

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Nineteenth Legislature

Monday, March 5, 1979.

EVENING SESSION
Throne Speech Debate Continues

MRS. J. DUNCAN (Maple Creek): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I rise to formally address this Assembly for the first time, I will use it as my prerogative to take the member for Morse (Mr. Gross) to task.

Never, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would I have believed that an elected official, a representative of the people, would have stooped so low as to twist and turn every word spoken in this Assembly by the opposition and make a mockery of them. His personal attacks and innuendoes have been outrageous. The problems presented in the various speeches are problems, or concerns, of the constituencies and the constituents. I believe that it is the duty of the member, whether he be in government or in opposition to bring these problems to light.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. DUNCAN: — Instead of listening and caring the member for Morse chose to be flippant and sarcastic. His whole speech, if one can call it that, was filled with more questionable statements than anything of substance. It is easy to see why the member for Morse, Mr. Gross, is, and in all likelihood will remain, a backbencher for ever.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. DUNCAN: — I am sure his constituents will agree with me when I say that the member for Morse would have made a better candidate for 'laugh-in', than the office he was entrusted with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. DUNCAN: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like you to pass on to the Speaker my congratulations of his election as Speaker of the House.

You may have noticed some medallions on your desk, gentlemen, these are from the Chamber of Commerce from Maple Creek. They would like me to assure you that though the town of Maple Creek celebrated their 75th birthday last year, we will be more than willing and happy to participate in the Saskatchewan celebrations in 1980.

I would also like to express my gratitude to my constituents for their support at the polls, and to briefly acquaint my fellow members with the constituency I represent.

The Maple Creek constituency is a beautiful and varied one containing several of the most unique geographic features found in Canada. The most prominent of these, of course, is the Cypress Hills, an oasis of pines, ferns and flowers — an oasis amid the surrounding prairies. These hills rise to form the highest point in Canada between the Laurentians in the East and the Rockies in the West. In fact, the elevation at Cypress Hills Park is the same as the elevation at Banff. I am sure that the hon. member for Shaunavon (Mr. Lingenfelter), who owns the cottage next to ours, will agree with me that the Cypress Hills is one of the most unique areas in our province.

March 5, 1979

Another geographical surprise in my constituency is a vast area referred to as the Great Sand Hills, a sparsely populated area of rolling sand dunes situated in the centre of this constituency. In fact, a picture which some people criticize, appeared on the cover of the 1977 Sask Tel's phone book. The remainder of my constituency is largely well-ordered farm land dotted with small urban centres designed to fulfill the needs of the surrounding farms and ranches.

Mine is a rural constituency then, with a unique geographic character. It follows then too that the people possess a unique character and have special needs. My area was settled by a strain of self-reliant farmers, ranchers and businessmen, and their attitude of independence prevails still today but that is not to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that these people are against co-operation, for working bees, branding parties and community projects are still a common way of life and we are proud of them.

Yet for all the government's glowing examples of themselves as great motivators of successful ventures and programs my constituents are not satisfied. Their election of a Conservative MLA for the first time attests to this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. J. DUNCAN: — It seems that the needs of my constituents are not being met. Now why should the Maple Creek constituency be dissatisfied with the present government? Well, because these residents of loam, sand and sage are a self-reliant strain of people concerned not with being supported but are more concerned with supporting themselves. They are a strain of people who resent government intervention, whose livelihood for generations has depended upon the practical use of the resources at hand. For these people government too must be regarded with a pragmatic outlook rather than an idealistic one. When government is not managed as efficiently as a business my constituents are not impressed. My constituents do not identify themselves with wastes and deficits. To my constituents profit is not a dirty word — to them profit comes from good management. They are not like the closet capitalists who sit across the floor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. DUNCAN: — Being a closet capitalist, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is probably the only reason for failure of disclosure and conflict of interest legislation to be included in the throne speech.

Yet, as much as my constituents resent it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, government intervention becomes more and more apparent every day. Despite firm opposition by the beef producers of my area, the Minister of Agriculture continues to talk of marketing boards and let me tell you, talk like that does not sit well with the majority of my constituents.

Perhaps the minister will use the timeworn excuse used by his predecessor that the people had a vote on such and such a date. What a bloody awful excuse to use to impose an unwanted program such as the Hog Marketing Board that was rejected by a majority of the hog producers.

Their so-called mandate after this election, Mr. Deputy Speaker, should be put into its proper perspective. They should be reminded that about 52 per cent of the voters voted

against them and their socialist policies. As I said before, the ranching-farming community in my constituency is unhappy with the threat of a marketing board. But the government had lost the love of the rancher a long time before this. It was easy to see by the implementation of changes in the NDP's land-lease policy. There are many lease holders in my constituency whose operations' viability depends upon long-term control of the lease attached. In many cases the only water running for stock on a section of land may be on a leased quarter and if the rancher cannot be assured the use of this quarter, the value of his land drops. In spite of what the Minister of Agriculture thinks, each of these quarters of grass land is not comparable in value productivity to a quarter section of Regina loam. To produce enough beef or sheep to make a living requires more land and much of that land is leased. But what is the government's policy concerning that lease? Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on Tuesday the Premier made quite a point of saying that my party in our motions did nothing but condemn the government and condemn we did. But he failed or perhaps was scared to read the whole context of those motions. Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did condemn the present socialist government. My motion read:

That this Assembly condemn the Government of Saskatchewan for its failure to recognize the need of the ranching community for long term control of their lease to maintain their economic viability by arbitrarily and without cause cancelling leases and further that this Assembly urge the Government of Saskatchewan to rescind such powers as set out in the provincial land regulations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. DUNCAN: — To my constituents this is not an unreasonable motion or an unreasonable condemnation because the Provincial Lands Regulations, Part 3, Paragraph 2, Chapter 8 states:

A grazing lease made for a term of more than five years may be cancelled without showing cause after two years written notice.

That clause is a direct threat to any leaseholder. Now I ask why would any government want such a power? Why is it impossible for farmers and ranchers to really control their land whether it be leased or deeded? Well, the answers to these questions are both frightening and simple. In keeping with this socialist government's belief that land is a natural resource and that all resources belong to all the people, this government has over the last years used everything in its power to acquire more and more land. This administration does seem to single out the independent farmer and rancher as targets for restrictive legislation. And why? Because such people with a history of independence and self-reliance pose a threat to this government's principle of socialism. Farmers and ranchers and small businessmen, for that matter, are the epitome of individualism and will suffer at the hands of a socialist government until they are destroyed. That's why they can't get a long-term lease. That's why they can't transfer their lease at a time of sale and that's why the land bank exists — to compete with young farmers for land rather than making it available on the open market.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame on you.

MRS. DUNCAN: — The land bank is there as the biggest speculator of all with the weight of the provincial Treasury behind it. It is there to inflate the price of land beyond the

March 5, 1979

means of a young man interested in entering this industry. It all boils down, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the question of who really owns this land. Can a government which has done little or nothing but collect lease fees and taxes for all these years honestly and with a sense of fairness assert that kind of high-handed ownership authority over tracts of land which has in many cases been in the same hands for many, many generations?

Historically, governments have ignored the worth of this land by arbitrarily allotting many, many sections to the CPR, the CNR or the Hudsons' Bay Company. Leaseholders, however, have always regarded that lease as an integral part of their operation and have developed it accordingly.

Another issue in my constituency which is causing some concern is the question of Indian land claims. Here again, the government has proven ineffectual in dealing with this problem in my area. The Nikaneek, one of the Saskatchewan Indian bands with outstanding land claims, resides in the Maple Creek area. While everyone involved readily admits that the sooner the problem of land claims is settled the better, little seems to have been done to accomplish this despite promises from both the federal and the provincial governments. I would issue an invitation to the Minister of Highways to hook a trailer onto his car and travel the No. 21. We often refer to ourselves as living in the forgotten corner and if he ever travelled the 21 and tried to keep going in a straight line he would know why we do call ourselves the forgotten people.

AN HON. MEMBER: He flies everywhere.

MRS. DUNCAN: — I have already endeavored to prove that the political character of my constituency is at least partially determined by its geographical features, but simple location plays a further part in having my constituents seek an alternative to the NDP in that we border the province of Alberta. When people live within easy driving distance of Alberta the inequities between the two provinces are readily apparent. It is very tempting to shop across the border for major purchases saving the cost of sales tax and being able to buy cheap gasoline. But sadder than this is a temptation for Saskatchewan's young people to take their education here and immediately migrate to Alberta to find jobs. We spend millions and millions of dollars to educate these children but have nothing to offer them when they are finished.

Our old people, too, are tempted to retire to Alberta centres rather than stay here in Saskatchewan and who can blame these citizens? People at or near retirement age must bear in mind the cost of health care and nursing home care. I would like to make a comparison for the Minister of Health of the inequities between Saskatchewan and Alberta in the field of nursing home care.

In Saskatchewan, level I nursing care costs \$492 per month of which the resident is required to contribute \$492 a month. In Alberta the same care costs \$618 per month of which the resident is required to pay \$153 per month.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. DUNCAN: — In Saskatchewan level II nursing home care costs \$646 per month of which the resident is required to pay \$502 per month. In Alberta the same care costs \$618 per month (look around, Mr. Minister) of which the resident is required to pay \$153 per month. In Saskatchewan level III nursing home care costs \$942 per month of which the resident is required to pay \$512. In Alberta the same care costs \$618 per month of which the resident is required to pay \$153.

It should be pointed out that effective April 1 level III care at the Pioneer Village in Regina will be \$1,086 of which \$656 must be paid by the resident. These people in Pioneer Village have had two increases in the last eleven months, two increases totalling more than \$100 per month, and yet the government has not increased their subsidies by any amount. During the election this government accused the Progressive Conservatives of threatening to tax the sick or threatening to tax the poor. I would just like to know who was threatening whom with what.

Another area of deep concern to many residents of our province is the inadequate facilities available for level IV care. This is an area of major concern, not only to the elderly, but to the sons and daughters, the doctors and the communities at large. I do compliment the Minister of Health for recognizing that there is a problem in this area but I do criticize him and his department for their failure to grasp the actual enormity of this serious problem. In a press release dated January 11 of this year the Minister of Health stated: 'The addition of level IV beds in rural and urban centres throughout the province is proving very satisfactory'. This is complete and utter nonsense. Here is a government supposedly concerned with the well-being of our senior citizens, offering two beds to rural hospitals to take care of their level IV patients. Obviously, the Minister of Health could not have contacted these rural areas to assess their actual needs.

The hospital at Leader opted not to participate in the program because they already have six level IV patients in the hospital at any given time. The hospital board at Maple Creek had already passed a motion to set aside 10 beds specifically for level IV care; and the city of Estevan, through their own research, found that their city requires at least 20 to 30 beds for level IV care. What has this government offered? Two beds.

Perhaps if the minister made a fact-finding tour of the hospitals in the province, he would find out exactly how many acute care beds are being used for the care of level IV patients. He also might include in his fact-finding tour stops at rural nursing homes and he would find that, though these homes are a credit IV and get paid for only up to level III care, many, many of the beds in each of these homes are in actual fact being utilized for level IV patients.

Now what should be done to correct this very serious situation? I believe that hospitals should be updated, despite the cost, by opening closed beds or, if need be, adding an entirely new wing, or perhaps adding a wing to an existing nursing home and equipping and staffing it properly. You may say that this proposal is too costly and too unrealistic. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a Progressive Conservative, I feel it is our moral responsibility to look after the aged, the infirm and the handicapped. I feel that it is the moral responsibility of any government to provide adequate health care to all its citizens. So we see both a lack of funding and a lack of understanding combining to defeat this government in its benevolent endeavors in the health field.

Now which is it — a lack of funding or a lack of understanding — that is keeping the Year of the Child program in the background. That program is certainly not overfunded either. Only \$100,000 has been allocated to it. Surely, we have more support to give a project with such far-reaching objectives as set out by the United Nations. The Minister of Social Services (Mr. Rolfes) made quite a point the other day by claiming that this \$100,000 was about \$100,000 more than put up by any other Tory government in Canada. Well, obviously the minister was misinformed. In conjunction with the Year of the Child, good old Tory Ontario has allocated the sum of \$4 million to be used by the . . .

March 5, 1979

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. DUNCAN: — . . . Department of Community and Social Services for, and I quote, 'the purposes of identifying and developing more cost-effective approaches that will improve the delivery of children services'. Now, that's what I call a step in the right direction.

Dr. C.J. Messer, a Regina consultant psychiatrist, is quoted in the Saturday, September 16, 1978, issue of the Leader Post as saying, 'The Department of Social Services is a bureaucratic machine gone wrong and it can't undo what it has done. Poor people are hard done by, by this bureaucratic machine.'

How true these words are. The welfare system is now a huge impersonal machine in a distant office, dispensing money at whim and with no set guidelines. This huge impersonal machine cuts both ways. While in some cases it dispenses money easily, in many cases, it does not recognize the real need of some people. What is the young, single, deserted or divorced mother to do when she is told by social services that since she is capable of finding employment, she is not eligible for assistance? Does it help her peace of mind to tell her don't worry, your government is the leader in social programs? Is it not her right as a woman and as a mother to stay in her home to care for and to raise her children if she chooses to do so?

AN HON. MEMBER: - Shame.

MRS. DUNCAN: — What do you say to a 55 year old woman whose 64 year old husband is level three nursing home resident and who because they own a small home are unable to receive assistance? What is she to do? Divorce her husband as has been suggested or should she be compelled to sell this family home? Does it help her peace of mind to tell her her government is the leader in social programs? What do you tell an elderly couple who had the foresight to purchase cemetery plots that since these plots are considered assets, they cannot receive a supplement? Do you tell them that they should sell their cemetery plots and when the time comes, their government will bury them in a pauper's field? Does any government care? Why have the residents of Hazlet and area been subjected to the emotional upheaval because of the Prairie Rail Action Committee (PRAC) report? Why doesn't the federal government accept the Hall Report? Does anyone ever care? People have lost their confidence in governments at every level mainly because people don't care.

Well I care — I care very much. As a mother of four small children, I want my children to grow up with pride and with a sense of confidence that they will be allowed to use their own initiative and to use their own talents to become responsible for themselves. I want the right to be responsible for my own children also. The proposed changes in The Minors Act, I feel are threatening my right as a parent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. DUNCAN: — I want my children to grow up knowing that they are morally responsible for others less fortunate. A big government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, fond of bureaucracy cannot help but be impersonal. It cannot help but lose sight of the basic human need to be recognized for the person's individual worth and not to be recognized as a number in some department. I challenge this government to truly be a leader in Canada by recognizing the true basic needs of the people but I know it will be difficult. Big government by very nature seems to encourage dependence upon it and big government by very nature seems to stifle self-reliance and initiative.

It was imagination and a wish to be free that brought many of our ancestors to this province. I am proud of my Ukrainian ancestors who fled oppression to come to a new, unknown land and who used their own initiative and who used their own determination in the face of many hard times to make a new life. I believe that that same independence, that same initiative and that same determination can continue to support our province and help it grow if such trades are fostered and not hampered. Because of the conviction I share with the people I represent that human independence is a positive trait, a trait which suffers under a socialist government, I cannot support this Speech from the Throne, but I do support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Health): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, once again it's a real honor to speak in this throne speech debate on behalf of the people of Humboldt constituency. In the last election they re-elected me as their representative for the third time. I'm very grateful for that support and that expression of confidence and I intend to represent them with all of the ability and energy that I have — as I have tried to do in the past.

I was listening very carefully to the comments by the new member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) and I would like to congratulate her on her delivery. Although I cannot agree with much that she said — she speaks from a difficult position speaking on behalf of the Conservative Party — nevertheless, I do want to say, and put it on record in the House that at least she indicated to me some hope for that caucus. She did speak in a fairly constructive way and made some points which were objective rather than being totally negative, as we have heard so often from her colleagues across the way. I did note though that she drifted off into some of the pattern of her colleagues when she spoke about government intervention. But then right after speaking of what she alleged to be government intervention in the land-lease arrangements she spoke of, she immediately turned around and asked for government intervention to make sure that leases be available on crown land for some of her constituents. And it's that kind of inconsistency among the members opposite that is going to keep them there for a long time to come, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

March 5, 1979

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I have to make brief reference to the comments made by the member for Maple Creek on the question of level IV beds in Saskatchewan. I guess it is excusable because that member has not been a member except since October 18, so she would not know that in 1971 when this government was elected, there were only 518 level IV beds in all of the province of Saskatchewan and that in 1978 or at the present time, there is a potential for 1,456 level IV beds in the province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I would invite any member opposite to compare that kind of progress to any kind of similar progress there may have been in any other province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — You know, I am one of those individuals whose ancestors also came from central Europe. They came from Warsaw in Poland and I want to say to the member that just as her ancestors, mine came because they were looking for a new life. They were looking for freedom, away from the ownership of almost everything by a very few. If any of those members opposite wanted to look into that kind of history they would find that they were trying to get away from the ownership of land, for example, by a very few landlords who then would lease it out to a large number of people who became their servants. That is the kind of thing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that a CCF and an NDP government has turned around in the province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Governments such as this in this province which have caused similar things to happen across Canada, have provided opportunity to everyone regardless of position or wealth or job and opportunities to everyone so that there is no discrimination on the basis of wealth or income or position.

Through you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the absence of the Speaker, I would like to extend to him my congratulations on his election and re-election as the Speaker of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — He has in the past displayed good judgment, I think, in the last legislature under some rather difficult times, as the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) would agree, I am sure. I think it's a tribute to Mr. Speaker that the members of this House have chosen him to be our Speaker again for this legislature.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Collver) mentioned today during question period, I believe, the work done by the Kinsmen Telemiracle and I would join with him in extending my congratulations to the Kinsmen and the people involved for the exemplary job that they did during this weekend in raising almost \$1.5 million for the handicapped.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I, too, would join with the members of this House who have spoken before me and I know those who will speak after me in extending my

congratulations to the member for Wascana (Mr. White) and the member for Shaunavon (Mr. Lingenfelter) for their remarks in moving and seconding the address in reply to the throne.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I think it is clear from what they have said and the way they said it that they will make a major contribution to this Assembly in a most positive way and with some vision for the future for our province. They have also indicated and continue to indicate that they will serve their constituents very well.

I was particularly happy to note, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that Clint White has lived in the town of Humboldt and he and his wife and family in my constituency. They have many friends there. Also I had the privilege of speaking at the nominating convention of Dwayne Lingenfelter when he was nominated, and I knew then, when I listened to him and watched his convention, that he was going to be the member of this Legislative Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would also extend my congratulations to all members in this House on their election on October the 18th. It's a great responsibility that constituents bestow on a person as their representative by electing them and I would like to wish all on both sides of the House the very best in their work during their term.

When the next election rolls around this wish will be a little more confined, I can assure the members opposite, and less generous to them, but for now we all have put the election behind us and prepare to serve the citizens of Saskatchewan, each in our own way.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have had the honour to represent Humboldt constituency since 1971. It is basically a rural constituency but in recent years small industry has developed in many communities providing work for young people growing up in the area. Every community in Humboldt constituency has seen some growth since 1971. New homes, new people, new opportunities have continued to enrich our communities. This government's commitment to decentralize has resulted in such things as the establishment of the Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute in Humboldt and the water supply board main offices in Watrous. Mr. Deputy Speaker, unconditional grants and revenue sharing, the community capital fund and cultural and recreation facilities grant program have helped Colonsay build a new skating and curling rink complex, and Burr has built a new skating rink this year. The community hall at Guernsey has seen major improvements and a water supply system has been put in. Young has a new curling rink. Grenfell is soon to have an official opening of a new addition to their hall and curling rink, accomplished with the help of provincial funding. Plunkett has built a new curling rink and almost completed a new community hall.

Humboldt is planning a community centre complex that will cost over \$2 million, and that will be made possible because of assistance through the provincial government and through the NIP (Neighborhood Improvement Program) Program.

Our senior citizens in every community in my constituency have an activity centre made possible by provincial assistance on an ongoing basis, as well as some initial

March 5, 1979

assistance from the New Horizons Program. Meacham is in the process of planning such a facility at the present time.

The community of Viscount is improving its water supply this year with a pipeline. Our water supply board has been very helpful in this regard and will provide important funding to make this project possible. I'm sure that the Minister of Municipal Affairs will help in that respect.

The senior citizens' low rental housing in Bruno and Colonsay and Viscount, Watrous and Humboldt, established since 1971, have been of great benefit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Our senior citizens now have good housing at low cost which allows them to live in their own communities. Without a firm commitment from government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, these things may have never happened.

The members opposite complain about government involvement! I want to remind them again and I want them to think very carefully when they say those things — that without a firm commitment by government in such things as these that I have mentioned, many of them would never have happened. But a major portion, I might also add, of the credit must go to the people who live in and around and support these communities. Their enthusiasm and their pride in their communities is shared by this government. We believe that rural life is a good life and we have developed programs to keep it strong. I'm proud to represent the people of the Humboldt constituency and share with them their enthusiasm and pride in their community and it's good and exciting to be a part of them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I now want to turn briefly to the throne speech and issues of importance to our province here in Saskatchewan. I will have much more to say during the budget debate and in second reading on the bills that I will be introducing in this session and on some of the resolutions now on the order paper. I will elaborate particularly in the area of health care during the budget debate, although I do want to say a few things in my remarks today on that subject.

This throne speech is once again one of promise and of vision for this province but it also makes reference to an issue of considerable importance today to all of Canada and that is Canadian unity. I agree with and support the belief that Canada will remain a strong and united nation. We as a country have a relatively new but very rich history. We have had the good fortune of benefiting from the contributions of people from every part of the world and their histories go back centuries. They have brought to this country the best of their cultures and institutions and together these things give us strength and hope for the future. But we should not be so complacent as to ignore some problems that we as a nation and as provinces within confederation must face up to and resolve. There are those who would break this country apart and in light of this it is unbelievable that a leader of a major political party, Mr. Clark of the Progressive Conservative Party, along with a prominent spokesman in that party, Mr. Crombie, would even suggest that they would negotiate sovereignty association with the Parti Quebecois government in Quebec.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Canadian people must look real hard at what would

happen . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Deputy Speaker, now that the debate from the other side has stopped, maybe I will proceed. Canadian people, as I began to say, must look real hard at what would happen to this country under that kind of leadership and they will look especially hard in the next several weeks as there comes along a federal election and as we campaign in that federal election campaign. Our Canadian people have had enough of the kind of government that we have had with the Liberal administration and its floundering and they have to fear the result of a Conservative government that seems to have no consistent policy and which would be the patsy of every powerful corporation and corporate interest in this country and a party which could form a government that would sell out anything in order to be able to gain power. More and more and day by day the importance of a strong group of New Democratic Party MPs in parliament becomes apparent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Only in that way will some common sense, some social conscience and economic reality become a part of the action that comes out of Ottawa. Mr. Deputy Speaker, New Democratic Party leadership and influence in Ottawa can bring about the kinds of things that have happened here in the province of Saskatchewan. I don't need to look far and neither does any other member here to give you some evidence of what others think. I give you an article in the Weekend Magazine of February 13, 1979 and I point this out particularly after listening to two speeches in this House. I first listened to the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) and then I listened to our Premier, the hon. Allan Blakeney. If there was anyone who could not understand the reasons for the election results of October 18, a comparison of those speeches would show pretty overwhelmingly a major reason for that result.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the Weekend Magazine it is written by John Disard:

Of the provincial Premiers attending the First Ministers' Conference in Ottawa next week only Saskatchewan's Allan Blakeney can match wits with Pierre Trudeau.

But I want to point something else out. He goes on to say:

But his greatest achievement has been to transform the province with the bleakest past into the province with the brightest future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the author went on to say that as Premier, Blakeney has re-established the Saskatchewan government's reputation as one of the most innovative and socially responsible in Canada today. That's the kind of leadership that we need nationally at the present time and into the 1980s.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as an MLA from a rural constituency I am most pleased that this throne speech, as every throne speech since this government was elected, has put much emphasis on the most important industry in our province and that is agriculture.

March 5, 1979

As has been so well put by other members on this side of the House, when all of the factors in our provincial economy are considered, agriculture is still the most significant contributor to it. In eight years this government has brought about legislation and programs of major significance to the farming sector. We have supported the development of new opportunities in rural communities and strengthened existing and established ones. Recreational, educational and cultural opportunities have been provided that prior to 1971 did not exist. School closing by arbitrary decision of the provincial government no longer happens. Pupil-teacher ratios no longer exist. The school boards have local authority and autonomy that they have never before had and even the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan), I'm sure, would have to admit that there is a lot to what I say in that. But they have more than that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they have the resources that enable them to make those important local decisions because of the provision of the kind of funding that this government has done. Since 1971, Mr. Deputy Speaker, our crop insurance program has been improved and expanded so that it is now a meaningful program.

The land bank has made it possible for many young farmers to get into farming, and it has assisted over 2,300 new or small farmers in obtaining an adequate land base . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I ask the members opposite when they criticize the land bank to go and talk to some of those land bank farmers . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Go and talk to them and ask them if they thought they would be farming today if it had not been for the land bank. I think they will get a very enlightened kind of message from them.

It has been put into question the credibility of the opposition party, the Conservative Party. They have talked about things in the past, as filthy hospitals, and made all kinds of other allegations about programs such as the land bank . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . and they said the land would never be sold. But last year the first sale on the land bank was made. We said we would do it and we did it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, just for the edification of the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) because of some comments she made about the ownership of land and the desire of people to have freedom. I want to remind her and the members opposite that it was this government that provided that foreign and corporate ownership of land is now controlled in this province and not turned over willy-nilly as it is in other parts of this country.

Since 1971 an agriculture machinery testing facility has been established. I heard the members opposite criticize the machinery testing facility. In fact I have heard the member who is seated over there, Mr. Birkbeck, suggest that maybe it should be done away with. I can tell him now that the people of Humboldt and area as the farmers of Saskatchewan are not very pleased with that kind of suggestion. The farmers need to know the kind of equipment they are buying because it is very expensive to buy. They just cannot rely on the promotion gimmicks that are made by the machinery manufacturers and they welcome this innovation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the cost price squeeze became serious, our government introduced the Farm Fuel Reduction Program last fall. The farmers in my constituency welcomed this as well. The hog producers now have a Hog Marketing Commission and a Hog Prices Insurance Plan to prevent prices from falling out of the bottom and causing bankruptcy to many of them from time to time.

I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this is only a very short list of many of the accomplishments this government has brought about in the area of agriculture. In this throne speech, mention is made of several initiatives in the agricultural field, and one in particular, the establishment of a major initiative in agriculture research that will have a major and long-standing impact on agriculture in our province.

We live in the world of growing demand for food. That demand for food is a need which our farmers have shown in the past that they can fulfil, and the Canadian Wheat Board has shown that it can and will sell larger amounts of grain . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . and research can help them produce even more while at the same time ensuring the productivity of our soils for future generations and preventing our environment of land, water and air from being made unsuitable for all living things in the future. I welcome this major new initiative and my constituents welcome it and on their behalf I congratulate our Minister of Agriculture for his efforts in putting it together.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, while this government has shown its confidence in rural communities and Saskatchewan farmers, and while Saskatchewan farmers have displayed their capability to be exceptionally productive, the obstacles that have had to be overcome have been almost overwhelming at times. Efforts by multinational grain companies aided by the federal government and Progressive Conservative politicians to destroy orderly marketing through the Canadian Wheat Board have had to be beaten back and that fight, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is not finished yet. It is still on.

Secret meetings are now the order of the day involving the railways and the Palliser organization and it is said, unnamed interest groups which I submit speak for the Liberal and Conservative parties and represent their policies and attitudes on agricultural matters. Secret meetings to change the Crow's Nest rate — in the dark of night a plot is planned to take from western farmers the benefit of the crow rate. The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, they're not involved and I say that the Saskatchewan farmer is therefore, not involved. The Saskatchewan farmer stands to lose over \$130 million a year and so therefore, these groups that meet in these secret meetings ignore him. Our position on the Crow's Nest rate is very clear: it must not go; it must stay and we intend to fight with everything that we have to keep it for Saskatchewan farmers. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we now have the PRAC (Prairie Rail Action Committee) report.

Let me say in my view, it is one of the worst hatchet jobs of the West to come along for some time. Its recommendations are a destructive blow to the framework of rural Saskatchewan. Its deviation from the restriction to analyze the prairie rail authority lines only, to several lines that Hall thought should be retained, such as the Lewvan subdivision and altering some of Hall's abandoned mid-recommendations can't help but lead one to wonder how independent that report really was from the pen of federal government influence.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, PRAC is nothing less than an attack on the prairie grain industry and the towns that serve it. It assumes that there would be no negative impact on communities stemming from abandonment. I invite its authors to go to a place like Meacham and ask the people there if abandonment of their line would have no negative impact. It assumes that the impact on energy cost due to a shift from rail to truck would

March 5, 1979

be insignificant and it puts more weight on the interest of the railways and the multinational elevator companies than those of farmers and rural communities. The authors of PRAC appear to have decided that they would recommend and then look afterwards for the appropriate figures to justify those recommendations. And in a letter to the Meacham Wheat Pool Committee on August 10, the executive director of PRAC stated that the latest five year average receipts at Meacham was only 649,000 bushels and therefore they were going to recommend that line be abandoned

Mr. Deputy Speaker, no mention in that letter is made of Peterson, with is also on that line. And for this reason the Meacham line is recommended for abandonment. They ignored the fact that in 1977-1978 this line had receipts of almost one million bushels — with Meacham and Peterson combined. I might add that this was in years of deplorable train service with closures of the line for some parts of the year that to this day can't be justified. It was deliberately done to try and deviate some of the grain deliveries to other centres.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, PRAC (Prairie Rail Action Committee) clearly established its conclusions, as I have said, and then used figures to support them. The communities served by this line, with help from the province, are preparing to present their case to the Canadian Transport Commission (CTC). It will not throw off its arms and give up as some would like, and neither will I as the MLA for the area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, last week we saw at the federal level again the lack of action by government and what might be expected from a Clark Conservative government. Evidence has been provided that multinational corporations — and particularly those in the food industry — have been gouging the farmer and the consumer. And corporate profits have increased dramatically, helped by the federal corporate tax cuts which have not resulted in more jobs as they were meant to do, and which the NDP members in the House of Commons said they would not do. We need federal action to stop this gouging which is a major factor in increasing inflation. The NDP has proposed a commission with the power to roll back prices, which we support in this province. And what is the result? The Liberals and the Conservatives in parliament joined hands to vote against that proposal. Conservatives show signs of fighting Liberals, they show signs of fighting them tooth and nail, but when their mutual friends, the multinational corporations are exposed, they join hands and rush to their defense. And there is no doubt that he who pays the piper, plays the tune — and here is a clear example of Liberals and Tories playing in the same key, while strummed by the corporations who pay their election bills.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Members opposite should understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I ask what was the Tory response to the NDP proposal to control prices? They said through their leader, and others, that they should have an election because we need action. They said tell the public what is going on, because the public needs to know. I can't disagree with any of that. I think we should of had an election long ago, and I think that the public needs to know. But they also had a chance to vote for action and they voted against it. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the public know about prices; and they know about gouging and excessive profits. Ask the housewife. Ask the farmer what happened to his cost. Ask the small businessman about the squeezes he finds himself in. They know, And they want something done. And only the NDP members in parliament government

announced some action. They are going to establish a new national commission on inflation — with no teeth. So what's new about that? We have had in this country a Food Prices Review Board — it had no teeth and power. We've had CSIP it had no teeth and power. And now we have a new national commission on inflation and it will do no more than either of those two other operations that were established by the federal government. We see only more inflation. We see only a bloating of corporate profits and now we have a new toothless wonder which will give the Liberal government an excuse not to talk about this problem in the coming election campaign. We know the present Liberal government is not prepared to take action and we have seen the Conservative response as well and let there be no doubt, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that if there should be a Joe Clark Tory government after the next election, we would see an escalation in prices and therefore inflation, the likes of which we have never seen. It doesn't take much imagination to see the result of a Clark government facing up to the banking institutions or to the corporate conglomerates. We already know what the opinion and the attitude of Sinclair Stevens is when he talks about the fact in his view that Canadians should be hewers of wood and bearers of water.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the people of this province went to the polls last fall, the result was an unqualified endorsement for the New Democratic Party. It was a vote of approval for this government's past record and an expression of confidence for the future. It was an overwhelming endorsement of the leadership of our Premier. It also answered a question in which I as Minister of Health was particularly interested. That was what the people of Saskatchewan think about our health programs and policies. The answer should be obvious even to the Tory opposition which repeatedly said that our health programs were in trouble and that they were under-funded and some of them were frills. These statements were not correct before the election and they are not true now. It is reassuring to know that the electorate of this province were not taken in by the misleading opinions and statements of the Hon. member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) and his colleagues.

During the last election both opposition parties attempted to belittle the public's confidence and trust which were earned through our initiatives in the health field. They tried to minimize our achievement by saying that of course they would give health care the same high priority which NDP governments have given it. Well, actions speak louder than words, Mr. Deputy Speaker, so let's have a look at the opposition parties' records in the health care field. The Liberals, we well know, introduced deterrent fees in 1968. And what has happened to them? They were wiped out in 1971. The fact that the Liberal Party was totally eradicated in 1978 might be an indication that the public's memory is not as short as some like to think. For the Liberals 1978 was simply a conclusion of something that began in 1971. The Conservatives, never having been entrusted with government authority in our generation, devoted their efforts to undermining the public's confidence and pride in its health system and we all know what happened to them last fall. Now in all fairness, however, one must admit that the ruthless actions of Manitoba's Conservative government which seemed almost inebriated by its newly acquired power were not helpful to the Conservative cause in this province. And the Alberta Conservatives removed all doubt about their priorities when they raised the medicare premiums in 1978, and at the same time, lowered the gas tax. I find it, Mr. Speaker, rather ironical and almost cruel to read in the Edmonton Journal a statement on January 16 of this year that the Alberta government was not going to introduce a dental care plan for children, particularly disturbing, Mr. Speaker, when we know that the size of the Alberta Heritage Fund estimate of March of 1979 is going to be \$4.7 billion; and you have to wonder where the priorities are. It is particularly disturbing and reason for people to fear a Conservative government when

March 5, 1979

you see that the waiting list in Edmonton hospitals is over 6,800 and in Calgary over 6,400 people.

Then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is Ontario's big blue machine which has been cutting a wide swath in hospital beds and there is no relief in sight. The Ontario Tory government intends to reduce hospital beds to a ratio of 3.5 per 1,000 population by April 1981. Last year in Saskatchewan we had an approved hospital bed ratio of 5.3 per 1,000 population. Ontario does not intend to stop there. In fact, as of this April, Ontario patients who will occupy chronic care beds longer than 60 days will be charged \$909.80 a day. The psychiatric patients who stay longer than 60 days in psychiatric hospitals will also have to pay \$909.80 a day. I must say that this seems like a rather odd attempt to offer psychiatric patients equal treatment but then as we well know, Tory minds work in strange ways.

Mr. Speaker, what about the Conservative federal position on medicare? Well, the federal Tory scene isn't much better. I want to just quote for the record of this House from the Vancouver Sun the opinions of the Leader of the Conservative Party on health care. He said, and I quote:

Health insurance today encourages people to abuse the system by making unnecessary trips to doctors. The problem is now to introduce an incentive to use more judgment without penalizing less well-off or discouraging truly necessary visits.

Here is the bottom line:

One way might be to consider all or a portion of the value of a doctor's visit as taxable income for the patient. Something like a T-4 form could be issued.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for a party opposite that tries to tell people that they do not believe in deterrent fees, in health premiums, it is pretty difficult to swallow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — It is pretty difficult to swallow the fact that maybe by some slim chance that fellow who was speaking in that article I just read might be the Prime Minister of this country.

Mr. Speaker, the health care system in Saskatchewan, I maintain, is moving in the right direction. The results of the last election support this as do the findings of a public opinion poll conducted recently by the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion. This poll asked Canadians to rate government services in terms of good value and getting their moneys worth. On a national scale 88 per cent thought that medicare was good value for their money, and the highest rating given to any government service in the prairies, this figure rose to an impressive 93 per cent, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Now I heard several members on the opposite side of the House say what they thought to be the Conservative policy on health care, particularly the new members. Well I'd like to enlighten them on what their colleagues in this House were saying and the positions they took which led us to believe quite honestly that they would ruin our medicare system and we still believe it if they were ever elected. The member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan) said that Conservatives have been saying that we have a good health care plan. Isn't that interesting when you take into account some of the statements that have

been made opposite, the likes of which said that our hospitals are filthy and dirty — none of which was ever verified even though they said they would have documentation.

The members opposite said that the children's dental plan was no good. They said that the drug plan was no good. They said these things were a frill and unnecessary and the member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) said that community clinics should be destroyed and wiped out because they were not serving the function. The member for Rosetown-Elrose said that in the last election in the program of the Tories, they said they would have no deterrent fees and that there would be no charges for appliances. Well I want to remind him that in this province now because of the SAIL program, there are no charges for appliances so that is at least one program and commitment that you would have delivered on because you would have had nothing to do.

On the question of deterrent fees, let me just put into the record some things that I think members opposite ought to be reminded of from time to time. A former candidate of the Conservative Party — and this is Dr. Daunt from Yorkton — told the meeting he favored some measure to curtail needless medical treatment and he praised former Liberal Premier Ross Thatcher, for bravery in introducing the utilization fee. You have to ask, Mr. Deputy Speaker, do they really mean it when they say they do not believe in deterrent fees? The member who no longer sits in this House who retired voluntarily was speaking in the budget debate in March 1977 said many people in the province would be willing to pay \$10 a day for a hospital bed. Can we really feel comfortable and can the people of Saskatchewan feel comfortable when the Conservative members say that their policy is one of no deterrent fees?

Then there is the member for Swift Current (Mr. Ham) who is not seated in this House right now who was quoted as having said and I read from the Star Phoenix of October 28, 1974:

Dennis Ham, a candidate in Swift Current rose to avoid personal support for the introduction of deterrent fees.

So I say to the member for Rosetown-Elrose and other freshmen members of the Conservative caucus they should look at the record of the members who were here prior to the October 18 election before they say that some of the things that were said in the campaign were not correct because they only stated what your colleagues stated in this House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the throne speech makes reference to a number of issues or a number of matters in the field of health which I will be dealing with at some length when I introduce various pieces of legislation. One of the areas that we feel is particularly important is the area of child and youth services, especially because 1979 has been declared the International Year of the Child by the United Nations. And the Department of Health's most important initiative in this regard is going to be to do a very major review of the programming and services provided to youth and adolescents in the province during this year. The study will attempt to define the range of health services for children and youth and will then go to determine the extent to which existing services meet those needs. It will then prepare recommendations to deal with the identified problem areas.

We believe that such a study must include extensive public consultation. Child and youth concerns effect the very fabric of society and we are committed to obtaining the views of a wide cross section of the population on this subject. The Canadian Council

March 5, 1979

on Children and Youth has recently published a report entitled, 'The Child As Citizen'. The report discusses the needs of children in relation to Canadian law and social practice. It also argues for the recognition of children as persons in their own right. At one point the report issues what can only be interpreted as a challenge to the healthcare systems. It states that health care is more than a matter of medical management and that health concerns are tied to a broad range of social factors, socio-economic status, socio-cultural differences, poor housing and sanitary conditions, poor nutrition and poor basic education. And it goes on to say, and I quote: 'That one of the basic objectives of a reformulated health policy must be directed to the child's basic environment, which is and should be, the family.' To respond positively to this challenge will require innovative approaches to a whole series of exceedingly complex issues.

I am hopeful, however, that the Department of Health study in this area will produce some recommendations which might be helpful in meeting the health needs of our children and youth in a comprehensive and integrated fashion. This is not the sort of subject about which we can realistically expect to reach a consensus early. A lot of thinking and dialogue is needed. I have often spoken in the past about individual responsibility for one's health and such a goal need not be restricted to adults. Rather, what is needed is a strategy whereby the lifestyle approach to personal health can be tailored to meet children's needs. In fact, it makes a lot more sense to focus our resources of promoting healthy lifestyles among children than it does to try and alter established behaviour patterns in adults.

A significant portion of the study will be devoted to this aspect of child and youth health and I am keenly interested in its outcome. Mention has been made in the throne speech on legislation which I shall not deal with in my remarks this evening, Mr. Deputy Speaker, except to make reference to the fact that I look forward to introducing and explaining the new community health unit act and the cancer foundation act and other such related legislation.

I just want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying this: That health care is a basic necessity of life and it should be accessible to all regardless of the income or status of the client. We are convinced that the progressive premium tax or deterrent fee is neither forward nor efficient. This premium should be, where it exists, abolished across Canada, abolished as a financing device and replaced by a progressive tax that is fair and efficient — the income tax as is done in the province of Saskatchewan and with revenues from our resources. And I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this approach is reinforced in this throne speech and the intention of this government. The Conservative statements and experience in other provinces show that that kind of an approach would be threatened by them, and so therefore. I would oppose the amendment and whole-heartedly support the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise again in this Assembly, the nineteenth legislature of this province, to debate the throne speech. I must admit it's going to be one of the greatest challenges of my life; to debate the throne speech because about what's on the back is about what's on the inside — and that's not a whole lot of anything — but I'm going to do my best because it does suggest a few ideas that they might possibly have with regards to the future of our province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, before I get into the text of my remarks this evening. I would like to briefly comment on the remarks made by the Minister of Health, the speaker that just took his place. He refers to the former Liberal Party and their charge that the NDP government would not sell land bank land when that five-year term was up. Mr. Minister of Health, you charged that we were saying the same thing. Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is where the Minister of Health is wrong. The Liberal Party was saying that, and we were not saying that, and I suppose that could be one of the contributing reasons why we're here and they're not. Unfortunately, for once, and not too often, they weren't too far out because when you announced your program for the sale of land bank land I was asked if I thought that that was going to be an encouragement to Saskatchewan farmers, to buy that land that they had been leasing for five years, and I said absolutely not.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the Minister of Agriculture cares to differ with me then maybe he could, for the pleasure of this House, table on the legislature the numbers of farmers that have purchased land bank land since the lease purchases were available.

Now then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, members of the government holler across and say well you can't force them to buy it. Well that is correct, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but this government could provide incentives and encourage young farmers in this province to buy land bank land.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member for Quill Lake speaks and I don't have to worry about him because when I'm speaking nobody's listening to him and I can't really hear him anyway.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I may just refer again to the remarks by the present Minister of Health, and maybe it will be the former Minister of Health in not too long a time — just want to make that point, you're wrong there — and you're wrong in regards to my remarks surrounding PAMI (Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute).

The Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute is a good institution, and at the time I made my remarks there were some things I felt needed to be corrected, and because of the remarks made from this side of the House and not the then Liberal Opposition, those corrections have been made. Further, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sure that the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) who has been familiar with the implement sales and the John Deere dealership would have something to say as to whether or not his machinery was proven and tested adequately enough for the farmers of this province. I suggest that the major machine companies are doing an adequate test. I suggest that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the members over there get a little excited whenever I stand to speak and I've got it figured out. After hearing the speaker from that side of the House, Mr. Deputy Speaker, my head could have been spinning if it were as light as the heads on that side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, these members are wobbling and waving back and forth and trying to find something in the top story but they are not finding much. Every time they open their mouths they only give me one more opportunity to criticize them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'll say again with regard to PAMI (Prairie Agricultural Machinery

March 5, 1979

Institute), it is a good institution. It does have its place in particular with regard to new machinery. I'll cite one good example and that's the large balers when they first came on stream. There have been some good test results coming out of PAMI. So again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Health (Mr. Tchorzewski) is wrong in his comments and his accusations of this Tory Party on this side of the House.

The approach, Mr. Deputy Speaker, taken by the Minister of Health is the same approach taken by the majority of the members on that side of the House. They have been doing it since they were in office since 1971 and that is providing an air of division among groups of Saskatchewan people. They want to divide and conquer and that is just what they have done.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the NFU (National Farmers' Union) is a political organization. Those are the comments we hear coming from that side of the House . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, they don't like that. They stand over there and they say, oh, the Tories don't like co-ops. When I turn that around and I say you are suggesting that the NFU is a political organization, you don't like it. I tell you that the membership in the NFU is low; it's low, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because rural Saskatchewan will not support them anymore than they have supported this NDP government.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it isn't just the NFU. What are they doing now? They are turning around and they're trying to say that the Pallisers is in some way a Conservative organization.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — There you are; it goes clearly on the record, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this NDP government feels that the Palliser farm organization is a Conservative organization. Well, I'll tell you. The Palliser organization is not going to appreciate the view point that you have, very much. It goes on and on and on, Mr. Deputy Speaker — the approach of this government to divide organizations. There are people who say that all NDP members' wives shop at the Co-op. Now can you imagine anything so silly coming from the government side of the House? I can't . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . and that's coming from this side of the House. Well, now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm really not encouraged to hear the minister responsible for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan joining in this catcalling because, Mr. Minister responsible for the Potash Corporation, you happen to be one minister on that side of the House that I have some respect for so I suggest that you might maintain that respect. That's right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: — Now, don't get carried away.

MR. BIRKBECK: — No, I'll try to contain myself. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm referring to the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter), I'm heeding his remarks. Now then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, again, the Minister of Health makes reference to this crow rate. He says the crow must stay. I agree the crow must stay and you must go.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no time that the members on this side of the House ever, at any time, suggested that the crow rate must go. Not at any time! Anymore than this side of the House has ever suggested that they were opposed to the

co-op organizations, as the Attorney General made remarks I believe, either the first or second day of the sitting of the legislature. Oh, yeah, you boys over there, you're down on the co-ops. It was in regard to discussions around CPN (Co-operative Programming Network). That's the kind of innuendo that this NDP government and its members therein are casting all across this province and that's the type of action that they portrayed in this election and that's what got them into power. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if it's in my power, in any way in the next four years, to make the people of Saskatchewan aware of the more than low tactics that this government uses to maintain power, then Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm going to do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the minister of health refers to our wonderful health program and again no one on this side of the House ever said that the health program wasn't a good program. Mr. Minister of Health, would you mind turning around in your chair, looking right at me, opening your ears, clearing your mind and listening? The Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan strongly supports the present medicare system in the province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, furthermore — you might listen, Mr. Minister, and remember your reply to me — and I believe it was in the estimates — where you admitted that the cost to Saskatchewan people was in fact \$436 per man, woman and child. The budget . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . now somebody says it's not true. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I note a few people in the galleries tonight. Yes, there is one left in the press. There's a million people, approximately in this province, and the budget for health care is \$436 million. Now does one million into \$436 million not equal \$436 per man, woman and child?

AN HON. MEMBER: — No, to socialists, that equals nothing.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Well, now, the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) maybe makes a good point. It may equal nothing.

Now then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just want to conclude my remarks regarding the Minister of Health, and to tell him that he knows that we support the health plan. Our suggestion, very simply, is what the Minister of Health is now going to do. He's going to streamline the health care system. That's exactly what we said we would like to do. So I ask you to continue with that. I commend you, Mr. Minister of Health, for taking that approach — it's just another example of when they've taken Conservative suggestions from this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm going to move off the subject of discussing the Minister of Health's comments. I think that he, like all members in this House, meant them in very earnest taste. Sometimes one questions whether it was good taste or not, but none the less, he is a very talented member of this government and a talented minister. I commend him for that.

While we're talking about some of the members over there that are worthy of the positions they hold, I think that it bears mentioning a few others. The Attorney General

March 5, 1979

is one of the most able and capable members in this legislature. He's like everyone else, as I reply, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) — he's going to make a few mistakes but generally speaking he's one of the best ministers this government will ever have!

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the minister responsible for Municipal Affairs is another one of those who falls in a high rate category. That's the minister responsible for Municipal Affairs, the member for Last Mountain-Touchwood (Mr. MacMurchy). Now, he came very close, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to losing that seat but that was maybe because of factors beyond his control, and certainly not of his wrongdoings. He's another good minister, but like the Attorney General and a few of the others, they are subject to making mistakes from time to time and we can accept that, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

There are members, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on that side of the House who surely — I don't know where to start, really. The member who spoke this afternoon, the member for Morse (Mr. Gross) — now the member for Morse formerly used to sit down there — but oh boy, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we got a speech here this afternoon, and I don't know — the Minister of Health was talking about the need to maintain psychiatric care in this province and if we get many more speeches like that — well, you know we're going to have a real need for it, Mr. Deputy Speaker. But I can only say that the member for Morse, in his speech — really to sum it up I suppose, well, that was gross. If anything was, that was.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't really want to have to refer to those two members again this evening. In fact, as far as the member from Morse (Mr. Gross) is concerned, I don't want to have to refer to him ever again as long as I'm in this legislature and that is for at least four more years.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the indulgence of the House and the acceptance of the members opposite, possibly with the acceptance of my own members, I might move into the more sensible, more rational, comments that I'll have to make this evening — because in commenting, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the comments from the government side it is very difficult to be rational.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to, through you, congratulate Mr. Speaker for being elected to the office of Speaker for this nineteenth legislature. Mr. Speaker has in past, had a very difficult task to perform with two opposition parties — his task is now more simplified, and I look forward to his tenure and his office in this next four years as being a very pleasant one. I have a high regard for Mr. Speaker and his office, and I can honestly say, in my own personal involvement in the legislature, have had no differences with Mr. Speaker of any major consequence. So, I congratulate him and look forward to working with him again for another four years.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would also like to welcome the new members to the nineteenth legislature, on both sides of the House. It has often been said new members from this side of the House are not going to have a lot to offer to this Assembly. I have to congratulate our own members for their speeches that they've made so far — they've been superb — superb speeches, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — They show great promise for the province of Saskatchewan. Now, I would refer to the member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew). The member for Kindersley is the type of a man, an MLA (Member of the Legislature Assembly) that has visions for this province and will be preparing to present long-range policies. I know a number of our members have some deep feelings about this province and some good ideas which they are now in the process of putting together, and will soon be presenting to this government, hopefully from time to time, for their acceptance.

With regards to this government's acceptance of our suggestions, I can only say that later on this evening I will refer to the many times in which this government has taken our advice.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, my congratulations would now go out to the mover of the Speech from the Throne and to the seconder. Unfortunately, the seconder did not check with his speech writers, and I think he got himself into a lot of hot water really that is going to ride with him for the next four years. You know, I looked across to him today, and he was just burning — he was as red as that carpet. That thought is going to stay with him, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for the next four years — and as I say, he should have checked with his speech writers.

With regard to the member for Wascana Regina (Mr. White), I don't see him in the House tonight, but I wish he was — I would like to say that I appreciated his presentation. He put his arguments across well and in a respectable way. I would like to make reference to some of the remarks made by the mover and by the seconder. Before I do that, I would like to suggest to the House that possibly if my remarks in reply to the Speech from the Throne were to have a theme they could carry one of two or possibly a combination of both. Either the Rhinestone Cowboy or Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I say that in light of the fact that the Rhinestone Cowboy would reflect on a lot of old cowboys over there riding on a horse called taxpayer. I anticipate that before the next election, Mr. Deputy Speaker, taxpayer is going to kick those old cowboys off. Furthermore, with regard to the theme of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, what this government portrays itself to be and what in fact it is and what it does — they're always two different things. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the members opposite can keep those two ideas in their minds, you know, long enough until I finish my speech then they will realize what I'm attempting to say. I want to illustrate these two themes and I'll refer to the mover of the speech and I note, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the member for Regina Wascana (Mr. White) has now taken his seat and for his benefit I will just restate, very briefly, my comments. Mr. Member, and mover of the Speech from the Throne, I was only congratulating you while you were out for a job well done in moving the Speech from the Throne.

Now, with that, I want to move into some of the remarks you did make and that was with regard to the Year of the Child. We have many letters coming into our offices regarding the Saskatchewan Council for International Co-operation and it would seem that with your paltry sum of \$100,000 made available to the Year of the Child, you have led us to believe that the economy is only one-tenth as good as you said it was. You don't understand that. You suggested \$100,000. Our member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) suggested \$1 million. She didn't suggest a million because there was all that much money running around. But after all, she'd been hearing reports from the government about the economy and it was doing so well and there was all this potash and uranium. I see there's a member — the one perhaps, that prefers to be closer to the lavatory than the Premier, or something of that nature . . . I don't know whether he's going

March 5, 1979

to let them go through with uranium development or not. But nonetheless, I have to mention that surely \$100,000 is only one-tenth of what you've led the people of Saskatchewan to believe that the economy of this province is worth. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe it's worth more and I believe the young people of this province are worth more.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I may just take a moment and take a look at some of the remarks that were made by the mover of the Speech from the Throne and he states 'that we believe the citizens of today have an obligation to the citizens of tomorrow.' I agree with that but what in fact you are doing through this New Deal for People is you are leaving the citizens of tomorrow, which are the young people of today, to ride in on a measly \$100,000 and inherit a heritage of debt. That is what you are going to provide for the young people in the years to come — a heritage of debt . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well, it might be an old Liberal speech, but it's a new Progressive Conservative member and I don't see any Liberals around here at all. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just hope that the member for Regina Wascana (Mr. White) will think about that and think about the terrific debt which this province is compiling, which our young people eventually must inherit.

Now, the member for Regina Wascana makes reference, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the rights of women. I'd like to remind the member that members of this side of the House, in particular myself, have spent a great number of hours meeting with groups of women — the Saskatchewan Action Committee — and assisting them in formulating their policies. We don't agree with them all the time, but nobody stands stronger for the rights of women in this province than we do, and if you want to check your record, you check the number of women you have employed as principals or vice-principals in the educational system. Where is your encouragement in that area?

You make reference to the Indian people and surely, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is a problem which this government has yet to resolve. The federal government has suggested, in fact they are stating quite strongly, that they will be going ahead with land claim settlements with or without the agreement of the provincial government. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they have said they will be starting in the northern half of the province. They will be starting in the northern half of the province because in the southern half there is not enough land available to settle those land claims. We have put questions to this government in defence of the Wildlife Association and its lands that were purchased with the Wildlife Development Fund. We said, you're not going to trade those lands, are you? Those aren't your lands to trade. Mr. Deputy Speaker, very simply, the question and the responsibility is on the shoulders of this government here in Saskatchewan today to tell the people of Saskatchewan, to tell the Indian people of Saskatchewan, how they propose to settle these Indian land claims and when, because all the while that it takes and all the time that drags on, on this issue, creates more division and more animosity between those two peoples.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what we want to do is to highlight the similarities between the Indian people and the white sector of this province, not to highlight the differences, and I am only suggesting that if this government can put pressure on Ottawa (you are always in favor of putting pressure on Ottawa), well, put pressure on them now to resolve these Indian land claim settlements. Now, the member for Regina Wascana (Mr. White) said he wasn't going to talk about the farmers, that he was going to leave the subject of agriculture to the member for Shaunavon (Mr. Lingenfelter). Well, the former member for Shaunavon had a few remarks to say in this legislature as well on

agriculture, and I tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the member for Shaunavon today, judging from his ability so far, is going to have a hard time beating the former member for Shaunavon, a Liberal member, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will refer to his remarks on agriculture later on, but I want to further quote some remarks that were made by the member for Regina Wascana who says that — the phrase is, Mr. Speaker, a record of success and a promise for the future — which adorned air waves during the recent election — was not idle patter. This government, Mr. Speaker, carries on in the best traditions of Tommy Douglas and W.S. Lloyd. Now you have just stated, Mr. Member for Regina Wascana, what we have said many times before. Those two former premiers did start something good. They did carry on something good, and I ask you to question your own government — what major programs since taking office in 1971 has the New Democratic Party started? Not anything like medicare, but they are taking credit for it. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he speaks of low unemployment because of resource policies. Well, I suggest that with the exception of the only recently announced expansion in the present mines, and possibly if they accept our suggestion to uncap some of the gas wells and start production there again, you might have some employment because of your resource policies, but you didn't create any jobs when you took over what was already in existence.

AN HON. MEMBER: — They killed the goose.

MR. BIRKBECK: — The golden goose, that's right, they killed that goose. Yes. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, surely the member for Regina Wascana, when he speaks again in this legislature, doesn't have to omit an awful lot to come up with an excellent speech. Now then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I might just move to some of the comments that were made by the seconder, the member for Shaunavon. Let's just look at what that member had to say. He has, Mr. Deputy Speaker, commented here.

There were other events of note today, Mr. Speaker. As members know, our part of the country had an eclipse of the sun today. The moon passed in front of the sun and a cold darkness fell over the land. Mr. Speaker, it was as though the heavenly bodies themselves viewed any advance by the Conservative Party of Saskatchewan with such alarm that the sun disappeared from the sky.

Well, you know one wonders whether or not comments like that are really all that worthy coming from the member for Shaunavon (Mr. Lingenfleter) but I would suggest to him, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that had we not known why the sun was disappearing momentarily, we would have thought for sure that the last person had left Saskatchewan. That's right. You might have to tell them that, member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman); they don't understand that. And further, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member for Shaunavon (Mr. Lingenfelder) goes on to say that 336,000 jobs are created in this province because of agriculture out of some 400,000 workers.

Well, I don't know what you're telling us. I've been telling this government for a long time that there is a great number of people affected by the number one industry in this province — agriculture. I've been attempting to get more funding for research thank goodness it's here. I've been directing comments to the Minister of Agriculture attempting to get him to realize, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that agriculture is an important industry. The member for Shaunavon (Mr. Lingenfelder), Johnnie Come Lately just realizes that it's an important industry and employs the majority of the people in this province.

March 5, 1979

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he goes on to refer to the low electrical rates in Saskatchewan. I only ask the member for Shaunavon (Mr. Lingenfelter) to check one thing. Check the rates charged the residents of Saskatchewan, the city of Regina as opposed to those charged in your own constituency or in the town of Shaunavon. You will find that the rates are adjusted and they charge rural subscribers more than they do city subscribers. Now, if you are a rural MLA in defence of a rural constituency I expect to hear you, Mr. Member for Shaunavon (Mr. Lingenfelter), speaking out not in defence of your government but maybe you might have the internal fortitude to stand up and differ with them for once because it used to appal me as to how 39 members on that side of the House could stand up and all think alike. Now we have 43 of them to all stand up and think alike and I can't understand that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — Now with reference, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the member for Shaunavon (Mr. Lingenfelter) says that this is a wonderful place to live. He's got it all figured out. Everything's wonderful. There's a wonderful health system here. We've a wonderful education system here. We've a wonderful road system here. There are wonderful NDP members - more and more all the time. Yes, you like that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — Well then I ask the House, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I ask this government — the member for Shaunavon is talking and writing. I don't know how he does two things at the same time but he's attempting to. I want him to hear this. In 1926 to 1976, you know that's only 50 years, the population has only increased by 100,000 approximately — 100,000 people is all that's come to this land of opportunity, to this rich promised land of the future. Mr. Deputy Speaker, in contrast looking at the national figure, why it's over double. It's from nine million to 23 million in the same period. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, surely the member for Shaunavon can't be thoroughly convinced that this is some kind of a dreamland oasis. Maybe it is the way he thinks. I don't know but nonetheless, Mr. Member, those are the facts and you should check these facts.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm going to direct a few comments to the Minister of Labour because he's another minister that has the greatest of potential, great capabilities. He knows his department. What I don't understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is how he can degrade himself. He goes on with these ridiculous remarks criticizing the various speakers and for anyone that sits down here and is close enough to hear what that hon. member says, it does not, Mr. Deputy Speaker and members of this Assembly, bear repeating. It doesn't. I wouldn't repeat it in this House and if anybody needs to have a drink of water and clean their mouth, well you do. O.K. There you are. Would you maybe like to have one with me?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, some of the members on that side of the House are getting a little annoyed. They're getting a little tired. I don't know, do you want to go home? If you want to go home, go home! Nobody's stopping you. We don't have to worry about that because I have a few more comments to make. That's right. Well I see he's walking and chewing gum again at the same time so . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have to get into some rather serious remarks that were made again by the member for Shaunavon and let me just note what he has to say. Oh no, the

members opposite shouldn't mind hearing what I have to say because I'm quoting the remarks of their member, the member for Shaunavon and if he's going to make comments about me, that should excite you all. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he says, best of all, the policies and programs of this New Democratic government have always been designed to fit the needs of the family farm. Now not everyone thinks that is such a good idea. In the June 29, 1978 edition of the Western Producer, a Conservative member of this legislature had some interesting things to say about his party's stand on the issue of maintaining the family farm. He said and I quote: (now he's quoting me!) The economics and agriculture that dictates bigger as better should be given priority over the outmoded concept of the family farm. That was the agricultural spokesman of the Conservative Party of Saskatchewan speaking just last year. Oh, hallelujah! While it is fair to say in his defence, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that he was sometimes forced to share the assigned duties as party spokesman of numerous other members of another opposition political party, which incidentally aren't here anymore, presumably he was stating his party's stand. Now then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he goes on to say that:

There are other interesting comments on the subject of family farms by opposition members of the Conservative Party. Grant Devine, Conservative Party candidate in the Saskatoon Nutana riding in the last election wrote an article for the publication, Business Review. In the article Mr. Devine says 80 per cent of our farmers are non-productive. He says that those 80 per cent should find something else to do and let the 20 per cent, who are good businessmen, carry on the farming.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those statements were not from some part-time supporter of the Conservative Party or just an ordinary party member: the statements came (get this) from two of the most prominent Conservatives in the province.

For that I thank you, Mr. Member for Shaunavon.

In the first case the sitting MLA for Moosomin, Mr. Birkbeck and in the second, the Professor of agricultural economics and agricultural policy maker for the Tory Party. The Conservative Party of Saskatchewan has some strange policies, policies that if ever implemented would stunt the development of our province for years to come. But their policy as it applies to the farming family is in a category all by itself, it strikes at our very way of life. If there was ever a body blow aimed at rural Saskatchewan, it was that portion of the Conservative Party's platform which deals with family farms.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member might think that he made good comments. He might think he knew what he was talking about.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . repeating yourself.

MR. BIRKBECK: — No, no, I'm not repeating myself. I'm just doing quite fine, thank you. I'm really enjoying myself, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I hope that the members opposite are listening.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — I said that as long as I'm here. I'm going to try and teach the members opposite something. Tonight I'm going to start to do that and I'll start with the member

March 5, 1979

for Shaunavon. The member for Shaunavon I see wears glasses and he should try another set or check those ones or get a hanky or something and clean the ones he's got because he should have read a little further. He should have read a little further; when he was digging in, he didn't dig deep enough. I want to quote to you, Mr. Member for Shaunavon, because what you were quoting was a misquote and you know it. It only proves . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Maybe the Regina Lakeview member (Mr. McArthur) would like to get into this. It's just like playing a game of cards. It's a little gamble. Maybe you would like to all get in, hang yourselves, everyone of you. You bet, I would just be glad to take you all on . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, now we've got the member for Kelsey-Tisdale (Mr. Messer); I've just got to stop for a minute and say there's another minister of this government that's worth his salt.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member for Shaunavon failed to look further or he totally ignored the facts which is likely the case. That's consistent with this NDP government — twisting and turning and innuendoes. Let me quote now to the member for Shaunavon my letter to the Western Producer which was subsequently printed in the Western Producer. Now you will understand Mr. Member for Shaunavon. You don't have to hang your head. I am not done with you yet; lift up and face it. You were able to hand it out, now let's see if you can take it. My letter to the editor of the Western Producer:

Dear Mr. Drydon: With reference to the article which appeared in your issue of July 29th, 1978 your quotation (?) 'He said the economics of agriculture dictate bigger is better, should be given priority over the outmoded concept of the family farm' is regrettably unfounded in that it was never said by me and subsequently admitted by your reporter as a misunderstanding and misinterpretation on his part. This mistake is perhaps understandable in that it was a telephone interview. As discussed with you today. I would like you to rectify the Producer's error in your next issue.

In recapping my comments for clarification let me state as your article clearly shows both NDPs and Liberals favor limitations on farm size and they still do and the Progressive Conservatives do not and we still do not. This should not be interpreted as meaning that we support large farms over small. In reply to your reporter's question I simply stated one of the basic reasons for this . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order, order, please! I again find it very difficult to follow the debate. I would ask members on both sides of the House and particularly, senior members, that you are sent here by your constituents to act in a responsible manner and I think that they are entitled to that performance here. So, I ask both sides of the House to keep that in mind. You are to set an example for new members and I ask you to try and carry out the duties of your democratic government in a responsible way.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, because of the interruptions from the government side of the House which delayed things even further — mind you it gave me a rest . . .

. . . again should not be interpreted as my supporting large farms over small just because of my recognition of the rationale behind the trend. The Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan strongly supports the concept of the family farm unit whether it be large or small. Let me also state here that since the NDP formed the government farm sizes have increased and farm numbers and numbers of farmers have decreased.

My remarks on the Land Bank have not been clearly outlined by your article, especially with reference to our last resort position.

When they printed the correction they also included my remarks on the land bank. The member might just check the record and he'll be able to see that what he was quoting was a misquote and obviously he doesn't have the investigative nature that a good MLA is going to have to have in this legislature to survive.

Now when I say that the NDP favor legislation to limit the size of farms I'm not just kidding. They had a resolution at their convention which the Minister of Agriculture had to get into and he had to oppose that resolution because he didn't want the NDP government going ahead and passing a resolution favoring legislation of farm size, even though the minister wants it. He wants it, he says right here the agriculture minister, Edgar Kaeding, argued against the resolution, asking for a legislated limit on the size of farms, describing it as a delicate issue which rural Saskatchewan is in no way ready for. He's afraid to implement the policies that they believe in because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they fear they might lose some political support, they might lose some votes, they might lose power and for that reason they are not prepared to stand on what they really want to do.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, any member of the legislature who wants to read that is more than welcome to as it's available here if they want. I'll table it in the legislature. So it's your party, Mr. Member for Shaunavon, that wants to legislate farm size. Maybe when they do, and I understand you have eight quarters and I have two, and if we could equal that out we could each have three or something like that. Yeah, that's your philosophy! Do you believe in your philosophy? Sure you do! Like a pot's egg you do!

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member for Shaunavon thinks that's a wonderful idea, this equalization and legislation of farm size — limiting farm sizes. He wouldn't go along with that. He wouldn't share his farm with anybody. But you keep in mind, Mr. Member for Shaunavon, I own two quarters — two quarters — and I am the guy with the cowboy boots and the cowboy hat, right! I'm the guy that's going to get all the small farmers. What a joke!

Mr. Deputy Speaker, here are the figures and this is all I want to say on this subject. The number of farms 1971 to '76 has decreased by 6,012. Six thousand and twelve less farmers since your government took office and this is the party that's in favour of rural Saskatchewan. This is the party that's in favour of that small farm. They're going to maintain it. Oh yes they are, but they lost 6,000 while they were trying. And then they turn around and credit us and say we're the ones that are going to do away with all the small farms. What hypocrisy, Mr. Deputy Speaker! Surely it has to be! Hypocrisy from that side of the House!

Furthermore, the average farm size has increased by 78 acres per farmer since 1971. There's the facts again, member for Shaunavon. So what you're saying and what your government is doing are two different things. So I think, Mr. Member, and being a new member, you've learned a lot in your short term in this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: — He didn't learn it from you, that's for sure!

MR. BIRKBECK: — Well that's because he wasn't here when I was here. That's why he didn't learn from me. Hopefully he'll learn a few things over the next four years.

March 5, 1979

So that's all, Mr. Speaker, that I have to say with regard to the member for Shaunavon. Well again, as usual, the government misunderstands. They never understand it's from this side of the House. They thought I was finishing my speech.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member for Shaunavon speaks of Cargill Grain and CPR (Canadian Pacific Railway) versus the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and the CNR (Canadian National Railway). He talks of those huge profits that have been compiled by Cargill, but he doesn't talk of the huge profits — somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$30 million — by Saskatchewan Wheat Pool . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . there is nothing wrong with that, anymore than there is wrong with profits in Cargill . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order, please. Order.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when that hootin' and hollerin' comes from that side of the House, it just proves a point that I made earlier — that they want to divide farm organizations and organizations that service the farm sector in this province. They'll stand behind the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, like we do, but they'll stand opposed to Cargill, and we don't stand opposed to any farm organization in this province. We aren't trying to divide and conquer like you people are . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It services the farm industry . . . Now, I'm going to skip over some of my remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I've got to conclude my remarks pertaining to the member for Shaunavon (Mr. Lingenfelter). He has made some stupid remarks regarding a former Premier of this province and I think he has really been harassed over that long enough, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I don't want to see any more members from this side of the House lashing away at the member for Shaunavon any more. I mean, he knows the mistake he made — he knows — and the members on this side of the House don't purport to judge people like the NDP. Only the NDP feel they have the final judgment. My goodness, I don't know whether I have to face the pearly gates or red sheep when I die. Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me go on. Let me leave my comments now with regards to the member for Shaunavon, because if I know him he'll be silly enough to stand again in this legislature and make a whole bunch more mistakes — unless he learns. We've been telling him a lot of things from this side of the House and he might have learned a lot and maybe I won't ever have another chance to talk about him. I hope not.

Now let me talk very briefly about programs that have been proposed by the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan and have been accepted by the NDP . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . that will only take a minute, yes it will, because I've got it itemized and it's all in short form so it won't take too long. Let's take a look at the first one — April 24, 1978 — we called for improvements in the cancer care program. Who called for those improvements? I recall the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) standing in this House. He was telling this government, and he was on his feet again today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, trying to get through to the member who is responsible for health. Now, those improvements came about, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and for anyone that cares to look, we'll just leave this. If one of the pages would like to pick that up — I'm not going to get into it. You can table it, just take it and set it right out there and the members can go over it. That proves that we raised the issue of cancer care program improvement and this NDP government accepted it. Number two, we spoke about the gas prices and the need to adjust the gas prices along the Alberta border because in Alberta, they

know how to manage their resources. They have the money there to reduce taxation — in fact, eliminate taxation on gasoline and you don't have that option here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — So, that created another problem, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for this government. They had to resolve that matter and I'll just table that, I won't take any more time in the House on that matter. A former member for Rosetown-Elrose raised that issue in this House. He asked the member responsible for the Department of Revenue to look into the matter and make adjustments and those adjustments were made.

Now here's a goody, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We can take a look at the Minister of Agriculture now and consider the things that he's had a little problem with, really. We talked of a farm cost reduction program needing to be reinstated in the province of Saskatchewan. That's what we said. I'm not even going to go through it, my remarks are here and I'm going to table this as well. But the remarks in reply to my request in this Assembly, asking the Minister of Agriculture at a time when farm profits were down and farm expenses were up, to reinstate the farm cost reduction program — he said no, Mr. Speaker, no, we are not anticipating such a move. As we all know, election time came around and we hear an announcement. They're going to reintroduce it. Now, I don't know whether we should take credit for that or whether they just used it for a political tool or not, but I would suspect that maybe we won't take too much credit. I'll table that as well, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That shows that this government will use the taxpayers' money to their own means and they've done it just there in an election platform with regards to the farm cost reduction program. You either used it as an election gimmick or you took our advice to reinstate the program and you're on the hook on that and you can't get off and you know it. And if you think you can then stand in this House, when you take your place, and try to refute those charges.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the next one I hold dear to my heart. I'm going to table this as well because it saves a lot of time and I have some very constructive remarks further on down and it gets more constructive as I go, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I don't know whether they can absorb that much in this length of time or not but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me go back to Friday, September 9, 1977. I issued a news release calling on this government and I'm going to table this as well, to bring in some improvements for weather forecasting in the province of Saskatchewan. Now then, that's what I wanted to do. I said we're not getting our fair share from the federal government and that it's your responsibility to press the federal government for a greater share and if they won't come through then we'll have to pick up some of those expenses ourselves. Now, I'm going to enclose and I want the members opposite to look at this. There's the headlines from the paper as well — now keeping in mind this is 1977. Well, it goes on improved forecast called for — and I might just mention to the press as well that at the time they didn't know what weather was all about. They thought this was some kind of a political gimmick that some how or another I was, you know, trying to say that I could change the weather. They didn't get the story. They didn't understand what I was trying to say. I don't know whether they understand now. That doesn't matter because time will prove anything and it has proven here that you've failed to take our advice in this instance. You failed! That was back in 1977.

Now then, we move up a bit in time — a year to the day and I was interested to note the coincidence of this — a year to the day, September 21, 1978. Now, I'm calling on the provincial government to again take their case to the federal government and criticize them and condemn them for the cutbacks in the weather forecasting. It's here. It was in

March 5, 1979

the press. Now then, you know, forecasting cutback again. Now this comes for the member for Regina South, Mr. Rousseau. Now he's trying to get across to this government that surely somebody over there can listen to what we're trying to say. Now I don't need to get into any of that either because it's self-evident. It's very self-evident that we on this side of the House, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and members opposite proposed a good suggestion to you and it fell on deaf ears and the people of Saskatchewan are the ones that are going to pay for that mistake. We'll pay for that mistake and then to deal with the hypocrisy of the matter, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when a member brings a resolution to this House — it's Mr. McArthur to move the following resolution — No. 5.

Hear, hear! the members say. Hear, hear for what? Hear, hear on that side of the House is nothing to hear. There's nothing going on over there. Hear, hear where? But he says that this Assembly, recognizing the importance of Saskatchewan farmers — oh my good Lord! They've recognized it eventually. Finally they've struck through to the heart of their brain. They understand now what we're trying to say. What's wrong with you over there?

Other citizens have prompt, accurate and reliable weather forecasts, opposes the action of the Minister of the Environment of Canada in attempting to remove weather forecasting services from Saskatchewan and regrets the federal minister's lack of prior consultation with the staff of Regina weather office, the government of Saskatchewan, the Saskatchewan public and should have gone on to include and the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan! If he'd had any sense — because what I've just tabled will prove that if you'd had any sense, Mr. Member for Regina Lakeview, you would have included that in your motion. Maybe from then on when members stand up in this House and are sincere about a motion — they're sincere about an idea — they want you to listen — you can have the credit, but at least do it.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't want that point that I've just made on that weather issue to fall on deaf ears. I don't want good suggestions coming from, in particular, new members of this legislature on this side of the House to fall on deaf ears.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to go on now to make some proposals that I hope this government will have enough good sense, courtesy and respect to listen to. They can shoot their small, cheap comments across the floor all they like but in the eventual end of things they must listen.

Now the member for Melville, who won't be here much longer — he speaks up again. The last time he spoke I spoke and I replied to a motion you presented, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member was upset because I said that he was sincere as he introduced his motion about crop depredation in the wings of a snow white dove. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we were supporting your motion and we're supporting it now. The member for Wilkie is supporting it. If you were sincere in presenting that motion, then you'll be sincere in accepting the motions of the member for Wilkie in this side of the House.

It goes on, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I refer to programs that we proposed and this government accepted. I covered the farm size and the numbers of small farmers. I covered that subject when I spoke about the member for Shaunavon. There is a way. Oh yeah, he's shaking his head. He doesn't know which way is up so he's gotta do something.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, sit tight, I'll refrain my remarks. I'll try but they have to try as well.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we're talking about land bank and we're talking about farm numbers and we're talking about comments that you're referring to and criticizing us about with regards to Grant Devine, you take a look at what he was really trying to say. What he was really trying to say is that 80 per cent of the production in this province is produced by 20 per cent of the farmers. Now that's what he was saying. That's fine. What we are saying is that you either accept that and be prepared to subsidize those 80 per cent that are not as productive as the 20 per cent or subsidize the farmers themselves. Well, obviously we are getting it from somewhere now because that's the present day case. That's what the situation is.

Agricultural research I have already mentioned. We called for more research expenditures and we have those moneys available now for research. We've called, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for tighter controls in foreign ownership of land. Thank the Minister of Agriculture now for having introduced that legislation, and it might seem from some of the agricultural boards and their presentations that we may have to tighten those controls even further.

We proposed and I am not sure which member of our side of the House introduced a question in the House, calling on you, Mr. Minister of Agriculture, to introduce at least some kind of rat control program in the province . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right. The response we got in the question period was the same one I got just now when I suggested we have a rat problem in this province. If you want a law, fine. I note the members are laughing. The agricultural boards that are sending those letters into my office asking us to pressure the government for such a program — we'll be getting the comments from *Hansard*. We'll be watching your action but it is another suggestion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, from this side of the House. You didn't listen when we first mentioned it. We are telling you again now. (Rural Municipalities.) It is out in the R.M.'s They want it, and you are going to have to introduce it.

I won't mention too much on the mortgage program. I bet the member for Kindersley will have a few words to say about that when he rises in this House. The Progressive Conservative Party in Saskatchewan comes up with an idea with regard to mortgage rebates and the Premier comes up with one in his election platform, following another Conservative idea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is just to mention a few and again for the Minister of Agriculture's perusal I want to table this as well. Mr. Deputy Speaker, make sure the Minister of Agriculture gets this. I have also included my reply to them and this is regarding the rat problem and we've got it here and it's Agricultural Extension District Board No. 5. The background information is there. It's all in black and white. I hope you can understand it. It's typed . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to, as usual, mention two or three of the problems in our constituency and the same one that I have mentioned to the Minister of Highways, brought to his attention on many occasions, and that is of our highways and the many potholes. I am going to table in the House again an article for the Minister of Highways, where some research was done in the United States. I've underlined some of the areas. It says here Texas was plagued, would you believe, with 8.2 million potholes in its highway system. Now you profess to have more miles in Saskatchewan than any other province. Saskatchewan and Texas are about the same size. I would suggest that we have at least 8.2 million potholes in our province . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I know, there's a couple over there too. But, Deputy Speaker, it says that it takes one ton of asphalt to fill an average 18.2 potholes. And get this — at a time when this

March 5, 1979

government is preaching conservation of fuels. According to the research (this research was done in the United States) motorists raced 808 million gallons of fuel costing \$500.8 million by slowing, stopping and starting around potholes. Now, you know, our highway system might be a long one but I guarantee you it's got a lot of potholes. Now the Minister of Highways can check this information here. Table it, see that the Minister of Highways gets that information. Then well . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . know, Mr. Minister of Highways, you'll take it under consideration because, you know, under that deep crust you're a pretty sincere minister and can get the job done too if you take a notion.

MR. BAKER: — Best highway system in Canada.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Well now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm amazed to see the Mayor here tonight. He's taken a seat. I'm — well, I'm not amazed — I asked him to come back here tonight and he did.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know the members are — you know, had about all they can absorb for one night, but if you'll bear with me and if just maybe for about five or ten minutes you'll be very quiet and listen very carefully, I really do have something that I think you should hear. Now, it relates, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the throne speech and how it so ineffectively deals with any of the problems we have in this province — in particular, the economy.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, before I conclude my remarks on this throne speech and because the throne speech makes no specific reference to how this government intends to check inflation and boost productivity, I would like to project some of my ideas as to how the economy might possibly be improved as it relates to both the Canadian picture, and more particularly, our own Saskatchewan picture.

Let me first deal with the floating exchange rate. I'm glad to see the Minister of Finance in the House tonight, and the Minister of Revenue. I believe the Canadian dollar should be allowed to float freely with intervention only to prevent too great a movement either way and only over a short period of time. I disagree with the massive borrowing to support the Canadian dollar, a million dollars a day to support the interest alone. Now if we don't think that's a serious problem then we should think again because if we take a look at the figures in the United States, where the taxes collected there will only cover the interest on the national debt for three seconds, I think it's something to fear here in this country. What Ottawa said it was going to do and what it did were obviously two different things. This irresponsible action on behalf of our federal government has been, in my view, at least part of the reason for the fall of the Canadian dollar. Possibly one can know too much as Canadians have been over-reacting in my view to short term movements in the Canadian dollar. It is in the news on a daily basis and it is always related to the value of the United States dollar, an equality which I feel is a false standard for the Canadian dollar.

There are quite enough factors affecting the value of the dollar without our over-reacting to the news of its rise or fall in the current listings. I suppose what I am suggesting is that we as Canadians unite and go out and earn and produce and boost productivity and possibly show a little less concern for the statistical data thrown before us on almost a daily basis which is in part a distraction and inhibits growth throughout the business communities. Ottawa initially suggested that the dollar should be wherever the market said it should be and on the other hand used our foreign

exchange reserves to support the dollar and support it vigorously. Then the reserves had to be replenished by foreign borrowing. The act of borrowing provided yet another unfavorable sign. The demand for U.S. dollars to meet the net interest expense to service and eventually repay those foreign borrowings will be with us for many years.

The foreign exchange market also knows that unless offset by an increase in net exports or by an increase in private capital inflows or by further government borrowing this demand for U.S. dollars will tend to weaken the Canadian dollar in years ahead and this tends to weaken it now.

Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I realize that some defence can be made of supporting the Canadian dollar artificially as we are now. The price of our imports goes up and puts upward pressure on domestic prices and costs. But surely the experience of governments around the world has proven currency defended at a level other than what the market says it should be must inevitably end up at the market level anyway. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the quantitative analysis of other problems regarding inflation in other countries throughout the world has proven that the quantitative analysis as opposed to the economist's idea has always proven out. In other words, borrowing massive sums of money to support a falling currency is not in the long run the answer to the problem. Government support is not only ineffective but frequently counter productive.

For these reasons regarding the floating Canadian dollar which I say is not truly a floating Canadian dollar — of recent it has been a drastically sliding dollar — I have good reason to blame our present federal government under the leadership of Pierre Elliott Trudeau. With less taxation by all levels of government productivity from each and every one of us as citizens of this great country would increase. Productivity throughout the private sector is the greatest support there is for the Canadian dollar. I suggest we take away government intervention and inject rewards for personal achievement and with that philosophy firmly in mind we, the people of this country, will keep the Canadian dollar afloat and will float it high.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what are we doing about inflation? What we are doing currently seems to be an attempt to control the money supply and subsequently inflation. What is the money supply? The money supply as it is defined today in this country is the total amount of money in circulation plus the demand deposits in the chartered banking system. This is the money supply that we, as Canadians, are attempting to control in order that we might control inflation. The fact is there is more to the money supply than I have just defined. The money supply surely should include trust companies, credit unions, foreign financial institutions operating in Canada and so on. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if we are to adopt the philosophy that inflation can be controlled by controlling the money supply, then we should be controlling all of the money and not just part of the money — not just that within the chartered banking system but that which is outside as well. My suggestion, therefore, to governments, both provincial and federal, that are making monetary policies is to look at monetary growth in all sectors.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, obviously the Attorney General doesn't want to learn anything about the financial problems of this country. It would seem that he wants to, you know, just sit there and cat call and not really have any problem . . . yes, the Attorney General, yes . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes, I'm saying that if we're going to take that approach to controlling the inflationary problem of this country then that's what we're going to have to do.

March 5, 1979

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me further say there are two or three forms of inflation but I want to deal primarily with domestic inflation. Domestic inflation is a result of the money supply growing faster than production. What we are attempting to do is protect ourselves in changes in the market place in the long run. We want to protect ourselves from these changes because these fluctuations affect and change the inflationary rate. Surely we can't expect to protect ourselves from these changes in the market place in the long run. If we do, then we have lost what free markets are really all about. The free market allocates goods and services, fairly and efficiently amid shifting supply and demand through changes in relative prices. Nothing does this job better than a market place; it's certainly better than any government board or bureaucrat. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if we are to deal with an inflationary index, then let that index compensate only for our domestic monetary inflation. Let it not compensate for what we import. Let it not include price increases due to domestic scarcity. Mr. Deputy Speaker, again what I am suggesting is that we, as individuals, take a look at the price of goods, take a real in-depth look at inflation. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe we, as individuals have an opportunity to turn this free market place to our advantage and so we should, rather than taking a negative approach of calling upon government to intervene in the market place because that intervention is only causing greater inflation — and the Attorney General heard that. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I guess what I am saying is that if goods that you require are too high priced, then leave them on the shelf and buy elsewhere or replace them with equivalent substitutes. We can make the best progress towards the greatest good for the greatest number when we look at the facts as they are and when we are far-sighted enough to allow free markets to function with minimum interference. If as individuals we do not take this approach, then we have sacrificed some of our rights as individuals to participate in these free markets. Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me conclude with a few remarks pertaining to the future of our economy which all Canadians are preoccupied with today. Mr. Deputy Speaker, you hear voices such as mine argue that our federal government has failed, and they have. There are voices of our premiers arguing that there should not be a sharing of resources. We hear arguments that there should be a sharing of powers among all levels of government — federal, provincial and municipal. We hear arguments of regional disparities and of language discrimination, whether it be real or imagined. We hear arguments of effectiveness or lack of it in governments over the responsibilities of business over inflation and over unemployment. It would seem that we as Canadians have become sceptical and suspicious and surely someone, somewhere is ripping us off in some way or another.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that all we hear is complaints and criticisms. Let us look at the broader perspective; by that broader perspective we can very easily see that Canadian standards are very high. Let us start to take a look at the brighter side of things and realize that we are at peace in our land. It is reasonably safe to walk our streets, although getting less safe all the time in the city of Regina. Our institutions throughout our province and throughout the country are reasonably responsive to our local concerns and governments are remarkably free from corruption in relation to other countries. We still maintain freedom of speech, a freedom that we as Canadians sometimes do not exercise frequently enough. Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I am suggesting, and what I hope this government will hear is that we have reason to think positively. We have reason to be proud of our care and concern for the disadvantage in our society. We have good educational institutions and we have a good business community. We are rich in natural resources and we do have a skilled work force and are one of the world's major trading nations. Our growth on a national perspective still out-performs most other countries around the world.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the members opposite and those who support the federal Liberal government I am sure at this point are wondering just what it is I am trying to say, just what it is I am opposed to. All of these things are doing so well, and if all these factors are doing so well, then really, what am I opposed to? Mr. Speaker, very simply the actions of Pierre Elliott Trudeau in the last ten years and the actions of this NDP government since it took office in 1971. Some of those actions I have already described have taken us as a people in the direction that is leading us away from those strong values that we hold so dear and that we have been unable . . .

Mr. Speaker, interrupted the debate and the question being put on the amendment, it was negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 15

Larter	Lane	Andrew
Berntson	Birkbeck	Duncan
Katzman	Ham	Garner
Swan	Pickering	Muirhead
Taylor	McLeod	Rousseau

NAYS — 35

Smishek	Whelan	Cody
Romanow	Kaeding	Koskie
Messer	Feschuk	Lusney
Snyder	MacAuley	Prebble
Byers	McArthur	Long
Kramer	Johnson	Gross
Baker	Allen	Thompson
Kowalchuk	Vickar	Engel
Matsalla	Rolfes	Lingenfelter
Robbins	Cowley	White
MacMurchy	Tchorzewski	Hammersmith
Banda	Shillington	

Debate continues on the motion.

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — What I was just saying regarding the economy, refers to the throne speech and how it so inadequately dealt with the financial problems which this country has and that this province has, I can only say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we on this side of the house as I have now indicated are positive. We are progressive and we are conservative and we are proud of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have put forth many good ideas; we'll be putting forth many more good ideas as long as they don't fall on deaf ears. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this government will hear our pleas when there is a deviation from the goal which we perceive as a provincial goal and as a national goal and one that all should strive for.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we on this side of the house stand united and will stand strongly in

March 5, 1979

opposition to this government or any government which attempts to take away these values, these basic principles of living which are the basis for a just and fair society, Mr. Speaker, because this throne speech is in no effective way dealing with these problems and these issues which I have now outlined. I must say that I must be voting most strongly, as I am sure most members from this side of the house will, against the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D.G. BANDA (Redberry): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, after listening to that load of manure from across there, it is no wonder that members on this side of the house know better than to listen to their ideas from that side. I think it would be most unfortunate if we listen to the ideas of the hon. member over there who says that this province lost 6,000 farmers. I want to tell the House and the members across there that if we had listened to his ideas we would have lost 10 or 12,000 farmers in this same time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have a lot more to say on the throne speech debate and now I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:40 p.m.