

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — My understanding is that there's very . . . Mr. Speaker, is that there are very strict regulations and laws as it comes to who can run and who can't run for federal nominations and federal election. And that all of the rules and laws that apply to federal candidates will apply to anyone in this caucus or anyone else in the country when they run for federal office. That all of the laws that apply and are in place will be followed very diligently by any member of the NDP when they come to run for nominations. I'm sure that the Liberal Party will follow the same rules. And I'm sure that Mr. Goodale, whether you support him or not, was following all the rules and regulations that were in fact in place.

If you want to change the laws at the federal level as it applies to federal candidates, you're in the wrong place. You'll have to run for a nomination and go to Ottawa.

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

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, as I stated before, talk is cheap, and the people judge a government on its actions. When will you and your government . . . when are you going to cease using your power to ramrod political agendas through this House and direct it to achieving some meaningful democratic reform which will actually make this legislature workable again? It's the government's responsibility to show leadership.

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Well I think it's the responsibility of all members of the Assembly to make the Assembly work. And obviously the members of the opposition right now are involved in a filibuster to prevent the GRIP Bill from being presented to the House. And that's fair enough. They're using the rules at their disposal in the rule book that we all follow to delay the tabling and the first reading of the GRIP Bill. And they've done that effectively I believe now for 57 days. And that's well within their mandate.

Now there comes a time in the Assembly where we will use as a government the rules of the Assembly to table and give first reading to a Bill. That's not unusual. The rules are there for all of us to apply.

I never heard the Leader of the Liberal Party once in Rules Committee say that this rule should be changed. If you're saying rule 34 should be excluded from the rule book, that's a fair comment. But I have not heard you once in the Rules Committee make that argument. So if you're opposed to it, there's a place . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order.

### **Complaint Against Crop Insurance Board Member**

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the minister responsible for the Crop Insurance Corporation. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister responsible for Crop Insurance.

Mr. Minister, you are responsible for a multibillion dollar industry in this province. I'd like to quote from the letter, because this letter that was given to you in February and tabled in this legislature today has a quote that I think that you should be reminded of.

As Mr. Saul says:

He then stated that I could have done the same and that maybe I should have . . . a closer look at the program this spring. I replied that I had better morals than that and that if everyone thought the same as him the crop insurance system would collapse.

Mr. Minister, this was a person who wrote you a letter with witnesses' names attached, who heard your board member say this in public. The system would collapse because of what your board member was condoning.

You said that you performed an investigation. Mr. Minister, for the sake of Mr. Saul and the witnesses who signed the letter, would you table that investigation in this House?

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

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Mr. Speaker, we do not do legal investigations of hearsay and moral values of people. And again I say, we are not in the business of judging farmers' morals. That's not what the Crop Insurance is here for.

And the Crop Insurance, if you look at what happened in Crop Insurance this year, the fertilizer use is going up — way, way up in Saskatchewan, and not doing so in the neighbouring provinces. You will see that this was very widespread; that the program encouraged farmers to produce for the program, to seed crops that were not right for the market, to use input and management practices that were not right for the market. The program encouraged that. That wasn't the farmers that were immoral; it was the program that was immoral. And we've made changes to the program. And if you would let us bring it into the House, those changes would be in here

and implemented and that would solve your moral problems.

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

**Mr. Swenson:** — Mr. Minister, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, that's not the question that was asked. You were sent a letter, Mr. Minister, by a contract holder with witnesses' signatures attached, that your board member was advising people in his community to abuse the system — not to use inputs, not to use fertilizer, not to use spray. This is your board member.

Now, Mr. Minister, you admitted in this House the other day that all of your board members from the Liquor Board were bought-and-paid-for NDP members. Mr. Minister, if the same criteria's in place, I can see why you don't want to reveal the investigations. Surely a contract holder of Crop Insurance has a right to ask the minister for an investigation. And you should table that here today, sir.

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

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Mr. Speaker, nobody has the right to ask Crop Insurance to check farmers' morals. The program is what was creating the problem. The program was creating people to use poor management in poor management decisions. The program was causing farmers to make bad management decisions. And that was a reason for the program change.

It had nothing to do with the farmers' morals. It had to do with the lousy program that was introduced by the previous administration. And we made the corrections to the program that now let farmers make the decisions based on what they can grow, what they can grow best, and what they can sell best. And we do not in Crop Insurance have to go out to the farm and tell them how to farm their land. They can make those decisions on their own. And that was the purpose of the . . .

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

## **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

### **SPECIAL ORDER**

### **APPROPRIATION BILL**

**Bill No. 86 — An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year ending March 31, 1993**

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that Bill No. 86 be now read a second and third time.

**Mr. Devine:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to draw to the attention of the public, and particularly the media that explains to the public what's happening in the legislature, exactly what happened in this interim supply Bill yesterday.

I want to draw to the attention . . . It was a holiday yesterday throughout most of Saskatchewan, and perhaps some of the media didn't recognize that for the first time

in Saskatchewan's history we had a Minister of Finance bring his officials into the Legislative Assembly and when we asked questions of the Minister of Finance, he wouldn't answer them. He never got up once to respond.

The government, the NDP government, invoked closure on interim supply so that in the normal proceedings where you have grievance before supply . . . members of the opposition can ask questions and the minister should give you answers. The NDP administration invoked closure which meant we only had 20 minutes a piece. And when two or three of us asked questions, starting with the member from Arm River, about health care, about education, and agriculture, we waited for the Finance minister to get on his feet and he refused to stand.

And that's never happened in the history of Saskatchewan. And as far as I know, it's never happened anywhere in democracy in the British parliamentary system, where the Minister of Finance when he has his officials here to answer questions — and we're going through grievance before supply — he doesn't get to his feet.

People have asked, what's happening in the Legislative Assembly in the province of Saskatchewan?

(1445)

Imagine, we're talking about money going for taxes and health care and education, agriculture, roads, and we want to ask the minister and his officials that are brought in here: why this? Why not that? What are you doing with one-twelfth? Why are you out? What are the variations? And the Minister of Finance doesn't get to his feet. We've never seen that. And no one has ever heard of that in the British parliamentary system. This Legislative Assembly under the NDP with their new rules is turning into a complete democratic sham.

How could the minister bring his officials in and have them sit through this, knowing, knowing that he would not stand up and answer questions? Mr. Speaker, it's such an oddity, it's so undemocratic that we'd have a chairman of this Legislative Assembly, Mr. Speaker — you weren't in the Chair, the chairman — because you could ask questions, and we're all here to get information, and the Minister of Finance will not respond.

He's an NDP Minister of Finance, afraid. And in front of his officials and in front of the television cameras, afraid to answer questions. And in part because he's afraid of the answers. But secondly, Mr. Speaker, he knows once he gets up and then takes his seat, he can't get up again, given the crazy rules of this Legislative Assembly. He was confined to one answer. So you bring in officials, and even if you had the courage to answer a question or two, when he sat down he could never get up again. What nonsense.

We have members of this Legislative Assembly who have been here 15, 20, maybe 25 years, like the member from Quill Lakes and others. And they, Mr. Minister, they, Mr. Speaker, know all of the reasons that you bring officials in and ask them to help the minister give the answers. And now when you get the NDP drunk with power and they

come in here and they change the rules unilaterally, they bring in closure even on interim supply. They even rule themselves out of participating.

Well I want the public to know, those in the gallery, those in the public, those in television and radio, that when we asked this minister questions about health and education, he stood for the first time — it was a black, black Monday — the NDP Finance minister didn't get up from his seat and answer one question. Not one question.

We had closure imposed on us — closure imposed on us. And the Minister of Finance from his seat saying, that's not right. And it's absolutely right. We brought it in. We had the first speaker after closure, the second, and the third speaker after closure. We waited for the minister to respond and he said absolutely nothing.

He brought his officials in. They never counselled him because they never had to for two reasons. Number one, because he's afraid, and this lack of courage in coming up with the answers because people are complaining all across the province is bad enough. But secondly, he was stymied by his own rules because he knew if he did get up and give an answer — how many items have you increased the tax 15 per cent? — and then he sat down, he couldn't get up again.

Now what kind of a Legislative Assembly, Mr. Speaker, is that? What kind of Assembly when the Minister of Finance in supply, in grievance before supply, is only entitled to one statement and then if he takes his place he can't answer any more because of the haywire rules, the arrogance, the undemocratic nature of the NDP administration.

How could any of you go back home, or 15 years from now when you're trying to explain to the public about your great performance in 1992, justify the Minister of Finance not being able to speak because of your rules in this Legislative Assembly. Unbelievable.

Mr. Speaker, the member from Regina Dewdney who failed to get up, the Minister of Finance who wouldn't get up in the Legislative Assembly, and answer questions because of the closure motion here — and he had a chance once and he wouldn't because he was afraid to give the answers; and secondly because he knew he could have no rebuttal, couldn't dig it up — this is what he said about this kind of process in 1989.

And I quote this NDP Finance minister when he was in opposition, the self-righteous individual in opposition. This is August 7, 1989, and this is the member from Regina Dewdney, the NDP member who now is afraid to stand in this Legislative Assembly and invokes closure:

But I want to say, as other colleagues of mine have said, that even though the government may muzzle us in this legislature, we will not be muzzled in saying the things that need to be said. Because if we can't say them in here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we will say them from one end of the province, wherever we go, because those are the kinds of things that are important to the people of Saskatchewan. Democracy will be protected by



this opposition to the largest extent that we can, at every opportunity that we can.

Well, Mr. Minister, Mr. NDP Minister, you didn't like closure. You didn't like the thought of it. And you said what you will do is you will tell people all across the province about how the Legislative Assembly here was trying to hush you up in opposition. And now you sit in your place through estimates of supply and never even get up to speak as a result of your rule changes.

Well believe me, Mr. Minister, you're going to eat those words when you say we're going to tell people all across the province. The people of Saskatchewan are going to know about the NDP and the undemocratic nature of the NDP. The hypocrisy — the hypocrisy.

And the minister points his finger over here because I'm reading to him what he thought and what I believe he knows is right when he was in opposition. And he sits there as a minister of the Crown and brought his officials in in some sort of a sham and façade, knowing he wouldn't even answer a single question.

What do the officials say when they go back into the bureaucracy? Well the minister brought us in, but we couldn't even advise him because he couldn't speak, given his own rules. It's a joke all over town in the bureaucracy. Officials come in to advise ministers and they can't even respond because the sham this Legislative Assembly has turned into. What a joke.

And the member from Quill Lakes says, why don't you grow up and get on with it? He's yipping from his seat. These kinds of rules, this is what you got elected for. This is it. This is it. Now he's . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order. I ask the member from Quill Lakes to please not continue to interrupt. I'm sure he will get up later on to make his views known to the legislature.

**Mr. Devine:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And the interesting part, Mr. Speaker, about the closure motion yesterday and the words that are so diametrically opposed to what the NDP said in opposition and what they're doing in government, is while the members like the member from Quill can chirp from their seats, not one of them got up and spoke. The political cowards. Not one got up and spoke about interim supply and about what they're doing with the money.

Every member of this Legislative Assembly had an opportunity to stand up there and tell us why they got elected, tell us about their new reforms, tell us about the self-righteous nature of all of these things, and not one of them . . . But when we get up to speak, they talk from their seat and they clap, and it's bravado, as they jam the rules through — unilateral changes, when even a minister himself can't respond in supply.

It is pathetic, absolutely pathetic. No place else in Canada will you see this. And only with an NDP administration. The back-benchers, I'm sure, are really proud of this when they get to their caucus meetings — really proud of them. Boy, what a nice democratic bunch, the

non-democratic party. That's what it is — the non-democratic party, when your own rules don't allow your ministers to respond. Because if you didn't reply and you check it with the Clerk, he was one chance and then he's cut off. Great rules! Great rules. And not one of them would get up and defend them.

Not one NDPer would stand in his place or her place and defend these rule changes. Not the minister, not the member from Quills. And the member from Quills says it's not a rule change. When you bring in unilateral changes to the way this place operates and only the NDP get . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I asked the member . . . it wouldn't be so provocative if he spoke through the Chair rather than to individual members in the House. But having said that, I want to ask the member from Quill Lakes again, please not to interrupt.

**Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, when the members chirp from their seat . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. I asked the member to direct his answers through the Chair, and let's get on with the topic that is before us.

**Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, the members of the NDP would not speak when they had an occasion, not once. They found other avenues to speak up, but they didn't have the courage, the political courage, to speak up in this Legislative Assembly. And as well on this black Monday when the Minister of Finance couldn't answer questions, the NDP members of the legislature, and only in Saskatchewan with the NDP, guess what else happened? They voted alone with their rules. Only the government got to vote. Imagine, Mr. Speaker.

The tradition is, you look to the Sergeant-at-Arms and if he brings in the members from both sides, then away you go. And he looks to the opposition first. Not under the NDP. You don't even need other members in the Legislative Assembly. So two rule changes unilaterally made.

Yesterday was a black, black day, when only the NDP, only government members, get to vote in Saskatchewan. Isn't that democratic? Well there they go, Mr. Speaker. They had an opportunity to defend this yesterday and they didn't defend it. They can chirp away now. Undemocratic.

It's a disgrace of every Legislative Assembly across the country. You get elected because you believe in some things. This is not part of the history and the legacy of the CCF-NDP (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation-New Democratic Party). Where do you find this in the books? You find this somewhere in the bowels of the files in Tommy Douglas House?

Where's this from? Where do you get it from? What is this new-found democracy, this non-democratic party that will even muzzle its Finance minister and muzzle all the members? The caucus members can't speak. You can't speak. And they say: well just watch. They had every opportunity with closure, on closure, on closure, to

speak. Mum. Not one of them spoke, because they're afraid to speak.

And number two, they're told if they do speak, it might prolong this because they'll dig themselves into a hole. Well you've dug yourself into an historic hole that you're not going to get out of for generations, because nobody's going to forget this.

As the minister of Finance said in '89: we're going to tell people all over the province about this. Your federal members of parliament are ashamed of you. Rod Laporte is ashamed of the NDP in Saskatchewan. He doesn't want any part of you. He says I'm not a part of the NDP in Saskatchewan; it's a different party; they're on a different agenda; they don't ask us about this. They said the NDP federally are going nowhere, they're going down the tubes. And in Saskatchewan it's led by you people because you are arrogant, and you unilaterally change rules.

And imagine in democracy now when you won't even allow your minister to answer questions in interim supply, and none of your members stand up to defend it. What an unbelievable Monday yesterday was, and then only NDPers get to vote in this Legislative Assembly. The first time that's ever happened here, and as far as I know the first time we've seen it in Canada.

How do you feel about that? Vote NDP and only the NDPers get to vote. The opposition doesn't matter. We'll change the rules.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I would remind the Leader of the Opposition that we are on interim supply, second and third reading. That means we discuss the principle of the Bill that is before us, not what occurred in the House yesterday on something else. And I wish that he would get back on the principle of the Bill that is before the legislature.

**Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, the principle of this Bill, interim supply, is in such shambles. The principle is in such shambles because the Minister of Finance yesterday refused on this Bill to answer questions. Now that's never happened — ever, ever happened in the history of Saskatchewan where the Minister of Finance wouldn't answer questions on interim supply.

He was muzzled by the rules that the NDP brought in. The caucus are all muzzled. So the officials come in. They are of no use at all. And, Mr. Speaker, the officials comes in and they're set, and he wouldn't bring his deputy minister. He brought somebody else, somebody else. He knew very well that he wouldn't respond.

And the NDP House Leader knew there would be no point in having him respond, because if he did get up, that would be it. And he'd have to take his place and then he couldn't respond again. What an absurdity, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the principle of this Bill — unprincipled, absolutely unprincipled.

(1500)

I want to add to that, because when we look at the process

that we go through now on interim supply, on the principle of grievance before supply, where we experience these kind of rule changes . . . And listen, Mr. Speaker, I'll give you another good example, and I just use the Minister of Finance when he had to experience this and what he said. Here's what the member from Saskatoon Riversdale said about the same process:

. . . a government coming in and using the heavy hand of its majority and arbitrarily deciding in its opinion that the opposition's debate has been too long, in its opinion that our arguments have been irrelevant, in its opinion that we ought not to be talking about it.

They come here to define the rules of this legislature, to do this arbitrarily by simple majority, and to equate this kind of heavy-handed, undemocratic, unprecedented, and unwarranted attack to the rules where all the members agree . . .

That's the NDP leader, the NDP Premier, August 4, 1989.

And he goes on to say about this procedure:

But I tell you, Mr. Speaker, what this does show. This motion today shows (that) this black Friday for democracy, this unprecedented attack on freedom in the province of Saskatchewan, maybe an attack on 26 lonely members of the opposition.

Well there you go, Mr. Speaker. In this process the NDP leader, who is Premier now, condemned the closure because he only had 26 members in opposition. And he says, the huge majority would do this. Now the NDP have all of the members but 11 and they have to ram it down the throats of a smaller opposition. Ten members here.

And they will not answer questions; they changed the rules; they do exactly the opposite to what they said before. They even changed the rules so that they can't speak. And on top of that . . . The NDP leader talked about a black Friday. On black Monday yesterday, the NDP even got to vote only by themselves. How democratic!

**An Hon. Member:** — Where were you?

**Mr. Devine:** — And the Minister of Finance says, where were we? We were watching you, Mr. Minister of Finance, vote by yourself under your rules where you can't even speak. And the NDP administration has changed the rules so only they can vote. Only the NDP can vote, because we are cut off from speaking and cut off from answers. We have a small time to speak, and then when we want answers, you are cut off from giving the answers under your rules.

And the NDP member from Regina Dewdney says, well where were we? We were here fighting for farmers, fighting for people, and fighting for rules that are democratic. And a non-democratic party has changed all that in the province of Saskatchewan. And the hypocrisy of campaigning on the opposite is what's very interesting.

Mr. Speaker, the same arguments come forward from the member for Regina Churchill Downs. This is on August 7,

1989, when he apparently in good conscience didn't like unilateral changes or closure. And I quote:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in what I think is an (ever) historical debate, the first time closure has ever been invoked in this province.

And he says this, and I want to read it carefully and slowly to the hon. member. This is the NDP member from Regina Churchill Downs. He says this about closure:

And I sincerely hope (this closure) will be the last time (it's used and) ever invoked in (the) province (of Saskatchewan).

Mr. Speaker, look at the hypocrisy. Look at the political hypocrisy. The NDP member for Regina Churchill Downs, Mr. Speaker, said this:

I rise to take part in what I think is an (ever) historical debate . . .

And then he goes on to say:

. . . the first time closure has ever been invoked in this province. And I sincerely hope it'll be the last time closure is ever invoked in this province.

That is the NDP member from Regina Churchill Downs who said he hoped he'd never see closure again. But was he telling the truth? Did he really believe that? I believe he believed it. And I believe all the NDPers believed it.

And yesterday we had it twice by an NDP administration.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I want to remind the Leader of the Opposition again, that speech that he's making today would have been very appropriate yesterday when we were talking about closure.

Rule 15, rule 15 is what we have before us today, is second and third reading of the Appropriation Bill, and rule 15, let me read it out to the members. Rule 15 simply says:

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

This is the second and third reading of the Appropriation Bill. The closure did not, did not, pertain to the second and third reading. It pertained to the other stage of the Appropriation Bill. And your speech, sir, would have been in order yesterday, but today you should be on the principle of second and third reading of the Appropriation Bill. Order.

**Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't believe, the members of the opposition certainly don't believe, that this Bill should be read a second or third time. It shouldn't be. It shouldn't be because it's all wrong.

This is historic. What happened yesterday is all wrong and we don't believe it should be read a second or third

time or ever, under these reasons.

Because the minister couldn't even answer questions. How could we have it read a second or third time when he can't answer questions? It's absurd. You don't need an opposition then, if that's all you need. You can vote by yourselves, you can run your own rules, you can just have a monopoly. And that's what NDPers campaigned for. Monopoly's fine as long as they get to run it. A dictatorship is fine as long as they're in charge.

Well, what socialist gobbledegook! Pathetic. That's what they said in the Soviet Union for years and years and years.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Will the member please get back on the Bill that is before the Assembly. It's a second and third reading of the Appropriation Bill. The principle of the Appropriation Bill, that's what's before the Assembly today.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Point of order, sir.

**The Speaker:** — Yes, what is your point of order?

**Mr. Neudorf:** — My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that what we are debating now is whether or not this Bill should be read a second time. That's what this is about.

We are saying, sir, no, it should not be read a second time. And the Leader of the Opposition is going to great pains to tell the people across the floor and the people of this province why it should not be read a second time.

Now if he is not allowed to advance his arguments, then I submit to you, sir, that we cannot do our job as the opposition. That is why we are adamant that he should be allowed to make his arguments, sir.

**The Speaker:** — I'd like to just consult with the Clerk, please. I think the member is making a valid point of order, but I want to check.

Order, order. I think the member from Rosthern has a valid point of order. But the problem that we're having is that the Leader of the Opposition is dwelling only on the closure. If he makes his argument that the second and third reading should not proceed, that's valid.

But if you're arguing on the closure part, which only was on stage one, then it doesn't pertain to this. If you want to draw in the closure from time to time as to your arguments as to why second and third reading should not proceed, that's fair enough. But, sir, you can't base your whole argument on other rule changes that do not pertain to second and third reading.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — But he's only on the first half-hour of a three-hour speech.

**The Speaker:** — Well that may well be, but I'd like him to draw it to the appropriateness of second and third principle of the Appropriation Bill.

**Mr. Devine:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well I agree whole-heartedly with the argument that we shouldn't

proceed with second and third reading for lots of economic reasons as well as the closure reasons. The closure that got us to here was such a sham that we shouldn't proceed with second and third, and all the economic arguments that we couldn't get answers for.

So I could read the member from Arm River's questions that he asked the minister, and then we sat here and we didn't get any reply, so we don't believe that we should proceed. We can't proceed. How can we proceed when we didn't get any answers from the minister and he was locked in in a procedure from the day before that wouldn't let him get up on his feet?

It's that ridiculous. I've never heard of it. I've never seen it. I don't know that any Legislative Assembly has ever experienced anything like this when members stand and ask questions knowing that they can't get any answer. How could we be in support of this thing proceeding through that sham, that awful, undemocratic arrangement. And secondly, to let the minister off the hook so we can bring his officials in and not respond, how can we let it go to second and third when he didn't get on his feet?

And then on top of that, under these new rules, they get to vote by themselves whether we like it or not. And now we're into second and third, and they want us to pass it and let it proceed?

The public, nobody — nobody in Regina, Saskatoon, or anybody that believes in democracy — would believe in this. What we just saw Monday and Tuesday is not democracy. We're cut off. The minister's cut off. Only the NDP get to vote by themselves. Only the government gets to vote by themselves on a supply Bill, and this is grievance before supply. We were complaining; we're asking about health. We ask about nursing homes. We ask about agriculture. We ask about GRIP. We ask about the Liquor Board. We ask about pensioners. We ask about diabetics. We ask about chiropractors — no answers.

How can we let them proceed to second and third reading of an interim supply when they won't respond to the public? We get letters and requests and phone calls over and over and over and over again, asking us to lobby the government, asking them why they're doing that.

My seat mate has a survey the NDP have done — \$50,000 survey prior to the budget. But we have all kinds of questions that we want the minister to respond to, and we couldn't respond to the fact that they have spent \$50,000 on an NDP survey, taxpayers' money. We can't ask them in interim supply. Now isn't that ridiculous. How many NDPers have we always heard asking, what about your polls, taxpayers' surveys, the polls.

Well here we've got one through freedom of information. The NDP have done this survey, and we can't ask the Minister of Finance to explain it, to justify what he's doing. And he's got health, education, unemployment, and all these things in here. And the rules cut him off so he can't speak. And if he does speak, he only gets one crack. He has to take his place, and therefore we couldn't ask anybody. In fact I'm not so sure how it works after that. You're just cut off.

Now this is the track and the black, undemocratic box that this Legislative Assembly has got itself into, and the NDP opposite are trying to justify that. So should we let the second and third reading proceed? Of course not.

Imagine what they would say if they were on this side of the House when this . . . We didn't even come close to this kind of a procedure. They were pulling their hair out and screaming "undemocratic" and all of that. Now they're doing it like it's never been done before, even cutting off their own caucus members and their own MLA and their Finance minister voting alone, and they expect us to give them free will to proceed.

So you're right, Mr. Speaker. It's because of the procedure. It's because of the unanswered questions by the hundreds that we have, even on their own expenditures. They spent this money prior to the budget so they had to fund it out of somewhere. Even where did you get the money for the survey? Why these questions in the survey? Why didn't you ask about agriculture in your survey? Why didn't you ask about uranium, economic development? Why didn't you ask about a plan for economic growth in your survey? They can't answer any of those.

They jump right over it. That's why we don't want this to proceed. And the minister sits there. He doesn't have to answer questions; he doesn't have to do anything. He's free. And the NDP think that this is normal, this is something we should defend.

(1515)

Mr. Speaker, I've asked the minister time and time and time again if he would explain where his revenues come from, why he's allocated his expenditures the way they are. And we had many more questions with respect to the whole health care budget. And it's one-twelfth of the expenditures, let alone the GRIP, and we went through the one-twelfth. And now we're in a position where none of that can be answered in this grievance before supply. And we have some grievous questions. And black Monday meant that they could vote by themselves and didn't have to respond.

So I just say to the members opposite that this is a complete sham of a procedure. This Legislative Assembly is not about democracy. It's about a dictatorship. Why should we let an NDP dictatorship do as they like without answering questions, without standing on their feet, and only voting on this to get it to where it is today by themselves? We can't ask questions in this debate. We get to speak and that's it. They don't have to respond. For all I know, they won't respond at all.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm just going to sum up my remarks by saying this . . . and to the general public. Yesterday was a black day for the Legislative Assembly in Saskatchewan. A black day because it was closure on closure. It was the first time in interim supply when we have the Minister of Finance and his officials here that he would not answer a question, because number one, he was not prepared to answer the questions, and number two, he knew that if he got up, he would be sit down for ever after that because of

his own rules.

And the public should know that, that the NDP have even muzzled the government. And finally, when it was all said and done, the NDP got to vote by themselves for the first time in the Saskatchewan's legislature. I'd be ashamed of myself if I was an NDPer sitting in this Legislative Assembly. You should all be ashamed of yourselves. Dictators. Unprecedented, unparliamentary, unfair. And the arrogance of believing it's . . . well I guess they can do it because they got elected. And they know full well they'd never get elected on anything like this. If you campaigned on this, they'd kick you from here to Hamilton.

That's the unfair, undemocratic, despicable part of the NDP and why so many people know that's really what they're all about — the small minds that have always wanted to get elected to run something. And they don't really know why, just to do it. And then you get a chance to have power, you just run roughshod over everybody. Tell them about their morality. Tell them how to change contracts. Tell them how to change the rules. Tell them they don't have to vote in the legislature. Tell them even ministers of Finance don't have to answer questions.

What a record. What a pathetic record. Mr. Speaker, I certainly won't be supporting this, going into second and third reading of this Bill, passing it, because I think it's absolutely a sham and it's shameful.

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

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as the member from Estevan, the Leader of the Opposition has outlined so ably today, that we are involved in a process here that I think puts a lot of disrepute on this particular debate, on this Legislative Assembly, that will ultimately, Mr. Speaker, lead people to be far more cynical about politicians than they already are.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to start off in saying my opposition to the second and third readings of this particular interim supply motion is eloquently summed up by the member from Riversdale in a previous debate. And he said to this House, and you've heard this quote before, Mr. Speaker:

What new-found Democrats are these, Mr. Deputy Speaker? What new-found democracy is this? What kind of a charade is this? What kind of an unprecedented action is it for these people to bring forward a motion for rules change without consultation . . . without any consultation from us; out of pique, out of pique.

That's the words that the Premier of Saskatchewan in a previous debate, Mr. Speaker . . . A debate that had so many of the elements, so many of the possibilities involved for downfall in it. And we've seen that downfall occur in this legislature in this interim supply motion.

We have closure upon closure, meaning that it isn't possible for this opposition to agree with second and third reading of this particular Bill. It has meant that the

questions that should be asked on behalf of the taxpayer, after three interim supply motions and two special warrants, Mr. Speaker, going into the sixth month of this budget . . . that means taxpayers have to have answers to expenditures. That means that this opposition should be very diligent questioning a government that said it would never, ever embark on a process such as that.

Coming from a political party that criticized over and over again one special warrant, one special warrant from the former government; that in a committee similar to this, took great issue with a Finance minister of the day and said, we have every right as an official opposition to ask question upon question upon question before we grant you interim supply; questions about your tax measures; questions about your revenue; questions about dealings with the federal government on an issue that is still with us today, Mr. Speaker, and that is GRIP — all of those things from the members of the New Democratic Party when they were in opposition.

And they said to the minister of the day: Mr. Minister, we cannot grant you second and third reading on your supply motions because you won't answer these questions for us.

And the member from Regina Dewdney was vociferous in asking about revenue from the harmonized sales tax, and absolutely insisted that before second and third reading could be granted on that particular interim supply motion, that the minister of Finance had to account for those revenues on an ongoing basis.

And you know what, Mr. Speaker? I can remember after reading the debate in *Hansard*, that the minister of Finance was fairly forthcoming. Even though in the narrow ruling that could have been applied on interim supply, he didn't have to give the member from Regina Dewdney anything, if he would listen to the current Minister of Finance in his interpretation.

I mean, he would like us, Mr. Speaker, to come in here, simply glance through his document, say trust me, boys, and give me the cheque. I mean that's kind of the attitude that we have from this bunch. We got a great big majority, you know. We recently got elected. We can do whatever we want. I'm going to go write a cheque to the federal government for nearly \$14 million here shortly on the whole question of agriculture, and I don't expect you guys to ask any questions on it. You've got to trust me that I'm going to write the cheque properly; that we're going to negotiate properly.

So you ask some more questions about those negotiations and some of the analysis that his department has done in regards to the federal offer. And we're told it's none of our business, simply trust me, write me the cheque, this process shouldn't take any longer than an hour. And if it does take more than an hour, I'm going to have the House Leader come in and use closure. And then when he uses closure, we'll set it up so that nobody can answer any questions, even myself, because if I do I have to sit down and I'm done.

Now that's the kind of process we're involved in here, Mr. Speaker. We have a Minister of Finance who's spent

considerable amounts of the taxpayers' money on a survey. And it asked a whole lot of questions — a thousand respondents in the province of Saskatchewan — asked a whole lot of questions about unemployment, deficit, government spending, economy, recession, education, constitution, taxes, resources, industry, environment, health, grain prices, agriculture, rural economy, other, don't know, refused. I mean, it covered the piece, Mr. Speaker. And the minister supposedly built his budget around it.

But can we ask any questions about this expenditure of taxpayers' dollars? Somewhere in that interim supply, at some point, either through a special warrant or interim supply, this thing had to get paid for. No doubt about it.

I'd like to know from the minister why there were no specific questions in here on Saskatchewan's largest industry, agriculture, and how they were going to approach GRIP. And I guess that's because the decision had already been made, that they were going to break the contracts. Therefore they didn't need to ask anybody about it.

And I wonder why, when we're polling Saskatchewan people by the thousands about issues pertaining to the budget, why we wouldn't ask them anything about the Saskatchewan Pension Plan, why we would disenfranchise 54,000 people. You would have thought 54,000 people would have registered on the Richter scale somewhere of a very expensive survey done by your government to set your budget by. I would have thought so. But maybe that decision had already been made, Mr. Speaker, and that's why the Minister of Finance wouldn't want to talk about those kind of questions in grievance before supply.

And I don't see a darn thing in here about economic development and the uranium industry — once again heavy, heavy ramifications to the budgetary process, a very large industry in our province, tens of millions of dollars in royalties, tens of millions of dollars in taxes, thousands of employees.

I would think those things impact upon the budget of this province very significantly. But they're nowhere in the survey. And I can't even ask the Minister of Finance why they weren't in the survey, why this expenditure of the public's money on pre-budget information wouldn't include the uranium industry and the pension plan and GRIP. And we can go on and on and on, Mr. Speaker.

But we can't ask those questions, because if we do, Minister of Finance says no, the resolution's very narrow. And after a couple of hours of that, the House Leader says no, we've got to have some closure here to make sure that you don't ask those questions, make sure that the public expenditure on survey results doesn't get talked about.

And then we change the rules so that members on this side are expected to vote on second and third reading of this Bill knowing full well the process involves not asking any questions and not having the Minister of Finance answer any.

And it's a strange, strange process, Mr. Speaker. When

one goes through, Mr. Speaker, all of the various verbatim from 1989, and it pretty well covers the piece here, Mr. Speaker, on issues like this, you really have to wonder what the New Democrats would be like if they were on this side of the legislature today faced with granting second and third reading on this supply Bill.

And I would like to read into verbatim a quote, and I'm sure it was used in this Assembly before, Mr. Speaker, but I think it's important to refresh the minds of members. This comes from a very vocal member of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker. This is from the member from Regina Rosemont:

Seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this motion before us, this motion which would limit the democratic right, this motion, rule 33(1), that would limit the democratic right of the citizens of the province to participate, stands in stark contrast to our attempts to democratize this legislature for the citizens of the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. And I guarantee, Mr. Speaker, (this is the personal guarantee of the member from Rosemont) I guarantee that when we form the . . . government in this province, those members (meaning the Conservatives) will have the right to have their viewpoint . . . as opposed to this kind of undemocratic, undemocratic jackbooting that faces us here in this legislature.

(1530)

Well I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the member from Rosemont is out getting fitted for the jackboots. Because that's what we've seen in this legislature in the last few days. We have seen unprecedented use of power by this government to make sure that the official opposition doesn't ask those questions. That we grant supply without grievance. That we give the Minister of Finance a blank cheque to do what he wishes without having to answer questions, even though we are into the sixth month.

And I find that strange, Mr. Speaker, from a party that in its own throne speech, delivered a few short months ago, talks about these very things. A process that isn't simply allowed in other jurisdictions.

The member from Arm River was relating a conversation that he held with a member from the Ontario legislature last month on this particular item and how this government is ramrodding this legislature. And he said to the member from Arm River, it would take at least six months in our legislature for this to occur. We simply would not be allowed to get away with this type of high-handed, in the words of the member from Regina Rosemont, jackbooting procedures that we're seeing from this government.

And yet we're asked to grant second and third reading. The member from Regina Elphinstone, the House Leader of the government, stands on his feet and says that you've held this legislature up for 57 days on the GRIP Bill.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we all know that's not the truth. Yes, the official opposition left this Assembly for 18 days; that included weekends. But I remind the member, it was the Speaker of the Assembly that suspended the GRIP Bill for

some 28 days. It wasn't the official opposition. It was the highest officer of the House.

And I remember well, the only time that I can remember closure being used by my government, and it was after over 100 days — I don't know the exact figures; maybe other members in debate will know those things; maybe Mr. Speaker remembers — but it was a long ways down the road. It was after dozens of hours of debate on a particular issue and I think the House had been in for five or six months — I don't know, something like that. I mean to even equate those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, with what we've seen here is at best hoping to pull the wool over the public's eyes, and at worst it's exactly what the member from Rosemont is talking about.

And I don't know why this government in their first term, their first full term in this House, would want to resort to these tactics. I mean they've got four years. If there is legislation that is that unpopular, all of the alternatives that have been presented to this government could have rectified that situation and perhaps allowed this opposition, after a decent amount of questioning, allowed the second and third reading of this particular supply motion to go ahead.

But that's not the case. And that means, Mr. Speaker, that this session will undo perhaps much of the goodwill felt by the public in this province when any time you have a transition in government. Usually when governments change, Mr. Speaker, there is a sense of optimism, that change is as good as a rest.

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

**Mr. Swenson:** — That all of those things that happen in society when you have shifts after 10 years will sort of give people a breather, and whether they agree philosophically or not, they'll sort of get on with their life.

And instead, we have this oppressive, oppressive NDP government using its heavy hand, its moral authority, its massive majority sort of at a daily whim. I mean, we can tell people what to wear now in this province. We can break contracts unilaterally. We can change the rules of the legislature unilaterally. We can do all sorts of things on a daily basis because we won. We have a big majority.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I can remember full well being part of a majority every bit as big. And between 1982 and 1986 there was no closure. Every member of that NDP opposition could stand on their feet and talk for as long as they want, and they did. There was no closure, there was no unilateral rule change. There were debates on interim supply. And at the end of the day, the opposition granted interim supply without closure being forced down their throats, without some ridiculous rule change that says that I can't ask questions to the Minister of Finance with his officials in this Chamber and he can't answer them.

I mean, Mr. Speaker, we have sunk, I think, to new lows in this Assembly if this is the process that we're going to lower ourselves to in granting these second and third readings. It is a new low for this Assembly. And I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, this type of action and procedure will drag it lower — it will. It will drag this Assembly lower

and lower and lower in the public's esteem because of those actions.

And the way it looks, Mr. Speaker, that we shall be back in this Assembly probably in about a month's time, in the dying days of August, not with lots of time to pass interim supply, but the opposition will be notified a couple of days before the end of the month that we must grant the minister interim supply. And I suspect at that time, because government members will be even more frustrated, they will seek closure again on interim supply, that we'll probably see closure on many Bills, that we'll probably see the hours change.

We might even be sitting in here 24 hours a day, Mr. Speaker, for all I know. If the government seems to think that might break the opposition down, that it might stop the opposition asking questions on behalf of people all across this province, I suspect they might do that. I mean, they got enough members. They could probably rotate them in and out of here in three shifts, you know. And we could work this place 24 hours a day, and they could wear the members of the official opposition out that way. It wouldn't surprise me at all, Mr. Speaker, if that's the mode that we got into here because this government seems bent on doing anything possible to do that.

It says second and third reading and interim supply shouldn't be any problem for you people. Simply be quiet, go away, and let us do our thing.

In the survey that I was referring to by the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, he asked a number of questions on taxes. These are questions 38 through 42. Question 38 says: Is an increase in provincial sales tax acceptable to you as a Saskatchewan taxpayer? Sixty-eight per cent of the respondents said, completely unacceptable. When you put that with the next two categories, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you find 90 per cent of Saskatchewan people in that category of either completely unacceptable or slightly unacceptable.

We go down here another notch, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and it's a question 40: Is an increase in personal income tax acceptable? Well 58.6 per cent say completely unacceptable; 14.1 per cent, nearly completely unacceptable; 17.4 . . . I mean you don't get up till you hit the median mark here at 4.4 per cent. Once again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we've got 31, 58, we're way in the high 80 percentage of Saskatchewan that thought that a personal income tax raise was completely unacceptable. What we got out of the minister was a 10 per cent surtax on personal income tax.

Now I would have thought, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that those are the kind of questions that you should ask in grievance before supply. That when Saskatchewan people feel this strongly about certain issues, that because we don't have a budget passed, we haven't had the Minister of Finance in estimates — and I mean at any point in time those can be called, as you well know, Mr. Deputy Speaker — that given that people had strong reactions to the survey information that the minister sought prior to designing his budget, that you would want questions asked about this.

And I know that the former New Democrat opposition asked many questions in this regard. Did Saskatchewan people want a gasoline tax increase? — 48.1 per cent, completely unacceptable; 21.2, right next door; 18.9, we get a way up here to 5.5 per cent before it's acceptable.

There is all sorts of information in here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I think, given that the minister based his budgetary decisions on this survey, or at least he spent over 50,000 bucks asking people questions about it, that we should be asking very fundamental questions.

And as I said earlier, we should also be asking about what was left out of here. I mean, when you take the entire provincial economy and the ramifications of the changes that have been brought about by the Minister of Agriculture and the minister of Crop Insurance on this economy and the potential for the loss, it's no darn wonder, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this granting of interim supply on second and third reading is simply unacceptable to this government . . . or to this opposition.

I mean, somehow in the mix here, in our survey results that the Minister of Finance commissioned, somewhere in the mix we forgot to ask people about the 2 to 300 million bucks that the folks in the drought zone are going to be short. That's a lot of money, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to this province. That's a whole lot of dough for a whole lot of families in a whole lot of communities where it's dry.

And we attempted in the first day before closure was used to ask the Minister of Finance about the new federal offer and the analysis that his department had done in regards to that and what the impacts were in the province of Saskatchewan. And I know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that those analyses are done. They're done on a weekly basis, the same as they analyse the money markets, the same as the do currency swaps, the same as . . . I mean, the bureaucrats in Finance, quite frankly, crunch numbers from morning till night. That's what they do. And there are lots of them.

And the minister has that kind of information because he has to be prepared. If the provincial government was going to take the federal deal, and as the minister says, I need 23 million bucks to offset that, that means I'll send my guys into the money market and they'll hedge, they'll do a currency swap, they'll do an intervention on one of our bond issues. They can do many things to guarantee that when that \$23 million comes due at some point hence, it'll be covered off.

That's what the bureaucrats in the Department of Finance do. And it has been done in anticipation of some type of offer from the federal government, some kind of transaction, because any minister that didn't do that would be negligent in his responsibilities.

And I do believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for all his partisanship and his wish to rule this legislature in a very arrogant way, I do believe that the Minister of Finance knows how to work hard; that he probably does listen to his bureaucrats for hours every day; that he does ask questions about analysis; he does keep his eye on the bond market; that he does keep his eye on the American dollar and the Japanese yen and the German mark and

Swiss franc, and all the areas that he happens to borrow in. And maybe he picks up the odd Singapore dollar once in a while. I don't know.

(1545)

But the thing is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, those things are watched on a daily basis as is that federal offer and the ramifications it'll have on this province. He doesn't hesitate to come in here and say, I'm going to give the feds 14 million bucks on a program that you guys were involved in back in 1988 and expects us to say: okay, fine, yes we trust you, without asking some questions about what's going on at present.

And that's why we can't, can't in good conscience, Mr. Deputy Speaker, grant this motion. I mean, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think just about every member of this legislature on August 4 can think of other things that might be more appealing than this hallowed Chamber of ours.

And I know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we all take our responsibility seriously. But if this government is going to persevere, persevere down the road that it has chosen to set with the unprecedented actions of the last few weeks in this Chamber, then we are going to spend an awful long time in this Assembly. Because there's only one way to fight that type of undemocratic procedure, and that is to spend the time here and fight it.

And you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm sure that's what was going through the minds of all of these New Democrats here that we have from *Hansard* in years gone by — Rosemont, Riversdale, Saskatoon Sutherland, it was called — it's Saskatoon Sutherland-University now — Saskatoon South, Prince Albert Carlton, Humboldt, Churchill Downs, Hillsdale. I mean it just goes on and on and on, Mr. Speaker. Regina Albert North, Regina Dewdney, Moose Jaw Palliser. It just goes on and on.

You know, Mr. Speaker, they were saying the same thing, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They said you know, there's only one cure for the heavy hand of government; that's to stay in this Chamber for a long, long time and debate and fight to get the democratic agenda back on course so that people in this province can feel that they are having their concerns handled in a democratic process. All in the last couple years, this was all said on the record, over and over and over again.

And now we see the very same people using the rules of this Assembly like they've never been used before to thwart that very process. I don't know how any of those people, how any of those people can walk down the street in their home town, in their constituency, and look people in the eye. I don't know how they can do it. Because if they can, that means that there is nothing in their soul at all except a black, empty hole — nothing else at all.

I mean, political licence is one thing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but to stand in this House for so many hours and so many weeks and so many months fighting for these very principles and then to turn around and impose the opposite when you have this large, overwhelming,



sweeping majority, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is simply unacceptable to anyone that believes in the political process in this province — simply unacceptable.

It is indeed a black day on Monday the 3rd for this province. It is a black day on Tuesday the 4th, and it will be a black day, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for every day that members of the opposition have to stand in this legislature and read back to these new-found democrats their own words on these actions.

And you know what, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by rule 15 of this House, the Minister of Finance will get his way. He will make sure that second and third reading of this particular motion go through. The House Leader, the member from Elphinstone, the Hon. Minister of Economic Development and Trade has already made sure that the front end is looked after, that the sham process was looked after, that the closure, the railroading . . . So that means that the member from Regina Dewdney, the Finance minister, will get his second and third reading. And they can call a vote in this House, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and it doesn't matter if the opposition's here or not. Doesn't matter a hoot.

So I'm wondering, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what's next? If it's not 24 hours a day to make sure that we get second and third reading, and that we get GRIP, and that we get everything that's on our agenda, because we promised the folks inside that we're going to get our dirty work done early in our term and then we'll be nice, expansive people after that — what's next?

Maybe the simplest solution to the whole thing would be just to limit every speech in this legislature to about five minutes. I'm sure that the House Leader can find somewhere in the rules where he could come up with that. Or that each member only be allowed three questions in committee. That would certainly speed the process up. That would make sure that we would get second and third reading off probably in about an hour and a half on any given time. There's only 10 members of the opposition. If they each took three questions and each question was — oh, I don't know, two or three minutes — that means that two hours ought to . . . if an hour and a half didn't do it, two hours ought to do it easy. If we just would limit them each to three questions, that should take care of it.

And any time on second reading, well we'll use the rules from rule 16. I'm sure the Government House Leader's looking through his rule book right now probably, and I think a rule 16 is about 15 minutes for the mover and 10 minutes for the seconder. Well we could just take rule 16 and we could apply those rules to the House here, and 15 minutes — well 15 times 10, what's that? That's 150 — yes, that ought to look after the opposition in about two and a half . . . two and a half hours? Yes, that would look after it.

And that would certainly expedite things, wouldn't it, Mr. Speaker . . . or Mr. Deputy Speaker. And I'm sure that this government would be quite comfortable with that. I mean, it's the next logical step down the road. The next logical step so that we can make sure second and third reading of interim supply go off without a hitch here.

Make sure that we don't ask a bunch of questions about \$50,000 surveys; that we don't ask a whole lot of questions about federal government offers in agriculture; that we don't ask about 54,000 contract holders in the Saskatchewan Pension Plan; that we don't ask about 66 rural hospitals that are probably going to get the chop; we don't ask about level 1 and 2 nursing homes and their patients and what's going to happen to them.

It would be much more convenient, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if we just took rule 16 time limits, applied them, and we could dispense with all of this nonsense. That seems to be the attitude that we have in here. That's why we get closure on closure. And that's why, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I guess we're going to have to spend a lot of time in this Assembly reminding New Democrats over and over and over again about their very own words, their very own words that they said in this Assembly and around this province over and over and over again. Because I'm afraid a whole lot of repetition, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the only way that it's going to sink into their heads what they're doing now that they have this massive government.

You can't say one thing and do another consistently, Mr. Speaker, and have anyone in this province place any credibility in the political process.

And that's what we're going to have to do here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because we simply cannot grant this Finance minister interim supply when he wants supply without grievance. He wants supply without grievance and that simply isn't acceptable because his government has used the rules of this Assembly to make sure that he gained supply without grievance.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will now take my seat and we'll get on with the process of allowing other members of the opposition to remind New Democrats about what they said, and see if we can't get this government to change its mind; change its mind so that we do have grievance before supply; change its mind so that we do get our questions answered; change its mind so that they start behaving like the government that they promised Saskatchewan people, not like the dictators that they've become.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

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

**Mr. Kluz:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm proud to rise and speak in support of second and third reading.

As a new member, I sit back and think of the way it was. You know, in 1982 and prior to 1982, when we had terrific highways, we had a terrific credit rating — probably the best in all of Canada — we had timely budgets; and politicians were respected at that time, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And in 1982, let me remind the members opposite, we had a surplus budget of \$139 million. And today, what do we have today? We have accumulated debt of \$15 billion, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That is \$760 million interest for this year alone — over \$2 million per day. Just think of what we could do with that interest that we're paying, over that \$2 million per day.

And if we didn't have to pay the interest on the public debt, we would have a \$249 million surplus — \$249 million surplus if we didn't have to pay those interest charges.

And when the member from Thunder Creek says, let us ask some questions on this, well if they will look back to *Hansard* on July 30 from pages 1849 to 1867, that's 18 pages, the member from Thunder Creek and the member from Estevan were asking the Minister of Finance questions. They had ample opportunity to ask questions.

And now that closure is taking place and the members opposite say, when this happened when we were government when we did this, that the opposition said we would take it from one corner of this province to the other and tell everybody about what's going on in here.

Well let me tell the members opposite, they have that opportunity as well to do that. But somehow I think they're not going to do it, probably because they're a little bit lazy. And they had 18 days, they walked out of this Assembly for 18 days, got together some petitions, tabled them in this Assembly; there's 240 names on that petition. My, were they ever working hard. They interviewed the member from Morse. He said, oh it's a nice holiday we're having here. And they interviewed the member from Estevan on a golf course.

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

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Assembly and the Speaker whether the member has the right to tell people whether I was interviewed or not and whether this member of this Assembly has the right to prove that he was never interviewed.

(1600)

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order. What the member is raising is a question of debate and is not a point of order, so it's not well taken. But while I'm on my feet, I might encourage the member for Kelvington-Wadena to find some relationship between his remarks and the Bill that's before us.

**Mr. Kluz:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I will be getting to that in short order, but just trying to get some of my points across. And I think it's time the members opposite took off their rose-coloured glasses and got on with business.

We have to get business done in this Assembly. That's why we are moving this way. It is day 58, day 58. Now when I go back to my constituency in Kelvington-Wadena . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm having trouble hearing that, Mr. Deputy Speaker; it sounds like the magpies in my backyard. It obviously must be getting to the members opposite.

But when I get back into the constituency of Kelvington-Wadena or any place here in the city of Regina, even the Conservative supporters are telling me, let's get on with the business of this House. I'm glad you ended that bell-ringing; let's get on with this business. We

have 10 members that we voted out of government; let's get back to business.

There's 32 estimates to do in this Assembly, 25 we haven't touched yet. And the member from Thunder Creek said, that's a disgrace. Well the only disgrace is the shenanigans and the ranting and raving of the members opposite.

The member from Thunder Creek says it seems like the Minister of Finance is saying, trust me, trust me with this budget. Well maybe I think we should, because if you look back to 1982 and prior to 1982 when he was the minister of Finance under the Blakeney administration, he did have a terrific reputation, in fact balanced and surplus budgets . . .

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

**Mr. Kluz:** — And maybe the only reason they can't trust him is because they can't trust themselves. The previous opposition was opposed to the previous government invoking closure because of the going-ons that the 10 deficit budgets . . . And the public was also opposed to them on October 21.

The members opposite were not responsible in government. They don't seem to be too responsible in opposition. You should be ashamed of the way you ran this province for the last nine and a half years — the waste, the corruption, the mismanagement. And this interim supply, like the Minister of Finance's reputation, you should be able to ride on that. Not like the 1986 budget where the minister of Finance said, we are going to have a \$350 million deficit. And I was saying, 1986 when the minister of Finance said, we are going to have a \$350 million surplus budget. I believe that was an election year. And we find out after that it was some place around 1.3 billion.

And we take 1991, when the minister of Finance said it was going to be a \$265 million deficit. Four days into the election the member from Riversdale wrote the then premier and said the people have a right to know. They have a right to know. Is this deficit on track? Let's tell the people the whole truth. Tell them the story and then we can go campaign on the financial shape of this province.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order, order. Order, order, order. I've listened very patiently to the member for Kelvington-Wadena, and the member has yet to relate any of his remarks to the Bill that's before us.

And the Speaker has previously interrupted members who spoke to this Bill to remind them that they should begin to relate their remarks to the matter that's before us. And I'll give the member the floor but encourage him to tie his remarks to the Bill that's before us.

**Mr. Kluz:** — Well thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I was just trying to convey the message that when the member from Thunder Creek is saying why should the Minister of Finance say trust me, I was just trying to relate that this interim supply Bill should be — and the money that was asked — should be a direct correlation with that on the previous credibility that the Minister of Finance has had.

So that is the relationship I was trying to get that across. And that was what my point is. And I will just finish off my remarks just to show that the Minister of Finance is going to be doing a good job.

So you know, when we got the letter back and said yes, yes that the deficit is on track and we formed government and checked out the actual financial state of this province, find out the deficit is going to be close to a billion dollars. It was a budget that wasn't even passed. It ran from the legislature.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we were elected to govern. This House is going to function. We're going to pass our Bills, and we're going to pass this budget. And it is going to be an honest budget, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Thank you.

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

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Is the Assembly ready for the question? I'll have to recognize the member for Arm River. The member has the right to close debate, but only after other members have had the opportunity to enter into the debate.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman. That was a nice try by the Minister of Finance. But he's been around here long enough to know, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that he has to give everybody a chance. And I'm sure glad that someone, Mr. Deputy Chairman, gave the member from Kelvington-Wadena a chance, because I can sure see now why that Sherwin Petersen says, I'm going to run again. I can sure see why. He knows that he's got a sure way in.

But I do want to, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I do want to . . . the Deputy Speaker, I want to congratulate that member for getting up and at least saying something. That's more than any of the rest of you have done. We've been sitting here for almost 60 days in debate and nobody but just the minister that introduces a Bill ever says anything in this House.

We have chirpers and chirpers and they never get up. And I want to congratulate the member from Kelvington-Wadena, even though I didn't agree with some of the things he said. Mr. Speaker, he said that the word will never get out, the word will never get out of this legislature to the province of Saskatchewan; it will never get out because the Conservatives are too lazy.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to inform him that I've never seen a lazy free enterpriser in my life, because they've been keeping the socialists in this province for a good many years. And I think it's in order. The member from Kelvington-Wadena misled this House, Mr. Speaker, when he . . . he misled the House when he said . . . I think he done it on . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I know the member may wish to look over there, but he should direct his questions over here. The Chair is over here. Okay?

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It'd be a pleasure to look your way. It'd be a pleasure. Then I won't

have to look at them.

He made the statement that in 1982 that when the now Minister of Finance made such a wonderful job with his balanced budgets, when . . . He'll have to be tuned in, Mr. Speaker, on what we talked about here yesterday.

And I guess he doesn't listen when he's in this debates, listening to the debates in this House. Because back in June 1 when we got your, Mr. Speaker . . . his Minister of Finance today, who was the minister of Finance in 1982 admitting . . . and I'll repeat, Mr. Speaker, for the Assembly again just the last part here where . . . this is a quote, this is a quote, Mr. Speaker. And I want to make it very clear that I said here back in May: we don't want to keep on hearing about this here balanced budget that the NDP left, and that the Tories left all this mess you've got.

Well I'm going to tell you where the mess started from. It started right here. It's after me questioning, Mr. Speaker, right here, right here.

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

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Speaker, I questioned . . . for several hours I questioned the Minister of Finance. Then finally I asked him under oath . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. I've only been back in the Chair for five minutes and I've heard the Minister of Finance twice interrupt. And I wish . . . I know he's going to have his opportunity later on.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you very much. I'm just so anxious when the Minister of Finance gets up to answer all our questions that we asked yesterday in the motion. And then also he'll be answering . . . I'm sure when he gets up to speak he'll be answering many of our questions, Mr. Speaker.

But I want to go on with my quote for the member from Kelvington-Wadena. After I asked him — the now Minister of Finance — he finally gave this answer:

I can give it to you right now. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the member opposite: 1992 the total Crown corporations' debt, self-liquidating, not in any way a burden on the Saskatchewan taxpayer because the Crown corporations' earned income . . . They charge power rates and telephone rates and they paid the loans that were provided to them. But the Crown corporation debt was \$3.397 billion.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on the Consolidated Fund, which is on the government side, taxpayer supported debt, do you know what it was, Mr. Chairman? A hundred and ninety million dollars . . . Do you know what it is today, Mr. Chairman? It's almost \$9 billion after 10 years of the good and wise management of the member from Arm River.

All told . . .

Now this is a statement that I don't want any members to keep on arguing about because this is his statement:

All told, when you consider the sinking funds which are provided, and the member will know what that's all about, the gross debt for the province of Saskatchewan in 1982 was \$3.5 billion.

Now how do we have members, Mr. Speaker, getting up and saying about this balanced, clear budget?

I mean, and then take the \$3.5 billion and put it into . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. I'm sure that the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster will get up later on and speak on this debate. But until she does, I wish she'd let the member from Arm River have his say.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Speaker, thank you. As the member from Estevan has said here today and the member from Thunder Creek, this is a black . . . these are black days for Saskatchewan. And it is, when we have a heavy-handed government. As I closed my remarks yesterday Mr. Speaker, I said I was ashamed of the members opposite that has made this black day. And I want to repeat that again today, that I'm ashamed of you.

Because, Mr. Speaker, they keep saying that we filibustered and held this House up for 50-some days and how ashamed we should be of ourselves. I'm going to get into it a little later. But I just want to start out with . . . in 1989 the House sat from March 8 to August 25. And closure, for the first time in this province, on the potash Bill, was on August 4.

Now if you've figured out the days, from March 8 to August 25, that's 170 days less holidays. And I didn't figure them all out. I figured eight per month and maybe one or two more holidays was approximately 120 days sitting. And we were close to the end, not at 50-some days when we had a filibuster going on and on. But, Mr. Speaker, we didn't come in with a closure like this.

And I wish to . . . I have a quote here, Mr. Speaker, from *Hansard*, by the House Leader, in 1989 when he spoke on the closure motion on August 4, 1989.

(1615)

**The Speaker:** — Order. I wonder when the member from Kindersley is going to get into this debate.

**An Hon. Member:** — Next.

**The Speaker:** — Well, then wait your turn. All right?

**Mr. Muirhead:** —

Mr. Speaker, I'd say let's talk . . .

This is what the House Leader at that time was saying, Mr. Speaker:

. . . let's talk a little bit about the current debate on Bill No. 20. How long has it gone on? Well, Mr. Speaker, it has gone on now for 80 hours, some 80 hours of debate on second reading on this Bill.

Now if that isn't filibuster . . . And there's a lot of members here that were here then. The new members, I don't blame them. But the new members here know 80 hours of debate.

Mr. Speaker, this motion that we have before us today will allow with, I believe, fairness and reason, that this Bill will be debated . . . 120 hours (more). And I suppose, Mr. Speaker, the question is: how long is long enough? Surely, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill, being debated (for) more time . . .

Now we went on and on, and we have somebody has read off some quotes from *Hansard* and all those things. I may give a few more of those later on.

But, Mr. Speaker, let's . . . just to have the record straight so we don't have this here arrogance coming from the members opposite, the House Leader, when he says that you'll sit here for 56 days . . . this was said sometime last week, 55 or 56 days. And you've done nothing. Only two estimates passed . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That is right.

But let's talk about who's been filibustering this last 50-some days. I'll tell you who the filibuster is. When you ask questions of ministers and you do not get answers and you bring in Bills like the GRIP Bill, you must expect that. You must have known you were going to get it.

Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Finance, I blame this here closure on the interim supply Bill directly on you — directly. Because the other night when we opened up the supply Bill, it started out about quarter to three last Thursday. I believe it was quarter to three in the afternoon, and you answered no questions from quarter to three till 5 o'clock.

The member from Estevan, Mr. Speaker, entered into the debate and asked questions from 7 o'clock until quarter to nine — not quite two hours — and couldn't get any answers whatsoever. He was answering . . . asking questions pertaining to the one-twelfth of the Crop Insurance and how much more money could you possibly be looking at to put together if there's emergency comes up in Crop Insurance.

And you, Mr. Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance could have avoided this whole thing, could have avoided all the problems and debate in the interim supply Bill going back to May and June and now, if he'd have just stood up in this House. And even if it was questions that he could say, oh well you can get those in estimates, why wasn't he man enough just to answer a few questions, and we wouldn't be in this mess today. This wouldn't be happening. He could have answered questions.

You used to put up an awful scream and holler over here if our minister of Finance didn't answer the questions. And we've been through that before back in May. Mr. Speaker, to the minister, we've been through that and through that. Our minister gave in and gave you answers.

It's their arrogance, Mr. Speaker, is why we're sitting here

in this position today. They're saying, Mr. Speaker, that we're not to ask any questions about GRIP — not to ask any questions because that's policy.

Well okay, GRIP is policy. I will admit that. Changing it or whatever is policy. But I'll tell you one thing, that the financing of it is not policy. The financing is where the money comes from, and that is your duty, your responsibility when we're asking the minister questions pertaining to the financing of GRIP. It is your responsibility to answer. And you just stood up and said to the chairman — hour after hour in May, June and July — oh you got to get those answers from the departments in estimates and sit down.

If he's the Deputy Premier, Mr. Speaker, he could have just stood up, answered some of the questions, and we wouldn't be into this here difficulties we're in.

I know one of the members from Saskatoon said to me the other night that why don't you ask questions. That's after the closure, and we're down to the 20 minutes. And I don't blame her because somebody didn't tell her what the rules were, Mr. Speaker. She said, why didn't you ask questions?

And I said, well if we ask a question and sit down, we've lost our place. But as the member from Estevan said today, it's worse than that. It's much worse than that because, if the Minister of Finance got up and answered one question, he couldn't get up again either.

Now we know — and I want to have it corrected on *Hansard* here if anybody's got the thoughts that these are new rules — those rules there for 20 minutes on closure have always been there, but the rule for closure after a few hours of debate has never happened before. It has never happened before. Certainly when the member from Estevan was speaking, there was heckling coming over there that those rules had never been changed. Well they haven't been. You've only got 20 minutes on these particular type of debates on closure. But why the closure, Mr. Speaker? Why did this heavy-handed government bring down closure from three o'clock in the afternoon to a quarter to nine at night, and then we moved on to the E&H Bill?

Well I'll tell you why it is because it goes right back to the GRIP. It goes back because we're asking them questions. What should happen? What would happen, and where's this planning if maybe somehow the public gets to these people, Mr. Speaker, and we do have public hearings? We need to know what it's going to cost. We need to know their planning.

Mr. Speaker, when I was . . . One of the members said something about when I was in Bismarck a few weeks ago for meetings. Yes there was four provincial governments representing there: Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta and 20 or 21 states of America. And it was very interesting, Mr. Speaker, when the three speakers — the speaker from Alberta, the speaker from Manitoba, and the speaker from Ontario — talked about how you pass Bills through their legislature, their respective legislatures.

And it's very interesting when the speaker from Ontario — an NDP speaker, a real nice gentleman — and he ran us through how a Bill gets passed. And I was wondering how . . . And in this here . . . It was an environment Bill, and it was a controversial Bill. And I couldn't understand how he was talking about it took six months to get this Bill through. He said six months it lasted.

But what happened is the people had their say. The people were taking their requests to the opposition. The opposition were asking the government for public hearings. The government wasn't listening, but eventually they listened to the public. The public had their day in court. They had their day because eventually they allowed public hearings for 30 days, then another 30 days. Then, Mr. Speaker, it went on to a total of six months. This time the public had hearings, public hearings, and voiced their opinions. And the environment Bill had amendments from the people, amendments from the opposition, and amendments from their own government. And I was very pleased to see how democracy happens in Ontario, but I'm not very pleased to see what's happening here in Saskatchewan today.

We're not getting those . . . We wouldn't be in this impasse in this House, Mr. Speaker, if it wasn't for the GRIP Bill. And it's not whether it's versus '91 or '92. It all comes down to a very important issue, and that's this make-believe letter that's deemed to be sent out to the farmers on March 15. That's the most dangerous precedent that's ever been set in this province of Saskatchewan.

And I'm hoping, Mr. Speaker, that before we get through this here Bill we're on here now and before we get through the GRIP Bill and before we get through some other Bills in this legislature and before we get through estimates, I'm hoping that the good people of Saskatchewan will be heard by this government. I still feel sincerely that some of these members in the front row, Mr. Speaker, will eventually listen to the people and will have public hearings and let the farmers have their day in court because it's serious, Mr. Speaker, when a government changes the law while a court case is going on so the farmers will lose their day in court.

Why couldn't we just not put the GRIP Bill aside? We wouldn't have this impasse in here. We wouldn't be all getting so angry and so irritable with one another . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We could have common brotherhood, as one of the members said across the hall. And I'd like to have that, Mr. Speaker.

The way we could have that is just let the farmers have their day in court. Let the judges of this land decide what's right and what's wrong. Don't change the law beforehand so the judge has to rule in a different manner.

Now that's what we need to have: co-operation in this House. We need . . . When we want to talk about the interim supply Bill, the Appropriation Bill, certainly it's never been held up in this House too long by any party. I never seen it in my four . . . I think this is my 15th session, 14th year. And I've seen it 2, 3, 4 days some time in opposition. And I think we held it three days or four days here. But it always gets through in time. Nobody ever

needs to start threatening somebody else that any opposition or government or whatever is going to oppose a Bill so long that somebody doesn't get paid. I mean that's just using scare tactics.

But this time it could have been done the other night. Last Thursday. Our intentions were to have the Appropriation Bill completely — right through second, third readings — completely finished last Thursday night because we had a lot of questions to ask. And from quarter to three till quarter to nine, if it had've went to 10 o'clock, would have been ample time if, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Finance would have answered questions right from the beginning.

But to stand up time after time after time and just say to the chairman and to us that you must get that answer out of the estimates or from somebody else. Well maybe he's partly right; maybe he's partly wrong, Mr. Speaker. I do believe, I do believe that all he had to do was just answer some of the questions that were important on our minds and we wouldn't be in this serious situation today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how . . . what way we have for him to respond or to . . . I suppose when closing debate I'm hoping he'll try to answer some of our questions here. We were asking the other night, our member from Estevan was asking all about crop insurance and the GRIP program and where additional funding would come from and is it in the one-twelfth of the interim supply Bill.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we got no response. But we also know that they're getting phone calls and letters continually from throughout the province where the crops are not good in this province.

Why did we get into this impasse or into this here change in GRIP in the first place? It came from the north-east and the easterly part of the province, Mr. Speaker. There's where the people, starting back in '91 while we were in government, they were protesting against the 1991 GRIP and they wanted changes.

Mr. Speaker, if I was getting too much onto GRIP I apologize. I've been around long enough to know, Mr. Speaker, when I get the eye, I better change my remarks. I guess I have a disadvantage, Mr. Speaker. I sit too close to him. If I was over there farther I wouldn't be able to see you.

But, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely just want to say that anything I say on GRIP here it's because . . . I'm not going to talk about policy. I have no intentions to get into that. But if we do want questions answered and we did want questions answered on where was the emergency money going to come from in this interim supply Bill if there was the deal made in Ottawa.

I've got a letter here that I'm going to refer to later on that the Premier sent to the Prime Minister asking for help for the drought areas of this province. And they were talking, and there was an offer made back and they said, now they've saved themselves, Mr. Speaker. Yes, we've got negotiations going and perhaps, seeing we've got the doors open that we'll work out something.

So I think it's right and legitimate that we ask the Minister of Finance that what if tomorrow that there's some kind of a deal made, where is the provisions? Where's the provisions?

I just couldn't understand. I didn't get a chance to ask the other night, Mr. Speaker. I didn't get a chance to ask these questions. But the kind of a question I would have asked here and I was going to ask it back in June in interim supply and I didn't, I neglected to ask it when I was asking questions then.

And, Mr. Speaker, he says that one-twelfth, I understand from memory, that the budget for Crop Insurance roughly 110, 11 million dollars, and one-twelfth of that is around that 9 to 10, 11 million, whatever the figure would be. It's approximately \$10 million. And you take \$10 million, or whatever it is, each month — it must be about 11, I believe, Mr. Speaker, if calculations are working right in my head here — about \$11 million per month. And what do they do with that money, Mr. Speaker?

(1630)

They don't pay out any claims in January. Maybe a few in January left from the fall before. But not in a year like last year. In February, March, April, May, and June and July, and you'd have to be the end of August before there could be any claims paid out. So I know from being minister in Crop Insurance approximately what it costs the province. They have to pay the administration.

But for the costs of paying the share of the premiums and what not, and paying into special programs, would only come up as maybe two or three times a year. Maybe from middle of August in the westerly side of the province till claims could come in as late as, I suppose, the end of October to the middle of November in the east side of the north-east. So that's when they pay out their money.

And I wanted to get that information. I don't know whether I'll ever be able to get it now, is why and what do you do with the money that you have each month? I mean, each month you take in this here \$11 million, and it doesn't take \$11 million per month to pay the administration of Crop Insurance. So I know that there is questions asked here. There's this document here that he so kindly sent over to us that there's some extra money, 13 million or something, to go to Crop Insurance now.

Well that takes care of one month, but what about all the other months? Where does it go? And, you know, those are questions that are . . . it bothers me that we can't get from him. And we've had this government just say to us when we're about to ask these questions and the member from Estevan asked him for almost two hours the other night, from 7 o'clock till quarter to 9 and couldn't get an answer, till finally there was a precedent made when the Minister of Finance got up and got a little angry and started making political speeches. And then so did the member from Estevan.

And so then the House Leader knew he had to get control of his Minister of Finance, so he come in on closure. And that's what happened, Mr. Speaker. If the member from

Estevan . . . or, I'm sorry, if the Minister of Finance had have not broken rank and started into political speeches, we never would have had closure. We would have been all through maybe. I don't think the way he was answering questions that we would have finished that night for the interim supply Bill, but if he had have been answering, we definitely could have been finished by 10 o'clock that night.

We have no reason, Mr. Speaker . . . what would be the possible to reason to hold up an interim supply Bill? What is a possible reason? It's been happening for ever in here — just get some answers. We're entitled to ask a few questions. There's nothing wrong with asking a few questions pertaining to 4 or \$500 million.

I'm the critic for ACS (Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan) and Social Services and several other Crowns, SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation), and PSC (Public Service Commission). And I wanted to ask questions about . . . I wanted to ask questions, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Finance about how much of that one-twelfth that's allocated to Agriculture, how much of that money gets back to Agricultural Credit Corporation. I wanted to know that. I needed to know that because we have farmers out there that would sure like to know if this government's spending any money whatsoever on farmers, or are they just spending their money on law firms and taking the land away.

That's mostly what they're doing from what I can see, Mr. Speaker, now that they're spending their money or their one-twelfth that they put to Agriculture and then they put it over to ACS, and I don't know how much. But I wanted to ask the question. I wanted him to say that this law firm and that law firm and that law firm gets X amount of dollars and cents to go out and foreclose on farmers. Because that's what's happening. The Farm Debt Review Board will tell you right today that the hardest lender there is to deal with over Farm Credit Corporation and all the powerful banks, which I call the warmongers of the world, is the major banks plus you got your credit unions, and then you got ACS.

And when they said ACS has got to be the most hard outfit to deal with and they should be the best. Mr. Speaker, they should be the very best. When you're dealing with ACS, you're dealing with the government that's supposed to have a heart. And certainly when they were dealing with us, we had a heart for farmers.

And we were promised . . . and we want to know these questions: how much, how much money has gone to lawyers, to law firms? Is there any money still going back to the old law firm that the now Premier and the Minister of Justice belonged to? Is there still money going through to that firm from this one-twelfth that we're talking about here? How much money is going to foreclose on farmers?

That's what we need to know. We need to know. We have a right to know that MacPherson Leslie & Tyerman, their law firm, how much money they're getting; what's their share of the one-twelfth; what's their share of this interim supply Bill for this next month?

**An Hon. Member:** — Put a lid on it, Gerry.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Speaker, one of the members across the way, Mr. Speaker, is saying to me I should put a lid on it. Well I'll tell you, I can't understand that because I used to . . . that individual sat about right here for four years and we didn't want to put a lid on her because we knew she had the right to speak in this House. We knew she had her right. And I gladly, gladly listened to that member. And I even told her . . . and I met with this individual several times and says, you do a good job, you do a good job.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, they had something to say all right. And they went out and said it at election time. And there's where the Minister of Finance is wrong on not getting this information about this here interim supply Bill because they went out and promised everybody in this province they were going to balance budgets, lower taxes, increase jobs, save all the farmers. And what did they do? They broke every last one of them. They broke them worse . . . well they haven't broke balancing the budget yet. He hasn't broke balancing the budget yet.

Well that's the only credit, Mr. Speaker, that I sometimes say to people throughout the province that maybe he will live up to his promise on balanced budgets. He might, but on the backs of whom? On the backs of whom? He doesn't care how many senior citizens . . . we have a right to know how much money was saved in that one-twelfth through the departments when they cut people back on their diabetes insulin and their pills and their drugs and people that had to have these treatments from the chiropractors and what not. How much money did they save? Was there less money to the Department of Health?

When people have to pay for getting their eyes tested, Mr. Speaker, we need to know these questions and these answers. We have a right to ask them. Why couldn't he have stood up and say very quickly, yes, this one-twelfth to the Department of Health is that much less this time because we socked it to those there senior citizens and we squeezed their pocket-books and we got extra dollars and cents. But he won't let us ask that question.

We want to know, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we have a right to know how much did you squeeze out of the seniors in this province and how much did you squeeze out of almost everybody. I guess everybody's included in the E&H (education and health) tax. How much did you squeeze out of them? How much did these here seniors that will . . . 90 per cent of them will never vote for this government again, and we have a right to know on that supply Bill, we have a right to know how much money you squeezed out of those people because they're not very happy with them, Mr. Speaker. They're not very happy with this government.

I have a right to know in Social Services. I have questions that I wanted to ask him about the one-twelfth that goes to Social Services. I have a right to ask this here Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker. I have my rights to ask him that all the different departments . . . how many departments and agencies do you collect the one-twelfth from, that you pay the one-twelfth into? How many are there? I have my right to ask him that.

And then I have my right to . . . when he answers that question . . . how many of those departments didn't use up their one-twelfth, and where does the money go? Does it go from there into the Consolidated Fund? That's what I wanted to ask him, but we've been stifled, and we can't ask.

Did the deficit that I think that we're still running behind on because they've put extra money . . . they have put up a little extra money now. They got the Tories . . . our opposition jumped on them so hard about the highways and byways and tearing up these gravel roads that he added a little more money — it's right in here — to the one-twelfth. There's more money to Highways because they decided now that they're not going to gravel all . . . tear up and make gravel roads out of all these here roads.

We have our rights to ask that. I want to know these things because that's what we're here for. When I was sworn in as an MLA in the floor of this legislature — and it's been four times now — our job is to scrutinize the king's money. That's what we're here for: to scrutinize the king's money. And this opposition, this government, Mr. Speaker, they seem to feel that we have no right to scrutinize. They think that we'll just take the rights of those Tories away. We'll just tell them. We'll do what we want. If we made a blunder, Mr. Speaker . . . and I've had some of the members opposite tell me that our Minister of Agriculture has made a blunder, and we'll have to cover up for him. And I've had them tell me that. But I won't mention the names. But if a member pushed to, I will mention them in his here . . . But those are private conversations that I'd just as soon not do that.

But I will say under oath that I've had members say that our problem is why we're sitting here. From members opposite, I've had two that I'm thinking of now that said because of the blunder of the Minister of Agriculture by not sending that letter out is why we're in this impasse in this building. Why should the farmers in Saskatchewan suffer for that blunder? Why should they suffer? It's not reasonable.

Mr. Speaker, we have a letter here that I think is very important; it's very pertinent to the supply Bill. It's a letter that the member from Estevan did talk about a little bit the other day. He read one quote. But I want to have permission to read . . . it's only a short letter, if I could read it all into the record. It's a letter the Minister of Agriculture sent out to every producer in this province.

Income problems continue to cause tremendous hardship for Saskatchewan farm families. Your Premier and government are sensitive to these problems and want to ensure that the federal government in Ottawa understands just how serious the situation is in rural Saskatchewan. The Premier sent a letter to the Prime Minister of Canada, the Right Honourable Brian Mulroney, outlining the provincial government's position on farm income. I have attached a copy of the Premier's letter and would welcome your comments and how you think the federal government should respond to the farm income situation. If you should decide to write directly to the Prime Minister Mulroney expressing your concerns, would you please provide Premier of Saskatchewan with

a copy of your letter.

I have also enclosed information from Saskatchewan Agriculture and Food regarding changes in the sharing of costs of the agriculture support programs between the federal and provincial government. The province, in spirit of its limited financial capacity, has taken on a dramatically increased role in providing income support to farmers.

They don't seem to say that the income support . . . So that's what they're saying, that it's increasing dramatically: that is why we feel the federal government must provide the additional support that is so badly needed by Saskatchewan farmers.

The Minister of Agriculture has responded to that. Maybe you should have kept the old GRIP format, and we wouldn't need to be begging from the federal government. Just because you're too cheap to pay up doesn't mean farmers should do your dirty work and write to the federal government. Do your own job. That's the only response we got from him. Now that's serious.

Now that last comment, Mr. Speaker, I've got a comment I want to make about that, but I'm not going to make it just yet: the province, in the spirit of its limited financial capacity, has taken on a dramatically increased role in providing income support to farmers.

I have a comment I'm going to make about that a few minutes later. I have, Mr. Speaker, some quotes that I'd like to put on the record. Mr. Speaker, it's pertaining to the . . . And I think it's important. It's why we're into this mess here we're in here now — this impasse. We're into it because of a closure motion. That's why we're here. So I'm not going to go and repeat the ones that, Mr. Speaker, that the member from Estevan and the member from Thunder Creek did. But I want to read some of them.

The member from Humboldt:

Mr. Speaker, we are here in this debate because this government, I believe, is drunk with power as well. They are so consumed with themselves, so consumed with their friends, and so consumed by the power that they wield, that they just refuse to allow the democratic process to work. They simply just do not respond to democracy in a traditional way in this province because they are so drunk with the power that they hold.

And that's August 7, 1989.

It sets that arrogant attitude, and let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, I think the reason they're doing this is because every time they do it it becomes easier, it becomes more accepted by the people of the province. Once it's done, then the people they think will say, well it's been done before, then they'll accept it a little easier next time and the next time and the next time.

August 7, '89.

(1645)



Well as I said in the beginning of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, that shows you the arrogant government we've got here because this was done after the House came in on . . . and, Mr. Speaker, I see the — and which I shouldn't be looking at him; I should still stay looking at you, you're much better looking, Mr. Speaker — the Minister of Finance. I will turn this way or this way. He's the one that is just shaking his head at me now as if this is wrong. But I'm right when I said that the House came in on early March of 1989 and went out in 170 days later. And that the closure Bill came in on August 4.

So let's don't say that they aren't an arrogant government, Mr. Speaker, because they are. Any time you get a . . . and that was after 80 hours of debate. And we only had less than six hours of debate. In fact it was less than five, from 3 o'clock — quarter to 3 till 5 o'clock and then at a quarter to 9 we had closure on the interim supply Bill. Never, ever, has that happened in the history of the Commonwealth. Never, ever, has it ever happened.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the history of the Commonwealth goes back a long time, I understand in England, about 700 years and on record. And England goes back about 700 years and I had an individual when I was in Bismarck here two weeks ago tell us, that they said a Bill like this, that he is sure because it was checked out when they had this problem in Quebec, that it's never happened in the British Commonwealth in 700 years — 700 years.

I have another quote that I'd like to read, Mr. Speaker: this debate, Mr. Speaker, is about a government with its own agenda, agenda that is not in the best interests of the people and that is not good for the people of Saskatchewan.

Well let's just stop there for a moment, Mr. Speaker, because maybe this individual is right. Maybe that Bill that we're talking about wasn't right for the people, but the people should have had their say. Just like this GRIP Bill that I'm asking for finances and a commitment of make a deal with Ottawa where it is one-twelfth of this money. There's no difference. It's there. And he should be providing for it.

That means they're going to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, with a forked tongue. It means they're going down there asking for money or writing letters but don't mean it and don't want it because they know they're not going to get it because they didn't provide in their budget. They didn't even provide.

This debate is about muzzling the opposition, Mr. Speaker. Muzzling the opposition — something that this government is not reluctant to do because we've seen related examples of how they've muzzled other people who have effectively spoken out against their policies, their cutbacks and their harsh and cruel tactics, Mr. Speaker — August 7, 1989.

Another thing I wish to talk about, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that this motion violates the very spirit of democracy. Imagine these here hypocritical people saying that in 1989 and turn around and muzzle us after less than five hours. And we only had one speaker on the GRIP motion

the other day and we got muzzled. So, Mr. Speaker, if the people in this province don't realize they soon will, because I tell you, the member from Kelvington-Wadena will see how much this ambition this here 10 people on this side have to get the message out over the next four years. And I will guarantee you that there will be very, very few people that saying these terrible statements will be re-elected to this legislature.

Mr. Speaker, maybe I do have a quote from Moose Jaw, but I'll just take a check. I'm afraid there isn't. But I do have one more here. This is one more here:

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I find this piece of legislation so abhorrent. He doesn't have the right to decide how long I can speak in this legislature. He doesn't have that right. The people of Saskatoon South have elected me to speak for them.

August 7, 1989 *Hansard*. So I say again, you don't have the right. You just don't have the right as a government to tell me whether I can or cannot speak in this legislature. The people will decide that.

Mr. Speaker, I have another one here:

. . . this is a government afraid of words, afraid of words and afraid of ideas, afraid to let opposition MLAs, elected by their constituents to speak for them, do just that in these legislative chambers, the chambers of the people . . .

August 7, '89 *Hansard*.

This PC government with this motion has said formally and officially with their closure upon closure motion they said: if you dare to oppose us, if you dare to criticize us, if you dare to speak against us, we will eliminate your right to speak. Now isn't that got to be some statement, Mr. Speaker? We will eliminate your right to speak. Isn't that got to be a statement and a half. Since when do we not have our right?

The members opposite that are chirping at me now, they all have their right to speak. At least I gave the member from Kelvington-Wadena a bouquet for getting up to speak. But where are the rest of you people? Where's the member from Moose Jaw that could speak for 12 and 15 hours? Where is he now? The front benches have muzzled him and says: no you can't speak. There is the House Leader and the Minister of Finance . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. In case the member has forgotten, we do have a motion before us that relates to interim supply. And I've listened very carefully for the last 10 minutes and he has not related at all what he said . . . he was doing all right at the beginning, but lately he has not related it at all to the motion before us. So I ask him to get back to the motion.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do appreciate you, Mr. Speaker, bringing me back on the topic because I will say I was getting carried away. But I enjoy getting carried away once in a while in here, Mr. Speaker.

And I will go back to the Minister of Finance now. We'll go back and discuss a little more about this here GRIP and why there wasn't a provision for more money for the farmers in that one-twelfth. We'll never find out, will we? I'll say to our own caucus here, we'll never find out because they won't answer any questions. We can't get any answers from them.

I mean even when he was able to answer, from quarter to three last Thursday to quarter to nine that night, which was five hours, he had a right to answer and he wouldn't answer one. And I'm asking, Mr. Speaker, I'm asking, will . . . I'm hoping that when this member, when this Minister of Finance gets up, that he will answer some of the questions. He's had a chance. He's had his office, and his MAs (ministerial assistant) had a chance to go through the *Hansard* and see the questions that I asked yesterday. And I expect an answer to them. I expect an answer. At least not be arrogant like you did yesterday, Mr. Minister; that when three of us spoke yesterday — three of us — and we could . . . we were going to keep on.

Well we thought for sure that you . . . Mr. Speaker, I'll address my remarks through you to the Minister of Finance, that we thought for sure that we'd better not have 10 speakers because it's going to be hard for him to remember all these answers. So we had three — we had three people speak. And then we sat down and thought for sure he'd get up. No way. He wouldn't get up. He didn't get up. He almost did. I seen him put his hand on his desk, he was going to get up, but he got the nod from the House Leader and he sat back down in his chair. I seen it, Mr. Speaker. I've been around here long enough to kind of know what goes on and how . . . dispositions of people.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to make a comment, and this comment that I'm going to make will probably cause a problem in this legislature. But this individual that wrote . . . that drafted this letter to the producer in this province and sent this letter out to all the farmers in Saskatchewan — there'd be thousands of them going out. And it says in here, and I want to repeat it: the province, in spite of its limited financial capacity, has taken on a dramatically increased role in providing income support to farmers.

Now whoever drafted that letter, whatever bureaucrat in this province drafted that letter, absolutely lied to every farmer in this province of Saskatchewan.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order. The member, on two accounts, is out of order. Number one, the subject matter that he is referring to has absolutely nothing to do with what we have before us. And secondly, I will ask him to withdraw the words "lie" that he has just made.

And he knew before he said it, that's what makes it so sad. He said that he was going to be out of order and then goes ahead and does it. And I'm asking the member to — he knows better than that — and to withdraw those words that he has just put before the legislature.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Speaker, this is a . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order, order. I want the member,

without any comment, to withdraw the words that he just spoke, that the bureaucrats lied to the legislature. Withdraw the statement without any comment.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Can I, Mr. Speaker, have you had . . .

**The Speaker:** — No, you cannot. You either withdraw the statement or you don't. I'm asking the member to withdraw the statement. He knows it's unparliamentary. He said so himself before he even made it, that it would be unparliamentary. I'm asking the member to withdraw the statement that people lied in this Assembly.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Speaker, when you check *Hansard* you'll find I didn't say that and I will not take that back.

**The Speaker:** — Order. I want to ask the member . . . The member knows that we do not use the word "lie" in this Assembly. He made the statement to this Assembly, that what I am going to say is probably going to get me into trouble. That, I think . . . I'm paraphrasing, but those were his words. So he had knowledge of what he was going to say was unparliamentary.

I'm simply asking him — he knows better than that — I'm asking him again to please withdraw those words. You know that they're unparliamentary; you said so yourself. I'm asking the member from Arm River to simply withdraw those words.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — I did not say it in that manner and I felt that I'm right to say that in this legislature, Mr. Speaker, when I'm talking about somebody lying outside the legislature.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order. I've asked the member to withdraw those words. I'll give the member one last opportunity to withdraw those words, otherwise I will name the member under rule 28. I ask the member to withdraw those words.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Speaker, my last comment is that whoever drafted that letter lied to every farmer in the province of Saskatchewan.

**The Speaker:** — All right. Order. The member leaves me no choice. And therefore under rule 28 I will name you, Gerry Muirhead, and I ask you to leave the Assembly for the rest of the day.

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The interim supply Bill that we are dealing with here today is something that, as I said yesterday, is a very legitimate thing that the government should be asking for.

And it's also legitimate that we have the opportunity to ask questions about interim supply Mr. Speaker. But we haven't had that opportunity. We haven't been given the opportunity to ask questions of the minister. We all had a number of questions. Everyone in the opposition had questions with respect to the areas of their critic responsibility; that they would like to be able to ask questions of the Minister of Finance on this.

The Minister of Finance is asking for something in the order of \$400 million from the taxpayers of Saskatchewan

and we think it's relevant that we should be given the opportunity to ask some questions about where he intends to spend that money. But we simply haven't been given that opportunity.

As the rules of this debate would be, we would only be given individually one opportunity to ask a question. One question, we'd have to sit down, and then we would lose our opportunity to ask further questions.

And that simply isn't the way a democracy is supposed to work, Mr. Speaker. It's supposed to be grievance before supply; an opportunity for us to ask questions before it's voted on and the money is appropriated to the Minister of Finance.

We had questions, and a number of questions, Mr. Speaker. Various members on this side of the House have asked a number of questions and none of them have been answered. The Minister of Finance simply refused to answer the questions. He didn't bring in . . . he brought in his officials and we weren't able to ask a single question.

We wanted to ask questions about economic diversification and trade — what they planned to do in that area. What they plan to do with the Piper Aircraft deal, what they plan to do with Saska Pasta, what they plan to do with the AECL (Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd.) agreement, what they plan to do with meat packing plants at Moose Jaw and Saskatoon.

SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation), through this minister of . . . the House Leader, lent the packing plant in Moose Jaw six and a half million dollars. We haven't been able to ask a single question in this interim supply Bill about that deal — not a single question. We weren't able to ask questions about Impact Packaging in Swift Current . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. It now being 5 o'clock, this House stands recessed until 7 p.m. this evening.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.