

EVENING SITTING

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

Resolution No. 42 — Government Betrayal of Election Promises

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as I was speaking before the recess for the supper hour, talking on a number of areas of promises that had been broken, or have been, and are being broken by the government.

But while I've been sitting here, some of the members opposite have brought to my attention a column. And it seems that they like to dwell upon the fact of individuals who may have been hired by the former government. But let me just let the people of Saskatchewan know what the columnist also says:

However, let's be honest: NDP Premier Allan Blakeney's government was up to its armpits in patronage, too. That's the nature of politics. When you get into power, you pay off your friends.

And then he says:

Yet I don't think Blakeney was as oblivious to outright theft and thievery as was Devine.

But he also says:

But to conclude, Grant Devine himself is one of the most honest men in Canadian politics.

What about the new chairman of the Liquor Board? Isn't that the brother-in-law of the member from Quill Lakes? Isn't? It seems that got a reaction. It seems that some of the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, certainly don't like to be reminded of the individuals. Well whether or not it was, but I think, Mr. Speaker if we wanted to dig out our forms we could find out that certainly the member from Quill Lakes, a number of other members, have over the years had a number of family members involved in government. And where did they get the jobs? Strictly through patronage. The same jobs that Mr. Jackson talks of here that Mr. Blakeney was aware of, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, when we were talking about government broken promises, we must take a look. And I was talking before about the fact that the opposition of the day, the present government, indicated that harmonization of the sales tax was not the appropriate thing to do. Mr. Speaker, many people on that side of the House at the present time, when they were on this side of the House, indicated that there were other ways of finding tax revenue to generate, or ways of generating revenue in this province in order to meet the financial needs of the government.

Mr. Speaker, let me just quote a few comments by members opposite. The member for Regina Elphinstone, in *The Prairie Progress*, October 16, 1990: Lingenfelter advocated an increase in personal income tax, an adjustment to corporate tax, collection of corporate back taxes, and an end to deferral of corporate tax.

And yet all along, Mr. Speaker, during the election campaign, they argued, no new taxes; we won't need any more new taxes. We will find the money we need. And they always talked about this pie-in-the-sky comment of waste and mismanagement. They're going to bring waste and mismanagement under control and they'll find all the revenue they need to operate the services.

It's interesting when you talk about harmonization, that in the *Star-Phoenix*, February 27, 1991, the member for Regina Churchill Downs suggested that the NDP supports a single sales tax. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's what harmonization would have done in the province of Saskatchewan. It would have harmonized the provincial E&H (education and health) with the GST (goods and services tax).

And yes, Mr. Speaker, no one likes increases in taxes. And, Mr. Speaker, I think the fact that the former government was up front and suggested the harmonization of the provincial sales tax, or the E&H, with the GST was the appropriate way to go. I believe today many members on the government side of the House are beginning to wonder if they made a mistake in suggesting harmonization, they shouldn't harmonize.

There were members on that side of the House that admitted that harmonization may be an appropriate form of addressing taxation. Listen to what the present leader of . . . the Premier of this province said as an opposition leader, April 12, 1991, from the *Star-Phoenix*. He, referring to Romanow, admits that tax harmonization may be the easiest way for business to adjust to the GST.

And certainly, Mr. Speaker, we talked about that before, the fact that harmonization would have been a very positive step forward for people across Saskatchewan, for the government, and certainly for businesses, as harmonization would have created a more level playing-field for businesses across our province, would have given the business community some incentive and a greater ability to be able to provide the services at cost, and they would have had a refund on some of their taxes, Mr. Speaker, in line of what the GST gave them the refund on, on their power bills, on their telephone bills, on their heat consumption.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, what we've seen since the election and through the minister's budget, we have seen that taxes have increased in every one of these areas, so not only did the business community lose out by the inability or the unwillingness of the government to harmonize; they also faced even higher taxes than what they were facing before. And no wonder we find business men and women across this province very indignant and unhappy with the performance to date of the present government.

Back on April 12, 1991, an article in the *Star-Phoenix*. It says: The NDP (New Democratic Party) claims the province has no legal authority to a level a tax because the provincial budget has yet to be introduced.

And it also said on CHAB radio, Moose Jaw, May 9, 1991: The NDP says harmonization of the GST with PST

(provincial sales tax) isn't bad; it just needs adjusting.

So it would appear to me, Mr. Speaker, that many members on that side of the House, including front-bench members, felt that harmonization in the long run would have been an appropriate form of taxation in this province, would have been a lot fairer or more fair for the people of Saskatchewan.

And yet we find on CKCK TV news, May 7, 1991, the Finance critic. It says: Ned Shillington today told an all-party debate that the tax would be rolled back in favour of higher income taxes.

Mr. Speaker, what I find many people continually complaining about is the fact of this little cloud or the feeling that there are people across this province and across this country who feel that there are so many so-called rich people who are not paying their fair share of the taxes across our nation. And, Mr. Speaker, what I find . . . it's interesting to just go around and try and find the so-called rich that the government member would be talking about. Who are the rich people? Maybe some of them are in this Assembly. Who knows? Mr. Speaker, it all depends what your perception of richness is. And I think for a lot of the voting public out there, they might perceive politicians as being overpaid, although I would suggest that many times we've heard a lot of people mention they wouldn't . . . people have said to me they wouldn't do this job. They wouldn't even spend five minutes doing the job for what salary politicians get.

Mr. Speaker, in the *Star-Phoenix* on May 22, 1991, Mr. Romanow said he recognizes the loss of business tax rebates under the PST will hurt and promised to find other ways to help business.

Now recently in this Assembly we raised some questions with regards to the government . . . regarding business and we're asking the government to lay out their plan for the province of Saskatchewan. What is their plan? Do they have a plan for businesses? Do they have a plan for economic activity, economic development, Mr. Speaker?

And yes, the Government House Leader is right about the only plan they had was just to get rid of the former government of Tories. I don't think that's the type of plan that people in Saskatchewan were looking for. People were looking for a government and a leader to create some new initiative, to lay out some ideas so that they could see their province and see their province continue to grow.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at the so-called plan, if there is a plan of economic activity, one has to question where it is as we take a look at the recent statistics, Mr. Speaker, regarding unemployment in the province, and regarding employment and jobs and job creation across this province, Mr. Speaker. We find that since the number of jobs have decreased, the number of people employed have increased since June to July of 1992. Then at the same time, when you look at the same figures, they also indicate there's been a substantial increase of unemployed people across this province since July of 1991, prior to the election. We also find there's been a very significant increase in the number of jobs that aren't

available and the number of people who have left the work force and the number of people who have left Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, that is a sound and solid indication that people across this province have become very disillusioned with the present government.

And as I was indicating earlier, talking about the members opposite and many members who have false illusions of who the rich are and who should and shouldn't be paying taxes . . . I just look back to some of the comments made by the member for Regina Churchill Downs before the cabinet of this province was sworn in. Before they were sworn in, they wiped off the books of some hundreds of millions of dollars of tax revenue. Well that's what this present government did when they were elected on October 21, 1991. They just said no to income revenue that they could have used to help generate some economic activity in this province, that they could have used to strengthen our education and health system across the province.

What about the member from Saskatoon Broadway as indicated in June 1991, that: this government has money for some people (referring to the former government). They have money for Cargill Grain; they have money for all the bigwig friends; but they don't have money for education, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, where's the money for education today? We find that not only in my constituency, but constituencies across this province and even in our universities and even in our major centres, Mr. Speaker . . . yes, 2 and 3 and 4 per cent of an increase maybe wasn't a lot of money and didn't seem to be very high or much of an increase. But to many of the educational boards across this province, Mr. Speaker, it was an increase, something that they could work with. And we all realize, Mr. Speaker, that we have to become more accountable. We have to make our system more accountable, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, when the government or the members opposite talked about economic activity, what were some of the promises they made to the people of Saskatchewan? One of the promises they made was the fact that they would get rid of food banks.

If elected, quoting from the *Star-Phoenix*, October 3, 1991: if elected, the New Democratic Party will work to get rid of food banks, said Atkinson. It will fund hot lunch programs in schools. The NDP will re-establish the school-based dental plan and the training program for dental therapists needed to staff local clinics.

Well, Mr. Speaker, one has to wonder where all these promises are. What about the elimination of food banks, Mr. Speaker? It seems to me from what we've seen over the past months there are even more people going to the food bank. And I say in a province that has so much to offer, the ability to produce well above its ability to consume, it's shameful that we have food banks and people having to depend on food banks, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there are many young people this summer looking for work, many young people who didn't have

job opportunities open up for them because the government's commitment to young people and to jobs wasn't there. We just take a look at the Partnerships '92 program, Mr. Speaker, at what kind of commitment the government came out with very late in the day. I believe it was towards the end of April they indicated that they would have another program to help the employers hire young people to work for them and to create jobs. Mr. Speaker, when at the end of the day when everything was said and done, we find the program was only funded to the tune of \$1.6 million when last year it was in the \$6 million range.

(1915)

And so, Mr. Speaker, you will wonder why it is that so many young people will be looking or have to look at other alternatives to fund their education this coming year, as they further their education either through the university or some of the regional colleges across this province.

Mr. Speaker, we've been talking about the fact that this government promised that they wouldn't increase taxes, that they wouldn't ask the people of Saskatchewan for any more, that the people had had enough. And, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest today that yes, today people would say the same thing. If they said it yesterday, they will say it even a lot more loudly and loudly and a lot more clearer that yes, they have had enough of increases in taxes.

What about our phone rates? Not only did the phone rates increase, Mr. Speaker, but we find while the government didn't harmonize the tax system, when the Minister of Finance brought down his budget, Mr. Speaker, what did he do? He increased the education and health tax by 1 per cent; 1 per cent hits every man, woman, and child, every business, every service that we in this province use and pay for, every product we purchase — 1 per cent.

To many people that was a substantial amount taken from their income. Not only 1 per cent, Mr. Speaker, on the tax portion, but the fact is that that 1 per cent also translated into more of an increase in your phone rates than just the normal . . . or not the normal, but the increase that was brought forward by the government because the tax portion increased as well on that amount.

What about power rates in this province? And, Mr. Speaker, we were promised no new taxes. Aren't power rates a tax? Aren't power rates a tax on the people of Saskatchewan? And when you look at power rates and you look back at what the former government did and the initiative that was taken to — first of all, Mr. Speaker — put telephone lines underground and placed telephone lines right through this province, Mr. Speaker — a commitment to strengthen our rural economy and our rural communities.

And then the former government also established a program to put power lines underground which was not only a benefit to rural communities but also would assist in being a larger safety factor. And yet what does the government say? No new taxes. They're not going to increase taxes but we have an increase in our phone rates,

in our power rates, in our natural gas rates.

It seems that everything we touched, Mr. Speaker, since the Minister of Finance presented his budget, we have increases in our tax system, increases. Money coming out of our pocket. It seems that Big Brother government has again dipped into our pocket. Taken, offered us some money on one hand and then reached in with the other while we weren't looking and taking something out of it.

What about increases in SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) vehicle insurance? As I've indicated, Mr. Speaker, a 1 per cent increase from the 7 to 8 per cent means a substantial sum of money and dollars that have been taken from individuals across this province. And where is the money going?

What has happened to the educational system? What has happened? What kind of a commitment has the government made to education? What kind of a commitment have they made to health, Mr. Speaker. In fact many communities across our province are very worried about their health services and about their hospitals and their care homes. They're wondering does this government really care? Does this government really care for rural Saskatchewan or even people in the large urban centres?

Did they take the surtax that they added to personal income tax? Are they going to put that into health care in our province, Mr. Speaker? I think it's appropriate, Mr. Speaker, when we look at the fact that the government and the Minister of Finance would continue to argue that it's now time to hold the line when two years ago and three years ago while the minister of Finance of the day was trying to do that very thing, every time you turned around, it wasn't enough.

There wasn't enough of a commitment to health care. There wasn't enough of a commitment to education in our province. What about an increase on fuel tax? Or an increase on tobacco tax? Or an increase of 1 per cent in the corporate income tax? Or the corporate capital tax? Or 25 per cent on the corporate capital tax?

What about the increase on chiropractic and optometric services, Mr. Speaker? And, Mr. Speaker, I believe over the last number of days you have seen that there are many people across this province have and continue to speak out very loudly by sending petitions to our offices. And I must say to you and through you, Mr. Speaker, that the petitions that we've been presenting to this Assembly have been petitions that we haven't run around trying to drag and pull out of people like trying to pull teeth.

Mr. Speaker, people have been doing it on their own. They've been putting the petitions out. They've been in the offices of the optometrists and the chiropractors. They've been beside the tills in your local businesses. People themselves have taken up the initiative because they are very dissatisfied with what the government has done to date and certainly with what the Minister of Finance is intending to do, and the Minister of Health is intending to do, with health services.

We've brought to the attention of the Assembly the fact

that chiropractic services can be a very integral part in a health wellness model — or optometric services. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, many of the people who use the chiropractic services aren't using the services because they want to. But many people end up using the services because, Mr. Speaker, that was the most appropriate form of health care that is necessary for them at that time. And so, Mr. Speaker, we feel that by increasing chiropractic and optometric services, the government has again just gone a little too far as they are putting the burden of these services on the backs of the lower income people of our province.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about broken promises and chiropractic services. We talk about broken promises and no more taxes for the province. We talk about a commitment to health care and so far what we've received from the Minister of Health is a commitment to a so-called wellness model. And even though we've posed a number of questions over the past number of weeks, Mr. Speaker, we still have yet to see what the wellness model really means.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, one of the things we have seen is we've received a leaked copy of this wellness model which includes plans to close up to 66 rural hospitals and to consolidate health regions to only 7 in number. It says: local boards to be fired and individuals reappointed by minister alone. Mr. Speaker, that has created a fair bit of concern in my constituency, in a number of communities.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at it very closely and over the past number of years, I must also indicate that in the communities of Whitewood and Wawota, Mr. Speaker, the former government made a commitment to care homes in those communities.

And, Mr. Speaker, we also at that . . . the former government also went to the communities. And I've talked with the hospital boards and I've talked to people involved in the health field, and my community, the communities over the past number of years, indicating to them that it would be appropriate for the boards to start looking at possibly amalgamating and forming one board rather than two or three or four boards as we see across this province, as I feel, Mr. Speaker, that many times the services and the boards are performing the same service. And when you have three or four boards, Mr. Speaker, many times I don't believe we're getting the appropriate value for our dollar, as the boards are out protecting their own individual entity and purpose rather than working towards the betterment and the wholeness of their community.

And I would like to indicate that over the past four or five years, Mr. Speaker, in some of the communities I represent a number of boards have, on their own, taken up the initiative that was suggested by the then Health minister, Mr. Graham Taylor, that they amalgamate. And a number of communities, most of the boards, health boards in the communities are now under one board. They took the initiative themselves.

So I would suggest that if the government really felt strongly about rural hospital boards and care home

boards and home care boards getting together, that I think if they would have continued the consultative process, they would have had ready acceptance of that program, Mr. Speaker. Because many communities were already in the process of, and had the gears in motion.

Mr. Speaker, an area that has really created a concern, a grave concern for many people across the province of Saskatchewan, is the elimination of the Saskatchewan Pension Plan. However, we find the government did later reverse or has reversed the decision. But people across this province still really don't know what the government means by the reversal, other than the Minister of Finance indicates that he will not be putting any more money . . . will not be offering any matchable grants to the pension plan holders across this province.

And I would suggest, as I have over the past number of days, Mr. Speaker . . . past number of weeks, that the Saskatchewan Pension Plan was a very good plan, that it was a very sound plan. It was a plan that gave men and women, and specifically women, the ability to plan for their future. And I know there were many women who got involved in the plan that were in just a very short time before they started collecting, and yet the government today will argue that that automatic monthly pay-out of \$15 was just a little too much to accept, that we couldn't afford it.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, I think if we took the long-run view, the overall view of what the pension plan could do for us, and the fact that government costs, as people get older, are going to increase the demand for more government services; if people were able to plan today for their retirement tomorrow, and especially women have a pension plan that they could be involved in, Mr. Speaker, I think it would bode well for each and every one of us as it would take a greater . . . the load would become less on the government as many people would have monies invested and put away themselves.

So I would ask the Minister of Finance to reconsider the fact, as many people across this province have, as 48,000 women have, and 56,000 men and women involved in the Saskatchewan Pension Plan have indicated, I would ask the Minister of Finance to reconsider and to not just reverse his decision on discontinuing and eliminating the Saskatchewan Pension Plan, but strengthening the plan, Mr. Speaker.

And it may not mean a matching grant of \$300. It may, as many people have indicated, even if the government put up 100 or \$200, and it may also mean, Mr. Speaker, cutting down the amount that a person would be able to make in order to be eligible — maybe dropping the ceiling, Mr. Speaker, so that we're indeed placing the pension plan where it should be, in the hands of those who can least afford to have a pension plan or don't have any access to a pension plan, so that we're helping those individuals who truly should receive the finances and then allowing the pension plan to build. And I would ask the Minister of Finance to reconsider it. I would also ask the Minister of Justice to give consideration to placing the Saskatchewan Pension Plan under the pension Act that he has before the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard a comment from across the floor indicating that consultations are taking place and I trust indeed that a very serious consultation is taking place, that they are indeed talking to people and looking at ways in which they can strengthen rather than eliminate or just let a plan sit in limbo to the point that people finally say, well there's really nothing in it for us so I guess we'll get out of it.

Mr. Speaker, I talked about frozen or eliminated health facility capital projects in rural areas. I have a community that was promised a new hospital and they were wondering today where their hospital stands. Is the government of the day even interested and considering proceeding with this facility or is it just going to die? As a number of people have indicated, that because they didn't elect an NDP member to represent them in the House, their hospital proposal is now dead in the waters.

(1930)

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that this facility will indeed get due diligence, that it will be . . . that if the government is talking of reviewing it, certainly they will look at it very seriously as the Moosomin community is a major centre in the area, not just serving people in south-eastern Saskatchewan, not just serving people in the Kelso and Maryfield and Fairlight areas and Rocanville areas, Mr. Speaker, but certainly serving people right across western Manitoba as well.

And, Mr. Speaker, we happen to live in an area where a lot of the trade that comes into some of our communities, Mr. Speaker, comes from Manitoba communities and people who live along the border because they find it more convenient and closer for them to come and use the services that we have in our eastern communities.

Mr. Speaker, another area that many people are becoming very disturbed at and really beginning to raise more concern every day is the fact that this government promised when they were on the campaign trail that they would strengthen the GRIP (gross revenue insurance program) insurance program. They said that they would make it even stronger, fairer and more equitable. However what have we seen, Mr. Speaker?

We have seen the government take a program which was giving the farm community the ability to at least carry insurance that would give them a bottom line . . . that they could put the required funds into the needed inputs such as fertilizer and chemicals, Mr. Speaker, that they could put them and make it do a very diligent effort or make a very deliberate attempt to produce a crop.

And, Mr. Speaker, we've indicated from day one that people across Saskatchewan, the farm community were not happy with GRIP '91, Mr. Speaker. They recognized and they suggested that changes were needed and we recognized that. In fact as we were meeting with people across the province through public meetings in the spring of 1991 a lot of questions were raised, Mr. Speaker, and the ministers of the day, the federal ministers and the federal people, Mr. Speaker, did take the time to listen to those concerns.

However, Mr. Speaker, we found that there wasn't enough time to institute many of the concerns that were being raised and they were being put on the back burner to be brought forward at a later date to strengthen and improve the GRIP program. Certainly when the election took place on October 21, 1991, Mr. Speaker, we felt and believed, and I believe many people believed that the government of the day was going to take some of the suggestions that were presented — not only by people in the field, not only by the farm community, not only by farm organizations, but even by the agents, the crop insurance agents — take a lot of the proposals that were put forward, bring them forward into the plan. That would strengthen the plan and that would create a plan that would help people when they needed it most.

There isn't a farmer out there who is looking for a government hand-out if he's got his bins full and the price of grain is appropriate, Mr. Speaker. Well we find that, Mr. Speaker, what the 1991 GRIP program had available, it created a format whereby people, farmers themselves, supported and strengthened their communities, supported their local businesses, paid their bills, Mr. Speaker, paid their taxes, were able to start making payments on some of the loans that were dragging or that were falling into arrears.

And, Mr. Speaker, by the time everything was said and done, there were many people who began to realize that 1991 GRIP had a lot of potential with some minor changes to it. And as we've been debating in this House for the past number of months, we've been asking the government to reconsider the fact that they just took this program that they were going to strengthen and have gutted it — just taken away the very fibre of the program, Mr. Speaker.

They've taken a program that would have protected individual producers, and, Mr. Speaker, they've basically made it into a universal program that does nothing for the individual out there who has a crop loss such as many farmers are facing today, a crop loss due to weather conditions beyond their control. Whether it's drought, Mr. Speaker, or whether it's a hail-storm that comes through, you're looking for an . . . you've got an excellent crop coming up and the hail-storm wipes you out, Mr. Speaker, this new program does nothing for you because what it does . . . yes, you can collect your crop insurance, and the revenue portion you will collect at some date in the future when the government finally decides to establish what the per acre may be. And, Mr. Speaker, when that decision is made, every producer, whether they've got grain in the bins or whether they don't have any grain, receive the same payment. There isn't . . . the fairness isn't there as there was in the 1991 program.

We also see the . . . Mr. Speaker, when we talk about rural Saskatchewan, we talk about the government's commitment to strengthening rural Saskatchewan. The indication that the government and the Minister of Rural Development is talking about the possibility of reducing the number of rural municipalities — and that is of grave concern to SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) members across this province.

Mr. Speaker, we all realize that municipalities and the

funding that is needed to help municipalities run, their added funding is needed to maintain the services in municipalities as well.

Mr. Speaker, what I would like to mention is every time we turn around in this Assembly and we talk about a commitment by the province or a commitment to the GRIP program, it's strengthening agriculture in the province. Mr. Speaker, whether it's the Minister of Finance, whether it's the Minister of Agriculture or the Government House Leader, what do the members continually fall back on? Their favourite saying has gone from waste and mismanagement to blame it on the federal government. They blame it on the federal government for cutting back on revenue sharing, Mr. Speaker.

And yet at the same time they turn around and they reduce the revenue sharing to local governments across this province — not just rural governments, Mr. Speaker, but municipal governments. And then one of the major concerns that municipal governments have indicated, and it's in the news today, is the fact that this government is now going to unilaterally impose the ward system on the two largest centres in our province again, Mr. Speaker. And from what I hear, Mr. Speaker, many of these urban municipalities, the large municipalities, want to have the choice themselves to decide whether they want the ward or the at-large system.

And I believe if the government is very intent on consulting, if the government is intent on listening to people, if the government is intent on showing that it isn't the bully that they have shown they are over the last number of weeks — in the fact that they've introduced closure motions such as they have, used their majority to the degree they have, Mr. Speaker — I think they would give urban municipalities the ability to choose the electoral system that they would like to have.

Mr. Speaker, we find that the government have also increased fees right across this province — in agriculture, increased fees to land surface-right fees. They've increased breeder fees in our community pastures, Mr. Speaker.

They're talking about also not just reducing municipal revenue sharing, but eliminating . . . redrawing the electoral boundaries to reduce the number of rural constituencies as well. And, Mr. Speaker, I think with the programs that have been introduced by the government, programs that take away the services from rural Saskatchewan, the lack of commitment, I think the government's going to say, well we should take a look at redrawing the boundaries of the rural boundaries because of the fact that people are going to look and, rather than staying in their smaller urban communities, because the jobs aren't there because the government has taken away any avenue that people had of finding of employment by allowing schools to close or taking away hospital facilities . . .

And certainly in my communities, hospital and care home facilities are one of the major contractors or major employers in the community. They create jobs for not just families, Mr. Speaker, but certainly young people as well

during the summer-time. And we see that if the jobs aren't there, if our hospital's closed, it may mean anywhere from 15 to 30 people — jobs that are lost in the community; jobs which may have a very significant impact on a family's income. And if it isn't there, Mr. Speaker, they probably will take the . . . look very seriously at moving to communities where jobs are possibly more plentiful. But as I indicated earlier, it would appear that the job opportunities in this province just aren't there, as the people of Saskatchewan may have thought they would be by voting for the NDP on October 21, 1991.

And when I talk about a commitment to rural Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, I look at the Fair Share program, a program announced by the former government.

Mr. Speaker, we look back to the discussion and the debate that took place regarding the Fair Share program. And I want to leave some quotes with the House. Certainly you can expect a gentleman by the name of Doug Archer, the mayor of Regina, to be very concerned about the decentralization program, the Fair Share program.

On STV (SaskWest Television) *Viewpoints* in April 7, 1991, Mr. Archer said: Well certainly I want to protect our community. At the same time I can't go out and argue that all the civil servants' jobs have to be in the city of Regina. That in and of itself doesn't make sense.

Now the minister . . . or the mayor of Regina indicated that he wasn't in favour of decentralization but he also, it appears, must have come from a rural community and indicated that maybe some of the jobs could serve Saskatchewan well by being in other communities outside of the major city.

In the *Leader-Post*, May 30, 1991, the quote was: The opposition says it won't reverse the agricultural department's move to the Humboldt area if it forms government. And yet every time we've met in this House last spring, Mr. Speaker, every time the opportunity came, the opposition of the day derided the government of the day for its Fair Share program. And yet I find, while saying one thing in this Assembly, when they're out in their constituencies they found it was okay.

What about on CKCK Radio? It says the member for Humboldt, Eric Upshall, and this is what he said: We will continue the process of decentralization. Or the member for Quill Lakes, what did he say about decentralization? While he was complaining about decentralization and Fair Share in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, he said: The NDP isn't opposed to decentralization.

Even the Premier today, of the day, and back in June 10, 1991, the *Tisdale Recorder* said: For the PCs (Progressive Conservative) to say we would cancel Fair Share . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I have been observing the interference with the member from Moosomin for some time now and I've been trying by some signals up here to get members to calm down, but that doesn't seem to work.

So I'm asking members, if they have something to say to each other, not to yell across the Chamber but to get together and talk about it that way . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, I noticed you did.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I just want to go back to a quote that I was into, talking about Fair Share, and a quote by the then opposition leader, the present Premier of the province in the *Tisdale Recorder* in June 10, 1991: For the PCs to say that we would cancel Fair Share is an outright lie.

And I think any of the members who are sitting here today that were here prior to last fall's election would indicate that the debate in this House . . . many of the members who, while they were out in rural Saskatchewan while they were out campaigning, indicated that they weren't diametrically opposed to Fair Share, Mr. Speaker, in this Assembly very vividly spoke out against the Fair Share program promised by the former government.

And when you look at what's happening in rural Saskatchewan today, Mr. Speaker, you find that there are many communities . . . maybe some of them weren't as receptive as maybe the government would have liked, or many of the people in their communities would have liked regarding the Fair Share program, but I suggest today, Mr. Speaker, that that Fair Share program would receive a lot better reception in rural Saskatchewan in light of what we see is taking place due to the commitment by the Finance minister to tax Saskatchewan people and tax rural Saskatchewan people, discontinue services to rural Saskatchewan.

The Premier also indicated back in June 13, 1991 — the then opposition leader — the NDP will freeze the Fair Share program and then evaluate each program moved against six criteria if elected. It says: Romanow did not rule out moving departments back to Regina. And that was out of the *Star-Phoenix* of June 13, 1991.

(1945)

So while the then opposition leader was indicating that they would look fairly at the Fair Share program and the commitment to move civil service jobs out of the city to a number of communities around the province, he also indicated that he would not think twice about possibly moving some of the jobs that were already in rural Saskatchewan into larger centres like Regina.

And, Mr. Speaker, we're all aware of the debate that has taken place in the town of Humboldt regarding the removal of the court-house from the town of Humboldt. And the fact that I believe through the co-operative effort of the mayor and the community, I believe the commitment has been made to leave the court-house in that community.

And I wonder who the MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly) is for the Quill Lakes. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if that same commitment would have been made in an opposition member's riding. We may see in the near future.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the present Finance minister in *The Western Producer* on June 6, 1991, speaking about Fair Share said: An NDP government would not move employees back to Regina if they had already been relocated. And it says: Tchorzewski says the NDP isn't against decentralization. This is from *The Western Producer*, June 6, 1991.

And also I wanted to indicate the fact that many of the members on their side of the House as well . . . and I want to mention the NDP candidate in Yorkton on radio on June 10, 1991, said after the announcement was made in Yorkton, his announcement, his comments regarding the announcement of decentralizing some services to Yorkton were: the announcement here in Yorkton is a welcome announcement. Any time we have the opportunity of getting new jobs, new opportunities, new employment in our community, we look forward to that. And certainly today's announcement on behalf of our city and our chamber of commerce, our economic development committee, were welcome for sure.

Mr. Speaker, that's the NDP MLA when he was a candidate in Yorkton. He was talking about the fact that decentralization of a service to his community would be very welcome, that people would welcome it. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, over the past number of months we find that there are many people lamenting the fact that the government decided to totally forget about that promise that they would re-evaluate the Fair Share program, that they would look at it fairly, and that that they would sit down with communities and discuss the program and make it a better program. What was their answer, Mr. Speaker? To totally cancel it.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, while the mayor of Regina may have indicated that some jobs could work out of Regina, he also indicated that he wouldn't want to see government services move out of the city. But he also was more than welcome and was part of that welcoming committee that flew to Toronto to talk to Crown Life employees trying to sell the community of Regina to the employees of Crown Life as they moved the head office here to Regina.

And even Farm Credit, Mr. Speaker — it seems that while people spoke against the program on one hand, on the other hand they were very happy that the government was thinking of their community and looking at ways in which they could bring more activity into the community through jobs, through bringing companies and employment to the province, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what about its commitment to agriculture? I talked about the GRIP program. What has the government done? Last night one of my colleagues, or a couple of my colleagues were in Humboldt for a meeting with the hog producers. And, Mr. Speaker, I think when we look back at the debate prior to the October 21, 1991 election, we find the government was indicating that they were committed to rural Saskatchewan, they were committed to agriculture.

And I don't think there is anyone in this province will not admit and not argue that agriculture plays a very vital role, a very important role in the economic engine of this

province. In fact it is the number one economic activity in this province is agriculture, and one of the largest employers in this province, Mr. Speaker.

But certainly what do we have, as I indicated earlier, when you see the breeding fee increases? No one will argue increases, but 31 per cent? That is unreal; that is unfair. What about the feed grain adjustment program? What does that do to the feeding industry in this province that we worked so hard to establish, Mr. Speaker? A feeding industry in the hogs and in livestock — finishing livestock across our province.

Mr. Speaker, the feed grain adjustment program, many people would argue, isn't necessary and wouldn't be necessary if the producers in Saskatchewan didn't have to compete with the programs that we have in Alberta and Manitoba and other areas across this country. The fact is the feed grain program was just creating a more level playing-field for the producers across our province who were into the hog industry and who were into the meat industry, feeding livestock. Mr. Speaker, it gave them a more level playing-field.

And because of that feed grain adjustment program, assistance program, what did we find? We find that there was increased construction and renovations and enlargement of our packing facilities in our province which meant jobs for people in centres, urban Saskatchewan.

However we find today, Mr. Speaker, the feed grain adjustment program is eliminated. Many feedlots are now being closed down because, Mr. Speaker, many people felt and found that at the end of the day about the only dollar they really made came from that feed grain adjustment, the fact that they were helped by a percentage of their feed grains and a tonne payment.

And I think of a farmer right in our area, Mr. Speaker, who really didn't support me as far as his political views, Mr. Speaker, and worked very hard for the government of the day. But, Mr. Speaker, because of the programs and initiatives created by the former government, decided to start feeding cattle to diversify his farming operation.

And he even indicated to a very close friend of mine, as they were talking about the farming and talking about the crop situation and talking about what he was doing and how he was making out feeding his cattle, he indicated that the feed grain adjustment program was one of the main reasons that he continued to feed cattle. Not to make money, but he didn't lose money and it gave him a few dollars to work with at the end of the day by the time everything was said and done.

And his indication was he would have to reconsider what he is really going to do because you can't afford to do work for nothing. You can't afford to do something for nothing. You ask a contractor or you ask a labourer, a person out in the labour field, if they'd be willing to work for nothing. And I dare say there isn't a person around who would go out and work for nothing, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, they cancelled the cash advance programs, programs, the cash advance system, which placed cash

into the hands of farmers on the basis of the number of livestock they had available such as the cash advance to the grain producers. It was a program that gave farmers access to cash until they could move their product to market so that they could pay their bills rather than the bills piling up on them, Mr. Speaker, the interest building up on those accounts and becoming even a heavier burden.

They've capped the fuel rebate program for farmers. And we even see today, as I indicated earlier, they're trying to pass legislation to force farmers to accept GRIP '92 even though it would appear to us, Mr. Speaker, that the government is breaking the law by doing so. And certainly that's an area that we will continue to debate in this Assembly and to bring to the attention of the government and anyone who's interested the fact that we feel that it is very unfair for the government to use their majority and to use their position to rewrite the rules to change a contract or even to say that that contract never did exist and hide under their legislation even though it may go — and we believe it is going — totally against the principles of the rights of individuals as entrenched in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, section 7.

Mr. Speaker, another area that we see . . . where we see the government renege on its promise to Saskatchewan people was the Minister of Highways talking about allowing so many thousands of kilometres of highways in this province to go back to gravel. And I think here again, Mr. Speaker, we find that as people spoke up on the issues and the fact that — it may or may not have had a major impact — but the fact that the majority of the highways that would be laid out as possibly going back to gravel roads, Mr. Speaker, happened to be right in the constituency that the Minister of Highways represented. I know that may have influenced the minister to reconsider his decision. We don't know for sure, but certainly there are many communities and many people across rural Saskatchewan who are thankful that at least the government has reconsidered.

And in light of that I think, Mr. Speaker, there are many other areas that we feel the government could reconsider. And as we indicated today, we've asked the Minister of Justice if he would even use his influence to take the Bill that his colleagues are bringing before this Assembly to the courts and allow the courts to make a speedy decision on this decision. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Justice is an honest and basically a good individual and that he really stands for the rights of individuals. And we believe, Mr. Speaker, in light of some of the changes that the government has made today that the Minister of Justice will indeed . . . soundness will take over, Mr. Speaker, and he will reconsider his lack of commitment to take this legislation to the courts and allow the courts to make that decision very shortly.

Mr. Speaker, we also wonder what the government is doing regarding the plebiscite results. And as many people are aware of the fact, there were three plebiscites placed on the ballot last fall. And every one of the plebiscites had a resounding vote in favour of those plebiscites: a vote in favour of deficit financing; a vote in favour of cutting funding on abortions, Mr. Speaker; a vote in favour of being able to voice their opinion on the

constitution.

Mr. Speaker, we are going . . . we will continue to ask the government what they intend to do with the results of the plebiscite. Are they going to listen? Are they going to accept the fact that the people on October 21, 1991 spoke out very strongly and expressed their views and opinions regarding these questions.

Mr. Speaker, another area of major concern to the people of Saskatchewan and I think to all people in Saskatchewan is, and as I talked about it a while back, is the economic plan that the government has for this province. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, one of the areas of economic activity and I believe an area that we in this province have and should have and should take a hold of, grab a hold of to develop, is the uranium industry. We saw prior to 1982 the government of the day said that there would be no more uranium mining in this province. We see the former government entering into an agreement regarding the Atomic Energy of Canada to create economic activity by getting into an agreement which had the approval of SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association); which had the approval of SARM; which had the approval of the Canadian Federation of Labour; which had the approval of the Saskatchewan chambers of commerce; the North Saskatoon Business Association; the Saskatchewan Real Estate board, Synergy today — and certainly Synergy has raised . . . and talked to a number of people and has had a number of petitions; Students Advocating Nuclear Energy; municipal councils throughout Saskatchewan; Great West Rural Development Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, all of these organizations, representing thousands of people across this province: the mayor of Saskatoon; the city of Saskatoon; a number of the mayors in the northern areas of the province. Mr. Speaker, to them it would mean economic activity. And all we see of the government of the day is leading people to believe that the only aspect to that agreement was the construction and the building of a CANDU reactor in this province, when, Mr. Speaker, it would have given the government, working together with Atomic Energy, the ability to explore alternative sources of energy across this province.

And we all know, Mr. Speaker, that our water resources are becoming more scarce. SaskPower continues to remind us of the fact that at the consumption rate of increases that we've had over the past number of years, we will not have the ability to meet the needs in this province of providing energy, providing the electricity and the heat that will be needed to light, power, and heat our homes and run our businesses and run our manufacturing, Mr. Speaker.

And, Mr. Speaker, we have a tremendous resource in this province. And I believe it would be appropriate that we look at ways of developing the resource rather than just becoming . . . or continuing to be hewers of wood and drawers of water, Mr. Speaker, continually taking our raw product and moving it out of the province and allowing other people to develop the product, develop the resource, and then we turn around and we purchase . . . repurchase the products and repurchase the resources.

(2000)

Mr. Speaker, we see a government that promised . . . or gave a verbal promise to open and honest government. And we can take a look at the Gass Commission, commission a number of — what was it — four individuals commissioned to look into the books. As the Premier will continue to argue, we said when we went to the people that we will look at the books. We will open the books. But, Mr. Speaker, even the Provincial Auditor is questioning and quizzing the government and some of their activities just following the election, prior to the end of the government fiscal year.

The Provincial Auditor is wondering where the government took . . . or why the government would have taken millions of dollars in amortized long-term debt, transferred it from the Crowns to the Consolidated Fund, and then all of a sudden forgiven the debt which then, Mr. Speaker, built up the overall debt in this province for the year, the calendar year of 1991-92, by some \$1.6 billion, Mr. Speaker. No wonder the government today is now standing here and telling us they don't have any money.

But it may be interesting to see where they are two years from now. Are they going to be standing in this Assembly and bragging of how well they did, the fact that the Crowns are now making money because they took all the amortized long-term debt and they removed it out of the Crown so that they didn't have to pay for that debt, wrote it off? Are they going to be standing here and telling the people of Saskatchewan, look what we did for you, when in fact all they did was transfer their accounting practices . . . or change their accounting practices?

And certainly the Gass Commission had some good comments, the positive comments, some comments where they made comments about the former government and about the fact that the books were open all along, Mr. Speaker, that anyone who wanted to had access to the books. They could take and they could reopen the books, Mr. Speaker, and see for themselves that the government was being forthright, open, and honest.

We also find, Mr. Speaker, if we look back to the time . . . the six months following the election, what kind of agreement did the government work out with high-ranking, long-term officials in this province? Men and women, many people across this province, many people in the public service who had been in the service for years, for 15 and 20 and 30 years, Mr. Speaker, all of a sudden, Mr. Speaker, even though they came in under Liberal governments, were hired under NDP governments, because they happened to continue to work and be able to work in the public service and were elevated to higher positions, they might be Tories, so their jobs were cut and their contracts were not even honoured. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that is becoming of an open and honest government.

What about — and members today indicate — what about patronage? They talk about the former government. And as I indicated earlier, that's something that certainly we could get into, and the government indicated there

would be no more. In fact very early in this session one of the ministers indicated that there wouldn't be any more political hirings. People would be hired on merit.

And, Mr. Speaker, we have a number of questions before this Assembly, a number of questions where we are asking the government. We are certainly going to follow up and see if the government adhered to that promise made to this Assembly and to members on the opposition side of the floor by the Minister of Justice.

Another area of grave concern is some of the legislation that is being brought forward. And when we talk about honesty and openness, Mr. Speaker, and the government renege on their promises of being more open, I think of an area that needs more debate. And, Mr. Speaker, both parties or a number of parties have already indicated that they have no problem with some of the concerns. It's the critical wildlife habitat Act. It's an Act, Mr. Speaker, that would delegate a number of areas of land in this province to critical wildlife habitat.

However, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that that consultative process that has been spoken about by the government hasn't exactly taken place, as we see the stock growers on one side very concerned. And as I look at the legislation and as I talk to a number of individuals in my community and constituency who have been very heavily involved in the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation, individuals who really want to see this Act passed . . . But they also realize and share some of the concerns that have been raised by the Saskatchewan Stock Growers' Association because they feel that the process of consultation and working together wasn't exactly followed through.

And so I believe, Mr. Speaker, that as we enter into greater debate on that we will see whether the government is as open and as honest as they indicate they are. And we trust that the minister and that the Executive Council will take note of a number of the amendments we plan to bring forward to indeed give the critical wildlife habitat Act, the Act its ability to not only put lands under the Act but also to recognize the rights of individuals or ranchers in the south-west and to also give the men and women involved in the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation the fact that they have greater access to hunting across this province.

Mr. Speaker, we could talk about a number of areas, and many other areas that the government has shown a lack of leadership, a lack of ability to lead in the economic field. We could talk about the Piper Aircraft deal. We wonder where it sits today. What about the Husky oil upgrader, Mr. Speaker? What about the government? What have they done to promote the possibility of Promavia international manufacturing aircraft in Saskatchewan?

What about Saska Pasta in Swift Current, and certainly the Minister of Energy and Mines — I am sure — is very concerned about the Saska Pasta plant in Swift Current as it will mean jobs to his community. What about Westank-Willock in Regina, Mr. Speaker? What commitment has the government made? And we noted yesterday, Mr. Speaker, a number of the employees were on the steps of the legislature voicing their concerns with the closing down of their plant. What about Echo Valley

Conference Centre?

Mr. Speaker, yes there are a number of areas where the government must answer for what they have done in light of what the people of Saskatchewan believed they would do if they voted for them in the 21st election.

Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated there are many other areas that we could speak to, that we could bring forward in our discussion tonight, but I believe, Mr. Speaker, there are some of my colleagues as well who would like to speak to the motion and to raise a number of points and concerns that I have failed to raise tonight or not as well aware of that they would like to bring forward in this debate as well. So at this time, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to move a motion, seconded by the member from Rosthern:

That this Assembly condemns the government for its massive betrayal of Saskatchewan voters by introducing a budget and legislation that contradicts promises made during the election campaign, including, imposing no new taxes, supporting rural Saskatchewan, increasing support to health, education, and agriculture, conducting an open and honest government, and listening to the people.

Mr. Speaker, I so move.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And I want to say that it's my pleasure to second the motion. And I want to also at this time thank the member from Moosomin for coming up with such a rather all-encompassing, creative motion such as we have before us this evening, Mr. Speaker.

You know, normally I pride myself on being an individual that when he gets up to speak has a reasonably orderly mind so that we go through the speech step by step. But when I take a look at the parameters of the motion that is before us this evening, Mr. Speaker, it really is all-encompassing and also all-condemning, I would suggest to you, of the government opposite. The latitude of the motion is such that encompasses pretty well every action that the government has done and should not have done, and has not done but should have done. And that is the type of logic, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I want to pursue for just a little bit of time tonight. I do not intend to take a lot of time, but I wanted to bring some thoughts to the people's minds in Saskatchewan tonight for their consideration.

The normal procedure on a debate like this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that we will have a member get up to move the motion and then we have a seconder as I am doing now. And then of course the opposition — and I'm assuming that they will do this — that the member from Saskatoon Broadview will be getting up following me . . . Broadway, pardon me — Broadway, Fairway, we've got to be careful on the names of the constituencies here — and she will be making an amendment.

Normally of course we are saying that this Assembly condemns the government for its massive betrayal. And normally then the opposite side will say commends. And I would certainly hope that the member then will get up

and read her amendment which says that this Assembly commends the government for its massive betrayal and continuing on just to keep in tradition. Because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I intend to do is take a look for a brief moment the massive betrayal of Saskatchewan voters as this motion indicates, by introducing a budget and legislation that contradicts promises — that contradicts promises made during the election campaign, including imposing no new taxes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this was a promise made during the election campaign upon which the folks opposite got elected by promising no new taxes, that they would support rural Saskatchewan, that they would increase support to health, that they would increase support to education, that they would increase support to agriculture. And in addition to all of this support for the various sectors of our society, they would be conducting an open and honest government and listening to the people.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is such a litany of promises that it boggles the minds why any group of men or women would go forward to make promises like that knowing full well, knowing full well that it would be nigh to an impossibility to keep those promises. And of course that has been borne out. That has been borne out in the last eight months or nine months or so of this government being in power, where they are now so busily trying to regroup and telling the people of the province that, sorry folks, the situation was worse than we pretended and that you're going to have to be patient for five or six or seven years until we get the situation under control. And then, and then maybe we will be able to keep our promises.

One member, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know from the opposite side said about taxes, said about taxes: enough is enough. Now members opposite may remember who that member was when she said, enough is enough, when it referred to taxes in *Hansard* of June 7, 1991.

An Hon. Member: — Who was that?

(2015)

Mr. Neudorf: — The member from Saskatoon Broadway is concerned whether I'm talking about her. I assure you I am not; I'm talking about the current Minister of Health.

But I think one of the underlying, fundamental betrayals of this government revolves around the Premier, the Premier. Because the Premier on September 20, 1991, just prior to the election, the Premier said at a news conference, in his news conference statement, the Premier said: We will make no promise we cannot keep. I say, and I remember, members opposite, of that, the Premier in '91, September of '91, said: We will make no promise we cannot keep.

Now the member from Moosomin has already taken a fair amount of time this evening to describe the litany of broken promises, the litany of things that members opposite said they would do and then we find out that they did not do that. The Premier also said — this was prior to the September one that I just said — on March 24, 1990, the Premier said: I say the people of this province

are fed up with taxes, and we're going to change that. That was another statement he did.

And you see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the point that I'm trying to make here is that prior to the election there was a series of promises made to the people of Saskatchewan to get them to believe that if they voted in a New Democratic government that things would be different; that there would be more money being spent, but fewer taxes to the people.

The Minister of Finance, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is on record as saying the problem is on the expenditure side. We have a structural deficit. And he says revenues cannot fix this deficit; it has to be dealt with at the expenditure side in order to get control. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is an element of honesty in that statement. There is an element of honesty at that statement, and the Minister of Finance recognized that one of the areas in which you should be able to control the deficit is to cut on the expenditure side. And I think that behoves any government under the circumstances that we have today to attempt to do exactly that.

However his major, major shortcoming is, first of all on the expenditure side, the way in which they're trying to cut expenditures, the counter-productive methods that are being employed by the government at this time. And the folks that have been listening to proceedings in this House will be well aware of how we had the Minister of Health, and that a discussion that I had with the Minister of Health in many of the ways in which they're trying to cut spending.

But it's counter-productive. Because in trying to cut spending by optometrists, you send people to ophthalmologists. By trying to cut spending on the chiropractic side, you're sending people to physiotherapists. And at the same time creating a two-tier health system where people are going to have to make choices whether they want to maintain their health or spend their money on other things, be they necessities of life or amenities of life.

Those will be decisions that people will be making and hopefully, by and large, the citizens of this province are going to be level-headed about it and they will take it seriously, and they will make decisions for their health. But we know that many, many people will not do that. Many, many people will be able to succumb to the temptations to use the money for whatever reason they see fit. In other words, their prioritization will be different and they're going to suffer as a result of that, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

So we have here a government that is making all kinds of promises prior to the election, where we had the minister of Economic Diversification, he said . . . the minister of Economic Diversification, he said, we've indicated many, many sources where we would see the government saving the kind of money that would make these massive tax increases unnecessary.

I'm going to repeat that and then I'm going to raise the profile of the members opposite to what they were all . . . You know, what was the buzz-word, Mr. Deputy

Speaker? What was the buzz-word before the election that members opposite coined? And used quite effectively, I might add. Quite effectively.

Waste and mismanagement. Do you remember that, folks? Waste and mismanagement. And he has indicated, the Minister of Economic Development has indicated that, we've indicated many, many sources where we would see the government saving the kind of money that would make these massive tax increases unnecessary.

Well if they were telling the truth prior to the election, if it was true what they were condemning us for, that there was this massive amount of waste and mismanagement, where is it? I mean your minister himself said that there's enough waste and mismanagement that no tax increases are necessary.

What have we seen on the other hand, Mr. Deputy Speaker? The long litany of tax increases that the member from Moosomin has just gone through. And I'm going to be taking some time on that too because it's so relevant to the discussion this evening that we have to reinforce to the members opposite.

I don't think we have to reinforce this to the citizens of this province. They're quite well aware, thank you, about the tax increases that have been levied against them. They're very well aware of that and they resent it. But I think members opposite are becoming blasé about the whole situation. I think members opposite have this rolling off their backs like water off a duck.

And we have to make sure that we impress time and time again upon members opposite of the folly of what they are doing and the price ultimately that they are going to pay for this action and for this deception that they have perpetrated upon the people of Saskatchewan in that false campaign of the fall of '91 to get elected. That is what we are trying to do with this particular motion, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

And furthermore, Mr. Deputy Speaker — I know I've gone through a few of the quotes — I want to just turn our attention to an individual that was fairly popular during question period this afternoon but found that he could not stand in his place and answer the questions that were being asked of him. And that is the Minister of Justice who in *Hansard* is quoted on April 24, '91 saying, the problem isn't government revenues. The problem is not government revenues. In other words, of course, what he was saying, is saying that we don't need more revenues.

In fact what he was doing, I would suppose, is supporting his boss at the time, the now Premier. Because the Premier went on record in the fall of '91 saying the same thing. The problem isn't in revenues; \$4.5 billion is enough for any government to operate. You should be able to work within that framework. Those were his words.

So then we had the now Minister of Justice on April 24, '91 saying, the problem isn't government revenues. We're getting in enough money. I repeat again, government revenues have increased by 70 per cent in the last nine years, and the government that can't operate

with those kinds of numbers is a government that doesn't deserve to be a government.

Folks, that's your own Minister of Justice, not ours. He is saying that 4.5 is enough, and if we can't operate under that, we shouldn't be in a government. And I ask members opposite, the *Estimates* that have been finally tabled, what is the amount in those *Estimates*? What is that amount? Is it 4.5? I suggest to you that it is not 4.5, ladies and gentlemen across the way, but literally over \$5 billion. And the member from Humboldt chirps up, and you would think that after his meeting with his folks yesterday in the Humboldt area and the farm producers, he would be shameful and be sitting there even more red faced than he is, so that he would be cognizant of what the people in Humboldt are thinking right now about him and the Minister of Agriculture.

And I have to give the Minister of Agriculture credit and I'll do that publicly right now. You, sir, came into a hornet's nest in Humboldt. The folks treated you well, but at least you had the nerve to come out this time and face them and try to explain your program. And I'm referring of course now to the opposition, to the FeedGAP (feed grain adjustment program) and the cash advance program. And I'm not going to go into detail about that, but it's something that is very, very important to me as well as a hog producer.

But you at least came out, and I know what their request was from you for now to have another look at that whole program and see if you cannot sustain it. Or if you're going to be taking the bit in your mouth and going down to the road of destruction of the hog industry, do it at least gradually. So that was a request, and we've been listening very intently and with a great deal of anticipation to your ultimate answer to their request.

But now coming back to the Minister of Justice, where he says a government that doesn't live within those means doesn't deserve to be a government. And you're not living within those means because you have upped that 4.5 quite substantially, but that's not the only condemnation. The biggest condemnation is going exactly the opposite of what you said you would never do, and that is the massive tax increases that you have implemented upon the people of this province.

Because the Associate Minister of Finance, the toy minister from Churchill Downs, is on record and I know that this has been quoted many, many times because you people across the way were elected on the premise that you would be different, that you would do things for the people of Saskatchewan the way that they had anticipated. And you have failed them utterly. You have failed them utterly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — I want to say to members opposite that I appreciate your acknowledgement. I appreciate your acknowledgement of how you have failed the people of the province. When you said one thing, you got elected on that. And immediately, the day after, you turn around and you knife the people of Saskatchewan in the back. You break your promises. You jack taxes up.

Now I want to come back to that. The Minister of Justice said on April 24, 1991: a government that cannot live within those revenues doesn't deserve to be a government. Now you came up from 4.5 to over 5 billion in your budget. But that's not the only condemnation. The other condemnation is that concomitantly you raised the taxes to unprecedented heights. There is the condemnation in you folks. And do you know what? Do you know what? You did that knowingly.

Now I'm getting a lot of heckling from the opposite side, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And that happens, as we know in this House, every time you start to hit a discordant note. And the notes that I am creating are very discordant for members opposite . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I assume you heard what the member said.

The member from Quill Lakes, chirping from his seat, is making unparliamentary remarks which I guess we will have to ignore at this time. But he has not got the nerve to get up in this Assembly and speak. I know he's not only not got the nerve; I know that the member from Elphinstone is the one that is muzzling members opposite. But it is the ones who have the courage to go against his rulings, to speak up . . . and I've already indicated that the member from Saskatoon Broadway is waiting anxiously in her seat to respond to some of my remarks.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Associate Minister of Finance — as I was trying to say about three minutes ago before we were so rudely interrupted by members opposite — the Associate Minister of Finance said on May 21, 1991: the NDP won't raise any personal taxes for four years. That was a solid commitment made by the member from Churchill Downs while he was sitting across, approximately where I'm standing right now, as Finance critic.

So the people of Saskatchewan respected the position that he held. And when he said that, you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what the people of Saskatchewan did? They believed him. They believed him. And when they compared our plan as we projected it in the fall of '91, which included harmonization, we said to the people of Saskatchewan, there is a tremendous burden, a millstone hanging around the necks of us and future generations, and our children . . . We recognized that. We said there was a \$14 billion deficit.

Your leader today, your Premier, the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan, said in the fall of 1991, there is a deficit of \$14.2 billion. He said that; he recognized it; he knew it. You all knew it. And yet, what did you do? He said that. And what did you do? You purposely went out and made outrageous promises, knowing full well that you would never be able to keep those. But the important thing at that time was to get elected. And, you know, what amazes me all the time is that . . . I'm a practical man; I'm a fairly pragmatic man. And seeing that it's hindsight . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order, order. Order. Order, order. All members will have an opportunity to enter into the debate after the member who is now speaking has

finished. And I ask them to wait until he is finished. And I ask the member from Humboldt to observe order, and ask members to all observe order. I recognize the member for Rosthern.

(2030)

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I have no problems with the member from Humboldt speaking out. We all understand why he's not able to control himself tonight, so we'll make allowance for his condition. So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I could allow to be able to make my presentation without this type of extraordinary interruption, I want to make the point again, and emphasize, and underscore the point, that members opposite were elected under a false premise. The false premise that members opposite were elected on, they full well knew the conditions of the province, the economic conditions of the province, and yet they decided that they were going to make promises such as spending more on education, spending more on health, spending more for universities, but at the same time they also promised that taxes would not go up.

And I'm not creating these things. The quotes that I'm using are to underscore and to legitimize what I'm saying because these are the words taken right out of the mouths of members opposite during the election and prior to the election. So these are the kinds of things that I think that we have to take a look at. And when we start taking a look at the tax increases, for example, and I think that is the thing that a lot of the people in this province object to. They are already tottering. They're already under tremendous stress.

Not just the farming community. We talk a lot about the farming community, but we also have to take a look at the other segments of our society that are under stress, and not necessarily only those on social welfare. We have that intermediate group, I think, that is so significant, and that is the working poor.

I know we have SIP (Saskatchewan Income Plan) and SAP (Saskatchewan Assistance Plan) and FIP (Family Income Plan) programs, and they're necessary, but there are substantial number of people besides those 90,000 people that fall into that category that are protected — the working poor. And what we have seen now is a litany of tax increases that they are forced to bear. And we can talk about senior citizens, and we can talk about the medical costs that have been raised. We can talk about the \$380 for the drug prescription plan. We can talk about the increase in the plans for people living in second and third level in nursing homes, levels 1 and level 2 in nursing homes, those kinds of increases. We can talk about the power rate increases. We can talk about the telephone rate increases. We can talk about the increases in SGI, for example, telephone. Now when you take a look at the telephone company, they're making about \$5 million clear a year. Why would you increase the telephone rates up to 30 per cent?

Why don't we take a look at power rates? SaskPower has made lots of money over the last years.

If we take a look at Saskatchewan Government Insurance,

so we talk about SGI and the \$60 million that SGI made over the last five years. They cleared \$60 million in five years. But what happened as far as the increase to the SGI rates was concerned? We had a 4 per cent increase. We had a 4 per cent increase, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in SGI rates. But not only that. Because the minister of SGI had to take a lot of heat for it . . . I know what reasoning went on in Treasury Board. They say, we're going to have to take a lot of heat for this. We may as well get two whammies for one, so we'll say right now that there will also be a 4 per cent increase next year because it ain't going to get any hotter. So that's what you've done. A company that in five years has cleared \$60 million profit, has a contingency fund of \$60 million, you've increased it 4 per cent this year, and you've already said it's automatically going to be increased 4 per cent next year. That's all built in, in a company that's making money.

Why is that? Why is that? To show what a wonderful job you folks are doing next year when you rob it out of the Crowns and put it into Consolidated Fund and say, oh, look what we were able to do with the deficit. Or is it going to be kept there until such time as the slush fund is called for, until such time as you need the fund? And in the mean time, the people of Saskatchewan are going through a lot of disillusionment, let me assure you, a lot of disillusionment.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a little bit about a member from Moose Jaw. I think it's the member from Moose Jaw Wakamow, I believe. It's not the deputy chairman anyway; it's the other fellow. I wouldn't want to attribute this to the wrong member from Moose Jaw, but it's not the one who acts as our deputy chairman. When he says, Mr. Speaker:

. . . when a political party says one thing before an election, and then having won the election on the basis of those policies and platforms and statements, when that party then is given power and turns around and does just the opposite, Mr. Speaker, that makes a sham of the parliamentary democracy.

That's not me talking. I'm quoting the member from Moose Jaw. I'm quoting from *Hansard*, July 25, 1989, page 2887:

. . . when a political party says one thing before an election, having won that election on the basis of those (promises) . . . turns around does (exactly) the opposite, Mr. Speaker, that makes a sham of the parliamentary (process).

And that ladies and gentlemen is basically the point that I've been trying to make tonight because in my estimation that is exactly what has happened. That is exactly why you were elected, and we find out that that has happened that way.

There's another quote here from the member from Saskatoon Broadway. You see . . . and I know that she's going to be getting up immediately after me, so I want her to address this point.

And this, Madam Member, you said on October 3, 1991.

And this is quoted from the *Star-Phoenix*: if elected, the New Democratic Party will work to get rid of food banks. It will fund hot lunch programs in schools. The NDP will re-establish the school-based dental plan and the training programs for dental therapists needed to staff local clinics.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — So from that I'm glad to hear that they are still depending on doing that. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, having hit a cord with members opposite, I hope, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that what we see in the future, as far as the members opposite are concerned, that these kinds of things will come to pass. Now I know the member is going to get up and say, we've done certain parts of it and we intend to do more. We intend to do more as the fiscal situation in the province improves because when we were elected we didn't know what the conditions in the province were.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — That's what you'll say. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that one-handed, empty clapping is . . . and I remind members opposite, the Premier said, the now Premier said in the fall of '91, there's a \$14.2 billion deficit. Could I repeat that? The Premier said there's a \$14.2 billion deficit. That's what he said prior to the election. So you folks knew.

Now I can get into the Donald Gass Commission report and I can show you there where he says that the books of the Tories were always open. The books of the Tories were always open for anyone who could read an economic book. So you either, for one of two reasons, for one of two reasons, you either couldn't read an accounting book or you chose not to.

So we are now saying to you, you knew and yet you made those promises and we're expecting you to keep up and live up to those promises. You are not doing that this far. That's all I'm saying.

To me and to the people of Saskatchewan, as they look at this horrendous situation that we find ourselves in . . . I know, you're going to blame the Tories. They did it. They did it. You've been in government for nine months folks. For nine months.

An Hon. Member: — Not nine years.

Mr. Neudorf: — Not nine years. You never will be. I assure you, hon. member, you never will be. You're in here. We've got a one-term Premier, we've got a one-term government. It doesn't happen very often in Saskatchewan, but we've got a one-term government. I don't know who's going to form the next government but it won't be you folks . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You say it won't be us, fair game. But it will not be you because . . . Why? Because of the massive betrayal that the people of this province are experiencing so shortly after they had such high expectations of you.

Maybe it's not all your fault. Maybe the expectations were something that you couldn't live up to. Partly, to give you

a certain amount of credit here, maybe the expectations were so high that it was impossible for you to live up to them. But I suggest to you, nowhere close to what the people of this province are experiencing right now.

And it's not just . . . it's not just pure economics, folks. The Minister of Justice finally said something today. He finally said something. He couldn't resist it. But I say to the Minister of Justice, most sincerely, part of the condemnation . . . and I've been stressing — and I recognize that, because we have to take kind of turns here — I've been stressing the economic things.

But the other thing, the other parameter which is enclosing around you, is the open, honest, self-, self- . . . Well forget that self. I don't know what I was going to say. But the open, forthright approach that you were going to be taking. And I draw attention to the Minister of Agriculture; I draw your attention to the GRIP Bill. I draw your attention to the demeaning of the rights of the people of Saskatchewan to have their day in court. You're just taking it right away from them. No consultation. And I could go through the consultative approach. I won't get into that, but we could do that.

But Minister of Justice, you are not responding to our request. We believe firmly, and our lawyers are telling us . . . and I think your own lawyers and you as a lawyer are extremely uncomfortable, Mr. Minister of Justice. You are extremely uncomfortable with this because you know ultimately it's going to go to the Supreme Court of Canada. This is a challenge under the charter of rights. The Constitution of Canada is being broken by this one self Act here under the GRIP, and it's very, very serious. And the Minister of Justice says, no, no.

Ultimately what you're doing is you're taking away the rights of this people, of the province of Saskatchewan, to have their day in court. You are saying . . . You as a government recognize that you made a mistake. Your preamble on that Bill is . . . how many . . . there's 14 preamble's, whereas's. And every lawyer that I talk to says that is proof positive that the government is very concerned that they are breaking the charter of rights, that they're breaking the constitution. Because every Bill that does that has those whereas's.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Why do you put that in there, Mr. Minister of Justice? Why is it in there? Then you're putting yourself, as a government, recognizing that you have made an error . . . to correct that error you're saying now to the folks and to the farmers of this province — not just to the farmers; anyone else who's going to get this retroactivity slapped on them — you're telling them now, never, ever, will you be able to take the Government of Saskatchewan to court because we're above the law. That's what you're doing.

So it's not just a matter of the economics that I've been stressing in my speech, but I want to draw attention to the open, honest, forthright government that you claim to be. And the people of Saskatchewan, in my riding, are telling me they don't like that. And they are telling me to come up to motions like this because they believe in what we're

saying. And they want us to draw it to your attention any way we can. And we do that with the petitions. We do that with the petitions. And we've got petitions here, 5,000, 6,000, 7,000. And they're growing. They're saying, we don't like what you guys are doing. From the economic, the wellness program, whatever you want to call it, there's a lot of discontent.

(2045)

And my only objective, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in getting up today, was not to rile members of the opposite side up, although I seem to have done that. But my objective was to get up, point out to the people of Saskatchewan who happened to be listening, and to the members opposite, some of the concerns that we are experiencing, some of the concerns that we are hearing, and hopefully pass that on to you so that you can take it into consideration as you deliberate as to how you're going to be going into the future.

We recognize on this side it's tough. It's tough to be in government. I remember when I first got elected back in '86, one of the first times in the House, and like all you young — young, politically young — back-benchers, it's an exciting time in your life and you're looking forward to it.

And I happened to be eating at the Imperial 400, breakfast. And who was sitting there eating by himself? No, no, not the Minister of Justice, but rather the Premier himself. The now Premier. And I sat with him and we had breakfast and we had casual conversation. And during the course of the conversation I remember one comment that I made to him. And that was, Mr. Premier, if you would have been elected in 1986, it would have served you right.

Because back in 1986 we knew the toughness that it was going to be to govern. And we knew that we were in rough shape and that it was going to be tough. And he recognized that.

And I just want to say to you folks right now that we on this side recognize that it's tough to govern. It's not easy. It serves you right for getting elected now. That's basically, I guess, what I'm saying. But the people are looking toward you. They're looking to you for leadership. They're looking to you as a group of men and women that are going to accept the responsibility that comes with being in government. And it's tough.

Now if you would do things that in our estimation were more reasonable than what we're seeing right now . . . And the contentious issue is undoubtedly GRIP right now, and I think that kind of overshadows all of the other things. But if those kinds of issues were not there, I would make my commitment as a member opposite here, as the House Leader, that things in this House would be better. Things in this House would be better.

But as long as that is hanging over us as a dark burden and a shadow over us, it is going to be a contentious period of time. Because one thing affects the other. And then we're all human here; we're all emotional. It's a high-strung, high-packed activity that goes on here from 9 o'clock in

the morning till 11 o'clock at night. And I think upon reflection, Mr. Deputy Speaker, under cooler moments I may not have said some of the things that I have said tonight. I'm not sure.

But this is the way this House operates. And we have to, we have to be accountable for what we do and our actions and so on. And now all I'm asking for from members opposite is that there has to be some kind of a reasonableness coming forth and we will respond in like way. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks I will move an amendment to the motion that reads as follows:

That all of the words after "Assembly" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

praises the government for carrying out its first campaign pledge to bring the finances of this province under control.

Mr. Speaker, for several months now the members opposite have spent their time and effort condemning the new government that was elected on October 21, 1991. In our efforts to try to get a grip on this province's finances, we have had to make some tough decisions. And I note that the member from Rosthern talked about leadership and talked about toughness. I would contend that the government that was elected on October 21, 1991 has provided leadership and has made some tough decisions.

When we came to office on November 1, 1991, the cabinet made the commitment to try and understand where this province had been in the last nine years fiscally and the Gass Commission was struck. The Gass Commission reported to the government in February of 1992 and at that time it became clear to us that the province's finances had not been adequately represented to the people of this province by the former administration. We learned that over \$14 billion in the combined debt had been accumulated under the leadership of the Conservative Party of Saskatchewan.

We also knew after being elected, that the people of this province no longer wanted waste and mismanagement, that they wanted an open and honest and accountable government. Well what we did, Mr. Speaker, was introduce some new principles. What we introduced was the principle of independent accounting to make our government's spending more accountable to the people. What we said to the auditor was that our books would be open for all to see.

We also wrote off \$1 billion in bad loans and bad debts that had been undertaken by the previous administration. And we also wrote off \$875 million in non-recoverable debt in the Crown corporations. And the financial statements were audited and they were presented to the public for scrutiny.

Now as a result of that, we had to make some very difficult budget decisions. And I recall saying, prior to October 1991, that this province had \$4.5 billion of revenues and surely we could live within our means. All of the

members of the government side said that because we thought we could. We thought that we wouldn't have to increase taxes unnecessarily.

But when we came to government we learned of this horrendous deficit, this horrendous debt that meant that over \$760 million, this year alone, would be spent on interest in servicing that debt. We also learned that the government had badly misrepresented or miscalculated the debt that would be accumulated in their last year of office. They told us that some \$245 million would be the debt and we learned that it was over \$1 billion. We had a choice. We could continue to spend the way the Tories had done in previous years. We could raise taxes. We could cut services. Or we could do a combination of raising taxes, cutting services, and still running a debt.

And we had the debate within our caucus on what we would do. And we had some . . . It was a difficult debate. Of course there were people who wanted to balance the budget. There were people that were prepared to have a larger deficit than what we came in with in April. And then there were people who thought we could do a combination of raising revenues, cutting services, and still having a debt.

To have balanced the budget would have meant that there would have been a tremendous economic impact upon the citizens of this province. There would have been horrendous job losses. As it was, we had to undergo a balancing act.

Now the members opposite will say that we betrayed the public's trust. I would say that we had no alternative. If we are going to get the debt of this province under control, if we are going to continue to provide the kinds of services that people have come to expect, then we can't continue to spend the way we have in the past. That there could be no argument.

There were people who will say that we shouldn't have cut chiropractic services, that we shouldn't have cut the optometric services, that we shouldn't have done all these things. And I would say to them that those decisions were very, very difficult. But if we are to maintain the basic social structures in this province, we must get the debt under control and our government is committed to doing that.

Now the members opposite have spent a great deal of time criticizing us. We witness daily the harangues. We have spent close to four months in this House listening to the members opposite condemn our efforts. And I have to tell the members opposite that the public is becoming increasingly sceptical and cynical, not only about yourselves, not only about us, but about all politicians. I'd like to remind you that we are four years away from an election. You will have plenty of time to criticize the government and get your political party in order. But at this stage we are 10 months into a new mandate. The people of this province defeated you and day in and day out I hear people say to me: we defeated those people. Why are they continuing to try and control and run this province?

An Hon. Member: — How many times have you talked to

them about anything?

Ms. Atkinson: — Lots of times. I talk to my constituents regularly. I talk to people all across Saskatchewan. And they thought that they defeated you on October 21, 1991, and quite frankly they really don't want to hear from you any more. They are tired of Tories.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — They are absolutely fed up with you. And you can read the newspaper. There was a gentleman that wrote a letter to the editor in the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* today. And he said that he thought it was time for us to lock you out. Now that would be totally undemocratic, totally undemocratic, and we're not interested in doing that.

We also have an article in Monday's *Star-Phoenix* where Paul Jackson, who used to be a speech writer for your former leader, tells us that there's more corruption to come; there's more corruption that went on under the Tories. Paul Jackson is even sick of you people.

Now we are providing leadership. We have introduced several dozen pieces of legislation. We have a budget. We have a direction. We have a new wellness plan that is going to be released momentarily. We will determine our future. We will determine our future. That is leadership. Of course, your job is to critique the government. That is your job. But your job is not to obstruct the goings-on in this legislature. That is not your job. Your job is to critique the government in a reasonable, responsible way.

Now I listened very carefully to the minister . . . or to the member from Rosthern. And I have been reading *Hansard*. And day in and day out you people stand up and you make allegations in this legislature that are totally untrue. And I refer to the August 3 *Hansard* where the member from Rosthern talked about one physiotherapist being from the Yorkton area.

And that's simply not true. There are three full-time physical therapists in the Yorkton hospital. There are two part-time physical therapists in the Yorkton hospital. And a new physical therapist is coming on stream. So there will soon be basically five positions. But the member opposite said there was only one. And it's not true.

Today I listened to the member talk about some other items, misinformation. It goes on and on and on. If we are going to have a reasonable debate in this legislature, I think what we should be doing is putting forward positive ideas for the future of this province.

All of us were elected on October 21, 1991 and we came here with ideas. We should not be here to criticize only. This forum should be a place for people to put forward ideas that will advance the future of this province. But we never get to do that in this House. And I think it's time for real democratic reform where members of this House can talk about the future and can talk in positive ways.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — I know that every member in this House

has good ideas about how we can reform the health care system. Why not have a debate on real reform to the health system where all of us could join the government, the Minister of Health, in advancing positive initiatives? We never get to do that.

All of us have ideas for economic development. All of us. But we never get a chance to put forward our ideas in a public forum. What we do is sit here and listen day in and day out and day in and day out to absolute nonsense that is rhetorical, that is political, and does not advance the cause of democracy in this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(2100)

Ms. Atkinson: — Quite frankly, I am tired of private members' motions that either praise the government for this or condemn the government for that. Let's have private members' motions that talk about the future, that talk about positive economic, social, political, cultural advances.

I think that's what the people of this province want to hear from us. They are tired of hearing negative rhetoric where the Tories bash us and the NDP gets up and bashes the Tories for nine years of waste and mismanagement.

This has been a long, long summer session. There's no question about that. And I think most people don't even pay attention any more to us because they've decided that we're totally irrelevant and maybe we are.

But we can become relevant to the citizens of this province if we decide to change our behaviour. I am tired, like Mr. Speaker is, of the hooting and yelling that goes on across the floor day in and day out. We have to be more civilized than that. Surely we are more civilized than that. I am tired of listening to people debate, spend 2 or 3 or 4 hours debating something. If you can't say it in 15 minutes, I don't think you should bother saying it. You shouldn't stand in this House for two or three hours just to hear yourself talk.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I have other colleagues that want to be able to talk. I'm not going to spend two hours or three hours like the former members did, speaking to this amendment. I've said my piece. I hopefully have said it in 15 minutes, and I will sit down and let my colleague second my motion. So I will move the following amendment:

That all the words after "Assembly" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

praises the government for carrying out its first campaign pledge to bring the finances of this province under control.

And this is seconded by the member from Saskatoon Idylwyld.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cline: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for

me to rise this evening, Mr. Speaker, to second the amendment proposed by my colleague from Saskatoon Broadway.

I've listened to the member from Moosomin and the member from Rosthern speak tonight about open and honest government, and it struck me, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps this was not the best subject for those members to raise in this House given the record of the previous government that they were a part of. And I'd like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I've been talking to a lot of people in my constituency and around the province. And many people have said to me that instead of harping and complaining on and on, that perhaps the members opposite would do well and place themselves in better stead with the public if they would issue a public apology to the people of the province for what they have done, because the people know, Mr. Speaker, that the present government unfortunately inherited a very difficult financial mess from the previous administration. And the people know that steps have been taken to get the situation under control. The first step was the creation of the Gass Commission, an independent commission of some very knowledgeable and distinguished people in our province who opened the books and studied the finances of our province, made some findings, and made some recommendations.

And what the Gass Commission found, Mr. Speaker, was that there was a lot of waste and mismanagement under the previous administration that had not been revealed to the people of the province and only became clear after the election. This occurred throughout the 1980s, Mr. Speaker, and the Gass Commission, the government, and the people are going to make sure that it does not occur again. And I predict, Mr. Speaker, that despite the protestations of the opposition, it will be a very long time indeed before the people of this province will place their trust and the financial purse strings of this province in the hands of the members opposite.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cline: — The government has moved, Mr. Speaker, in the budget, in a very realistic way to try to restore some kind of financial stability to our finances, just as any family must do. Any family in our province has to live within its means. And if it finds that its debts are way out of control, and many times more than its annual income, then it has to take some measures to deal with that, Mr. Speaker, and this government is doing it. It's doing it openly, and it's doing it honestly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cline: — Because we, Mr. Speaker, are the trustees of the people's money. It is not our money; it is their money. We cannot spend it foolishly; we have to spend it wisely. We cannot squander our resources and we cannot mortgage the future of generations to come.

The government has made some decisions which I think in isolation are very tough decisions, and they are decisions which I find regrettable. I find it regrettable that we are in a position where we have made some of the decisions we've made. The decisions have been tough,

but I think they've been honest, Mr. Speaker, and I think they've been reasonable.

The approach of the government in the creation of the Gass Commission and looking at the finances of the province and opening the books to the public, and the approach of the government in involving the Provincial Auditor instead of fighting with the Provincial Auditor as the previous government did, stands in stark contrast to the record of the previous government. And I would quote, Mr. Speaker, from the *Special Report of the Provincial Auditor*, which was issued April 21, 1992.

The Provincial Auditor, referring to the Conservatives' record in the last few fiscal years, had this to say at pages 14 and 15, Mr. Speaker. He said, "The Estimates are inaccurate." He said, "The organizations (that is government organizations) spend money for purposes not authorized." He said, "The organizations' internal control systems are violated." He said, "The organizations' financial statements are inaccurate." He said, Mr. Speaker, "The Public Accounts are inaccurate."

That is what the Provincial Auditor said in his special report, Mr. Speaker, and he repeated it again and again throughout that report. And the Provincial Auditor is a servant of this legislature, Mr. Speaker, and all of the members of this legislature, and that is what he said. And it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that that does not give us a very good example of open and honest government that the members opposite are now preaching to us about.

Their record, Mr. Speaker, speaks for itself. What it has done is to leave this province in a situation where the government this year will spend \$760 million to pay the interest on the debt accumulated by the previous Conservative government. If we did not have to pay that interest, Mr. Speaker, we would in this fiscal year be operating at a surplus. Mr. Speaker, \$4.5 billion in revenue should be enough to govern this province, but it is not, for the very simple reason that the government has to pay \$760 million in interest on the debt created by the members opposite.

If we did not have those interest charges, Mr. Speaker, we would not only have a surplus budget, but we would have more money for the much-needed health and social programs that we have always prided ourselves on in this province. But, Mr. Speaker, the money is gone and many people in the public have been asking, where did the money go?

Well the members from Moosomin and Rosthern talk about open and honest government. I'm going to try to be open and honest with them in terms of what has been revealed through the legislature and the Provincial Auditor since we took power. Both members who spoke about open and honest government were part of the previous administration. They should be aware of their own record. According to the Provincial Auditor, Mr. Speaker, under the previous government 130 employees were paid but did no work for the government organizations which paid them at a cost of \$5.166 million.

Nine government organizations made payments to

advertising agencies but received nothing in return. And the amount of \$439,000, Mr. Speaker, was paid by government organizations to advertising agencies that did nothing for that money. Two advertising agencies, Mr. Speaker, Dome Advertising and Roberts & Poole, were paid \$10,250 per month for more than two years but rendered no services. That amounts to more than half a million dollars to two companies which provided no services to the Property Management Corporation which was paying them. And I think most people in Saskatchewan would have the attitude, Mr. Speaker, that that would not be a bad contractual arrangement if you could get it. But unfortunately that kind of arrangement was only available to a select few under the previous administration.

Over \$300,000 was improperly paid, Mr. Speaker, to Charlton Communications to do advertising paid for by the Property Management Corporation at the request of members of the cabinet of the member from Estevan. The cabinet ministers were provided with private viewing suites at the Centre of the Arts; SGI picked up the taxi bills of PC ministers and their staffs; \$16,000 was spent by the Liquor Board to entertain the cabinet at the Big Valley Jamboree; \$19,285 worth of liquor was delivered by the Liquor Board to PC offices; seasons tickets to the Roughriders at taxpayers' expense, not to mention an account, Mr. Speaker, at the Green and White Lounge; cellular phones in vehicles provided to cabinet ministers — I'm sorry, to MLAs — we may hear more about that later.

These are, I think, Mr. Speaker, only some of the horror stories that have come out with respect to the record of the previous government. Others include the Liquor Board paying defeated Tory MP (Member of Parliament), John Gormley, \$1,000 a month while he went to law school. Mr. Gormley received as much as \$48,000 of taxpayers' money despite the fact there's no record of what work he might have performed. The former chairman of the Liquor Board charged the board \$11,845 for real estate fees never paid to a real estate agent and authorized by the chairman himself. The Liquor Board paid the salaries of 11 Tory loyalists but has no record of any work they might have done.

The Property Management Corporation, Mr. Speaker, purchased a luxury van for \$30,000 to be used by the premier on tours. This van was not used because the premier's entourage was too large in fact to use it. But it included such necessities as a TV and VCR (video cassette recorder), power window and door locks, running boards, a roof rack and four captain's chairs. Since the van was not satisfactory for the former premier's purposes, other vehicles were rented at public expense.

One individual, Mr. Speaker, was paid by the Property Management Corporation the sum of \$53,000 to organize a summer tour for the former premier. That individual was paid \$230 per day and at that rate would have worked for 49 weeks which is quite interesting, Mr. Speaker, since the individual was supposedly organizing the premier's summer tour — all the more interesting when one considers that yet other people were paid at a high rate to act as the premier's full-time tour directors.

(2115)

The Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation paid the salaries for nine people who did no work for the corporation but worked for cabinet ministers. It also paid the salary of an individual who worked in the partisan caucus office of the Conservative party.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we found out that the Property Management Corporation had paid to the publishers of the *Sask Report Magazine* the sum of \$324,000 essentially so that it could run government propaganda in the magazine under the guise of news. And what was particularly disturbing about that revelation, Mr. Speaker, was that there was no indication in the magazine that the 16 pages of glowing stories about the government and wonderful things happening in Saskatchewan were paid for by the government. Rather the fact that the government had anything to do with the information in the magazine was kept secret, which it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, is not quite consistent with people who now get up and speak about the need for more open and honest government.

The other very troubling aspect of this particular deal, Mr. Speaker, was that the contract the then government entered into with the publishers required that the government would approve the editorial content of the magazine, which I think is surely an unprecedented and very unwarranted intrusion into free speech and freedom of the press in our province, Mr. Speaker. And I would be surprised if any government has ever entered into that kind of arrangement with the press before. And I would be surprised if any government would enter into that kind of arrangement with the press ever again.

The opposition stands here, Mr. Speaker, day after day and berates this government about a perceived need — perceived by them — for more openness and honesty. And it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this government is not perfect — no government is — but compared to the administration the difference is very dramatic. I'm very pleased that the government has taken steps to open the books and let the people know how we got ourselves into the financial mess we're in, and to try to deal with that mess in a very sincere, and honest, and reasonable way.

Now what are the supporters, or former supporters, or so-called supporters of the opposition saying about this, Mr. Speaker? Well, Paul Jackson, the former assistant to the former premier, now the Leader of the Opposition, had this to say in the *Star-Phoenix* of yesterday, August 10. It's very interesting.

Even the headline is interesting, Mr. Speaker, because it says: "Many in Tory hierarchy corrupt to the rotten core." He doesn't say, corrupt to the core. That's not good enough. He says: "... corrupt to the rotten core." That's what people in the Conservative Party are saying.

And then he says, Mr. Speaker:

AH, THE SCANDALS that come out of Grant Devine's erstwhile government!

Fellows who apparently ripped off the taxpayers

with ease, gals who drew a paycheque but seemingly did no work whatsoever.

Who says (who says) there is no free ride in life?

Then he asks:

Am I surprised about the revelations and allegations concerning my former boss's enterprise?

No, not at all.

Indeed, during my stint with Grant, Eric Berntson and Lorne Hepworth, I made an observation to them that many of those in the Tory hierarchy were either corrupt or incompetent, and some were both.

I suspected many of Devine's movers and shakers had their fingers in the till, which was one reason I was never really part of the inner circle. Many of the Tory high-flyers suspected I knew what they were up to and they also knew I was not about to be corrupted myself.

And then he explains that he had to get out of this operation because, even for someone as committed to the Conservative cause as Paul Jackson, what was going on in the previous administration was too much for him to take.

Then he goes on to say:

... I don't think Blakeney was as oblivious to outright theft and thievery as was Devine.

So the frauds involving the Saskatchewan Transportation Company, and the allegations regarding the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation, Saskatchewan Liquor Commission and Sask Report magazine and other rumors and rumblings surprise me not at all.

And then he says, Mr. Speaker:

There's More. Believe me, there's more.

Now I thought, Mr. Speaker, that I had heard it all, but Paul Jackson tells us we haven't heard it all and that there is more.

Then he concludes:

Sadly, he (referring to the member from Estevan) was surrounded by some of the most dishonest men and women who ever wore a party button or unfurled a political banner.

Let's hope they will finally be brought to justice.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am very, very happy to rise in support of the amendment proposed by the member from Broadway, that the new government should be praised for carrying out its first campaign pledge to bring the finances of this province under control. I'm proud of the fact that the government has opened the books to the

public and reveals to the public how its money is spent, because we are the trustees for the public.

So I support the amendment and I will oppose the original motion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to be long this evening, but I do want to say right off the bat that I will be speaking against and voting against the government's amendment.

As usual, Mr. Speaker, we are treated to a substantial amount of arrogance from these people. I see the member from Saskatoon Broadway standing up and saying that, you people should be going home; you shouldn't say anything. This is very typical of this new NDP government, you know. They are the ... sort of the high lord executioner of Saskatchewan now. I mean, we tell people what to wear in bars. I wonder what's next. You know, we're getting really close to sort of the old invasion of the bedroom stuff again that they were into in their former years.

These are the people that are so afraid of farmers taking them to court, Mr. Speaker, that they have to take all of their legal rights under the constitution away from them in this legislature. They're the people that are so afraid of a 10-man opposition that they have to unilaterally change the rules.

So it doesn't surprise me at all, Mr. Speaker, that we have this pair stand up in the House and tell us to be quiet, that we shouldn't be heard, that because we're New Democrats we have the divine right to rule in this province, that we know more than everybody else, that we're smarter than everybody else. And quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, it gets a little bit tiring when one hears this day after day after day.

I took a ride with the member from Morse last night. We drove up to Humboldt to attend a pork producers' meeting because we wanted to see sort of the results of 10 months of New Democratic rule on the agriculture sector. And I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, there'd be probably a lot of people in that room that Mr. Speaker was probably familiar with in the Humboldt area, that took a great deal of issue, Mr. Speaker, with this sort of high-handed tactics of the new government. This heavy touch of arrogance didn't go down well with the pork producers in Humboldt and area I can tell you very much.

And it doesn't surprise me at all, Mr. Speaker, when the New Democrats sort of stand up to do their standard procedure with one of these motions that the theme that seems to run through over and over again is that you've got to blame somebody else.

You see you've got this big majority that you went out and got because you promised Saskatchewan the world. And you were so hungry for political power that you would stand up in front of everyone in Saskatchewan ... What's that phrase that George Bush coined, you know. No new taxes. You know, read my lips. Read my lips; no new taxes. As a matter of fact, we're going to take away some

of the taxes. Well, Mr. Speaker, we've certainly learned about taxes in the last few months haven't we? I won't bore the Assembly with the list because it grows daily, Mr. Speaker, but I've got several pages here now of: read my lips; how would you like some more new taxes? Because that's all we've gotten from these people.

So it's no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the opposition finds it necessary to bring forward motions on private members' day to sort of bring these people back down to earth, you know. We don't quite have divine right to rule yet in this province. There still is an opposition; there will be an election in three or four years, we hope. I don't know what'll happen to the rules of this place because it seems when you get under these people's skin, they get very vindictive, and they like to take things away from people that sort of take them on.

And that was very evident tonight when we see the members stand up and say, you shouldn't have the right to speak in this Assembly, you should go home, you should be quiet, you should let us do what we want. We should have interim supply and we shouldn't ask the Minister of Finance questions. It's called supply before grievance instead of the other way around, you know. Something that we worked out on a plain in England about a thousand years ago, but now with New Democrats, it's called supply before grievance.

And the way you do that is that the minister stands up and says, I would like \$435 million and I'm going to spend it sort of this way, and then the House Leader stands up and he says, by the way, I think we'll have a little closure along with the supply motion. You see and that way the Minister of Finance gets to spend what he wants, and we don't have to listen to the opposition except for 20 minutes. It's kind of convenient, don't you think, Mr. Speaker.

And then the member from Saskatoon Broadway stands up and says, even 20 minutes is too much, you people should be quiet and go home because you lost the election. You see you shouldn't ask the Minister of Finance about spending 430-some million dollars. You see that's the attitude that we're dealing with here, Mr. Speaker.

I see the member from Saskatoon stand up, and this new member who seems to know it all. This is the member that makes the very same allegations in Public Accounts and then asks the committee to send letters to people so that they can reply and defend themselves. Well I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that he didn't bother reading any of the replies. There was none of the responses from citizens of the province, the Public Accounts, said by the member from Saskatoon. It's one thing to stand in here and make the allegation; but we certainly wouldn't want any responses in here because that might ruin the story. I mean we are expected in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, to say it is gospel because a New Democrat said it.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the last time we had a New Democrat government in this province, in this province, there was a judge — there was a judge — that passed some judgements, and he talked about a thing called DNS (Department of Northern Saskatchewan), and he

said, quite frankly we have something here that has run amok. We weren't talking about a few employees in this building; we were talking about half of this province. Half of the province of Saskatchewan had run amok was the judgement from the judge. And from the palace in La Ronge, they administered the amok.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that before the sanctimonious people opposite stand and tell the opposition that they have no place in this legislature, that they don't have the right to speak and be heard, that they should clean up and admit to some of their past performances as a government and as a party.

(2130)

Well, Mr. Speaker, the member from Saskatoon Centre I believe it is, if that's . . . Idylwyld now. The new member that obviously knows so much about the finances of the province should refer back to what his Premier and his then leader said during the election campaign some eight days before the election, when he talked about a \$14.2 billion total debt.

And I'm sure he has listened with interest to the questioning by the member from Arm River with the now Finance minister in the second interim supply that we had in this House some two months ago when they were talking about the debt in 1982.

And after several hours — we didn't have closure that time, you see, Mr. Speaker, so we were allowed to ask the minister questions — after several hours the member from Regina Dewdney said, well I think, if my memory strikes me right, with everything in it was about \$4.8 billion, 1982.

Well, Mr. Speaker, simple arithmetic with most people tells you that under normal banking circumstances you will get about a hundred per cent increase over a 10-year period of time. Now some people with a sharp pencil tell me they can . . . that they can do it in seven and a half years. But we'll give the minister credit; we'll only allow a doubling.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we had 4.8 billion in 1982 and the member from Riversdale says we have 14.2 eight days before the election campaign after he's promised everybody in the world, read my lips, no new taxes, my arithmetic leaves me with about six and a half billion dollars. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that you probably can find six and a half billion dollars of projects spread around this province employing people by the former government. I'm sure that you can.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it's that kind of hypocrisy that absolutely necessitates motions like this being brought forward in this House every once in a while. Because if we don't remind these people about those promises — you know, read my lips, no new taxes, read my lips, we will have agriculture spending like we've never had in this province before — you know that . . . what's the phrase they use all the time? Cost of production. That's the one I really liked all the time during the election campaign — cost of production to rural people.

And what have we got today? Well we don't have cost of production, Mr. Speaker. What we have is called take your rights away so that you will never ever question an NDP cabinet again. That's what we've got. We got a piece of legislation that says the minister can change the crops insured in the middle of the crop year. We got a piece of legislation that says I've got a nice field of canola growing out there and come August the minister says, oh the member from Dewdney needs a little more cash, I guess canola is off the list. I mean that's the kind of legislation we got here, Mr. Speaker.

Now how does that stack up? — and by regulation no less — how does that stack up with cost of production? So no new taxes, cost of production for Agriculture.

Oh, then we got the biggies, Mr. Speaker. We got Health and Education. Nine and a half years you Tories have been going to destroy the medicare system. You know what we got to do? We got to give a major cash injection. Mind you, the member from Riversdale says eight days before the election, we do have a \$14.2 billion deficit, but we still believe that Health and Education need a major injection. Okay, this is eight days before. I mean we are into promise mode here by now. We've still got eight days to go. We can smell victory. We want to be Premier, we've been in this House for a quarter of a century so it's into high gear. And away we go, knowing full well we've got \$14.2 billion, but we're going to promise some more for Health and Education.

Well lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, the member from Riversdale is Premier. And we promised all of these things. Now we publicly said we've got a \$14.2 billion deficit all in, but now how do we cover this with the folks? How do we square it? Obviously we can't live up to our campaign promises; we've got to get on with something here. So why don't we hold a financial review commission? There should be enough cover there to sort of do a few things, hey.

And who should we get to serve on that? Well we'll get ourselves a chartered accountant from a firm that does megabucks with the government all through various agencies — Deloitte & Touche, it's a good accounting firm but they do a lot of government business. And then we'll go find ourselves three, no less than three, donors to the NDP Party. I wonder if they're like the donors for the Liquor Board. I wonder if the same criteria was used for the guys on the Gass Commission as the Liquor Board. The Liquor Board seemed to be about a hundred bucks and up and you're on.

Now we also know that with the Crop Insurance board that there's a little bit of different criteria there, that maybe it's a little bit higher cash donation to the NDP Party. We're not sure but we've got three of them pegged now and we're researching the rest. Now the Gass Commission, the Gass Commission, Mr. Speaker, because it was a little more high profile, I'm sure that the donations . . . And I haven't looked at them lately, but they were a little bigger and very high-profile people.

So when we've got this commission, you see, we can put it to work. But we don't have any conflict of interest guidelines that are public that people can feel confident

about, you see?

So when somebody absences themselves from the room when we're discussing something to do with the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool like Biggar Malt or whatever, we don't know who's voting on what. We don't know who's saying what because the conflict of interest guidelines are never made public.

So we have a Gass Commission without conflict of interest guidelines that comes up with some recommendations so that the member from Riversdale who told the public eight days before the election that there was a \$14.2 billion deficit can say, whoops, sorry folks, all the promises I made I can't keep.

You know that business about, read my lips, no new taxes? Read my lips, increased spending in health and education. Read my lips, cost of production in agriculture. You know those promises?

Well, so now we're down to it. Ten months into the game the 700 companies that supposedly were going to come and save our bacon because the Economic Development minister was going to lead the list with Piper and 699 were going to come roaring in right behind, well I haven't heard any airplane engines lately and I haven't heard anything from the other 699.

So here we are. We're 10 months into the game. We got 16,000 less jobs than we had last year at this time. We got 6,000 young people that were working gone out of this province, and we got 2,000 less jobs in agriculture. And now the Minister of Agriculture is doing his best to destroy the packing industry, which is another 1,500 jobs.

So you know what? Things aren't going too smooth and I guess we got to blame somebody else. So one day it's the former government. And the next it's the feds. And then when things really get tough we'll go down and pick on the RMs (rural municipality). We don't like what Bernie Kirwan says so we'll hoot and laugh a little bit at him and we'll blame the municipalities for a few things when they complain about the minister tearing up the roads.

You see, Mr. Speaker, when you're bankrupt of ideas, when you're so arrogant that you don't believe anybody should oppose you, there's only one thing to do — that's blame somebody else. It's the oldest trick in politics. It's a heck of a lot easier than actually coming up with some concrete solutions.

Or it's easier than eating a little crow and saying, you know what? I guess I messed up a little bit. Maybe I should backtrack and rethink this process a little bit.

An Hon. Member: — Have you ever done that, Rick?

Mr. Swenson: — You bet I have, sir. You bet I have. You know, there you go again, Mr. Speaker. I mean we got total arrogance here. The minister chirps from his seat that was going to bring 700 companies to our province and salvation.

This is the minister that sent his friend Reggie Gross off to Florida to save us with an airplane factory. You know, the

same Reggie Gross that built all the nice condos in the parks. You know, and the minister chirps from his seat. I wonder what Reggie Gross is up to these days. I suspect he's hovering around the edges a little bit. You know Reggie Gross is one of the kind of guys that would do well in a Paul Jackson article. Seems to me they do a lot of quoting about Paul Jackson — Reggie Gross just fits the mould perfectly.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it's time that this government with this large majority stop worrying about changing the rules in this Assembly so that they can silence 10 members, stop worrying about bringing in legislation to take away the constitutional rights of farmers, stop worrying about manipulating adults in this province in the way that they responsibly approach the use of alcohol, and get on with governing.

Get on with bringing some of those companies to this province. Get on with some legislation that doesn't have the business community up in arms and demanding meetings with the Premier. Get on with co-operating with people that are going to bring jobs and employment to this province. Get on with getting off of agriculture's back and get on with pulling with them.

And I would suggest it might even help to co-operate the odd time with the federal government. Now you don't have to do it on a day-by-day basis or even week by week, but once in a while why don't you just co-operate with them, bring some cash home and get on with it. You know, don't believe that you're smarter than everybody else all the time. Don't believe just because you were . . . sort of have this socialist mentality that everybody else is absolutely wrong, and simply get on with doing what you were elected to do.

Now you made a bunch of foolish promises, you can't live up to them, fair ball. Just get down to the day-by-day stuff. It's real simple. You get up in the morning and you start one hour at a time and you just start building away at it, you know. And if you do that week after week, and month after month you never know, something good might happen. But all of this criticizing everybody else, all of this arrogance that we see displayed by this government isn't going to get us anywhere.

We are going to be down to 700,000 people before you know it. Where are they going? They're going to Tory Alberta. Well, Mr. Speaker, it's time that these people, it's time that these people accepted that there will be criticism, accepted the fact that these 10 members will be here for the next three, four years and they'll probably bring forward amendments and they'll probably stand up and filibuster and they, I'm sure, will criticize this government because that's their job. That's what they get paid for. To stand in this House and say to the Minister of Agriculture, no we don't think you should take away the constitutional rights of people. We think you should have sober second thought and regroup. And you should get on with building this province, not tearing it down. That's what this opposition will do.

And I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, the words of the Opposition House Leader who said, there can be some co-operation, that there can be opposition and

government working together. And all we have to do, Mr. Speaker, is get rid of some of this arrogant attitude that because we won an election, because we won an election, everyone should cease to speak for at least 18 months. That's about what I figured they thought the honeymoon would be, that we should cease to speak and let them have the honeymoon. And after that, then maybe we can come back once in awhile and say something because that was the attitude displayed in the debate tonight, Mr. Speaker. And that's simply not acceptable. So when the government gets over that attitude, then we probably can have some co-operation in this House, and we can get some business done.

And that's why, Mr. Speaker, that's why I think I have no choice but to say no to that arrogant amendment that was put in and vote against it and support the main motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I will be voting against the amendment and for the motion on a matter of principle related to the Legislative Assembly and to politics in the province of Saskatchewan particularly because we are in a democracy.

And I'm going to base my arguments this evening — the few words that I have — on the fact that the NDP administration have talked when they were in opposition about their principles. And they talked during the campaign about their principles. And what we find, Mr. Speaker, is they have let the people down because they have reneged on their principles.

And that's particularly annoying to the public who vote for people who believe they're going to do what they say. And they vote for people who believe they actually have convictions.

I'm going to start tonight, Mr. Speaker, with a couple of quotes from one of the hon. members. And it's not going to be the Premier. And I've done that a few times. It's not going to be one of the front-benchers. It's going to be the member from Moose Jaw Wakamow.

(2145)

An Hon. Member: — He's a good man.

Mr. Devine: — And one of the hon. members said he's a good man. And I want to, Mr. Speaker, quote the hon. member prior to the election. And then I want to talk about what happened since the election.

This is July 25, 1989, page 2887 in Hansard. And this is the member from Moose Jaw Wakamow; at that time I believe it was Moose Jaw South. Mr. Speaker, I quote. This is the NDP member from Moose Jaw:

Mr. Speaker, when a political party says one thing before an election, and then having won the election on the basis of those policies and platforms and statements, when that party is then given power and turns around and does just the opposite, Mr. Speaker, that makes a sham of parliamentary democracy.

Now the members opposite said, the man from Moose Jaw South, Moose Jaw Wakamow, is a good man. He is a preacher, he's well known in the community, and he has a solid reputation. And he says, Mr. Speaker, when he's on this side of the House, that if you campaign on one thing and then turn around and do the very opposite — particularly when you've won power on what you've said — that makes a sham of parliamentary democracy.

Now that quote, Mr. Speaker, is the reason the motion is here today because these people campaigned on one thing and have turned around and done the opposite. They campaigned to help farmers, they campaigned to cut taxes, they campaigned to increase health care funding, they had campaigned to help rural people and seniors, they campaigned to make sure that medicare was funded and not charge user fees, and on and on and on — I have a long list — and they've done just what the member from Moose Jaw Wakamow finds so appalling. They make a sham out of parliamentary democracy because they got elected on political perjury. They didn't tell the truth. Or if they did say something, they've done exactly the opposite.

So they went out in front of all the public and they promised whatever it took to get elected — I'll cut your taxes, I'll fix up the farmers, I'll decentralize, I'll provide you with jobs, all of those things — and as soon as they get elected, they not only do the opposite, Mr. Speaker, they stand in the legislature and say: and you shouldn't call us on it. You shouldn't remind the public because we won the election on this. You shouldn't tell them and you shouldn't hold up the proceedings. Even if we change the rules, even if we take away the right to go to court, even if we do the opposite of what we said, even if we make a sham of parliamentary democracy — don't you talk about it in here because we won the election on that sham. Well how about that, Mr. Speaker? How is the public expected to feel? Not very good.

Mr. Speaker, I want to quote the same member again when it comes to the arrogance of the NDP administration in this House ramrodding and pushing through legislation. The member from Moose Jaw Wakamow says this about rule changes, unilateral rule changes. And there's several quotes here, and this is in August 7, 1989, and days that are close to that, in *Hansard*. And this is the NDP member when he was in opposition and he talked about limiting the rules and limiting debate, unilaterally bringing in closure and changing the rules here so the opposition couldn't speak.

Mr. Speaker, democracy can withstand every attack except neglect, except a government that will so neglect the traditions of democracy. Mr. Speaker, they do this. Why? They do it for short-term political gain. For their short-term political gain, they are willing to neglect a century — almost a century — of democratic tradition in this legislature.

This says the man that voted to change the rules in closure.

Mr. Speaker, here's another quote from the same

individual.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, democracy can withstand every attack except this kind of neglect.

And the member from Moose Jaw Wakamow goes on to say this:

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to you that on this side of the House, democratic traditions do matter . . .

So when the hon. member was on this side of the House and he's a Democrat, he says:

. . . democratic traditions do matter, the traditions of the place do count. Not once, Mr. Deputy Speaker, not once in all the years of CCF (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation) or New Democratic Party administration in this province, not once did we seek to stifle the free speech of the legislature; not once did we seek to limit debate in this House. Not during the heat of the debates of the late 1940s, not during the medicare crisis, not during that time when the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan was being formed, not once did we seek to limit the rights of the opposition to speak in the legislature.

The NDP MLA from Moose Jaw South, Moose Jaw Wakamow, spoke in here, talking about the NDP never limiting the right to speak in the legislature when he was in opposition. He goes on to say:

On this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, democratic traditions count.

And then he goes to say:

Well, Mr. Speaker, if I were a back-bencher on that side of the House (this is really interesting, Mr. Speaker, given what he had just said about the sham of democracy — if I were a back-bencher on that side of the House), if I were a back-bencher over there, I would be absolutely ashamed to be voting for this motion. I would be absolutely ashamed to be counted in with the . . . (rest) of government in Saskatchewan history to limit free speech in this House. I'd be absolutely ashamed to stand up with that front bench and do as they have beckoned me to do.

That's what the NDP member said from Moose Jaw Wakamow when he was here, and this year, he voted to do the very thing that he said he never would believe in and never would do. And he called that a sham when he was in opposition.

And it goes on to say, Mr. Speaker:

. . . this motion may pass. I expect that enough of the back-benchers will fall in line some time today, that this motion will pass, and free speech and debate in this House will be stifled. Their potash . . . legislation may pass, but some day, Mr. Speaker, some day either sooner or later, they will have to go to the people. The people will have an

opportunity. Who is there that will stop them? The people of the province will stop them, that's for sure.

And he goes on to say, Mr. Speaker:

You (can) see, Mr. Speaker, they may be able to stifle free speech, free speech in this legislature. They may be able to silence this opposition. They may be able to deny members of the House the right to speak, but they will not silence the people . . .

And then he goes on to say, which I find extremely relevant:

Mr. Speaker, (this is the member from Moose Jaw Wakamow) 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 it is the means by which this government wishes to privatize the potash corporation; I stand to oppose this motion because it limits the freedom of speech.

So says the NDP member from Moose Jaw Wakamow when he sits on this side of the House.

And then he goes on to say on August 7, the NDP member from Moose Jaw Wakamow:

. . . I'll put my name on record against this limiting of free speech in the Saskatchewan legislature. And when that day comes and I no longer have a right to sit in this legislature and to speak here, when that day comes, I will at least not go away with the shame of knowing that I was part of a group of men and women who sought to limit those rights in this House.

Well, well, well, Mr. Speaker. That same member, when he won the election on the sham of promising lower taxes, then gets on that side of the House, votes against the very principle that he stood and argued for here day after day after day in 1989. Now that's what the NDP are all about. Whatever it takes to get elected.

And why people want us to stand in our place and fight the Draconian GRIP legislation and fight changes in taxes and fight the changes in rural Saskatchewan and protect industry and encourage investment here in the province, is because they know if there was an election today, the NDP would not get elected. They would not get elected because they'd have to stand up and say, well these are the taxes we're going to levy, here's how we're going to limit free speech, here's how we're going to go against our principles. And all the things that they said in opposition mean absolutely zero. Nothing.

And it doesn't matter what your profession. Whether you're a farmer, whether you're a policeman, or whether you're a preacher, or whatever it is, if you're elected NDP, you can say one thing when you're on one side of the House and do exactly the opposite once you get into power on the basis as the member from Moose Jaw

Wakamow said, on the basis of a sham — elected on something that you knew you would never do but you promised it anyway. Then you get elected and you do the very opposite.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have closure at its worst here when we find that on August 11, 1992, we have introduced into the House closure, closure, and the latest closure when they promised they would never do it when they were in opposition. They're going to limit the speech of members of the Legislative Assembly like they even did to the Finance minister when he was in here, so he couldn't even answer questions because he would have got skewered on his own petard as a result of the fact that the rules said if he got up and sat down, he couldn't get up again. What a mockery. He could only speak once, and we're asking him questions and questions and questions, and he didn't rise once on interim supply, not once, because if he did and then sat down, he couldn't get up again. So my colleagues here and there could ask him questions and questions and questions, and he couldn't speak.

Now what kind of rules are those? What kind of rules? Can anybody over there justify those rules? Would the member from Moose Jaw Wakamow stand in his place tonight in debate and defend those rules? Would he stand and defend those rules, where the Minister of Finance can't even answer questions, as a result of time allocation and closure in interim supply? He brought in all the officials. My colleague from Arm River asked him several questions, and the Minister of Finance can't get up because if he did get up and answer a question or two and sat down, he would not be allowed to get up again. Imagine. People don't even believe it when you're talking to them. They say, for Heaven's sakes, who would bring in rules like that? And they say, well I guess the NDP would.

And here is the notice we got today. Listen to this. The public needs to listen to the rule changes. Here is the notice the opposition got today — time allocation, which is closure at its worst, the worst kinds of closure.

Notwithstanding the rules of the Assembly and following adoption of this motion, when the order is called for resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 87, An Act respecting amendments to Certain Farm Income Insurance Legislation, not more than one sitting day shall be allocated to debate on such order.

That there shall be two sitting days allocated to the consideration of the said Bill in the Committee of the Whole.

One day to talk about it and two days in Committee of the Whole. And the member from Moose Jaw Wakamow, who had this great flowery speech on principles, is going to stand and vote for that. And he said, when he was on this side of the House, he would never, ever, ever be on record sticking up for an administration in the province of Saskatchewan that would do such a thing. He said he wouldn't follow the front benches. He wouldn't follow the front benches. And in a year now, on something where they're at court, they've denied the rights of

farmers, they've changed the rules, we're going to get one day, and two days in committee, and that's it.

And the members have spoken tonight, Mr. Speaker, and they've said, but the opposition shouldn't speak up. They shouldn't speak up. They shouldn't get in the way because all these arrogant things the new government is doing is absolutely necessary. Well what balderdash. What balderdash, Mr. Speaker. Is this on the tradition of Tommy Douglas that recommended this somewhere in his writings? And the tradition of Allan Blakeney? Is this on the tradition of any NDP leader or CCF leader? Where are you getting these ideas to do this? Why are you so afraid of 10 members speaking about fairness and democracy and principles that you stood in your place and hoped to get elected on? What in the world are you afraid of?

Well, Mr. Speaker, if they are so self-righteous, so self-righteous, then I would expect members to stand up and stand up and . . .

(2200)

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order! I want to draw members' attention again to a rule which says that when one member is on his feet others are not to interrupt to the extent that that member can't even speak in this House. And I ask members . . . and some of the members have been interrupting at least a dozen times tonight, and if they continue I'm going to ask them to please leave the Chamber.

Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to draw to the attention . . .

The Speaker: — Order. I just made a statement and the member from Shaunavon is no longer . . . I mean I haven't even sat down and he's already — not from his own seat but someone else's seat — making statements in this House. I'll now ask him to please cease and desist.

Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to add my comments here, and there's a large number of financial promises that were broken by the NDP administration. And they no doubt don't want to hear this, and they don't want to hear about the principles they talk so highly about and then renege on them. But it's more than just the 10 members here that are talking about it, and it's more than just the public. But it is being reported, and it is being published by newspapers, weeklies, dailies all across the province, over and over again.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, and as we know, after a short while of breaking campaign promises in Ontario, the NDP government there is extremely unpopular. They ran third in a by-election and clearly they're going to be a one-term administration. And this NDP administration is following right on the heels of the collapse of political support of the NDP in Ontario.

And listen to some of the editorials, Mr. Speaker, when they talk about keeping campaign promises and living up to expectations, having a plan, creating economic opportunity. And these are mostly in 1992, but they've been in the last three or four months. And I quote here the

Leader-Post, and this is February 4 in an editorial: "NDP's democracy tested":

. . . the real test of the NDP's commitment to democratic reforms comes now that the party is in power.

What the editorial is saying, well let's see them for what they really believe in.

It is in a position to enact changes that will have a direct impact on how much control it will wield over government.

To date, the NDP has no formal process in either caucus or cabinet to discuss issues relating to democracy. The closest is a cabinet committee on ethics that has been working on a package of democratic reforms (reforms) the government plans to introduce in the spring session of the legislature.

There's a void. There's nothing put forward on democratic reforms. No tabling of them, no new ideas. It's right out of hip national. Every day, every day into this Legislative Assembly we find that they're bringing in reforms or changing taxes or changing rules or cut-backs or changing their promises, day after day after day, flip-flop, flip-flop, because they don't have a plan. And it was reported as early as February this year. They don't know what they're doing.

Next editorial, February 6: "NDP playing same old political game". We expected the reform, we expected some new ideas, we expected the honesty, we expected the principles that they talked so highly about over on this side of the House. And I quote an editorial on February 6, *Star-Phoenix*:

In the months leading to last fall's provincial election, Romanow solemnly pledged there would be no bloodbath in the public service. He said competence and ability to do the job, not political affiliation, would be the standard applied to those working in government. The NDP, Romanow said, would not engage in the purge and politicization of the civil service that happened under the Devine government.

His argument was that if the NDP took power and proceeded to root out those labelled as Tory partisans, such a purge would become the accepted approach every time government changed. Romanow was saying the New Democrats were going to be different from the Tories.

Well what happened?

But after three months, the evidence clearly shows the NDP can be just as vengeful when it comes to the civil service. In fact, in some ways, the New Democrats are worse because they are more treacherous and sinister in their methods.

Treacherous and sinister in their methods of purging other

political parties from the public service.

What we have seen is a consistent pattern of behaviour that is completely at odds with what Romanow said before the election.

Well there's the old theme again, Mr. Speaker. They said one thing before the election in their opposition and on the campaign trail, and it's exactly the opposite afterwards. So the editorials have said, you promised you wouldn't practise patronage like this. You wouldn't be treacherous. You wouldn't be sinister in your methods. You would be kind and decent and honourable. And you'd have principle and you'd defend freedom of speech. And today we got another closure notice, over and over and over again.

The NDP will defend this purge by hiding behind the deficit argument and claim it is all part of downsizing and the elimination of redundant positions.

But that is just more of the deception (says the editorial). This is a planned, orchestrated and well-executed political purge that is being handled by a small group within executive council.

And the Premier's estimates aren't even up yet. There's a small group in Executive Council that is involved in this treacherous and sinister move to purge the civil service according to editorials that are going across Saskatchewan.

And the NDP said they'd never do that. They campaigned on the fact that they didn't believe in partisan politics. The public service would be above that and they would not change the rules to limit free speech and they would reduce taxes. Well, Mr. Speaker, no wonder the public is fed up with them in eight months. No wonder they're falling and diving like a rock in public opinion. And no wonder there are motions before this House that show that the NDP are incompetent.

Another one from the *Star-Phoenix*: NDP breaking election vows re the budget. And it starts off: for a guy who didn't make many promises before coming Premier, Roy Romanow's not having much trouble finding ones to break. It's been almost five months since they took power. Instead of making excuses for breaking promises, the New Democrats should get their act together.

Excuses, excuses, excuses. That's it. That's all we hear. It's the federal government's fault. It's opposition's fault. It's the SARM's (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) fault. It's their mother-in-law's fault. It's the rule's fault. Parliamentary democracy isn't fair any more; they had to change that. It's their fault. We shouldn't speak in here. That's our fault.

The editorials are just beating on you something silly. It's been almost five months since they took power. Instead of making excuses for breaking promises, says Dale Eisler, the New Democrats should get their act together. What is the plan? What would you do if you got elected? People ask that. I can remember asking that in the 1991 election

campaign. Well what would they do?

Well they said, well we'll just cut taxes, provide more services, more health, more everything, better manage, and everything will be just sweet as you can imagine, highly principled, no patronage. And the editorials are ripping this administration and ripping the NDP worse now than they did the Bob Rae NDP in Ontario after its first eight months.

And they said they would balance the budget. Well for Heaven's sakes, they had an \$800 million deficit in the last budget, 500 in this one. Their credit rating is falling through the floor — falling through the floor. And they said, oh no, it's easy. We'll just show you how to manage. We won't have a 4 or \$5 million GigaText problem. We'll be fine. We just won't do those things. It'll be fine.

They've given more money . . . they could have hundreds and hundreds of those kinds of projects on just the money they've wasted sitting on their thumb and getting in the way.

Well the editorials continue. Here's one, March 17:

NDP must escape the 1970s

. . . after five months it is becoming obvious just the opposite is true. If anything, the NDP is struggling with the levers of power. (Struggling.) The new government is unsure of where it's going and how it's going to get there.

Says the editorial. So the public is saying, I don't think they know where they're going. I don't think they had a plan and I don't think they know how they're going to get there. They're going to tax and cut and hack and break their promises and change the rules. They're even going to change history, democracy here, that the member from Moose Jaw Wakamow talked so righteously about, that he would never ever change. They've even talked him into voting for all these Draconian measures.

And today, what do we get? The worst closure of all, time allocation that limits debate on a Bill that removes the rights of people to sue the government and defend themselves in court. How ugly. How awful. How despicable. How pathetic for so-called principled people that got elected because they were going to do good.

And they say, well I must do this because there's a deficit. For Heaven's sakes, they campaigned on the deficit. They campaigned on it. They say there's a \$14 billion deficit. So that isn't new; they campaigned on it.

But once they get in power, as the member from Moose Jaw Wakamow said, then they make a sham out of democracy because they do the opposite to what got them elected. Exactly the opposite. And he will live with those words for the rest of his life — the rest of his life. He campaigned on it and they're here in *Hansard* and I believed him when he said it. I believed him when he said it.

An Hon. Member: — Write your own speeches . . .

Mr. Devine: — And the hon. member from Swift Current says, well write your own speeches. I'll tell you, I made this one up. It wasn't very difficult. You just have to listen to what the people said on this side of the House, then give them a little power and watch them blow it all to pieces.

And the editorials say the same thing. And the people are saying the same thing. And on top of it, when you can't get it done, you change the rules when you said you'd never do that.

That's as low as you can go in this building. You can't get your own way with 10 people here, so you change the rules so you can bully everybody. It wasn't enough to get elected. You had to change the rules so you could just walk right over everybody else. What despicable. What in the world is this? The NDP administration . . .

An Hon. Member: — The rules allowed us to change it.

Mr. Devine: — And they're hollering from their seats, Mr. Speaker: the rules allowed us to change it. Well aren't they proud? Aren't they proud that they got a big majority, and they can change the rules so that now that they can even limit this small opposition from speaking up.

Isn't that just classic democrats? Isn't that classic democracy in action? Isn't that so beautiful? Isn't it something you can tell your grandchildren about, that you had this huge majority and you didn't like the opposition so you just ramrodded rule changes so that we couldn't speak, so the Minister of Finance couldn't even stand in his place in interim supply because if he did and spoke and then sat down then he couldn't get up again. What a record. What a record. And this is your claim to fame. This is what being NDP is all about.

Well we could read speeches upon speeches upon speeches about the new-found Democrats that the NDP had here. That the NDP leader spoke here, right from this spot. I mean the room would echo with the kinds of things that they said and what I quoted tonight that they said here. And the hypocrisy of doing the very thing they said they would never do when they got this huge majority.

What are they afraid of? What is it? They're afraid of themselves, Mr. Speaker. They know their own arrogance. They know their own lust for power. They absolutely understand the greed and the need for power that runs through the NDP all the time.

This is as good as it's ever going to get when you're an NDPer. This is it. You finally got the government. And you might make the cabinet benches, and that's as good as it's ever going to be for you. And whatever it takes to get that and even to hang on to it . . . well you're not going to hang on to it. You're not going to hang on to it. Not at all. Not given, not given . . .

An Hon. Member: — Try it.

Mr. Devine: — I'll try it. You just call an election any time you like, and you'll know because you couldn't campaign on this. You wouldn't dare campaign on what you have done in the last eight months. As my hon.

colleague said tonight, you've not only done it for this year, but then you, as a slippery politician, extended it for the next year and the next year.

Huge monopoly profits in the utilities. Little old senior citizens, single parents, working poor — they have to pay the power bills. They have to pay the utility bills, and you stick it right to them, the old Saskatchewan family of Crown corporations.

You didn't learn at all from those Romanow-Blakeney years. You didn't learn at all. You just got the Saskatchewan family of Crown corporations bloated up with monopoly profits so you can do what? Go out and campaign in three or four years and promise them a bunch more. That's what it's all about. And the people know it. It's in the editorials.

(2215)

And you know what, they aren't going to believe you. Because you taxed them and taxed them and taxed them when you promised not to. And they have no choice. They got to pay their telephone bills or you cut them off. They got to pay their power bills or you cut them off. You got to pay your insurance or you don't have any. And then if you don't like them, you can take them to court — take them to court. And then you'll even pass a law so they can't even sue you.

What nice people. What honest, good public servants. New-found, honest Democrats who were going to do all this like magic. And then get elected and be kind to people and kind to the seniors and kind to health care workers and kind to single parents and kind to native people. And you're just jamming it to them. You've never seen such monopoly profits that you've got. And you're sticking the rates up where they have no choice.

What sensitivity. And what a plan. Isn't this amazing? What an economic, industrial plan. I know what we'll do. We have three monopolies. And monopolies are natural monopolies which should be regulated by government so that you don't make monopoly profits. And if you go back and look at our administration, you found very small increases. But what do you do the first time you're in? You're in there and you raise them through the roof. It's pathetic. It's absolutely pathetic that you would pick on low income people who don't have any power. And you stick them with higher and higher utility rates.

Mr. Speaker, here's another editorial. This is from the *Star Phoenix*. Party headquarters virtually empty, virtually empty: seeds of NDP downfall already sown. What the editorial says: while they preach no patronage, they've got the administration just packed with hacks and packed with relatives and packed with NDP supporters. And they've got them on boards, they've got them in government, they've got them in Executive Council. And it's absolutely packed. And they said they'd never do that. They campaigned that they'd never do it.

Since November 1, NDP headquarters has become a forgotten and virtually irrelevant place. It's significance evaporated almost instantly when the New Democrats marched to their landslide victory. This decline of the

party machinery is not unexpected; in fact, it's inevitable. With the NDP, it's inevitable. Because this is it; this is the religion. This is it, whatever it takes to get elected. And then pack the people in there. You can campaign that you'd never do it. But you do it. You do it. And you plot it. And then you stand self-righteously . . . even the Attorney General stood in here and said, we have no patronage. And unbelievably, they even put it in the Speech from the Throne. We filled 500 positions with our own. They have in the Speech from the Throne . . . And the Attorney General stands up and . . . we have no patronage in the NDP administration. Well he has to smile from his face because well he can't say it with a straight face; it's impossible. All the editorials are full of it, saying this is . . . in fact it's the worst. I don't know if he was in here. No patronage, with a nice smile on his face.

Well I'll read it to you with a straight face. This is what they says about your patronage, Mr. Attorney General: in fact in some ways the New Democrats are worse because they are more treacherous and sinister in their methods. That's what the editorials say about your patronage . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well he says, so they're wrong. Well fair enough, the whole attitude over there is, well the public's wrong now. The opposition's wrong. We'll change the rules. Everybody must be wrong because you got elected. If you got elected on the truth, it would be one thing. But if elected on a sham like the member from Moose Jaw Wakamow said, then you've got yourselves a problem.

On June . . . another editorial says . . . and this one is in the *Leader-Post*: consultation is lacking. The NDP administration does not consult. What we see is government policy designed to create economic advantage and a more effective method of raising taxes only creating impediments and increasing the work-load from small business.

No consultation with small business, no consultation with farmers, just raise taxes. Make it more difficult for them. Everybody has to join a union; that's the plan. Whether you're in the oil patch, whether you're in the farming community, or whether you're in construction, everybody join a union. That's what I got elected for. Well you didn't talk an awful lot about that in public before you were elected.

And the editorial goes on: it's a complaint that the Romanow government would be wise to heed. Already there are growing numbers who say the NDP government talks about consultation but doesn't act on its promise. You don't act on your promise even when you promise to listen and consult with people. For a government barely seven months into its mandate, the list is growing of those who already feel left out of what was supposedly going to be a government of reconciliation.

Well you have made an enemy of virtually every group in the province. You have broken contracts so now people know that you can break any contract. You have the business community very upset. You have the resource sector upset. You have farmers suing you. You have towns and villages worried about their life and job opportunities. You've got the SARM and SUMA upset with you. You have the taxpayers upset. You have Indians

and native community upset.

You have people now who have contracts who are worried. Nurses have contracts. Teachers have contracts and you have unilaterally and retroactively broken contracts. So who's next? Treaties could be broken; pensioners are upset; seniors are upset; those that use insulin are mad at you; optometrists are upset; chiropractors are upset. We have petitions in here by the thousands. Can you think of a big bunch of people who are real happy with you?

And your consultation is the key word. Once we get into power we will consult with the optometrists. We will consult with those who have diabetes. We will consult with those who want nursing homes, level 1 and 2, and we will consult with those who are worried about patronage and we'll consult with the farmers. We'll consult with the credit unions. And the credit unions have backhanded you and said, I don't like your legislation, your proposed legislation.

And the editorials pile up and pile up and pile up. And they're credible editorials because they're credible arguments. You don't have a plan. You don't know what you're going to do in agriculture, what you're going to do in economics. One day you're going to do something in uranium; the next day you're not. One day you're going to do something with upgraders; the next day you're not. One day you're going to harmonize; the next day you're not. One day you're going to raise taxes; the next day you're not. One day you're going to rip up highways; the next day you're not.

For Heaven's sakes. And you got elected on all this nice consultation and all this nice plan of people who really had it together. You really had it together.

And then they sit from their seat, Mr. Speaker, and say, but you should not be allowed to speak in this legislature. We'll hush you up. We'll bring in time allocation and closure, because, Mr. Speaker, they don't like to hear the truth. And the truth is they are arrogant, they don't have a plan, they've made serious mistakes, and they have done the opposite to what they campaigned on.

And in terms of principle, all you'll ever have to do the rest of your lives is read what you said when you were on this side of the House and then look at what you did when you're on that side of the House.

The Speaker: — Order. I ask members not to intervene when the member is speaking and . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well that's his privilege. And if the member wants to do the same, all he has to do is get up in his place and I'll recognize him.

Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well I'm sure that when we read their self-righteous quotes from this side of the House when they were here, they find it a little difficult. And they should. If they have conscience at all, they should be embarrassed, they should be ashamed.

Another editorial, and these are just coming day after day. June 16, this is the *Leader-Post* and it's about GRIP:

By now it's apparent the New Democrats have totally botched the entire GRIP issue (says the editorial).

You totally botched it. A major mistake.

An Hon. Member: — What date is that?

Mr. Devine: — June 16, 1992:

They came to power promising to "improve" the insurance plan for farmers and have instead turned it into a holy mess.

So here is an urban editorial that says that the NDP have absolutely botched GRIP and turned the entire farm program into a mess.

While their proposed changes will reduce the cost of GRIP on the provincial treasury, the new plan is arguably less popular with farmers than the one it replaces.

Basically, the government has turned this into a public policy nightmare and deserves the grief that it's getting.

So what it says to the member from Quills is that you deserve this grief. You deserve it. You have botched it. You've made a serious mistake, and you know that. I mean, your members in your front row will tell people on one to one, whoops, we really wrecked on this one. We really messed up. This was a bad mistake.

And they tell people that. They tell them outside in the hall. They tell the media. They tell our members. They tell the public. They really made a mistake on this one. They knew they shouldn't do . . . oh this is a terrible mistake. What are we going to do now? Well I guess we'll have to just do what we can. Maybe they'll take us to court; maybe we won't. And they botched it up so badly, Mr. Speaker, that after this — you know why they did? — they had to change the rules of the House to kind of force it through, so they dug themselves into a hole.

You botched it. You made a serious mistake. We were holding it up, so then you changed these rules despite all your high-minded arguments for not doing this. These principled people, you succumbed to it. You botched it up. You wouldn't admit you made a mistake, so you changed the rules.

Now people are suing you. Now we have legal advice that says that this could end up in a constitutional challenge, and we'll go and we'll ask the Attorney General day after day if he will reference this to the Court of Appeal and to the Supreme Court as we did with the boundaries Act because they have botched it up. Just clean it up and we'll proceed. We'll see this thing go as quickly as possible. And the man will not stand in his place in question period. He won't stand in his place. The Attorney General of Saskatchewan won't stand in his place because they botched up the Bill according to the editorials and the public.

And then they want us not to speak. And they stand in

here arrogantly and say, you should not speak. It's only eight months. Leave us alone, leave us alone, leave us alone, they say.

You have taken away the rights of people before the courts. You've changed the rules. You've changed their contracts. You've changed their lives. You've taxed them. You've broken every campaign promise you can imagine. You've got all of society mad at you. And finally the thing you do is say, but I'm going to cut you off so you can't talk on TV or public . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well you can call an election. The member from Quills says we call an election. I'll tell you, call an election. Go call an election. I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, if any of the members want to stand up and take their record in eight months and go to the campaign trail, they are more than welcome on your record, your record. The NDP administration . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Now we have debate going on between the member from Rosthern and the member from Quill Lakes and I think the member from Shaunavon. A number of people in it. We can't have four or five people debating at the same time. I ask members to please let the member from Estevan have his say.

Mr. Devine: — I have an editorial here, Mr. Speaker, that gives you a bouquet. And I want to just refer to it because as an NDP MLA and candidate I give you credit for pulling the GRIP Bill when we were at this impasse. I didn't agree with all the decisions that you've made, but this editorial says that you did the right thing. And had we been able to proceed and to work through it, because they made such a mess of it, I don't even think that we would have got into the rule changes.

Another editorial goes on to say that the NDP government must be condemned for trying to push through rule changes that limit bell-ringing in the absence of consensus among members of the Rules Committee. That's what the public says. You should be condemned for changing these rules unilaterally.

Such an Act by definition is an attack on parliamentary democratic process. It sounds just like the member from Moose Jaw Wakamow when he spoke here. He said he would never be part of this . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Shame, I guess shame. It's a principle statement that the man made here, a principle statement. And then he's on the other side and the member said well I've said that.

I'm going to say it again and again because I thought he believed . . .

The Speaker: — Order. I do want to remind the . . . I have kept track and the Leader of the Opposition now has referred to . . . repeated the government has changed the rules, I think he's said it now six or seven times. That is repetition. And unless the member can make a new argument on it, I will have to call him to order if he continues with the same repetition.

What's your point of order?

(2230)

Mr. Neudorf: — My point of order is, Mr. Speaker, that in making his remarks, the Leader of the Opposition is emphatically trying to make the point that these rules were changed. He may have made the comment six times, Mr. Speaker, but they have changed the rules eight times, so he still has two to go.

The Speaker: — Order. That is certainly not a point of order, and I think the member from Rosthern knows it.

I simply want to say to the Leader of the Opposition if he continues with the repetition of the same argument I will have to consider asking someone else to speak.

Mr. Devine: — Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I said at the outset, Mr. Speaker, my argument would be is that this motion is all about condemning the government for not living up to their promises. They said one thing prior to the election and they're doing one thing, they're doing something else after the election. They said one thing on this side of the House, and when they get on that side of the House they change their mind, and the public is upset. So we're condemning them in this motion. And the flip-flop which is part of the rule changes, the flip-flop and the hypocrisy of standing here and campaigning on the things that they really believed in and then doing exactly the opposite with this huge majority, is the whole basis for my argument.

So it says here that the NDP government must be condemned for trying to push through these changes. The reason it's completely unacceptable is because the changes are driven by the NDP government's partisan concerns — partisan. And that's the essence of my delivery tonight. They didn't care about the people, didn't care about farmers, or the taxpayers, or the principles they talked about when here. It's just whatever it takes to get elected. And they can even have their members stand here, preachers or not, and say one thing and then go right over there and do the opposite. And he called that a sham, Mr. Speaker. He called that a personal sham. So he has to live with that.

And they may not like to hear it, but every one of them did it. Every one of them did it. They campaigned on it and those that were elected before know what that means in this Legislative Assembly. And then to go over and do that, and cut off our right to talk about it and to debate it, is as low as you can get in this House. What else could you do? What else could you do that would be any lower, any worse, to do the opposite to what you said you believed in and then cut off my right to talk about it? Unbelievable.

Make no mistake, the government is trying to ram through the changes because it wants to pass its legislation to amend the Gross Revenue Insurance Plan (GRIP) for farmers. If there were no GRIP bill, and had the Opposition Tories not already walked out for 18 days, the NDP would feel no urgent need to change these rules.

This is the *Leader-Post*, July 8.

Thus, the motivation to change the rules of the house in the midst of a session and without a consensus of the members, is little more than a

partisan NDP effort. It is an affront to the legislature and any person with (one) ounce of integrity will admit as much.

For Heaven's sakes. Anybody with an ounce of integrity would admit it, and you know it's right. You know this editorial is right on. Your integrity went right out the window when you got this huge majority, and you're afraid of this handful of people that might bring you down. Do you know what you've done? By reacting to us, you've brought yourself down because we got inside you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Devine: — We got inside you. And they cheer for this, Mr. Speaker. The member from Quills cheers because we said we finally opened up the NDP heart to look inside to see what you're really made out of. We opened it up and there's not one ounce of integrity in that heart. None. We opened it up because we said the 10 of us are going to stand and fight for farmers and fight for rights and you said, oh my gosh, no we won't let them do that.

And you went as low as you could. Take away our rights to speak. More of it today. And that's what you're really all about. Frightened of yourselves; frightened of what you know is in here, which is the greed and lust for power. To rule for what? Rule so you can put NDPers or relatives and friends in places instead of somebody else's? Is that what it's all about? Is that what it's all about? The member from Quills knows all about that. We've had lots of fun in this Legislative Assembly going back and forth and back and forth. The list is about that long.

Well, is that it? Is that the whole *raison d'être* of NDP? It isn't about integrity. It isn't about honesty. It isn't about being consistent with the things that you believe. And the editorials are coming more and more and more to say exactly that.

And then on July 11, the next day, Mr. Speaker, a big editorial: the NDP is suffering internal ills. It's finally getting inside. That old cancer of hollowness is getting to the whole party.

And only the loyal are invited to speak and only the loyal can come out for coffee. And only the loyal are going to be there because, oh-oh, we're losing it, boys. They saw it, they opened it up and said look what we are. We are this sham of an administration, sham of a government as described by the member from Moose Jaw Wakamow who said anybody who would do that makes a sham of democracy.

In case you hadn't (this is the quote) in case you hadn't noticed, there's trouble in (NDP) paradise.

These should be the best of times for the Saskatchewan New Democratic Party. But less than nine months after one of the party's largest and, arguably, most impressive . . . (election) victories, the NDP has become a house divided against itself.

Instead of the party basking in the afterglow of

victory and the Romanow government gliding through an extended honeymoon, a siege mentality is taking hold.

A siege mentality is taking hold of an administration that has absolutely let down the public on every promise they made about democracy, about the democratic rules of this Legislative Assembly and about the campaign promises.

Each day it's more apparent that discontent runs deeply in party ranks. It has reached the point that some of the most stalwart NDP supporters are predicting that, unless the Romanow government dramatically changes course, this will be a one-term government.

So in a few short months the editorials are saying, this is a one-term government. You don't know what you're doing; you don't have a plan; you're into treacherous activity; you're taxing people; you're breaking promises; and the whole administration is being called a sham by people in your own party.

And now you're only inviting the loyal to show up. And you won't let us talk about them. Can you believe this? Cutting us off, these 10 individual MLAs, taking on both sides of the House. You are so mighty and so powerful and so righteous that you have to change the rules so that we can't speak.

For Heaven's sake. That's what Saskatchewan . . . That's on the legacy of the CCF? Tommy Douglas would recommend this? And the member from Swift Current says, it really hurts. Hey, it really hurts. Look, he's . . . (inaudible) . . . He doesn't even get the point. The point is there are principles in democracy. There are principles in democracy. He says, no, no; there's no principles.

Well of course there's not if they're not NDP. No darn principles. NDP, no darn . . . They don't believe in any of the things they say. And that's what this motion is about. You're not delivering what you said you would. And you can't just get out of it by saying, well we found a deficit. You campaigned on the deficit. Your leader said it was 14.2 billion all last year.

So what was your plan? Your plan was, we'll do whatever it takes to get elected. Then once we're in, we'll shut them up, we'll change the rules, we'll do all of this stuff.

Well that's why the editorials and the public are beating on you. I mean this is like Bob Rae's administration. He got these kinds of editorials, only it was later. You're picking them up in the first few months.

An Hon. Member: — . . . like Mulroney.

Mr. Devine: — Well he won two back-to-back governments. He just said he's a little bit like the Prime Minister when he won back-to-back governments, majorities. But we'll see, we'll see if this NDP administration is capable of this.

An Hon. Member: — You're a sore loser.

Mr. Devine: — Well the hon. member says I'm a sore loser. I've won three times and lost three times. This isn't about winning and losing. It's about the principles of the individuals that you are running against.

You don't know why and they laugh about that, Mr. Speaker. That's what the NDP talked about when they were on this side of the House. They said, we are people of principle, we would never do one thing and say another, we would never do any of that. And the editorials are saying the opposite.

And now the members both, they stood in their place and voted for the very things that they felt so righteous about. That's not principle. They call it a sham. They call it a sham. And they wouldn't campaign on it.

Let me give you a couple of examples, Mr. Speaker. The NDP promised no new taxes, no new taxes. I've got a list of taxes here. You promised no new taxes.

First of all, there's a great big deficit, but don't let that bother you, the NDP is going to get rid of the PST. Okay? No new taxes. And here they are: increased phone rates, power rates, natural gas rates, and SGI vehicle insurance rates. That's for starters. Increase of 1 per cent in the E&H (education and health) tax — that's a 15 per cent increase. New surtax on personal income tax — 10 per cent. They said — and I've got quotes in here — that they would reduce the cost of fuel to farmers. How about that? That's what they campaigned on: we will not only give you the cost of production, but we will reduce the tax on your gasoline and your fuel. They increased the tax on fuel. Who did that? Who did that? The new NDP administration just days after they got elected.

Increase in tobacco tax; increase of 1 per cent on the corporate income tax; increase of 1 per cent on the corporation capital tax surcharge; increase of 25 per cent on the corporation capital tax rate. That's just to mention a few. And they said, no new taxes. That's why this motion is here. How can they do that? We've never seen anybody do that. We campaigned a couple of elections ago about taking the gas tax off, and we took it off. Tell them about it, and we did.

Promised to stand behind rural Saskatchewan farmers. Here's the second campaign platform. They're going to stand behind rural and Saskatchewan farmers, rural people. Listen to what they've done. And they didn't campaign on this. I don't know; maybe they did in Regina or Saskatoon or Weyburn. Well this is what we've got in this legislature.

They've eliminated the Saskatchewan Pension Plan, and when there's a big uproar, they said, oh we'll kind of bring it back. And they brought back a shell. So they don't match it, they don't guarantee any income, but it's kind of there so you kind of fool some of these seniors. Well I'll tell the seniors tonight, the pension plan is gone. It's not there. They've gutted it. They didn't say they'd do that, they didn't campaign on that, but that's what they've done.

They've froze and eliminated health facilities in rural Saskatchewan. Did they campaign on that? For Heaven's

sakes, no. They were going to build new ones and they were going to help everybody do it.

They cancelled the rural natural gas distribution program, the natural gas distribution program, which is a pretty good program. People get natural gas on their farms, towns, and villages. They cancelled it. They didn't campaign on that, but once they're in power, they've got to cancel that. They didn't bring it in when they were in power, Mr. Speaker. In 1970s and the early '80s, Mr. Speaker, when the NDP were in power, they didn't have a natural gas distribution program. They didn't do it. So we brought it in. Well when we did it, then they had to cancel it.

We didn't have a pension plan when they were in power, so we brought one in — very popular. They cancelled it. Didn't have a new agricultural building when they were in power. All those years . . . You needed it for years, a brand new ag college building. They didn't do it. We did. They condemn it.

We put together new hospitals, expansions in . . . a brand new City Hospital in Saskatoon, expansions in hospitals across the province, in the city of Regina, wings on hospitals, rehabilitation centres like the Wascana Rehab. They didn't do that when they were in power. Now that we're in power, what do they do? They cancel hospitals. They cancel capital projects. They're going to close rural senior citizens' accommodations. And this is for rural people. They gutted the GRIP program. The reduced municipal revenue sharing. And I've got quotes upon quotes upon quotes that the government has to give a bigger share and to help the rural municipalities. This is what the NDP said when they were on this side of the House.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what did they do? They did the opposite. They taxed them more. And they said, oh but it's because there's a deficit. Well you campaigned on the deficit. You all campaigned on the deficit. You said, well there's too big a deficit. Therefore, we're going to have to fix this up. And what did you do? You said, well we'll cut taxes. And we'll manage. And then we'll do all these nice things for people. And you just whistled through your teeth.

(2245)

An Hon. Member: — If you're so sure, let's have a by-election, Grant.

Mr. Devine: — Well let's have a general election. The member from Humboldt wants a general election. We'll be glad to get into it. Let's have a by-election in Humboldt.

The Speaker: — Order, order. Both members are out of order.

An Hon. Member: — He didn't start it. That's not fair.

The Speaker: — Look, I think the Leader of the Opposition can defend himself. He doesn't need your help. I've asked . . . The Leader of the Opposition knows he should direct his questions through the Speaker. And

the member from Humboldt certainly is out of order. And it isn't the first time tonight that he has been warned.

Mr. Devine: — Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The members opposite obviously don't like to hear these comments, and that's why they've changed the rules, so they're going to limit our debate which is indefensible.

What else did they do? User fees for cancer clinic patients from outside Regina and Saskatoon. That really helps rural people. Reduce the number of rural municipalities. That's really going to help a lot of rural people. Reduce the number of rural ridings, the big plan, the rural revenge. I'll tell you what we'll do to those rural people. They voted Tory twice, '82 and '86, and they voted Tory federally. I'll tell you what we'll do; we'll reduce the number of seats out there, reduce the number of ridings. And then when they come to vote, they won't matter because we'll have most of them in the cities. Isn't that a nice plan for people? How do you feel about that? Isn't that kind? Isn't that honest? For what? So you can get in power. So your friends can have a job. Is that it?

The papers already are full of patronage that you're into. They said what else are they about? They don't have an agriculture plan, no economic plan. They haven't balanced the budget. Their credit rating is going through the floor. What in the world did they get elected for? To do this to rural people. Agricultural fees are up.

Cancel Fair Share, and we've got quotes of all kind that said they would never do that. They would never do that. By the members from Humboldt and the NDP leader have said, we will not cancel Fair Share; we'll continue Fair Share. And we'll read the quotes. In fact I might have them here. If he gives me a minute, I'll probably look them up and get them and give them to him.

And the member from Quill said the same things, and the member from Humboldt, oh yes, we'll continue with Fair Share — anything to get elected. And then once they were elected — bang! — it's gone. Bang, it's gone. When they thought there might be some departments going out into their communities, they said, oh that's really good; that's really nice. And then when they get elected, the axe, it's gone, absolutely gone.

And those quotes are absolutely accurate, and they would do anything just to stay in power because that's what they're all about, and that's what the editorials are saying.

They cancelled the feed grain adjustment program. They've cancelled the cash advance program. They've capped the fuel rebate for farmers. They've increased pasture rental fees. And this was to be in defence of rural people. You've cancelled all of these programs, raised their taxes on the basis of we're going to help farmers. So the taxes were changed, Mr. Speaker. The rural programs, they went exactly the opposite.

And here's another promise. The promise was fund increases for health care and education. Now listen to this. The CCF-NDP said that they were going to increase funding for health care. If you look at the budget you don't find it there. User fees on chiropractic and optometric

services.

The Minister of Health was in here the other day. She says she's going to charge the people \$13.6 million more if they've got eye problems or if they go see a chiropractor. Good NDP plan. Boy I'd like to campaign on that one if I was an NDPer in Swift Current or Humboldt or Melfort or some place else. Isn't that nice.

They increased deductible for prescription drugs from 125 to \$380. And when we put it on at 125, the NDP members said over and over again, you've wrecked health care; oh, these people won't be able to handle it. And they cried and they wept and they pulled their hair out here and said how terrible it would be. And then when they get into power it's not 125; they've raised it to \$380. For Heaven's sakes. They removed diabetics from the drug program so people have to pay for insulin.

There's a freeze on all capital projects. Cuts in funding of both education and health care. Proposed the closure of many rural schools, and certainly the member from Arm River is familiar with that. And increased air ambulance fees. That's when they promised that they were going to help in health care. And the lists go on.

And people are writing. Petitions come in and say, that isn't what you promised. You said that you would help people in health care. They promised to listen and this is a good one. They promised to listen.

Number one, they've ignored all the plebiscite results. People voted on three plebiscites in the last election and the NDP administration will not touch any of them and they promised to listen. The public spoke. They had it on a ballot, the first time in Saskatchewan's history. And the NDP just said, nope, I don't see that I've just got one eye, plebiscites don't count. They don't count. Nothing to do with policy.

And we're going to ask people — and we'll be tabling, introducing our legislation here so that people's voices will be heard. And you can change the rules here but we will make sure because every campaign that you go into, they're going to know the things that you said and know the things that you did not do — like listen to the people who passed three plebiscites.

Balanced budget legislation, they said, we want to see it. NDP say, no. Constitutional hearings, they want to see it. No. And the NDP laugh a little and they had the opportunity, harmonization to balance the budget. No.

They cancelled the AECL (Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd.) agreement which had the approval of SUMA, SARM, the Canadian Federation of Labour, the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce, the North Saskatoon Business Association, the Saskatchewan Real Estate board, Synergy today, Students Advocating Nuclear Energy, municipal councils throughout Saskatchewan, Great West Rural Development Corporation. All of these groups, every one of them supported the AECL agreement and every one of them, every one of them supports it today. Every one of them supports it today.

That is SUMA, SARM, the Canadian Federation of

Labour, Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce, the North Saskatoon Business Association the Saskatchewan real estate board, Synergy today, and students and the municipalities all supported the AECL agreement. And the NDP said nope, we're not listening. We're smarter than that. We won't do it.

And out goes hundreds and hundreds and literally thousands of jobs. And it's economic development. And they won't do it. Why? Why won't they do it? What's the justification? What's the justification? They never did come up with justification. Well the party has this kind of position. We don't really . . . you know maybe we got to kind of . . . well we still haven't heard. What is it? Why are they against it? Do you know why they're against the agreement?

Well Grant Devine and the Tories did the agreement and it made a lot . . . We couldn't do that. They got enough credit with agriculture buildings and hospitals and economic development and diversification. We can't give them that one.

Well what is your plan? Where are the airplanes? Where's the diversification? Where's all these other things? We don't see it. Pasta.

Well they promised to listen, and, Mr. Speaker, they didn't listen to farmers. They didn't listen to plebiscite legislation. They didn't listen to the AECL agreement. They didn't listen to SARM or SUMA or chambers of commerce, of boards of trade or anybody else.

Who did they listen to? They listened to themselves. And the group's getting smaller and smaller and smaller and smaller. Now they only invite those loyal people because that's all that's left. Just the loyal ones.

And when we ask them questions here in the House . . . we ask the Attorney General, will you stand on your feet and defend your legislation? Not a word. And that accomplished lawyer, the Minister of Agriculture gets on his feet and he just defends agriculture and the law day after day in here.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they promised to listen but they didn't. They also promised to be open and honest. Can you believe that? Open and honest. And the editorials are full of the treachery and the sham and the dishonesty and the botching. Open and honest government they promise. They've got closed-door commissions, verbal contracts with high-ranking officials — verbal contracts, verbal contracts. And the minister says, where? Verbal contracts aren't worth the paper they're written on and you know it. The member knows it. Verbal contracts, and you can kind of change the verbal contract by a conversation, by a conversation changes a verbal contract, Mr. Speaker, but that's the new line. The new NDP line is, well we haven't got it down on paper yet; it's a verbal contract.

Well for Heaven's sakes, Mr. Speaker, we had farmers shake hands here. We had farmers sign contracts. Mr. Speaker, we had farmers sign contracts, sign contracts. They've had contracts with a handshake, and the NDP administration breaks those contracts, introduces law to do it retroactively, removes any court process.

And what does it do for its own hacks? They get verbal contracts which are honoured. Imagine the hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker, when the NDP campaigners and the NDP hacks get verbal contracts which are honoured by the front bench over there and farmers sign contracts between the provincial government and the federal government . . . And the NDP says no; retroactively we'll have deemed them not to have existed. And what's more you can't sue us. You can't sue us because we'll pass a law here says that we're above the law. And for other NDPers you can have verbal contracts, and that'll be okay. The NDP will honour the verbal contracts, but anybody else that has real, signed ones, paper, we'll just pass a law.

Can you imagine the hypocrisy in that? Mr. Speaker, that's why this motion is here. They promised open and honest government, and they've brought in legislation to wipe out honesty, to wipe out access to the law and to the courts, to break contracts. And if that isn't good enough, then they use their large majority to change the rules here so we can't remind people of that.

And they don't want to sit. We've been in the House — what, 60 days, 70 days? Sixty-four days. We've been in here 120 or longer and we've never had this kind of thing happen. But they have to bring in these rule changes because they don't like us reminding the public that they change contracts. And for themselves, the verbal contract is honoured. And they laugh about that, and that's typical of the arrogance. They laughed at farmers have lost their contracts. Farmers are going to lose millions of dollars, and the NDP ministers sit there and laugh because they give their own people verbal contracts.

They introduce a number of Bills which reduce individual rights — and they said they'd be open and honest — and give sweeping power to the ministers. And if you look at the right . . . I mean, for Heaven's sakes, if you have a bar of soap in your house, the Minister of the Environment could come in, without a warrant, without anything else, and say, well I think there's something in there, we'll just break the doors down. What kind of right . . . They need those kind of powers, I think, in Bills 3, 10, 13, and 14. You could have police investigations; you could go in there without any kind of warrant.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we're certainly getting their attention, aren't we? They're chirping from their seats over there. This is as lively as they've been. And if they would have spoke in their place, maybe we'd have learned something in here — the justification. If the Attorney General would just stand in his place in question period and just address the questions, it would be very, very informative, I'm sure, to the public if we could find out why the Attorney General won't refer the GRIP Bill to the public. And the Attorney General says, well no, we don't need to because he's just trained his new hand-picked Agriculture minister in law here, so he can stand up and he can enlighten us all about the legalities of the GRIP Bill.

They promised . . . here's another promise. Study decentralization on a case-by-case basis. That's what they said, case-by-case basis, and that they would continue. They cancelled Fair Share altogether and they

promised not to. And the MLAs from those communities like Humboldt said we will never do it, but they did it.

They promised to eliminate poverty. Mr. Speaker, they promised to eliminate . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And the member wants a point of order . . . They promised to eliminate poverty. They promised to eliminate . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. Order! The member from Humboldt has been warned several times today and I don't want to warn him again. And I ask him now to stand up and apologize to the House and withdraw those words immediately.

Mr. Upshall: — Mr. Speaker, I stand and apologize for calling the Leader of the Opposition a liar.

The Speaker: — The member from Humboldt, I just want to give him a warning. He has been disregarding the Chair considerably in the last little while and I simply want to tell him that it's 11 o'clock now, but I don't want that kind of behaviour to happen tomorrow.

The Assembly adjourned at 11 p.m.