

The Assembly met at 9 a.m.

Prayers

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

#### Motion for Time Allocation

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, after a few short remarks I intend to move a motion along the following lines:

That, notwithstanding the Rules of the Assembly, and following the adoption of this motion, when the order is called for resuming the adjourned debate on motion for second reading of Bill No. 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 and that at fifteen minutes before the set time of adjournment, unless sooner concluded, the Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings and put every question necessary to dispose of the order; and,

That there shall be two sitting days allocated to the consideration of the said Bill in Committee of the Whole, and that at fifteen minutes before the set time for adjournment on the second sitting day, unless sooner concluded, the Chairman shall put every question necessary to dispose of every section of the Bill not yet passed, and shall report the Bill forthwith to the House, and the question for first and second reading of any amendments shall be put forthwith and decided without amendments or debate; and (Mr. Speaker),

That there shall be two hours allocated to consideration of the motion for third reading of the said Bill, and at the expiration of the two hours, unless sooner concluded, the Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings and put every question necessary to dispose of the order for third reading of the Bill; and,

That consideration of the Bill, pursuant to this motion, be a special order of the assembly to be called immediately after orders of the day.

Mr. Speaker, I want to explain the rationale for putting this motion forward at this time. The people of the province are very much aware of the fact that early in the spring of this year the Minister of Agriculture announced that there would be significant changes to the GRIP (gross revenue insurance program) program in the province of Saskatchewan, the reason being that the existing program was very, very expensive for the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, that the major off-loading of funding for agriculture programs which was being developed and undertaken by the federal government — that is, on the GRIP program, the amount, percentage being paid by taxpayers of Saskatchewan — was horrendous. Hundreds of millions of dollars for farm programs that had up to that point, in terms of western grain stabilization, in terms of

the rebate on fuel, the two-price system for wheat, transportation programs, all off-loaded onto the backs of the taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

That it was a decision made by the new government in Saskatchewan, that to lay that kind of an onus, burden, on the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, that very area that was experiencing very, very significant hardships and recession as a result of world grain prices and as a result of right-wing governments' export enhancement programs that was undermining the price of wheat at the world level, that to expect the taxpayers in the very jurisdiction that were being hit the hardest to pay more and more and more, left the taxpayers and the Government of Saskatchewan no option but to say to the federal government, enough is enough when it comes to off-loading onto the taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

Therefore we announced to the public very clearly that we were going to make major changes to the GRIP program, and we did announce and indicate to the public in this session in every way publicly that we were going to bring a Bill to change GRIP.

We made it public. We were up front with the public, unlike changes made to GRIP in the past that were done very quietly and secretly by the former government, outside of the legislature. We indicated we were going to make the changes. Some people will not like the changes. Some people will like them. That's fair. That's the way legislation should work.

The debate should take place in this House and it has. And for three months now, since we first announced we were going to make changes, we have debated the GRIP legislation in one form or another — on the streets, in the coffee shops, in the press, in question period, in the House. And for three months we have allowed debate. It is now day 65 of the session and we are still debating the Bill.

Now the time comes, Mr. Speaker, when debate ends and filibustering and obstruction starts. It's the opinion of the public, the opinion of many farm groups, the opinion of the members of the government, that we are now no longer in debate but we are into obstruction by a small group of desperate opposition members struggling to maintain political support in rural Saskatchewan.

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

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I maintain this has nothing to do with the best interest of farmers and certainly not the best interest of taxpayers, but has to do with political agendas — political agendas. And I'll tell you why.

We introduced a motion in this House in the first week of this session, calling for \$500 million from the federal government. Now, Mr. Speaker, the public know full well that if those members of the opposition were interested in the taxpayers of Saskatchewan or in the farmers of Saskatchewan, they would have supported that motion and we would have probably had the \$500 million for farmers from the federal government.

But what did they do? Mr. Speaker, every one of them who were in the House at that time stood in their place and voted no to the \$500 million for the farmers of Saskatchewan. That's what they did. The member from Kindersley argued against the \$500 million from the . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. We've only taken seven or eight minutes and already there is too much interruption in debate. I ask members to please not interrupt to the extent that they are.

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to take only a few short minutes and I want to say that I haven't interfered or tried to interfere in the many, many days of debate that the members opposite have launched against the government on Bill 87. And in trying to explain this motion for just a few moments, I really would like the members to pay attention to the position being put by the government, because, I would argue, it is a very rational and logical position being put by the government.

That is the off-loading of federal responsibility for agriculture from the federal government, that is the other taxpayers in the rest of Canada, for an area that is very, very hard hit as a result of world grain prices that come as a result of right-wing governments, policies in the United States, in Europe, and in Canada at the federal level — that is the massive export subsidies on the European grains moving into the world market and the export enhancement program by the American government that has undercut and, in many ways, killed the spirit and the economy of rural Saskatchewan.

Now the federal government has a responsibility to pick up a bigger share of the GRIP program, and that is why we announced that we were going to make changes in order to make the program work better for farmers and to put the burden of onus on the federal government to pick up their share.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say again that there is a point where debate, legitimate debate, becomes obstruction. Now the public will judge whether that was today, whether that was a month ago, or whether in fact we are being too rushed in moving this motion that will put time allocation on Bill 87 that deals with GRIP.

The opinion of the members of government is that we have gone far beyond legitimate debate into bell-ringing — still at every opportunity, even though the House has voted to end bell-ringing. We saw the other day, instead of debating, for about four hours the bells rang on very, very non-consequential motions in order to delay the working of the House.

Mr. Speaker, that is not debate; that is obstruction. We have seen day after day — And we have had many phone calls to our office from people watching the debate — watching members opposite repeat themselves, what they call debate. The people calling us are saying, look, enough is enough, get on with the working of the House; the budget is being held up; we have not had a budget in this province for two years, and it simply isn't right that a band of angry Conservative members who are still

desperate as a result of their massive defeat last October should hold up the workings of the House.

They're more specific than that. They say that in October of '91 we believed we voted the member from Estevan out of the premier's chair in order that the member from Riversdale could carry out the workings of the province. They say it's inappropriate that that member from Estevan still continues to try to run the agenda of this province that for 10 years led us to rack and ruin and \$14 billion in debt.

So today, Mr. Speaker, I say to the members opposite that we introduce a motion that is reasonable, allows for debate. They are still allowed to hoist the Bill for three days which will give them a number of days to continue the debate both here in the Assembly and in the rural community if they so wish.

And I would argue that the members opposite, unlike the 18 days they rang the bells, that this period when they hoist the Bill, if they do and I really expect them to, that they take the time not to golf, as was the case in the last bell-ringing incident, but go out and visit with farmers. Tell them the truth about the Bill. Tell them about the off-loading from your colleagues in Ottawa; tell them about the off-loading, the hundreds of millions of dollars that the federal government has shifted to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan — and ask them their opinion whether that should continue.

I say to the members opposite as well, and in particular the member who yells from his desk, from Thunder Creek, that what we need here is some legitimate debate in this Assembly for the next few days, and then allow the democratic process to take place — that is a vote by elected members of this House — as to whether or not we as legislators will decide Bill 87 should be passed or not.

Now if the members opposite say they don't have enough time, even though there will be time allocation, I know the members in government will allow to stop the clock this evening to allow them further debate if they want — and I make that offer to them very sincerely — or tomorrow night at 11 o'clock or the next night or the next night or the next night. Of if they would like to sit Saturday and Sunday in order to get their point across, we are very willing to be here any time between now and when the Bill finally is passed, in order to allow them time to move amendments and allow them to speak.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say that we were more than a little surprised on Tuesday of this week on private members' day when we offered up several times during the day to allow them to debate GRIP, they refused to go to it. It was based on that premise, that they were not willing to debate GRIP, along with the public pressure, that we introduce the motion today.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the member from Swift Current:

That, notwithstanding the Rules of the Assembly, and following the adoption of this motion, when the order is called for resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill No. 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 and that at fifteen minutes before the set time of adjournment, unless sooner concluded, the Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings and put every question necessary to dispose of the order; and,

That there shall be two sitting days allocated to the consideration of the said Bill in the Committee of the Whole, and that at 15 minutes before the set time of adjournment on the second sitting day, unless sooner concluded, the chairman shall put every question necessary to dispose of every section of the Bill not yet passed, and shall report the Bill forthwith to the House, and the question for first and second reading of any amendments shall be put forthwith and decided without amendments or debate; and,

That there shall be two hours allocated to consideration of the motion for third reading of the said Bill, and at the expiration of two hours, unless sooner concluded, the Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings and put every question necessary to dispose of the order for third reading of the Bill; and,

That consideration of the Bill, pursuant to this motion, be a special order of the Assembly to be called immediately after orders of the day.

I so move.

(0915)

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had some notes I dropped down last night, but after listening to the House Leader's opening remarks, I got two or three hours just from his nightmare that he had last night.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the statements coming from the House Leader this morning, the member from Elphinstone, that that's exactly what has happened to him. He's had a loss of memory. He doesn't know what's happened in the past. He doesn't know that they won an election last fall on a bunch of promises they have broken, and so he must have been dreaming last night when he comes out and saying all these things here.

You know, he said I wonder if we're paying attention. Well, Mr. Speaker, we're paying attention all right. There's no doubt that we're not paying attention. That's why we're here. That's why we're here, fighting for the people of the province of Saskatchewan over this here GRIP Bill and other Bills that has come down from this government with a dictatorship model to it. That's what's happening, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, he talks about the three-day hoist and going out to play golf. Well that's an insult — that's an absolute insult on the members on this side of the House when probably today there's maybe 20 of them out golfing now, maybe 30. It's an absolute insult.

Mr. Speaker, where does the House Leader think that we

got all our information from, that people are against this? On the three-day hoist . . . on the 18 days when we were out there, we were out talking to people. Where do they think that I got that list of all the towns the other night? I got that list and it came from the province of Saskatchewan in 18 days. Goodness! And if this heavy-handed . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order, order. I'm not ridiculing the speaker. I just want to say, look, we just started a few minutes ago. I think we should cut the interruptions to a minimum. We've got a long day ahead of us and I would like to keep everybody in the House that we can.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a long day ahead of me and the more they sit me down to rest my legs will be the better I guess, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, just a few more comments on the House Leader's comments. He's saying, but we have to do time allocation and shut this opposition up. It's not shutting us up — it's shutting the people of Saskatchewan up. It's their voices that we're having heard in this legislature. It's their voices, Mr. Speaker.

But we should be doing this at 120, 130 days, not at the 60 days. That's when you do closure, time allocation, or whatever. This GRIP Bill is one of the most important Bills that ever hit the legislature, and we're not saying that . . . at election time, when they said they were going to do changes in GRIP, that's fine. And they have the right to do that. They have the right.

But they haven't got the right . . . And he says, Mr. Speaker, that they were going to . . . they promised a Bill last fall at election time on GRIP. They didn't promise a Bill. They had no intentions of a Bill of this nature until the farmers started to win their case in court in Melville. And that's when they had to come in with this here retroactivity Bill that makes part of the Bill void, and then takes the right of the courts away. We've heard that so many times from my colleagues.

But you'll have to listen and listen — you'll have to listen to that for four years. And you're going to be. It's going to haunt you for the rest of the eternity for the NDP (New Democratic Party) in this province of Saskatchewan — is having a Bill void, a part of section of a Bill which is important and it's . . . you're just voiding it out of people's life. And then taking the rights away afterwards: you can't go to court and sue. I mean it's never happened. It's never happened.

The member from Elphinstone also said this morning that this off-loading onto Saskatchewan farmers . . . Well I'll tell you, the federal government didn't off-load onto any Saskatchewan farmers. The federal government, Mr. Speaker, over the last eight years since they've been in power, has put about \$14 billion dollars into agriculture — 14 billion. No government in history ever put that kind of money into agriculture. And they're trying to put more in now and this government won't even accept it. They're wanting to put another \$30-some million in, matching with \$23 million. And they wouldn't even accept that.

And he has the nerve, Mr. Speaker, to stand up here and say, well the federal government is trying to off-load onto Saskatchewan. Well that's not correct. The reason for it is . . . They've got one thing in mind, Mr. Speaker. They just say, well we've won an election; we've got to balance that budget. Under all circumstances that budget has to be balanced.

They know, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite, they know that they didn't get a good vote from rural Saskatchewan. And they're saying we're playing politics. They didn't get a good vote from rural Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, they didn't, because we got 130-some thousand votes and most . . . you couldn't count the votes we . . . it would only take you a few minutes to count the votes we got in Regina and Saskatoon. We only got 10,000 votes out of Regina and 10,000 out of Saskatoon.

So, Mr. Speaker, the reason why we're here discussing this here . . . and it's wide-open debate. The member from Elphinstone talked about election, the big mandates. He talked about everything — off-loading, western stabilization — he talked about everything. So I want, Mr. Speaker, to respond to some of these things that he said.

This is not correct, that they got this great big mandate from rural Saskatchewan. We all know they got a mandate, Mr. Speaker, from Saskatchewan. But they didn't get a mandate under the things that they're doing. They broke almost every promise. They got one thing in mind — balance the budget, balance the budget. But on whose backs? On whose backs? Whose backs are they going to balance the budget?

Mr. Speaker, the House Leader, Mr. Speaker, keeps on saying — he's said it for months in this House — that the federal government has reneged on Saskatchewan farmers. And that is absolutely not correct. That is absolutely not correct, Mr. Speaker. And they know it.

They're the ones that's reneging on the farmers in Saskatchewan. It's not just the farmers in Saskatchewan, plus it's everybody in Saskatchewan. It takes in every business man, every senior, everybody. When farmers don't have money and they don't succeed, everybody suffers. This is an agriculture province. And they've forgot about agriculture.

We had promises, promises galore for farmers. The Minister of Agriculture went to a meeting the other night out in Humboldt area and he should ask . . . the House Leader should ask him, Mr. Speaker, what took place out there. Any place he goes, he gets it, and he gets it bad from people that voted for him. He gets her and he gets it good.

The member from Quill Lakes couldn't possibly go out into his riding, Mr. Speaker, couldn't possibly go out into his riding and explain exactly what this is all about, that what we're doing is bringing a GRIP Bill to this House and tell them what it's about and what we are doing and the retroactivity of this Bill. And he couldn't possibly tell them that.

And that's why it's wrong to have closure and time allocation so soon because we need time for him to go out and tell his people. We need time. Where were they in

that 18 days? Why weren't you out telling your people, hey this is what we're going to do. Do you endorse us?

The other night when I was speaking, Mr. Speaker, I challenged the members opposite to get one person in Saskatchewan to phone me — one that will say, I agree with what the government's doing. I haven't had a phone call . . . Yes, I did have a phone call. I had 13 phone calls since that time from the city of Regina only — some of them are farmers that live in Regina — saying, you're right on the money.

But, Mr. Speaker, I haven't had one person . . . and I still challenge them again today. Every member go out and talk to your riding people. I challenge the member from Moose Jaw. I ask him to go to Moose Jaw and talk to his city people that are not farmers, and say, this is the Bill that we're bringing in the House, and we give a few hours . . . that's enough. Just tell them we give them a few hours speaking time, to the opposition, to speak about the GRIP. They talk about this here two months debating Bills. Well this government here is just fooling around with this here Bill. They're determined to get this Bill through.

What are we talking here about this morning, about time allocation for? What . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. We're going to have a lot of interruptions today. And I will tell members that I'm going to warn you two or three times, and if there are continual interruptions, you will find yourself outside of this legislature. I will invoke rule 28.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Why are we here this morning? Why is the first thing on the agenda time allocation on the GRIP Bill when we've already had . . . he does closure all the way along the line, as every time he sees fit. He did closure on the interim supply Bill after we spoke for five hours and 15 minutes. And he just stood up and interrupted the member from Estevan and says, I bring in closure on the interim supply Bill. It's never happened before in history.

Why aren't we on estimates this morning? They want to get the GRIP Bill just rammed through this House. They want to get it done regardless, because they're frightened of the constitution, the reality of it. They know that there's a good chance that it's wrong. But they want to get it done, then turn around and say to the people of Saskatchewan, oh, this opposition is holding up the legislature on a few things like estimates and Bills, other Bills. We got other important estimates.

And he keeps saying we haven't passed. Bring them forth. We need the energy and supply in this House, we need the Minister of Agriculture, we need the Minister of Health. Why don't you bring these important ones forth before you talk about closure and time allocation on anything? Why don't you just set it aside for a while?

Set the GRIP . . . it's the most contentious Bill we've got, we know that, ever in the history of this province. Not the Bill in itself, just the . . . You got a right to bring in a Bill pertaining to your thoughts on GRIP, but not this retroactive part. The mistake, I've got all kinds of quotes here where you've all admitted it. The Minister of

Agriculture has admitted it, the House Leader's admitted it, there was a mistake made. They didn't send the letter out to the farmers.

Why don't you leave that Bill to the last? And then . . . That's the things you do in the closing hours of a legislature is those Bills that are of a controversial matter, you debate those last. We should be on to estimates, Mr. Speaker, instead of me standing here this morning and my colleagues and myself will have to talk here until 11 o'clock tonight. And he suggested, the House Leader, that maybe we could stop the clock at 11 o'clock and then maybe we could sit on Saturday and maybe we could sit on Sunday and we could just have all the time we want. And then we're going . . . we can hoist the Bill for three days.

Is that . . . Why aren't we into business of the House? Why aren't we doing the business of this legislature? Bring the other Bills forward. We got other farm Bills that are very important — far more important than this GRIP Bill. This GRIP Bill is of no importance to farmers at all other than take their livelihood away, nothing at all. It just ruins them. It wrecks their farms. It will. And if the Minister of Economic Development is worrying about economic development in this province, Mr. Speaker, he should first think of economic development on that farm. That's what he wants to think about. Because you have stifled the farmers.

And I was sincere the other night when I went through town after town, and I'm going to go through . . . Later on this morning I'm going to go through some riding by ridings and talk about your own rural ridings where you've misled your own people in those ridings.

We should be getting on with things. We don't need to be sitting here fighting and fighting all summer. It's ridiculous. Sixty days — we're roughly 60 or 65 days or whatever, Mr. Speaker, and that is not the time to get into wrangling. If we got something that we're not getting along about . . . and who could possibly, who could possibly get along when you bring that type of a Bill in and that retroactive piece of legislation? So why didn't they leave that aside and get everything else done?

Why haven't we . . . he wouldn't dare. He knows that he'd be embarrassed. The government knows, Mr. Speaker, that if they bring the Minister of Agriculture in here for estimates and bring the minister responsible for Rural Development and Crop Insurance and the Minister of Health and the Premier on his . . . he's responsible for the whole government, Executive Council. They know they'd be embarrassed.

(0930)

So what they want to do is get the GRIP Bill rammed through, get it done, and then they're going to bring these things on in the closing hours. I've seen them do it before because I was here from 1978, as you were, Mr. Speaker, '82 when all the . . . that's when they'd bring the most important . . . when everybody's got agreement to maybe get out the next night, we'll stop the next night at 10 o'clock or something like that and then we finish at 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning. Everybody's tired and nobody's

paying any attention.

Why can't we have accountability in this government? Why can't we have the Premier, who's responsible for everything you've done in the first nine months of government or whatever it is — it'll soon be a year, it's coming closely, it's next month that the election . . . it'll be a year next month since the election was called — and why can't we have the Premier stand and give us all the time we want for him to answer questions?

Because he must be proud of what he's done. He must be. They must be able to compensate and tell the people of Saskatchewan, we are . . . instead of talking about closure, he should be able to say, well we think we done the right thing by breaking all those promises. He should be able to stand here and say why we went after seniors and after farmers and hit everybody in the province by raising their taxes.

They promised all these things to be gone. He should be standing here, instead of talking about closure today, and the Premier should be absolutely defending his government of everything you done. We need several days at him. And we need some time with the Minister of Agriculture.

But what this government is doing is saying, look at, we are going to just ram this GRIP Bill through. And when that is done, then we're going to go out and say again to the people of the province of Saskatchewan, well these Tories are holding up the whole legislature. They didn't really care about the GRIP. They're just holding it up, period. Look at, the GRIP Bill's passed, and they're still holding it up.

You want to believe we're holding it up. If you think that it's going to be smart to talk about sitting on Saturdays and Sundays, well if you start talking about any longer hours than what you're talking about now, for 10 people to debate in this House, well I can tell you that when you put your ministers up here for estimates, you'll have to go closure on estimates. You'll have to do that too.

**An Hon. Member:** — Why?

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Because we may want to keep . . . 10 people keep one minister on his feet for several days. Then you'll see how you like it. Mr. Speaker, we have a right to have the Minister of Agriculture and the House Leader and the Premier and the Minister of Energy sitting there. We have a right . . . and the Minister of Social Services, I'm a critic of. We have a right to be able to question these people. And we have a right. That is our right, because it's happened for ever.

The House Leader says, why would you do that? We would do that because it's only the minister that answers questions in this House. So naturally we got 10 people asking questions to one minister. You know, he tries to fool the public. But you can only fool the people part of the time, not all of the time. They finally catch on. And they're catching on out there. The people out there in Saskatchewan are absolutely fed up completely with this government now and their actions — their actions today, their actions that they've done this whole legislature, and

the actions that they've done since they have won government. They didn't have, I don't think, a month or two and they were in trouble by breaking their promises.

And they have to stand in this House and defend it. And we want you to defend it. Stand up and tell us where we're wrong. Tell us that it's all right to . . . what you've done in health care and what you've done in the various departments, in Agriculture. Tell us why. But you won't let us at them — you won't let us at them. They're just hanging on here, waiting for the 70 days to be done. And they know that Regina's MLAs (Member of the Legislative Assembly) that get a free ride here for 90 bucks a day, they won't be able to get it any more and they want this House closed on 70 days.

Well I can tell you, since I've sat here — this is my 15th session — very seldom this House has ever been even close to done in 70 days. It just doesn't happen. It's always, most of the time it's always been running, in my 15 years, from 90 to 130 days.

Now why are we talking about . . . They got the media so upset that the media's wondering why we're holding the House up all summer. Well any time, Mr. Speaker, that a government brings a House in in the end of April and wonder why we're not done in May and June, go ask the government. Don't go ask the opposition, why are you holding things up? Don't ask us, I say to the media. Don't ask us that we have to sit here and discuss and debate on closure half the time. We're debating closure. We don't need closure; we need co-operation.

Did this government, Mr. Speaker, ever think of co-operation? All we need is co-operation. All we need is the House leaders and the whips to sit down and we could have discussed it at any time, and we could have had co-operation. We're willing to co-operate, but we're not willing to give in on something that we're absolutely got principles for. So don't try to say you're just going to shove it down our throat and we're going to co-operate. Co-operation means co-operation on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, this is not . . . this whole debate, this whole legislature is not supposed to be . . . we're not supposed to be here discussing what's politically right for the NDP government, and we're not supposed to be here what's politically right for the Conservatives, opposition. We're here on behalf of the people of the province of Saskatchewan. And they can sit in their seats and they can grin and they can chuckle and they can smile, but I'll tell you, I'll go back again.

And I ask the members that are grinning over there to go and ask their constituents: is this right and is it proper for us to do this, bring this kind of a Bill forth that it probably is unconstitutional in the manner that we're doing, and then say you got no right to take it to court? Go ask them that. Just go ask your constituents. Because I can't find anybody that'll say that's right.

I got the president of a . . . NDP constituent that has made the statement that it is wrong, but I'm still NDP. But it's wrong what they're doing. We've got some family of the Reg Gross's that was in the elevator just the other day. In

fact, I believe it was his father. Reg Gross's father. And he couldn't believe . . . He said, I can't believe what we've done. I've been an NDP, NDP all my life. And he says, now this here Premier, he's crazy, and this here Minister of Agriculture . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order. I think the member realizes that that kind of language certainly is not going to help in order to keep the decorum and order of this House. And I just caution him to use some other words in order to express his ideas in this Assembly.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I respect your ruling. But it's very difficult when I'm repeating what somebody else has said. I'm repeating what somebody else has said, not what I've said. I didn't say that, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** — The member knows full well that you can't quote everything that somebody else has said and use it in this legislature and then legitimize it. So I ask the member to please use language that helps with the order and the decorum in this House.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Then we'll just say that Reg Gross's father was not happy with the Premier. He was not happy with his actions. And that should be permissible. And he's very, very angry with the Minister of Agriculture. Now that happened publicly right in the constituency of Morse.

And so don't tell us, Mr. Speaker, don't let these people here tell us and sit here and look at us that everything's fine. Our constituents believe exactly what we're doing is right. They know what you're doing is wrong.

I challenge the member from Swift Current, when he goes home this weekend, when he's in church on Sunday morning to ask his people when he comes out of church, do you believe what we're doing? When he goes to the smorgasbord or whatever, maybe he goes to that Chinese restaurant in Swift Current, just say to them: I'd like to talk to you, my friend; I'd just like to say to you, this is what we're doing in this legislature; and I want to know, I want to get your feeling, do you back me on what we're doing? Mr. Speaker, I want him to go and ask the people and not just take it for granted that's what they're going to say.

Because I stayed in Swift Current on Monday night. And I can tell you what . . . if he goes and talks to the people that work at the desk at the Imperial 400 in Swift Current that isn't what he's going to find out. He needs to ask them what the people that come in there for coffee and to the cafe all day long say.

That's what he needs to do, Mr. Speaker. Ask them their opinion if this is right what we're doing here this morning, if this is right. But you've got to explain it all. Mr. Speaker, they have to explain the whole, entire situation.

You just don't go out there and say, well we had our right because we promised at election time to change the GRIP Bill. They had the right to do that. And all they'll say is, well we're just changing the '91 to '92 GRIP and we said we would. But it's in the manner in which they done it. That's what they have to tell their constituents.

That's why we're here debating this GRIP Bill. That's why we will not back off. And I tell the House Leader, Mr. Speaker, that he's going to have to go closure on the closure, because we are not going to quit talking on this motion this morning until he goes closure on that. He'll have to do closure on closure. And that's the only way he's going to keep us up, because the 10 of us can go on for days and days and days and days until you won't get your summer holiday that you so badly want.

Even though we want to go home and harvest, we think more . . . we want to go home and harvest, Mr. Speaker. My family need me at home, but I believe in the people of the province of Saskatchewan and my constituents want me to never give up on this GRIP Bill.

And when you explain to the people, well the non-farmer, you'll explain to them about the '91 versus '92 GRIP and they'll say: I could care less. Then you tell them of the manner of what this . . . how this is happening, that they're having a portion of the Bill just as if it had never been proclaimed. That's what they're doing, Mr. Speaker. They're just taking part of that Bill and just saying, that's how it's been analysed by the experts, the legal experts. That it's just that . . . part of that Bill, we're going to take it out of your life, and it never happened. And then if you don't agree, we've also got a part in the Bill that says you can't take us to court any more.

Now if anybody possibly was . . . Everybody is elected individually in here and you have some good merits about you or you couldn't get here. Somebody has to have something good about them. They got to like you. So for goodness sakes, be honest with your people. Go back and you tell them, will you back me on what I'm doing?

I can tell you how I know whether I'm backed or not, because I have 14 phone calls that I make . . . My caucus has known this for years — I can do the quickest poll and the best poll of any place in Canada. Gallup couldn't touch the poll that I do. Because I phone 14 people on my inner executive. They have four phone calls to make. They phone four others. And so that . . . my 26 towns, I can get back in about 48 hours what these people think about any subject whatsoever.

And if they think it doesn't work, then tell me why I've been re-elected for four times. Tell me why I've been re-elected. Because I've been informing the people of Arm River. I've been informing them and informing them.

But I can tell the members that just came back here for the second time now — most of the members here are on their second term; there's a lot of members only once — and my advice is to be honest with the people. And if your people don't agree with this type of legislation, for goodness sakes stand up and say so.

Because I was in government for nine and half years and many times I wasn't agreeable of something we were doing and I told my people . . . I asked my people, what do you think? And they said, we are against. And I would come in and say so. I've stood right in this House and I've said so. And I'll do it any time. I'll do it any time about anything in government. I'll be honest with the people.

I've always done it.

And when you people out there that don't believe this, then put it to practice and you'll find out. Just don't keep in touch with your people, don't ask them their opinion, and see if you'll return. You wait till this gets . . . I'll say that the 650,000 voters in the province of Saskatchewan, that my statement is likely that it would be a miracle if 50 to 100,000 . . . well I don't think there'd be that many; only a small, small portion really know what's happening here in this legislature.

No matter when I go home . . . I had a phone call from Hanley yesterday for somebody that's on my executive. He has a problem with Crop Insurance. Nothing to do with last year's GRIP; it's about getting into this year's GRIP. They made a mistake with his papers and whatnot. And he said, is the GRIP Bill passed yet? And so I said, no. He said, I just want to know. He called me my name. He said, I just want to know, Mr. Muirhead, what is the hold-up? I mean, why are you fighting it?

And so I explained to him. He says, well that's sure something I never heard before. I didn't know anything about that. I'm not much for listening to the television. I keep a lot of cattle. I'm out in the evenings . . . (inaudible) . . . and I didn't know.

But I'll tell you, he was not a happy camper after I explained to him what was going on. And so that man, he said, I've got about 30-some relatives in the Hanley area and we're having a family picnic this Sunday, so there's 38 more people going to hear about it. So it goes on and on. And you give this a few more months or a year, whatever, and unless you people stand up in your own ridings and be counted, be counted, you are going to fall. There is no other way. You must do it. And if you think city members are going to be excluded from this, forget it. Because there's people right on the streets of Regina here that do not know what this underhanded, dictatorship-type thing you're doing here. I mean it is unreal what you're doing.

(0945)

We talk about what co-operation, Mr. Speaker, would do. I've seen it back . . . This is not the same type of a government that I sat with in 1978-82. We had some . . . I can remember our House leaders and the different agendas and whatnot, different Bills that come forth, and had some . . . a lot of dissension, but I never seen it once it didn't get worked out. I never seen it once that we needed extended hours that there wasn't agreement. You just don't up and do it the way you are and expect co-operation.

I ask the people, I ask the back-benchers to go after your House Leader and your front row and say, if you don't want to sit here all summer then for goodness sakes bring the legislature in in February or January and you'll get out in your 70, 80, 100 days. That's what it takes. It takes that long . . . It takes that long to do legislation in this province. And if you think differently, well you're being misinformed by your front row. You new members are being misinformed by your front row. Because you cannot do the business of this legislature and the amount

of Bills and all these dictatorship-type Bills, you can't expect to get it done in 60 days. It is impossible. It is impossible, Mr. Speaker, to do it in a right and proper manner.

And I don't think, Mr. Speaker that . . . I am sure, talking to back-bencher after back-bencher — nice people — in conversations, I am certain when we get into conversation, they really are being misinformed, not told in their caucus what this is all about. I don't think they understand. If you're a non-farmer, you don't get to understand the GRIP. I remember about two months ago, when we first started talking about GRIP, when nobody could see anything wrong with what they were doing.

Co-operation, if we would just learn to co-operate. I don't know of any more individual that would want to co-operate more than my people around me. We want to co-operate. But we're not going to be dictated to. We're not going to be dictated to. If you've got a Bill that you want to bring forth to this House and it's done rightfully and honourably and you're not going to do any crazy legislation in it — Mr. Speaker, if you're going to do it right and proper — well then you'll get co-operation because you have your right to put those Bills forward. But you haven't got your right to bring an unconstitutional Bill into this legislature. You have no rights to do that.

Those rights . . . We are fighting on behalf and talking on behalf of the people of the province of Saskatchewan. And we are right when we're saying that we're speaking on their behalf and we're going to take it right to the last moment, and then we hope that what happens, and for the sake of not the Progressive Conservatives but for the people of the province Saskatchewan, that this Bill will be stopped either here — it'll get public hearings . . . I'm still hoping, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill will get public hearings yet. Because that's the way it should be.

That's what happened in Ontario when they had this same bell-ringing limits that we got here, 30 minutes to an hour, and I'm hoping rather than closure . . . closure is all we can think about here. It's closure, closure, time allocation, and closure. It's not right.

Why can't we do like NDP Ontario? The people came in and voiced their opinions at hearings right in the legislature and then they put it out for 30-day hearings on an environment Bill that was important to the people of the province of Ontario. Really a contentious Bill. And so everybody co-operated.

And when that Bill was finished it took six months and it made a lot of unhappy people that were . . . the government were trying to force that through, but they gave in to the wishes of the people of the province of Ontario and took amendments from the public through the oppositions, and accepted some . . . put some amendments in themselves from the public and the Bill got passed in six months.

Now if anybody tells me that this is right that we had the Minister of Justice stand here in question period yesterday . . . He stood here and he very, very clearly said that when he was asked the constitutionality of this Bill and what the courts are going to do about, he said, I don't know; I don't

know.

When your Minister of Justice doesn't know, doesn't that put the province in a terrible, terrible position? It puts us in one of the worst positions that any government's ever been in the history, Mr. Speaker . . . and any province or state in North America because your Minister of Justice says I don't know about the constitutionality of this Bill.

Now that is terrible, terrible. It is wrong that when he said that — he says, I don't know, I don't know what would happen — he said that. Look at *Hansard*. He said, I don't know.

He didn't stand to his feet, Mr. Speaker. He did not stand to his feet and say, I have sat down with the people that drafted this Bill, I have sit down with the Minister of Agriculture, I have sit with all the people that was involved in drafting this Bill, and they have told me that it is no problem whatsoever. I guarantee you that this Bill is constitutional, that it'll get by the Charter of Rights, that there's no problem.

But he couldn't do that. He didn't, because he's an honourable man and he would not mislead this here House by saying something that he couldn't back up. So the Minister of Justice can't back it up. The rest of us aren't lawyers. There's no lawyers over here. I don't know of a lawyer in this House right at this moment. But if there is, for goodness sakes, get on the phone like I've been doing. I have phoned several firms that I know, people that I know well, our own personal, family lawyers. I have phoned them and I said, I need to have to know what you think about this.

I have phoned several firms in Saskatoon and I've had several get back to me. And they said, well, we're not constitutional lawyers, but what we feel is what the courts should decide. I can't make . . . for their sake — that's their law firms and business — I'm not going to make them put their names public. But I know that if the members opposite would do the same thing . . . phone their lawyers, get advice, and see what you're doing is right.

It's not right. It's absolutely wrong. Freedom is being destroyed in this province of Saskatchewan — absolutely being destroyed. If this Bill passes, what can follow? All we'll know is closure, closure, closure. Because when you do it the first time, it hurts anybody. We had to do it after 120 days. That's what we had to do on the energy Bill.

And it bothered me, it bothered . . . but there was hours and hours and hours given. All the opportunity to talk about the energy Bill. Did the energy Bill go ahead? No it didn't. People's voices were heard.

Why don't you do that? Let the people of Saskatchewan decide. You can't keep on destroying the rights of the individual. And that's what you're doing. You are destroying the rights of the individual, of their voices being heard in this legislature.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I challenge these people to go out and talk to their people and see whether I'm right or not. And if they can come back with a list of people that . . .



names, legitimate names that said we are backing you, well then, they got some support.

But I went through a terrible pile of towns the other night — and I didn't get half through them — that we've heard from. I've heard from every town in my riding, either by letters or phone calls, and why should my riding be different than any other riding? And it isn't different. They're all the same.

Something's happening in this province of Saskatchewan that . . . it bothers me, Mr. Speaker. It really bothers me. Because how far is this going to go? If this government doesn't do something for farmers and something for business men out there to stop these foreclosures and bankruptcies day after day after day . . . They don't understand. They haven't got involved like I have and many other people — I know some has — to look at why is there so many suicides and people taking strokes and dying because of shocks of losing their business.

And they come out from eastern Canada or from Europe and they homesteaded here in the early days, Mr. Speaker, and they thought they were in a land of freedom and they thought they could work hard and do well, and they're seeing their whole life taken away from them. They see that they're being . . . they worked hard and they're losing family homes.

This government must take heed. They must take heed. They're going to be responsible. When things go wrong, they'll be responsible. This province of Saskatchewan — and I don't like to talk doom and gloom but all you have to do is be in touch with people and it's a doom and gloom out there in rural Saskatchewan. I've never seen anything like it.

I thought it was bad while we were in government for nine years, how things were going downhill in rural Saskatchewan. I'm saying rural Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, I'm talking about all Saskatchewan. I'm talking about every business there is in this province of Saskatchewan — nearly everyone ties in with rural Saskatchewan. We're all rural.

A citizen listening to me here this morning in the city of Regina is rural. You may live in the city, but when the rural people don't survive and the towns don't survive, they lose their farms, they move into the city and they take your jobs away.

I mean people last summer, Mr. Speaker, would think this was a pretty terrible thing talking about all these closure motions we have in here now, but they thought it was a tragedy because some of them, to hold on to a job, had to move out into rural Saskatchewan on Fair Share Saskatchewan; had to move out to be able to try and save some of the towns and spread government jobs throughout the province.

But now, maybe the people that opposed it, maybe the ones that opposed it should stop and think about the population in the towns going down, down, and down, and then they lose their farm and they come in and they lose their job to a farmer. Maybe he's well educated. Maybe he's been a teacher at one time and he takes a

teaching job. Maybe he's an accountant and then he went farming. He loses out; he comes back in.

It's got to . . . the whole situation is terrible. We talk about over in Europe, we talk about the Berlin Wall. And I'm going to relate the Berlin Wall today to what's happening right here with this closure motion in Saskatchewan. That Berlin Wall was put up there in the country of Germany to . . . and it separated the Russians from the German people, the free enterprise from the socialists. And it sat there for nearly 40 years. And they took it down because the people had enough of dictatorship. They had enough, absolutely enough.

The good people . . . I was talking to the member from Morse. He's going over to Russia with Campus Crusade in September. I have a friend in EYM (Expanded Youth Ministries) that's going over to Russia. You couldn't do that a few years ago.

The Berlin Wall came down in Europe and they're trying to get rid of that socialist dictatorship but I'm afraid that it's being built in Saskatchewan. There's been a wall built between the government and the people of the province of Saskatchewan. It's happening out there. And that's what people feel. I know that they must be getting the same phone calls we're getting and you're not listening.

If the members here have to be getting the call — because I'd never get a call from anyone outside my riding and most the ones inside — are you letting your MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly) know? Are you telling them what you think about all the different things this government's done? Are you informing them? Are you telling them what's happening? Are you telling them that every . . . you broke every election promise? That this here Premier, instead of being in here defending closure, he's still out there defending what happened at the last election. But he can't defend that he hasn't lived up to one election promise, except I'll give him the benefit of the doubt that maybe he's trying to balance the budget.

But he promised, he promised faithfully that there'll be no increase in taxes. He promised he was going to do more for farmers than ever before. The Minister of Agriculture is trying to tell that to people throughout Saskatchewan. He goes around there: we as a government are going to do more for farmers than any government's ever done before. But, Mr. Speaker, they're not believing them.

They're not believing them when they said last fall, Mr. Speaker, that there would be a moratorium put on farm land. There's been like several hundreds of foreclosure notices gone out since last fall. They've broken that promise. We're sitting here . . . They're trying to get the farmers. It's going to cost him probably a few hundreds of thousands of dollars. It's going to cost maybe up to half . . . if this crop . . . there's a lot of areas of this province, Mr. Speaker, that needs rainfall.

And perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it could be up to half a billion dollars that this change in GRIP . . . and even could be more. Because last year if the crop, under the '91 GRIP, it would have cost close to 3 billion if we had had a 1988 crop. And by fortunate we were blessed . . . by good fortune we were blessed with a good crop, one of the best

in the history of this province. And still there was a lot of money to pay out to farmers. Farmers had a good crop and still got some money back.

But under this new GRIP Bill, why we're here . . . and they wonder why we're discussing closure, why we're discussing time allocation. Why wouldn't we? Because we're fighting for farmers out there that their crops have slipped away. Their crops have slipped away on them and they can see themselves into a disaster with the 1992 GRIP Bill. But the big disaster, as I said before, is when you take them on to the type of Bill and how they're doing it.

(1000)

Mr. Speaker, I have some quotes here that I'd like to just bring to the attention. It's a headline in the *Leader-Post*, July 30, which is not that long ago. "Gov't getting prepared for another GRIP battle." Why do we want to prepare for GRIP battles? Why do we have to battle one another? Why the GRIP battles? Why don't we sit down and listen to logic, listen to your Minister of Justice, and discuss this thing and let it go out to public hearings? Why can't this go out to public hearings? Because we're saying it right here.

I'm not going to read the whole thing. This is a quote:

"We're not about to jam it at the Opposition," government house leader Dwain Lingenfelter said. "We'll give them plenty and ample time to debate the bill."

So first reading of the Bill came in, Mr. Speaker, and this is a quote right from the House Leader: We'll give them ample and plenty time.

So what did we have? The motion come in to introduce the Bill, and the member from Morse started to speak at quarter after 11 on a Friday and at 1 o'clock — that's an hour and three-quarters . . . We come in Monday — closure. Now that is not right. That's not treating the people across the province of Saskatchewan in this opposition in a right and proper manner.

They don't seem to understand that when we were sworn in as MLAs, that our duty is to see that things are done in a right and proper manner in this legislature. And we'd be wrong, we'd be absolutely wrong if we up and just said: well okay, you can do closure and we won't say a word about it. We naturally had to debate that.

I'd like, Mr. Speaker, for the members opposite to go through their *Hansards* and see how much time of this House has been wasted debating whether we debate or not. You know, for goodness sakes, count up the hours. And don't blame us. Because don't jam us; if you're going to jam us and not co-operate, we're going to jam you back. Because we want you people to take it serious.

When this gets to the Committee of the Whole, we're going to be asking that Minister of Agriculture to go out for public hearings, that he couldn't possibly say no. Nobody could say no to a public hearing. It would be impossible, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Agriculture, when we ask

in Committee of the Whole or whatever. He should be doing it now.

He should stand up, make a ministerial statement this afternoon and say: I want to announce that there's a lot of unhappiness out there pertaining to the GRIP Bill. And I'm going to say that we're going to pull it . . . we're going to momentarily pull this here GRIP Bill for a few weeks, and we're going to hold some public hearings throughout Saskatchewan. And we're going to tell them exactly, we're going to tell them exactly, Mr. Speaker, exactly what the Bill is all about and see if you'll back us. They're going to say exactly the whole thing about closure and about the type of Bill it is. And we're going to ask you, do you back us on what we're doing.

So naturally they know they're doing what's right. They think they're right. But there's nothing wrong with public hearings. They did it in Ontario. And they'll do it . . . I never hear any problem any place in Canada with this bell-ringing episode at all. There's nothing wrong with the 30-minute bell-ringing and get on with the work of the House and then let the Bill or subject matter go out to the people. Let the people decide.

Another quote here, headline, this is August 6, this isn't very . . . just a short time ago, Mr. Speaker: "Farm-aid bill fight continues". That's all people are reading in the paper: "Farm-aid bill fight continues". So the people reading these here articles in the paper, most people glance through the paper, they see: "Gov't getting prepared for another GRIP battle"; "Farm-aid bill fight continues"; "GRIP bill called illegal". I mean they're just saying . . . people out there probably read the headline and dump the thing in the garbage. Because before I was an MLA, I never paid much attention to what went on in here unless somebody come and told me.

And all people know, that it's just a fight over GRIP. They don't know the details. So I know for sure that there isn't a doubt about it, that in this here province of Saskatchewan where a government that says they're democratic, that they believe in the rights of the people, that we'll take this out for hearings throughout the province of Saskatchewan. I know they'll do it.

Here's another quote here:

Although government House Leader Dwain Lingenfelter said he'd give the PCs "a lengthy period of time" to debate the bill, he left the door open for another closure motion if the Tories take too long.

Well, you know, before we even debate it . . . and he's saying, if they take too long I'll close out on them. Well did he ever stop and think that co-operation, that maybe if you just had have said nothing about closure and said I'm going to give them plenty of time, that we might have been reasonable, that we might have put our points across? We can only speak so long. You know, we're only 10 of us and 55 of you can't play out 10 people. You can only . . . you can outspoke us, surely to goodness.

Surely to goodness, you can get to your feet . . . Last night I seen people get to their feet here on the debate and some

of them were up two minutes and they couldn't even stay on the subject matter, and two or three minutes is all they could speak. They didn't even know how to do what we're doing, to stay on the subject matter of that debate we were on last night. They don't know how to do it. They get up to try, but try doing it like we're doing it for hours. Try doing it. Try doing it and stay on the subject matter.

We're doing it because the Speaker stopped us when we're not doing it right. And you people are not doing it. Get up on your feet and debate. I'd like to hear you today, instead of us talking till 11 o'clock tonight on this here closure — because we're going to go till 11 o'clock tonight, we're going to go all day tomorrow, we're going to go every day until there's closure. Because the only way we're going to get this here stopped, there has to be closure some time this morning or this afternoon so we can get stopped tomorrow. Otherwise we'd go all day.

So, Mr. Speaker, I challenge them to get up and defend what they're doing. Challenge them to get up, and get up and defend what you're doing and then send what you're saying . . . And I challenge them, take that *Hansard*, like I do, send *Hansards* out. I used to send out . . . we all can send 10 *Hansards* with no charge to your constituency. I send out as many *Hansards* as I possibly can. I take photocopies and I send out.

So I challenge them, when they get up and speak, this is something you can do in your own office. You can get up and put your remarks in words in this legislature. And then when that *Hansard* gets out, take that page . . . and I don't suppose they could speak a page, but if they did get a whole page in, photocopy it and send it out to 5,000 homes — that's approximately how many homes in their riding — and say, do you agree with what we're doing? Do you agree with what the stand the government . . . Or do you . . . do I, as your MLA, take a different stand on behalf of you as the constituents? Do I take a different stand? That's what you have to do.

Another heading here. "GRIP bill called illegal". Mr. Speaker:

A Saskatoon lawyer believes the bill amending the Gross Revenue Insurance Plan is on very shaky constitutional ground and thinks it will be challenged in court.

Well, and the name is right here. I'm not going to read them out. But it's already been made public, the law firm. Well I don't know why they're not nervous about it. The Minister of Justice yesterday or three days in a row was sure nervous enough about it. He let the Minister of Agriculture answer, and then finally the Minister of Justice says to himself, well that Minister of Agriculture is destroying me so I'll get up and I will answer yesterday.

So he get up, Mr. Speaker, and he said, I don't know. I don't know. I don't know what's going to happen in the courts. I don't know. And of course he doesn't know. And if the Minister of Justice doesn't know, why don't we just pass this Bill? Instead of talking here about foreclosure and time allocation for hours, why don't we just have, Mr. Speaker, why don't we have the House Leader get together with our House Leader and our whips and say,

well are you in favour of passing the Bill? And we'll refer it to the courts.

I mean it's so simple, so easy. Because you're right. You say you're right. If you say you're right, do it. You got no problem with it.

**An Hon. Member:** — Sit down and we'll do it.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Speaker, I guess I'll have to sit down because we got a commitment from the House Leader that they'll do it, that we'll let the Bill pass, we'll let the Bill pass and we'll send it right to the courts.

So when I'm through speaking . . . I don't know how to do this because how can I sit down and lose my . . . Is there any way, Mr. Speaker, that I can sit down and get that commitment from him and then get back up after he makes that commitment? Because it would be all over. Well I say . . . And the best way to do this, Mr. Speaker, is the House Leader come and talk to our Deputy House Leader here and make that deal and then she's all over. She's all over.

We pass the GRIP Bill in a matter of hours. We can have it done tonight, with the rider on it. It's been said by the House Leader, we'll do it. So I must keep my place and speak while they do that. So, Mr. Speaker, as I go on with my remarks, I ask the House leaders to get together now and put that down in writing and we got the problem solved.

So I want all viewers to realize what the House Leader, the member from Elphinstone, just said: We'll do it. And what they're going to do — and I'm so pleased that on an hour and 10 minutes I've been able to accomplish that this morning — that our House Leader has stated that if we let the GRIP Bill through today, we're all finished tonight. We can have it done, Royal Assent, everything, and then we have agreement that it goes, that it doesn't get — no, sorry — it wouldn't get proclaimed until it goes to the court.

That naturally would be our agreement — it has to go straight to the court, to the supreme court of Saskatchewan. So they can get together and work that out. And in the meantime, I'm happy about that. I'm happy that the House Leader has finally agreed. And I thank him for that co-operation, Mr. Speaker.

**An Hon. Member:** — It's good you're happy, Gerry. That's the important thing.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Well it's good that a member that's been here that long, the member from Elphinstone, is a . . . He was here in 1978 when I came in, and I've had a lot to do with him and I've had a lot of battles with him. But I seen him in 1978 to '82 . . . I've seen them give in before. Now they've done it again; they've finally done it. He says, we'll do that. So I'm happy that the . . . I hope the media's picked that up because maybe that can hit the noon news, that the GRIP Bill is now settled.

It's great news, Mr. Speaker, for the people of the province of Saskatchewan that now their voice has got heard. That we're going to have the GRIP Bill passed it its

entirety and then it's going to go to the court to see if it's constitutional or not. That's just great news for the people of Saskatchewan. And I know that the media will have their TVs and their sets on back there and that'll hit the noon news. And so we're accomplishing something this morning, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have . . . I want to go through a few ridings and just talk about the members from a few ridings. I'm going to start with the member from Redberry. He's from completely a rural riding. And I'm going to ask, Mr. Speaker, and challenge the member from Redberry to go out this weekend, just this weekend — this GRIP Bill will probably be passed tonight, but if something happens that it doesn't, it doesn't make any difference whether it does or not — ask the people in his riding, the member from Redberry, ask the people in his riding: do you agree with what we're doing in this legislature? Do you agree? And take out your remarks when he stands to speak, when this individual, this member, Mr. Speaker, stands to speak in this House, and he says very clearly that I'm part of a government that brings in a retroactive Bill that we're going to void. I want him to show that section that we're going to void that part of the Bill, the '91 GRIP right out of their life, and then if they don't agree, we're going to not allow that farmer to take it to court. And then it's secondary whether they ask him about '91 or '92. He's probably already voiced his opinion. But find that out and then come back and tell your House Leader and your Premier what you found out. I'd tell him to do that.

The member from Shellbrook-Torch River, that's completely a rural riding, pretty well a rural riding. I don't think any of Prince Albert comes into Shellbrook, but if it . . . I don't think it does unless the new boundary lines had it do so.

But, Mr. Speaker, I ask that member to go out and do the same thing. Now that's . . . when I spoke the other night, that scenario that I didn't have very many calls from, but I did have some. We did have some. I had Shellbrook-Torch River — I haven't got those notes here, that book here, with the numbers beside them of the calls — because that's a pretty good crop area. Our member that came from there, he always talked about land of milk and honey in the Shellbrook-Torch River area. I'd like to know what his remarks are in this legislature about how the '91-92 GRIP affects them. Because I can remember some people that a year ago said that '91 wasn't that best for them up there.

(1015)

So get a feeling. I challenge him to get a feeling from his people exactly what they're saying about the GRIP Bill, but be sure — be sure — that you add in the part that I'm asking the member from Redberry to do, that you tell him, Mr. Speaker, you tell your individuals. You can do the same as I do. You can phone 14 people or 15 like I do and then tell them to phone four or five more. You'll have the feeling of your whole riding before you come back on Monday morning. But be sure that you give them a copy of the Bill or tell them what's in that Bill and about the part being void and about the part that says no recourse to go to court.

And then, Mr. Speaker, we'll move to the member from Kelsey-Tisdale. I'd call that maybe a . . . there's some bigger towns in that area, but it's still a rural riding but it might be a little more a urban-rural riding. But there's an area where I'm sure that the member would get some negatives on the '91-92 GRIP because that's the area where it's been so dry this summer. That's the area that a year ago they didn't seem to talk much about GRIP whether it was good, bad, or indifferent. Their land . . . they got a lot of land in the area that's high producing and not high assessed and they said it wasn't a big thing to them. But now it is. It's serious. Kelsey-Tisdale has got a large drought area there. And if the Minister of Agriculture would just go up to some of these specific ridings like Kelsey-Tisdale, Mr. Speaker . . .

The Minister of Agriculture should be announcing that . . . well if our caucus . . . in that 18 days that we had this walk-out, 11 sitting days, I'm sure that the Minister of Agriculture must have went up and visit with the farmers in that area. And if he didn't have, Mr. Speaker, he should have. He should have went up there. The Minister of Agriculture should have went into Kelsey-Tisdale because that's an area where there's a poor crop. There's one of the poorest crops in there. And I've only seen poor crops in that area when they got early frost. They quite often get frost in that area. But now . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture heckles such a weak, weak remark, saying that he didn't go out . . . he's admitting that he didn't go out any place in those 18 days to talk to anybody, because he thought we might be back in the House.

Well there was six of those days were weekends that never would sit here. And everybody would excuse the Minister of Agriculture. We'd excuse him now. We would excuse him day after day after day, Mr. Speaker, because he's been here answering . . . trying to answer questions . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order, order. I do want to remind the members that we are on time allocation motion, as to why or why not time allocation should be put into effect, and that's really the topic that is before us. And I ask the members to please get back to that topic.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We wouldn't be sitting here talking about time allocation and talking about this Bill, and we wouldn't be in this here mode that we're in if the Minister of Agriculture had been out talking to people about the GRIP Bill.

Because they would have informed him that they're either doing right or they're doing wrong. And I'm sure that whatever message that the Minister of Agriculture could pick up out in rural Saskatchewan, we'd pick up the same message. And he can't prove to us that he's picking it up.

But I ask him this weekend to fly up and land — don't fly over — land and go through the Kelsey-Tisdale and ask them: do you agree that we're going time allocation and closure on the GRIP Bill, and tell them what's in it and speak to people. They'll come. I'm sure that if he said . . . he could put it on the air up there right today that I will be Friday night in such and such a hall in Kelsey-Tisdale, and

you'll get probably 1,000 people. They'll come for miles to listen to him explain the GRIP Bill. They'll come for miles. And I challenge him to do that.

Then if he can come back in here Monday morning with a vote that they endorsed everything he said — that he said that we're doing time allocation; we're doing closure on every move the Tories do . . . And he'll say, and there's nothing wrong because we can't shut these guys up. But he has to be sure he tells why he can't shut them up. He must say that we're doing all these things because of a part of the GRIP Bill, Bill 87, is that they're moving . . . they're having a part of the Bill void — disappear for our life — and then if you don't agree, Mr. Farmer, we are not going to allow you to take us to court.

So come back in and see if those thousand people or 2,000, what he'll liable to get . . . He's liable to get more people in that area that you'd have to use an outside park. You wouldn't be able to get a hall. So I challenge the member to do that.

The member from Pelly is over in that area. That's a good crop area. And like I said the other night, we've had a lot of calls. I ask that member this weekend to go home and do the same thing. The member from Nipawin's in a poor crop area. He'd do the same thing. He goes home . . . But he can advertise the meetings for tomorrow night. We're the ones that has to be here till 11 o'clock tomorrow night. We'll excuse a dozen of these rural members not to sit here tomorrow night till 11 o'clock. They can't golf while it's dark and so they could go and . . . They can't fish when it's dark, not very easily.

So if they could have a hall meeting in their riding tomorrow night and say . . . and advertise it right, so that you could do it now. Advertise it today that I'll be speaking on Friday or Saturday night. You could do two or three or four. And bring back to this legislature a commitment, a passed endorsement of what this government doing is right, correct, honourable, moral, the whole bit.

And there would be . . . You know, it's the best way, Mr. Speaker, that they can back the opposition off. I'm just telling them how you could sit us down and shut us up. Bring in hall meetings, endorsements saying that the Tories are wrong and that we're right. But have an amendment from every one of those meetings. We'll say 15 members goes out and have 15 meetings, or each have two or three meetings each, over the weekend. You'll get . . . come by the hundreds, if not the thousands. They'll come.

And I ask the House Leader to go down to the old area of Shaunavon and say that he's going to be speaking in the town of Shaunavon tomorrow night. He'll have two meetings on Saturday and maybe a couple . . . He has to go to church, naturally, on Sunday morning. So Sunday evening he will have another meeting, Mr. Speaker. And say to the people at these meetings, we need an endorsement what we're doing is right. We want you to tell us, from my old riding of — his riding . . . the old riding slipped my memory — Shaunavon, and we want you to endorse this with a motion from this meeting.

And I'm sure if somebody as high profile in the government as him, the one that's bringing all the closure motions forward, that he'd probably get park full of people will gather to listen. And then ask for a motion from the floor to see if how many people, how many show of hands will endorse what we're doing and how many is opposed. And then come back here Monday morning.

And if you all would do that on the weekend, that would be the best way for you to . . . And you have nothing to do. The back-benchers have nothing to do here. They don't speak. If they do get up to speak, it's two or three minutes to talk on a motion. And so we're asking you . . . That's what we ask you to do. Come back in with the motions, endorsements from rural Saskatchewan. And that takes in — when you go to Melville — that takes in cities. You go to Swift Current, that's cities. Yorkton. We're talking about all of Saskatchewan. You could have one right here in Regina. Probably get the smallest count, Mr. Speaker, right here in Regina.

These things we don't have to do, Mr. Speaker. We've come to these 10 seats that are behind me here, we've been doing that. We've been speaking to people all over our ridings. We know where we stand. And I've got my, what I call my sister ridings that I look after, and that's Last Mountain-Touchwood, Humboldt, and the Quill Lakes. And we've had contacts — I've contacted my people in all these ridings to get a feeling from the farmers, where do you stand on this retroactive, dictatorship-type Bill. Where do you stand?

So we know where we stand, but I would like . . . So the member from Quill Lakes doesn't have to take my word for it that his riding is against what they're doing. I challenge him, Mr. Speaker, to go out and hold hall meetings, get . . . ask for . . . He wants hundreds and he wants a few thousand people out to come and tell me that I endorse you, what you're doing.

I ask the member from Last Mountain-Touchwood. I've got to talk to that gentleman several times. He's a real nice individual and a normal man. And I know that if he would phone someone in every town in his riding, that we're going to gather in such and such a place in Last Mountain-Touchwood, Cupar, or Southey, or his home town, Raymore, Semans, whatever, and I'm going to be asking your opinion of what's going on in the legislature here . . . That he explains exactly what's going on.

He takes some copies of *Hansard* . . . but at least he takes the Bill out and reads them the parts of the Bill that we are debating in this House and why we're sitting here right now on a time allocation and say to them: do you think we should just shut these Tories up and shut these farmers up in Saskatchewan? Ask them that question and ask if you can get an endorsement from your riding. Ask them. That's the way democracy would work. That's the way it would work. You go ask your people.

We have asked our people. We know where we stand, and we're sure we know where your riding stands because we've been getting contacts from the whole province, but let's say the . . . I say, Mr. Speaker, the representative, the MLA, is the one that should be doing it. Come in here and lay it on the Table and say, we've

been endorsed by this many people. I challenge you. And I'm not going to put a prediction on what will happen. I just challenge them to do it.

There's no reason why you couldn't have some . . . You would never get big crowds in the cities; that just doesn't happen. You don't get as big a meetings. But you could get a hold of your executives, the city members here like the member from Regina Victoria. There's no reason why he couldn't contact his executive this weekend. He can do it tonight or tomorrow night or Saturday night and say, I want to go through this here Bill that's causing all this here hold up in this legislature and see if you agree. And bring back an endorsement. Bring back an endorsement.

Now I don't know whether it's asking quite a bit for the member from Athabasca to do that — he's a long ways from here — but whether he's going to go home on the weekend or not, I don't know that, but I'm sure he could phone his executive and do the same thing.

We know that when we get to Rosetown-Elrose we know where they stand there. That's the riding that was held 12, 13 years by Herb Swan, and Herb has done a good job and along with the old executive out there contacting the people from the Rosetown constituency and they're saying the Minister of Agriculture is totally, absolutely wrong. And they challenge him to come to a meeting in the Rosetown-Elrose area.

Go to Beechy, Mr. Speaker, and talk about time allocation and talk about foreclosure and talk about whether we're doing things right or not. Ask them. When he gets down to this point, he should have the . . . when he goes to a meeting, the minister responsible for Crop Insurance, and asks them is it right that we're going to foreclose on these people, on these Tories in here to shut them up, and then explain the '91, '92 GRIP in a right and proper manner . . .

Because the '92 GRIP, Mr. Speaker, is absolutely wrong for farmers. It's the wrong type of an insurance policy. All it is . . . and that's what we're here arguing about for so long, that they said they were going to change the GRIP Bill. They promised improvements in the '91 GRIP Bill.

And for goodness sakes, Mr. Speaker, I agree that we had to have some changes to the '91 GRIP, but they entirely took it away, brought in a policy where it's nothing but an option to cover yourself on insurance on the price of grain. Whatever the price of grain is, you're just like gambling the markets. It's just like going to play crown and anchor and you gamble where the wheel is going to stop.

It's exactly the same thing because you put the . . . you insure your price of wheat. If the price of wheat goes up, you collect zilch, and if the price of wheat goes down, you'll collect money.

Now what happens, Mr. Speaker . . . that's what's wrong. That's what the farmers are so upset about. And that's why they've come back now, Mr. Speaker, the farmers, and said — and have said very clearly — now we understand what a good program the '91 GRIP Bill was; along with some changes, we had what we wanted. But the '92 GRIP

Bill, if the price of wheat ever went up over \$3 a bushel and you had a complete crop failure and grow zero wheat, you get nothing. The price of wheat don't help you if you get no crop whatsoever.

That's why it's wrong. And that's what the farmers . . . it takes the farmers a long time to have to put it into reality and that's why so many farmers in my area and the Last Mountain-Touchwood area and the Humboldt area and Rosetown and Biggar areas, the people that I'm in contact have said, we want back what we didn't want last year. They didn't want the '91 GRIP. They took it and they felt that it wasn't going to do the job for them and didn't realize that it wasn't that bad of a program. It was a guarantee for farmers. It was bankable.

(1030)

And now what have we got? We're sitting here and you're wondering why — we heard the House Leader speak this morning — why, why do we have to have closure and time allocation. It's because the farmers are protesting. We're not standing here protesting. If anybody thinks that in this province that we 10 people like sitting here in July and August and maybe September . . . And we should be home harvesting and helping our families survive, like in other provinces in Canada. I know in Newfoundland — I was down there, Mr. Speaker, one time — and they shut the House right down when the main fishing season's up. They adjourned for a while. But we don't have that luxury here in Saskatchewan.

So we need to be home. But we're going to stay here as long as people are saying we're right — that we're right, and what we're doing is right, protesting this government, protesting this government on this heavy-handed legislation. And that's what it is. It's heavy-handed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I asked the member from Weyburn . . . The member from Weyburn, he's got a . . . there's a good crop growing around Weyburn. They're maybe going a little short of moisture there now to fill it up. But they've got a good crop growing. And he's got a . . . I call Weyburn an urban-rural riding because there's farmers . . . it takes in a rural area.

And, Mr. Speaker, the people in that area . . . That's my family's old home town. So I got a lot of contacts in the Weyburn, Yellow Grass, Pangman area, where it's . . . Bengough, Milestone. They got a good crop growing and I can't find one person in the area that says '92 GRIP is best for them. But as soon as you tell them . . . they tell you that, then you go back and tell them, hey, this is what's happening in the legislature. And then that's when they really get riled.

This morning, Mr. Speaker, as I was coming out of my apartment, I had a friend of mine that I've got to know quite well. And he said, you're off to the legislature; what's up today? And I said, time allocation I think will be on the agenda this morning.

He said, is that all those people can think about — this man would have to be 70, 80 years — that's all they can think of is closure and time allocation? He said, but then

of course, he said, you have been sitting there a long time I suppose; maybe everybody wants out, even yourself. I said, no, we haven't been sitting here very long. This government didn't bring the House in till almost May. We've only been here 65 days — 65 days.

Oh, he said, that's right. He said, you usually go in — I've seen you here for 10 years — you usually go in in February, March. That's right, he said. Well so that's the government's fault that they're there so long. And I said, right on. He said, I wish you good day; give it to them. He says, don't give in.

And this man had nothing to do with the farmer, nothing to do with the farms. He had nothing to do with a farm in his whole life other than he's smart enough to know that the farmers have to survive and the people of the province of Saskatchewan have to survive.

It's just unreal, Mr. Speaker, what this government is doing. And that's what's riling people up. I challenge the city members that's here to go to their malls this weekend and just start talking to people as they come along: here, I'm the MLA from such and such, and I want to tell you what's going on.

This Bill, Mr. Speaker, is absolutely constitutionally wrong. What are we going to do when we're sitting in an impasse like that, that we're at time allocation and foreclosure and we know that we've got the serious doubts about this Bill being a legal Bill, that it would pass the Charter of Rights and the constitutional courts? What are we going to do about that? What are we going to do? And our hands are getting tied now.

We're down to whenever this here closure . . . The House Leader probably before the day's over or tomorrow will go closure on closure — that's what we're going to have — and we'll be stopped. And then, Mr. Speaker, what's going to happen is we have one day left in second reading, one day which . . . That's fair enough. I'm not worried about the one day in the second reading.

But the rights that's been taken away from us is to get at that minister, Mr. Speaker. That Minister of Agriculture needs about 60 days. He needs instead of 18 hours in Committee of the Whole, he needs 1,800 hours. That's what he needs. Because we could go on and on and bring in every individual that's talked against this Bill and the public would become aware. The public would become aware if we could keep him here in Committee of the Whole, and put amendment after amendment, and the bells would ring, and the public would get sick and tired of it, and they'd ask what's going on. And then we'd have a chance to get all 600,000 voters in Saskatchewan, we'd get them all, get all the voters aware of what this government's doing to them, and then they'd back off.

But what they're doing is giving us 18 hours in Committee of the Whole to ask this minister questions. He's been here now, he's been a member of the government and the Minister of Agriculture since last fall after the election. And we couldn't get at him last fall when the legislature was on; we only had the Minister of Finance stand up and they even went foreclosure on an interim supply Bill — talk about a heavy-handed government that don't care

about people, don't care about people's rights.

And we're the ones that's speaking here on behalf of the province of Saskatchewan, their rights. And we don't get our rights. We are not getting our rights in this legislature. It is absolutely not right. People sit over there and grin and smile at me, but some good-thinking people are sitting there with a pretty sour look on their face because they know I am right. They know that I am right.

I see the member from Moose Jaw there. He is a good man. I know him quite well. And he is a sad man because he knows when he goes home and tells his people this weekend that they are foreclosing on us, we're foreclosing on the Tories and we're shutting them up and we're doing time allocation and we said that's enough of these guys, and these people are going to say to them, what is it that the Tories are fighting about? What are they protesting so much about? So he will naturally tell them well, we think we're right in saying that this Bill is retroactive and we're going to void part of that there clause from the '91 Bill that the March 15 letter, it didn't go out. But that wasn't good wording in the Bill so we're just going to take that portion of the Bill and void it from your life. It just never happened.

But then he'll have to tell them, Mr. Speaker, well my friends in Moose Jaw, I have to say to you that we also are not going to give the farmers the chance to take it to court and then see what he brings back for a message. I mean they're not going to come back with that great of messages next week. But I hope they can because that's the way to shut us up. That's the way to do it.

If the Minister of Agriculture won't let himself be available for questioning in this House . . . Because when we get him, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we get him in estimates and we get him in Committee of the Whole, we'll get you, period. It'll be the end of his career. There will be no more foreclosure notices in this House. There'll be no more time allocations when the Minister of . . . with that Minister of Agriculture, because he won't be in that position. There's no way that Saskatchewan is going to stand for it any longer because no matter where you go: what is the matter with that man?

I want to repeat what the father of Reg Gross said this week, that there's . . . the Premier, he's not doing things right and proper. And I was stopped for using the words I used before so I can't say words like he said about the Minister of Agriculture — it wouldn't be allowed in this legislature — that he is absolutely doing the poorest job for the farmers. And it's Reg Gross's father that said it, an old time CCF-(Co-operative Commonwealth Federation) NDP, and that's coming all over.

I've got the candidate, and I'll put it right in the record, the candidate from Arm River, not coming from him directly but indirectly from his family saying, boy I'm telling you, it's sure a good job that our nephew didn't get elected because it's bad business, I'm telling you, what they're doing.

I don't know what's going on. The Deputy Speaker's . . . are you asking me to quit, Mr. Deputy Speaker? Well you just waved a motion. You just waved a motion in front of

me.

Because there's nothing I'm saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that isn't . . . there isn't anything because it was set in here this morning. The House Leader got up and spoke this morning. There isn't a subject that he didn't touch. He's got on to western stabilization. He got on to almost anything you want to talk about, about the federal government off-loading onto Saskatchewan. Off-loading, off-loading — when a federal government gave 13 to \$14 billion and he says the federal government is off-loading on this province.

It's the provincial government that is off-loading on every farmer in this province of Saskatchewan, for \$23 million — \$23 million. And they said, Mr. Speaker . . . there's more reasons why we're sitting here, why we're here and talking about closure and time allocation. There's more of the reasons why we're here. Because the Minister of Agriculture sent letters out to everybody in Saskatchewan saying, regardless of the economic conditions, we have dramatically increased our funding to farmers, when we know just prior to that the Minister of Finance admitted there was a \$75 million cut-back. So it was an improper letter that went out.

It was signed by him and it misled all the farmers in Saskatchewan. It was a terrible thing for him to do. So that's what's making farmers angry, when they know that their pocket-books have been gutted by this government. And then you have the arrogance to send a letter out saying, we're giving you more money. Well why didn't you give them 23 million more? You cut back 75 million. Why didn't you take the federal government's offer and we wouldn't be in this situation here today.

Now I'm hoping that this is all to an end. I'm hoping when I sit down, that the House leaders have got this all worked out. Because we got it on the record, and I want to put it there again, that I suggested that we finish this GRIP Bill today. We'll all finish it. And there'll be a clause go into the Bill or whatever, amendment or whatever, that it goes from here, this House, right to the Supreme Court of Canada.

And that's what the House Leader said. He agreed. Agreed. So I'm hoping that hits the noon news, that the media's picked that up, that the GRIP Bill is finally . . . that the GRIP Bill is finalized. You don't need to worry, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The members don't need to worry about whether the media comes out there or not, because they get it on their television. It's probably getting ready to flash the news of Saskatchewan that the House Leader has stated, yes, we agree that we will send it to the courts if we can get this Bill passed today.

Well that's no problem. We will just do it so fast. So after I'm through here, my remarks, I hope that that's what can happen.

Mr. Speaker, I have something I want to go through here before I sit down. It kind of sums up my remarks. I don't think it'll take more until dinner time. Mr. Speaker, since . . . I just want to go through some chronological order here of what has happened in the last . . . and what's really been happening and put it on the record.

Since day one, this NDP government has been intent on pushing through their political agenda, using any means. Resorted to using closure three times, and now this motion. This is nothing new. We faced this arrogant government during the first sham that the NDP called a session. We faced this last fall. We went through it. They put closure on an interim supply Bill. At that time, the NDP were introducing a motion in our province that's never happened before and an interim supply Bill was only debated a short time, and that's when they started, a motion that's tripped opposition members with the right to freedom of speech. We were not able to question the ministers, as I said a few minutes ago. We were not, Mr. Speaker, able to get at one minister.

We had the Minister of Finance trying to answer for the Minister of Health and answer for the Minister of Agriculture, answer for the Minister of Energy. And that's not right. We should've had . . . That got us off to a poor start right last fall.

And that's why we're . . . this arrogant government causes us . . . It's not co-operation. The co-operation should've been here right away. You come in with a big mandate of 55 people, or whatever, to 10, to 11 opposition members. Why didn't you show . . . You got the numbers on us. You can out vote us on anything. Why didn't you show co-operation to us?

Why didn't you just . . . anything we asked, why didn't you answer because you promised for wide-open government. We should not be discussing time allocation or closure under any circumstances. We should be able to answer any question, because you're right. And we should get answers.

If we would get answers . . . They talk about — I see it in the paper — the media writes, the opposition's filibustering this House. Well it's not correct. I said it before and I'll say it again. The people that's responsible for the stalling of this House and the filibuster is the people that won't answer the questions. If you'd answer questions in question period, if you'd answer questions in estimates . . . but you don't bring them forth.

Instead of being here discussing this Bill or this motion, we shouldn't be doing it at all. We shouldn't even be discussing it. We should be on the Agriculture estimates. We should be on Health estimates.

They said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they said there's a cure for that. Do I get a commitment that Health, Agriculture estimates are coming on today? No . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I've been told, if I sit down and try it. Well I wouldn't trust those people over there. They'll change their minds so quick, by the time I sit down, they'd have new . . . if I sit down, I know what's going to happen. Likely before I'm through, likely what their House Leader's doing now is writing another closure on the closure motion. That's what's going on. He's going to have a closure motion on the closure motion. And that's not democracy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we were stopped from getting questions from this open and honest government and



they didn't want their ministers answering questions. And that's what happened here last fall . . . were successful at ramming the appropriation Bill. They were successful in ramming the appropriation Bill through the Assembly.

Now NDP are ramming time allocation motions through on GRIP. NDP must be tired, tired of listening to logical and reasonable debate. That's why you don't want to listen to reasonable debate.

You won't even debate us. We talk for hours; you talk for minutes. We talk for hours and you talk for minutes. If I sit down, if a member gets up, it'll be two minutes like last night — two minutes. And then we've got to get another one up.

(1045)

The NDP are ramming allocation motions through on GRIP. NDP must be tired, as I said before. And they are. They're tired of listening to reasonable debate, don't like being reminded of how devastating their retroactive GRIP Bill is. They can't stand it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for us going on day after day talking about the portion of the GRIP Bill, that they want to just have it void from our life, and they don't want to have us saying day after day, hour after hour, they don't want us saying, and if you don't agree, Mr. Farmer, you have no right to take it to court. They don't want us to keep saying that, so they've got to shut us up.

But they're not going to. You can't shut us up. When you go foreclosure and foreclose on us on this here GRIP Bill and we are stopped and we can't get another word, don't forget — then comes maybe three weeks or a month in estimates with the Minister of Agriculture on his feet, ten to one. You just try ten to one. We've been sitting 55 for 10 here for 65 days. And then when we get onto estimates and Bills, we'll just have one minister with ten onto one. And you'll get a taste of your own medicine and your long hours.

You'll get a taste of your medicine from 9 o'clock till 11 o'clock. You'll find out what it's like. You'll be going back . . . the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will be going to his House Leader. Why did you get me in this mess because I can't even answer their questions. They're always right. He's going to be in the worst mess he ever was in ever.

The Minister of Health, she's going to go and say to the House Leader: why did you force these Tories; why did you make them arrogant on closure motions and time allocation; why did you do that? Why did you anger those Tories? Because they're hitting me on the people dying from lack of medicine, that can't get chiropractor treatment, all these things, and they're closing my hospitals, and they're giving it to me. And the trouble is, they're right.

And they're going to jump on that House Leader and they're going to say: why did you put me in this mess where I've got to stand here for hour after hour, day after day, when my back's killing me and I need a chiropractor treatment so bad and I can't get out of here? I mean it's going to be unreal, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's just going to

be the worst carryings on that you've ever heard of.

**An Hon. Member:** — You're off the subject, Gerry.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's certainly on the subject when I just finished saying that she's going to go and he's going to go to the House Leader and said, why did you force foreclosure and why did you force time allocation onto the opposition members and put me in this terrible position. Because 10 . . . and I say it again and I want you to listen carefully because you're giving it to us now — 55 people versus 10. But you wait till ten versus one.

The Minister of Agriculture now, I know he's already rubbing his feet; he knows what it's going to be like to stand for 18 hours. He's worried. Then he's worried about what he's going to say, he's going to say, because we'll go after him about closure. He'll hear about closure, closure, closure. I'll tell you, when you . . . you'll have to answer.

But then this is only small. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is nothing — this is nothing. It's when this legislature is over and you have to go and answer to the people of Saskatchewan, there's where you're going to be in trouble; there's where you're going to wish you had have listened to the people of Saskatchewan through the opposition, and listened and not rammed down dictatorship Bills like you have in this House. You're going to wish that you'd never even thought of the word closure. The House Leader is going to wish that he never knew how to spell the word closure. It's going to haunt him for ever. It's going to haunt, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will haunt everybody in this legislature for ever and ever and ever.

Mr. Speaker, do the members opposite care, NDP government bullying the motion through the House like this, abusing their majority? Do they care? NDP government becomes so caught up in it's power that they are willing to push through any legislation that suits their needs. And that's what they're doing. Anything.

I've never seen it. The old NDP government was not like this from '78 to '82. We could sit down . . . we had many Bills. I can remember Eric Berntson, instead of talking closure — he never thought of the word — he would come over in opposition and go over there and talk to the House leader and say: well here, our guys don't agree on this. And if you don't pull that Bill and get, you know, put some amendments into it, we're going to be here a long time. And we're getting these kind of comments from the ridings, we're getting it from the people. And sure enough, there'd be some reasonable negotiations. But not with this government. They're right, they're just going to slap us right down.

But I can tell you, you're facing 10 people that's going to be too much for you. Because when you get a free enterprise that gets his dandruff up and he knows how to fight, I'll tell you, he knows how to work, he knows how to produce. Because the free enterprise in this province has been keeping the socialists for a hundred years. We've been keeping you because you never even learned how to work. Socialism — you just want to even 'er all out.

NDP government has included measures in the various laws it is passing that will take away rights from groups and individuals and increase the powers of cabinet minister to act without scrutiny. GRIP is not the only Bill in this House that stripped individuals of their rights. So far the NDP have introduced or announced plans for Bills that will allow government employees to enter private property without a search warrant.

That's why we're here, that's why we're here. They want to shut us up. You want time allocation and you want closure. You don't want us to be telling people about that environment Bill, An Act to amend The Environmental Management and Protection Act. You don't want us talking about it so you shut us up.

The minister to divulge personal records to the public, NDP Party members or anyone else a cabinet minister chooses. Bill 14, An Act to amend The Child and Family Services Act. You want to shut us up so we can't talk about these things.

You know that it's wrong. That's the reason you want closure. If there's something that the Tories don't like and the people don't like, close them down, shut them up.

A minister to forbid a court of law from hearing or receiving evidence held by a government employee that might be relevant in determining a person's innocence or guilt — Bill 13, An Act to amend The Adoption Act. We argued about these for several days before and we let them go because there was no sense in it. But we let those Bills go. Those are my Bills, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We talked about them for a while and we let them go. But it gives the ministers the rights . . . But we finally . . . when you shoved this GRIP Bill at us, we said, no way, because the people said no way. And we're not going to stop.

A minister take over the role of the labour board to determine proper union certification in the construction industry. NDP hand-picked labour committee recommendation.

The government justifies its moves to increase the powers of cabinet ministers at the expense of individual Saskatchewan voters by saying the measures are necessary to protect the public from unacceptable practices.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's why we're here. That's why we're debating this morning — because you're trying to shut us up to voice our opinion.

The Minister of Justice has not commented on the trend to reduce individual rights and there have been no legal opinions or studies released indicating what impact the various measures have on the justice system.

You do things and you start thinking about it afterwards, when it's too late. Think it out first. Don't bring these type of Bills and motions to this House until you think it out and be responsible. You're not being responsible.

The government will go to any extreme to carry these actions out. The NDP think we should allow them to break into the private property without a warrant because

it will protect the environment, that we should allow them to remove the rights of miners because the mining companies are evil corporations, and we should take away legal rights of farmers entrenched in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms so that they won't lose in court.

It's wrong, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's wrong, wrong, wrong. These kind of Bills are wrong. And as soon as we go to debate it: enough of you, be quiet, closure. That's all we can hear. That's all they want to talk about.

When the Bills are wrong, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when something's wrong, when the people are speaking . . . And I've challenged them. I know I'm right because I've challenged you last week to go out and get somebody in your riding to phone me to say they agree with this Bill. And you can't get anybody to do it. You can't find one, you can't find one individual, because you can't find them. You'd have to pay them to do it. They wouldn't do it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I challenge the Minister of Agriculture, like I said before, to go out this weekend in his own riding and advertise a meeting in Beechy for tonight and maybe Rosetown tomorrow night and maybe a couple . . . You'll have to use parks. Halls won't work because they'll be filling parks to come and listen to you explain the Bill.

And then when you do, is when you get an endorsement from that crowd. Say: I want a motion from this group of people saying that we endorse you on this Bill and we endorse you that you're making part of the Bill void, that we are endorsing you that you can't take it to the courts. And then bring it back in here. And all the members do that. And then you'll back this group of opposition right off because that means you're right.

But I challenge you to do that. And if you can't do it, that means that you haven't got the backing from the people.

Mr. Speaker, I feel for the NDP back-benchers. They're being led around by the nose. That's exactly what's happening. Because go do what I suggest, as an old veteran in this House — go ask your people. I suggest to the back-benchers to go home to the constituency and find out exactly what the people knew what the government was thinking. And that's exactly what I've been telling you for a long, long time here. So I'm just wrapping up saying, go ask your people if you're right.

Heavy-handed governments so intent on pursuing its political agenda, it is blinded. It just gets blinded. That's what happened in all the socialist countries in Europe, Mr. Speaker, and here we live in the province of Saskatchewan where people came from those countries. They came to get away from socialism and dictatorship. They came over here to get away from it. And then all of a sudden now these here dictatorship-type of people been elected, been elected with a mandate, and they broke every promise. They come in here and all they can talk about is closure, closure, closure. Heavy-handed governments so intent . . .

Labour legislation will pay back the election favours of '91 but doesn't assure you of a victory in 1995. It won't

assure you of a victory, my friends, in 1995. Legislation like GRIP '92 is your ticket back to the opposition benches. It'll put you right over on this side of the House.

You've had ample time to start acting like a government. You've been there, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they been there for nine months. And act like a government; be a government; govern this province. You got so used to saying . . . when you were in opposition, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you used to say, we're going to make this place ungovernable. Well now you're in government. Don't keep the same attitude. You're making it ungovernable. You got the same attitude — we're going to make it ungovernable.

You'll find out that these 10 people sitting here with me, that if you co-operate, co-operate and try to work things out in a right and honourable manner for what's best for the people of Saskatchewan, we could wind this House up and be gone. But if you're going to just shove this down our throats it isn't going to happen. Soon Progressive Conservatives economic initiatives will have been taken hold. Just wait till Crown Life and FCC (Farm Credit Corporation) move out to Saskatchewan, and they're going to jump on there and say that . . . they're going to say, Mr. Speaker, it was our idea and we got it.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say in my last, final words before I make an amendment . . . I'm going to make an amendment, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm not proud to stand here this morning and speak on this here motion that we're talking about. I'm not proud. We should have come in here this morning and the House Leader should have had estimates brought forward this morning. We should have been discussing Agriculture estimates or the Premier's estimates or the Minister of Health's estimates, the important departments of this government. That's what we should have been discussing this morning. We want the estimates brought on. And if they can't bring them on, we're sitting at 60 or 65 days, and a government that never brings forth their important departments to be discussed and so we can ask them questions, so the people of Saskatchewan know where they stand, then I'm just ashamed of this government.

And I want to say in closing, before I make the amendment, that I'm . . . every time I've been speaking anything to do with GRIP . . . and my closing remarks are that — the front benches and the senior members — that I'm ashamed of them for the type of government they are running. I am absolutely ashamed of them. And I know that their constituents would be ashamed of them if they go and tell them the facts, what's happening in this legislature.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, my last words, challenging them to go and ask their ridings this weekend. Hold meetings, come back in here with all your endorsements and see if you're on the right track. Especially to the Minister of Agriculture — I want him to come back in here saying, I'm endorsed by one person. Even stand up and give us one person besides his staff that support him.

Give us the names of one person that will say . . . I'll bet you that his EA (executive assistant) that works for him, Ernie Spencer, in his office, who was born and made in

my town of Craik — He was brought up in a right and honourable family, a real good individual — I'll bet you when he gets away from the office, he says, I can't believe that my boss is a part of this terrible tragedy. I'll bet you that's what he's saying to himself.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to make this here motion moved by myself, seconded by the member for Moosomin:

That the words "pursuant to a Saskatchewan Court of Appeal ruling on the validity of Bill 87" be substituted for the words "notwithstanding the Rules of the Assembly".

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

(1100)

**The Deputy Speaker:** — The member for Arm River has moved an amendment to the main motion. I find the amendment to be in order. The amendment does not construe an alternative to the main motion that's before us, but seeks to replace certain terms of the main motion. Therefore any debate at this point should be on the amendment strictly. It will not be a concurrent debate. So at this point the question before us then is the amendment which has been moved by the member for Arm River, seconded by the member for Moosomin. The amendment reads:

That the words "pursuant to a Saskatchewan Court of Appeal ruling on the validity of Bill 87" be substituted for the words "notwithstanding the rules of the Assembly".

**Mr. Flavel:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to rise today to speak on this amendment, the whole amendment of time allocation, the whole motion of time allocation, and what this opposition is doing to the government in this session. Mr. Speaker, the whole process that the opposition is taking today is not a process over GRIP, it's not anything; it is just a waste of taxpayers' dollars. It is keeping this legislature . . .

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order. I have just, I think, been clear on what it is that I think the question is before the Assembly, and that is the amendment. The amendment proposes to make some changes to the motion that's before us, and I've ruled that the debate is not concurrent. So that the question that's before us right now is not time allocation as such; the question that's before us is the amendment. If the member has remarks to make, he should make them strictly adhere to the amendment, pertinent to the amendment.

**Mr. Flavel:** — Mr. Speaker, this amendment is all about obstruction. This is not debate. We have gave them an opportunity to debate this Bill on different occasions. On Tuesday we wanted to adjourn private members' day to allow them to debate Bill 87.

**An Hon. Member:** — What did they do?

**Mr. Flavel:** — They refused. They have had ample

opportunity to debate the GRIP Bill. And because of their obstruction, the motion for closure was put in. They have had ample opportunity. And I listened to the member from Arm River today go on and on and on about phoning our people, talking to our people, going out into the country and talking to the people before we bring a Bill in, or before we make amendments to it.

Well I tell him, Mr. Speaker, we have been out and we have been talking to the people. We were out during the bell-ringing, and we were talking to the people. We were out and did a blitz of Last Mountain-Touchwood and we talked to the people.

The member for Arm River says, Mr. Speaker, that we are not a government of the same type of government as they were. You bet we're not. We don't want to be the same type of government.

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

**Mr. Flavel:** — And the people told us on October 21, they don't want us to be that kind of a government. They said that they wanted us to be a government that gets in here and does what has to be done to fix what the mess had been left after nine and a half years of Tory rule.

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

**Mr. Flavel:** — Mr. Speaker, the member from Arm River says, go out and phone someone. In fact he challenged me to go out into Last Mountain-Touchwood and to phone someone in every town and ask them the question: do you think we should shut these Tories up? I know what the answer will be. If I phoned those people, they will say yes. They said we told you yes in October 21 and we said it loud and clear by giving you the largest majority that Last Mountain-Touchwood has ever been won by.

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

**Mr. Flavel:** — Mr. Speaker, they continue to obstruct over there. They walked out of the legislature over — what did they say? — changed rules. But they've been on record as saying it wasn't to do with the changing of bells . . . the ringing of bells. It was to do with GRIP.

But I want to compare that walk out. And they say, well that's all right. The New Democrats when they're opposition did the same thing. They walked out in '89. But there's a difference. The big difference was in 1989, when the Tories walked out, after the 1986 election they had over 50 per cent of the people of Saskatchewan voted for them in the 1986 election. They had 26 seats. They campaigned that they said they wouldn't do it. And during that walk out, Mr. Speaker . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. I want to remind the members that on the ruling made by the Deputy Speaker, that the amendment that has been made is simply taking out "notwithstanding the rules of the Assembly". The following words have been substituted, "pursuant to a Saskatchewan Court of Appeal".

It's very clear on the understanding that this is not a concurrent debate, that the debate must take place on the

amendment that has been proposed. It's very clear in the documents by experts on this when they simply say . . . If it is . . . similarly, if it is intended to leave out certain words only and to substitute other words, then although both the original and the proposed words may be discussed, debate should not range over the other words of the motion to which the amendment is not directed.

Order. The debate must be on the amendment that has been proposed.

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — My point of order is, is that the rules being applied here to this amendment . . . I've noticed in the past in amendments that have been moved by the members opposite on private members' day on many motions, that there is great leeway allowed by the Chair and the Speaker when amendments are moved.

The only point that I want to make is this, and get clarification, is that we don't want to question at all what the Speaker's ruling is. But if we're going to follow that tightly and closely on every ounce of the word of the rules on amendments, that we would very much appreciate if that were applied to every amendment put in this Assembly from now on. Because I think we're setting very, very serious precedent when we allow people no leeway on a motion or an amendment of this type.

**The Speaker:** — The member, I think, makes a very valid argument, if we follow what has been the practice in many instances in the past. But no two instances are the same. And the member knows that. In this particular case, as we did yesterday in the subamendment . . . the subamendment yesterday was very narrow in its aspect.

Today, the amendment is also very narrow in its aspect again. And all I'm saying is to the member, that he must relate his argument to the amendment that is before us. And he can't just range all over the place. And that will be the ruling, and that's the one I'm going to enforce.

**Mr. Flavel:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this amendment again is just another example of delay. And I want to try and tie into why . . . that I'm speaking against this which says it has to go to the courts. Why it is unnecessary to have this amendment.

And I go back to the walk-out. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to try and tie it in, if I can, to the walk-out related to the 1989 and the walk-out by this government, which was a delay, an unnecessary delay, where they had the chance . . . that we wouldn't have needed this submotion, or this amendment.

And I go back, Mr. Speaker, to say that — and I hope I'm on the right track. And I'm sure if I'm not, I will be corrected, Mr. Speaker — that when we walked out in '89, and I wasn't part of the government then, but when they walked out in '89, the Leader of the Opposition and the now Premier of Saskatchewan toured the province and held rallies in every . . . in a great number of small towns all around rural Saskatchewan and filled the hall

on every occasion.

He had one in Last Mountain-Touchwood, and he came out to Southey. We couldn't get all the people in the hall. They went out and they asked the people what they thought of the walk-out. They asked the people what their opinion was and they consulted with them.

And while he was doing that, the other members were out collecting petitions. And they came back to this Legislative Assembly, Mr. Speaker, after 17 days with consulting with thousands and thousands of people, and tabled 120,000 signatures in this Legislative Assembly, on petitions.

Comparing that to what has happened in the last and to show why this motion, these people walked out for 18 days, when they walked out in the 1991 election, they had some 20 per cent of the voters vote for them. They didn't have the backing of the people. They have 10 members. And what did they do in those 18 days? The Leader of the Opposition came back with what? A better tan and a better golf game.

Why didn't they go out and hold rallies in the towns of rural Saskatchewan? Why didn't they go and consult with them? I know why they didn't, Mr. Speaker. Because they're scared to go to rural Saskatchewan right now because they'll be told to get back into the legislature and get down to work and get on with the business of it.

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

**Mr. Flavel:** — In fact, Mr. Speaker, when they walked out and went golfing, our members went to work and went and consulted with the people on it.

So it's another delay; it's another waste of the taxpayers' dollars. Now we're on the time allocations and we're on the rules that say 10 minutes or whatever for bell-ringing. And there was a show of it last night, the waste and the delays. A vote on a submotion that had no value to it. We were all in the House when the vote was taken. They rang the bells to the maximum — to the maximum.

As soon as that vote was taken, there was another vote taken on the amendment. We were all in the House again. What did they do? Rang the bells again to the limit, on their own amendment. They walked out on their own amendment. Makes you wonder if they have to go back and decide how they're going to vote in it.

It's a delay; it's a waste of time. They are wasting, and they have for nine and a half years when they were in government, they wasted the taxpayers' dollars. And now all we see from them in opposition is more waste of the taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I am hearing from people in my constituency — not my supporters but some of their supporters — that are saying . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — What few remain.

**Mr. Flavel:** — Yes, what few remain . . . are saying, why don't they let you govern the province? They messed it

up; they were no good as a government; and now their own supporters are saying, and they're no good as an opposition either.

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

**Mr. Flavel:** — Mr. Speaker, when we introduced the GRIP, we campaigned on changes to it. That was the difference in the walk-out. They campaigned that they were not going to do anything with SaskEnergy and they did it. And we campaigned we were going to change GRIP. The people voted for us because we said we were going to do it. And now we're doing it.

And they persist in wasting time. In fact the member from Arm River says, he says we're going to keep you here all summer. Why? Why would they want to keep us here all summer? Why don't we get on with the business of working, get the legislations passed, and get out of here? He even states, well we would go 1,800 hours and when we get in Committee of the Whole — 60 days.

**An Hon. Member:** — Is that co-operation?

(1115)

**Mr. Flavel:** — Co-operation? That's a waste of time.

Mr. Speaker, he says that if the Bill passes, what's going to happen. If the Bill passes — and there is no reason for it to go to the courts; it's an obstruction of the whole business — he says if the Bill passes, what will happen? Well I'll tell you what will happen, Mr. Speaker. If this Bill passes and when this Bill passes, the farmers will start to farm the land and not the programs.

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

**Mr. Flavel:** — Mr. Speaker, agriculture will prosper and Saskatchewan will once again start on to the road to recovery.

Mr. Speaker, they continually change their minds. Now they want to move an amendment that it should go to the courts. First they said they didn't want any changes to it. On March 15 they said . . . first they said no changes on March 15, and now on August 14 we are, or 13th, they say we want you to change the Bill. We want you to change it. And they move amendment after amendment after amendment. They don't want to debate the Bill. They move an amendment now, it has to go the court. Then let's pass the Bill and let the courts decide whatever's going to happen. That's up to the courts. Our deal here is to pass the legislation, and that's what we want to do.

Mr. Speaker, the whole thing of this is . . . and we had to change the Bill because of the off-loading that has come out of Ottawa, that those members opposite have sat for nine years and watched Ottawa off-load onto the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, they always said, and the member for Arm River says, he stood up and he always . . . he stood up against his government when he had to.

Well as far as I know, my understanding is he never did

vote against his government on anything. He was led around then; he's still being led around. And he's being led around on this amendment to take this thing and pass it to the courts.

It's an unnecessary amendment, and it is not needed on this Bill. They are wasting time. There's more obstruction. That's all it is. It's not an amendment to go to the courts. It's another amendment to obstruct the proceedings of this House.

And, Mr. Speaker, because of that amendment, and because of that amendment, I want to consult with my caucus members and so forth, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move adjournment on this debate.

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

Debate adjourned.

## NOTICE OF MOTION FOR CLOSURE

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise to give notice pursuant to rule 34:

That at the next sitting of the Assembly immediately before orders of the day is called for resuming the adjourned debate on the motion to allocate time for proceeding on Bill 87, An Act respecting amendments to Certain Farm Income Insurance Legislation, and any amendments or subamendments proposed thereto, I will move that the said debate be not further adjourned.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### ADJOURNED DEBATES

#### SECOND READINGS

##### Bill No. 87

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

**Mr. Toth:** — Mr. Speaker, as I was speaking last night and as I indicated to the Assembly, certainly the debate on the GRIP Bill has occupied and taken up a fair bit of time in this Assembly. It's a debate that will take and occupy a fair bit of time, not only as it has in the Assembly but across rural Saskatchewan from back even in the fall of 1990 when the proposal was put forward for a revenue insurance program, Mr. Speaker. And there's no doubt in my mind that this debate will be ongoing and will continue.

And I say that, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that trying to devise a revenue insurance or an insurance program for the agriculture community that actually becomes a very supportive structure of our rural economy and our whole Saskatchewan economy, will take time. And because of the complexities of the whole economic situation regarding agriculture the fact that we in

Saskatchewan, we in Canada, have very little control over the prices we receive for our product.

And, Mr. Speaker, one of the main reasons we have such little control over these prices and over the prices we receive for our product is the fact that, Mr. Speaker, the prices are set on a world market. They're set in nations where the production may . . . is much larger than ours; but also, Mr. Speaker, they are set by nations where the populace base is much, much larger than here in Canada.

If we look at the Canadian situation, Mr. Speaker, we find that less than . . . or around 3 per cent of the total Canadian population is involved in agricultural production — less than 3 per cent. And yet the 3 per cent of the population in this country involved in agricultural production, Mr. Speaker, produces five times more product than we in Canada are able to consume. Because of that, Mr. Speaker, we have become, and are, and have continually been, an export nation. Some 80 per cent of the product we produce — 80 per cent of the wheat or any of the grains, the cereal grains we produce, the livestock, the meat we produce in this country, in this nation — must find its use and consumption on other markets.

And because of that, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for us to try to achieve higher prices for our product. And as the prices are dictated by world markets, Mr. Speaker, it makes it very difficult for individuals in the farming sector. And as we have seen over the past number of years, as we've seen starting in the late '70s we did have a period of some good economic growth in the agricultural sector.

But as you saw through the, say, the '75-80, '79-81, period where prices of agricultural products had risen — wheat in particular to that \$6 range, and we saw the time when flax was in that \$15 range, and canola was in the 9 to \$10 range, Mr. Speaker — at that time it appeared that we were nicely on our way into a period of such high economic, rapid economic growth, that spending could indeed fall in line.

And we saw the price of our land move to double and triple and quadruple and even go five times what it actually should have been, five times its productive value, because it just seemed there was a period of time in our history, Mr. Speaker, where there was no end to what we were going to receive. And we could produce the product, we had a price that gave us a return on our investment, Mr. Speaker, and people felt, well the farming and rural and agricultural community was booming. Certainly the Saskatchewan economy was booming as well. That we could spend, continue to spend, without really having to give account for our spending. In a lot of cases, a lot of the spending that was done in this province was done on the basis of the capital gains or the capital investment as people would buy land.

And I know the comments were made about the fact, well I've just paid \$70,000 a quarter for land. Maybe it was four times what it was . . . its actual productive value was, Mr. Speaker. But because of the inflationary factor people said, well if I don't quite make it, the price is going to continue to rise, I'll unload it and it'll become an

investment and maybe I'll make \$10,000. It won't pay for itself, but maybe I'll make \$10,000 on my investment.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, there was a day of reckoning. And that day of reckoning started in the early 1980s — in 1981, '82, '83, when the prices of grain took a nosedive, Mr. Speaker. The price of the product we were producing took a nosedive. And we didn't have a system in place, Mr. Speaker, that would protect and stabilize the agricultural economy. All we had, Mr. Speaker, was crop insurance.

Now crop insurance is, as I've indicated, strictly insurance. But, Mr. Speaker, with crop insurance . . . And just for the people who may not recognize or realize what crop insurance did, crop insurance protected the producer to the tune of the producer could carry 50, 60 or 70 per cent of what his long-term average productionary value was. He could carry protection on 70 per cent if he carried the maximum of his production value. So if you were producing an average of 30 bushels to the acre of wheat on your farm over the long term, 70 per cent, if you carried that at high average, was 21 per cent — you could protect yourself for 21 per cent or 21 bushels to the acre of crop protection. And you were given two or three, and in the last number of years, four different price options.

Mr. Speaker, there were many times where you would have . . . drought would come through, or you'd have conditions take place that were beyond your control and your production would be below your 21 bushel guarantee, and you may have carried a guarantee factor of \$4 a bushel — \$4 a bushel and 21 bushels guarantee would give you \$84 to the acre. And if you fell below that production factor, you were brought up to that \$84 guarantee, Mr. Speaker. Taking the crop you produced, if it was 15, the extra six bushels you were paid for.

However, Mr. Speaker, there are many times when you could be carrying that high guarantee factor of \$4 a bushel, and find that by the time the crop year rolled around and you moved your product to market, and you've produced, you ended up maybe with a production factor of 22 or 23 bushels per acre on your farm, two or three bushels over the guaranteed or the insured guarantee, Mr. Speaker. And the market would fall from that . . . maybe the market was in the 4.20, but fall to the 3.50, to \$3. You were out \$1 per bushel on that other 21 bushels. And you didn't get a pay-out. So you may end up with \$60 in your pocket on your production, even though you were insured for 84. But because the way the program was set up, it didn't pay you that extra revenue portion.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the attempt was made to try and stabilize the agricultural sector by introducing a program that would guarantee the revenue portion of your insurance component, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, so what we've seen over the past two years, and in fact, going into next year, we've seen a very serious and long-term debate take place. And trying to address how indeed do you guarantee or set aside or establish a guarantee program that will place . . . give farmers the ability to carry the insurance that they would feel would be appropriate for their farming operation?

And I must emphasize the reason for the insurance program, Mr. Speaker, was to let people know right across Canada, people out . . . labourers, or whether they be teachers, whether they be nurses, whether they be lawyers, whatever profession they may be in, because of the feeling and the animosity we find in our nation towards agricultural producers, because people were coming to . . . or beginning to feel that they were continually throwing dollars, good money after bad, into the agricultural sector.

The reason for an insurance program, Mr. Speaker, was to inform people that farmers would have the ability to carry insurance and protect themselves if they faced a period of severe loss or whether it was through drought, whether it was through hail, whether it was through frost, Mr. Speaker, giving farmers the ability to carry the protection that they needed.

And I can well remember, Mr. Speaker, the number of debates that took place across this province back in the spring of 1991, before the introduction of the 1991 program. And, Mr. Speaker, originally, the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development had worked together and had set up some 25 meetings across the province.

Now you can rest assured, Mr. Speaker, when you look at the vastness of our province and the miles and the many communities in this province and the 60,000 or the 50,000 farm families we have across this province, Mr. Speaker, what we found after the first series of meetings, we found people very annoyed. They wanted to have input to the GRIP legislation. They wanted to have input to the gross revenue insurance plan.

(1130)

And it didn't matter where the ministers went, whether it was the Minister of Agriculture, whether it was the Minister of Rural Development, when they scheduled a meeting, whether it was in Whitewood, whether it was in Weyburn, what they found, to their surprise, that the meeting halls that they always . . . that they chose . . . and they even felt that that meeting hall might be just too large; they're spending too much money renting this facility. But because they didn't know what kind of reception or what kind of turn-out they would have at these meetings, Mr. Speaker, what we found, what the ministers found, Mr. Speaker, that the turn-out was beyond their beliefs, beyond their expectations.

In fact, even in my constituency the complaints I heard was: why in the world didn't the departments locate a facility that would accommodate more people? Why did they rent such a small facility? Why didn't they at least rent the largest facility in the community so that when people came they wouldn't be on the outside trying to hear because the speaker system wasn't set up or wasn't capable of reaching out to people who ended up outside of the building standing? Because the indication, Mr. Speaker, was that many people wanted to hear and wanted to have input to the GRIP program.

And so, Mr. Speaker, over the period of the spring the 26 original meetings turned into, I believe, some 50

meetings across this province. And many ideas were thrown out. Many ideas were placed before the ministers. Many ideas were placed before the bureaucrats regarding the building and the creation of the GRIP program.

The unfortunate part, Mr. Speaker — and the commitment was made by the federal and provincial governments of the day — the unfortunate part was that many producers wanted to see major changes right up front to the program. But because we were already into the spring, into February and March, and were getting to the point where people were ready to start signing their contacts and establishing their contracts so they would know exactly where they stood as they began to plan their spring seeding operations, it was impossible, Mr. Speaker, to make major changes, although some minor changes were made and some minor changes were worked into the system even though they didn't satisfy all producers. And we realize that.

But the commitment was made to take those ideas and to continue an ongoing consultative process to look at improving the system for 1992.

And then, as we are all aware in here, Mr. Speaker, because it's a federally-provincially funded program — federal contributions, provincial contribution, and producer contribution to the insurance premium, Mr. Speaker — because it's federally and provincially funded, we're all aware of the fact as well, Mr. Speaker, that the process must take place to allow the federal government to bring forward the recommendations that their committee has brought to their attention.

And so I think . . . and the argument, as we've been laying that out, Mr. Speaker, has been along the lines that the provincial government should have given the process time to develop. The federal government said no, we will not make major changes this spring because we cannot . . . we don't have the timetable or the time frame to make the changes and to place them in the hands of the producers prior to the deadline that had been established in the 1991 contract that farmers signed.

And people would ask, but why would you have to sign a contract? Well, Mr. Speaker, we can look back to the crop insurance program over the years. Crop insurance was the type of program that if it looked like it might be a good year, then you just decided not to carry crop insurance for that year. Or if it looked like your area might be in . . . or your farm might be in a situation that the year may not be as good or it may not be as productive, then you carried insurance. You were in or out, just a matter of signing, just a matter informing the corporation by, I believe it was April 30, that you were going to be involved in the crop insurance program for that year, and then going in and filling out your form and deciding which crops you wanted to put into the crop insurance program.

The problem with that, Mr. Speaker, was because of the in-and-out ability yearly, it was very difficult for that insurance program to carry itself. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, when the gross revenue insurance program was brought into place, the suggestion was made that if you're in, you're in for, I believe it's five years, Mr. Speaker. You sign up. You signed up for five years.

If you decided that you didn't want to continue to be a member of the program, Mr. Speaker, then you gave notice that you were going to get out of the program. And you gradually got out of the program over three years. And then you would have, if you got out of the program, once you said you were getting out of the program, over three years you phased out of the program. And then once you were out of the program, you would have to wait two years before you could reapply. And then there was a three-year phase-in.

The reason for that, Mr. Speaker, was to try and acknowledge that insurance is only capable running at a break-even position and carrying itself if there are people involved that committed to the program. And we can talk to any insurance corporation in Canada and you will find there isn't any corporation or insurance company across this nation that would be able to survive if people were just in and out of a program or in and out of their insurance program, Mr. Speaker. Therefore the long and hard debate that has taken place, taken place in this legislature.

Now the difficulty we also find with the GRIP program and what we're finding with the 1992 program is that the 1992 program, what it has done is really — as the government and as the Minister of Agriculture would argue — well it's taken away the ability for farmers to, if you will use the term, if you want to use the term, abuse or take advantage of the program.

And, Mr. Speaker, that one component in many farmers' cases of allowing the producer to market his production over and above his guarantee at whatever the market price is, is something that producers right across Saskatchewan argued for and suggested they should have. And therefore, if the . . . and when they take the time, and when they put the investment into their crop production, Mr. Speaker, by producing, by putting in the fertilizer, by putting on the chemical, by managing their farm operation, and if they produce over their average, Mr. Speaker, by being able to do that and by being able to keep that production over and above that average or that guarantee.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that was a good component and that was a component that I spoke about during the campaign, a component I spoke about at a Sask Wheat Pool sponsored all-candidate meeting, Mr. Speaker. And I believe at the end of the day the general consensus at the meeting was as well that that was one positive component to be added to at the 1991 GRIP program — not changing it to the point that you went on an area average pay-out.

And that's where we find the great difficulty with the new program, Mr. Speaker. The new program, in and of itself, has some positive aspects, and we recognize that. Certainly the biggest detriment to the new program, Mr. Speaker, is it hurts the individual who, through no fault of his or her own or their own, as a family, the individuals such as we see in the Melfort-Tisdale area, individuals in other areas of the province, Mr. Speaker, where . . . even in the Kinistino area. The former MLA was just in yesterday and he mentioned about some of their crops



being no more than six and eight inches high.

And we've also seen reports from the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool where there are areas in this province where crops are being ploughed under because there's not enough to the crop, as well, to even make hay out of it for livestock feed, Mr. Speaker. These are the areas that are going to be very severely affected by the 1992 program.

Why, Mr. Speaker? Because if they would have been under the 1991 program, if their average would have been . . . The 1991 program, number one, paid them 100 per cent of the long-term average, as far as acreage average bushel production, and gave them the ability to choose a price option. And, Mr. Speaker, on that basis they were guaranteed their bottom line.

If their production was 30 bushels and they had the guarantee was \$4.15, the IMAP (indexed moving average price) price, they would be looking at somewhere in the neighbourhood of 124 or \$125 an acre. However, under this year's program they're looking at an IMAP price which we knew would be somewhat lower.

But they're also . . . the big factor in this year's program is the fact that their protection is based on 80 per cent of their long-term average if they took the 80 per cent. You were given that option. And as well, Mr. Speaker, it's based on an average of an area. And I would suggest the areas that have been drawn up and have been mapped out, Mr. Speaker, are so large and they are so broad that they allow for this factor that's going to take place this year where one person could have a crop and his neighbour down the road may not have a crop because of drought or because of frost, Mr. Speaker, and find that in the end when the average . . . the revenue portion that will be paid out or if it comes, depending on how the formula breaks down, if it comes out, whether it's 10, 15, 20, or \$25 an acre, the person with his bins running over will have not only his product to sell and . . .

There's a good possibility that the price of grain could go up, although we've seen over the last number of days on the Chicago market the fact that the price of wheat has been dropping steadily. And I think the reason for that, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier, the factors regarding the price of our product are determined outside of the boundaries of this great nation we live in. And the reason for the decrease in the price of wheat is the fact that the product coming off in the States right now is coming off much better than was anticipated. And on that basis, Mr. Speaker, it has put pressure on the world markets.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the person who has good production this year is going to find that not only is he going to have grain to market, not only is he going to have his bins full and being able to put this product into the market system, Mr. Speaker, and receive a return on that, but he's also going to get the same acreage pay-out as his neighbour down the road who has no crop to market even, and no crop to even take advantage of this year's prices.

Mr. Speaker, you can see why we are speaking out very loudly and why we have taken time to debate this motion and this Bill in this Assembly. Because, Mr. Speaker, we

believe that we should at least give opportunity for the process and talk about the fact that if it's wrong, give the government the ability to look at what has taken place. And they have had ample time, there's no doubt about it. They have had ample time to and become . . . I'm sure that even the Department of Agriculture is becoming more and more aware of some of the real problems that they will be facing with this new program as the harvesting begins and starts to proceed across this province.

And Mr. Speaker, the indication out there as well is not that even though in a lot of areas the crops are very lush and look to be very productive . . . We saw in our area last year, Mr. Speaker, where we had stands of wheat that many producers anticipated as they were swathing and as they were inspecting their fields that there may be a 40- or a 45- or a 50-bushel crop here, and yet the disappointment when after they pulled the combine into the field, Mr. Speaker, and after that grain was harvested, the fact that a lot of those crops, Mr. Speaker, that were anticipated to be in the 40- to 50-bushel range actually came off in that 30 to 35, and in some cases even as low as 25. Mr. Speaker, a stand of grain as you're driving down the road may look lush and productive but that doesn't necessarily mean that it's going to actually produce what it appears to produce, because it can be very deceiving.

And therefore, Mr. Speaker, we may find more than just the drought areas of this province where people are going to find that this 1992 program has become a very severe detriment to them trying to balance the ledger in their farming operation. It's going to become a detriment to them trying to meet the needs and trying to be able to keep up to the bills and going in to people that they've dealt with over the years, whether it's the bulk fuel dealer, whether it's the fertilizer dealer or the agent who's been handling their chemicals, Mr. Speaker, people that each and every one of us in the rural sector, we all know each other face to face and we're friends and we deal with each other. We not only deal with each other in our businesses and through our business operations, Mr. Speaker, but we deal with these individuals in the curling rinks and in the skating-rinks and in all kinds of community endeavours. And you become very close friends.

And I would suggest that there are many people, many producers who themselves, if they aren't able to pay their bills, feel bad about it because they don't want their close friend who's working as an agent, who's bringing fuel out to their farms faithfully over the years, they don't want him to think that now all of a sudden they're turning their back on him and aren't interested in paying their bills. And I believe most producers, most farmers across this province are very diligent and very conscientious and endeavour to . . . it is their extreme desire to make sure their bills are paid and up to date.

And also, Mr. Speaker, not only is it the problem of paying up bills, it creates, without funds in the hands of farmers, it creates a problem for people in the business community. It creates a problem for the small equipment dealers across this province.

And we take a look at a number of our communities. And in the community of Kipling, Mr. Speaker, we don't have an implement dealer left in that community. And that is

basically because of the fact that, number one, Mr. Speaker, because of the difficulties that we have seen in agriculture, because of the lack of a comprehensive and sound revenue or an insurance program, Mr. Speaker, Farmers were unable to make their payments, were unable to make their commitments, and in many cases were unable to continue the normal upgrading of their equipment, that many of our small equipment dealers across the province finally had to close the doors because they couldn't continue to operate on the basis of building up debt after debt after debt such as we have seen in the agricultural sector.

(1145)

So you can see, Mr. Speaker, why the government would be very concerned about the debate that is taking place here. And whether or not the media is following it very closely, Mr. Speaker, is not the question. The fact is, that as long as we are debating in this House, and the fact that we're getting closer to the harvest season, Mr. Speaker, we're getting closer to the time of year when producers will get a better understanding of where they stand regarding the GRIP program, where they stand regarding their ability to meet their commitments this fall.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, the government themselves will realize that as well, that they are going to find that more and more producers are going to begin looking a lot more closer at the program, at where they're at. And as they begin to find out that they're further behind and that indeed what they had budgeted for this spring, what they had spent for . . . based on their budget, and all of a sudden their income isn't there, Mr. Speaker, and they're unable to pay the bills, that we're going to find more people on the doorstep, more people calling MLAs in this Legislative Assembly. Not just opposition members, Mr. Speaker, but even government members as well.

And I'm sure that government members, if they were honest, would indicate that yes, people across Saskatchewan — some have indicated, yes, we can live with '92. Many have said '91 would be more beneficial and '91 would help us get ourselves established and back on our feet.

And I would also suggest, Mr. Speaker, that under the '92 program, by year's end, Mr. Speaker, or even into the January and February of 1993, another factor that is going to crop up is the factor of farm foreclosures. Many people, even though today they have a bit of a reprieve because of the fact they've got a crop in the ground and the potential is there for some revenue, the fact that this program has been down-sized considerably and the guarantee is not there, Mr. Speaker, we are going to find, and I believe you will see, that there will be more and more farmers coming before the federal Farm Debt Review Board.

In fact there are some individuals in my area who are on the board, and they have indicated that they are amazed at the number of producers who still end up before the board, trying to look at ways and means of saving their farm operation.

And, Mr. Speaker, what we have found over the past number of years and months regarding . . . when it comes

to negotiations regarding farm foreclosures and having the Farm Debt Review Board come in, we find we get the lender . . . usually the Farm Debt Review Board by acting as a mediator is able to bring the lender and the farm family together. And on numerous occasions they've been able to sit down and come to workable agreements regarding their farm operation, regarding the foreclosure notice that has been set out there.

And in a lot of cases that agreement has been based on what guarantee the gross revenue insurance program was bringing to their farming operation. And we find, Mr. Speaker — however we find, Mr. Speaker, what it's doing this year, the '92 program is taking away that sound guarantee that many of these farm families had restructured and reorganized their farms around.

Mr. Speaker, we're also aware of the fact that we've been sitting for . . . this House has been open for a number of days, number of weeks, number of months, for a period of time. We're also aware that it's just about . . . the summer has just about passed us by. And we're aware of the fact that many people have been forced to give up and forfeit their holiday time because of the sitting of this Assembly. And as I noted the other day, I picked up an article that was written, and I took a look at the first paragraph, and I basically threw the article aside. I thought, well here we go again. It's an article that's just running the opposition down.

But yesterday I decided to pick the article up again and just look at it a little more closely. And I find that even though the article is based on the fact that there are many people annoyed at what has taken place in this Assembly and they're annoyed, as the writer of the article would indicate, at the opposition for ruining — I'm not sure if the word he's used here is quite appropriate, so I'll say, ruining — their summer holidays.

And talking about a good summer. And yes, I think we have to admit that even though July was kind of a cool and damp and wet month and it wasn't much for the businesses in our parks or even for the parks and recreation, the rural parks, across this province — many businesses found it to be a very difficult time of the year — the month of August has proven to be an exceptional month, an excellent month to be actually enjoying the great outdoors much more, rather than sitting in this Legislative Assembly.

And so I can appreciate the fact that there are people who are somewhat annoyed at the fact that their summer has just been wasted and their ability to spend time with the family has been wasted.

But the article goes on to say, talking about whether the Tories should have been speaking and debating in this Assembly. He says:

. . . we'd be remiss in not taking a hard look at the important questions of principle they've raised about the way the NDP government is operating.

And then as the article continues:

And once you begin to answer some of these

questions — (the question) who has been abusing the legislature and who has shown virtually no respect for the institution — you may reach the same conclusion as the Tories:

And what does it say? It says:

Romanow and the NDP can't be trusted.

The mistrust that must now be directed at the NDP isn't solely because of the hypocrisy they've displayed on this issue, although that hypocrisy is ample reason to question their principles.

And then he, the editorialist, Mr. Speaker, talked about speaking to one of his editors and he says:

... (the editor) reminded me (of) recently that hypocrite was the strongest word that Jesus ever used and ... he used ... (it) once. (And he says) Perhaps so, but Jesus never covered Saskatchewan politics. I dare say, had he, he would have used hypocrite at least twice.

Perhaps we can instead use a more politically correct term like "morally diverse" or "ethically challenged" to describe the 20-minute diatribe that spewed from Romanow Thursday, explaining why he now believes prolonged bell-ringing at the legislature should end.

There were times in his 25-year political career — like the potash nationalization debate of 1975 — where: (he says and he's quoting the then leader of the opposition, the Premier) "I feared this institution would not survive debate," Romanow — well into his wise old political sage role — told the Assembly Thursday.

But (he says) the legislature did survive the potash debate and even his own opposition's 1989 SaskEnergy debate, Romanow noted. (He somehow neglected to mention that the debate never occurred in the assembly. As the Tories did June 11 on the GRIP bill, his opposition walked out before the legislation could be introduced.

At any rate, (going back to the 1989 debate) the NDP was justified in denying the introduction of the SaskEnergy legislation because the Tories didn't campaign on its privatization in the previous election ...

And as we've indicated on the GRIP Bill, Mr. Speaker, the government talked about changes to the GRIP Bill. And the opposition of the day and the government of the day and the opposition, present opposition, while we were campaigning, talked about changes to the GRIP Bill, Mr. Speaker. But no one really anticipated that the government would use the majority that they have today to so diversely change the program, just wiping out from under people's feet their ability to establish an insurance program or an insurance guideline that they could manage with.

Mr. Speaker, what we also say, it's not just the debate

that's taking place regarding the GRIP Bill, there are other issues as well. And the fact that this Bill takes away the rights of individuals.

And the writer of this article also says:

... what are we now seeing from Roy Romanow in his first summer as premier?

Are bills with retroactive clauses contributing to public discussion? Is introducing closure an enhancement of public debate?

... what are not not seeing from Romanow and his government?

Quietly, the NDP is now releasing the regulations — the fine print explaining how laws are to be interpreted — that give NDP cabinet ministers some of the most sweeping powers this province has ever seen.

And, Mr. Speaker, as we've raised in this Assembly and we will continue to raise as we get into further debate on many of the Bills and many of the committees in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, I think not only the media, but many people across Saskatchewan are sincerely becoming very concerned regarding the process that has been followed by this government, by using a so-called majority, a large majority ...

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

**Ms. Hamilton:** — Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the person reading the article would — as they allude to in the second half of the article, the hypocritical opposition — if he would read the last two paragraphs or table the document.

**The Speaker:** — Order. That's certainly not a point of privilege. And our rules do not provide that a private member has to table any document. That only pertains to ... Order. That only pertains to cabinet ministers. Order.

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I believe the articles that are available are available to everyone, Mr. Speaker. And we all recognize that, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, when you look at ... and a number of the members opposite are talking about reading all of the articles that we have in front of us. And yet we see, Mr. Speaker, it was the government members thought it very appropriate for them to be waving around a document, reading one or two sentences that were to their ... what they felt were beneficial. Were they willing to read the whole article, Mr. Speaker?

And, Mr. Speaker, it also sounds like ... it sounds to me like many of the members have finally come awake and would like to enter into the debate.

It reminds me of a little story, Mr. Speaker, a little story I heard a while back of the senator who was noticed as being very astute and also was continually in the Assembly and appearing up for sessions. And people

thought, well boy, that's interesting that a senator would be noted as having been always in his place in the Senate.

However It wasn't all that long, about a few days later, that someone noticed that the dear soul had passed on and brought the question to the Assembly: how come you didn't notice that the reason the person was available at every meeting was . . . and that he had passed on. The comment was made: but, Mr. Speaker, it's because he was a man of so few words.

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

**An Hon. Member:** — Mr. Speaker, point of order.

**The Speaker:** — What is your point of order?

**Mr. Pringle:** — On this story about the senator. I wonder if the member would confirm that this is Senator Berntson?

**The Speaker:** — Order. Both members are out of order. I think the member from Moosomin realizes that we are on the GRIP Bill. Order, order. Why is the member on his feet?

**An Hon. Member:** — Point of order.

**The Speaker:** — Yes.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that we don't want a further travesty of the Legislative Assembly. The points of order raised are obviously frivolous with the intent of distracting the member from Moosomin in making his speech.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order.

**An Hon. Member:** — Point of order.

**The Speaker:** — Look, I'm not going to take any more points of order. I've ruled that the member . . . By the way, the member from Saskatoon Eastview-Haultain, I did not recognize that, but he wasn't even in his right place when he made the comment.

Number two, number . . . Order. Number two, the member from Moosomin should recognize that we are on Bill No. 87. I think his story really had nothing to do with Bill No. 87.

It now being 12 o'clock, this House stands recessed until 2 p.m. this afternoon.

The Assembly recessed until 2 p.m.