

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
February 26, 1993

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next ask the government the following questions:

Regarding the Department of Executive Council, (1) what was the total expense incurred from expanding the cabinet from 12 to 18 members; (2) how many additional ministerial assistants were hired; (3) how many other staff were hired; (4) what is the total expense of those hired; (5) what is the total value of additional salaries provided to the MLAs (Member of the Legislative Assembly) promoted to cabinet; and (6) what is the total value of additional benefits and allowances provided to MLAs promoted to cabinet?

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Whitmore: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you and to you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce some guests today. In the west gallery, Mr. and Mrs. Cecil and Ina Ralchenko from rural North Battleford who are dear friends of mine and came down yesterday to partake in the throne speech activities and are today taking part in the activities in the House. I hope the House would give them a warm welcome today. Thank you.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to welcome to you and through you to the House today in the Speaker's gallery we have Cory Deimert of Shaunavon and I wish all members to welcome him.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you Miss Joyce Roth. This is her first trip to the Assembly. This is her first time in, and I would like to ask all members to help me welcome her to the Assembly.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly Mr. Orest Myzak who is a long-time ag rep from Canora, in the west gallery, and would like to welcome him to the Assembly.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Government Economic Policy

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question will be to the Premier this morning. Mr.

Premier, since November 1, 1991, the citizens of this province have witnessed the most dramatic betrayal of the truth ever forced on an electorate in this province. They thought they were voting for less tax, and they have been gouged. They thought they were voting for lower utility rates, and they've had their pockets turned inside out. They thought they were voting for increases to health, education, and social services, and those have been ravaged.

It's no wonder, Mr. Premier, that people by the thousands are not only abandoning your political party but this province as a whole.

Mr. Premier, my question is, instead of the sleight of hand that you seem to be making an art form of in politics today, will you try your hand at telling the people of this province, the taxpayers, and this House if you intend on implementing some form of a tax reduction in the upcoming budget that will give people in this province some hope to stay here and build?

Perhaps a fair and equal application of a harmonized tax system would be a start. Or will you be very selective, as you have in the past, and keep gouging people? What will it be, Mr. Premier?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the hon. member for the question. Unlike the hon. member's question, I work from a different assumption.

I believe the people of Saskatchewan voted for change. They voted for change where the books of the province would be opened up; the true state of the fiscal situation would be revealed to them; that the sleight of hand that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition talks about, being practised for nine years by that former administration, be ended.

It has been ended. We have on our hands a fiscal crisis, not only domestically in the province of Saskatchewan, but almost nationally. In the midst of all of this horror left behind by you, sir, when you sat on the treasury benches, and compounded by your allies in Ottawa, notwithstanding all of this horror, we are trying to renew Saskatchewan by providing, as the budget will reveal, compassion for those who are affected the most, and opportunities for small business, where possible, to try and have the economy grow.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Mr. Premier, you have once again lapsed into the only defence that you seem to know, and that's to blame anybody and everybody for your own incompetence, for your own deceit with Saskatchewan voters, and the unfair tax grab that your own ability to govern has shown people.

Can you today, Mr. Premier, tell us what specific plans your government has other than paying off your friends and taxing the productive sector and the middle class

right out of this province. What real plans do you have to stimulate renewed confidence in our province's people? They need leadership, Mr. Premier, and they are knocking at your door. And I'm afraid so far no one has answered. Mr. Premier, answer the door.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Well I'm pleased to answer the door, but not only that, I'm pleased to walk right, straight through the door, thanks to the opening of the member's question. Because what the member says in his question is the only defence that I have is blaming somebody else. What the hon. member ought to realize is that the best defence is truth. Truth.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — And the best defence is the \$15 billion strait-jacket, sir, that you have put us and the people of the province of Saskatchewan on. That is the truth.

And also the truth is that we have proceeded in other areas. I have here in front of me a new agriculture paper. I have here in front of me a new health vision paper. I have here in front of me a new economic jobs strategy paper — something, sir, which in nine years your administration either had neither the vision nor the courage to advance.

We are providing the people hope, but we're telling the people the truth. The truth is through waste, through mismanagement, through horrific deals, we have a year or two ahead of us of toughness, but we have hope; we have daylight at the end of this tunnel that we are in now. And that daylight is again to provide opportunity and security and compassion for the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question once again is to the Premier. Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that the Premier talked about truth this morning. It's the point that we've been trying to make, Mr. Premier, is that Saskatchewan taxpayers feel that they have not been getting the truth about many things.

Mr. Premier, why don't you do as you did in Prince Albert with the agricultural question where you did come clean with Saskatchewan farmers, where you did come clean and say that you shouldn't have changed, if you had it to do over again, the GRIP (gross revenue insurance program) program?

While we're on truth, Mr. Premier, why don't you today admit that the government's lack of a plan and vision is what is wrong with this province? It's the only thing that is holding Saskatchewan taxpayers back from pulling themselves up by the boot straps and making this province a better place to live. Why don't you admit that truth today, Mr. Premier?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I think that there are

basically two answers in that question because there are two different directions that the question has. First of all, if I may say to the hon. member opposite, the vision is clearly set out, set out in the Speech from the Throne, the vision which is the journey of renewal and the various position papers and subsequent follow-up legislation which you'll see in this session, and tax initiatives and budget initiatives to back up the specific plans which we have articulated.

The hon. member talks about coming clean with respect to Prince Albert and GRIP. I said in Prince Albert something I've been saying for months, and I repeat here again: the mistake that we made was to try to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear in changing GRIP. GRIP '91 and GRIP '92 are flawed; they're fundamentally flawed.

And if I may say so, today's Canadian Press story from Edmonton says that in Alberta there will be a \$400 million deficit in Alberta on GRIP alone. And in Manitoba the Minister of Agriculture, Glen Findlay, said the plan was designed only as an interim measure, and they too know that it is flawed. Sir, if you fessed up, talking about the truth, to the truth of the programs, namely the programs which are fundamentally and basically flawed, you'd be on side in devising programs which really support family farmers.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again my question is to the Premier. Mr. Speaker, that's the fundamental problem that we seem to be having in this House today and that Saskatchewan taxpayers have, is that given an opportunity to come clean, the Premier once again slides back into his old ways. And I think, Mr. Speaker, it's appropriate that I quote to the Premier exactly what he did say in Prince Albert on January 13, 1993:

The changes we made to GRIP '91 and GRIP '92 were not the answer, that's for sure. They added to the problem in some ways. I think that if I had to do it all over again I wouldn't have touched it. I wouldn't have touched it.

Mr. Premier, the problem here is that you probably shouldn't have touched a lot of things and we wouldn't be where we are today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — My question to you was, Mr. Premier, will you now tell this Assembly what some of your vision is, not doom and gloom, but vision for the taxpayers of this province so that they aren't going to feel that the terrible medicine that you've brought upon them won't some day give them a cure. Can you tell us that, Mr. Premier?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think about the only person left in Saskatchewan that doesn't understand what the vision and the plan is surely must be the Leader of the Opposition.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Because we have been saying this over and over again.

The Leader of the Opposition would have us not touch anything. The Leader of the Opposition would not have us touch the \$15 billion deficit. The Leader of the Opposition would want us to add \$1 billion each and every year as you did for the nine years that you were in office, bankrupting not only our children and our grandchildren, but bankrupting this province. That's what the Leader of the Opposition would not have us touch.

Well I tell you, sir, we have got the guts and the courage and the duty to touch that. We are going to tell the truth in the books as we have, and we're going to tell the people of Saskatchewan the truth — that you saddled this province with the largest debt in the history of Canada, if not province of Saskatchewan. And we're about to correct it. We're not listening to your truths.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. Mr. Premier, in your throne speech delivered in this House yesterday, you asked to be judged on its own terms. You asked that we allow you some latitude.

Well, Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the throne speech the only concrete things we saw were community bonds and AECL (Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd.), the initiatives of the former government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — And those were the truths, Mr. Speaker. Those were the truths. The things like the Premier's commitment on accountability to never use special warrants again. That is evidently not the truth.

Mr. Premier, since your government is really the cause of the despair that Saskatchewan people are feeling, and because there are no concrete solutions in the throne speech, will you admit that the choices you've made so far are the wrong ones and be a part of participating in the solutions, not creating problems?

Mr. Premier, give us some indications of what your government is going to do to simply get out of the way of Saskatchewan people, Saskatchewan taxpayers, and let them get on with fulfilling the destiny that they all want to achieve. Tell us how you're going to get out of the way then.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Well, Mr. Speaker, this question period, by way of the questions, has a very, very familiar ring from last session and I've given I think about 20 copies of our campaign slogan, called "The Saskatchewan Way," which is what we campaigned on: "First Things First — Common Sense Financial Management." That was what we got elected on. New

direction, new . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. This is the first question period of a new session and I want to warn members that I will simply not accept the interference, either when the member asks a question or when the minister is answering. In this particular case there was no interference when the Leader of the Opposition asked his question and I expect the same when the Premier is answering.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Well thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. All I wish to say in response is, if there is a cause of despair, it is the despair wrought by nine years of the most profligate, wasteful, incompetent government in the history of the province of Saskatchewan.

I tell you, sir, in my answer that if there is hope, it is the fact that we are going the exactly opposite direction in bringing fiscal sensibility and priorities and hope for those who need it in this province. And the people in the province of Saskatchewan . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. This is a question period I think for the opposition to seek answers from the government . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well you can't expect it if you're constantly interrupting. If the member from Wilkie wishes to waste a question period by interfering when the Speaker is on his feet, that's fine with me.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I don't think I have anything further to add to this question. And judging by the heckling from the opposition, they are allergic . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Next question.

Mr. Swenson: — My final question today to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, tell this Assembly then how huge tax hikes, utility rate hikes beyond the rate of inflation, continued out-migration, higher unemployment, erosion of farm safety nets — how then does this square with your NDP (New Democratic Party) promises in the last election? How does that square in a throne speech, the second throne speech of your government, that doesn't correct any of those problems?

If that's the record that you campaigned on, Mr. Premier, then I would say that that NDP program that you always trot out in this legislature was a terrible falsehood that you perpetrated on the Saskatchewan voters. Mr. Premier, square the NDP platform with those points that I've just raised this morning.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm running out of copies of the NDP campaign platform . . .

An Hon. Member: — We'll print some more.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — We might have to print some more to mail them over to the Leader of the Opposition, but only if he promises to read it — just once. And if he reads it once he will see when we describe the Saskatchewan way, exactly what we're doing and why

we're doing it. And he'll find that what we're doing there is essentially in its essence the direction that the people of Saskatchewan want us to go.

And I say to the Leader of the Opposition opposite there and to the small band of supporters which he has, the result of the election results, the election in '91, prove, prove exactly the fact that the people of Saskatchewan know, want, demand us to take an entirely different direction than yours, and we're going to do it. Fiscal integrity and hope and opportunity — that's our approach.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Job Creation

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Premier likes to talk glowingly about his campaign literature, Mr. Speaker. Common-sense management would not recognize the things that you've done so far, Mr. Premier. Increased taxes and utility rates do not lead to economic activity. Restoring faith in politicians does not entail breaking campaign promises. Bringing people together does not involve pitting community against community in health care services.

Mr. Premier, my question is for you. I notice in the throne speech you talk about creating 8,000 new jobs. Would the NDP leader please report how many of the 700 companies and 16,000 additional jobs promised in the last throne speech have become a reality.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order. Before the minister answers I just want to direct to the member from Kindersley, he does not direct a question to the Leader of the NDP. The Premier and the ministers answer for the government, not for a political party.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to the member's question on job creation because it's a very, very important issue. To have the member know that there are a number of areas where there have been significant jobs created, I want to go through a few of them here today. And I'm sure the member will be interested.

Spar Group in Swift Current expansion, 60 to 80 jobs; Hitachi Industries in Saskatoon, the new increase in the expansion of 25 jobs; Norquay Alfalfa Processors — and I want to compliment the member from that constituency — 45 jobs for his effort; Babcock & Wilcox in Melville, 35 jobs; Sears Canada, 900 jobs; Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, keeping jobs and rebuilding that smelter, 375 jobs; Wanuskewin Heritage Park in Saskatoon, 40 jobs. And the list goes on and on.

And I want to say to you very clearly, very clearly — if the members would care to listen — is that job creation is very important. We're working with companies like Flexi-Coil and Mr. Terry Summach, who has been involved in trade missions with us. The employment level there has gone from 400 when you were the government to 800 now. And I can say in many, many areas there have

been significant changes that are very different than Promavia, Trinitel, Joytec, and those job-creation projects like GigaText that not only didn't create employment, but saw millions of dollars of taxpayers' money now having to be paid off by this administration.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. NDP talk about economic renewal and job creation but only mention in their throne speech, AECL and community bonds, both initiatives that were put forward by the previous administration, not yours, sir. Not your administration, sir.

The Premier . . . Mr. Speaker, my question is again to the Premier. The Premier has been unable to give us examples of businesses that are coming to Saskatchewan. I wonder if he could give us some examples of a business or businesses that will not come to Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the members listen to the answers before they read the prepared questions, because I just listed for him, I just listed for him a large number of job projects. But I will repeat some of them and add new projects to that list.

I mentioned Wanuskewin Heritage Park, 40 jobs; the TCCCS/IRIS (Tactical Command and Control Communication System) National Defence contract that has come to Saskatchewan, 50 jobs; Mercury Graphics, 30 jobs; Sask-Can Fibre Inc., 4 jobs; Alcatel Canada in Weyburn, their new \$10 million expansion; Phillips Cables, their \$1.7 million expansion.

And I say to the members opposite, if you want to go through this list — I say again, there are many, many more — come to my office and I'll give you the long list of companies that are expanding and moving to Saskatchewan.

And listen to what I say because there have been thousands of jobs created and that is why the business community is very, very interested . . .

The Speaker: — Next question.

Mr. Boyd: — Mr. Speaker, if the Premier and his cabinet would listen to their constituents, they would know the kind of harm and fiscal and economic steamroller that they're rolling over this province with.

We know of, for example, Mr. Speaker, that a major hotel chain has put off its decision to locate in Saskatchewan as a result of the doom and gloom that this Premier continually wants to present to the people of Saskatchewan.

Can the Leader of the Government please provide Saskatchewan with some kind of hope and encouragement to bring this new economic development initiative to Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the member opposite that we have had great cooperation from the business community in developing the

economic renewal strategy for Saskatchewan. Literally thousands of business people have been positively having input into our economic development plan.

I consulted with that member before this document was released, gave him copies of it, consulted with him, and asked for his opinion and input. I did the same to the Leader of the Liberal Party — asked for input and comment. To date I am still waiting for your input, positive input to this document. And I still wait.

The Leader of the Liberal Party said that she would bring one project per week to the House or to the government. I still wait after more than 52 weeks for the first example of economic development to come from that member.

So I say it's great to criticize. But the business community of this province have bought into economic development program. If you haven't, I ask you sincerely to come, bring your projects, and we will work on them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that businesses will not relocate to Saskatchewan. Should we be surprised that there is no confidence in the business community when the Premier tells everyone that we're a basket case in this province.

Should we be surprised when companies think twice about locating, when the things like *The Melfort Journal* . . . the member from Melfort stands up and says the province is near collapse — a quote in *The Melfort Journal* — that's what one of your members says.

Is it any wonder, is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that people and hotel chains don't want to relocate in this province. It's no wonder to me and I'm sure it's no wonder to the people of Saskatchewan.

Will the Leader of the NDP of this . . .

The Speaker: — Will the member rephrase his question please.

Mr. Boyd: — Will the Premier of this one-term government please give this province one shred of hope, one peek at his vision. Will he stop his doom and gloom rhetoric long enough to offer the people of Saskatchewan some shred of hope in this time that you continually . . . to pervade people with this doom and gloom scenario.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to that question. Because quite honestly the only gloom and doom that I hear around the province is when people talk about what the previous government did. That's the only gloom and doom I hear.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — I want to tell you, Mr. Minister, a story about the confidence that the federal government has in this province. There was a proposed deal with AECL before the last election that we stopped and

reviewed.

Your federal minister, Mr. Jake Epp, not only had the confidence in the province, but cut the amount that the Saskatchewan government had to put in by 5 million and is moving that project here because not only do they have the confidence in the province, but they say they can do the deal cheaper and more rationally under this government than they could under yours.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — So you see the federal government, even your Conservative cousins in Ottawa, believe and have more confidence in this province under an NDP administration.

I say again, and I'm not going to go through the list, but new businesses are not uncommon. In fact, in almost every constituency there are examples: the Norquay alfalfa plant, Sears Canada locating in here; against the proposal to go to Conservative Manitoba or Conservative Alberta, they chose Saskatchewan.

So there are many examples of very positive business endeavours that are undertaken, and I wonder why the member has to be so negative in his approach to economic development.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1030)

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Neudorf: — A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Speaker, during the question period you ruled that there was no Leader of the NDP and I have no quarrel with that. The Minister of Economic Development at the same time, Mr. Speaker, referred to the Leader of the Liberal Party and there was no admonition for that. I'm just wondering if you could review that ruling and put that in order.

The Speaker: — I do recall and think the member makes a very valid point. At the time I should have interrupted, and I apologize for not doing so. The member makes a very valid point.

PRIVILEGE

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much for that ruling, Mr. Speaker. Pursuant to rule 16(1), I have informed the Speaker of my intention to bring forth a question of privilege and I would do so at this time, Mr. Speaker, the question of privilege regarding the conduct of the chairman of the Crown Corporations Committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that in ordinary circumstances a question of privilege occurring in a committee should be raised in that committee itself. But because this committee was meeting intersessionally, I as House Leader was not available until three days ago when I heard about this. And therefore I put this to you

that this is the earliest opportunity I have to raise this particular question.

But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, the question of privilege deals directly with the conduct of the chairman of the committee and calls into question his impartial function.

Given the nature of the issue, it was not possible to raise the question in the committee since the chairman had abandoned his role as the independent arbiter of the rules. For all those reasons, I suggest Mr. Speaker cannot rule the question of privilege invalid for lateness or failure to raise the point in the committee itself.

On February 11, 1993, the chairman of the Crown Corporations Committee engaged in debate with the member for Morse regarding facts before the committee. Without getting into the specific debate itself, I quote two simple statements that demonstrate without question that the chairman engaged in debate with the member and left the member without an opportunity to pursue his objectives as a member of this legislature. I quote the verbatim for that meeting:

... as chair (I quote), as chair, I must correct you on the facts (he said).

And he continues and I quote again:

But with respect to this issue, you are clearly not outlining the facts as they are.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious breach of that member's privileges for several reasons. Firstly, as the chairman controls the meeting, members have no assurance that they will have the ability to confront the particular interpretation of the so-called facts as the chairman declares them to be. The chairman must make rulings and run meetings, but if he strays into taking issue with members about facts under debate, the distinction between a ruling and debate will be lost and members will not have the confidence that the chairman himself knows the difference.

Moreover, members, Mr. Speaker, are prohibited ... they're prohibited by the rules from engaging in debate with the chair. By definite corollary, the chair must then not engage in debate with members. The chair was at liberty at this meeting to leave the chair and engage in the debate as a private member. But for him to boldly contradict the member from the chair on the facts of an issue is utterly unacceptable, Mr. Speaker. And I suggest that if the chair argues with members about the facts the committee is considering, the members are unable ... they're unable, Mr. Speaker, to execute their duties.

Now in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, either, Mr. Speaker, this breach of privilege must be acknowledged and corrected or members will find themselves with no choice but to assume that they must be prepared to engage in debate not only with members of the opposing caucus but with officers of the Assembly itself. And clearly, Mr. Speaker, you recognize that this cannot be allowed and therefore correction of that chairman is necessary in the interests of the privileges of the members and the good conduct of the

business of the Assembly.

And I ask you, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, that you rule that the chairman of the Crown Corporations Committee has in fact breached the privileges of the member from Morse and he has clearly interfered with that member's ability to do his duty. And no member can have confidence in the impartiality of that particular chairman until he is called to account for his inappropriate actions and this House is assured that there will be no repeat performance.

I thank you for your indulgence, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I just wish to speak very briefly to the point of privilege raised by the member from Rosthern. In consulting with the member for Regina North West, the chairman of the Crown Corporations Committee, in asking whether or not this issue was raised in the Crown Corporation Committee meeting, to show the importance of the issue, it was not even raised as an issue at the committee meeting.

Subsequent to that, I asked the chairman of the committee if there had been letters exchanged or any discussions held. He indicates it has never been raised in any way, even though there is a long time period between when the incident alleged occurred and when it's being raised.

I would expect it would have been raised immediately in the committee as a point of order. It wasn't. It could have been raised to the chairman in the intermediate period; wasn't raised. I think what we're seeing here, quite honestly, is a bit of grandstanding by that member; I know not for what reason. But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I would rule on that and give it the attention that it obviously deserves.

The Speaker: — Order. The Speaker's office received notice this morning regarding this question of privilege, pursuant to rule 6 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan*, for which I want to thank the member.

The question of privilege on proceedings in the Standing Committee on Crown Corporations on February 11, 1993, I refer members to Beauchesne's *Parliamentary Rules & Forms*, 6th Edition, which states the following, citation 107:

Breaches of privilege in committee may be dealt with only by the House itself on report from the committee.

Citation 760(3):

The Speaker has ruled on many occasions that it is not competent for the Speaker to exercise procedural control over committees. Committees are and must remain masters of their own procedure.

The important principle here rests on the fact that proceedings in committees are guided by the committee

chair and not by the Speaker of the House. A question of privilege arising in a committee must be dealt with first in the committee. When the committee reports the matter of privilege to the House, then the Speaker becomes involved.

There is a well-established practice in this Assembly on this very subject. And I refer members to the rules of the Chair on May 28, 1991; December 13, 1982; March 25, 1981; April 11, 1980; and April 19, 1976. I therefore inform the House and the member that it is not competent for the Chair to consider the matter of privilege raised by the member, and suggest that the matter be raised in the proper forum.

MOTIONS

Referral of the By-laws of the Professional Associations and Amendments to the Standing Committee on Regulations

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, I have a few routine motions that I would like to introduce at this time. The first moved, and seconded by the member for Regina Dewdney, by leave:

That the by-laws of the professional associations and amendments thereto be referred as tabled to the Special Committee on Regulations.

Leave granted.

Motion agreed to.

Referral of Report of the Provincial Auditor to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member from Saskatoon River Heights, by leave of the Assembly:

That the *Report of the Provincial Auditor* for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1992 be referred as tabled this session to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Leave granted.

Motion agreed to.

Referral of Public Accounts to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the member for Regina Hillsdale, by leave of the Assembly:

That the *Public Accounts* for the province of Saskatchewan for the fiscal year ended March 31 be referred as tabled this session to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Leave granted.

Motion agreed to.

Referral of Annual Report to the Standing Committee on Communication

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member from Quill Lakes, by leave of the Assembly:

That the report of the Saskatchewan Legislative Library be referred as tabled to the Standing Committee on Communication.

Leave granted.

Motion agreed to.

Referral of Annual Reports and Financial Statements to the Standing Committee on Crown Corporations

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Saskatoon Fairview, that by leave of the Assembly:

That the annual reports and financial statements of the various Crown corporations and related agencies be referred as tabled to the Standing Committee on Crown Corporations.

I so move.

Leave granted.

Motion agreed to.

Referral of Retention and Disposal Schedules to the Standing Committee on Communication

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member from Melfort, by leave of the Assembly:

That the retention and disposal schedules approved under The Archives Act by the Public Documents Committee be referred as tabled to the Standing Committee on Communication.

I so move.

Leave granted.

Motion agreed to.

(1045)

Attendance of Member to the Forty-second Parliamentary Seminar at Westminster

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member from Canora:

That leave of absence be granted to the hon. member for the constituency of Moose Jaw Palliser for Monday, March 1, 1993 to Friday, March 12, 1993 inclusive, for the purpose of attending the forty-second parliamentary seminar at Westminster.

I so move.

Leave granted.

Motion agreed to.

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

Mr. Roy: — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the Assembly to introduce guests.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Roy: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to present to you and through you to the members of the Legislative Assembly, two guests from my constituency, Kinistino, Mr. Reinhold Kirsch and his son Scott. They're sitting in your gallery, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Kirsch is a small-business person from the community of Middle Lake. He's in Regina today on business. And I'd like to ask all the members of the legislature to welcome Reiny and Scott to Regina, and I hope that they have a pleasant stay in Regina here today. Thank you.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Upshall: — Before orders of the day, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — Yes, the member may proceed.

MOTION UNDER RULE 42

Mr. Upshall: — I ask leave of this Assembly, pursuant to rule 42, to introduce a motion. This motion is dealing with the agricultural situation in Saskatchewan. And I will just read the motion:

That this Assembly call upon the Government of Canada to end its policy of offloading federal responsibilities on the backs of farm families by: (a) reversing its decision to increase grain transportation costs to Saskatchewan farmers by \$18 million; and (b) fulfilling its promise to provide at least \$500 million in a third line of defence payment.

Mr. Speaker, I so move, seconded by the member for Shaunavon.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order, order.

Leave granted.

Mr. Upshall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again I will say, at the conclusion of my remarks, I will pass this motion calling upon the federal government to stop its offloading and by reversing its decision to put \$80 million on the backs of Saskatchewan farmers through reducing transportation costs and to provide a third line of defence payment of at least \$500 million.

Before I start, Mr. Speaker, I thought about what we were doing here in terms of today being condolence day. And, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't sure that I wanted to supersede condolence day, but I'm sure that Mr. Perkins, Mr. Broten, and Mr. Thurston, who have passed away since this Assembly last sat, would be very pleased to set this condolence day aside to address the important issue of agriculture in this province.

Mr. Speaker, we have . . . I'm almost tired, Mr. Speaker, of standing up and talking about agriculture and asking the members opposite to cooperate with us to call upon Ottawa to make a decision to support agriculture in this province instead of putting it down.

Different from a year ago, I think this is one small step. A year ago in a similar situation with a similar motion, you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the members opposite denied us the chance to debate this issue and to call upon Ottawa to support Saskatchewan farmers. So I see a little glimmering. I don't know if it's the leadership race or what, but there's something, there is a slight move here and I'm really pleased to see that. Because with cooperation I think that we can succeed in ensuring Saskatchewan farmers get what they deserve.

The history, Mr. Speaker, of this Tory government in Ottawa has not been very beneficial to Saskatchewan farmers. In the past number of years we have seen the offloading on transportation alone. I'll just start with that topic.

Transportation. I can remember a number of years ago paying about less than one-third of cost to transportation. It was in statute that the Crow benefit, the Crow rate would be paid by the federal government in perpetuity.

We saw the beginning of the demise of that, Mr. Speaker, with the Liberal regime in Ottawa a number of years ago. I can remember Mr. Jean-Luc Pepin beginning the demise of the transportation industry in this country. Mr. Pepin and . . . what's his name from Humboldt?

An Hon. Member: — Otto Lang.

Mr. Upshall: — Otto Lang. My friend from Humboldt, Otto Lang, continued the tradition. And I see no change today, Mr. Speaker. I don't hear the Leader of the Liberal Party in Ottawa or the Leader of the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan jumping up and down and saying, let's stop the demise of the transportation industry for farmers in this country by continuing the offload; let's stop that. So I would assume that Mr. Chretien is going to continue on in this fashion.

Although again I say, if we have the cooperation of the official opposition I would assume and hope the independent member will now come onside and we can have a three-party united effort to call upon Ottawa to stop the offloading, to put a third-line defence payment into Saskatchewan so that we can survive for the years to come in agricultural industry.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — Mr. Speaker, as I said, Mr. Pepin, Mr.

Lang, began the whole process, and the Tory government has continued it.

Now I pay as a farmer much more than I paid. I don't know the exact numbers. I didn't have time to research the numbers, but it's something in the order of probably 30 per cent more than I paid 10 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, that cost to the farmer was a cost that he had a promise from government that he wouldn't have to worry about. But we've seen over the years the offloading. And now we're looking at \$80 million in I believe it's the Bill C-61 in Ottawa, taking \$80 million in the next two years out of the pockets of Saskatchewan farmers; 140 million out of the pockets of farmers in western Canada.

You add on to that, Mr. Speaker, the millions and millions of dollars that have been taken out of the pockets by increasing the transportation rate over the last number of years and it is astronomical. Mr. Speaker, I'm asking today that Ottawa open its ears to the plight of the farmers in this province, that Ottawa take a good, hard look.

We've seen Saskatchewan being ignored in recent times again. Thirteen thousand people were at the farm rally in Saskatoon sponsored by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, but most farm groups participating, a united front of 13,000 people in one place in Saskatchewan. And the Prime Minister of this country didn't have the decency to show up; didn't have the decency to show up because I think, Mr. Speaker, in the past he saw the opposition Tory Party in Saskatchewan not supporting the farmers and the government by calling upon Ottawa to do the job that they are supposed to be doing.

Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, that with this small step and the cooperation from the opposition, the new leader of the Tory Party in Ottawa, whoever it may be, that the new leader will come forward, look at the situation, hear the calls from farmers, from farm groups, from municipalities, and from the Government of Saskatchewan, hear the call and respond to the plight. I would hope that, Mr. Speaker, although Mr. Mulroney is still the leader.

And if you look around the room in Ottawa to see who might be the new leader, Kim Campbell's name comes up time and again. But in today's *Globe and Mail*, Mr. Speaker, today's *Globe and Mail* revealed that . . . You will recall the helicopter deal, the \$4.4 billion helicopter deal that Ottawa announced while ignoring a half a billion dollars, \$500 million that Saskatchewan farmers needed; they plunged forward by announcing a \$4.4 billion helicopter deal. Well in today's *Globe and Mail*, Mr. Speaker, it is revealed that that \$4.4 billion has all of a sudden jumped to \$5.8 billion. And who's the Defence minister? Kim Campbell, the leadership hopeful.

So again I hope that the opposition in this province stays onside with the government. Because we are going forward, Mr. Speaker, relentlessly. I've made this speech time and time again in opposition and nothing happened because the members over there, the offloading continued and continued.

I will make this speech until the point in time, Mr.

Speaker, where either I am not in this Assembly no longer or the federal government comes forward with a \$500 million third line of defence payment and stops the offloading that is so desperately hurting Saskatchewan farmers.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about what I would assume, because of history, that the Leader of the Opposition and the opposition members might say today.

I would hope that the opposition members don't use this opportunity, I hope they haven't accepted this motion, to use as an opportunity to stand up and grandstand and rail on about the GRIP program, which I think they might do. But I would ask them, please don't let me down.

An Hon. Member: — Don't let the farmers down.

Mr. Upshall: — Don't let the farmers down. Don't use this opportunity, Mr. Members of the opposition, to grandstand about a program that was fundamentally flawed in the beginning, continues to be flawed, and will be flawed until it dies.

I hope you don't do that, and you may not do that, because as referred to earlier today in the *Canadian Press* article, that Alberta, Mr. Isley is now saying: well GRIP ain't so great after all — \$400 million deficit in Alberta and it will grow. So what's going to happen in Alberta? The premiums are going to start escalating.

(1100)

Mr. Findlay in Manitoba told a farm group last month, and I'm now quoting from the CP (Canadian Press) report, that the plan was designed as an interim measure that would not be necessary after 1995. Well that is kind of a new twist to it because the Tory parties have been promoting the program from Saskatchewan . . . the Saskatchewan Tories, rather, have been promoting the program in Alberta and Manitoba, that it's going to be the greatest thing in the long-life program. But all of a sudden we see Mr. Isley, the Minister of Agriculture in Alberta, and Mr. Findlay, the Minister of Agriculture in Manitoba, starting to back off.

So again I would ask the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, make Saskatchewan work by cooperating with this government. Do yourselves a favour. The farmers of Saskatchewan, the taxpayers of this province, every person living in this province, relies on agriculture.

We have seen the statistics over the last number of years. Before the GRIP program was introduced, there was a 5,000-person job loss in Saskatchewan. Why? As reported, because it relates to the lack of support from the federal government. And I would say it would be a combination of the lack of support for income because of not delivering on the third line of defence payment that they had promised and also lack of support because of the offloading, the billions and billions of dollars I would say in the past and in the future if this trend continues.

Now we can talk about agriculture in terms of what Ottawa is trying to do. And we know that the federal government is sending the message that we're getting out of agriculture lending, agriculture financing. That's what the underlying message is from Ottawa. And I guess we will see, Mr. Speaker, we will see if that is true. I would certainly hope it's not.

If the members of the opposition and the independent member from Greystone, the Leader of the Liberal Party, continue to support this motion, we may be able to make some headway. Because we have a federal election coming up and historically, sadly I say this, historically the federal government has waited for the most part for a federal election in order to deliver finances to the province of Saskatchewan.

We're putting the farmers of this province in a position where they're begging. And why? We're putting them in a position that they're begging because there's a political agenda that the Tory government is trying to fulfil. Mr. Speaker, that is wrong. But we will see if the tradition continues that a federal election will produce funds for Saskatchewan farmers and indeed the farmers of western Canada.

Mr. Speaker, if there are no funds announced before this federal election, I would say that we're looking at a bleak history in agriculture in Saskatchewan in the short term. I think Saskatchewan farmers have the resilience to work through this, as we've seen over the number of years that we've been in a depression in this province, despite the fact that some of the people in Ottawa, including the recently resigned Prime Minister, are saying that the recession is over. Well I don't think the farmers in Saskatchewan think the recession is over.

Mr. Speaker, I don't understand. I don't understand why the federal government would stand on the podium in Ottawa and ignore the needs of a billion . . . or of a million people in this province. As I said earlier, the statistics show that the lack of agricultural support has cost this province jobs. About 40 per cent of the jobs in this province stem directly or indirectly from agriculture. Mr. Speaker, why do we have to fight and talk and work so hard and long to achieve something that should be obvious?

The member from Morse chirps from his seat, Mr. Speaker, about nothing in the throne speech about agriculture. Well I hope that he doesn't use this opportunity to put forward his hypothetical problem, I guess I might say. Because in Saskatchewan in the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, we have laid out a plan for this province to take us through the future — take us to the future. Planning for the future.

But I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, the member from Morse, instead of saying there's nothing in the throne speech about agriculture, should be phoning his counterparts in Ottawa and saying, look people, we need dollars out here. We have to stop the offloading. And we have to do it now, right now.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — Mr. Speaker, as I say, I've made similar speeches many, many times. But unless we continue, unless we as a government, with hopefully the support of the opposition and the independent member from Greystone, we will . . . we must continue to speak in this legislature, to put forward motions that are unanimous in this legislature to publicly call upon the federal government.

The devastation that was left in this province over the last number of years, the members opposite would like everyone to forget. And we saw that today in question period.

Mr. Speaker, without support from the people that we received in the last election, without that support we wouldn't be able to be in the position that we are today to turn this province around and make it a place where the sun will shine in the future. But the people gave us that support. And I just think it's fair, I just think it's fair that with the support like that, that we continue.

And this is the first opportunity since we've had the farm rally, the first opportunity since the introduction of the Bill in Ottawa to reduce transportation rates, the first opportunity we've had in this new session to stand in our places and call upon Ottawa to open its eyes to the needs of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, we will continue to do that.

The members opposite will do their politics. They will say we're not supporting agriculture as they go around this province. They will say there's nothing in the budget. They will say there's nothing in the throne speech. They'll continue to be negative. But, Mr. Speaker, that won't accomplish anything. What will accomplish something for the farmers and for the people of Saskatchewan is cooperation.

In the 1990s, Mr. Speaker, we see a world economy that is in the doldrums. There are some shining lights in countries around the world. But in the western world, Mr. Speaker, I say to you that because everyone in Saskatchewan is important — because the farmers are important and those working off the farm are important, everyone's important — I say that Saskatchewan is the only place in the western world where we're actually confronting a problem and have the intestinal fortitude to stand before the people and say, it's going to hurt, folks, but it's going to be better in the end. I say we're the only place.

I see now in the United States, Mr. Clinton talking almost the same way as we're talking. We hear other provinces talking about confronting the deficit, but I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan is the only province, the only government, I think, in the western world that is confronting a terrible deficit. And do you know what? We will succeed. We will succeed. We will succeed because in the 1990s the operative word is going to be cooperation.

And that is why today, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see the opposition coming into the 1990s just a small step by accepting this resolution. And I would ask them to please support this motion. And after you support the motion,

let's cooperate and send the message, a united message to Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, farm income in Saskatchewan this year is touted to be about \$241 million. That is the lowest since 1971. As I said before, we deserve better.

And I'm not going to prolong this debate, Mr. Speaker, although I think the longer that we stand in our places and talk — repetition, repetition, repetition — perhaps Ottawa will hear. If it takes a federal election, so be it.

But I ask as I finish my speech, Mr. Speaker, I ask the members opposite and the Leader of the Liberal Party to put aside the old politic, put aside the old politic, march with this government through the 1990s in cooperation . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well the member is still doing the old politic. He's sitting there in his seat and saying, one term.

Well you know, Mr. Speaker, the people will decide. The people will decide. But you know what, Mr. Speaker? The people are saying in Humboldt, my friend . . . I've been around to talk just recently, three weeks ago, four weeks ago, a full constituency tour, every town, and I didn't hear anybody say, you're doing the wrong thing. I didn't hear anybody say, you're doing the wrong thing. And they are representative of the people of Saskatchewan.

So I ask the members of the opposition to put aside the old politics. If we're a one-term government, which I doubt, it won't matter. Cooperation is going to be what it takes to turn this province around. And you can sit in your seats and chirp and continue the old politic, or you can stand in your places and cooperate and help us lead the people of this province to a bright future by getting Ottawa to support us, and by supporting the implementations of the budget that we have in the past and will continue in the future in order to turn this province around. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I got so enthused in my speech that I forgot . . . Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, I move:

That this Assembly call upon the Government of Canada to end its policy of offloading federal responsibilities on the backs of farm families by (a) reversing its decision to increase grain transportation costs for Saskatchewan farmers by \$80 million; and (b) fulfilling its promise to provide at least \$500 million in a third line of defence payment.

I so move, seconded by the member for Shaunavon.

Mr. McPherson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the chance to stand in my place today to second the motion put forward by the member from Humboldt and to speak on this motion.

It's very similar to a motion that I put forward last year. And as the member from Humboldt has eloquently stated, we have been bringing this same theme forward

continuously, and I believe that in this upcoming session we'll continue to do that. That being to act in cooperation, in cooperation with the opposition, in cooperation with the federal government, and all the stakeholders involved in the industry. And we're going to do that, Mr. Speaker, to help the farmers.

What we're asking the opposition to do is to support us this session. The Minister of Agriculture has brought forward a document and it's going to be taken out to the public in meetings with the farmers soon. This spring I believe we're being out there, and we're seeking positive dialogue with the farming community and those stakeholders. And we encourage the opposition to take part in this, bring forward their positive solutions if they have any, and work with us to help these farmers.

(1115)

Now I know the member from Morse commented that there wasn't anything in the throne speech yesterday regarding agriculture. But as I look at a copy of the throne speech now, Mr. Speaker, I see there's a couple of pages, in just a document of a few pages, on agriculture. And it basically addresses what the motion does, that is the plight of the farmers, the situation they're faced with, and what we expect from the federal government — that they fulfil their obligation, live up to their commitments they have made to the farming community, and stop their offloading onto the backs of these farmers.

I note in the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, provincial net farm income in 1993 is projected to sink to \$241 million, the lowest level since 1970, Mr. Speaker. And I think this really shows the situation that the farmers are in, that hopefully the opposition and the federal government of the day can perhaps set aside their leadership races and join in with helping turn this situation around.

Our concern for bringing forward motions at this time, Mr. Speaker, are due to perhaps recent announcements by the Prime Minister that he will be resigning. And of course this brings on a heated leadership race. I noticed watching the television last night, it's really starting to pick up. And brings to me the question that's raised is, who's in charge right now of agriculture in the federal government? Is this being put on the back burner so that perhaps someone can win a leadership race?

Is the intensity of this leadership race going to be focused on the more populated areas of the country? Well I hope not. In the West we don't have a large population but we have a way of life that I think that we have got to protect. And I would ask that the opposition in Saskatchewan support, lobby their colleagues in Ottawa to perhaps ensure that farm life can continue.

Mr. Speaker, the offloading that has occurred to date and the inaction of the federal government has had some serious impacts on this province, and I just want to touch on a few of them, Mr. Speaker.

Due to the fact that the third line of defence payment which was promised, the initial being 500 million back in 1990, I believe . . . so we are a few years short already. But when we take a look at the unemployment rate in

Saskatchewan, and I note that Saskatchewan had the lowest or among the lowest unemployment rate for some 27 years, Mr. Speaker, and now we're at a high 10 per cent. And it just shows the seriousness of the situation.

And by and large, this has a lot to do with the consumer confidence in agriculture, the mood of the province which by and large is set in the agriculture community, and how we need to address this problem right away.

We have had gains in areas of employment in this province, those being in transportation, community, communications, and other utilities of some thousand; finance, insurance, real estate of 3,000.

But, Mr. Speaker, when we take a look at the decline in the agriculture sector, because the farming community has really put a halt to their spending, what they're looking at now is just how they can exist. There was a decline in 1992 of some 7,000 persons in employment, and that loss is in agriculture. So any of the gains that we enjoyed in other sectors have been offset or have actually gone unnoticed due to the large loss on the farm. And this is due in fact because the farmers don't have the ability, they don't have the financial ability, to be hiring. And what they're relying on now is a lot of family labour, and this is putting a lot of stress on those families that of course many of the family members are already working at one or two jobs — off-farm income to support the farming operation. I know many families that are working into the wee hours of the morning to make this operation work. Of course none of those job numbers are showing up in the document.

The decline in agriculture employment I guess is due in large part because the rural residents, not just the farmers, but they've stopped their spending. And what we're looking at is small manufacturing bases, those that are making the cultivators and the sprayers in rural Saskatchewan and the stone pickers. They can't be hiring people either if they're not selling those products.

The number of bankruptcies that are occurring in Saskatchewan and the situation that will be upon us in the next year or two or three in keeping farms viable, farm families viable, is going to be another serious situation, and it's one that we're going to require help. The farmers are going to require a great deal of help from the federal government in dealing with some of the farm debt.

Another thing that shows up a great deal is the amount of stress that is put on our farm families both financially and emotionally. And it's really starting to show up in some of our communities. I know the member from Morse had some comments there; he's preparing for his speech. But I get calls from the riding of Morse, and many of these people are asking: is it possible that we can work in cooperation this time to achieve the goals that we all need?

And of course that message was loud and clear from the Saskatchewan farm rally also, that the 13,000 farmers there want us working cooperatively in this legislature to help solve the problem. They don't need to hear any more political rhetoric and comparison of programs. It's far beyond that and the member from Morse knows that, or

perhaps I should be forwarding some of the calls from his constituents on to him so that he can get a flavour of what's happening out there.

We have another problem coming up in the near future, and of course that's why the urgency of the motion, that being the spring seeding around the corner. And what we're looking at without this cash injection, immediate cash injection of monies that were promised in 1990, some three years ago, if we don't have that cash injection this spring, I ask the member from Morse how the farmers in his area are going to be putting their crops in.

This is a question that they're raising continuously. And I would feel quite comfortable in working with the member from Morse in coming up with some solutions and working cooperatively to achieve what's right for the farmers in this instance. We have lots of time for politics I guess closer to the next election, but I think at this point we'd better make sure that we're going to have a rural Saskatchewan to go out and campaign in for the next election.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — Mr. Speaker, just to talk a little more about the offloading that has occurred and why there is such a financial strain in rural Saskatchewan, we just have to look at what the federal government has been doing over the last few years.

It was only a few short years ago that crop insurance, 50 per cent of that bill was picked up by the federal government. Now within the borders of this province, Mr. Speaker, we find that within the boundaries of Saskatchewan we are now paying some 75 per cent of that program. And many times the Minister of Agriculture has referred as the blood transfusion from one arm into the other, and that's exactly what's happening.

We also look at the two-price wheat system, that the federal government pulled some \$250 million out of the two-price wheat system.

An Hon. Member: — How much?

Mr. McPherson: — Two hundred and fifty million. And they promised that that money would be coming back to these rural areas. Well I farm, Mr. Speaker, but I don't see where that money is coming out to help us as producers. It didn't show up anywhere on my tax receipts.

One other area, Mr. Speaker, is the western grain stabilization where the federal government not long ago paid I believe it was \$3 for every \$1 that the producers paid in. That was pulled away from the agriculture producers, Mr. Speaker. It was then replaced with a revenue program that once again within the borders of this province, like crop insurance, we're funding some 60 per cent of the program.

We have a lot of programs but they seem to be now all within. And it's unaffordable to a province that is in the situation that we are, in the financial situation that we are, and I think the people know why we're in that situation. I won't get into that. I notice that the members opposite all

lower their heads when I touch on it, so I want their attention so I'll get off of that subject.

In 1982 I recall the chant, and it was a chant: keep the Crow, let Blakeney go. Do you remember saying that? The member from Morse I think said that. Now with the help of Tories all across the province, they've got a new chant: let the Crow go, there's a leadership show.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — Once again, I just ask that the members work cooperatively with us. Put that leadership show on the back burner for some time. You can get back to that soon enough. But we have some problems — spring seeding, bankruptcies. We need cash, immediate cash. So let's work together and get that. And we ask that you lobby your counterparts to help us achieve that for the farmers — not for either political party; for the farmers.

I would have to wonder also, as it states in the motion, why we're back to grain transportation issues. I know that last year the federal government had many people touring the province, holding meetings to find out what the input of the farming community is, and the stakeholders, mayors, reeves. We were . . . everyone was involved in what should be done with the grain transportation issue.

Well I think the farmers and all those stakeholders spoke loud and clear as to what should be done, but were they listened? I have to ask, why were they consulted? Because it was loud and clear, the message back was status quo: don't change the Crow.

But before this can evolve — and I know the federal government is putting other proposals forward — we see that they are already cutting back 10 per cent a year over two years, which is increasing the cost to these people that can't even find ways of putting their crop in. It's going to increase their cost of operating their farms by some \$80 million here in Saskatchewan alone. That again is going to have a large impact on those unemployment figures that the member from Kindersley was so concerned about at question period.

So once again we just want your support in ensuring that the federal government live up to its commitment and obligation that they've made many times, that they will not be reducing the monies to the Crow benefit and that the status quo or the method of payment will remain as is. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1130)

Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, today we've witnessed a bit of the new NDP administration's policy. Their back bench was so disappointed in the Speech from the Throne that they had to initiate some relevant or thoughtful discussions on agriculture. And they even superseded the Speech from the Throne in coming and ask to have an emergency debate on agriculture because they feel so weak about agriculture, so ineffective and so poor where thousands and thousands of people have been

complaining in public that they have to put up another sham or a façade of some sort of effort so that they have an emergency debate.

And in the paper today, Mr. Speaker, everybody is saying, the editorials are saying and the public is saying, that the NDP policy in agriculture, the NDP policy in financing, the NDP excuse that it's only the federal government, is hollow; it's not valid. It's not accurate, and the public knows it. You're fooling no one but yourselves.

And to have a would-be minister of Agriculture, who wanted the job, be able to stand up in the House and give him a chance to speak along with his colleague from Shaunavon, to make them feel good that they're really doing something in agriculture is such a fake, is so flat. It is so empty that even the members opposite are sitting there saying, well I hope they finish; I hope they get it off their chest; at least it gives the back-benchers something to do.

Because the policy is so hypocritical, Mr. Speaker. And I'm going to amend the motion on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan — amend the motion to say that the province of Saskatchewan should at least cooperate and pay its fair share like other jurisdictions are so that people can receive the help that they're receiving in Alberta, the help they're receiving in Manitoba, and the help they're receiving across the country, from Ontario to Quebec.

But only in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, do we see 20,000 farmers come up in rallies to beat on the provincial government, to boo the NDP Premier of Saskatchewan because he says, oh I can't do anything. Even though I promised I'd give you cost of production and I promised I'd be there to really improve the agriculture situation, I have to do the opposite. And they boo. Well of course they boo.

And then he has his back-benchers, or maybe on their own volition, stand up here and say, well really it's the federal government's fault. Well nobody's buying that. I mean you can try to fool some of the people some of the time but you're not fooling anybody now except maybe some of your colleagues who sit in here and say, well gee that was pretty pathetic. The Speech from the Throne was pretty flat. I guess we better do something for agriculture. Make it look like we're doing something that's credible.

Mr. Speaker, this motion is about offloading. And today in the paper, today in the paper the media has pegged the Premier right on. And Murray Mandryk points out, for example, Romanow's complaints are full of inconsistencies.

On the offloading — the offloading going on in the province of Saskatchewan gets a triple A. This is a triple A, double, triple, quadruple A-plus offloading on the backs of the taxpayers in the province of Saskatchewan. Everybody pays.

Offload, offload, offload. And you promised not to. And I hope you have the courage to publish your 1991 campaign brochure that says you were going to do all these nice things. If you can get Phoenix house or somebody else to print it and publish it, I'll distribute it in my riding or any place across Saskatchewan and then just

write big joke across the whole thing.

I mean if you bring it up one more time it'll convince us once more that if that's all you've got, is the member from Humboldt to stand up and try to make a façade and some sort of fancy speech about what Saskatchewan could do if the federal government would cooperate, I mean it is a disgrace.

All the pain and all the suffering and all the people going broke and all the children and all the families that are under stress, and they just pick one or two bills out of their hat every month and say, it's like a lottery. Well this one was lucky; I guess I can pay it. Because of the NDP. Because of the NDP.

You promised to make it better. You said a little bit of management and a little bit of renewed spirit and everything would be fine, and it's pain.

And the media is saying you're full of inconsistencies today. They go on and say that the province of Saskatchewan is lacking in any clear direction in terms of the Speech from the Throne. Mr. Speaker, look at this. We talk about offloading. The Speech from the Throne, and it's in today's paper, says there's no clear direction except offloading. That's what it is. Offload onto your own people. And that's what it says.

That's what the public is saying about you. Offload on your own and hurt your own. And then stand up and say and have the member from Humboldt, who would like to be in cabinet and missed, you give him a chance to speak and say, well really it's the federal government's fault.

And in today's paper ironically again it says: "Mulroney didn't abandon Western farmers." He put billions into the Saskatchewan coffers, billions into the coffers. And the NDP in its hypocrisy stands up and say, well but we need more from the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, can you believe the gall of the members opposite in the pain and suffering that's gone on in the province of Saskatchewan and with their almighty campaign promises to fix it, will stand up in here and at the very same time they bring this emergency debate forward, the local media is kicking the tar out of them for being inconsistent, unfair, full of offloading, and beating on Saskatchewan people at the very time when they need help the most.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I find it . . . if this is the new wave of government politics and government administration in the province of Saskatchewan, if this is how the NDP do it in Ontario or in B.C. (British Columbia) or now in Saskatchewan, it isn't on; it's not fair. It's even . . . it isn't honest. It's nowhere near . . . The Premier this morning talked about he wanted to tell them the truth. Well for heaven sakes he's been in government now for almost two years, a year and a half, and it's the same thing, blame somebody else, not telling them what's really happening.

He's going to say, well I'm going to just put more offloading onto the backs of Saskatchewan people. I'm going to list some of these. I'm going to list some of these because he's admitted he's been wrong before and I

appreciate that and the media even appreciated it when he stood in his place in Prince Albert and said, I admit that I made a major mistake. And he forced us through it and you too, Mr. Speaker, all of us. This Legislative Assembly went through just some of the biggest pain you can imagine . . .

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

Mr. Whitmore: — I wish to ask leave, Mr. Speaker, to introduce guests.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Whitmore: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce today through you and to you, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the MLA from Rosetown-Elrose, Mr. Wiens, guests from the Elrose Composite School. We have . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. The member knows he's not to refer to people, to members, by their name but by their constituency.

Mr. Whitmore: — I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I wish to introduce to you today the grade 5 class, 25 students from Elrose Composite School, who are taking a tour of the Legislative Assembly today. Accompanying them today is their teacher Donna Benjamin; chaperones Mrs. Ellis, Mr. Reed, Mr. Parson, Mrs. Quinney, and Mr. Bone.

And I will have the opportunity to have lunch with them later on this afternoon and an opportunity to take photos with them. So with that, I look forward to their questions and I hope that the Legislative Assembly would welcome these people today. Thank you very much.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

MOTION UNDER RULE 42 (continued)

The Speaker: — Before I recognize the member from Estevan, I would like to remind members that we're not on the throne speech debate, we're on a specific motion. It should be wide-ranging but I think it must pertain to agriculture and what the motion is before us.

Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was about to go through some of the detail of offloading that the new NDP administration has imposed on the people of Saskatchewan, because this motion is about offloading and they're asking the federal government to stop offloading and to come on to provide more money when in fact the NDP have done two things.

They admitted they were wrong. The NDP leader in Prince Albert admitted that he was wrong on GRIP and he's been booed by thousands — literally over 10,000 people booed him when he said that — and approximately 20,000 people have rallied across the province in saying the NDP administration is wrong on agriculture; they did not tell us the truth.

The second thing I'm going to do is list how they have offloaded on their own people in the province of Saskatchewan when they promised they wouldn't do that, and the hypocrisy of asking Ottawa for more when in fact you keep offloading onto the people of Saskatchewan. So even if you got more money, the people have no confidence at all that you would help them whatsoever.

You've expanded your cabinet; you've bloated it up. People are talking about cabinet ministers flying around the world with no deals and nothing happening, and then at the very same time you tax people.

Now let's just look at how they've offloaded, Mr. Speaker. They've increased all of the utility rates on Saskatchewan people, and not just once but twice and now three times. And the utilities were fat and sassy with excess profits and retained earnings two years ago. And they've increased rates and increased rates and increased rates. Increased phone rates. They've increased installation rates much larger than inflation, and installation fees. They've increased power rates.

Now if you're a farmer in tough condition on a farm and you've had your power rates increased and your telephone rates increased and your insurance rates increased, what do you do? Did you have any alternative? No. The new administration, the NDP, says well that's a government monopoly and we're here to take your money; and if you don't like it we'll cut you off. We'll cut you off. We just offload on you on a public utility.

A natural monopoly is there to be protected so that people in government can say I'll regulate the rates to protect you from gouging. And what do you do? A natural monopoly is used to hose the people. And you've raised rates up and up and up at the very time the member from Humboldt says, but they're hurting and they're suffering. Well what hypocrisy. He can't look at himself in the mirror. And the members opposite couldn't. You've raised telephone rates and power rates and insurance rates.

And, Mr. Speaker, as you know, every place in the world natural monopolies are put in the public sector to regulate so they're not gouged. This is a public utility, not an NDP cash cow. That's the problem you face because you offload on people because you don't really care.

You don't care about agriculture. You don't care about families. You don't care about rural municipalities. You don't care about seniors. You don't care about native and aboriginal people. You just want your share of big bucks out of a monopoly. And on top of that you use them for patronage so that at least your friends can get a job.

Despite what the Attorney General says, you have lots of patronage. And you pack it in the only utilities or only Crown corporations that are left, thank goodness. Thank goodness one of the major reasons of putting them into the private sector is so that you can remove the patronage. At least you can't do it to Saskoil and to Sask Potash and PAPCO (Prince Albert Pulp Company) any more. I mean that's all you want.

The rate increases on natural gas, on SGI (Saskatchewan

Government Insurance) vehicle insurance, 15 per cent increase in taxes in the PST (provincial sales tax). You promised you would reduce the PST. No more. It's increased. And we're not even into the budget.

But the offloading on Saskatchewan people when you promised no more taxes. No more taxes. Read the NDP leader's lips. He said he would not offload on the taxpayer. What has he done? Nothing but tax increases since he's been in power. And we can expect even more to come in the budget. And they're complaining about offloading.

This, Mr. Speaker, is unbelievable when they would now go back to the very people that got them elected and they're going to go to them. I hope the member from Humboldt can walk around Humboldt or Watrous or other places and say: how do you like the tax increases so far? How is it? Isn't it really nice? You've got a new surtax on personal income of 10 per cent, increase on fuel tax, an increase in tobacco tax, a 1 per cent increase on the corporate income tax, increase of 1 per cent on the corporation capital tax surcharge rate, an increase of 25 per cent on the corporation capital tax, imposed user fees for chiropractic service, imposed user fees for optometric services, and we're looking at drug fees that went up from a hundred bucks to over \$375 per family and individuals. And they're worried about offloading.

Well the motion before the House is just a sham, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It is just a façade. They're trying to duck and hide from the truth. They didn't have the courage to even debate the Speech from the Throne today. They had to come with an emergency debate to show everybody how they cared about agriculture. Well we'll love to talk about agriculture.

I'm amazed that they let you away with it, Mr. Member from Humboldt. They put you up there and said, well gosh, I guess we'll go with you and maybe we can kind of divert this, show how much we care; maybe we can fool the people of Saskatchewan one more time, fool them one more time. Well I don't believe it when the list of offloading is here. And all because you campaigned on one thing and decided that you would do exactly the opposite.

You could have had balanced budgets. You could have had economic activity. You could have had some excitement. But oh no, you had to do it your way. And now we're really seeing that without a plan it's just get hit in the head, all pain, no relief; it hurts. And the Saskatchewan public from Moose Jaw to Melfort to Prince Albert to Estevan, Swift Current, are saying: did we ever make a serious, serious mistake listening to the NDP.

(1145)

And now you're going to come in with more. The NDP leader yesterday said, whoop, you're going to get a lot more; it's going to be more and more and more pain. And then he's got his cabinet ministers running around the province and says, the province is about to collapse; therefore we've got to offload on the province, offload on the people, because if it's about to collapse, we've got to offload on the public that elected us. Because they

wanted power.

Power to do what? Power to do what? Power to create economic activity? Power to cooperate with other jurisdictions? Not on your life. Power to cooperate with the business community? The business community says, for heaven's sake, if you're going to broaden the tax base and offload on the public, at least harmonize so we can have some economic incentive to do some real economic development. No. Can't do that.

So they don't cooperate there. They don't cooperate with labour. They don't cooperate with pensioners. They don't cooperate with seniors. They don't cooperate with farmers. They don't cooperate with the chamber of commerce. They just offload — tax and hit and tax and hit and tax and tax and tax. Democrats worldwide do the same. They talk about the new world and all it is is offload onto their public.

Plans to reduce the number of MLAs in rural Saskatchewan. Offload, Mr. Speaker — wow! Look at the political agenda. Squeeze them real hard, tax the farmers, cut out their programs, make it really miserable for them. And then I guess what we can do, after the population goes down we can cut the number of seats and we'll do it under the guise: well but, by gosh, we have to balance the budget; we've got to do our fair share here.

And what are they going to . . . do you think you're fooling people? What kind of malarkey. You can bet your cowboy boots that everybody in Saskatchewan knows exactly what you're up to. In the next election you're saying, well maybe we can just squeeze enough seats out of the major urban markets; to heck with the people in rural Saskatchewan. We will offload like you can't believe and squeeze them and squeeze them and squeeze them just so we can win another election.

Because the population will go down in those rural ridings that support free enterprisers or generally any place else, and you say most of the democrats are coming from the radical left wing of the major city centres and we can maybe survive one more election there. And won't you be proud of that?

That's the big offload. Well I'll tell you, your plan is out in the open. Everybody knows your plan. Everybody talks about it; they see through it. And, Mr. Speaker, you know that they rammed through legislation here even after . . . Well it was interesting. The NDP leader admits he made a mistake. We didn't have to go through this façade we went through in the House last session where you changed the rules, unilaterally did things that we'd never seen in parliamentary democracy, voted without the opposition — all because of a mistake the NDP leader says. He admits now, should have never touched it — should have never, never touched it.

This place was in a shambles; it closed down for three weeks, all because the NDP leader made a mistake. And said, you know, if I'd have just gone with the flow with the rest of Canadians, we could have had a lot of money into Saskatchewan farmers' plans. We could have worked for '93-94, changed GRIP the way people might like to.

But no, he had to unilaterally, retroactively change it and then impose this pain which was part of his plan all along because he wants to reduce rural seats under the guise that it's going to be economically more efficient, so that maybe the NDP can last more than one term. That kind of offloading, Mr. Speaker, is pathetic. It's politically dishonest.

In the Speech from the Throne we're asked to judge this government on how it's doing in economics, how it's doing in taxes, how it's doing in openness, how it's doing in providing a vision. And they can't even get into the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker. They got to go on an emergency debate on agriculture and try to redirect with some sort of lightning rod on another topic. They are so ashamed of their record already.

Reduce the number of MLAs. Imagine! That's part of their plan that was talked about yesterday.

They released the wellness model. And if you want to see offloading, just look at the new wellness model. I've met with my hospital board and people in health care in Estevan this last week, and I'll tell you, they look at the wellness model as the biggest offloading joke you can imagine. It's an excuse.

Do you know the problem with the NDP? They say, the NDP runs around and says, I want to have your advice. I want to listen to you. But do you know what? People can talk but the NDP don't listen. They don't listen. And everybody knows that, whether you're looking at health boards in Beechy or schools in Outlook or Elbow, or hospitals or administrations any place. The NDP say, oh I'm here; I'm here from the government and I'm here to help you. But they don't listen.

They've already made up their mind they're going to reduce the number of rural seats, they're going to offload on municipalities, they're going to close hospitals, they're going to close nursing homes. And they're going to do this under some sort of guise that they've got some big plan.

So it's not only taxes where they've offloaded, and utilities, but now it's in health care, health care models, administrations, and smaller and smaller communities. And indeed I eventually think it will be even larger communities where you're going to see the largest attack, under the guise of Tommy Douglas on health care, that you've seen in your life.

And there's some more hypocrisy — well Tommy said we could do this. Imagine! And you're supposed to be consistent with the beliefs of the CCF (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation), that said I am there to help you in health care and help you in farming and help you with your children and reduce the taxes and to make sure that you have services.

Under that man's vision, you do all this taxing and cutting and hurting and eliminating representation, change the rules of the House. Then you can kind of flippantly go along, well I made a mistake. It was only a 4 or \$5 million mistake. Saskatchewan people will never get over it, I suppose. Whoops! I made a mistake.

And I think the *Star-Phoenix* or somebody else said, well the Premier's a pretty nice guy; he admits he made some mistakes. Well he's right if he's right and he's right if he's wrong. Right?

An Hon. Member: — Wrong.

Mr. Devine: — I think that's wrong. He made a mistake in this legislature. He cost hundreds of millions of dollars for the people of Saskatchewan.

I talked to a machinery dealer yesterday right here in Regina. And the machinery dealers are telling us that they're having a very good year and for one particular reason. I said, well how could that be, because Saskatchewan farmers are hurt so bad. What is it? And he said, you know what? Flexi-Coil is going to be out of air seeders pretty quickly. We're going to be out of this and out of that.

I said, what's happening? He said, you know what? Alberta farmers and Manitoba farmers have good, have very good programs, Mr. Speaker. And if you will talk to them — and I'll gladly give them your names — they're coming in here and saying, holy smokes. The Progressive Conservative government in Saskatchewan designed a heck of a farm program for the rest of the country. In Saskatchewan, you've kicked it out. And they've got money in Alberta and they've got money in Manitoba. They're coming to Saskatchewan to buy farm machinery because they're out of it over there.

And they're saying, I don't know what you guys did but I'll tell you we've got a fine program from where we are. We're not going to rallies, not 15,000 people coming to a rally in Winnipeg beating on the Premier. No. Not in Alberta; only in Saskatchewan. There aren't rallies any place else. The offloading in Saskatchewan, the tearing up of agreements, the admission of major mistakes, the collapse of credit ratings, the fear, and then . . .

An Hon. Member: — Despair.

Mr. Devine: — And the despair. That's right. Even the cabinet ministers are preaching despair.

Look at this. Mr. Speaker, look at this. This is what the new NDP Premier is telling his cabinet ministers to say around the province. And he's talking about his worry about offloading. He's saying . . . This is the *Nipawin Journal* and this is the cabinet minister representing the Melfort riding. And the headline says: province is near collapse — Carson.

Now is that what you want them to say? Do you want them to run around and say yes, we're near collapse; that's it. Just gloom and doom. And then on top of that, they'll make it even more of a collapse because they're going to tax people and tax them and tax them and tax them and tax them. Tax everything, tax the utilities, tax their farm, tax the gas, tax the rural municipalities; offload, offload, and offload, and then run around and say, well you're near collapse.

No wonder, Mr. Speaker, that they're not on their feet defending the Speech from the Throne with optimism and

glowing terms of what Saskatchewan's going to be. They had no idea, Mr. Speaker, what to do if they formed government, none at all. They had no plan. They say, well we're here. We've just got to wade into this and it'll all be fine. And they have got ruin in rural Saskatchewan.

They have no economic plan. There's no economic development. And if they do have anything going, it's because of community development bonds, Saskatchewan savings bonds, industrial development that was started by people who could work with economic activity and the private sector. And all because they didn't give it any thought at all; they just wanted power, just power. And what have you got? New highways? No. New highways? No . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member from — where are you from? — Quills, the member from the Quills says, well they got rid of me. Imagine. That was their objective.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Devine: — Yes, look at this. See, what did I tell you, Mr. Speaker? That was their whole . . . Their whole objective is just playing politics, not for the people, not for the farmers, not for the farmers.

See the true politics, the true political objective of the people in here on the opposition, on the opposition, in the benches opposite, is just to be there. No help for people. They said, oh well, we'll promise the public anything, just anything at all, just to win. And then what have you got? You've got offloading; you've got the closure of rural health care facilities. They eliminated the Saskatchewan Pension Plan, so they offloaded on pensioners. And seniors all across the province thought it was a good plan; in fact CCFers and NDPers thought it was a good plan.

But no, they offload the problems that the NDP have on pensioners; they've frozen or eliminated health facility capital grants in rural areas; they cancelled the rural gas program — offloaded on rural people again. They reduced municipal revenue sharing, and I'm sure when you look at this budget you're going to see more offloading on municipalities. User fees for cancer patients outside Regina and Saskatoon — offload on the sick, offload on the sick. And the member from Quills doesn't like to hear this but that's exactly what it is. He offloads on the sick.

Reduce the number of rural municipalities, eliminate the Crown lease surface rights, so . . . well they don't like to hear this, Mr. Speaker. They tax and tax and tax and tax and then charge the sick. And this is supposed to be in the great legacy of Tommy Douglas. They tax and tax and tax and then tax the sick.

The agriculture programs they've cut and tax on top of that; cancelled Fair Share, and they said they'd never do it. The member from Humboldt says: we won't cancel Fair Share. He won't admit it but we got him on quotes. The member from Humboldt said: we will never cancel Fair Share. What did they do? They cancelled Fair Share. And the member from Humboldt can eat those words. He can eat them because he didn't tell the truth like the rest of you, all the rest of you. You said, oh you'd never do that,

never raise taxes. There you go, you eat them. Because you're raising taxes. And you know what? There's more to come.

Offload on Saskatchewan taxpayers because you had no idea what you were going to do when you won. Cancel the feed grain adjustment program? Well temporarily, he said, we'll keep it there because of the heat we're getting from the livestock industry. Increased fees; cancelled the cash advance; capped the fuel rebate program; forced farmers to accept the GRIP program that is universally unpopular; going back to gravel roads.

When we look at the offloading, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we can see that the NDP administration has no reason at all to do anything but try to put up a façade when they're going back to the federal government today.

They are so ashamed of their Speech from the Throne, so lacking in support from their members opposite in the back benches, that they've got to prop him up and say, do something — do something to kind of show that we're fighting with the feds. Okay, that would be really good. So they've put up this fake debate, this fake debate.

Now let me mention, last night, Mr. Speaker, last night in Hazlet, Saskatchewan, Mr. McKnight was there speaking at a PC (Progressive Conservative) function. And he reported again and he said very clearly, the federal government is there with its \$43 million if only the province of Saskatchewan would pony up and help farmers. One more time he said, we're there. We've been there in Alberta, he said. We've been there in Manitoba. Farmers there like their programs. But only in Saskatchewan have they cut and offloaded — only in Saskatchewan.

Wheat Pool members know it, United Grain Growers members know it, stock growers know it, people all over the country know it — that only in Saskatchewan under the NDP have the programs come to a complete stop. Because the NDP can't think above politics. They will not cooperate with the Conservative government in Ottawa.

(1200)

They will not cooperate so they suffer the pain and they offload and they hurt and they tell stories and they flip-flop. And then finally when they're really hurt, the NDP leader says, whoops! I made a mistake. It was only 4 or \$500 million. Saskatchewan is out . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And that's right, he won't fix it.

Why don't you make a recommendation that he do something about it? Why don't you help? Where's the hope, any hope at all or any help from the NDP administration? What is it? Did you give us any examples of what you would do to help?

Do you know what you're doing? You said, I'll tell you what we're going to do; we're going to have a little trip around Saskatchewan. Isn't that what the Minister of Agriculture said? We're going to talk about rural offloading and they're going to have meetings around Saskatchewan. Do you know how many places and communities you're going to south of No. 1 Highway? Do

you know?

An Hon. Member: — Nobody knows.

Mr. Devine: — Nobody knows. They don't care. A cabinet committee . . . The Agriculture minister is going to go around Saskatchewan. Do you know how many communities you're going to even talk to south of the No. 1 Highway? Not one. Talk about politics, partisan politics. As if there is no pain in Weyburn, as if there's no pain in Shaunavon, as if there's no pain in Assiniboia-Gravelbourg or Estevan — not one meeting south of No. 1 Highway because you say, well we've written those off and we're going to reduce the number of seats there to one or two anyway. Isn't that your plan?

You are going now out around rural Saskatchewan, and do you know where you're meeting people? You're going to go north of Saskatoon where you think, well I might have some support left up there, north of Saskatoon. You're going to go to Melfort March 15; Wadena, March 15. And look at this: Spiritwood, March 15; Biggar, March 15; Swift Current, March 16; and Grenfell, March 18. And this is all going to be done in the next 10 days or 15 days.

Number one, you're not giving them enough time, and number two, you don't even go to parts of the province that you've already written off, as if there's no pain there.

What politics, crass, crass politics. And you expect farmers to come up and . . . What are they going to tell you? What are they going to tell you? They're going to say, well why don't you do something? You're in government. What's your plan? Well we don't have a plan; we're here to consult. And then people will tell you stuff, and you don't listen anyway.

You've been booed all over the province. You're going to be booed and booed and booed and booed. You'll get out a few handful of supporters. How pathetic. How pathetic.

What's wrong with the rest of the province, NDP? What's wrong with the rest of the province? Why do you limit . . . I'll tell you, this is going to the rest of the province. And when we . . . we'll know. You're looking at places where you're in trouble. You've written off the South because you say that is going to be PC, no question about it. Now you're in trouble in some of your northern ridings, so you're going to go in there and say, well we need to shore up the member from Melfort because she's written off the entire province; it's all gone to heck in a hand basket. The province is near collapse, Carson says. So what do you do? We better have a meeting in Melfort, better shore her up. This whole thing is about partisan politics. There's nothing else. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have seen the musical chairs operate over there.

An Hon. Member: — Definitely should have Rosetown.

Mr. Devine: — And today, today . . . yes, well they wrote off Rosetown; it's all over. Yes. The former minister of Agriculture made such a mess of it that they canned him. And I mean they're not even going back into Rosetown. It's done; it's dust; it's over, boys. So maybe you can amalgamate that with Biggar and you'll only have one

seat. Is that your plan? Yes. There you go. See? That's their plan. So they've got all this all figured out.

And on the offloading, look at it. In the *Leader-Post* today the editorials that are normally kind to you are starting just to kick your pants. And it says: throne speech dull with lack of clear direction. All they see is partisan politics with you guys. That's it. There's no direction.

It's a little bit of, oh we'll consult here and a little bit we'll consult there and at the same time just hit them in the head — close their schools; close their hospitals; offload on the public; raise their taxes; raise their fees; mean speeder; tear up their highways; and if our cabinet ministers get in trouble we'll just shuffle the deck a little bit, put them in another portfolio, pass them on.

Now wonder you've got problems. Holy smokes. Unbelievable. And then, for the first time in I think Saskatchewan's history, before we could even get to the Speech from the Throne, you've got to have an emergency debate on offloading and blame somebody else.

How weak, how weak, how weak, how nobody would even have . . . I didn't think they'd let them get away with it. I honestly didn't think, Mr. House Leader, that you'd say: well this would be a good plan. This will really divert the energies of the Assembly. You know, this will really work.

The public's going to say, well at least they could defend their Speech from the Throne. This doesn't even account as a day we're talking about the Speech from the Throne. This is the NDP plan? And what are they saying? The media says: no direction. Whoops. Dull and no direction.

And the next editorial says: Romanow's complaints are full of inconsistencies. So you're inconsistent, you're dull, and you don't have any direction. How are you doing so far?

And now you've diverted the entire debate of the House into some façade speech about offloading, where you're the king of offloaders. And you expect us to endorse this, to join with you in your plan?

The only good thing you had in the Speech from the Throne which is acknowledged in the media is that you had some bonds and some investments in some privatizations, and AECL and Farm Credit are moving here.

That all that you've got. I mean it's unbelievable, Mr. Speaker. How we could even be into such a debate when you're supposed to be there to help people. If the federal government even gave you money, what you'd do is you put in your coffers for some darn fool program that you'll dream up to look after yourself politically. Because people have no confidence you care, no confidence that you care at all.

Well I'm sure there's going to be lots of debates in this Assembly and it'll probably be a long session, Mr. Speaker, because of the incompetence of the members opposite.

They could have balanced the budget and they could have economic development and they can't eat their mistakes during the last campaign. They can't admit that it was there. And the Minister of Finance knows it and the former minister of Finance knows it. I mean it's all there. Our legacy is there, he says. Our legacy is there and he campaigned on it as if he had it all fixed up, had it all fixed up. And he has no idea how to fix it up, none whatsoever. He has no idea how to fix it except to offload on the public and hit them in utilities.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to let my colleagues get in on this so-called emergency debate. There is real emergency and people want real help and they want the NDP to smell the coffee and get out of their political bunker and come out and talk to real people and help them. You have offloaded and you have hurt them. People are just shaking their heads and saying, how dishonest.

I'm going to amend this motion and I'm certainly not going to vote for yours. I'll tell you that. Nor would the Saskatchewan public. And if you took it to the Saskatchewan public today, you wouldn't get a rural seat in Saskatchewan and you know it.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to amend the motion and it's going to be as follows. Moved by me, seconded by the member from Morse:

That the motion be amended by deleting the word "Canada" and substituting therefor the word "Saskatchewan";

deleting the phrase "offloading federal" and substituting therefor the phrase "refusing to accept its fair share of";

deleting all of the words after the word "responsibilities" and substituting therefor the following:

for agriculture support and live up to its commitments by: (a) retroactively correcting the Premier's admitted damage to farm families in its destructive changes to farm policy; and (b) negotiating in good faith with the federal government to obtain a joint solution to the crisis, starting with a willingness to accept the federal offer of 43 million from the Canadian taxpayers in return for only a \$9 million contribution from the provincial government.

Mr. Speaker, I amend the motion today and my colleagues will be prepared to speak to that amendment because, Mr. Speaker, we fully believe that if the NDP have any conscience at all left that they will openly enter into discussions with the federal government, cooperate as they always talk about, and actually help farmers and rural communities and all people in the province of Saskatchewan now that the NDP Premier has admitted that he made a very, very large error. And we seriously and honestly and genuinely ask them to cooperate with the federal government.

The amendment that I have put forward asks you to do that. You have a responsibility to share in this. You have a responsibility to pony up with the people who can help as they do in Alberta and as they do in Manitoba. What this asks you to do is just act like they do in other jurisdictions. They cooperate in Ontario, for heaven's sake, under Bob Rae. They cooperate in Alberta. They cooperate in Manitoba.

Nobody's going to believe that this is a federal government problem in the province of Saskatchewan. It is an NDP-designed difficulty and crisis because you won't do anything but harm rural people.

So if you have any decency left, I ask you to sincerely support the amendment to this motion which says Saskatchewan has to do its fair share in cooperating with other jurisdictions — Manitoba, Alberta, and the federal government — to really help farmers who are in a crisis. And I think if you have any decency at all, that you will support the amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I believe the amendment is in order but I'm going to have to go through it. It's fairly complicated. But in the mean time . . . we have done that. In the mean time I will allow the member from Morse to continue the debate.

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a privilege again for me to enter into the debate on an issue that is very near and dear to me. Mr. Speaker, the discussion that was . . . the motion that was presented by the member from Humboldt, in my view represents only a partial solution to the real problem. And the amendment by the member from Estevan has identified what the real problem is.

The real problem, and it has continued to be the problem since the election in October of '91, has continued to be the lack of initiative by this government in dealing with the farm problem, in dealing with the farm crisis, in dealing with the very fact that there is no vision. There is no vision for the future in the province of Saskatchewan for rural Saskatchewan and there is no vision for what that rural component of this province . . . which is the history of this province.

And I noticed, Mr. Speaker, that in the context of the Speech from the Throne yesterday, that Her Honour read that they're going to reinvent the component that makes Saskatchewan grow — reinvent.

Mr. Speaker, the people want to say to this government, get out of the way; we can do it ourselves. That's what they have said over and over again. And, Mr. Speaker, that's what they're saying — move out of our way. If you do nothing it helps, but the way you've been working, you've destroyed every focus and every function of rural Saskatchewan that you can possibly take a hold of — every one of them. And I could list you every one of the farm policies that this Premier and the former minister of Agriculture and the present Minister of Agriculture have

cut to the quick. They have cut every one of those programs, and on top of that, Mr. Speaker, they have raised the rates to every one of those rural people by such significance that they're having difficulty making their payments.

My neighbour phoned me on Monday and said to me, he said what are we going to have in this throne speech that's going to make any difference at all? And I said, well I'm not sure what they're going to do, but from what I hear, there's going to be tax increases and cuts. That's what it's going to be — utility rate increases and tax increases across the board.

But what are they going to do for me? He said to me, I put my bills in a hat. We run a lottery every month, and he said, the lucky one that I draw gets paid that month. And that's what's going on all across the province.

And, Mr. Speaker, the rate increases the other day in SGI just topped the list. You go out and talk to the people in the country when they get their surcharge on their vans, when they get the surcharge on their three-ton trucks for delivering grain. The farm policy in this government stinks.

It is extremely important, Mr. Speaker, that the member from Humboldt and the comments he made about 40 per cent of the people of this province have a direct and indirect relationship to growth in the economy because of agriculture. And he said that. Why doesn't he say it in his caucus? Why doesn't he say it there? He says it in here, and because he says it in here . . . Before the Speech from the Throne has even had a mover and a seconder, he comes in here and says, my Speech from the Throne is inadequate. He says it's inadequate, and he says it because it's the truth.

(1215)

There is nothing but platitudes in that throne speech for agriculture. And the reason is that the Premier is not, number one, only prepared to admit his mistake, but he's not prepared to restore back to the farmers the things that he took away from them that were legally theirs and morally theirs.

Mr. Speaker, he took that away because he made that decision that he was not going to become involved in dealing with agriculture in a positive way. That was his decision. That's the only conclusion that we can come to because of what he says.

The member from Humboldt has also indicated that we should tell him what should be done. Well they've got a few rural members on that side of the House; why don't they tell their cabinet what to do? Or have they been shunted off to the side and said no, we're not going to listen to you. We're going to say it like the member for Melfort says it. Everything is in collapse, total disaster. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what we have here as a presentation by this government in a throne speech.

They didn't have the enthusiasm and the direction to provide for this Assembly a mandate for vision for the future in rural Saskatchewan. They didn't have it for

urban Saskatchewan; they didn't have it for health care. Why? Because the vision is gone. The vision is gone for what Saskatchewan really is.

They said, we've got to reinvent it — reinvent it, Mr. Speaker. And they said that right in the first page of the throne speech — reinvent it. "My government has asked the people to join in reinventing Saskatchewan's future."

My goodness sakes! We had a good Saskatchewan up till 1991. And, Mr. Speaker, that is a fact. You go and ask rural Saskatchewan. When you go around and have your meetings, when you go around in rural Saskatchewan having your meetings — in Spiritwood and Grenfell and in Swift Current — you're going to find out from the rural people exactly what they think of you.

And then why are you in court now on the basis of GRIP '91? Why are you in court on the basis of not dealing with the farmers of Saskatchewan in a fair and a legitimate way? Why are you in court about that? Because, Mr. Speaker, you were wrong when you put it in; you were wrong when you took it away. And, Mr. Speaker, I think we need to identify that as one of the major reasons why this government has a problem out in rural Saskatchewan. They have a problem, a serious problem.

And I even had interesting phone calls from families of individuals from individuals sitting on the government side of the House. And one of the gentlemen phoned me, he said, my nephew is the member from such and such a seat — and I won't embarrass him by saying the constituency he was from — but he said, I will never . . . he's my nephew but I'll never vote for him again. That's what he told me.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is the feeling of rural Saskatchewan. The rural members are letting their voters down time after time after time. And that, Mr. Speaker, is the reason why we raise this as an amendment. Because the Premier of the province has changed farm policies in such a drastic way that all of us, all of us are going to suffer. Of the 80,000 jobs in the city of Regina alone, 50 per cent of them have to do with agriculture. Who's going to suffer, Mr. Speaker, in this whole deal? Who's going to suffer? Mr. Speaker, it's the people of the province of Saskatchewan who are going to suffer, and seriously, seriously suffer.

Mr. Speaker, what about dealing with negotiating in good faith with the federal government — negotiating in good faith with the federal government? The member from Estevan said in his remarks earlier that the farm machinery dealers in Saskatchewan were having some success in marketing to people from Alberta, people from Manitoba. And I'll tell you why, Mr. Speaker. He talked about offloading. Well the federal government made available to the people of Canada a tax credit in agriculture — a 10 per cent tax credit on purchases of farm machinery.

Mr. Speaker, that's the reason why there's farm machinery going out of the dealerships in the province of Saskatchewan. That's the reason. And that's the reason, Mr. Speaker, that the people in the province . . . That's the only reason the people in the province of Saskatchewan

have to have any benefit from the bad things that this Premier has done in the province of Saskatchewan.

Where is the vision? Where is the vision for all of the programs that should be happening in the province of Saskatchewan in relation to agriculture? I would say, Mr. Speaker, I would make this observation, that the people in the province of Saskatchewan know and understand agriculture. Forty per cent of the economic activity is driven by agriculture in this province. And that, Mr. Speaker, is a fact.

We need to consider this from a number of areas. We, prior to 1991, asked the federal government to set up a third line of defence. We asked them to set it up. And has this Premier along with his ministers done anything in relation to setting up a third line of defence with the federal government? Have they negotiated? Have they negotiated an opportunity in good faith with the federal government? Have they negotiated an opportunity for a solution to the crisis? No, Mr. Speaker, they haven't.

Have they even begun to consider the offer that the former minister of Agriculture made to the people yesterday, and as late as yesterday in Hazelton: that the people of the province of Saskatchewan, if they did what they should, they would take the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to deal with an opportunity for expansion of the GRIP program. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what they offered as late as yesterday. And that, Mr. Speaker, is still on the table.

Mr. Speaker, we need a strategy on the part of this government for dealing with agriculture on a long term, not just from day to day but from year to year over a five-year period, at least a five-year period. Is there anyone on the other side who has a vision for what rural Saskatchewan should really be? Is there anyone there that has a view to making the economy in the province of Saskatchewan roll?

And I watched the Premier yesterday as he spoke on a news conference, and he became irritated at the fact that the federal government was asking for some money back. But he became really, really irritated by the fact that the federal government was asking for that money back.

And, Mr. Speaker, it brought to mind some of the reasons why we are in that position. One of the reasons for that is because we're losing people. We're losing people, Mr. Speaker, on a daily basis. People are leaving for jobs. In rural Saskatchewan people are just leaving because there's no job opportunities. Why? Because they don't want to stay on the farm because there's no way that people can earn a living on the farm based on the economics that there are today.

Mr. Speaker, this government has cut and they're going to probably axe the feed grain assistance program — it's got a new name now but that program's likely going to be axed in the budget. They're probably going to axe the livestock cash advance program. They scrambled all over the place in the province talking to the people of Saskatchewan, saying the federal government should reinstate the grain cash advance at no interest. They did that; they do that on an annual basis. But what do these

people do? No, we'll take that \$12 million or roughly that amount of money that is spent for the livestock cash advance and we'll scrap that program.

What do they do with counselling and assistance for farmers? We'll scrap that program too. We'll shuffle it off into ACS (Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan) and we'll throw it down the pipe and we'll say: we don't want to deal with counselling and assistance for farmers today.

They scrapped GRIP '91. I had a gentleman from Balcarres, from the Indian reserve, come to me and speak to me about how GRIP '91 had been an asset to the Indian reserve on the basis of being able to go to the bank and borrow money against that volume of dollars that they were going to get for a return on their investment in farming that land. They had a secure, legitimate document that would deal with giving security for them. And the reason it's important for them is because they cannot use their land as security. They have no security so they had to have some. GRIP '91 provided that.

This Premier has to come to the point at some time in this mandate that he has and acknowledge that agriculture must start to receive some attention from this government. It was platitudes all the way through — the Crow, the Western Grain Transportation Act, the barley. All of those things were just platitudes that this government floated out because they have no . . . They have absolutely no vision for what the future of Saskatchewan should be.

That, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what this province is into. The whole of their assessment is that agriculture is gone; it isn't worth saving. And that's their attitude.

Mr. Speaker, talked a little bit about a new land trust. Well let's call it no trust. The people of the province of Saskatchewan don't have any trust in you. And if you call it a land trust, Mr. Speaker, the people of the province have no trust. They will treat that probably the very same way they treated land bank. They didn't have any trust in you then and they don't have any trust now.

Mr. Speaker, the original motion talks about offloading, talks about offloading in a very specific way to do with transportation. And I want to point out to the people in this Assembly, in an article in *The Western Producer* today. "Mulroney didn't abandon Western Farmers" — that's the headline. And Mr. Knisley goes on to say:

During the 1988 election campaign Brian Mulroney spent little time in Saskatchewan.

Very little time. But what did he do? He went to Outlook, Rosthern, and Wolseley talking to crowds of farmers.

And while that campaign was a great free trade fight elsewhere, in those communities free trade took a back seat to cash.

Mr. Speaker, farmers in the province of Saskatchewan, in rural Saskatchewan are strapped for cash. Seniors are strapped for cash. Everyone is strapped for cash and yet their utility rates go up in power, in natural gas, in

telephones, in SGI. All of the essential services that are provided to these people to maintain their homes, the rates are going up.

It has to do with an annual 4 per cent increase. But where does that 4 per cent average increase come? It comes to those . . . the greatest volume of people that has the highest cost load in relation to this tax increase. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what this government has a problem.

I'm going to go on to quote again:

"When Western Canada called Brian Mulroney as prime minister and said agriculture is hurting and we need help, the government of Canada responded."

That's a fact, Mr. Speaker. And I could go through a whole list of items that they said we will, we will ensure that the people of the province of Saskatchewan, the province of Manitoba, and the provinces of Alberta and across Canada, that agriculture will benefit. And they did come to the aid of Saskatchewan people.

In dealing with the component of the article:

In the 1988 campaign Mulroney said whenever he and Devine met the former premier always said: "Thanks a billion."

And it wasn't a hundred million here and a hundred million there; it was a billion here and a billion there. And that's a fact, Mr. Speaker.

And I would hazard a guess that the Minister of Finance would have a whole lot less problems with the credit unions in the province of Saskatchewan if the people in this government would have rationalized their decision making and understood what the impact of cutting out agriculture was really going to do.

(1230)

Cutting out agriculture, Mr. Speaker, is going to absolutely devastate the credit unions in the province of Saskatchewan. Those farm policies are going to hurt every credit union in rural Saskatchewan. And I know that for a fact because it's happening in my own city. It's happening in Swift Current. We have an amalgamation process going on of probably the two largest rural credit unions in the province of Saskatchewan. And they're amalgamating. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because the income from agriculture is not sufficient to generate the income for those credit unions.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, it isn't large enough. The income isn't large enough in rural Saskatchewan and in urban Saskatchewan to make the businesses profitable in relation to that development. And that, Mr. Speaker, is a fact.

We had amalgamation of the Ponteix credit union with the western savings in Swift Current. Now they're having a meeting in March now to decide whether the two credit unions will go together. And, Mr. Speaker, it isn't going to take long and that's all going to be put together. Why?

Because this government hasn't taken seriously their responsibility of dealing with the rationalization of the credit to the people of the province of Saskatchewan in rural Saskatchewan. They haven't done that. And it's affected a large cross-section of people in this province.

When Mr. Mulroney rolled into office in 1984 it is unlikely he expected to spend much of any time on farm issues. Well what happened in '84 and '85? 1984 was the highest income ever recorded in Saskatchewan's history in agriculture, Mr. Speaker. Ever recorded.

But it had one of the lowest net incomes up to that point in time. The highest recorded income with one of the highest recorded costs in relation to that income. And one of the major reasons, Mr. Speaker, was the high level of interest . . . the high interest rates in that period of time. And that, Mr. Speaker, is one of the reasons why the costs were so high.

1985 was the first U.S. (United States) farm Bill and it drove the cost of . . . or the price of grain down immediately. Immediately the reaction in the international market was that the grain prices went down a buck. And from that point on, Mr. Speaker, there had to be a response by the Government of Canada, and there was. There was a response by the province of Saskatchewan, and there was. For the rural people in the province of Saskatchewan there was a response and it saved the credit unions. It saved the people in small business in rural Saskatchewan.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is a fact. And it's a fact that is represented by the erosion of at least 2,000 people out of the farm sector employment side. In 1991 and 1992, 2,000 people left employment in rural Saskatchewan in agriculture alone in the province of Saskatchewan. And I saw statistics today that there are 10,000 less jobs available today than there were a year ago. And since 1991, there are 34 less . . . 34,000 less jobs in the province of Saskatchewan today than there were in 1991.

And what has happened, it's because of the policy set down by the Premier of this province and, Mr. Speaker, because it hinges on at least 40 per cent of the gross benefit to the people of the province of Saskatchewan, this gross benefit has caused the decline in employment opportunities. Go out into the market, the employment market today, and you're going to see that there is very, very little opportunity.

My son is graduating from commerce this year at the University of Saskatchewan, and 29 out of the graduates got a call from accounting firms — 29 out of the whole graduating class. That, Mr. Speaker, is the opportunity that young people have in the province of Saskatchewan. There is none.

There is none, Mr. Speaker, and why? The reason is we have not dealt fiscally equitably across the province in dealing with the people in rural Saskatchewan. That, Mr. Speaker, is the reason why we are amending this motion that was presented here today and saying that we need this Premier to negotiate in good faith with the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier in a radio show in Prince Albert said this: that changes we made to GRIP '91 and GRIP '92 were not the answer, that's for sure. They added to the problem in some ways. I think that if I had to do it all over again, I wouldn't have touched it. And then in italics: I think our mistake here was trying to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear.

Well, Mr. Speaker, 1992 GRIP definitely was the sow's ear. It was the other one, if '91 was the first one. And that, Mr. Speaker, I never ever said in this province, and I spoke to 20 to 30,000 farmers myself in the spring of 1991, and I said this isn't perfect but we've got to start some place. And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what the Premier should have done in dealing with GRIP '91 versus GRIP '92. He should have gone across the province and asked the people, what do you really want to have?

He campaigned on the basis of a cost of production formula. And, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier today would go across the province and talk about the cost of production formula in relation to GRIP '92, he'd be laughed out of the place, which is just about what happened in the Pool meeting that they had in Sask Place in Saskatoon.

When he went to give his closing remarks, they all raised up their yellow sheets and said, that's enough; we want an end to this. That's what happened in Saskatoon and that's what the farmers are going to tell you when you go travel around with your road show to places across this province. That's what they're going to tell you.

An Hon. Member: — You never showed up in Rosetown.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, the member from just north of the city here, I forget the name of seat, he says I didn't show up in Rosetown. Well I sure did. He wasn't there; I was. And, Mr. Speaker, I've been at Melfort and I've been at North Battleford and I was in Saskatoon and I've been a whole lot of other places, talking to farmers. I went out and stuck my neck out on GRIP '91 and the farmers said, go with it but let's improve it.

And what did you do? You absolutely, totally destroyed it. Absolutely destroyed it.

The member from Last Mountain-Touchwood is the member that didn't go to Rosetown, and that, Mr. Speaker . . . these are the reasons why this province is in trouble.

You can tax all you want, but some day people are going to say to you, enough is enough. That's what you said. In 1991 I clearly remember the then leader of the opposition standing in the seat just beside me and saying, I can govern this province on what — what? — four and a half billion dollars. Now it's up to 5.1 and he just increased the deficit by another 500 million and more, and growing.

He said he would never put in special warrants; it was a thing of the past. And what did we have last month, Mr. Speaker? We had some warrants. And what are they for, Mr. Speaker? Those warrants are for the kinds of things that this Premier is doing in relation to farm policy. He needs to correct them. He needs to deliver a kind of a policy that isn't going to destroy rural Saskatchewan.

Whether it's in health care, whether it's in social services, whether it's in agriculture, whether it's in Sask Power Corporation, whether it's in SaskTel, or whether it's SGI, all of them, all of them, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of the province is using to twist the energy out of agriculture, turn the screws down on agriculture. Because why? Because once upon a time in 1982 they threw them out of government. That's why. It all comes back to that.

And, Mr. Speaker, he's not here to serve the people of the province of Saskatchewan. He's here to serve his own needs and his own ends. That's what he's here for and that's what he's trying to do.

From all of the views of the people that I receive on a daily basis, having been around my constituency in the past six months, I hear that over and over again. People are saying they're tired of this Premier. They're tired of his agriculture policies. They're tired of him sticking his nose into their business. Just give us an opportunity. Leave things as they are for a while.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this province has to begin to instruct his ministers, his Minister of Agriculture to negotiate in good faith. I don't believe it was the member from Rosetown-Elrose that negotiated in good faith. I don't even think it's the new Minister of Agriculture who's operating in good faith with the federal government.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine asked for some information on the Crop Insurance Corporation and I gave it to him. And he wanted to know what the administrative costs in Crop Insurance had been for the last 10 years, so I dug the information up. And there were some interesting things I discovered, Mr. Speaker, some very interesting things. And I'm going to raise them in Crown Corporations. Some very interesting innovative bookkeeping, you might say.

And a question came to my mind is, why was \$36 million of interest put in administrative costs in Crop Insurance? Why? Because, Mr. Speaker, the Premier in his farm policies is jerking around the federal government. He's doing the same thing with the farming public of Saskatchewan.

There is a formula, Mr. Speaker, that deals with crop insurance and a certain amount of the money that is paid by the federal government and the provincial government in relation to the interest costs on the debt in crop insurance. And then the federal government pays an additional 50 per cent of the administration costs.

So not only did they, Mr. Speaker, not only did they recover from the side of the interest costs from the federal government, they turn and put their share into the administrative costs and get a double consideration from the federal government and pay half of the \$36 million yet besides.

Now you want to talk about negotiating in good faith when you do that with the federal government? You do that in good faith when you negotiate with anyone, is you rig the books? That's what you're doing.

The 1991 statement of crop insurance was four times as

high for administration costs as the previous year. Why, Mr. Speaker? Why, Mr. Speaker? — because these people had some innovative bookkeeping. That, Mr. Speaker, is the reason why these people have a problem. That's why they have a problem.

And as we go about rural Saskatchewan talking about health care, these rural policies, people are getting very, very discouraged, very disappointed. And when they come to speak to me in various locations they say, I can't believe what they're doing. They are going to totally destroy.

I stopped in an A & W and was having supper, and I heard behind me an older gentleman and a lady. The gentleman said, would you take the tray to get rid of the dishes and the garbage, because I want to go talk to Harold. And he came over and he talked to me. And I didn't know what his name was; I don't know what business he's in. But he said to me, this government is absolutely crazy in what they're doing. They're absolutely foolish in their approach to how they're managing the economy. They're absolutely not to be trusted in how they're managing the economy.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is happening over and over and over again in this province. And, Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely certain that it's going to continue to happen until there's an awakening on the other side about what the real vision for the people of Saskatchewan should be.

There is a distinct belief, Mr. Speaker, that the people in the province of Saskatchewan have no faith in what you can do for rural Saskatchewan. They have absolutely none.

(1245)

Other people who have come to me and said, I made \$6,000 on my farm to feed my family, to do all of the things that I have to do as a family; \$6,000 is what that family makes. And I would hazard a guess, Mr. Speaker, that that family is one of the well-off ones in that community. Because I know that there were many people who did not receive any benefit from crop insurance or from GRIP '92 in relieving the kinds of conditions that existed because of the way the program was worked. That is how serious a problem it is.

And, Mr. Speaker, that's their record. It was their record, Mr. Speaker, in the '70s, and it's going to be their record in the '90s.

And, Mr. Speaker, one of the very fundamental reasons why I am not involved in the NDP Party is because of the 1970s and how they treated rural Saskatchewan. And there is going to be a decision made in 1993, '94, and '95 about what your role in rural Saskatchewan is going to be and how people are going to treat you.

And I don't understand, Mr. Speaker, in light of politics, the economy, good management of the economy, all of those reasons why these people would be doing what they're doing. I don't understand it. There's something about these people, they must have an inside feeling of wanting to make the people in this province suffer. And I

don't know what it is, but across the province these members should have some sense that the people in rural Saskatchewan are suffering.

Why don't they do something about it? That's my question, Mr. Speaker. Why don't they do something about it? Why doesn't the Premier correct some of the things that he knows are wrong? He knows they're wrong. He said they're wrong. He said, if I had to do it over again I wouldn't have touched it.

Then, Mr. Speaker, and if an apology to the people of the province is necessary, I believe that restitution is also necessary. There is in my view a necessity for this Premier to acknowledge not only his mistake in dealing with rural Saskatchewan but also correcting it, restoring it back to what it was.

Mr. Speaker, I had the same constituent that called me regarding pulling the bill out of the hat for a lottery — who's going to be the lucky guy today — he told me that it had been between 25 and \$30,000 that he had lost in this '92 GRIP. That's what he had lost. And that's what he's destroying the farm families with, the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan. He's destroying them.

And then the member from Humboldt read that \$400 million had gone out of the Crop Insurance Corporation of Alberta. Well this is supposed to be actuarially sound, Mr. Speaker, over a 20-year period. Some days you're going to pay in; some days you're going to pay out. Some day rural Saskatchewan's going to pay in, and sometimes they're going to get a benefit.

And that's the same as is going to happen with SGI. They made a decision over on the other side, because of injuries to people, that they were going to raise the rates in SGI. I have yet to see the proof of that, but that's the reason. But that, Mr. Speaker, is the reason that SGI raised their rates, because there's injuries in car accidents and people are suing for it. Fine, if that's the reason, raise the rates.

If there's a deficit in the Crop Insurance Corporation, raise the rates if it's necessary. Farmers understand that and they're not against it. But give us a time line to do this. And what the program was suggested to do in the first place was that it was supposed to be available for these farmers over a 20-year period to break even. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what the corporation's responsibility was. But did they do it? The Premier said, I wouldn't have touched it if I'd have known what it would do. Well that is what the problem is. And we're asking the people in this Assembly to acknowledge that. We're asking the people of this Assembly to say that along with the Premier, that he made a mistake.

And not only that, Mr. Speaker, I wish we could have debated a throne speech that would have provided an opportunity for a benefit to rural Saskatchewan, but there is none, there is none.

There is an opportunity in rural Saskatchewan to deal with a little booklet that's got a few, 20 pages, that's going to tell us how to deal with agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan — “Forging Partnerships in Agriculture.”

And there's six meetings to talk about it, Mr. Speaker, six meetings in the province of Saskatchewan to talk about it. And that, Mr. Speaker, is almost disgusting.

We're talking about a problem that is massive, Mr. Speaker. We're talking about a solution that needs some very fundamental assessment by rural Saskatchewan, but what are we getting? We're getting a Minister of Agriculture who is not even likely going to attend the meetings. In fact there are I think three on one single day in that agenda that he has. That, Mr. Speaker, is how he's going to consult. He's going to send these people around and say, oh yes, I'm going to consult but I'm not going to be there. I'm going to send these other people out to talk to them.

Why? Because he hasn't the courage to do it himself. He hasn't the courage to go out there and market his new “Forging Partnerships in Agriculture.” He hasn't got the courage to market it. He hasn't the courage to go and step out in front of a group of people, and say this is what I believe the future of Saskatchewan should be because he knows that he's going to be cut down on every one of the things that he's got mentioned in here. He knows that. So what does he do?

And now he will use as an excuse that he has to stay in the House. Well from the throne speech agenda, he isn't going to be doing much in the House because he isn't going to be very active, not on the budget nor in the budget-making process nor in the legislative process. He's going to be sitting to the side because he hasn't the power to generate enough action in the cabinet to make his points of view known, nor the arguments to express the feelings of the people of the province of Saskatchewan. Why? Because he hasn't gone out to ask them, Mr. Speaker, and when he has he hasn't listened. That, Mr. Speaker, is the reason why he's got a problem.

The member from Humboldt said . . . In a letter that we got earlier he said: it is my intention later today to present a motion to the Assembly under rule 42 seeking emergency debate on aid for Saskatchewan farmers. Well, Mr. Speaker, we're talking about that. It's a red herring as far as this throne speech is concerned. It's a way to deflect from the real opportunity the kinds of things that we need to debate in this House to have a vision for the future of the province of Saskatchewan. The people have a vision. The people have a vision for diversification. But does this government? No.

In question period early today the member from Elphinstone said that Spar Group had hired all these new people. Well, Mr. Speaker, they laid off a hundred less than a month ago. They laid them off. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because the economy is down. They laid them off. They may hire them back in six months. That's the kind of optimism and vision that these people across the way have.

And, Mr. Speaker, when you talk about “Forging Partnerships in Agriculture”, it's time that the Minister of Agriculture was prepared, along with the Premier, to go out into the country and take some heat.

Forging is generating the heat to make things happen, Mr.

Speaker. Forging in partnerships in agriculture, forging in the context of the word meant that you were going to heat it up and put it together and make it stick, and do it together and make it go.

But what are you doing? You're ripping agriculture apart from one end of this province to the other. You're ripping apart rural Saskatchewan from one end of this province to the other. You're pitting small communities against small communities in health care. You're pitting small communities against each other in trying to look for opportunities for economic diversification. And there is none, Mr. Speaker. There is none, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it talks here about a number of issues dealing with farm debt. We should talk about farm debt. Why wasn't it addressed in the throne speech? Why wasn't it addressed in the throne speech?

We want to talk about provincial debt. Sure let's talk about it in the context of the throne speech. I don't have a problem with that. But let's deal with it.

Let's talk about the process of the national evolution in agriculture, dealing with the Crow or dealing with the Canadian Wheat Board. Let's talk about it. I have no problem doing that.

And, Mr. Speaker, I stand on the side of the people of the province of Saskatchewan and rural Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. And I'd just like to ask the member from Quill Lakes where he stands on these issues. Because he should be going out to rural Saskatchewan along with the Minister of Agriculture and dealing with the problems in rural Saskatchewan. Then he would start to understand it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I will, Mr. Speaker. I will get very specific later on in my discussion, not on this issue, but on the throne speech.

Mr. Speaker, he's talking about farm size in this. And he's going to have six meetings in four days and that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what he's going to have. He's going to have it all in the North. He's going to have it all where he thinks he's going to be comfortable. He's probably going to make it in buildings too small to get any people into.

But, Mr. Speaker, that's the reason why we raise this as an issue, that we will demand from this government an assessment of rural Saskatchewan every way you turn it — in health care, social services, in farm debt, farm size, GRIP, whatever. We will deal with it in the livestock sector, and, Mr. Speaker, the people of the province of Saskatchewan want us to do that. They want us to come forward in a way that is going to be right for the people of Saskatchewan. That's the reason why we are standing up and we are asking that the Premier correct his mistake. He admitted it.

But, Mr. Speaker, along with admitting it comes the responsibility of re-establishing what he wants to do. And he said it in the throne speech — nothing. He said absolutely nothing. He talked about things that he did the last time. He talked about things that he may change as far as restricting ownership as it relates to perhaps foreign ownership. But did he talk about the real issues of cash out in rural Saskatchewan? No, he did not.

He did not talk about it in any way, shape, or form. And, Mr. Speaker, your motion talks about \$80 million being taken out of the WGTA (Western Grain Transportation Act). Well, Mr. Speaker, that government opposite has taken way more than \$80 million out of the pockets of farmers. In fact, Mr. Speaker, purple gas in the province of Saskatchewan and its relation to agriculture, probably took more than \$20 million out; the cash advance for livestock, another \$12 million; the feed grain assistance program, another 7 or \$8 million. And, Mr. Speaker, diversification in many shapes and forms has been cut to the quick in rural Saskatchewan. And that, Mr. Speaker, is more than the \$80 million that you are complaining about in the WGTA.

And, Mr. Speaker, if they would have gotten off and started negotiating in good faith with the federal government on the WGTA, they would have come to some conclusion. And that's why we raise it in this fashion, Mr. Speaker, negotiating in good faith with the federal government, regardless of their stripe. We did it in '82 to '84 with a Liberal government. And every time you folks turn around, all you do is kick them. Do you think they're going to smile at you?

And the people of the province of Saskatchewan are beginning to believe, they're beginning to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Secretary should maybe give up his post as a cabinet minister while he's recovering. And that, Mr. Speaker, is a part of what he should be doing in light of saving the people of the province of Saskatchewan some money.

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

The Assembly adjourned at 1 p.m.