

EVENING SITTING

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 87

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Wiens that **Bill No. 87 — An Act respecting amendments to Certain Farm Income Insurance Legislation** be now read a second time and the proposed amendment thereto moved by Mr. Devine.

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As we were talking before supper, I'll just repeat a couple of little things we were talking about before supper, Mr. Speaker.

What is really this 1992-91 GRIP (gross revenue insurance program)? That seems to be the issue out there with the farmers. And the people that ask you, they say, well tell us the difference between the '91 and the '92 GRIP. So you try to explain it to them. Well it doesn't really affect me, so if they're not a farmer, well oh so what.

Well then you'll go ahead and explain, well that's not really the big problem in here; '91-92 GRIP, Mr. Speaker, is an issue among the farmers and of course among the taxpayers. But the average person out there that's not involved directly or with a farm or they're more concerned when you tell them about the type of Bill it is. That's when they get really upset as soon as you sit down. And I've sit down — with I suppose in this last two or three months now, it's not dozens; it's got to be in the hundreds of people in groups and whatnot — and explained, Mr. Speaker, what really this government's trying to do.

And soon as you tell them about the retroactive Bill and they said, well you people have had retroactive Bills before. And I said, yes all governments have, but it's what people wanted. It'd be maybe, Mr. Speaker, the type of a Bill that didn't make any difference. It was a Bill that was introduced well say maybe in March or April. The Bill could be introduced in the House, and people are waiting on this here housekeeping Bill or whatever it is or a Bill that people are asking for. And quite often that Bill has been in my years in here it would be proclaimed to take effect back maybe six months, or three months, or back even . . . it might even be to the day of the introduction of the Bill. So that's what I'm finding mostly out there and that's what the people in the province of Saskatchewan have got to understand.

And I plead with them to understand that the '91-92 GRIP is a big issue for the farmers themselves. But for everyone in this legislature that is not a farmer or not even directly involved with a farm — no connection whatsoever — I ask them to please understand what's been happening here for the last . . . Well we've been sitting here approximately 60 days and then we had 18 days that the bell rang. So we've been here, soon be 80 days. And most of this . . . We've got a lot of work done. We've got a lot of Bills passed. And we've got some estimates that have been . . . we've sat for several hours. As I said this

afternoon, they're not passed, and they could have been passed, because the ministers won't answer the questions.

I sit here tonight, Mr. Speaker, talking about why we're sitting here on a GRIP Bill, because nobody wants to talk about it. Nobody wants to try to come up with a compromise for it. And ministers will sit here in their estimates and just get up and say just anything at all for political speech and not answer questions.

So if they would answer questions and we could get all the people involved in this here impasse we're in — and I sincerely mean this, Mr. Speaker — if we could just get the people that are involved, like the Minister of Agriculture and the minister of Crop Insurance, the Minister of Finance. The House Leader is a high priority minister in this House, the member from Elphinstone. There's the member from Quill Lakes, one of the members from the North. They've been around here a long time. Plus there's some members that were elected here in 1982 and '86 that are getting to be high profile ministers. The Minister of Health is here and she's a high profile minister.

If they would all sit down and discuss this and discuss it with some of our people, sit down and say, well look at, what's the best thing for Saskatchewan, what's the best thing for the people of the province of Saskatchewan — not have on your mind all the time what's the best thing for the PC (Progressive Conservative) Party and what's the best thing for the NDP (New Democratic Party) Party and what's the best thing for the Liberal Party. That seems to be what everybody's . . . whatever's best for us.

When are we going to start, Mr. Speaker, getting serious about this terrible disaster that's been going on in . . . I won't just say Saskatchewan. It's right across the whole grain belt — right from Texas to Prince Albert, we've got a farm economic problem. But now we've got an economic problem all over North America and generally most parts of the trading world. We've got an economic problem. We have to have people who use their heads.

As the member from Thunder Creek here said this afternoon when he was speaking, Mr. Speaker, he said that he couldn't see anything in this Bill that would do anything for farmers. There isn't anything. I guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture and to the people across the . . . members of the government, there isn't anything in the Bill that's going to mean anything to people. It will not put extra money in the hands of farmers.

All this Bill can do, Mr. Speaker, all it can do is put more money in the hands of the government. So that is breaking their commitment. The GRIP Bill, the '92 GRIP Bill, as far as I'm concerned, breaks the commitment that this government made at election time.

And I want to take it right directly to the Premier, which I'll be coming back onto him several times tonight. He's the one that's the head of this government. He's the one that went throughout all the province of Saskatchewan campaigning for the last three or four years. And he just

kept saying what a terrible government the Tories were and we're taking this here government into debt that will . . . and at election time, they said, oh this government's got a debt of \$10 billion and they created it all, and that we left . . . 1982 were defeated by the PCs it was a balanced budget.

Well we wouldn't be here now talking about this GRIP Bill, Mr. Speaker, in this impasse we are, if the government opposite had more money. We know that, because they've admitted that it's not the . . . it isn't the farmers that . . . whether it's '91 or '92 Bill because, or '92 GRIP, because, Mr. Speaker, they said that for a long time. They kept saying '92 was best for farmers, '92 is best for farmers.

But it's not the way. It's come out to be very common knowledge now that it's best for . . . And I can't just up and say it's all wrong. They say it's best for the pocket-books of Saskatchewan people; it's best for the Department of Finance. If they want to take that attitude and say that's all right, but while doing so, Mr. Speaker, when you're breaking contracts, that is wrong, totally wrong.

In my lifetime I always felt, I don't care who it was, if a man would never break his word that they come up high in my books — if he never breaks his word. And I can . . . Naturally I'm not going to mention names, but I know people opposite that I've dealt with in this government, and they'll change their mind from day to day and their word is not good. I want to bring to the attention of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, a gentleman that I dealt with when I was whip in this House back in 1979 to '82, I think three years. Anyway, it was three years, '79 to '80-81, I believe, and his name was Gordon MacMurchy.

He was the minister of Agriculture, and he was either the deputy House leader or the deputy whip. And I do know that if he was left in charge and if that man ever gave me a list of what the day's agenda was going to be, everybody around him can suffer but his word was good and it would never change. And we didn't have the same philosophy, Mr. Deputy House Leader. Mr. Speaker, I said deputy House leader or deputy whip. Mr. Speaker, Mr. MacMurchy, if he ever give you his word, his colleagues around him would suffer because he wouldn't break his word.

And that's what this government is not doing today. They're not the government that I even knew from '78 to '82 because their word doesn't mean anything to them. And to prove it they wouldn't go out and break their word to 50-some thousand contract holders. You wouldn't do such a thing. To break your word to the contract holders of Saskatchewan.

I've got people that have told me, well '92 GRIP doesn't really hurt me too bad. If it rains and I get a good crop I might be able to be not be too bad. I might even do as well or better than the '91, but I don't like the changes; I don't like the idea that this government can up and change my contract.

I wouldn't have been happy, Mr. Speaker, that if back in . . . crop insurance came out in 1962 and I didn't sign up for crop insurance. It was 1964 when a man by the name of

Emanuel Lang . . . he ran for the . . . in fact he was a CCF (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation) candidate and a real good gentleman. He drove into my yard one day after the election, and he had lost, and he said I'm signing up people for crop insurance. And I said, I'm not interested. Well he says, you might be interested because I understood that you said if they put in spot hail that that might interest you. So I joined crop insurance in 1964.

In 1964 I had a light crop but I didn't collect crop insurance. I carried crop insurance from 1964 to 1980 or '81 and never did I see a contract get broken. If I had've put a claim in any one of those years, if I'd have had a poor crop and I put a claim in, and somebody said, well it isn't what you said; the contract has been changed. They've put an Act through the Assembly to change part of that contract, well you wouldn't take that. That would mean court. You would sue . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, did you hear . . . I wonder if the . . . I'd like to put it on the record that the House Leader, the member from Elphinstone, said when I was minister of Crop Insurance there was more skulduggery than he ever heard before. Well I'll tell you that's an awful statement for him to say, because it took me three years to clean up the mess that they were running. It's the mess that they were running. I run a place of honour.

The Speaker: — Order. We've got a long evening ahead of us and I would prefer if members allowed members to debate in this House without too much interference. And also while I'm on my feet if the member could direct his questions through the Speaker it may also help.

Mr. Muirhead: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will direct my questions through you. I'm speaking; I'm not asking questions. I'm speaking. They can worry about that afterwards.

Yes, I guess the member from Shaunavon at that time, he'd be wondering . . . We all wonder what happened when he got kicked out. He got kicked right completely out of government and said don't come back, we don't want ever to see you down in Shaunavon again. And he didn't . . . I don't think he's even shown . . . I understand he even goes in, Mr. Speaker, in the dark to seed his crop. He don't want to be seen in the daytime. But yes, Mr. Speaker, now he's safe in the arms of Regina.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I'm not here to have to argue with the members opposite. That shouldn't have to be tonight, Mr. Speaker. I should be able to go on and make my remarks and I shouldn't have to . . . because if they're going to talk from their seats, I'll respond. I'll just do that, but I'd rather not. I'd rather keep on and talk about the terrible things that this here government has done. When the member from Elphinstone, the Minister of Finance, the deputy minister of Finance, the Minister of Justice . . . these are the people that know this is wrong. And I won't name any names, but there's been people on that side of the House that have told me, we have made a mistake and we have to suffer for what we've done.

An Hon. Member: — Name them.

Mr. Muirhead: — And that's right. If they push me too hard, Mr. Speaker, I will name them.

Mr. Speaker, we know that every individual on that side of the House knows that this is not a good Bill. If anybody can hold this Bill up to Saskatchewan, I will challenge every member on that side of the House to take this Bill out and show them to their friends and say: is this all right?

(1915)

And I'll just put it on the record, what I'd like them to read to them. We'll go to part of the Bill here. And just read it to any of their friends, any of their supporters, and I guarantee you, Mr. Minister, or Mr. Speaker, they won't have too many friends after they just read this one part.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or the regulations, section 49 of every revenue insurance contract deemed to have been entered into pursuant to subsection 5.1(1), being the provision stating that any changes in the contract shall be mailed to the insured not later than March 15 of the year for which the changes are to be in effect and that those changes are deemed to be part of the contract on and after April 1 of that year, is void and of no effect and is deemed to have always been void and of no effect.

Now I understood from the, Mr. Speaker, from reading the media and listening to the opposition members respond to the media, that they were going to have . . . part of this Bill was going to be a clause deeming that there was a letter sent to the farmers prior to March 15.

Well that's bad enough but it didn't come out that way. It come out this way: that the whole year of their life is void. It didn't happen. It would just be like we can say, Mr. Speaker, that the member from Shaunavon was never born. He's not here. He never was seen. That's just exactly what they done. I mean the past member from Shaunavon, the now member from Elphinstone.

That we just say, hypothetically, Mr. Speaker, that somebody wants to take a Bill to this House. You take anybody member you want and we'll put a Bill through. And we're going to say that this Bill's going to be hypothetical Bill that the member such-and-such was never born and we'll just put him out of our life. Now that's exactly what they've done to 50,000 farmers. They've taken their contract, Mr. Speaker, and they've made it void.

They absolutely, Mr. Speaker, they will not . . . they say they don't like what I'm saying because I'm challenging them. And I'm challenging everyone that's listening on television tonight or watching or whatever; everybody that reads the news; everybody that asks every day and is getting more so and more so and more so, day by day by day.

Mr. Speaker, all they got to do is just read the papers now. All they got to do is even just read your own . . . what the media's saying about you. They're talking about a dictatorship government.

I mean no one, no one, when the Minister of Agriculture gets up in Committee of the Whole . . . I don't suppose

he'll even speak more than a minute or two on second reading, because he wants to get out of here fast. But I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that he's not getting out of here in Committee of the Whole. He'll be here for day after day after day after day.

We talk about extended hours. Well I can tell you, extended hours to 10 members, it's not going to be too healthy for 10 people on to one minister. And if they want to, they may go closure. They probably will. But I know that they'll never do a thing like that and go closure on estimates. So if they want to know what it's like for 10 of us to have debate the whole works of you and we don't get any debates back . . . Mr. Speaker, this Assembly is for debates.

So if we're standing here and we have to talk hour after hour after hour, the 10 of us, and we have to do all the running of this legislature and we . . . I finally said that so much the other day when I was speaking here on one of the Bills and we did get two or three members get up and read a speech off, a 5- or 10-minute speech. And the Leader of the Liberal Party read off one, about 10-, 15-minute one. And that's all we get from these people.

If they are so sure, Mr. Speaker, that this GRIP Bill is correct and right for the people of Saskatchewan, stand on your feet and say so. I challenge every representative representing a farm riding to please stand on their feet and put on the record so I can get a copy of it and we'll send a copy of everybody in your riding, and I challenge you that you won't get up. Because you don't want to . . . you can't get up and defend this Bill. There isn't a farmer or a person representing a farm riding that could get up and defend what's in this Bill.

And then to make it worse, to add insult to injury, Mr. Speaker, they're going to make that part of the Bill void, that that March 15 deadline was never there in the first place. It's just gone.

Now when we talked about it . . . I hit on it just a little bit before supper — but we talked about being unconstitutional. We asked the Minister of Justice today if that's not an item, a part of that Bill that should be going to the supreme courts of Saskatchewan . . . or the Supreme Court of Canada, then I don't think there ever was one. Because I do believe this will go down in history of being the downfall and the finish of the NDP Party of Saskatchewan for ever and ever and ever more. Amen. It'll be the end of them. There isn't anyone.

There's thousands and thousands of people. There's 625,000 out there in Saskatchewan right now, Mr. Speaker, approximately, maybe 650, and not likely 100,000 would know anything about this; maybe even 50,000 would understand it.

But day by day by day as I talk to people, and they talk to people . . . I have sent out letters to people. I have 14 people, Mr. Speaker, in my riding that are my, what you call, my inner executive. I phone them, and they have four calls to make. And that covers my 27 towns in my riding which I have more towns than any other individual here in Saskatchewan. I have the most towns of any riding. And I can on one evening if they are home, but it

maybe take two if not, whatever, we can cover two to three to every town to see what's going on. And I'll tell you, I know what's going on. And if anybody thinks it's any different in the ridings around me, it's not.

When I have people that voted for this government . . . and not many farmers did, and a lot of rural towns did and that's how they got elected. They didn't get elected by the rural polls, I'll tell you. But there are some farmers that voted for this NDP government. And they voted because they said they're going to keep all these promises. We'll never break a promise.

The Premier of this province was in the town of Outlook and he said, I promise. I promise to balance the budget, lower taxes, create jobs, go to Ottawa and save the farmers. I promise to bring back money. What did he do?

Then he was asked right after that, his first question asked — and I think it's on record for about seven or eight towns in my surrounding ridings where he spoke, where the first question asked, I know at Outlook was, Mr. Speaker, was: Mr. Premier . . . or he wasn't the premier then and I can't use his name of course but we'll say the now Premier was asked, you're saying and we're all saying that the Tories' essential services are too high and what are you going to do about it? And he says, well I promise to either hold or lower.

So we can say that maybe by him doing the things he's done, broke every promises, that's why we're here talking about the GRIP Bill. This government, they know for sure — and they've admitted it — that they're out of money. And so who's going to get it first?

And it's not picking up the farmer. It's not saying, you, Mr. Business Man, we're going to get you first. We're going to get all Saskatchewan. We're going to get you all because we haven't got an essential service. SaskPower, SaskEnergy, SaskTel, SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) — they've all had increases. Income tax, pension plans — everything's had it. It all comes back here, and we got to get some money out of the GRIP program. We got to save some money here.

But the thing is, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has gone throughout this province of Saskatchewan. And he did it at election time and saying we took over such a terrible debt from the Tories. That's our problem. We were shocked with dismay. We didn't know that that kind of money was out there.

Well I want to put on the record for about the fifth time this year that I have it here in *Hansard*, where I got the Minister of Finance to stand in this place under the interim supply Bill and admit that there was a \$3.5 billion worth of debt that we took over in 1982.

And I'm going to say it every time, Mr. Speaker, that I can get to my feet, that we started out with a \$3.5 billion debt. And take that in 1982 figures, in 1992 figures, and you can see why we're here discussing a GRIP Bill. Not a politician in their right mind would want to say, well let's go out and tell 50,000 farmers that we have to break a contract. We don't want to tell the union people that we don't want to hurt you. We don't want to tell the nurses:

you're going to get cut. We don't want to tell the hospital administrators: we're going to take your hospital away from you. But I guess we're going to have to because we're broke.

Well, Mr. Speaker, who are they hitting hardest? I shouldn't use the word hardest because they're hitting everybody. There is not an individual in the province of Saskatchewan isn't being hurt and hit by this government. They're just being knocked right down. There isn't any place you can go, because what are they going to do next? As I said many times in this legislature, the only group of people they haven't hurt is the groups they haven't met yet. And that will always be that way as long as we got an NDP government like we have today.

They're not the old CCF government that I knew, Mr. Speaker, under Tommy Douglas. He was a kindly man. I didn't believe in his philosophy, but he was a kindly man with a heart. He would never go out to farmers and say, we're going to break your contract. Goodness, if this government can break contracts, what can they do? They may break contracts to no end. What about if they can break this contract, Mr. Speaker, if they can break this contract with the farmers, absolutely go out and break their word and cost them maybe from a half a billion to three-quarters of a billion dollars?

This crop now this week isn't even as good as it was last week, Mr. Speaker. We had rains here about two weeks ago and it looked like we were going to come out with an above-average crop. Now according to the Wheat Pool, we're slipping to a below-average crop. In my area, in Arm River area, I would say we're going to be much below an average crop. In the south end where I live, in the Craik-Davidson area, we're looking in about a 20, 25 bushel crop. And I understand that west of Davidson that there's been several thousand acres of stubble worked under the ground, worked up. Now if somebody says that these people aren't going to be angry because they got their contract broken — Mr. Speaker, they are angry people.

How do you have a possible . . . how do you possibly have a farmer that signs a contract in 1991, here's my finances for four years; there's my contract; it's going to be guaranteed so much a year for four years. And in that contract, it says it shall not be changed unless you get a letter each year prior to March 15 of any changes in that contract. So what did this government do? Oh, we won't worry about that. They changed it. And the Minister of Agriculture said it; he said it several places because we heard it right from the review committee that he said, well there's ways of getting around that. He thought there would be ways of getting around that, but there wasn't a way of getting around. They found out they had to bring in this Bill, and that's why we're all here. That's why we got this terrible, terrible problem we're in here right now.

What would they do? We got farmers, Mr. Speaker, we got farmers that are hurt and angry. When you hurt the farmers, who else do you hurt? You hurt all the business men and all the machine dealers in the province of Saskatchewan. I can give you the machine dealers' names, but I won't, in the Craik, Davidson, Dundurn, Hanley area, Outlook area. And I'm not going to put them

on the record, but they would likely tell me, go ahead, because they said, if this here 1992 GRIP goes ahead and our crop keeps slipping back, I see our doors closing.

If they had the '91 GRIP they knew what kind of money they would have in their pockets. And we have this here arrogant Minister of Agriculture that stands to his feet and said this is what farmers are asking for. Well I can't find the farmers that are asking for this. I don't know where they are. If you can find them . . . Mr. Speaker, I challenge every member on that side of the House just to give me a name so I can phone tomorrow and say, I want the '92 GRIP. Just give them to me. Just bring me the names that want the '92 GRIP.

I'll give you thousands and thousands and thousands of names that literally . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You see, Mr. Speaker, they're backing off already because they said if they give me the name I'll be badgering them. Just tell them to phone me, then I won't be badgering them.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the members opposite, go out and find a farmer, find a farmer any place in Saskatchewan, but be sure you tell him the facts. Be sure you say that we have changed the '92 GRIP, but in doing so we had to kind of have some retroactive legislation. We had to kind of put in a little Bill in here that said that that part about the contract is void, that we took one year out of your life.

Now you tell that to a farmer out there and read what I read in here about that Bill and then tell him to phone me if they're still in favour of the '92 GRIP. Now the only calls I'll probably get will be somebody's campaign manager — if he hasn't left and went to another party.

Because, Mr. Speaker, just over this here GRIP Bill . . . I haven't got it here tonight. I've got a lot of letters here I'm going to be going through later on, from town after town after town, but I have got one that wrote a letter right to the Premier and a copy to us, and he's absolutely quit the party. And he was ashamed that he ever belonged to it for 38 years. And he's quit over this here breaking of this contract.

Now if this is so great, if this GRIP Bill is so right, then what is the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Agriculture and the Premier got to worry about? Just let it go to the court. Just let it go to the court. Just let . . . It's in the courts in Melville now. The farmers have won three rounds.

So soon as the farmers won their third round, the government had to start talking to themselves. They said, hey we're in trouble. We're going to look like fools out there if those farmers win that case in court. And we're going to have to go back to the '91 GRIP. It's going to cost us more money, but mostly we're going to look bad. So we'd better make sure it don't get to court.

Because that is the other part of this Bill that I can't stand. There's a whole . . . there's some . . . there's several parts in here that's worse than others. But even if . . . Any time in your life if you've got a contract that somebody breaks, you've got a right to go to court. I don't know in North America if you've got a contract, a legitimate contract to

somebody and it's broken, you haven't got a right.

(1930)

But let's just read here for all the listeners and all the television viewers of Saskatchewan, that just going down from the paragraph I mentioned before that they're going to make that part void, that that void . . . that that part of the March 15 letter has gone from your life and never that Bill . . . part of the Bill was never proclaimed.

Now let's get onto this one:

No action or proceeding lies or shall be instituted or continued against the Crown or a Crown agent based on any cause of action arising from, resulting from or incidental to:

Well I'll tell you, that's never been known. It might be an individual out there that had a contract with somebody, and they broke the contract and they sued and they frigg'd around. But has it ever been known in the Commonwealth of our country, our great countries, all the Commonwealth nations, has it ever been known that you're going to take a person's court rights away, that you can't take it to court because it's deemed to be different? The rules have changed but to add insult to injury, we're not going to give you a chance to take it to court. You cannot sue the government. I've always had my right; you had your right.

I wonder where the defeated members are going to think — or maybe even when they're elected — if they smash their car up tomorrow. Mr. Speaker, I wonder what they're going to think if they smash their car up and they go to SGI and says, I could get it adjusted. Well we've changed the contract, SGI says. That part of your car is not covered. That part of your car is not covered any more. Well wouldn't we have a bunch of crying people. And it's terrible. I couldn't expect you to be any otherwise. You would have to be upset.

But now we got a group of people over there that keep their head down. They're ashamed. We seen the Minister of Justice today, the most . . . I know the man well. He's a very . . . I like the man. He's a good individual and he's not the type of person that can stand this. He cannot stand what's happening in here. He's asked about it today and he just turned in his chair, he smiled, he's nervous, and then he had the Minister of Agriculture, the member from Rosetown, get up and try to cover up for the Department of Justice. Have you ever seen, ever, Mr. Speaker, ever in the history of this country, where a Minister of Justice cannot stand to his place. He cannot stand to his place and defend his own department, and has to get a new Minister of Agriculture — been elected for eight months — stand up and cry away about all the reasons about GRIP and never once answered the member from Estevan, never even remotely even touched on the question he asked. Because all the member from Estevan asked, very nicely, is this.

This is a lot of controversy out there. Constitutional lawyers are saying it's unconstitutional. It's wrong what we're doing. Some others are saying well maybe it's all right, and the NDP said it's all right. And I don't know. I

don't know what's constitutional and what isn't, but I haven't phoned a constitutional lawyer over this last week and especially who I've talked to since last Wednesday night, that not one that says I can't tell you what the courts are going to rule. And I'm being fair. They're saying, I can't tell you but I can tell you there's enough evidence in that Bill and enough disaster in that Bill that it should go to the court to decide. And my colleagues all agree with me that it should go to the court to decide, that we can't have some individuals that . . . a cabinet minister on this side of the House, stand up in this House and say, well it's not going to go there, and we say it is constitutional, and we're going to just foreclose, and we're going to go closure and closure and closure while the farmers are getting foreclosed upon.

The farmers get foreclosed upon, and then the machine dealer gets foreclosed upon, and then the business man and the town gets foreclosed upon on, and then the people in the city of Regina, Saskatoon, Yorkton, Moose Jaw, Weyburn, all the bigger cities. It leads to foreclosure after foreclosure because there's going to be about three-quarters of a billion dollars less money come in to this here province because this disastrous government over here don't know what they've done.

Mr. Speaker, another thing that's . . . I'm going going to go back on the '91 Bill here, the '91 contract. What was great about the 1991? I touched on it a moment before that here's an individual, he's having problems hanging in there and he's . . . maybe he's at the boards losing part of his land or maybe he's been foreclosed upon by the bank and part of his machinery and he doesn't . . . but then he got maybe a good crop and he thinks maybe he can hang on but he doesn't know what the price is going to be. He doesn't know the price.

So what's he going to do? He just doesn't know how to sit down and make a budget. The banker tells him, I've got to have a budget from you. Well how can I make out a budget when two years ago I made out a budget for \$4-and-some cents a bushel for wheat and then before the year was out it went . . . end of July wheat dropped to three, zero, five, or whatever. And then last year the people that made their budgets out at \$3 wheat, wheat dropped to \$2.09 a bushel.

How does a farmer make a budget out for his . . . to his banker when we could just jump around like a rubber ball like that but always seem to be jumping down instead of up?

But so the governments got together, all the provincial governments in Canada and the federal government and we sit here and you blame . . . this government blames oh, the Tories brought in the '91 GRIP. It's the Tories from Saskatchewan that brought in the '91 GRIP.

But somehow or other how did every province in Canada agree to it, that this will be the start? We'll start with something that we can guarantee farmers and fishermen a guaranteed price for their product. It's a small amount of money in this . . . but it's a lot of money for this country.

It's very difficult, Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan, very, very difficult when our government House and the

federal government in the last eight, nine years has sent about 14, \$15 billion to the farmer — 14 or 15 billion. Perhaps it's more, but that's the figures that's on my mind — 14 or 15 billion. I did hear 18 but I know 14 or \$15 billion. Now that's quite a hardship on all the taxpayers in Canada.

But let's go to United States. They have farming land right from . . . their main grain farm is from Texas in a banana shape right to Prince Albert, Saskatchewan — stopping at the border, of course — the American farm land.

And so they have a problem with their grain prices, their cattle prices, what not. So the American government, they subsidize the grain, they subsidize their cattle. But I can tell you that the coffee growers and the people talking, having coffee tomorrow morning in New York, wouldn't even be talking about a dribble of money that went out to central United States. But in a small country like Canada, if we have a billion dollars, say, a half a billion dollars — even 2 or 300 million's a lot of money — and it comes to Saskatchewan farmers and Alberta and western farmers, the bulk of it, and a little bit goes across Canada; well I can tell you that everybody in Canada talks about it because it hits their pocket-books hard. It hit them hard.

But what else do we do? If we don't save our farmers, if we don't save our farmers, like I said before, we don't save our business man. We don't save our little towns. We got enough trouble. We have towns all over this province disappearing.

I've been an MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly) for 15 years. I've been here longer than the average MLA that ever stays elected. And I've been around so much of Saskatchewan. And as I travel throughout this province of Saskatchewan, you have to, you just think that each time you go around, if you don't stop and think about it, hey, boy, if you stop and think — what's happened to that little town? There used to be a place to get a coffee there. There used to be a good restaurant there. It's closed. And I could go in here and maybe buy a tire, but they're closed. These little towns are getting smaller. And the bigger towns are moving the size that the other towns used to be.

My town of Outlook is the biggest in my riding. It's had a small drop, but it's not going up like we want it to go up. From 1978 to about 1988, that town increased in size every year. Now the last four years it has gone down in population. It's happening all over. And why? Because we're not putting the money into the hands of where it doesn't stay there.

You give money to farmers, give help to farmers, and she's gone back to the . . . the money's gone to all over Saskatchewan, right into the economy. They have to spend it to stay alive. They have to do it. They have to have fuel. They have to have machinery. They have to have fertilizers. They have to have this to farm.

And so if they have no money and if . . . They can't keep on. This here GRIP program, I have a whole bunch of letters here I'm going to get into shortly. But it's absolutely serious, Mr. Speaker, of the implications to individual farms. I imagine that I've had more letters than any

individual. I imagine I've had more letters than the Minister of Agriculture, stating here's my hardship. I've been getting this because I've been here for 14, 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, somebody handed me a piece . . . I imagine they intend it to be garbage. I didn't know. I threw it in the garbage. I didn't know what it was. Is that what they meant? I didn't know . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . See I wouldn't know, Mr. Speaker, because I didn't read it. Whatever somebody handed me, I put it in the garbage. Because anything that comes from that side of the House will likely be garbage.

Let's talk, Mr. Speaker, let's talk a little bit more about how many people could be hurt if we keep on breaking these contracts. We talked a little bit about union contracts. We have discussed that.

What about all the nurses in the province? What happens if they'll have their union, they'll organize, and they'll talk about it for a year or two, and they'll work up with a bargaining program with everybody, and finally they'll make a settlement. What would happen if all of a sudden you just put a Bill through this House, we're going to break that contract? What would happen, Mr. Speaker, if every nurse in the province of Saskatchewan had a broken contract? You'd have every nurse standing out in front of the legislative buildings out here. You'd have every union person that could walk.

Well, some people say to me: where are all the farmers? I farmed all my life. When I was angry at the government you never seen me . . . I just done whatever I could to survive. But I didn't do it by gathering in big crowds.

But maybe it's the way to do it. Maybe they should be doing it. Maybe we should ask the farmers. Maybe we should have, as an opposition, asked the 50,000 farmers to come in here because I think we could have . . . the city of Regina would have been in a serious situation.

Talk about broken contracts. What about if hospitals in this province, Mr. Speaker . . . That relates to GRIP here. We're having a broken contract in GRIP. What about the people that had built the hospital? The town put the money into hospitals and then they come along now, they talk about, through the wellness program, they're going to perhaps close the hospitals.

We've got another one, Mr. Speaker. And, Mr. Speaker, when I say we're going to talk about closing hospitals and the Minister of Health clapped, so I don't think she . . . She must have meant something else. I'm sure she didn't . . . She would never mean about closing hospitals. I'm sure of that.

But one that I am quite concerned about is a contract that this government and the federal government and the people from North Dakota come into, and that's Alameda dam. And Alameda dam, Mr. Speaker, is something like GRIP. This government is breaking a contract by not finishing that Alameda dam.

They kept saying it would never fill up; that that water would never fill that dam up; that it would take 100 years of snow and it would never fill. Now there's 35 feet of

water and danger of it rolling down there and flooding out Minot.

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

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether or not the member opposite has to relate his comments to the Bill that we're addressing? I fail to see how Rafferty-Alameda or rural hospital closures relates to this particular piece of legislation.

The Speaker: — Order. I have listened very closely to the member and he is relating. His main topic seems to be tonight, breaking of contracts. And if government is breaking contracts with various people, he's relating it to this Bill. He refers back to this Bill of breaking contracts with 50,000 farmers. So I think what he is speaking about is relevant.

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that because that's exactly what I've been saying because I got a list here of contracts — union, nurses, government employees, doctors, hospitals, Alameda dam. We could go on and on about contracts that get broken, how it affects the lives of people.

This government, Mr. Speaker, this contracts broken at Alameda dam and they don't finish it. And all of a sudden that dam lets go and you got Minot and North Dakota suing the province of Saskatchewan, there'll be no more Saskatchewan. That would cost more money than the treasury would make in 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, I have with me tonight a list of all the towns . . . I have a list of the towns that have written me or phoned me concerning GRIP. And in the town of Dilke and RM (rural municipality), and when I am . . . I got Dilke, Holdfast, Penzance, that takes in one, and Chamberlain takes in one RM. But from that particular town, I've had approximately seven or eight phone calls protesting against GRIP, but six out of the eight have said to me that if I have to settle on my poor crop, that my farm will be in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, this is serious and I ask the members opposite to be very, very serious about this. That any time that I was in the government side and some minister, or member of the opposition said that somebody was in danger, in danger of a disaster, I'd be very, very serious about it.

(1945)

I've got in Holdfast area, I've got more. I haven't got the exact amount. But I know there was a . . . would be at least a dozen from that area, Mr. Speaker.

I have letters here, and I'm not going to read out names. I've never asked them if I could read their name and it's not necessary. I've just got the numbers. There's around 12 or 13, with 3 in the Holdfast area that I know because they're dealing with the boards. And last year, through the 1991 GRIP, these three farms that I'm dealing with over there, they were foreclosed upon. And then they used a section 16 of the Farm Debt Review Board, took their case

to the Farm Debt Review Board, and it went on for about four or five months and tried to put a package together. And in the mean time Farm Credit foreclosed on the land, and the banks on the machinery. But between the Farm Land Security Board, mediation services, and the Farm Debt Review Board, and all the debtors concerned, sit down and worked out a package.

And what worked out the package, Mr. Speaker? What worked out the package is when he come in a year ago, I'd say about last April, with his '91 guarantee, his 1991 guarantee on a contract is what let that package go. It made the package viable.

Now do you think that those . . . and that's only three that I know about. What about the 33 that are around him? That's the three farmers that says that under the '92 I have no chance of survival. What do you think those people are thinking? A government broke a contract, and I have to break my contract with the people that foreclose upon me.

When somebody forecloses on you in Saskatchewan, when a farmer is foreclosed upon or a business man or whatever, and you can work out a deal . . . Some people go through bankruptcy, business men and farmers. And you work out whatever you have to work out. Or sometimes you stop by the boards. I understand there's a new bankruptcy Act coming through from . . . it just passed in Ottawa, where it's for farmers and fishermen now where you can sit down with another vehicle.

So if they work out these things to see that if a farmer can survive, the first thing they say, what's your income? Where's your income? Well you got to have income. But the farmer will sit down. And he says, well here's my income; I've got 40 head of cattle. This one farmer I'm thinking of particularly here. He said in his letter he's got 40 head of cattle, and approximately 20, 25 of those calves that fall will be sold and some heifers kept over for replacement and then a few cows sold. So he's going to sell up to 30 head of cattle.

So the lenders say, well the markets are pretty solid on cattle, so that's a pretty concrete bit of income. Well then how much do you think you're going to grow on your wheat? Well I usually . . . my average over the last 10 years has been 27 bushels an acre. And in 1990 I got some that made 40. And so they averaged out that his wheat would make 30 bushels to the acre.

And so they figured out what's the price going to be. It was \$3-and-some cents a bushel that year; three twenty plus a little payment made about \$3 and a half. So the end of July came. And what happened in 1991 . . . or the '90-91 year that wheat dropped to \$2-and-some-cents a bushel, and he couldn't keep up to his contract.

But this individual last year for the '91-92 crop year, he was able to redo it and say, okay, Mr. Lender says yes. Now we can see your way clear. Now these people are phoning and saying to me that I might as well have went three years ago. You might as well let me go then. You shouldn't have had these boards. You shouldn't have had anybody to try and save me. I'm three years later in getting back out into the work place.

So it's caused a lot of sadness, Mr. Speaker. And I mean sad. It's terrible. The town of Liberty . . . I didn't get quite so many from Liberty. Liberty is an excellent land base. But there's problems are arising to get worse there because there's high-priced land in that area. I know of land in that area that sold maybe 2 or \$300 higher than there would have in our area.

So I'm starting to get phone calls. I haven't had a letter from Liberty, but I've had a lot of phone calls saying, what's going to happen; are we going to get the '91-92 GRIP? They said, I'm going to be in a financial situation, a bad situation, if I have to settle for the 1992 GRIP.

I'm asking some of these people about how much he is . . . do you know what the difference will be? Well do you know the first answer is, I don't know. That's the worst thing. They don't know. As I said to the Minister of Agriculture, I challenged him to sit down with any farmer in Saskatchewan, tell him what his contract will be for revenue for 1992-93, and he said he could do it. Well, Mr. Speaker, he can't do it. It is impossible because here's common sense, and all farmers will know that I'm absolutely right, that whatever our price of wheat now is, about \$2.45 a bushel and we're guaranteed through GRIP about . . . around \$4.05 up to so many bushels per acre, but that's on the old GRIP. On the new GRIP, it's whatever the price of wheat is, is what your revenue is going to pay. So I guarantee that he will not know the price of wheat until January of 1994.

Now it's a sure thing that he can't tell you. The member from Elphinstone said it's not true, Mr. Speaker, but I guarantee you that the price of wheat just got set here about a week ago for the 1992-93 year. That's the crop that '91 GRIP is on. It's on the '91, '92, '93 GRIP. And so our price is set at \$2.45 a bushel. So a year from now, on July 31, our pool closes. And there's X amount of dollars and cents so we'll just use an example. Say it does go for \$2.75 a bushel. We'll just give the benefit of the doubt that wheat may go up 25 cents a bushel as an interim payment or whatever, and it's 2.75. So they send out a little payment or so on GRIP, whatever, but they do not know what the final is going to be until the Wheat Board lets them know between July 31, '93, until the first week in January, '94. And if anyone, anyone in this government or anyone in the province of Saskatchewan, any farm groups, can challenge me on that, and prove them right, I'll put a written apology and pay for it on the front page of the *Leader-Post*. Because I am right and you people know I'm right.

There's no other way. You have to be . . . It's only hypothetical figures, Mr. Speaker, is all they use. When they had their meetings in Findlater, Davidson, Craik, Rosetown, they had these meetings this spring and they said, we want to make it very clear that we're only using hypothetical figures, that we're estimating as this is what it could be.

And this is what it is. It's absolutely . . . there's no guarantee what you're going to get from the GRIP. Exactly the same thing as the '91 GRIP. Nobody knew the price of wheat. But they all knew that if you're guaranteed \$150 an acre, that between the price of wheat and the GRIP

money, you would get 150 bucks an acre. They knew they were getting it some place, from either wheat or the GRIP.

So there's the difference now. As I said this afternoon that it's an absolute shame that our crop insurance program is absolutely ruined. It's an absolute disaster that we have to have an outfit of people come in here and think they know how to run government and take crop insurance and make it so if you grow a good crop and you got more money than anybody else, you use more fertilizers, more spray, and get a better yield, you're going to collect. You're going to do better.

And the poor little guy out there that can't . . . that he can just afford to just get by the crop insurance guidelines, he's going to seed it in a right and honourable manner, he has to seed it.

I know the mandate of Crop Insurance, Mr. Speaker. You have to farm in a husband-like manner, and that's summer-fallow reasonably. And you got to spray for weeds or get out there and hoe them out. There's even a provision for the people in the province of Saskatchewan that don't want to spray at all. There's even a provision for them to carry crop insurance and be covered.

But I put that there when I was minister of Crop Insurance that you have three adjustments of your crop that year for a weed count. And that's the way it is. And there's no other way. Thank goodness they haven't changed that, but they likely will. Mr. Speaker, they'll probably change that too. They'll probably change it. Anything that's going to save this government a dollar, anything that's going to save them any money whatsoever, and they don't care of the cost and nobody — they don't care. They're uncaring. They're a uncaring government.

Mr. Speaker, I don't like repeating so many times, but I'm not repeating exactly the same matter. But I want to instil very clearly . . . I see the Minister of Justice is looking at me here. And I want to say to him, Mr. Speaker, very clearly, that he is not going to have a very good night's sleep tonight. It's going to be hard for the Minister of Justice to sleep tonight when the member from Estevan asked him a concrete question three or four times in question period and he had to let the Minister of Agriculture get up and answer his question.

When any time in this province when you're talking about the most serious, serious Bill ever to hit this legislature, the Bill 87. Never was one like it. The Minister of Justice is uncomfortable now, just like he was this afternoon, but I know that he'll come through. I know that this man will come through. I have faith in you, Mr. Speaker. I have faith in the Minister of Justice that he'll see that this'll either go to the supreme court of Saskatchewan . . . or the Supreme Court of Canada or that there will be public hearings before this Bill becomes law in this legislature. And if this man does not do that I'll lose all my faith in him, and then we'll be all Saskatchewan asking him to resign, which I don't think it will happen.

Now let's just talk a little bit . . . I'm going to come back to my list, Mr. Speaker, because that's a lot of towns I got to go through here and that could take a long, long time. But

I'm going to come back to that, so we'll just cover something else here.

I want to talk about how my trip to Bismarck, sent there from CPA (Commonwealth Parliamentary Association), from the government, how it relates to the GRIP Bill. And it certainly does. Because representing in Bismarck was two individuals from Saskatchewan, two of my colleagues from the government side. And there was 20, 21 states partly represented off and on from the States, and the province of Ontario, province of Manitoba, province of Saskatchewan, and the province of Alberta.

And the Speakers, Mr. Speaker, was there from Ontario, Manitoba, and Alberta. And naturally, Mr. Speaker, you couldn't be there because it was the only House that was sitting at that time. And I know you would have been there if the House hadn't sit. And I'm sorry you weren't because you would have had a lot of input, Mr. Speaker, into that great four days that I had down there.

So it was very important. And how I'm going to relate it to the GRIP Bill is this way, that I couldn't believe what I was seeing. We all sat around this table, and there was a lot of us sitting there, and the Speaker from Ontario showed a film of how a Bill is passed in the legislature. And it even come up there. They're either the 30 minutes or an hour's bell-ringing rule, the same as here. I can't remember whether it's 30 minutes or an hour. And I wondered how this Bill . . . because I'd heard in the outset that it took six months to get this Bill through the legislature, six months. But how could it do it? How can you do that?

Well when he went through it, finding out that when it gets . . . it was either third reading or Committee of the Whole where enough people — the media and the opposition members and the public — would put enough protests in that they finally went out for 30 days of public hearings, public hearings. And that led to more public hearings and more discussions. And this was an environmental Bill, Mr. Speaker, which was a very serious Bill in Ontario. And it was a lot of complications but the people got their way. And that's how I want to relate to Saskatchewan and what's happening here.

If an NDP Ontario can listen to the people about an environment Bill that affects the lives of people, maybe not financially but just affects the environmentalist people . . . It affects them. And they can let the Bill go out for six months of hearings or all together. And then in Saskatchewan when we've got a Bill that affects the whole province . . . this Bill affects every individual in Saskatchewan. And I think that it affects, like, people within states and provinces around here, like, a lot.

If the Minister of Justice, Mr. Speaker, doesn't get serious about this Bill . . . which I'm sure he must be, I'm sure that his draftsmen and the people in his department have been working with the Minister of Agriculture. And I'm sure they've brought it to their own attention, to the minister's attention, the seriousness of this here blunder that the Minister of Agriculture made, and then we have to cover up with this type of a Bill.

So I do know for a fact, we all know, that the members opposite know that this is wrong. So, Mr. Speaker, when

they know they're wrong, why did they bring it this far? How come it's still here? Why is it? Is it stubbornness because of pride that they want to push this down the throats of the people of Saskatchewan because they don't want to give in?

They knew that under our government, from 1982 to 1991, that the then premier . . . We made several mistakes in government that the people told us, and this man sitting beside me here, the premier of the province, the member from Estevan, stood up and said, we are going to change it. We are going to withdraw that. He put a tax on used vehicles. He took it off because the people said.

(2000)

Now the people are saying to you that this Bill is wrong. Why don't you listen to the people and take it . . . throw this Bill out the back door? If the member from Elphinstone, the House Leader, wants to know why we didn't have a smooth-running House this session, all he had to do was make sure that the Minister of Agriculture got out of this House with that Bill.

And you wouldn't have lost it, Mr. Speaker. It wouldn't have been lost. You would have just let it go to the courts and let the courts decide. But what have they done . . . Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Justice, what they've done is says you cannot have your way, Mr. Farmer. We are taking that, where it said that one part of that Bill is going to be void, out of your life. It's gone; it's history; it's gone out of your life for ever.

But then we want to come along and say, you can't sue us. So, Mr. Speaker, this Bill has to somehow get to the Supreme Court of Canada, and it will get there if, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Justice doesn't send it there, it'll get there by farmers, and if so, I'll take it myself. One individual took it before. On the boundary lines of the last election one individual says they're not right, so he started it going, and first thing you know we had it . . . the boundary lines, whether they're legal or not, whether they were going to go to the Supreme Court of Canada or not, and everybody knew that could take three to five years, and so it went the other route.

It had to go through the route of the Minister of Justice and the Lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan. So if they think, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill will just walk right through this House and then going to walk over Saskatchewan, forget it because you've got to get by a Lieutenant Governor that has to give her nod on this Bill. And you're going to be awfully surprised if she's not listening to this carryings-on this last few months and understands what law is. She, Mr. Speaker, may just . . . I've got a lot of faith in her and I've got faith in the Minister of Justice that somehow or other that justice will prevail. I believe that justice will prevail.

And the only way that justice will prevail in this province and that is if the Minister of Justice and the Governor General of Canada, they get together and decide this has got to go straight to the Supreme Court of Canada and let's decide whether we've got a legal Bill or we haven't. Why, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Justice want the farmers in Saskatchewan, all the people of Saskatchewan,

left suspended and have a court case that could be illegal? Why do you want to go through all that? Why do you want them to take it to the Supreme Court of Canada? He's the one that has to do it.

So don't be too surprised. Don't just think that this Bill's automatic because we've got a long ways to go. We've got amendments that I don't believe the Lieutenant Governor of this province is going to walk in here and just nod her head the right way. It's happened before, Mr. Speaker, where they don't pass Bills in this House because this Bill . . . And the Minister of Health looks at me as if there's something wrong with me.

Well I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, there's something wrong with her. She's doing the same thing in health. She's breaking contracts pertaining right exactly to what we're to here in GRIPs. She doesn't know what a contract is. When people go out there and build hospitals in this province and, they, Mr. Speaker, when they . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . the Minister of Health says, will I tell the truth? Of course I'll tell the truth about her. I do believe that she wants to tell the truth. I believe that somebody in her department somewhere, some place is misinforming her, but she'll know what the truth is when she has to go out to the town of Davidson or Outlook, whatever, and says, your hospital is closed, the contract is broke, exactly what we did to the farmers in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, we'll be waiting for the . . . as I said before on these here long sitting hours where 10 of us have to . . . We've been sitting here for 60 days, Mr. Speaker, and the 10 of us have to do all the speaking. Well I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that if we want to talk about GRIP, we want to talk about health, we want to talk about the Executive Council. We'll have 10 on 1 for a week and see how they like it because I know this government would never put closure on estimates. They wouldn't go that far . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, they'd never do that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to . . . this is important because I promised my people that I would get this on the record. The town of Stalwart, I want to go to that, Mr. Speaker. I haven't got any letters from the town of Stalwart because they use the Imperial post office and it comes through Imperial, but I have over 20 calls or letters from the Imperial zone, Imperial area which takes in quite an area. And I only know of one in that area that have told me directly that, I have lost my farm because of, I've lost it, I've already . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. I hear a lot of debate going on across the way here and I ask the two members particularly if they wish to continue debate, to go behind the bar and let the member from Arm River have his say.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Speaker, I'll move on to Simpson, the town of Simpson, my riding where it's . . . this town of Simpson is a . . . it's not as big as Imperial, but there's been too much high-priced land in there. And I've got more serious calls in that area. I didn't have as many calls. I only had about seven or eight, but five out of the seven are saying that if the '92 GRIP ended up . . . we finalized the '92 GRIP, I have no way to finance because my crop is pretty well gone; I'm down to under a 15-bushel crop, and I'm sitting in a serious situation. I don't know how to

survive.

The one particular farmer told me there that the way he figures out by using the '92 GRIP figures given to him by the government — now that could change, but not likely go up, it may go down, he says — that it could make a difference of about \$70,000 on that farm, and that \$70,000 was just what he needed to live up to his commitments.

Now the town of Allan and Bradwell — the mail all comes out of that same place, pretty well, so I boxed it all together — and I only got three phone calls from the Allan-Bradwell area. But I was talking to some people there the other day, a gentleman name of Larry Sommerfeld, and he tells me that he's my contact man in there. And now he's getting a lot of calls. He said that he's had contacts in the neighbourhood of 40 to 50 contacts from that zone that we want the '91 GRIP, that the '92 GRIP will break us.

Dundurn area is got to be one of the worst in my area. Dundurn, they were quite happy with the '92 GRIP when it first came out. They're low-assessed land, a lot of bush land around Dundurn, but they had a bumper crop last year. This year their crop's not quite so good. And being low assessed, now they're saying, hey I guess it would have been better in '91. But I haven't had any particular calls of disaster; at least they haven't told me. I was up there to their sports' day, and I talked to a lot of people there, that day. I spent part of a day up there, my wife and I, at their . . . I guess they call it their summer fair and parade.

And they just were not happy, period, with this government, Mr. Speaker. They said the GRIP is only the beginning. But when I sit at a table having dinner with them, Mr. Speaker, and explain, don't worry about whether it's '91 or '92 GRIP; that'll come out in the courts or whatever or this government just going to force '92 upon you. What is serious here, what is serious in the . . . to these people when we talked is when I explain to them about the retroactivity of saying that a letter is deeming to have been sent to them on March 15 and that's more than any of them could take. And after I made that, I had two phone calls from that area, as per my contact with them. So now it's quite serious.

Hanley area is probably — and Kenaston — is where I've had my most calls. No, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker; Davidson is definitely my most. The Hanley-Kenaston area . . . Hanley, Kenaston, and Hawarden area. There's one crop insurance agent that has that area and said there was a 70 per cent — the people that signed off, they were so upset they signed off — 70 per cent of those three towns didn't take any GRIP at all. They took the crop insurance and didn't take any GRIP.

Now I pleaded with some of them not to do that because I said, any money at all . . . And they'll be paying something out of the '92 GRIP; don't do that. And they said, well they had a meeting in there, and there was . . . They said we got three premiums to pay. We'll have to pay the crop insurance premium. We'll have to pay the revenue premium. And then we got no coverage for spot hail. A lot of them grow canola in there. So they said, we'll have to

put some hail insurance on. So they said, when you take all our premiums, if we never get any revenue at all, we'll still be better off. So that area is a lot of sad farmers.

As I'm going, I've only been through one, two . . . I've only been through about 10 towns, Mr. Speaker, out of my 25. And goodness, that's a lot of sad stories out of just those little towns. And I got every town with sad stories. So nobody can tell me, Mr. Speaker, this isn't all Saskatchewan, that it isn't the whole province.

The town of Bladworth and Davidson, I summed it together, and there's approximately 80 to 100 phone calls with about 12, 13 letters. I've kind of lost track; I didn't write down here. I just put 80 to 100 phone calls here. But the letters from that area, I've got some bad disaster stories out of there. Davidson's been a bad area. They've bought . . . The land prices got too high in there; they soared too high. There was three lending institutions there, and they outbid each other to lend too much money. And it's the Davidson-Bladworth area. I feel sorry for these farmers. They've had GRIP meetings there. And when the government had the meeting there last April, they were pretty near booed right out of Davidson.

Then they came to Craik that night. It wasn't quite so bad, but there wasn't one farmer . . . I didn't know of one farmer in the Bladworth-Davidson-Girvin area and Craik — that's four towns — that stood up and said to the government, the '92 GRIP is the best way to go. There wasn't one. Why is it, if this government's right about . . .

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

Mr. Lautermilch: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — What's your point of order?

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the member would be willing to tell the House if he signed up for the '92 GRIP program?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — The member, if he wishes, can so answer; otherwise the member continues with his debate.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Speaker, I'm going to move on to the Aylesbury-Chamberlain area.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the members opposite are being quite arrogant because if I had've or not have signed up, I wouldn't be telling them. What my personal business is has nothing to do with them. It's nothing whatsoever to do with them. My personal business has nothing whatsoever to do with them.

And let's just suppose that any members here . . . Let's suppose, Mr. Speaker. This is kind of interesting coming to insults on the side, but let's just say that I was totally, completely against the '92 GRIP as I am now. But you heard me just a moment ago say that I pleaded with the people in the Hanley, Kenaston, Hawarden area, please sign up for whatever there is. It'll at least pay you something. It's not as good as '91. So let's just

hypothetically say whether I did or I didn't. It's not their business but I would have no qualms in doing it because it would pay something. That wouldn't admit that I would say that it's a better program than '91. The thing that they don't understand, I haven't had a quota book for about eight or nine years.

An Hon. Member: — You didn't have it in '91.

Mr. Muirhead: — I couldn't have a GRIP program in 1991 because I wasn't a farmer in 1991.

Mr. Speaker, just so the member from Elphinstone wants to know what honour is, I can tell him that I have not had a quota book in my name since 1984.

The Speaker: — Order. That has nothing to do with the GRIP that is before us. I ask the member to ignore the comments that are coming from the other side and just stay on the . . . I'll take care of the members on that side. Just put your statements through the Speaker.

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It sure does give my legs a rest to sit down for a minute, though, so I don't mind. Thank you.

Now when you get into Aylesbury, Chamberlain area, Mr. Speaker, this is area . . . Aylesbury, Chamberlain area and that's getting back to that where I started out in that Holdfast, Dilke area. Their crops are not good in there, Mr. Speaker. Their crops are poor and I can't find one individual in there that, before they planted their crops, before they planted them, after they planted them and then we had a quite a bit of rain and then it dried up, and never, through that whole area with the potential of a good crop or a poor crop, could I get any one individual say, I want the '92 GRIP. Not one.

I'll jump now over to the Elbow, Loreburn, Strongfield, Hawarden zone. In Elbow area, that's an area in there that's heavier land than where we live in our area. I mean there's some land in there, a pocket of high-producing land where farmers were insured up to 150, \$60 an acre, and I had call after call from that area. And I'm going to be honest. I just didn't keep track of the Elbow area. They were all my friends there. They just phoned and phoned and said, look at, we just want to let you know we're protesting against the 1992 GRIP.

(2015)

The one person that says he was covered for 100, I remember this particular one, a Mr. Knutson from Elbow. I know he doesn't mind me putting his name on the record. He said, I was covered for about \$147 an acre and by using the department of Crop Insurance's new figures that I would only be covered now for about \$117 an acre. So he said, that's enough to take any possible chance of survival away from me in my area. So he said, it's serious to us. But he said, there's some worse than that. He says, some under the 1991 that didn't have their long-term averages, they have to use the area average completely; that they can't use even a blending of the 1992 or the area average. They couldn't use a blending. They're down to low as \$100 an acre — from 150 to 100.

So you start talking, Mr. Speaker, of farmers saying that they're going to be covered for 50, \$60 an acre, 20, 30. Well, sir, I wouldn't even want to have a contract that was going to give me more than \$20 an acre. This is the way I look at . . . If the contract, the '92 contract, was going to pay me more money than '91, I would say no, because they're breaking a contract. It's wrong. It's morally wrong. Everything's wrong about it. Don't break contracts.

I'll never be able to say enough about this, Mr. Speaker, about this business of breaking contracts. It is just absolutely, morally wrong. And soon as every time, Mr. Speaker, I say that, their heads turn the other way very quickly and look down, because not one of them can look me in the face and say that it's morally right. One's looking me in the face but he's not saying morally right.

Mr. Speaker, there's one hon. member over there, because he's looked at me and he did say, it's morally right. So I congratulate him for that. At least he thinks that. At least he thinks it. And if a person truly, honestly . . . If the members opposite, if they truly believe that what they're doing is right, well then it's not quite so bad. At least they believe in it. They believe it. But I know, talking to enough of the front . . . members of the front row, that they know that they've made a mistake and it's a blunder. And it's wrong.

And anybody with any legal thinking about them at all will know that something . . . to have something deemed out of your life, like I said a little while ago, if one of the members would just put a Bill through and we hypothetically said he never was born, he's out of our life and gone, well that's exactly what they've done to the 19 . . . to that part of the Bill from 1991-92. It's just gone. It's void. And that's what it says here. It's just void, out of our life.

We'll move on to the Loreburn area, the Strongfield area, Hawarden. Strongfield-Loreburn area I put them together, Mr. Speaker, but Hawarden, I spoke about it over here under the Kenaston-Hanley. So the Loreburn-Strongfield area, I haven't had as many calls. But I didn't have one, not one call that did phone me, had any good points to say about the GRIP program, or about the government, or about the Minister of Agriculture. They knew him. In that area we're getting so where they know the Minister of Agriculture, and they're wondering, what has gone wrong with the man's head to be able to sit in his position. And even if he's told by the Minister of Finance that he has to do this thing, why doesn't he do the honourable thing and just say, I'll get out because I can't do these terrible things.

Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Agriculture had honour about him, when the Minister of Finance says to him, I have to have you cut down on the GRIP program, and I got to cut back on this money to farmers because the treasury can't bear it, well most people will say, I can't break a contract. And that's what the Minister of Agriculture should have said instead of just going along with what they want him to do just so he can hold his position for a little while longer. He should have stood up in his cabinet and says, I will not break a contract, regardless. My word has to stay there, that it will not be broken.

At election time, Mr. Speaker, was there one individual over there that went out at election time and says, I will . . . going to break that contract? We're going to break the GRIP program. No, they said, we're going to try to improve it. So farmers took them at face value. They took them at face value. They said, well the NDP said they're going to improve the GRIP program. But they didn't say demolish it. And that's what they did.

The new program demolishes the old GRIP program. There's no even a connection with it. All it is, is the new GRIP program is just a gamble on the price of wheat. There's no connection with your crop figure, like I said this afternoon when I was speaking, that it's absolutely . . . it's just a disaster. It just makes me sick to my stomach that a government would put a Bill through this House to change this here program and have a program that if you get a good crop or nothing, you get the same money. Talk about a socialistic program. I've never seen anything like it.

Now where I've got a real serious, serious, serious area, I move in now into the Glenside, Broderick, Outlook area, and that's my irrigation area. Now that's the area that the '91 GRIP did not suit them a year ago. It didn't suit them. It was bad and they were not signing up. And we in Saskatchewan and our caucus and our cabinet, we understood it, and we had an awful time trying to get the federal government in time to understand this.

But we had a meeting where the member from Morse and the member from Thunder Creek and the past member from Rosetown-Elrose and myself attended a meeting in Outlook with the irrigated farmers and worked out what they had to have for survival. What would be reasonable for to start the '91 GRIP? What would be reasonable for you to enter it and have a safety net here?

So we took that back to cabinet. It got approved in the provincial cabinet, went to Ottawa and got approved. Now I like to see this government opposite be able to send their Premier down to Ottawa and get something approved. We sent our people down there and got it approved. But they would if they took the right kind of request down.

The kind they take, their socialistic programs down there, there's nobody in their right mind would approve them. Because all they want is just cut back, cut back, cut back on farmers. Come on, Mr. Fed, it's your responsibility to look after the GRIP program. You're the ones that have to do it, not us. We don't have to do it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that finishes all the towns in my riding. And I'm saying that that's 25, 27 towns I've been through. Some of them I didn't enlarge on as much as others, but it just has me, Mr. Speaker, lose sleep over this because I can't sleep. And when I go to bed at night . . . and this is happening to the farmers that I have represented for going on 15 years.

I just can't believe it's happening to them. That I have to look them in the face on weekends and they say is there any possible chance you can win on this GRIP Bill? And I'm saying, we are not going to win against the NDP. The

only way we have is our Minister of Justice, the Lieutenant Governor or the Supreme Court of Canada or the supreme court of Saskatchewan. That's the only way we have.

Well farmers are now starting to phone me the last while and saying where do we donate our money to fight this here GRIP Bill? Where do we donate our money? So that's probably maybe the way the farmers will have to do this: raise money, take it to the Supreme Court.

Now I want to move into the Humboldt-Watrous area because in Watrous-Humboldt I have a lot of towns here that have been contacting me. The town of Watrous or the Watrous area, Humboldt, Nokomis, Raymore, Semans, Govan. No, that's . . . Govan and Raymore, they move us out of Humboldt area.

But the Watrous-Humboldt area, I was over there not too long ago. Well I guess it's a little while now. It was before this Bill was this far advanced. And I was talking to some people in Watrous. In fact it was in the swimming pool in Watrous. And it actually spoiled my day there because farmers recognized me.

From the whole area they came for miles. They were bobbing around, swimming in that pool, Mr. Speaker. And somebody would swim up to me and say you're Mr. Muirhead. I got a complaint. Where are you from? Oh I could be . . . they could be from Kamsack. They could be from Kindersley. They could be from any place. But they were mostly from the Watrous area.

And I know that a lot of them, Mr. Speaker — and I earnestly say — a lot of them say, well I voted for that government but, over the GRIP Bill, never again.

You see, Mr. Speaker, politically if we didn't care about people, we on this side of the House should just let this Bill go through and never protest because politically that's the best thing for us. Politically the best thing for the Tories is to let it go, not fight it any more. Just fight it moderately and let it go, and let the people see what they've done to it. Take the message out the next four years.

But I assure you on this side of the House that we're not going to do that for farmers. We're not going to play political football with farmers. We have the . . . Mr. Speaker, if these people on the other side of the House would just get real serious about this and realize that the most important thing is people's lives out there. It's the lives of people, and they're not taking it serious.

And I know some good people on that side of the House that know I'm right, and they're worried about this. I've talked to a few of them about it, and they know that they're having trouble in their riding because many of the letters that I'm receiving . . . and I would say the majority, once they get out of my riding, once they get out of my riding . . . I've got all these towns here, Watrous, Humboldt, Nokomis, Raymore, Semans, Govan, Cupar, Southey, Wadena, Melfort, Nipawin, all these places. When I'm getting calls from this area, Mr. Speaker, we know the sitting MLA is sure getting them because I've never . . . anybody that's ever phoned me, I said: are you letting your MLA know? Yes, but he doesn't agree; he

agrees '92 is the way to go, so he says there's no sense contacting him. I've only had one. I had one person from the Nipawin area that got sympathy with his MLA from . . . he didn't say which one he was in favour of but he did treat him very nicely, and that's the member from Nipawin, said I got a good hearing with him about the GRIP.

Mr. Speaker, I was at a party in the town of Regina here, a 40th wedding anniversary, and the people were from Nokomis. And that's out of the Last Mountain-Touchwood riding and there was people there from Nokomis, Raymore, Semans and Govan. And instead of this being an evening of . . . you know, you're talking about happy times and friends that came from there, you have people that you . . . line up for food or you're lining up just to shake hands with somebody: hey, Mr. Muirhead, I'd like to talk to you. And it'd be always about the GRIP program. I voted for those people. They laugh over there, Mr. Speaker, but I'll tell you, any farmer in the province of Saskatchewan, when they see an MLA, that's the first thing that's on their mind, is my pension plan, my hospital, my GRIP program. That's the first thing they think so that's what they're going to say.

I can meet people in the elevator in the city of Regina that I don't know and they know me, Mr. Speaker, and they'll say what's going to happen to the GRIP program? What's happening to the GRIP program? I have people where I live — in my apartment in Regina here at 111 Lockwood Road — I'll meet people in the elevator, I'll meet people I didn't even know they knew me, Mr. Speaker, and they'll say: we just been hearing what this Bill's about, that it's retroactivity saying that something happened that never happened, that they're going to change legislation. They just shake their head and said: fight it, Mr. Muirhead, fight it for all you can, give it to them.

Back at election time these people hardly even knew who I was. But now they're all my friends. They're knowing now. They know that they made a mistake. They're people in the city of Regina.

I was in a parkade not too long ago and I met somebody — my wife and I. I didn't have a clue who he was: Mr. Muirhead, keep fighting that there GRIP Bill; it's wrong, it's morally wrong. It's coming all over the province. No matter wherever you go, it's the same thing. Wherever you go. I don't care where you go. I guarantee you right now, just anybody here, just go to a public place in the city of Regina, just go have a cup of coffee and just make conversation with a stranger at the next table. Have you heard what the NDP are doing down there about the GRIP Bill? And they say: oh, those guys. And I'll tell you, you'll get it but if you say who you are they're probably kind enough they won't say it. But they'll sure tell it if you don't know who you are. I've been bawled out and I told somebody I was an MLA and he just laid it into me about this GRIP Bill and said, I'll never vote for you again. And I said, well gee don't blame me, I'm not an NDP, and I said, oh I'm sorry. And they never farmed. They're in the city of Regina here. They live here in Regina.

I mean it's . . . And the member from Thunder Creek says when he goes in to Moose Jaw, and he's well known in Moose Jaw, and he said it's either hospitals or GRIP or

contracts, breaking contracts, breaking contracts. It's just no end of breaking contracts.

Yes, we hear some of the members here are saying they're even talking about this out in Vancouver. And I guess there is because I guess, yes, I guess we can get serious about Vancouver because we have . . . They're talking about it right down in United States. Because I was talking to an individual in Bismarck that owns land in Saskatchewan says, what's happening to the GRIP? And that was a senator from a family from one of the states in America at the meeting I was at.

So they're talking about you guys all over the world. People are saying, how are they doing it? How are they getting away with it? What's wrong with you people? Can't somebody make them listen? Is there no courts? Is there no laws?

(2030)

Well there is, Mr. Speaker, and I've said before, there is a law. There is a law in this country and I have faith and I'm definitely . . . I really believe that tomorrow or next day whenever the Minister of Justice is questioned, that he will get to his feet and either say that this Bill will go to Supreme Court of Canada or justify why not. One or the other. I know that he will.

And he can stand up and say, for sure. And if he's able to stand and say, for sure, absolutely for sure that it's a constitutional Bill, well then he's doing better than most lawyers I talk to because most people I've talked to over this last few weeks and said, it don't look good to me. It doesn't look like it's constitutional but I'm not able to say. It should go to the courts to say.

And that's what the Premier of this province has said, it must go to the courts. They're the ones that have to say. When the Premier of this province says it's got to be settled in the court, why does our Minister of Agriculture stand up here and just say, on? Why does the House Leader just says, on, march on, march on?

Well the only place this could ever happen in any of the . . . other than the third-world countries, the only place this kind of a Bill could ever happen and I doubt if it could happen today . . . I don't think it would happen over in communist Russia today. But up till three or four years ago under the communist government these things did happen. And that's what's happening here in Saskatchewan, is a Bill that wouldn't even last five minutes. Soon as the dictator, the president of Russia would say, this is the way it's going to be, that would be it.

Actually we're just going through just a procedure here, Mr. Speaker, about this GRIP Bill. We're just wandering on and going through with . . . they all know it's just a matter of time. We'll go closure, and we'll go closure over here. And they know they're going to get us.

But, Mr. Speaker, they're not going to get us. They may be able to go closure on us and push this Bill through. They may be able to. But I guarantee you that this is going to the Supreme Court of Canada if it can't be settled . . . If the Minister of Justice doesn't do it or the Lieutenant

Governor doesn't do it, then it's going to be myself along with other people that're going to make sure that it gets there. I have my right as a citizen of the province of Saskatchewan to say that this Bill is wrong — absolutely wrong. It's morally, literally wrong.

And I have my right to be able to see that it gets, along with the thousands and thousands of good people in Saskatchewan . . . and I'll bet you there's hundreds of thousands — when they know the truth, that will back the Tories in what we're doing. They'll back what's right. They'll back what is absolutely right for people. It's people that count. This government has forgotten about people.

The Minister of Health wouldn't look at me here tonight and smile, snicker at me, and say . . . as if something's wrong with me. Well there's not, Mr. Speaker. There's something wrong with her. There's something wrong with her, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — The member is straying from the topic. And those personal remarks about members in this House really don't add anything to the debate. And I wish he'd get back to the main topic again.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll do the best I can.

Mr. Speaker, I want to now talk about an area where they always grow good crops. And it's where the past Speaker lives at Cupar — Arnold Tusa. And it's always, since I've known him since 1976, there is always a little better crop on the average than our area. It's a pretty sure crop area through that area — Cupar, Southey, in that area.

And he tells me that he can't find one, absolutely one farmer on the streets or phone-call conversations, one farmer, not one that isn't angry with this government about the changing to the '92 GRIP. And even though they may be going to get a good crop, what they're angry about is what all people of Saskatchewan's angry about, is change in legislation, the manner of the way they are.

An Hon. Member: — Oh they are not.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice says, they are not. I challenge the Minister of Justice to get in a car with me tomorrow morning and go for a ride with me, and he'll find out whether they are or not.

That's what, Mr. Speaker, that's what the members need to do if they want to know about GRIP. That's what they need to do. You can't go, if you live in the city of Regina, there's no sense just knocking the next door and say, what do you know about GRIP? Because they wouldn't have a clue what you're talking about unless they've been listening to television and asking somebody.

But there isn't one individual in this province that believes in this type of legislation. Only the members opposite. They're the only . . . and even they don't believe in it. They're just doing it. They're just doing it. They don't believe in this type of legislation.

Now I've got letters and phone calls from the following

places, but I haven't got records of the . . . you know these are the people that are posing it. But they're not . . . I haven't got individuals giving me incidents, whether they're losing their farms or whatever, Mr. Speaker. And I'm going to name these towns out. I want them on the record because if they're going to phone our caucus and phone us or write us a letter, they need to be . . . their voice needs to be heard in here.

They talk about petitions. If we had all the people in these towns that I'm giving here tonight, if all the people represented in these towns signed a petition, there wouldn't be anybody strong enough to carry it, I can tell you that. Wouldn't be strong enough. Couldn't carry it. And they come from Nipawin, Tisdale, Carrot River. I will stop at Carrot River.

I was in Craik the other day. There was an individual that his brother had passed away in Craik and he'd come down to the funeral, and he was telling me about the Carrot River area and how they got a little better crop in Carrot River, poorer crops in . . . real poorer crops in Nipawin and down into Tisdale, Melfort. But in the Carrot River, they said, we're coming out of it pretty good, but they needed another rain. But they said the 1992 GRIP for them is a disaster.

And that's an area, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where they haven't even carried much crop insurance in the latter years because it's been a good crop area. But they don't have high enough coverages in that area. Because if only the area . . . if they never carried it, if the good farmers never carried it through the years, then they wouldn't work up an average that would make a good average for their whole crop insurance area, which a crop insurance area — there's only 12, 14 in the whole province so we're talking about a big zone.

And they don't have good coverage, but they said under the '92 it just drops on us. Arborfield, Kinistino. I have talked to people from Kinistino. I particularly got calls from Kinistino. Prince Albert, we just have calls in our office. And Duck Lake, we've had personal calls from there. Shellbrook, Canora, Preeceville, Saltcoats.

There's not one people . . . and what I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, that when these numbers that I've got here . . . the phone calls, 28 people from the Canora area's phoned in or written letters. I don't know the particulars because I just have it from our office or phone us in general or whatever, but anyone that phoned in was against.

Why doesn't somebody phone and say they're for? Nobody's phoning and saying they're for. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder if any individual in the province of Saskatchewan or any individual in this Assembly that's getting phone calls from farmers and saying to their MLA, I sure like the '92 GRIP and I sure hope you fight for it and I want you to vote for it in this legislature.

I don't think there's any. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just doubt we're getting any. There may be . . . They all got somebody, everybody'll have somebody in their ridings that '92 GRIP might be better for and I'll grant them that. It might be better for, but as I said before, all they got to do is

mention it to them. Do you like the '91 or the '92 GRIP or are you in favour that we're going to change legislation to take a contract and say that it's void, a part of the contract? And you can't say that to one. You won't say it to one. There's not one of you that would put in your local paper or send out a brochure. I haven't seen a brochure. I've seen the ... Where's *The Commonwealth*, *The Commonwealth* paper? Where's all your advertisements about the GRIP in there? How come you aren't saying, talking about this wonderful Bill. How come we don't see ...

An Hon. Member: — What's *The Commonwealth*?

Mr. Muirhead: — *The Commonwealth* is their NDP paper, Mr. Deputy Speaker. How come that we don't see a double-page ad? The new Bill, GRIP, GRIP. How come we don't see that, Mr. Deputy Speaker?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'll bet you they're glad they're leaving because they're embarrassed when these kind of things come out, because I say to them, if you want to advertise your GRIP Bill, why don't you advertise it in *The Commonwealth*?

You should say, every MLA should say, in my event I spent a day in my riding and I went to here and I went to here and I went to here and I explained the GRIP and they loved it. How come they don't do it, Mr. Deputy Speaker? How come every one of them, even the people that live in the city of Regina, how come you aren't talking about this Bill that's going to change history of the country. It's going to affect the province of Saskatchewan, or the province of Alberta. It's going to affect Manitoba; it's going to affect Montana, North Dakota, because everybody's going to hear about how a government broke contracts. They're going to hear how they broke contracts. Now when you have any government in Canada that legislates to break a contract, it's going to open the eyes of everybody for like, not hundreds of miles around, thousands of miles around. And it sets a dangerous precedent.

What's NDP Ontario going to say? Well if those guys out there in Saskatchewan get away with this, maybe we better break a contract or two and we can get away with it too. And out in NDP British Columbia, they're going to say to themselves, well I sure didn't think that could ever happen. I didn't think the law would ever stand for that. Maybe we could sneak a Bill through without it getting to the Supreme Court of Canada and we can get our way on something. It has a dangerous precedent, and that's why the Supreme Court of Canada has to stop it before it goes any farther. It has to be stopped here in Saskatchewan. It's got to be stopped, stopped now.

And I call, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I call on the government members to use their head, open their eyes, talk about it in their cabinets, and tell the Minister of Agriculture, you boofed her, begone with you, we'll get another Minister of Agriculture and then we'll get another Minister of Finance. We'll tell a different story to the Minister of Agriculture, that we love farmers and we're going to give money to farmers to save them so they can spend money on the business places in this province of Saskatchewan and Saskatchewan has the chance to survive.

Now that's what needs to happen. But we, as I said before, we as politicians, hope ... as politicians would hope you don't do it because you're gone in four years. But we love Saskatchewan people and we're going to fight for them to make sure that you don't do it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — ... (inaudible interjection) ... Well the member from Saskatoon Nutana wouldn't do it, period. If she was the minister of Agriculture, we'd never be in this position, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because when she stood on this side of the House, when she stood up to say she believed in what she was saying ... and she comes from a family that at least understands farming. She understands it. And I don't mean to blow anybody up but I'm saying it would not happen if she was the minister of Agriculture.

She would stand up to whoever had to be stood up to. But what do they do? Anybody that's got a voice over there, that knows how to stand up to GRIP and say that GRIP is wrong, they put you under the table and put you over here so they can't hear from you. They don't want to hear from those kind of people that aren't the type of people, wishy-washy, that just won't stand up for what's right.

Mr. Speaker, I got phone calls. I'm going to continue with Prince Albert, like I said before, Prince Albert, Duck Lake, Shellbrook, Canora, Preeceville, Saltcoats, Yorkton, Gerald, Duff — seven calls from Duff, Saskatchewan. Colonsay, Young in Humboldt constituency here — three from Colonsay, seven from Young; Clavet — these are just on the edge of my riding is why I get more in there — there's a lot of phone calls that come from Clavet, I believe, maybe are farmers that actually farm in my riding but phone from a Clavet exchange, and so that's why I got Clavet here. Probably explains why, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I didn't have as many from Allan because a lot of my farmers live in the Clavet post office area.

And Rose Valley, Rose Valley. The member from Rose Valley should take a little walk into his coffee row because there was a talk in coffee row in Rose Valley just a few days ago. There was a whole bunch of farmers sitting around talking, whether it was in a cafe or whether it was elevator or place of business, but it got ... the crowd got bigger and bigger and bigger and they said they couldn't find one person that would admit they voted for NDP. And they nearly all voted NDP or Liberal, but not any more because they were mad, angry at the government changing legislation.

I've got calls here from Kamsack and Pelly. I've got no particulars about that area, Mr. Deputy Speaker. But when I have got ... I hope, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that they're taking this serious. These are a lot of towns that I'm talking about, and I've got a lot more to read through here yet, but it won't take that long.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, looks like about 17 from the area of Quill Lakes — I think it means the Quill Lakes zone, I guess — 17 calls with 7 people in danger of losing their farms under the 1992 GRIP.

Lanigan area, that's in Quill Lakes also — although the calls I'm getting, I believe the farmers farmed in the

Humboldt area. And the letters that I got from the Lanigan area, that would be more or less the Humboldt area, but Lanigan is their town. A lot of high-priced land in there; a lot of farmers are having a touch and go.

And one phone call to one of our colleagues on that and it was quite serious. They said that they're another one of these examples, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where they said that they worked out a program through the Farm Debt Review Board land . . . Farm Land Security Board mediation services and section 16 of the Farm Debt Review Board and I think they maybe had to move into a section 20, and that's just about ready to say goodbye to your farm when you move to a section 20. That's insolvency.

(2045)

But they were able to, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when they came out with their '91 GRIP, say the boards all looked at them and say here's another man that we can save under the '91 GRIP. And he said it's too bad the '91 GRIP saved me a year ago because the '92 GRIP has let me go this year. I am done. Finished. There's no sense me trying. I'm going to go out and try to get a job or go back to school or whatever, but I'm done.

Now we got the land in which you call the land of milk and honey. That's up where George McLeod is — Meadow Lake. Now that's the land — since I've known George McLeod and other people up there since 1977 — very, very seldom in Meadow Lake area do you ever hear of a poor crop area.

Now I don't know the last couple weeks what's happened there on the crop in that area in Meadow Lake, but I know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that up till two weeks ago that the crops were poor. There are poorer crops to the north, and they weren't even concerned a year ago whether they had '91 or '92 GRIP; it wasn't a big thing to them. But now they are upset.

But as George is informing our people that as you tell them on the streets . . . they're not hearing the news like we do down here. You tell them don't worry about '91 or '92 GRIP. We'll tell you about the legislation. And then they go walking down the street and tell someone else, and it's getting to be the topic of conversation in the Meadow Lake area, is what this government has done.

Well I challenge the MLA from Meadow Lake to go visit all his coffee rows in Meadow Lake and the people that voted for him. Say, I want to know . . . Because that's what I always done in all my years in MLA. If there was something our government was doing that I didn't know whether they would support or not, I would go ask them.

So will you, the member from Meadow Lake, will you go and ask your people in Meadow Lake? That's what you need to do. Will you support me on the GRIP Bill? But let me explain the GRIP Bill, about the retroactivity of it, and having a part of it that's void, taken out of the contract, and there's no way to take it back to court and see if they still support you.

Redberry, we've had . . . I have had just the one call from

what you call the town of Redberry. But there's a total of pretty near 30 here in total. But I haven't had them. So I'm just talking here . . . So far I've only been talking about what I've got.

In the town of Biggar, in Biggar there's been a lot of calls. Someone was out to, from our caucus, out to Biggar, to a meeting out there. And I guess the farmers out there and the business men are really upset about this retroactivity in the GRIP Bill. And Harris, Harris is not that far from Biggar, and there was people there from Harris.

Now here's two towns here that I'm going to challenge the Minister of Agriculture to go and visit with. Because there's two towns here, Rosetown and Beechy . . . I've got two towns here. They're quite a way apart, but I talked to people from Beechy and I talked to individuals at Rosetown. But the individual I talked to from Beechy said that you can't find one town in that area . . . cause that's a high producing area, Beechy. The farmers from there, some of them recover as high as \$175 an acre on the '91 GRIP which will be down to approximately — they won't know for a year and a half — but it approximately will be maybe 110 to \$120 an acre coverage. So now with their crop not so good, with some of their stubble worked under the ground, there's a lot of people that's hurting bad in that area, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And I mean bad.

Now this is kind of jumping around. But I took this list just as it . . . where the calls are registered. Cut Knife-Lloydminster and Maidstone, that's together up there. That area up there, Cut Knife-Lloydminster constituency . . . but from Cut Knife itself and Maidstone. They tell me . . . I have people I know in Maidstone. And I'm hearing from that area, that they cannot find one person in coffee row, not one, no matter whether they meet to discuss it after church, no matter where, it's at a public meeting in the hall, it seems to be the conversation . . . What's going on down there in Regina with our GRIP? What's happening?

The people that are in favour of this 1992 GRIP, and in favour of what the government is doing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, pertaining to this type of a Bill and how they're doing it, there's nobody coming forth and saying so. There isn't anybody that will come forth and say, as I have said many times tonight, come and say, that this is all right, that they agree with this type of legislation.

Now I want to move down to Avonlea-Bengough-Assiniboia area. They're quite a ways apart, but they're still . . . they're kind of summed together here. It looks like about 47 in that area — 47 calls in that area that's protesting one way or the other. But there's no one in that area said, well okay, I'm losing my farm over it. I'm just protesting against the Deputy . . . against the 1991 GRIP Bill . . . or 1992 GRIP Bill.

Then we jump over to . . . There's more towns here in the Rosetown area. There's Dinsmore. There's a lot of calls from Dinsmore area. Their crops aren't that great in there and they're hurting in there. They're hurting bad.

Eastend, Gravelbourg, now that's good . . . Gravelbourg area is one of the best, sure crop areas in Saskatchewan. I can remember being down there when I was minister of

Crop Insurance, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we had the federal minister of Agriculture out here, Mr. John Wise. And we took him down there on a bus and went all through that area. And we drove from there right through to Shaunavon. And Gravelbourg area still had 30-, 40-bushel crops. But that land is so good and such high producing that their average was so high that they had a big coverage on the '91 GRIP, and their coverage is dropped so dramatically under the '92 GRIP that you got an awful upset group of farmers there. But to make it worse, that they haven't got as good a crop there this year. They haven't got their 40-, 50-bushel wheat crop. So there are people suffering there.

In the Ogema area there's good crops growing there. They've had good rain through Ogema. And I know, not directly from Ogema that I've talked to, just a phone call protesting. But I've talked to people that said the Ogema people said if they just had the '91 GRIP along with the good crop they have, they would be quite happy.

Mossbank area. There's a lot of calls here from Mossbank. It just says a lot of calls but it didn't have the number. Wilcox, another place in . . . Willow Bunch, Wood Mountain. Those areas, the crops are not good there at all. They're suffering bad.

And then there's a sad story in Balcarres, Mr. Deputy Speaker. There's a sad story there where a young family went through the boards and they dealt with the bank and they made commitments on the 1991 GRIP, borrowed some further operating money to get them on their feet. And this individual, under the 1992 GRIP, cannot carry on. And that's sad. I say to all members of the House that if somebody says to me they can't carry on under the 1992 GRIP, and we could have out of the guarantee of '91, then it's wrong. It is wrong, wrong to do it.

If it was just a program that the government put in place and it had to happen, well that's just what happens. But when you're breaking a contract to put somebody off the farm, that's serious. When you're breaking a contract, that's terrible.

Dysart, looks like about seven calls, no seven to eight calls from the Dysart area, no particulars on it. Edenwold, Wolseley, out here. Got a good crop growing out here in Wolseley, but they can't . . . talking to Graham Taylor and Graham Taylor said there isn't one individual that he can find in Wolseley that said they wouldn't be better off financially under the '91 GRIP.

So where do we get all this story that after these 12 people on this here board on that committee last winter that come in and says we got to change the committee. And the whole province says . . . or change the GRIP. And the whole province says, we got to change it to the better. Now if it's to the better, why aren't people happy? Why is this happening? Why are we here? Why is it happening that people are so upset?

They're saying, we want the '91 GRIP, naturally, because it was more money to them. They budgeted on it. You can go over into my colleague's area from Kindersley, and I remember talking last spring to somebody that was way south of him. I can't even recall the town. In the end of

March, the first week in April, he was planting his crop to keep the land from blowing. And he had borrowed his money under the '91 GRIP, and then they changed it on him. Well if anybody would think that isn't a sad story, that's terrible. That is absolutely terrible.

I had a man come to see me in the legislature here the other day when the House was sitting, from Pilot Butte out here. He's the one that brought me in this . . . Mr. Deputy Speaker, he brought me this poll that the NDP are doing. He received one of these here. Dear producer. And he went into the post office and said, is this supposed to be for me or whoever? It just says, producer. Do I have to fill it out? That's the day he got his mail.

Oh, and she says, well I don't know. It looks like I only got X amount of these and I just put them in boxes because I didn't know who was farmers and who wasn't. And so when he was in here, did he voice his opinion to me about what — him on good land — what 1992 GRIP is going to do to him, crop slipping away. He said, I thought maybe three weeks ago that it was going to rain enough and the crop would be good enough and maybe I could squeeze through it. It won't be too much difference between the '91 and '92. His crop is going downhill fast. And he says it's going to be a disaster.

When you start getting the good land right outside of Regina here saying that, well I'll tell you, we have got a disaster. You'll find probably the worst in the province, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's suffering the most of the change of the contract, will be the good land in the Soo Line, around Regina, around Moose Jaw, around the Melfort, Kindersley areas, where we have some of them around the Melfort area, where we have some of the highest-assessed land in the province.

And if the farmers kept track of their . . . what they produced for the last 10 years and were good operators, they were able to prove to crop insurance a high, a real high coverage because they had a high yield average. And that's why so much difference.

And then we say, this government says, oh, we're going to quit; we're going to encourage better farming. Well under the 1991 GRIP, it automatically encouraged good farmers because if you had poor crops for years, you farmed for crop insurance . . . and I know, and these members opposite don't know, if you have three poor crops and collect crop insurance, your crop insurance coverage was defunct. It was right down there with very little coverage. So you can't farm for crop insurance in Saskatchewan and survive.

So the farmers out there that were blessed with good rains and had good land had some tremendous coverages — and why shouldn't they get rewarded? That's what the free enterprise world is all about. There's no sin to make a dollar. This government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, seems to be it's a sin to make a dollar.

So they take and come out with a program that pays everybody the same, exactly the same in whatever zone you're in. If you're going to be covered for \$20 a acre or \$35 an acre, that's exactly what you get regardless of whether you get zero or 50 bushels an acre. Now that's

what you call real socialism. Pay the same to everybody. Just give them a cheque.

It proves then what it's all about. The whole GRIP program for 1992 is entirely a gamble on the price of wheat. That's all it is. So you've got no insurance about it. It has nothing to do with your yields whatsoever. Any time that . . . anything you pay a farmer, it has nothing to do with yield. I don't know why we're even connecting it with crop insurance for. Revenue insurance just guarantees you what the price of wheat will be.

So the farmer's got to decide last spring, well gee, I think wheat's going to go to 4 bucks or \$3 — I don't want it. Next farmer says, I think it's going to go to \$2 — I better have it on. So it's just a judgement call. It's not whether you've got moisture, whether you're a good farmer, whatever you are.

And that's got to be a wrong type of insurance. There's no way that the farmers in Saskatchewan told this government that's the way to go. There was no way you were told that.

It was not what . . . the hearings didn't tell you that. We had Mr. Furtan in our caucus office, and he's the one that said, these were the recommendations that came in. But after talking to him for a while, we come to the conclusion it's what he and a few people believed in. And we come to conclusions about what the few people across the way, the government believed. So they directed the committee.

And that's what we got. Because all the copies of the letters that I have, the copies of letters and the phone calls I've got that people that sent in a letter or whatever, a request for that hearing to be heard. And I seen it. I read the book. And the report came out. And their names were all in there. Their letters were in there, but they didn't pay any attention.

You read your own report that came out here on the end of March by the Minister of Agriculture, when they talked about the change to GRIP and the six-year leases on farm land. Mr. Deputy Speaker, they know right well that that isn't what the people asked for. Because I got a copy of the report and the report talked about the changes in GRIP. And the changes to all the different farm Bills that we've got didn't come from the letters and requests in that book. So where did they come from?

(2100)

That means that they didn't listen to all the requests they got. They just listened to the front row of this legislature here. They probably were told, Mr. Deputy Speaker, before the committee ever met: I want you to meet; and we want you to put a program together that's going to suit our needs, but not the farmers' needs.

The program was put together to suit the needs of the cabinet and the government of the day, not to serve the people of Saskatchewan. And it's the people of Saskatchewan that need to be served. It's Saskatchewan farmers that needed to be served. And when you serve Saskatchewan farmers, you serve all people in the

province of Saskatchewan.

The last town we talked about here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was Pilot Butte. And now I got . . . I'll just go ahead to finish off these towns here. I'm going to just name the towns. I won't even stop to say how many calls. There's Watson, Punnichy, Perdue, Pierceland, Landis, Lashburn, Grenfell, and Cudworth.

Now let's talk about where this is really, really serious. Let's go over to the west side of the province where I . . . The towns that I use, Mr. Speaker, didn't take in the very few towns on the west side. And these towns spells disaster for this here Bill. It's an absolute disaster. And these towns where crops are poor and farmers don't know which way to turn, I was over there, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to a meeting over about a year and a half ago, and it was pertaining to a telephone problem where they were right on the border of the Saskatchewan-Alberta border, and what province is going to own this here group of farmers — SaskTel or Alberta Tel? And they hadn't had crops in here for years.

Now here's some towns in here: Eatonia, Mantario, Turnor, Isham, Laporte, Alsask, Lacadena. These are stories in here, that we got stories from farmers in here that absolutely a disaster. We don't know how to talk to these people. Mr. Deputy Speaker, where that it's so close to the Minister of Agriculture, why can't he go over and just drive through those towns?

When I was involved in cabinet and involved in government, I would go to these places. Why don't the ministers and the back-benchers . . . There's about, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there's about 20, 25 that are never here every day. Mr. Deputy Speaker, there's members opposite that are out having holidays and getting ready for harvest. There's about 20 missing every day.

Why aren't they out going to these areas? Why aren't they going to the coffee rows in Eatonia and going to their halls and going to the elevators? And says, I want to tell you about the GRIP Bill. I want to tell you. And how is it going to suit you?

I can remember a year ago in this House when there was a disaster crop in the Kindersley area, when the opposition stood up here and condemned our minister of Agriculture. You're starving those people out of the province of Saskatchewan. But somehow or other they didn't have any trouble electing a member over there. They didn't have any trouble whatsoever, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Now why don't you people care about those people? Why don't you go to Alsask? Why don't you go to Glidden?

It looks like, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there's about 15 towns in the drought area, the Kindersley constituency, that we're calling disaster areas for crops. It's a disaster drought area.

Now what are these people going to do when they've got no wheat to sell, very little wheat, and they change the '91 GRIP to the '92, what are they going to do with it? Does this government not care? The government last year did. We sent . . . I remembering saying to the member from

Morse . . . and I can remember the premier going out and meeting with those people out there and talked to them and listened to their concerns.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have a few remarks that I want to also read into the record here. They're not very long, but I'm going to read them into the record. The NDP government doesn't bother sending any offers to help farmers . . . I'm just going to relax and read this in now instead of jumping around from note to note. This is just a little written statement but it's very short, but I want to read it into the record: All they offer is this reprehensible GRIP legislation. Not too long ago the NDP government turned down more money for farmers.

They turned it down. I say shame on them. When the Minister of Agriculture says here's a way to get out of this here impasse we're in . . . and I talked to some of the members opposite about it, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's a way we could have got out of this, the '92 GRIP. If you got a good crop and you got a few dollars out of '92, they can survive.

But these people that I read from this here . . . and there's another two constituencies here too. Maple Creek's got an area here — I won't get into it now, but I'll maybe get into it later — that they've got a whole bunch of towns that are just unreal for crop failures.

Now why didn't we take that federal money and that would have given them another 10, 15 to 20 per cent on their crop insurance coverage? And for \$23 million we're sitting here fighting and arguing about whether we've got a constitutional Bill or not. And for \$23 million we might have been able to settle this impasse and not have to be here tonight arguing about this Bill, worrying about whether the government's got to show the heavy hand and go closure or not. Because that's what they'll have to do — they know they have to go closure.

If they don't agree with the opposition . . . they should realize, they've been in opposition before, that when we were sworn in as legislators we're here to scrutinize the king's money. Here we are saying that \$23 million could put X amount of money into the hands of farmers and then they spend the money and help them survive and it helps the whole economy of Saskatchewan.

No, they knew it was the right thing to do but they were too stubborn. They just wouldn't change. They knew that if we changed then people are going to say they were like the past government when they changed a few times.

Certainly we lost support when we brought in programs and then withdrew them or took it out. But at least it was listening to people, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Listen to people and when you're wrong, say you're wrong. And I'm saying to this government you're wrong. You're going to be found out to be wrong. You'll always deem to be wrong, and why can't they stand up here and say to the people of Saskatchewan, we're wrong, we're going to pull this here GRIP Bill, let the courts decide. And they say, no we will not do it, we're not letting any court decide nothing. This government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is above the law.

We've got an environmental Bill. We have several other Bills that's come here that I just . . . I was never born and raised in a country that could stand things like this, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I wasn't made for this. My grandfather didn't land here in 1906 in this town of Regina and put 125 pounds on his back and walk out to Yellow Grass and homestead and thought that his grandson would be standing here seeing this happen in this great country of ours today. I'm sure that he would be ashamed of this good old province today.

And he came . . . and his ancestors came from Scotland. I heard the member from Morse talk about where his ancestors came from and I'll tell you we Scotchmen are very, very stubborn people. When we think we're right, when we think we're right we'll say so. But I'll tell you one thing I've learned from my family, when you're wrong you also say so. And when you're wrong you apologize like the . . . I was laughed at tonight here for making a couple of apologies on the record. Well I'm proud that I was brought up in a home when you're wrong you apologize.

And this government knows they're wrong and they can't apologize and they don't know how to apologize. They don't know, they don't even accept. They're so high and mighty and so powerful and so power-hungry that they just think that we're right and everybody else is wrong and all they can do is think of that 52 per cent vote they got in the polls. That's all they can think.

They don't even remember what they said last October. They said, we promise to improve your GRIP Bill. We promise to improve it. Well you improved it. As the member from Thunder Creek said this afternoon, show me one thing in the Bill that means an extra dollar to a farmer, going through all this commotion and it doesn't mean any help to anybody. It's a Bill that we're scrapping to take help away from all the farmers. It's not right.

This decision was made after the attempts from our caucus to persuade the government to accept the federal offer. We asked the government to consider accepting this proposal. The federal offer would have protected those individuals suffering from drought conditions — something that GRIP '92 will not do, Mr. Deputy Speaker, or will never do. Now that the NDP have rejected the federal offer, farmers are once again in a no-win situation if confronted by drought. Many of the NDP MLAs not in cabinet thought that this was a reasonable compromise.

Unfortunately, the NDP cabinet thought otherwise. Once again the NDP ignored our attempts at finding a solution to the GRIP stand-off. Following the rejection of the federal offer, the NDP announced its intention to reintroduce the GRIP '92 Bill. They have extended the sitting hours from 24 hours a week — actually we were only sitting approximately 20 but we'll say 20 to 24 — to 50 hours a week in attempt to wear down the opposition caucus.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you don't wear any caucus down. You might wear them down but you don't take the heart out of people that are determined. We don't gain an hours work by it, sitting 20 hours or 50 hours, unless people are agreeable and a co-operative spirit.

It's the first time in my 15 years that the two House leaders and the whips or whatever couldn't sit together and make a decision on what the extended hours should be, if need be. But I've never seen it ever happen in 57 days before, never. It's just around 60 now, or around that. And we're paid for 70 sitting days in a year. And we always sit 70 or more.

And so the heavy-handed government had to start doing closure, closure, closure on everything. We had a closure on the interim supply Bill, that it was just unreal. And that's what's happened in the motion. Certainly said today that the GRIP Bill hasn't had closure on it. But the motion to introduce the GRIP Bill had closure on it when it was only going after one speaker. One speaker from Morse spoke for an hour and three-quarters, and then we had closure.

That's what gets the Scotchman-type people and the people that are not happy with . . . that what gets our tempers up, and that's why things don't work. Because you upset us. Why don't you work in a co-operative spirit?

We know you outvote us. We will give in to that. I will gladly say that if you bring Bills forth in this House that I will say, well I don't agree but it's reasonable for your type of socialistic government and I'll bow to your wishes. But when you bring in things like this, you go closure, you go long sitting hours, and you just walk right over top of us . . . If you don't like the 10 hours we're going to give you, we'll give you 15, and if you don't like the 15, we'll give you 24. That's what's gone wrong, our co-operative spirit in here. That's what's happened. And there should be enough members over there to get a hold of whoever's in control and straighten these kind of things out.

There was no problem on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, of having some compromises that we could have worked things out. When we didn't take that money from Ontario . . . or from Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, when that money was turned down, was just not even thinking about it, and all we had to do was put up \$23 million. It would have been a little extra money for the people in the province of Saskatchewan that have no crop and it would have been what we could have solved this impasse with, and they refused to do it. They just didn't do it.

We do not intend to let GRIP '92 — I'll continue with my written words, Mr. Speaker — we do not intend to let GRIP '92 pass without a fight. And if they think they've been fighting and putting up problems to now, Mr. Speaker, you've seen nothing. Because we're going to do everything that we possibly can do to stop the GRIP Bill, to bring it to the attention of the people of the province of Saskatchewan which is starting to work day by day.

More people are phoning. More people are contacting. I spent a long time tonight going through all these towns. And I know I got two or three lists more here. But in all this pile of remarks here, some of them got missed. I see some more here that I'll go through later from the constituents from Maple Creek.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, our members will continue our attempts of persuading the NDP to make amendments to

this retroactive legislation. We do not intend to back down. My colleagues and I walk out of the legislature in defence of individual rights. That's what we . . . When we walk out of here, it's individual rights that we're thinking of. The NDP forced retroactive legislation into the House that takes away rights of farmers to the income insurance program they paid for, and for which the government and each farmer signed legal contracts. The government is in court over the changes to GRIP. Essentially this legislation will change the law and ensure the NDP government's victory in the courts. We want the government to hold this legislation until the court case is over so that farmers receive a fair trial. Obviously the government opposite does not agree.

Well let me refresh the members opposite on their progress regarding GRIP. Let me give you a review: the NDP GRIP '92 chronology. Pre-election NDP says, GRIP needs to be improved to pay out more money; promise a cost of production, a formula. Is that what we got in the GRIP, Mr. Speaker? No way. They completely broke their election promise. This is what they said before the election: GRIP needs to be improved to pay out more money.

(2115)

Now we had the Minister of Finance say that we can't afford that kind of money, even though he knows his accusations about the finances of the treasury . . . that he knew it was there before but he keeps trying to say that, oh we didn't know about the finances of the province. Of course he knew. He's admitted he knew. He's admitted there was a \$3.5 billion deficit.

Election — NDP says farmers will get better GRIP and more cash from Ottawa by voting NDP. Mr. Speaker, where is this money? A lot of farmers voted NDP, not that many but they did, enough to swing a lot of the seats on the eastern side of the province. There was a lot of seats between the Liberal split . . . and the NDP. Farmers voted NDP and they voted because, NDP says farmers will get better GRIP and more cash from Ottawa by voting NDP. Where is it? The GRIP's gone phut down '92. They admit it. They can't afford the 23 million to even get some more. They had no intentions of it — absolutely a complete election . . . They've broke their promise. Talk about broken promises.

I've watched the CCF since a young boy. I can remember when Tommy Douglas was elected in 1944 and there was a big swing to the CCF, a big swing. A big swing but I never heard of Tommy Douglas breaking a promise. I never heard. Maybe he did, but I never heard the talk on the street.

That's all you hear in Regina, Saskatoon — I don't care where you go in Saskatchewan — is NDP broken promises, everywhere you go. Everywhere. You cannot walk down the streets of Regina. And you well-known ministers, you have to walk faster. Somebody's going to stop you and talk to you. You know that. And they're going to talk to you about how poorly you're doing, how we will never vote for you again. That's what it's all about. What are you doing to the farmers, they're going to say to you. That's what they're going to say because you broke

the promise. You broke it.

You said you were going to get more cash from Ottawa by voting NDP. Now why did you mislead every farmer in the province of Saskatchewan? And if it's right, they'd have their money in their pocket. They didn't get 5 cents from you.

We had a letter that I think you think they did. Mr. Speaker, I think they actually believe they're helping farmers. The Minister of Agriculture sends a letter out to the farmers of Saskatchewan saying we dramatically increased your funding. We dramatically increased. When the Minister of Finance knew there was a dramatic drop of about 75 to 100 million to farmers — at least. Plus they wouldn't put in this extra money.

The nine years that . . . The nine and a half years that I was on the government side, there was only a few months went by that the member from Estevan, the then premier would say, yes, we're getting into debt to . . . The province is going into debt, debt, debt, and I don't want it, but our treasury's on line for farmers.

What do you do? What do you do with . . . Who's budget are you trying to balance out there? Why don't you try to balance something that we know you got to try doing the best you can with finances. But they're having trouble all over North America. You seem to think Saskatchewan's the only place that they got deficits. It's because we got an economic problem out there.

Mr. Speaker: NDP establishes GRIP Review Committee after the election of '91 which fails to consult widely with farmers. The committee recommends some changes, warns Minister of Agriculture, member from Rosetown-Elrose about the March 15 deadline problem.

The member from Thunder Creek talked about that this afternoon. He was warned. And he said, no problem. We'll get around that.

And I think every one of you believe that. And I think you made your back-benchers believe that. And that's why you got a problem today because you're trying to prove to your own back-benchers that we were right. We haven't got a problem. But it's getting out of hand on you. It's getting out of hand on you because you underestimated what ten . . . basically farmers on this side of the House, and our determination, what we could do for the people of the province of Saskatchewan. We knew we could get our message out to the people. So we determinately fought you. We determinately done everything we could do to get the message out that you betrayed the farmers and the people of Saskatchewan.

That, Mr. Speaker, if you're professional people and you're running government and a contract says you have to have a letter out on the March 15, why didn't your professional people get it out there?

An Hon. Member: — The feds were too slow.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Speaker, again someone says the feds were too slow. It's got nothing to do with the feds. It's got nothing to do with the feds. It's got nothing to do when

the member from Elphinstone says the feds were too slow. It's the provincial government that was too slow. It was them that didn't get the letter out.

You can't blame the federal Minister of Agriculture for the province of Saskatchewan not sending out a letter on March 15. I mean, I don't know just how far the House Leader, the member from Elphinstone, can take this, because he knows that when he says these things, he has to say it with a smile because he knows he's wrong. Because at one time he was a farmer, and perhaps he still is, and he understands, really underneath, but he also understands how the things go in the front benches here. He understands what has to happen.

The member from Rosetown-Elrose told committee: We can get around it somehow. Quote June 17, 1992. Because he said, Mr. Speaker, in the House today, when did I say that? Okay, when did I say it, when did I say it? Well I say we got the quote right here: We can get around it somehow.

Well I'll tell you that was said on June 17. That's months after the GRIP Bill had changed. He's having some time getting around it. Before he gets around it, he's going to be without a job. He'll be sitting in the back row and he won't be a cabinet minister any longer.

The member from Rosetown-Elrose announces changes but does not have information to farmers by March 15 deadline. Five Melville area farmers sue the government for breach of a contract.

What did we hear? I remember talking to the individuals when that started at court — laughed about it. What's five little old farmers going to do this great, big, old government? Five little farmers can't do nothing to us. They don't mean anything. It doesn't mean a thing. They laughed about it. But by the time it went through court: Over 10,000 farmers protest GRIP changes at rallies and meetings around the province.

Mr. Speaker, there's been many MLAs have gone to their home hall town ridings that have been booed and told to leave. I can't recall them right now, but I know the names and the halls but it's just not coming at the moment.

Over 10,000 farmers protested the GRIP changes at rallies and meetings . . . And that's got nothing to do with last March, last March and the first part of April when they were talking about the changes. I guess it would be in April. It was just prior to seeding, Mr. Speaker, when they had the meetings all over the 20-some . . . I'm not sure how many meetings they had in Saskatchewan, but as I said before they had a meeting in Rosetown and they had one in Davidson. I know in one day they had one in Davidson and Craik and Findlater I believe it was, Findlater or Bethune. There was three in the one day. I was not able to attend either one of the three but I had some of my family attend and some of my executive attend and they said there wasn't one individual, not one individual that would stand up and says '92 is what we want.

One farmer, when the member from . . . whoever was representing agriculture, Mr. Speaker, one farmer stood

up and says, well you know we have . . . I see three agents here tonight at this meeting and I see four or five crop insurance inspectors. Let's ask them about this moral hazards. Do you, without mentioning any names, do you know of any individuals that actually farmed in a moral hazard manner that were farming for crop insurance? And there wasn't a remark from any of the agents; they all shook their heads and didn't have a name.

And one farmer jumped up and says, well yes I know of one — I did it myself. And he says that I didn't put on any fertilizer because of the 1991 GRIP because I get the same money regardless. So the person that asked the question, Mr. Speaker, it was his neighbour, he says some remark to him, sit down. You told me the reason why you didn't put it on was because the price of wheat was \$2.08 a bushel. So the guy had to back down.

A lot of people didn't put fertilizers on last spring on ground that . . . or I'm talking about '91. They didn't put it on because if they had lots of moisture on summer fallow in my area, you never get more than 1 or 2 per cent of the farmers, whatever, fertilize summer fallow, just double crop.

So actually in those three meetings we didn't have one person that said they were in favour of the 1992 GRIP. May 13, Mr. Speaker, 1992, Judge Hunter rules the farmers have a **prima facie** case of breach of contract and lists the deadline for opting out until the matter goes to trial; government appeals decision.

Now this is starting to bother the members opposite then, Mr. Speaker. They're saying . . . well the member from Churchill Downs says, Mr. Speaker, they're so bothered and he kind of laughed about it. They're against judges. They think that what a judge says has to be wrong. What a judge says is right, Mr. Speaker. They're not . . . they're above the law. The member from Churchill Downs thinks he's above the law. That's really what it's about — above the law.

That's what you people think over there that you're above the law in Saskatchewan. We can do what we want. We don't care about judges. We don't care about courts. We, the cabinet ministers, can change the power. We'll be the power. We'll tell you what is going to be, and we'll take your rights away from taking to court in case we're wrong. Now that is right, Mr. Speaker. That is a right and proper statement I just said, that this government is so powerful and so arrogant that they can change the law and then so . . . change contracts and so making sure that nobody can protest they changed the law in the same Bill so you can't take it to court and sue them.

Now that has got to be . . . if that's democracy, boy, I tell you we got a lot of waking up to do in Saskatchewan. We got a lot of waking up to do.

The federal Agriculture minister says if Saskatchewan government will go back to GRIP '91, Ottawa will be picking up much of the cost shortfall, June 20, 1992. It's a quote — picking up much of the cost shortfall.

Well then he goes on to say deadline for the offer was June 30, 1992. The Premier says he can see the Tories' point.

He says that. The Premier could see our point. The member from Churchill Downs, the member from Elphinstone, Mr. Speaker, they don't see our point.

But I know the Minister of Justice does. And I know the Premier does because the Premier says he sees our point. He sees our point. And the Minister of Justice is a right and honourable man. And he will agree. He's a great friend of the Premier.

They spent most of the summer together in Ottawa over the constitution so they must have talked a lot about this here impasse in the House. And when the Premier says that we see the Tories' point, I'm sure that they talked it over and the Minister of Justice will say I see the Tories' point.

So I'm sure tomorrow or the next day he'll be standing up defending, either defending why this Bill is constitutional or else he will say perhaps, I don't know and I'm not sure, but I'm going to do the right and proper thing and we'll let the court decide. I am so certain that I have faith in him that's what will happen.

June 24, 1992, on a technicality, the court rules the government has a right to appeal, which we all knew that would happen. That's just common sense to have a right to appeal. And still we had members there, Mr. Speaker, running around and said, well, we won, we won, we won.

You didn't win. You just got scared and introduced a Bill to the legislature. June 29, 1992, the Speaker intervenes. Mr. Speaker said in his statement:

The vote on the GRIP Bill is thus suspended until I am informed that both government and the opposition, the official opposition are ready to proceed with the Bill or until the House itself makes a decision on the disposition of the Bill.

That's a *Hansard* statement, Mr. Speaker.

July 7, 1992, chairman of the Rules and Procedures Committee forces a vote in the Rules Committee. Now why did we have that? Why did that happen, Mr. Speaker? Why did we have that change in the Rules Committee, because those things never happen while the legislature is sitting.

Those meetings are always happen when the session is . . . when we're not sitting in session. You discuss those. You talk for a long time, which they did. There were some rule changes and then we decided to go with rule changes in the House, and then all of a sudden we had to have the bell-ringing changed so we could control this House and then you wonder why the rule changes all fell apart, is because when one part falls it all parts.

It's just more of democracy being stepped upon by, and we're being muzzled by, these here heavy-handed government opposite. It was done against the wishes of the official opposition. The NDP tried to reduce bell-ringing to 30 minutes and suspend controversial Bills for three days in order to force GRIP through changes. Opposition rings bell on motion and filibuster the motion.

(2130)

Mr. Speaker, this didn't have to happen. There's no way this had to happen. And I'm going to . . . my thoughts on this, Mr. Speaker, is that when this House adjourns or prorogues — likely we'll be adjourning — that you'll see the Rules Committee meet again and they'll be discussing some of these things and you'll see, there'll be some changes here. Because they'll perhaps have their GRIP Bill through. It'll probably be sitting . . . At that time it'll be sitting in the . . . It'll probably be passed but it'll be in the Supreme Court of Canada for a right and proper ruling on it.

Many compromises are offered to the NDP government by the opposition, the NDP accepted none. And you know that's right, Mr. Speaker, there was many that we gave but none were accepted. So the compromise just didn't happen.

July 14, '92, NDP announce they would use closure to end the debate on the rules and force the vote by Thursday, July 16. PCs question the NDP on rule changes, the choice for farmers between GRIP '91 and '92, allowing the court case to continue. Opposition after receiving no co-operation from NDP moved to adjourn the House and bells rang.

July 16, 1992, Speaker intervenes and forces a vote on the bell-ringing motion. The Speaker also suspends the GRIP Bill for two weeks. The NDP used its majority to stifle the opposition.

July 21, 1992, official opposition move a non-confidence motion asking the Speaker, Herman Rolfe, to resign his position.

July 30, 1992, written notice was given that the NDP plan to re-introduce the retroactive GRIP legislation, July 31, 1992.

August 3, 1992, the member from Regina Elphinstone gives notice on closure of motion to re-introduce GRIP.

We heard here today that there was no closure on GRIP. That is, not on the GRIP Bill itself, but there was to introduce it and you know there was. Mr. Speaker, we know how long that the speeches were. We know how long they were. The member from Morse spoke for one hour and three-quarters, and then we came in Monday morning and we had closure. One hour and forty-five minutes of speaking on the motion to introduce the GRIP Bill and the House Leader introduces closure, and he seems to be proud of it. And then he says he plans to use it again when the GRIP Bill comes into the House, likely later this week — *Star-Phoenix*, August 4, 1992.

Well something makes me think, Mr. Speaker, that a week ago Friday, the House Leader, the member from Elphinstone . . . seen him on television one morning saying that the GRIP Bill would be introduced today. And he shouldn't say those statements with an opposition like we have here because what he says doesn't come true until we say so, unless he does closure. We can't get by his closure. The heavy hand, we can't do anything about

that. That's one thing that we are stopped completely on is when we . . . You can't beat us. The 10 of us can stand here. We can talk and we can talk and we can talk and tell the people stories from the province of Saskatchewan. And you'll never stop us. We can go on and on and on for weeks and weeks and months, but the only thing that stops us is a heavy-handed government, and that is closure, my friends. And that's the only thing that stops us.

Seeing that it's now August 10, I'm sure we will not have long to wait for the Government House Leader to slam this legislation through the House with closure once again.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to get those on to the record. Mr. Speaker, there's someone that could help us with this GRIP Bill. There's a group of people that definitely could bring this impasse to a close, and I'm going to ask tonight and I'm going to be talking to them tomorrow, and it's the media. The media of the province of Saskatchewan, I challenge them to look very carefully into this legislation and start printing their articles and their television articles that shows the people of the province of Saskatchewan what's going on because that's what happened in Ontario with the environment Bill; the media done the job for the people.

So I'm asking the media, and I'm going to go and see them tomorrow — each and every one. I'm going to say, we ask you, Mr. and Miss Media, whatever, we need your help for democracy in the province of Saskatchewan, we must have your help. There's 10 of us, 50,000 farmers behind us, probably another 50 or 100,000 people know what we're talking about, but there's still another 4 or 500,000 people that know nothing about what's happening in this legislature. Many people don't even know we're here tonight, Mr. Speaker, don't even know that this legislature is sitting.

I've gone home on weekends — and I'm sure my colleagues have — and they say we're glad to see you home from Ottawa for the weekend. That's how much people know about a lot of what goes on. We need the media to help us, and I'm going to ask the media. I'm not going to challenge them because the media . . . they can do what they want. But this is once that we, the people of the province of Saskatchewan . . . not the opposition. It isn't us that needs you. It doesn't affect us. Like I said a long time ago, several hours ago, that politically better to let it go. And all we should be doing is out there door to door, telling people about what you did, and politically we're the best. But we can't do that to the people of Saskatchewan. We have to try and stop it, and we are going to stop it, somehow or other.

We may not be able to stop the Bill in this House, but we can take it to the Supreme Court of Canada, and it is going to go. It will get there. And the worst thing that could ever happen to this government is to pass this Bill in this legislature and then, about a year or two from now, have it all turned around — they lost it in the Supreme Court of Canada, and they are done and finished for ever and ever, amen. They'll be no more NDP in the province of Saskatchewan for ever. That will finish it, absolutely finish it.

So I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that the media will know what I'm saying. I'm going to ask them to be serious about this, that this whole carryings-on with this retroactive Bill, changing history in the province of Saskatchewan . . . Get the message out to Saskatchewan.

And I challenge every member sitting in their seats tonight, every member of this House, go out to your people, tell them what you're doing and see if you get endorsed. And I challenged some people before here, some members earlier tonight, Mr. Speaker, if they can bring me, give me names, go and tell people to phone me from their ridings and tell me they want '92 GRIP. Get them to do it.

Mr. Speaker, this, as I said when I started here about 4 o'clock this afternoon, that these are sad, sad days in Saskatchewan. This is sad, sad days in Saskatchewan. I said every time that I've spoke in this House since 1978 I was always proud to speak. And I am not proud to speak in this legislature on the topic that we're talking about here in this last few weeks. It doesn't make me proud to be part of an Assembly that brings these type of Bills to the legislature. I ask, Mr. Speaker, I ask the people like the House Leader, the Minister of Justice . . . Mr. Speaker, I thought my House Leader was going to tell me to quit. But he says, keep on; we want you to go for another two days. Now I don't know whether I can make another two days or not but I've got a lot more to say here all right.

We'll just turn, Mr. Speaker . . . Let's just go back and talk, Mr. Speaker, about some more tragedies. Mr. Speaker, it wouldn't be fair — I'm glad I found this here paper here — it wouldn't be fair to all the people that have phoned us and wrote us throughout the province and asked that what they're saying be brought to this Assembly . . . We've got towns from . . . These are the areas in the Maple Creek constituency that are hard pressed for a real poor crop and where the 1992 GRIP could finish these people.

Now surely, Mr. Speaker, of all the people I've mentioned here tonight from all these towns . . . I went through a terrible pile of towns. And I know that the Minister of Agriculture is not able to stand up and give probably one town or one RM that endorses him for the '92 GRIP, let alone the dozens and dozens I've done here tonight. He cannot stand in Committee of the Whole. He might as well prepare himself because when he stands up here in Committee of the Whole and we ask him to give us the towns and RMs that are supporting you on the '92 GRIP, he'll have his chance then. And I don't think he can do it, Mr. Speaker. I don't think he can do it.

Because we can't go any place that we don't get — and I'm not going to say that we get 100 per cent but I can't . . . anybody that is against us don't come forth and say so. So we have to say that 100 per cent of the people contacting us are in favour . . . or are against this Bill and against what they're doing.

The town of Johnsborough, Fox Valley, Richmond — I'm just jumping through some of these here — Horsham, Burstall, Golden Prairie, Hatton, Cummings, Mackay . . . Mackid, Cardell . . . (inaudible) . . . Piapot. I just drove through Piapot just on the weekend, Mr. Speaker, and the crops are terrible down there. They're burning up and

they're little short heads. I don't see over a five to eight bushel crop in some of those areas.

In fact I just drove through during the night, all last night. I wasn't able to see them coming back of course because I drove through the night from British Columbia to Saskatchewan, but going out. And then I drove as far as Swift Current last night and from Swift Current in there were a little bit better crops. And I guess there's pockets in the Maple Creek area.

But this is the list of the towns. There's one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine — it looks like about 20 towns in the Maple Creek constituency that have crop failure disasters, Mr. Speaker.

What are these people going to do? What are they going to do when they put in for a crop insurance claim and they've had maybe a poor crop the last couple of years and their crop insurance coverage is down and under the new '92 GRIP they're under the area average? And if they've been good farmers, they aren't even able to use that any more. And so it could be a disaster for them, an absolute disaster.

Mr. Speaker, I've got some more towns here that we have checked off where we're getting a lot of serious calls from, whether there's a poor crop or not. These are the towns in the constituency of Bengough-Milestone that we're hearing about poor crops and against 1991 GRIP. On this list, there's Ogema. But I mentioned it before, but it's Ormiston. And there's Pangman, Parry, Radville.

And I know when I go by Pangman there, when I mentioned Pangman, I know people there and there's a bumper crop there and still I can't find anyone in that area . . . I know a lot of people in Pangman — that's where my family originated around from Khedive-Pangman. Probably . . . yes, I see Khedive's on this list, Mr. Speaker.

And they've had lots of rain there, and they're saying that they're still going to lose on the '92 GRIP. It is not going to pay them as much money.

And I know the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, they're going to say, well we know this. There's going to be less money for them, but it's the treasury that comes first. The treasury comes before the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

Now if they're making out of a budget and that's the way the budget has to be, I'll go for that if it has to be that way. But for goodness sakes, when there's been a contract . . . the breaking of contracts to all these people I've talked about is the most disgraceful thing I've ever heard from a government ever.

The Radville area. For goodness sakes, the member from Radville go down there and talk to the people in Radville because they're angry at you. And I mean, angry. They would like to get a hold of the member down in Radville and tell her exactly what they think of this here 1991 GRIP, 1991 versus '92 GRIP, and then tell them what they think about the changing of the Bill in the manner of what they are.

Tribune, Trossachs, Verwood, Viceroy. There's about . . . oh, it looks like about 7 to 15 calls from each one of these areas, Mr. Speaker, that's marked beside them. And I've got no . . . beside these I have no incidents of stories unless they come to my mind from the particular call that came to me.

(2145)

Up in Biggar Go up to Biggar area. There's quite a few here that haven't had any from. But now we go to Delisle — there's a lot of calls from Delisle, Donavon and Kelfield It looks like about 40 from the Kelfield area, Mr. Speaker, and also 28 from the Laura area. The Laura area is over 20 phone calls from that area. Mead I'm just jumping through the towns. This is a list of all the towns in that constituency where we've had calls from. And as I said before, Mr. Speaker, and I say it under oath, and I say it honestly, that we haven't had a call, one call, none of us 10 people, that have said, fight for the '92 GRIP.

And I've always said, challenge the members opposite. Bring forth their towns and their names. They're saying, we're endorsing you on the '92 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes there's . . . I don't know. I never . . . Some of these must be small point because I've never heard of Swanson There's calls from Swanson There's letters from Swanson, Valley Park, Vanscoy, constituency of Humboldt, Mr. Speaker.

Elstow, I think there's good crops growing in that area. But still there's been . . . It looks like the most in the area is coming from around that Elstow area that oppose — at least the people that called in. The Humboldt RM and area — it says RMs and area — there's been about 75 from that area. Manitou Beach, Plunkett — I know where Plunkett is, Mr. Speaker. And there's four or five calls from that area with three marked "serious". Three of these are marked that they're a disaster.

And I had some reports before, Mr. Speaker, about Young And then there's the town of Zelma That wasn't on my list. The town of Zelma, there looks like seven or eight here with . . . It said 50/50, so that means 50 of those we were marking them whether they're saying that they're in a financial bind over what's happened.

Now I'm trying to just jump through this because this could . . . I'm going to jump up to Kelsey-Tisdale There's the ones that I had quite a few from. But there's a lot of calls from the Kelsey-Tisdale constituency. Hudson Bay, Hudson Bay, the crops are not very good there. And they're really complaining in the Hudson Bay area. Whoever is the member from Kelsey-Tisdale, it notes on here, member should go and talk to farmers. Go talk to the farmers and business men in your area. See if they support you what you're doing. Go talk to farmers in the Orley area, Weekes, and then the Tisdale area, Smoky Ridge These areas where farmers are phoning in on behalf of groups of people, phoning in saying, stop the '92 GRIP; stop it. It's going to break us. That's kind of the message from the Kelsey-Tisdale on that page, Mr. Speaker.

I went through quite a few from Kelvington-Wadena I'm going to go to my memory. I may double up on some from my list but on my list I just can't recall. I know I said

something about one person in Rose Valley but there's a lot on here from Rose Valley area and there's where the member from Kelvington-Wadena should be contacting his constituents in Rose Valley.

Now there's a serious-looking list is in constituency of Kinistino Middle Lake — a lot of people from there — Birch Hills, Batoche, Crystal Springs, 17 farmers. They're phoning on behalf of 17 farmers. Fish Creek and then Kinistino, I guess, has the most. But I had that on my list. And that's where there's some . . . the RMs up in that area, some of them are 60 and 70 per cent I know, Mr. Speaker, of foreclosures in those areas. Some of those RMs it's unreal of the hardships in those areas now and so now they put a poor crop and a '92 GRIP. This could . . . The Weldon area — I know people in the Weldon area and I know how serious that is there.

Mr. Speaker, I have a list here, constituency of Moosomin, but we'll leave that for the member of Moosomin when he speaks, to talk about the people in his own riding and also in Morse

Now when I talked about Nipawin, Mr. Speaker, I talked about some of these towns but didn't get them all. Aylsham — there's been a lot of contact from that area. I spoke about Carrot River I told the story about the one individual said they had a good crop in Carrot River but the '91 GRIP is not . . . would be a lot better for them.

There's places like Inkster I'm not sure where that is. But they say their crop is very poor there. The Nipawin area looks to be the worst, Mr. Speaker. It looks like over the hundred contacts from that area, from the Nipawin area, one way or another, by phone call, by person, or by letter from that area. And I've talked to a lot of people in that area.

I was talking to this individual from Carrot River that told me that . . . In fact I talked to the member from Nipawin himself, and he says that it's dry in that area. Now we didn't discuss about one program versus the other but it looks to me like it's . . . Smoky Burn — there's a lot of farmers in that area. I don't think that's a big farming area but it looks like they maybe have them all because they said farmers in that area completely against.

The next one, Mr. Speaker, is Pelly area. That area I'm quite familiar with. I spent a lot of time back in the 1977 campaign over there, by-election, then I've been back there to a lot of meetings since. I got to know a lot of people and that's a good producing area. The crops were all . . . They were short of rain there but this is one of the areas, Mr. Speaker, where there's a lot of low-assessed land but they out produce a lot of Saskatchewan because of the rainfall. They get a lot of rainfall.

So an awful lot of people up that whole line in the Yorkton north, there's a lot of bush land in that area, Mr. Speaker, and that's the area that didn't do well on the '91 GRIP. That area from Pelly to Hudson Bay and across the North, they're an area that did produce a heavy crop in 1991 and they had to pay a premium, a lot of those farmers. But they did get 50-, 60-bushel grain. And they're the ones that I think that the NDP were listening to, the people from that area, because that seemed to be their stronghold, up that

east side and there's where the NDP were saying, we got to change GRIP. We got to change GRIP because the farmers want it changed.

That's the group and the area in the province that wanted it changed. They're the area from Yorkton right up the east side is where most of the requests came, because I read it in the report that came out to the Minister of Agriculture and most of the letters seemed to come in from that area. The '91 GRIP they were really opposing. Most of the biggest bulk of the letters from the province of Saskatchewan and hearings were always saying we want changes. But these people didn't like the '91 GRIP. But now, go talk to them now, Mr. Speaker. If the members from that area would go talk to their people now they'll find it's much different because they got a poor crop up that area now. They haven't got their 50-bushel wheat on low-assessed land so now they're afraid they haven't got any wheat and they haven't got any price for their wheat and they haven't got any GRIP money, so they're going to be up against it. So now they're the people that was . . .

I got the same thing going all over, Mr. Speaker. I got the people in my area that last summer, last spring I couldn't get them to sign up for '91 GRIP. They seemed to be opposing it and now — but most of them did; there was a 96 or 97 per cent sign-up in the RM I live in, Mr. Speaker — and now the people are coming back and saying, I wish I could get back the program I didn't want a year ago. The program they didn't want a year ago, they didn't realize how good it was until this mess came in.

In the constituency of Pelly, where we've had most of our contacts is Pelly itself, the town of Pelly. It looks like Hyas I can remember the town of Hyas quite well. That's the poll I had there in 1977, Mr. Speaker, and I can remember that town quite well in the '77 by-election. And then there's, of course, the town of Kamsack. It looks like about 30 from that area.

That's the town that I'm familiar . . . Togo, Saskatchewan — that's good producing area in there. And there's been some serious calls from that area where a farmer says, if we have to take the '92 GRIP, we'll go under. Now it just says some, and I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether it's 1 or 2 or 5 we're talking about.

And there's an area around Regina here that I touched a little bit on before, but I think, Mr. Speaker, this may be one of the most serious of the province because there's where a lot of your high-priced land comes from, in this Qu'Appelle-Lumsden I would say that, other than my own riding, I'm probably getting more contact because I know so many people in that riding that . . . as I meet them in the streets and I talk to them and they come into the office here, they phone. And they know me and they've been writing letters, and reeves have been sending in letters, RMs saying that they want the 1991 GRIP. And some of these towns are from, that are getting . . . Bechard, Balgonie, Edenwold, Fort Qu'Appelle, Grand Coulee, Wilcox. It looks like the Wilcox area, that's . . . I had a story from the Wilcox area, Mr. Speaker, where a farmer from the Wilcox area was covered for \$227 an acre under the GRIP program.

I know farmers just outside of the city here, in Pense and

Grand Coulee, that were covered for over \$200 an acre, where they're able to prove a year ago, with their good farming practices and good land and blessed with good rains, that this one farmer had 47 bushels to the acre average for 10 years on durum wheat. So he was able to insure that times \$4.55 a bushel so that give him some place around that \$250 dollars an acre coverage, which I understand he's going to be close to \$100 an acre drop. So you can understand why farmers, when you start saying that one program versus the other . . . you've taken away from me.

Forget about all the reasons that the Minister of Finance says we can't do it. It's a program and a Bill that came out, and it's like the member from Thunder Creek says. There is no way, Mr. Speaker. He said there is no way that there's a thing in there for farmers. Nobody . . . The Minister of Agriculture will not be able to stand up in this House and say, well this is where it's going to be of benefit to farmers. He will not be able to do that when it comes to Committee of the Whole. He will not be able to stand up here and say, well this is going to really be a help to farmers, and we're going to be proud to put this Bill through this legislature. Well I tell you, they're not. They're not going to be proud because he's not going to . . . He's going to have to admit it, and he knows it. Maybe he won't admit it, but he knows it. He's doing it because he has to do it. They made a mistake, and they done what farmers didn't want them to do.

The Lumsden area, my goodness, and there's a lot of good land, and some a little poor around the valley, but oh my goodness, the Lumsden area, the calls in from the Lumsden area and contacts are unreal. I had that in my other lists here, Lumsden, but don't think I mentioned it.

Pilot Butte, I just had the one individual that talked to me, but it looks like in the Pilot Butte zone — I don't know how far it went out, White . . . (inaudible) . . . out through there — I think there's around that 30 to 40 contacts from that area, or it looks like it may be somebody writing in on behalf of that many people.

Riceton, they got land down in there. I know people down in the Riceton area that are complaining about this because they farm land up at Craik; it's Bert Wildfong, and he says that he was covered for \$225 an acre on five and a half sections of land in Riceton. And this year's, if it stays the way it is — the price of wheat now — and he get what the Department of Agriculture, Crop Insurance says he's going to get, \$75 an acre drop . . . (inaudible) . . . This is some of the best, high-priced land in the province of Saskatchewan. And it's just unreasonable.

And some people up in my area say well these people are covered too high. Well I know they had a high coverage, but then they paid a thousand dollars an acre for that land, and we paid 4 and 5 and 6 for ours, so it's worth twice as much, and over a 10-year period that pretty well doubles us. Our long-term average in the Craik RM is 25.5 bushels acre. And if this individual at Grand Coulee was able to prove 47 bushels acre, that's close to double. So you can see why their coverage is high.

But this government, when they put this all together, we said we got to stop this great big cheques from going from

these here individuals. We got to average it out. We got to give it to people that are deserving of it. But they don't know what they're talking about, and that's why farmers are mad at them.

(2200)

It's very interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that an awful lot of these people in these areas I'm talking about tonight, there was a heavy, heavy Liberal vote in those areas. And it seems funny that all these calls are coming to the Conservative Party and coming to our caucus and not going to the Liberal caucus because, if they are, she's not mentioning in this here legislature whatsoever.

Back to the Quill Lakes, Mr. Speaker. Towns that I missed before were Englefield and Jansen. Just says calls from that area, doesn't say how many. Watson, looks like about the 40 to 50 from the Watson area. Wynyard, it just said numerous amount of calls. And as I said, these books are to be marked on this book; if there's one call from one constituency opposing '91 versus '92 . . . now some of them may be giving comments that last year it looked like the '92 did suit me the best, but when I'm understanding it now and seen that the crop's not quite so good, I can see that the '91 program was best for all of us with some minor changes. We do get some of those, but nobody says, hey cut out that talk about '91 and get on the '92. We're not getting none of that, Mr. Speaker, absolutely none.

Now Redberry area, this is real bad because it's been real short of rain in the Redberry area. Now I haven't got a good record of the calls. I just know we've been getting a lot of contact from different people there and they're speaking on behalf a lot of people. I'm not sure in there where . . . I know that it's dry around Rabbit Lake, and I've talked to people in there. I talked to an individual there that used to be . . . or I had a contact — not directly but indirectly — from him where he used to be on the Crop Insurance board and their crops were just about shot here about three weeks ago. So it doesn't look very good for them, the Redberry-Redfield area.

Mr. Speaker, it looks like Blaine Lake is an area where there's been a few calls come in from.

Now here's the complete list from Rosetown-Elrose. This is the one that I was looking for here earlier, that I just had a few towns mentioned. We've had calls from places by the name of Ardash, like it's marked with X's and asterisks, how many and what not. Beechy's been the worst in this one column. Birsay, Bounty, Conquest, Dinsmore I know I had . . . in my list, there was an awful lot of people from the Dinsmore area, Mr. Speaker, that they want it on record the Dinsmore area and RM want the 1991 GRIP.

And keeping in mind, Mr. Speaker, that these people that phone and contact me, and I think the same with my colleagues, we say, well you're talking about the '91-92 GRIP. But we stop and say to them, Mr. Speaker, we say to them, well do you understand what type of Bill it is? And then when you tell them about that, that's when things really get bad; then that just draws more calls from that area. You tell a farmer and explain it. They're hearing something about it on the TV, but they don't seem to

understand it until you explain it to them.

That's why the members opposite . . . we're not into their ridings. We don't get into their ridings. That's why it's their responsibility to go out and talk to their people and see if they're being backed, because they wouldn't be backed if they'd go out . . . If the Minister of Agriculture hears a name of all these towns and points — and these aren't all towns; some of these are just little sidings — but if he'd go out to, I'd say, if he'd go to 15 points in his own riding, the bigger points in here, like if he'd go to Herschel and talk to the farmers in Herschel, he would never go back or else he'd come back to Regina and say, let's drop this thing because I haven't got a chance in the world to get elected out there again. He would get that message from his constituency.

There's some from Rosthern but we'll leave that for the member.

Shaunavon, there's an area where there's some good crops and some not so good. There's a lot of calls, Mr. Speaker, from Val Marie, Willow Creek, Climax, and I don't know just where the drought area comes in here . . . (inaudible) . . . is not on here, just calls from those areas. Frenchville, Frontier, Orkney, Glentworth

Now we're in an area, Mr. Speaker, we're in an area where I never hear much of crop failures but I understand they've been dry, but maybe coming back to not too bad a crop now, but that's in the Shellbrook-Torch River area. We're hearing from that riding. In fact, we're hearing from people on behalf of groups of people and we're getting that from Canwood, Choiceland, Emma Lake — I don't think there'd be too much farming area in Emma Lake, but that's where it's coming from. Paddockwood. That seems to be the only areas, but I don't know. That may be their exchange. I don't know where their farm land is.

Mr. Speaker, I have covered a lot of ground here tonight. I definitely think that I've got it on the record how bad this Bill is, how serious it is. And I make this . . . every time I sit down I make this same plea, and I'm going to be . . . trying to get down here very quickly, Mr. Speaker. And I'm going to put on the record again that the members of this government that are responsible for the situation and impasse we're in, that I'm ashamed of them. I'm ashamed they're not doing something about this because some of them over there, I know know . . . knowingly know what they're doing.

And I'm asking them, I'm asking again in closing, I'm asking the media to help us. I'm asking all people concerned out there, whether it's '91 or '92 GRIP — that's not the issue; that's the issue for the farmers and their pocket-books — but the big main issue is for the province of Saskatchewan that we have this type of legislation happen. Because if this legislation is passed and nothing is done with, and it doesn't make the Supreme Court of Canada and it is not turned around, we'll go down in history and it could affect all our lives for ever and ever in this province of Saskatchewan.

I was born in this province in 1931 and I've always been a proud Canadian. And I want to stay a proud Canadian. I do not want to be a part of this here government that's

bringing a Bill like this to this House. I was part of this opposition from 1978 to '82 when many Bills came through this House and I didn't go home and say well, I'm going to die over it, or it's just so terrible, I just can't stand it. They were just difference in philosophy. That's all the . . . many Bills were good and I supported . . . We voted for some of their Bills. Because I seen the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, vote for a lot of our Bills. They voted for the farm Bill, the farm Bills that we brought it. They voted for the farm land security Bill, they voted for the changes in The Farm Land Security Act The opposition voted with the government.

We brought in many, many Bills that this government voted for. It's on the record. I remember saying in this House how many Bills the government brought in in their year to years, from '82 to '83, '84, in there, that the opposition had no choice but vote for because it was best for the province of Saskatchewan.

But I'm saying that I will vote with the government any time if it's a Bill that's best for the province of Saskatchewan, and so will our caucus. But our caucus can have no part of this terrible, dictatorship-type Bill from a group of people that are dictating to the people of Saskatchewan, not only in GRIP but are going to break contracts. And it's the type of the Bill that is . . . that sets a precedent that we may never, ever, ever forget in the province of Saskatchewan.

I visited my grandchildren yesterday, three of them out in British Columbia. They were out there for two and a half months on a job. And my oldest grandson is 15 years of age and he said, grandpa, what's happening to the GRIP Bill? And I explained it to him, but I didn't get into the details. But I felt coming home that surely this isn't going to happen, that my grandchildren have to grow up in this province with the four years of this type of a government that's going to bring these kind of Bills to this here legislature, that does what this Bill is doing.

So somehow or other, I ask the media again and the people of the province of Saskatchewan and anybody over there that's got a good thinking head on them, for goodness sakes, forget your pride, think about the people of the province of Saskatchewan. Forget about politics and think about people in Saskatchewan, and let's get the job done and get off this impasse. And don't let this Bill pass. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — In sitting down, I do have a subamendment to make, amendment to the . . . My legs are so tired, I was just about ready to not get back up again.

Mr. Speaker, that the amendment . . . this is moved by myself, seconded by the member from Moosomin:

That the amendment be amended by substituting the words "House leaders" with "the Minister of Agriculture and the opposition member responsible for Agriculture" and by deleting all the words following the words "principles involved" and substituting the following therefor:

"because closure was used to unilaterally force introduction of this Bill in the Assembly."

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I have looked at the subamendment. I find the subamendment in order. I just want to remind members that the speakers that will speak now must speak only to the subamendment and not to the amendment or to the main motion. So whoever speaks now, following now, must speak only to the subamendment.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague, the member for Arm River, for his speech he's given in the Assembly today, although at times I was wondering if he was looking at the Guinness book of records and going to see if he could compete with the member from Rosemont. But I'm not quite sure if there's anyone here quite prepared to spend 16 hours on their feet at one time.

I'm pleased to second the subamendment presented by my colleague, a subamendment that substitutes the words "House leaders" with "the Minister of Agriculture and the opposition member responsible for Agriculture," and by deleting all the words following the words "principles involved" and substituting "because closure was used to unilaterally force introduction of this Bill in the Assembly," which causes the Bill to . . . brings us to the fact that the motion now reads:

the Bill not be read a second time because the Minister of Agriculture and the opposition member responsible for Agriculture have not reached agreement on the principles involved because closure was used to unilaterally force introduction of this Bill in the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the Chair is aware and as people across the province are aware and as members of this Assembly are aware, the reason we continue to debate the GRIP Bill in the Assembly is that one basic principle of the lack of the democratic process in the fact that government and opposition House leaders were not able to reach a position of compromise. They were not able to come up with a process, even as the Chair had given the opportunity or invited or asked the leaders of . . . the House leaders to do when the bells ceased to ring a month and a half ago.

(2215)

Mr. Speaker, many people will wonder, many people, as my colleague also indicated tonight, would say, well why would you spend the time speaking to such a motion or debating such a motion? And, Mr. Speaker, I must indicate that it's because of the fact that there are some principles that I believe all members in this Assembly really, fundamentally believe in: the principles of the democratic right of individuals, principles of government; principles that allow governments and legislatures across this nation, and certainly in the

Commonwealth, to operate on the basis of agreement, on the basis of co-operative attitude.

I must certainly indicate that over the past number of years co-operation was something that seemed to be more and more difficult to attain. And I think we can go back to last session. We will find there were a number of cases where there was amiable communication and there were times when it was fairly raucous as we look back to the . . . we can think back to the 1989 debate when the then opposition took the stance they did regarding the Potash debate.

Mr. Speaker, we look at the debate we've just been through and we're entering into, and no doubt there will be a final day we will reach eventually, but I must indicate that my colleagues . . . and I must give my colleagues a lot of credit for their willingness to stay and continue to debate in this Assembly on a matter of principle because, as we've indicated time and time again, certainly at this time of the year, the middle of summer, it would be much easier for each and every one of us to be some place else rather than in this Legislative Assembly debating legislation that we feel interferes with the democratic rights of individuals.

Mr. Speaker, why do we feel so strongly or why would we speak out so strongly on this fact? Well I think if we look around us, we find that there are many people across this province today who are facing some very difficult circumstances and difficult times. And I think individuals would feel that it would be appropriate for governments and opposition members to work out or try to find out ways of compromising, and certainly as the amendment before this Assembly reads right now, the fact that the government, the Agriculture minister, didn't even take the time to contact the opposition House Leader responsible for Agriculture and ask for some input, ask for some ideas, ask for some suggestions.

And I must indicate to this Assembly, and to people who may be watching, that there have been a number of suggestions placed before the Assembly regarding the GRIP Bill, regarding the motion before us today; a number of ideas and a number of suggestions that would have been . . . If the Minister of Agriculture would have taken the time, even just sat down, or even some of the government members or the government House Leader, the Minister of Agriculture, sitting down with the opposition House Leader, or Deputy House Leader and the Minister of Agriculture, or the member responsible for Agriculture, the Agriculture critic, Mr. Speaker, I think we maybe could have come to some compromise and some agreement on this motion.

The very difficult part about the whole motion, the whole process, goes back to the fact that when we first started to speak out on the motion, and speak out on the legislation, Mr. Speaker, we were speaking out because we felt that a government, which we believe and I feel many members, and certainly the Premier of the province has indicated that he feels very strongly about rights of individuals, feels very strongly that individuals should have their rights, their privileges should not be taken away from them. And I believe the Premier believes very sincerely in that as he was quite heavily involved in the repatriation of the

constitution back in 1981. And the fact, Mr. Speaker, at that time the repatriation of the constitution, even though it wasn't agreed to by all parties, Mr. Speaker, there was a level of co-operation and consent and members working together to reach agreements.

The repatriation of the constitution wouldn't have come about if there wasn't an agreement between most of the parties in the nation of Canada to agree to the repatriation, to agree to place the Charter of Rights and the Bill of Rights and Freedoms within the constitution — a Bill of Rights and Freedoms that gives every individual in this country, in this nation, the ability to be innocent until proven guilty, the ability to stand up for their rights, for their privileges, and the ability, Mr. Speaker, to stand up even to governments.

And I think what we have seen and what we have seen in the fact that this legislature hasn't been able to quite work co-operatively, is the fact that many members in this Assembly have not been willing to overlook their own individual interests. And unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I must admit that as I observe the proceedings and the goings-on in the House even this evening and through the last few days, I think back to, even in my time as being a member on the government side of the House, a back-bench member, and as I observed the workings of the Government House Leader, it would appear very significantly to me that maybe the Government House Leader is putting his own personal interests ahead of the overall interests and rights and the responsibilities of all government members.

And I think back to some of the House leaders of the time when I was in government, and I think at times sometimes we may not have stood up as soundly as back-benchers as we should have. We allowed maybe some of our Government House leaders to make suggestions that we weren't sure of, but because we were fairly new, we accepted and went along with and in our heart of hearts at times you wonder, well was that the proper thing to do. And I'm beginning to wonder today if maybe the House Leader here isn't doing the same thing. Because it's the principle of feeling, well you can't back down.

And that's when co-operation and compromise begins to fail. When you have parties and individuals on two sides of the House standing up and unable to reach agreement because they feel that by backing down a little bit maybe you'll look like all of a sudden you're becoming soft and you don't have the ability to govern.

And maybe that's the wrong concept that we have in this province and that many members have regarding governments and regarding government's ability to govern. And as we've heard indicated over the past number of weeks, and certainly the House Leader has indicated it in private discussions — the fact that his colleagues are telling him, well we were elected to govern.

I remember the same process taking place in our caucus. We were elected to govern; let's show this opposition. But as I look at my colleagues here, and I commend my nine colleagues for their efforts and for their willingness to sit here.

I should have taken some time just to go back to the 1982 legislative session just to see how the Assembly worked at that time when there were only 8 members on the opposition side, 8 members, 8 NDP members and some 56 members on the Conservative side.

I think, Mr. Speaker, if we went back to that period of time that the government of the day certainly didn't abuse their privileges and bring forward legislation that just totally went against a contract. And what we have before us, as I look at the . . .

The Speaker: — Order. I hate to intervene, but I think the member knows the subamendment that the member from Arm River has moved is a very narrow subamendment, and the member must stay on that subamendment. It deals only with the Minister of Agriculture and the critic in opposition and the latter part of closure. And the member must stick with that.

Otherwise if he wants to get into debate later on, he will be speaking twice on the same motion. So, the member must stay within that narrow confines of the subamendment in this debate.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate the job that the Chair has in trying to kind of guide the Assembly. And I'm also aware of the fact that . . . and I'm trying to confine my remarks to the amendment and to the subamendment before us where we talk about agreements, and the fact that parties working together to work and come towards consensus and agreement.

And certainly I will as I get into my speech as well bring up the fact that the amendment had a subamendment to it talking about the closure aspect of the motion and the fact that when this motion was again brought back before the Assembly, closure was introduced to allow the Bill to be reintroduced to the Assembly.

And as I look at the ability of members to work together and to come to an agreement, I see it . . . I believe it's very unfortunate that we are in the midst of the debate on this abhorrent legislation at this time; a debate where in opposition we are forced to make amendments such as this, Mr. Speaker, in order to try to bring the government to reason and to try to force the government opposite to recognize why this Bill should not be read a second time.

And as I've indicated, and certainly as we continue the debate, I recognize there will be more opportunities to get into further and more in-depth debate on other parts of the motion. But tonight I will really determine and to try and limit my remarks to the amendment . . . subamendment that's placed before us.

We believe, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill was contrived in consultation with farmers. But how can this be true when the government side did not even consult with this side of the House on amendments to the GRIP Bill? And the government has talked over the period of the last three months, Mr. Speaker, about a consultative process.

And it would appear to me that if parties are going to reach agreements on amendments and on agreements on

motions, that there should be not just a consultative process with people outside of the Assembly but certainly with people inside the Assembly as well, with members of the government . . . between members of the government and members of the opposition.

And as I indicated before, not once did the Minister of Agriculture confer with the opposition member, the critic responsible for Agriculture. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that possibly some kind of an agreement could have been reached. It may have been there. We don't know. And we will never know because of the fact that this process was never entered into.

However, in light of the statements that have been made by members opposite, by the Premier, by the Minister of Agriculture, it's very doubtful that even if the members would have sat down and taken the time to try and work out some agreement process, that they may have reached agreement. As I indicated just a few moments ago, the fact that we do have some strong reservations and many members have strong views regarding the question before us.

Not once, Mr. Speaker, did the Minister of Agriculture offer information to the opposition member, the opposition critic for Agriculture, on what the review committee was hearing or who they were seeing. Not once did he give the opposition critic the ability or the opportunity to sit down with the committee and to offer some suggestions to the committee prior to the process of meeting with the committee and arriving at the consensus that the government did regarding the GRIP Bill before us. And, as we can see, it's obviously a process which was not well informed due to the fact we were in the debate today.

Not once did the Minister of Agriculture provide to the opposition member responsible a review of the Bill when the opposition member repeatedly asked to see the contents. And over the period of the 18 days of bell-ringing and over the period following the intervention of the Chair and the suspension of the Bill on numerous occasions, Mr. Speaker, the opposition agricultural critic did ask the government Agriculture minister for an opportunity to see the Bill or at least to sit down with him and listen to some of his arguments regarding amendments or changes to the Bill that could have taken away the process we're in today, that could have defrayed all the speeches we're in, Mr. Speaker, and possibly come to some kind of a compromise that would have been agreeable — not only to the parties in this Assembly, but to men and women, the farm community, agriculture community, the business community across this province.

Not once, Mr. Speaker, did the Minister of Agriculture seriously consider any of the suggestions offered by the opposition member responsible for Agriculture to resolve the current situation of our farm families — a grave situation only made worse by this proposed legislation.

And, Mr. Speaker, in my travels again this weekend, I find that there are many people . . . many farm families are finding it very difficult. And it's not just farm families. It's families in our small rural communities, families that . . .

And at the same time when we talk about governments and opposition working together, I look at communities in my area such as the community of Maryfield hosting the Saskatchewan intermediate B ladies fastball and that was a co-operative effort. There was a consultative process that took place and if the members of this Assembly, if we as government party and the Government House Leader and the Opposition House Leader, the Agriculture Minister, the Agriculture critic, would have been able to sit down, we may or may not have reached agreement on this motion, on this Bill.

(2230)

Not once did the Minister of Agriculture seriously consider any of the suggestions. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, I believe we would have seen them. They would have even brought them forward in the Bill. And rather than a Bill that is interfering with the rights of individuals, Mr. Speaker, we would have seen the government indicating that yes, there was a mistake made but, Mr. Speaker, they would have taken the right view of recognizing the mistake and reaching out a hand of compromise, not only to the opposition members but to people right across this province.

The member from Estevan, indeed our entire caucus, offered advice that was varied and logically thought out, quite unlike the Bill at hand which will only serve to save the government money and further hurt farm families already suffering from drought conditions that they see all around them. And even in our area, the crops are excellent but the dryness, the drought, the hot weather we've seen over the last three weeks, Mr. Speaker, is playing a significant impact on the crops in our area.

We have to ask, why wasn't an agreement reached between the two agricultural representatives? Why wasn't an agreement reached which would have seen the government offer the farmers a choice of '91 or '92 GRIP? And, Mr. Speaker, I think many members will be very aware of the fact that that offer was laid out there, that that proposal was put forward in this Assembly, not only in debate on the GRIP Bill and on the motion, but certainly in question period on numerous occasions where members took the time, Mr. Speaker, to offer some suggestions and offer it and ask the Agriculture minister . . . the critic for Agriculture asking the Agriculture minister and even the Premier to give farmers the ability and the opportunity to choose either/or.

And I believe, Mr. Speaker, if that choice would have been given, as the member from Arm River had indicated, many people would have chosen '92. There would have been a few people chose '91, and I don't think in the long run the cost to the province would have been any more significant than what they are going to face today. In fact the cost may even be higher as people really look at the Bill and the significance of the Bill and decide that they have the right and the ability to challenge it.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, an agreement which would have clearly shown the government which GRIP program is more beneficial to farmers would have been more appropriate than this present legislation that we are debating in the Assembly today. And the only way we

could reach an agreement is to have the parties get together.

Why wasn't an agreement reached on taking the most recent federal offer? Mr. Speaker, we've heard the arguments, well it wasn't enough; and we've heard the arguments that the federal government is responsible for third line of defence. We've heard arguments that the federal government is responsible for maintaining the inputs and the cash flow in agriculture.

And, Mr. Speaker, I believe the province has a part to play as well. And the federal government did offer an olive branch. And our opposition critic offered that olive branch to the Agriculture minister as well and asked the Agriculture minister to give some serious consideration and do some negotiations with the federal government accepting that additional money that was available — additional money which would have topped up this year's GRIP program especially in areas where drought has become a major factor in Saskatchewan.

And we have to ask ourselves why the Agriculture minister didn't take the time and accept that proposal on agreement to help and support agriculture and small businesses and communities across this province.

We are far from seeing an agreement reached in the near future, Mr. Speaker, as long as this legislation remains as is. And it would appear to me that the process the government may have to use is the process they have used before, and we believe they probably will use again as we get into further debate in this Legislative Assembly. And not just on the motion before us, and not just on the GRIP Bill, but the fact that there are many areas, some very significant areas of government business that must come forward yet that I believe, as opposition members, we will have to, and must take the time to debate.

And so I believe that it would be appropriate for the House leaders to sit down and do some serious negotiations, if that's possible. And if it isn't possible, maybe the Agriculture minister and the Ag critic could sit down and at least do some negotiations on the GRIP Bill that would either forestall it or put it off or put it on the back burner and allow other business in the House to take place and to be discussed.

There has not been an agreement reached on the fact that this Bill will allow thousands of contracts to be broken between farmers of our province and the Government of Saskatchewan. And as we were discussing this morning in, I believe it was The Land Titles Act, Mr. Speaker, we talked about contracts even there. And the Minister of Justice indicated that he believed contracts are legal and binding.

And yet what the Bill does and what we have talked about and what we've suggested, the Bill goes totally contrary to what we really fundamentally believe, that contracts are legal and binding and that governments should not have or abuse their power to just retroactively go back and declare a contract void, and there wasn't an agreement reached allowing the government to do that. The government did that on their own. They did it unilaterally.

Mr. Speaker, one has to ask the question, what is to stop the government from breaking contracts with other professional groups in this province? We trust that before they would consider that, that they would indeed take the time, and they would sit down with opposition members, they would sit down with other groups, and they would discuss alternatives and look at alternatives, Mr. Speaker, and come to an agreement on the direction they would like to give.

Mr. Speaker, the motion before us, this motion directly relates to the principle of this Bill. And you have to ask if the government can go ahead on their own and break contracts, what is stopping them?

It seems, Mr. Speaker, we have seen a government that has not been willing to try to resolve matters co-operatively, by two sides coming together to talk and negotiate. Rather, Mr. Speaker, we find a government that has decided unilaterally to make changes in this Assembly, changes that destroy contracts with farmers, changes that would change the whole process and a number of the rules in this Assembly.

Do we see a government negotiating or trying to negotiate in this Bill? No, we do not. We witness, Mr. Speaker, the government's forcing a Bill's introduction. We witnessed, Mr. Speaker, a government using closure to force the motion, a legislative rule which limits debate in the Assembly. And, Mr. Speaker, a rule which, as we review the debate that has taken place over the past number of years in this Assembly, we find that closure is a motion that has been used very sparingly or very seldom prior to this legislative session. And I found it somewhat ironical that a government that was elected on the basis of consultation and looking at working at co-operative efforts would decide that closure is the only way that they can move their legislation and the mandate that they felt or feel that they were given. Mr. Speaker, when I talk about closure, we look back at the debate that took place in 1989. Prior to this session, Mr. Speaker, closure was used on two occasions in this Assembly.

On one of those occasions, Mr. Speaker, it was time in which there was heated and lengthy debate on the potash Bill. And I can remember many of the members who are sitting here today, many of the members who — I'm sure if they were on this side of the House and able to enter the debate, although even as back-benchers they could enter the debate — would stand here and take the same stand that we have taken and maybe be a little more vehement in their comments and in their speeches addressing the government and reprimanding the government for using such a heavy hand and bringing forward closure.

As I indicated, closure was a rule which has only been used twice in the history of Saskatchewan until this session. And it appears, in keeping with its dictatorial nature, the NDP have used closure three times in the past few weeks just to introduce motions and get through motions and Bills in this Assembly that they feel is their responsibility to do.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated prior to this session, the former Conservative government only used closure twice in nine years. And when we talk of closure, Mr. Speaker, we must

be mindful of the fact that closure is a process of limiting debate. Closure is a process where governments bring forward a motion to hinder or limit the ability of opposition members to speak to any motion or Bill or legislation that is before this Assembly. Mr. Speaker, it's a form of limiting debate that most members find reprehensible.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment just to go back to some of the debate that took place in 1989. And I find, Mr. Speaker, as I review some of the comments of the day, that many of the members who are sitting here today spoke very loudly and very clearly and very strongly and very adamantly about the use of closure. In fact I quote from the member from Saskatoon South: "That is why, Mr. Speaker, I find this piece of legislation so abhorrent."

And the member was referring to the Government House Leader of the day. He says:

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.

And then the member went on again to say:

So I say again, you don't have that 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, the fact that the government brought forward motion to introduce the . . . or closure to introduce the motion, indicated their willingness to take away and to tamper with the rights of individuals in this Assembly. Going totally against what people, what the opposition members of the day believed and spoke out against closure at that time.

What about the member from Prince Albert Carlton, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, in the August 7, 1989 *Hansard* the comments and I quote:

What can we say about closure, Mr. Speaker, and closure, or in this case it's a matter of closure on closure. Sitting back and listening to a lot of the arguments that have been presented, and listening carefully and knowing very well that this is the first time that closure has even been proposed in this legislature and ever used in this legislature, I can say that to me it smacks somewhat of totalitarianism.

Mr. Speaker, if it smacked of totalitarianism back in 1989, what does it smack of today? The government of the day back in 1989 was faced with the prospect of not a 55:10 ratio of members in the House, but I believe it was some 38 members to 27 members, Mr. Speaker. A much smaller majority the government had at the time, and yet, Mr. Speaker, the government today with their large majority, while in opposition back in 1989 thought it was appropriate for them to have the ability to stand in this Assembly and to speak to motions before the Assembly without being limited in the debate.

And that's what we find so abhorrent about the motion that's being brought before the House. Mr. Speaker, we strongly feel that there was no reason why closure needed to be used. In fact, if an agreement would have been reached or if the government would have even listened to the ruling of the Chair and offered some olive branches to the opposition, Mr. Speaker, I believe we could have reached an agreement and a consensus regarding the GRIP Bill.

And not just the GRIP Bill, Mr. Speaker, the whole process of how this Assembly would . . . and how this legislative session would evolve and the debate that will be taking place on other areas in the Assembly on motions and on Bills and on the Committee of Finance in the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the member from Prince Albert — I believe it's Prince Albert Carlton today — mentioned:

. . . that closure is somewhat of an affront to democracy. I think and I believe that is the antithesis of democracy — the exact opposite — because what it does is it stifles debate as opposed to what the democratic principle is of encouraging debate.

And I believe, Mr. Speaker, we all believe, that this Assembly, this is the place for debate. I don't believe there is any person in this province or across this nation who doesn't believe that regardless of the size of government and the size of opposition, that an opportunity for debate should not be . . . the adequate time for debate should not be given.

(2245)

And I believe, Mr. Speaker, the member from Prince Albert Carlton was right. I believe that members of that day needed to have an opportunity to speak without feeling that they were limited to 20 minutes. And certainly when we look back to the debate when these comments were made on the closure motion we must recognize as well that some 120 hours of debate took place in this Assembly prior to the closure motion being brought forward.

However what do we see at this time, just a few days ago? Simply an hour and a half of debate prior to the Government House Leader standing up in the Assembly and moving closure on the motion to reintroduce the GRIP Bill.

Mr. Speaker, as well we look at other members — the member from Humboldt. And I think there's some Saskatoon members I'll have to get to in a minute yet too, Mr. Speaker, but I just want to bring a few comments from other members that are sitting here today who were in the debate back in 1989.

The member from Humboldt, and I quote, Mr. Speaker, from *Hansard*, said:

Mr. Speaker, we are 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.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure if that would be the term that a person would use today, that the government of the day is drunk with power, but certainly the government of the day feels that closure is an important avenue open to them as a government in order to press forward their agenda, whether or not the people of Saskatchewan believe in it or accept it.

And we look back to last fall's election. And I believe on election night there was something like 52 per cent of the population gave support to the government of the day. But I believe, Mr. Speaker, if the government was honest, they would indicate that that 52 per cent was probably a blip in what their normal percentage of electoral balance is in this province, and that they would realize that more than some 60 per cent of the population literally do not believe in and support the NDP philosophy.

And so on that basis, Mr. Speaker, I would think that the government would have acted somewhat more carefully and would have looked at ways to communicate and ways to come to consensus and ways to come to agreement before using closure.

Mr. Speaker, I look at the member from Regina Churchill Downs. And how well I remember the debate as it took place in this Assembly, and the member just standing in this Assembly and speaking out very ardently, I guess I could say, or very vehemently in expressing his views to this Assembly regarding the motion presented by the House Leader of the day.

Mr. Speaker, (he says) I rise to take part in what is an historical debate, (and I think this is worth repeating, is an historical debate) the first time closure has ever been invoked in this province. (And, Mr. Speaker, I may have to repeat this a couple of times so it sinks in.) And I sincerely hope it will be the last time closure is ever invoked in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I think when members sit back . . . and certainly possibly there may come a day when some of the comments that I've made in this House, someone's going to stand up and repeat them. That's why I'm trying to be very careful that I'm using comments that I believe are somewhat constructive but also reminding members of what they really believe, versus just making off-the-cuff comments that could be used against me at a later date.

But I think, Mr. Speaker, we all agree with the member. We all agreed at that time that closure was something that any government really didn't want to use. And the member indicated at that time he felt it would be very inappropriate to use closure and it probably should be the last time it was ever used.

However, what do we see today, Mr. Speaker? We find that the government has already invoked that same closure motion three times in less than a week.

Mr. Speaker, the member goes on and he says:

. . . it is undoubtedly another factor — I wished it were not so — undoubtedly another factor is simply the desire of members opposite to enjoy their summer.

And how I wish that I could enjoy my summer. How many of my colleagues, and I'm sure many of the members on the government side of the House, would prefer to be on the outside of these legislative walls enjoying summer.

And some days one wonders if there aren't a number of members who haven't taken the time anyway, unilaterally taken the time to enjoy their summer. And, Mr. Speaker, there are so many things to enjoy in summer with the beautiful weather we have and the recreation and the beautiful parks we have around our province and with family, with friends, Mr. Speaker. And certainly, as I stand here speaking tonight, Mr. Speaker, and talking about the fact that closure was used, I would prefer to be at home with my family right now, and especially when I have family visiting from the Calgary area.

Mr. Speaker, I look at the Minister of Health, the member from Regina Hillsdale, and I think back to the debate of 1989. And I wonder what the Minister of Health today said when she was in opposition: Mr. Speaker, this debate, Mr. Speaker, is about a government with its own agenda.

And I think, as I read this, Mr. Speaker, it couldn't be more appropriate. It's about a government with its own agenda. An agenda that is not in the best interests of the people and that is not good for the people of Saskatchewan. And that's why we stand in this Assembly today. That's why we stand here debating this motion before us, because we believe the government has stepped a little further than maybe they originally intended to go.

And as I believe, as my colleague from Arm River indicated, there are some members on the government side of the House who are actually quite uneasy about some of the steps and the dramatic decisions that they have made, including the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Speaker, the member goes on to say: 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 repeated examples of how they've muzzled other people who have effectively spoken out against their policies, their cut-backs, and their harsh and cruel tactics, Mr. Speaker.

And, Mr. Speaker, I believe those comments, if they were appropriate in 1989, Mr. Speaker, they certainly are appropriate in this debate here today when we're talking about amendment that is criticizing the government for unilaterally using their large majority to invoke closure on a motion; a motion which allowed the debate or introduction of a Bill that is going against the very rights and principles of the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, what about the member from Regina

Dewdney when he entered the debate? He said: But what I want to say, as other colleagues of mine have said, that even though the government may muzzle us in this legislature . . . and 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 this 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.

And certainly, Mr. Speaker, I must indicate that as I have had the few short days I've been able to spend in my riding on the weekend, certainly we run into people . . . And my colleagues have raised that question too. Mention the fact that people are concerned. They are concerned with governments that would abuse their authority and their ability and their majority to withhold information, Mr. Speaker, or even to press their agenda on the backs of not only the opposition of this province, Mr. Speaker, but on the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, we could go on and on. I look at the member from Moose Jaw Palliser: and I say to this government, you don't need closure, what you need is a mandate. And I believe, as I read that comment, Mr. Speaker, I think back to the debate, and I believe the opposition of the day was continually calling the government to call an election. It seemed that every time a speaker got up and took part in debate whether it was on a motion or whether it was on a Bill before the Assembly, the term, call an election, came up I don't know on how many occasions, Mr. Speaker. But it was probably used on three or four elections per speech.

And even in the closure debate, it was: call an election. Well the election did come, Mr. Speaker. And unfortunately, it appears that the debate that is taking place today, or the same debate that took place at that time, obviously doesn't seem to apply today to government members.

What about the Premier, the then leader of the opposition? What were his views on closure, on the use of closure in this Assembly?

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 a heavy-handed, undemocratic, unprecedented and unwarranted attack to the rules where all the members agree.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the member, today's Premier, the then opposition leader, certainly believed that the use of closure was inappropriate. And I would dare to assume, and guess, and believe that the Premier of the day would believe that the use of closure is not an appropriate tool to be used by any government, regardless of the mandate they have received at any time, to force their will on the people of Saskatchewan.

And I believe that because, Mr. Speaker, I think we can just . . . some of the recent comments in the press regarding . . . made by the Premier regarding the Bill before this Assembly, regarding the walk-out, and regarding the bell-ringing, when the Premier said, well, he said, I can see the Tories' point, the Premier said. The government won't withdraw its legislation. He says, I worried about contracts and all of that. I mean one has certain rights. That's where the merit of this PC walkout is. But he says, the substance of what we did is right and if it's substance which is at issue in the terms of our fiscal picture and the like, process becomes a little less important.

And I find that very difficult to believe, that the Premier of this province would have decided that process becomes a little less important than the substance . . . if it's the substance that's right, that the rights of individuals is not important, when the Premier was so involved in the repatriation of the constitution and the entrenchment of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in our constitution. And, Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult to believe that the Premier would continue to feel that way.

What about the member from Regina Elphinstone? What were his viewpoints regarding the closure debate, Mr. Speaker? And then after the rule has been changed they keep up the debate for a couple of weeks and find they're still losing in the opinion polls and in the minds of the people in the province. And so what do they do then? Well they say to the people of the province, we're not playing in the game any more. We're not going to play any more. We've got the most players. We choose a game that we're going to play. We pick the referee. We change the rules to our best advantage and we still can't win, so we're going to quit playing. And then he says: well I say that closure is the most despicable rule that this government could invoke, Mr. Speaker. And I find that very interesting and yet the very same member who spoke out so strongly about the despicable aspect of using closure is the same member who introduced the closure motions into this Assembly. And yes, the word despicable is kind of hard to get your tongue around at this time of night.

Mr. Speaker, certainly we could go on through many series of debates that took place back in the 1989 session to reiterate the fact of how strongly we feel about the closure motion, and the fact that if members of the 1989 opposition felt that way, we believe that if they were still over here in opposition they would have the same process and the same ideas and the same views would exist. Mr. Speaker, I look at the comments made by the member from Moose Jaw:

Mr. Speaker, I stand to oppose this action to limit debate in the Saskatchewan legislature. I stand to oppose the silencing of an opposition. And I stand to oppose this motion, not simply because . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. It now being 11 o'clock, this House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow morning.

The Assembly adjourned at 11 p.m.