

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**March 12, 1981**

**EVENING SESSION**

**ADJOURNED DEBATES**

**MOTION FOR COMMITTEE OF FINANCE (Continued)**

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the opportunity of speaking in this budget debate is one that each and every member on this side of the House always looks forward to. I cannot say that this applies to the members opposite since the arguments raised by the budget critic and the members who followed so far have very little substance by way of constructive criticism. Their speeches, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are filled with half-truths, distortions, innuendoes and many contradictions.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Is this the same speech that you gave last year?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — No, this is different. The simple explanation for the difficulties the opposition is having is that the budget is difficult to criticize.

The budget, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is realistic for our times. It is one that just does not leave much room for criticism. I believe the budget before us is a forward-looking document, demonstrating clearly the fruits of this government's leadership in effective fiscal management and social programming, as well as providing the people of Saskatchewan with a positive outlook of confidence and optimism in the strength of our provincial economy.

It is my intention this evening to address a portion of my remarks to a number of initiatives and program expansions enunciated by the Hon. Minister of Finance on Thursday, last. I want to commend the hon. minister for developing this budget and effectively delivering his speech.

At this point, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would also like to congratulate the hon. members for Cut Knife-Lloydminster and Shaunavon for their elevation to cabinet. I have confidence that both will serve this government well. I want to wish them every success.

In describing this budget, phrases like 'a tremendous budget,' 'sounds like an election budget,' 'it's starting to pay off,' and 'good resource policies' could be heard among the Saskatchewan people. Similar descriptive phrases among municipal people are being heard at the rural municipal convention this week at Saskatoon. There is general satisfaction that this New Democratic Party government is on the right track in planning our economy and in managing the financial resources of our great province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MATSALLA:** — In the time allotted to me, I would like to discuss briefly several features of the budget that will be of general interest to the people of Canora constituency. Agriculture, of course, is of prime interest to the people of my area and, for that matter, of prime interest to all of Saskatchewan since the industry is a mainstay of our economy. This government is conscious of maintaining a healthy farm economy — not only in words, but in action as well. In demonstrating its commitment to farmers, the budget for agriculture is increased by 30.5 per cent to \$77.4 million.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, over the years, livestock producers labored in a very uncertain and unstable market system. Many a time, it was most discouraging and in a number of situations the producers just simply gave up the industry.

We believe it would be best if a livestock stabilization program could be set up at a national level. But neither the Liberal nor the Conservative governments would make a move. So, therefore, this government, in view of the success of the hog stabilization program, is courageously embarking on a similar program to help beef producers in stabilizing their industry. The new plan provides for voluntary participation and the government is prepared to share \$5 million.

To further assist the livestock industry, I am happy to hear that this budget provides for increased funding for veterinary services. The budget increase of more than 80 per cent in grants will greatly improve veterinary services in many of our livestock-producer areas.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the land bank and FarmStart are continuing to be popular programs with Saskatchewan farmers.

Farmers in my area are happy to hear that funds for land bank are being increased to \$35 million and that FarmStart interest rates will continue at a low level. Once again, this government is honoring its commitment to strengthen the lifestyle in rural communities.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government believes in maintaining a good relationship with local governments. Strong local government is essentially a good base upon which to develop a good provincial government. The good relationship that presently exists did not come by accident. It was developed by continuing consultations and by a desire to understand one another's role in government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is an ongoing commitment with this government that our rural communities must remain strong. Local, municipal, and school governments welcome the increased budgetary funding, providing operating grant increases of over 10 per cent for each of the rural, urban, and education departments. In addition, school capital grants have gone up by 19 per cent, providing for more than 50 new projects. I'm pleased that the project allocation included three projects in the Canora constituency (the total cost of which will be in excess of \$1.5 million): gym and dental facilities, along with some renovations at Lintlaw; new classrooms and a resource centre, along with renovations at Ebenezer; a new gym, administration and staff rooms, plus renovations, at Theodore.

I can assure the Minister of Education that the people and the students in these respective communities greatly appreciate the realization of these projects.

The increased funding to rural municipalities is most welcome. The inclusion of primary grid funding and the allocation of unexpended grant moneys as part of the total allocation for unconditional road construction is something that municipal councils have been looking forward to for some time. This kind of inclusive funding will greatly assist municipalities that have constructed roads for future payment. Several of the municipalities in my area this year will be eligible to receive over \$100,000 in road construction grants — a sum that will particularly improve their cash positions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to make brief mention of several other projects being undertaken in my constituency. Overcoming some of the financial difficulties in funding of nursing home construction, the communities of Canora, Preeceville and Invermay are making final plans to proceed with the construction. This government is committed to providing assistance at the rate of 20 per cent of the expected total cost of some \$2 million.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of my constituents, I want to express thanks and appreciation to the Minister of Highways for the continuation of paving Highway No. 49 from Hazel Dell to Lintlaw. This project is only one of the many highway improvement projects undertaken by this government to improve traffic safety and provide for comfort in travel.

The community of the town of Canora, I am certain, would want me to express appreciation to the Minister of Government Services for the planned construction of a new joint municipal-provincial administration office building. The building will not only provide the necessary accommodation, but it will greatly add to the prestige of this beautiful community.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this year's budget stands up front among all other provincial budgets in terms of low tax levels and improved people services.

It is interesting to note that this year's British Columbia budget points to a balanced budget. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to tell this House how this \$6.6 billion budget was balanced. It wasn't balanced by resource revenues, and it wasn't balanced through previous years' surpluses. It was balanced through at least a dozen tax increases on low and middle income people — tax increases adding up to some \$625 million.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is quite a contrast to the budget before us. We have new programs and improved social services with a tax reduction and only one modest tax increase. Now, how is this possible, Mr. Deputy Speaker? As I mentioned earlier, effective social and economic programming and good fiscal management. Yes, this is the answer, without question. The establishment of the heritage fund coupled with the development of our resources for the benefit of Saskatchewan people is providing us with the necessary revenues to help finance this budget. The dividend this government referred to when the heritage fund was first proposed is now a reality. The opposition at the time scoffed at the idea. They would have preferred to channel resource revenues into the pockets of multinational corporations with head offices outside the province and outside Canada.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the opposition financial critic in replying to the budget, followed the line and philosophy of short-term financing. He talked about reducing taxes right across the board, about freezing utility rates, reducing car insurance rates, and giving the resource development companies a break by lowering royalty rates. He also talked about expanding programs and services, but he didn't say where the money would come from. The hon. member for Regina South outlined the Conservative blueprint for developing new policies and for combating inflation.

I am at a loss to understand how increased expenditures can combat inflation or how short-term programs could bring our inflationary economy back on track.

I can only conclude, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that what the hon. member and the

Conservatives have in mind, if and when they happen to form the government (and God forbid such an occurrence), is to dip out of the heritage fund and the surplus funds to go on a spending spree for a year or two. Then, when all or most of these funds are gone, they will plead with Saskatchewan people for understanding. They will tell the people that if they want services they must be prepared to pay for them. Saskatchewan people will once again be forced to pay new and increased taxes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is the Conservative blueprint and I want to warn the people of Saskatchewan that what could sound like a Progressive Conservative policy blueprint could well end up a Saskatchewan financial disaster printed in red.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am pleased to note budget increases in health care and social service expenditures. Proper health care and use of welfare programs is most essential to the well-being of our society. I was also pleased to hear that new programs are being designed toward the strengthening of the family unit. I am one, Mr. Deputy Speaker, who believes that governments have a role to play in encouraging strong family units. It must be remembered that the key element in a healthy society is a healthy, unified family. Many a time we hear of family breakdown and of juvenile delinquency. There may be all sorts of reasons for these kinds of failures and it may be difficult to know what the solution should be. Nevertheless, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we as a government cannot stand by and take a hands-off approach completely. I believe we as a government have a responsibility to research into the causes of these breakdowns and to provide programs that may help to overcome the various problems facing families. I believe that this government has accepted this responsibility to a great degree through various social programs, from good health care to social well-being.

One other area, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that concerns me (and I'm sure many of us here and outside this Chamber) is the present diminishing trend in social and moral values. I realize that this is a broad statement, but so is the subject.

More specifically, I want to make a few comments about some of the immoral trends which are taking place in our television programs and movies. Vulgar language, and scenes of explicit sex and extreme violence are the "order of the day," so to speak. I believe that widespread, irreparable harm is being done to the youth of today by the viewing of such immoral programming.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as members of the legislature, we know that the provincial film classification board has the power, under The Theatres Act, to restrict young people from certain movies. I feel, however, that the management and operators of movie theatres are not complying with the regulations, and that we as a government are not doing the job of enforcing the regulations. I want to strongly suggest to the minister in charge, and to the hon. member, that a careful review be made of the practicality of the regulations as they are today. I would urge that greater effort be made in enforcing the restrictions included therein.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Why don't you tell us about Teletheatre?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe it's my turn to speak, and I would ask the hon. member to keep quiet in his seat. My attitude toward TV programming is similar, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I must say, and many will admit, that some TV programs have no place in a family home, or anywhere else for that matter.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MATSALLA:** — A lot of it is trash and mind-polluting. Here, too, I want to suggest that the government has a responsibility to censor and restrict TV programming that tends to be immoral.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can imagine that I may hear from the conservative elements in this House, and in society, that it is wrong for government to tamper in the market place. They may say that there clearly is a market for such movies, otherwise they would not have been produced.

To answer that, I would say this: we have tampered with the free market to provide working people with a minimum wage and safety on the job. We have tampered with the market place by providing medicare, hospitalization, and free public education. We did it because we thought it was right. No one in his right mind would suggest, at this time, that these things are wrong. In fact, they have contributed to the development of a better and more equitable society.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have to agree that we cannot specifically legislate morality. Morality is something that must be understood, encouraged, and developed.

However, I maintain that governments have a responsibility to provide for moral leadership and guidance through certain restrictions and moral standards. I believe that such government involvement would be welcomed by a majority of citizens, who at present feel helpless to do anything on their own.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we, as elected representatives, strive to make for our citizens a better society in which to live. We cut taxes; we build new hospitals and schools; we build roads and highways; we strive in every way to raise our standard of living. Let us not turn a blind eye to what I consider a very serious problem — a deteriorating and sometimes described as a sick, society. We, as Christian leaders, must strive toward developing a greater level of moral standards.

I realize that I have somewhat strayed from the subject of this debate. I appreciate your patience and the indulgence of the House for giving me the opportunity to discuss briefly what I consider to be a serious social issue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will gladly give my support to the main budget motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have a few brief words on the budget — perhaps for 10 minutes. Then, I understand, the attention of the House may centre on another forum. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe this is, perhaps, the best of the three budget debates I have been in. I think the member for Regina South made a very good speech on Monday showing the strength and direction which will carry us through.

I wish to make comment on two questions as it relates to the financial situation of the province of Saskatchewan: first, as it relates to the national energy program, and second, as it relates to section 125 of the constitution.

With regards to the national energy program, I think the most material fact, perhaps the most material figure, in the budget presented by the Minister of Finance last Thursday,

is the \$600-and-odd million budgeted to be received by the province of Saskatchewan as income by royalty and by rebate of the export tax on heavy oil. I think, in fairness to the Minister of Finance, he indicated that that was a cautious figure. I suppose, in time and perhaps by the early part of next month, we are going to see how close that figure is. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that is going to be the telling point with regard to just how nice this budget is going to be, because that figure, as we all know, could be substantially decreased from the point of \$600 million. I believe that under the national energy program the Liberal government in Ottawa has exactly one thing in mind. The point of the national energy program is for the federal Liberal government to shift oil exploration away from western Canada into other Canadian lands in the North or in Hibernia off the East Coast.

The problem with that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is this: The benefactors will be the Government of Canada; the losers will be the people of western Canada, particularly the prairie provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. It is an incredibly serious problem which we face under the national energy program. I believe that is exactly where the federal government is going. It is going in that direction in conjunction with many of the large multinational corporations at least partly in its back pocket. The people who will suffer for this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are not the owners of multinational oil companies. The people who will suffer are those in the small independent oil industry in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta — people who started out as tradesmen, who had a bit of ambition, took a bit of capital and built a small industry, whether it was a service industry, or whether it was a small oil company. Those are the people who built the oil industry in western Canada. Those are the people who are suffering under the national energy program. It's going to get worse, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because I believe that the direction of the federal government is to freeze out oil production and oil producers in western Canada. Consequently, those who will suffer are not only those in the industry, but also the governments, including this government. The \$600 million as budgeted in this budget is in fact a questionable figure. It's going to continue to be questionable.

I think yesterday the energy minister in Alberta, Mr. Leitch, indicated very clearly that the federal government, under Mr. Lalonde, has no intention of negotiating a new national energy program nor an increase in the price of oil which is so desperately needed if that part of our industry in this country is to survive. The Premier of the province tends to say he is very hopeful that things will come around and that there is going to be an agreement. I think we're fooling ourselves. For the year 1981, I predict that, in fact, the national energy program is going to have an impact exactly like the impact it has had for the last two years and one-half or three months. That is going to create serious problems to the economy of this province and to the economy of our sister province of Alberta. I suppose it's not a criticism of this government, but it is clearly an extremely serious problem which we face in this province. I call on the Premier to stand more strongly against Mr. Trudeau and the centralists in Ottawa because only by doing that are we going to bring our message through to not only the government, but also to the people of central Canada and to the businesses of central Canada, which will, in the end, be the big losers if this national energy program is to continue.

The second point I would like to get to now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the question I raised yesterday. That is this: presently before the Alberta Court of Appeal is the trial of Alberta Oil Ltd. and the federal government over the question of the national energy program and, in particular, the 8 per cent revenue tax. Now, the province of Alberta has initiated court action against the federal government. Our Premier, of course, in his typical way, said, "No, we won't join with the province of Alberta in this court challenge because it

really doesn't apply to us."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I say to you that it does apply to us, and in a very serious way. Here's the way. The province of Alberta, as you know, has entered into an enterprise which is to drill three gas wells in southern Alberta. The intent, obviously, is to produce from those gas wells, to transport that gas into the United States and to sell it there. Now it clearly becomes a question in that trial as to whether or not what they are dealing with there is an export tax.

But there is also another serious question which is involved and is being argued by the federal solicitors in that particular case. That argument is based on section 125, which says, 'You shall not tax the property of another government.' The argument of the federal lawyers is that the question of an enterprise is different from the question of property, so that the case in Alberta does not come under section 125 of the constitution.

Now, look at the ramifications of that particular trial, which we refused to join although the province of Alberta invited the province of Saskatchewan to join. Think of what will happen to our taxing structure and to our mineral wealth in this province, if the Alberta Court of Appeal and, more particularly the Supreme Court of Canada, rule that, in fact, that particular case is not in violation of section 125 of the constitution because it is not the property of Alberta they are dealing with because it's a commercial venture. Think of the implications for the province of Saskatchewan.

The Premier says, "Well, we will go later. We will follow the Alberta case to the supreme court because ours is different, as it deals with Crown corporations." But I say to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that if, as anyone knows, the Supreme Court of Canada rules on that, it could bring down some very strong precedent as it relates to other levels of governments being involved, in commercial ventures, whether it is Alberta Oil Ltd. Or whether it is SaskOil or SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation). It clearly is a serious problem if that court rules in that direction.

But, just as the Premier has chosen not to join the other provinces in dealing with the serious question of the constitution, he has likewise refused to join with the province of Alberta on this serious question. There are ramifications to the province of Saskatchewan, if the supreme court rules that section 125 of the BNA (British North America) Act does not apply to commercial ventures by provinces. What impact will that have on the situation of SMDC going into the province of British Columbia and into hardrock mining? I'll tell you what the problem will be. If Albert Oil Ltd. Is a commercial venture, how can we then argue that SMDC is not likewise a commercial venture? They are the same as Rio Algom. They are operating in the province of Saskatchewan, but they are also operating in another province. They are also, potentially, going to be operating in another country. Then the supreme court will simply come down and say, "SMDC is a commercial venture; it is not covered by section 125 of The British North America Act, and therefore is subject to taxation."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I say that argument is not without some logic. If that, in fact, impacts, just look at the implications for the province of Saskatchewan. It does not only lend itself to the federal government's injecting itself into the oil industry, the federal government will also inject itself into the uranium and potash industries. Once that has happened, we have serious problems with regard to the resource wealth of this province.

I have two questions to ask, Mr. Deputy Speaker. My first question is: who in this Assembly would think that Mr. Trudeau is making a grab for western resource wealth? Would anybody think that to be the case? If you do not agree with that, simply look at what is happening with the national energy program. It is simple and it is clear what the central government is going to do to the province of Saskatchewan. They are going to take away our resource wealth.

Those people over there like to say that we are going to stand strong to protect our resource wealth. I say hooley! You are afraid to go to court on the constitution and you are afraid to go to court on the question of the section 125 interpretation. I say to you that you could be too late when it's your time. If that Alberta case comes down, and we sit silent, and the judgment goes against Alberta, I'm telling you that the case we are going to go with, with regard to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, could go the same way.

My second question is: how many people in this Assembly have faith in the Supreme Court of Canada with regard to the protection of the resources of western Canada? How many? Exactly the same number that believe Mr. Trudeau is not, in fact, coming after our resources.

Those are the two most serious questions facing us. Those are the questions that are very big problems for us.

One further point I would like to make, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is this: We hear a lot of talk from the members opposite with regard to our education system. I will tell you that our education system is the other most fundamental question that we face in this province. If we are allowed to develop our resources, God willing and Trudeau willing, we need a trained workforce, but it is not here and we are not addressing the issue. It is window dressing to think that we are. We must start our education system in our high schools. We must get away from an educational system which wants to have a simple standardization of everything. Our educational system is promoting mediocrity, that is exactly what it is promoting. There is nothing there for the young man who want to get into industry, whether he wants to become a plumber, a pipefitter or a machinist. We desperately need them all, but there is no place to get them — certainly not from Europe and certainly not from eastern Canada.

It is a serious problem. There is no place in our educational system to promote the brighter students in our schools, at least not in rural Saskatchewan. That is the other important question that we must address if we are to look forward to building an economy in Saskatchewan that is more self-contained. What we have to do is capture that future and build a more integrated economy in this province. That's the challenge that we face.

And with that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I simply say that I don't believe that the budget addresses those questions. I think the member for Regina South has done an excellent job in the presentation of his speech and his position. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will be voting against the budget, and voting in support of the member for Regina South. Thank you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is with great pride that I enter the 1981-82 budget debate. I congratulate the Minister of Finance on his budget — an



expansionary, visionary budget. I congratulate all of the members of the Assembly who have participated in debate — on both side of this Assembly.

I don't think I've been in a budget debate in recent times where there has been so much clamoring to speak. I think that's true. We have stopped the clock on a number of occasions to let the hon. members speak in this debate and I think that says something for the members of the Assembly. But I think, indeed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it says a great deal for the budget that has been brought down by the Minister of Finance.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — I sense, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the problem that the members opposite have in dealing with this budget.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Keep on the highroad!

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — I'm on the highroad.

The difficulty, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has been so great that it has interfered with their leadership plans and they have not been able to mount leadership speeches on this budget. I think that's unfortunate for the hon. members opposite.

We saw an effort by the member for Regina South, and he had spent a good deal of time. We saw an effort this afternoon by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley, and we saw an effort just now from the member for Kindersley. They are having a difficult time. I say sincerely and honestly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I welcome back the member for Thunder Creek because it may well be that we'll get a speech from the member for Thunder Creek on this budget, and a speech which will enter him into the leadership race.

I congratulate the Minister of Finance because this budget contains more new programs that will be of direct benefit to more people than, I'd predict, will any other provincial budget in this country. I ask hon. members just to consider the social programs in the budget. Consider those social programs against budgets that are crafted by Conservative right-wing governments in other provinces. I ask hon. members to compare this budget and social programs in it with the budget that just came down in British Columbia. I ask hon. members to consider that this budget is a balanced budget and compare the budget in British Columbia with this budget.

You see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the leadership of Allan Blakeney and the New Democratic Party continues to pay handsome dividends to the people of this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — We have made great strides in the 1970s. We developed a broad base of social programs and we built the resource policies of joint, private and public development that has become the model for all of Canada.

Throughout the history of Saskatchewan, the NDP government, the CCF government, has always insisted on social programs and economic policies which improve the quality of life for people.

Saskatchewan holds the clear reputation as one of the best places to live in Canada. Our success was reflected in the faces of all those who returned to Saskatchewan last year for our celebration. There was pride, not only in those who came back, but there was pride in those who were here as they together recognized what has been accomplished in this province — a proud heritage, an exciting present and an unlimited future. We have a past, present and future that are filled with leadership (premiers, politicians, Tommy Douglas, M. J. Coldwell, Woodrow Lloyd, our own Premier, our Deputy Premier) recognized as the best in this country. That leadership, along with leadership in social and economic policies, has made Saskatchewan respected right across this country and right across the North American continent.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Saskatchewan has been a particular leader in policies related to rural development — rural telephones, rural electrification, rural bus services, rural schools (there is a scarcity factor), rural housing, senior citizens' housing in village and towns. The co-operative movement was built in rural Saskatchewan.

This budget builds on the base of existing programs to improve the quality of life in rural Saskatchewan. There's home care; there's school construction; there are level 4 beds; there are improvements to hospitals; there is funding for grid roads and supergrids and hard-surfacing into communities of over 50 persons; there's a farm housing program; and there's a health and social service centre for Raymore.

The 1981 budget also looks in a new way at the economic base of this province — the farm. And yes, there's a 30 per cent increase in the budget, but more importantly, in this budget there is some thought and there is some planning that asks not only what the social and service needs of farmers for Saskatchewan are, but it also asks what the economic needs of farmers in Saskatchewan are. What framework, what structure, what economic supports do farmers need in place, to be able to do what they do best, and that is, produce?

It's true that Saskatchewan farmers are the most efficient producers in the world, and they will continue to reward us handsomely with their skills. But they must have access to land; they must have access to the tools of their trade; they must have access to markets for their products.

The 1970s made an important start on ensuring that land and capital were available to new, young producers wishing to start farming. Land bank and FarmStart, answered the critical questions of transfer of land that faced us in that decade. A total of 2,540 farmers are now farming in Saskatchewan on land bank land. There isn't a member in this Assembly who does not know a direct-descendant farmer who is in land bank who will say, "I wouldn't be farming without land bank." Or who does not know a farmer who has sold his farm under the open competition who will say, "I wouldn't be farming without land bank." There isn't a member in this Assembly who does not know a farmer who has leased back from land bank, because he would have lost his farm to the banks and the mortgage companies, who will say, "I wouldn't be farming without land bank." Sons are farming with their fathers, brothers are farming together, and sons or sons-in-law have taken over the family farm. There are 2,540 who will tell us that if it had not been for land bank, they would not be on the land.

In 1981 funding to land bank was \$25 million. An additional \$5 million was allocated during the year in an attempt to take care of some of the long-standing applications to

sell to the commission. Still, there are 600 farmers on the waiting list who wish to sell their land to land bank. The 1981 budget increases the funding to land bank to \$35 million.

In 1976, 1977, and 1978, FarmStart approved 350 to 400 applications for loans each year. In 1979, approved applications almost doubled to 700. In 11 months of the 1980 fiscal year, over 900 applications had already been approved. Total funding approvals through FarmStart now stand at \$175 million. This is loan capital invested in economic development in the purest sense, in this province. FarmStart's 4,320 clients make up 52 per cent of the dairy industry in this province, account for almost one-third of all the hogs marketed in Saskatchewan. These are 4,320 farmers who tell us that they would not be farming if it weren't for FarmStart.

The 1981-82 budget provides an additional \$33 million in loan capital to FarmStart to meet the ever-increasing demands on this program. FarmStart and land bank have played a major role in re-establishing confidence in rural Saskatchewan. The 7,000 new farmers in these programs have been joined by sons, sons-in-law, and nephews who have taken over the family farm through inheritance, through purchase, or through rental arrangements. Together they have created a momentum and an enthusiasm for farming and for the rural community which has resulted in the fine showing of Saskatchewan in farm statistics.

As the Minister of Finance noted, even as early as 1976, Saskatchewan had a greater percentage of farmers under the age of 25 than either Manitoba or Alberta — a greater number of farmers under the age of 25 than both of those provinces together.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Saskatchewan land is a good investment. In world terms, Saskatchewan land is reasonably priced. In the 1970s, land was being bought by outside investors, and we could see the day when Saskatchewan land would no longer be available to Saskatchewan farmers. As this Assembly knows, there was a struggle to bring the act into place that effectively controls non-resident ownership of Saskatchewan land. All of the members who were here in 1974 will remember those debates, and will remember things that were said by members opposite. First, we introduced the limitation to a \$15,000 assessment. Then, when we saw that that was not working, we reduced the limit to one quarter section. When that still did not do the job, we moved as close to zero as possible — 10 acres. This was supported by all the major farm organizations in Saskatchewan and was voted for in this Assembly by members opposite, although the Leader of the Opposition said that was not his policy.

His policy is to have a graduated land tax, rather than to deal with this problem by legislation. I have that in mind, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I have in my mind the comments of the Leader of the Opposition in the constitutional debate in this Assembly when it opened last week. He talked about property rights as being part of the constitution. When he talks about property rights as they relate to the Saskatchewan farm ownership legislation, he believes that it's all right for the Toronto lawyers to own land in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the 10-acre restriction became effective May 6, 1980. With our last amendment to The Saskatchewan Farm Ownership Act, we have reason to believe (and make that clear) that the new limitations are proving effective. We will have to watch it.

This year's budget contained further major investment in irrigation and drainage and

flood control to make Saskatchewan farmland as productive as possible. Last year in this Assembly, we had a debate about the merits of extending irrigation to the west side of the South Saskatchewan River. In keeping with the promises of our Premier and me, we are pleased to make the west side canal available to farmers who wish to irrigate from it. We are presently talking with those farmers along the canal on costs and sharing of that development.

This budget also provides \$300,000 for a group irrigation project just north of Pike Lake, known as the Moon Lake irrigation project; \$200,000 for bringing another 1,200 acres under irrigation in the Central Butte-Tugaske area in the project known as the Greenlands extension project. Significant new dollars are added for increased irrigation grants to individuals, regardless of where they may live in the province. Individual farmers may apply for a grant of \$35 per acre for the first 50 acres, and \$10 per acre for the next 110 acres to provide assistance of \$2,850 per quarter section. Almost \$300,000 has been provided for additional irrigation grants in this year's budget, an increase of \$200,000 over the amount provided in last year's budget.

In addition to the irrigation projects, \$1.8 million will be expended to improve drainage and flood control in local conservation areas. Projects in Canora, Lashburn, Lanigan, Watrous, Guernsey, Paradise Hill, Naicam, Porcupine Plain, Beatty, Gronlid, Carrot River, Arborfield, White Fox, Duck Lake, and Hudson Bay are included in this drainage program. An additional \$1 million has been allocated to the implementation of the Qu'Appelle agreement and the Souris River Valley project.

The programs of the New Democratic Party government of the 1970s, and into the 1980s, are ensuring a land base protected now and into the future for Saskatchewan farmers. Mr. Deputy Speaker, farmers who were under 25 years of age in the middle and early '70s are now reaching their late twenties and early thirties; they are no longer developing farmers. They are, in most cases, well-established members of the community. They have taken their place in the community — in the Optimists groups, the Kiwanis groups, the wheat pool committees, the credit union boards, the co-op boards, and the municipal councils.

Their needs become, not operating capital to get started, but the needs of generations of farmers before them — some protection against the ravages of weather, a transportation system to move their product to market, and a fair and stable return for what they sell.

Throughout the '60s and the '70s, we saw the deterioration of the transportation system for grain to the point where the Canadian Wheat Board in 1978 laid producers' money on the line to begin to rebuild it. Saskatchewan had not been successful in obtaining actions on proposals to put the rail transportation system under public ownership or to move processed products under the crowrate guarantee plan. The Hall commission solution of paying the railways for what they moved, and letting them equip the system, just was not accepted. So something had to be done. Saskatchewan's initiative in committing the purchase of 1,000 hopper cars was followed by a commitment by Alberta to purchase, by the federal government to lease and the Manitoba government to lease. As a result 4,000 new hopper cars will be in the system in 1981.

I announced Monday in this Assembly the entry of the Saskatchewan cars into the grain service on Canadian Pacific lines. We are pleased to report that grain loading began

today for 40 of our hopper cars in the Saskatoon area. As of yesterday, a total of 123 hopper cars were on their way to Saskatchewan from Trenton. Mr. Deputy Speaker, these cars are a start, but more investment is needed if we're to have a system in place which will move the volumes of grain being contemplated for 1985.

The recent debate on the crowrate has stalemated any new investment decision. We cannot tolerate this kind of stalemate. There is no guarantee that the railways will put the system in place, even if they are given more money. The federal government has asked us to have courage, faith and trust.

The only way to guarantee a transportation system which will be adequate through 1985 and 1990 is direct public investment in the system to ensure capital assets. Public investment in the transportation system means that the public must own the assets to which it contributes. Ownership means control of those assets, which is as it should be, in a national essential service like transportation. There is a way to move the grain from western Canada to tidewater, while protecting the crowrate for the producer and the communities.

I know there is a swell of support behind the position that is taken by this government for protection of the crowrate. I hear resolutions to keep the crow from farmers at meetings in Carlyle, Montmartre, Young, Saltcoats, and Demaine. I note a report in the *Leader Post* today:

An overwhelming majority of delegates at the 76<sup>th</sup> convention of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities reaffirmed the association's support for the retention of the Crowsnest Pass freight rate.

Two resolutions on the issue were passed. The first one resolving "that we oppose any change in the Crowsnest rates and that they remain non-negotiable."

The one resolved "that the SARM undertake a vigorous campaign to back the position of our provincial government's stand on the retention of the Crowsnest rates."

The second resolution also requested the SARM executive to "prepare a submission for the federal agriculture department to express our further views."

That shows the feelings on retention of the crowrate among the 800 SARM delegates. Hon. members in this Assembly should be interested in nothing the next paragraph:

Only a handful of delegates voted against the first resolution, but Boyd Anderson, SARM president, was among the dissenters.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the \$9 million in this year's budget will make the first year of payment to the heritage fund for the \$55 million loan to purchase the Saskatchewan grain hopper cars. These cars are owned by the people of Saskatchewan. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I welcome the hon. member for Thunder Creek, I welcomed him before and I take the opportunity to welcome him now. It's a pleasure to hear his voice coming across from the other side.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — I hope, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I indicated earlier, that he gets an opportunity to speak in this debate.

The cars are owned by the people of Saskatchewan and the control Saskatchewan has with respect to those cars is reflected in the operating agreements which have been worked out with the railways and the wheat board. Members may well be interested in comparing the agreement Saskatchewan has with the wheat board and the two railways with the agreements that exist with the railways for the use of the Government of Canada cars.

One further point, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Saskatchewan has demonstrated its willingness to participate in providing solutions to the grain handling and transportation problems. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the issue is not the crowrate. The issue is whether we're going to have a grain handling and transportation system that will move 50 per cent more grain by 1985. We call on the federal government to respond to that issue. We call on it to respond to that issue because decisions with respect to building that system must be made now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the proposal for a market assurance plan put forward by the advisory committee to the Canadian Wheat Board this spring obviously presumes an adequate transportation system is in place. The proposed plan has laudable objectives and I disagree, strongly, with my counterparts in Manitoba and Alberta. I know my counterpart in Manitoba says, "We've got to have a meeting because I'm deeply concerned that a major change in grain marketing policy is being considered by the Canadian Wheat Board." I noted that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture for Alberta said, and this is reported in *Agriweek*:

Schmidt doesn't like the plan — not only because of the control it gives the wheat board over the crop, but also because of the control over the grain handling and transportation system that could go along with it. Clearly, the Canadian Wheat Board is interested in putting all coarse grains under their control and would like to do the same for rapeseed — which would mean the end of the open market in Alberta even for feed grains.

I disagree with my counterparts in Manitoba and Alberta. The proposed plan has the laudable objectives of assuring producers of markets for the grain they produce, allowing the wheat board to know exactly what stocks it has and where it has them. The plan has potential to increase the confidence of world buyers in Canada as a reliable supplier and the board will be able to match available stocks more precisely with export commitments and opportunities. But a backlog of stocks on the farms could cause a real problem for this plan and for farmers. An inadequate transportation system would undermine the plan completely.

I note that Charlie Gibbings, one of the commissioners of the board, is saying that with the plan, you have to have an adequate transportation system. We need to understand clearly the quota implications of the proposed plan. The balance of equity and productivity in the proposed quotas of the new plan is simply not clear. But, we commend the wheat board advisory committee, this group of elected farmers, for putting forward the proposal. We encourage farmers and members of this Assembly to think seriously about the idea. We trust that farmers will let the advisory committee have an opportunity to present its case and that the farmers will let the committee know what they think.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, with land to farm on, with a transportation system to deliver the grain, with a marketing system the producers have confidence in, we can then begin to turn our minds to the production issue. We know that increasing production by 50 per cent over a long-term average is almost impossible in dry years. But will it be difficult even in the years when there's adequate moisture? The question then centres around how we increase production and still maintain the health of the soil, and still maintain the family farm.

Now, the scientists look at this issue of production, this 50 per cent increase, and they say, "There's no problem at all." But they say to the farmers, "You're going to have to change your farming methods to do it." How do farmers respond? Well, they respond as they always have when some expert from the university comes to tell them how to farm and says, "If you do this and you do this and you do this, you'll be a better farmer." Farmers respond, "Gee-whiz, I'm farming as well as I know how to now." They're skeptical, and I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, rightly so.

The production answers for the 1980s lie in getting the researcher at the university and the expert on the farm together. "If something is supposed to work, let's actually see it work in my fields. Let's not have it hurt my soil."

The 1981 budget commits \$25 million over five years — \$4 million this year — to agriculture research for the 1980s. The emphasis will be on the crops and soils question: how to increase productivity while still maintaining the health of that soil. This means research into moisture conservation, snow management, stubble management and salinity control. It means research into cropping systems, and fertilizer, chemical and tillage combinations for extended rotation. It means plant breeding and variety testing for specific soil in climatic areas. It means study of chemicals and the ability to find and mix and measure toxic substances in plants, soils and animals. It means studies of rotations and tillage patterns to permit non-chemical weed control.

Funds will be allocated to livestock and animal research. More productivity in animals will mean lower cost to the producer, increasing offspring per females, housing requirements (especially in hogs), disease control, ventilation, herd health, more effective use of feed in the animals, the effort of shortage of trace minerals in feed or water on the growth and reproductivity of the animal.

Farm trials will be the emphasis. Contract funds will go directly to the university for laboratory work about things we still know very little about. Plant breeding will be a big item, and I say that because I fear the legislation put forward by Ottawa on plant breeders' rights. Can we achieve better drought resistant plants? Can we fix nitrogen into the soil directly off the plant? Bio-technology — can we develop pest controls through natural organisms? Rumen biologists — can we assist animals to make use of lower quality feeds? Is it a lack of certain minerals or vitamins in the diet which causes leg weakness in sows?

The majority of the research, I say again, will take place on local farms. Farmers willing to co-operate in a research project — on salinity, varieties, weed control or moisture management, for example — will be invited to provide the farm site for the work. The agricultural representative in the area, the farmer, and the university scientist together will design the project. Together they will record the results. Signs will be put up at the farm location of the tests. Arrangements will be made for other farmers to observe the

results.

Each area is different in this province — each soil zone, each climatic zone, and each soil type. What works in my home town will not work in the town of the member for Weyburn or the member for Rosetown-Elrose.

The research expenditures in this country will be controlled by the farm committees. Twelve will be established throughout the province. Each year, the Minister of Agriculture and the president of the university will sign a contract for work that is to go directly to the university and work that the university research will be doing assisting the farmers. I will announce in the near future a minister's research committee to advise me on this program.

Now, it's not new for a government to put money into research, but two aspects of this program are very new, indeed. First, it marks the first time our provincial government has made such a large ongoing commitment to agriculture research. Research has traditionally been the domain of the federal government, but the level of funds being allocated to agriculture research federally is simply insufficient to meet the needs of one of Canada's most important industries. This program combines with the \$3.5 million capital research fund, allocated in 1979, to reaffirm agriculture as Saskatchewan's most important industry and deserving of research funds in proportion to that importance.

I am pleased to report that the interest from the \$3.25 million fund, \$400,000, has been allocated to research projects by the board, chaired by Lloyd Loynes of Lac Vert. The research projects approved by the board cover the broad spectrum of agriculture.

The second aspect of this program, and certainly the most challenging, is that the research envisaged will go on throughout the province on local farms. We are used to laboratory research. We understand the university farms, and the federal experimental stations. We have seen small-scale field programs. But to work with farmers throughout the province in a co-ordinated and systematic way has never been accomplished before.

I say to this Assembly that farmers are ready for this work. Indeed, farmers have been asking for this type of research and we certainly look forward to making it a reality. The research work in the field will generate a host of conclusions — new information and experiences that will be worth showing to others.

In addition to the new role which will be played by the agriculture representative, as he organizes and undertakes extension activities based on local research, this budget provides for a doubling of funds to the agricultural societies and local exhibition associations in Saskatchewan.

Grants budgeted for this policy have increased from \$134,550 to \$273,160. All agricultural activity and expenses of agricultural societies are now eligible for 50 per cent cost-sharing. Societies sponsoring class B fairs, which make up the fairs in North Battleford, Yorkton, Weyburn, Swift Current, and the other cities in Saskatchewan (outside of Saskatoon, Regina, and Lloydminster) are now available for 50 per cent cost-sharing of agricultural expenses to a maximum of \$10,000 per year.

For societies sponsoring class C fairs, 33 agricultural fairs in rural Saskatchewan, in such towns as Kelvington, Perdue, and Nokomis, will now be eligible for cost-sharing of agricultural expenses to a maximum of \$5,000 per year.



Horticultural societies are also included in this program, and will be eligible for cost-sharing of horticultural activity expenses up to a maximum of \$1,000 per year. This will cover such places as Quill Lake, Sturgis, and Watrous.

Now, no matter what productive methods we use in rural Saskatchewan, we will simply not be able to farm without energy. Throughout the years we have changed from oxen to horses, to steam engine, to gasoline, to diesel. Always, energy has been an essential part of farming. I say petroleum fuels will continue to be the mainstay of fuel supply for Saskatchewan in the foreseeable future. But the national energy policy has shut wealth in. Skilled people have left Canada. Alberta has cut, by 60,000 barrels per day, its oil production. *Macleans* calls it an economic war between Ottawa and Alberta.

We do not have a pricing and development agreement with the producing provinces. The situation in the Middle East remains unstable. In our minds, therefore, security of supply will be the key issue. The security of energy supply will be the key issue of the 1980s. The increases in prices over the past three years have been difficult for farmers to absorb.

There is a very real possibility that we will not gain control over the supply in this issue. We may or may not ever get control of the price.

Conservation is important. The family farm improvement branch will continue to work with farmers in the design of energy efficient farm buildings. Farm homes are eligible for interest free loans from Warm Up Saskatchewan to improve insulation. The Prairie Agriculture Machinery Institute at Humboldt plans to include energy efficiency reports in its machinery tests.

Our major emphasis for farmers is therefore on supply. This year's budget contains major initiatives in SaskOil, nearly \$63 million in development activities. An additional \$63 million is provided to assist other companies in exploration and development of petroleum and natural gas. Three million dollars is provided for enhanced recovery projects in heavy oil. There is joint venturing leading toward the heavy oil upgrader. Federated Co-ops has plans for refinery expansion in Regina.

But we need to supplement this petroleum fuel. This budget commits \$7.1 million to a pilot ethanol plant based on renewable feed, stock barley, waste grain, and poplar pulp. The plant will be located in an area of Saskatchewan which will give easy access to adequate supplies of grain and supplies of poplar pulp.

The ethanol will be mixed 90 per cent to 10 per cent with gasoline and sold through the marketing system of Federated Co-operatives in this province. The by-product (which in the case of barley and grain is a protein mash of good quality) will be used as animal feed, and may be fed in feed lots in the area adjacent to the plant. Detailed discussions are being undertaken with Federated Co-operatives, not only in the marketing end but with a view to a co-operative development of the plant itself. Alternative co-operative structures to allow for the participation of other interested bodies are being examined.

Research will be undertaken into mixing ethanol with diesel to produce a diesohol which works in the farm diesel tractor. Research will also be undertaken into other alternative liquid fuels, including hydrogen and vegetable oil. Together, Mr. Deputy Speaker, these project will make Saskatchewan a leader in Canada in alternative fuels

research and development.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Let me review. We have the programs in place to take care of the farm transfer, to get new, young farmers on the land. We've made a start on developing a transportation system in this country. The elected members advising the Canadian Wheat Board have put forward some ideas on marketing to meet the needs of the '80s. Production research has been committed in unprecedented amounts with an emphasis on farm work. But I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, glaring problems remain in one major part of the Saskatchewan agricultural economy — the livestock industry.

Ever since Saskatchewan farmers began to farm, they have worked to protect themselves against the forces that they could not control. On the one side is the weather; on the other side is the market place. In the early '20s, '30s, and '40s, farmers fought for and won, through their co-operatives, the Canadian Wheat Board to handle and market their grain in the producers' interests. In the '60s and '70s, we developed crop insurance to protect against crop failures due to weather. In the past three years we've seen the crop insurance board meet the challenge through payments of \$90 million and \$100 million, and \$140 million this year. We know just how important that program has become.

But, the livestock producer has had neither of these protections, remaining at the mercy of both the weather and the market place. It's true that governments have brought in stopgap measures, and our own government (looking back on the '70s) spent \$40 million on the cow-calf advances and loans in 1976 and 1977 to sustain the industry. But the instability continues. Costs increase bringing increased risks. When there is a choice, grain is less work and has crop insurance and marketing protection. Cattle numbers in Saskatchewan have dropped from 3 million in 1975-76 to 2.5 million today. But a livestock industry is essential, not only to the Saskatchewan economy but to the Saskatchewan land as well. Programs which provide the livestock producer with long-term protection cannot be delayed any longer. Last year we were reminded of the importance of protecting the livestock industry from the weather. The provincial drought assistance program last year was a success in providing fodder, transportation, cattle transportation, well development, fencing program and timely information.

Our drought assistance program last year taught us the need for a long-term agreement to be ready and in place to trigger automatically when a drought sets in. All taxpayers accept the legitimate need for assistance in times of drought. Let's formalize it. Let's make it into a long-term agreement to protect the livestock producer on a long-standing basis. There will always be slightly different circumstances related to every drought. But the basic programs and the basic delivery vehicles can be agreed to among the provinces, the municipalities and the federal government.

From our experience last summer, this fall and winter it appears to us that the principles on the long-term drought program should be as follows: First, the provincial program should be cost-shared 50-50 by the province and the federal government. Secondly, the program should be administered by the province.

Farmers do not need another herd maintenance program type of nightmare of disaster on top of disaster. The local reeves and councillors should act as drought co-ordinators in each municipality.

The reeves and councillors did a fine job this year of providing information to producers and government. We thank them sincerely for their work.

Transportation assistance for fodder movement is essential. Producers are adept and resourceful at finding feed. Assistance should be automatic to move it home. Assistance must continue for the duration of the feeding emergency. Cattle transportation may be included but this must be recognized as a very limited alternative.

The emergency hotlines and the people who run them, including the listing service, are an important part of the package. Reliable nutrition information must be readily available. Provision must be made for water development, wells, emergency pumping to build dugouts, sloughs and farm and community wells.

Finally, an agreement must make provision for a standing committee of farm organization spokesmen, who can be called on to advise on short notice. The minister's advisory committee this year made a real contribution.

Drought isn't over, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We will be calling our committee together again March 26 to review the situation as we face it this spring. In the meantime, we will be pressing the federal government for a long-term agreement.

So on the beef side, the beef producer is buffeted by the market and the weather. The Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, at its convention last year, passed a resolution calling on the federal government to develop an improved system for marketing beef. I want to report to this Assembly that in July we took that position of SARM, and our position to the federal government and to other provinces across this land. In Toronto we called for national marketing and national stabilization for beef. But the federal government, of course, as you know, has refused to respond.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this year's provincial budget contains a landmark \$5 million to address the beef problem within the limits possible by this province.

We've looked at our experience for stabilization for hogs, know as SHARP (Saskatchewan Hog Assured Returns Program), and we built this plan around our experience. I report to this Assembly that 791 producers were in the old SHARP, and today there are 1,137 producers enrolled in the new SHARP.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — A voluntary stabilization plan for beef in Saskatchewan will be established in 1981 and will apply to slaughter cattle. The producers will be able to enrol a fixed number of head in the program with provision being made for multiple operators. The producers will contribute a percentage of their gross sales to the plan and the government will match this amount. We anticipate the contribution to be in the order of 2.5 to 4 per cent. This will be adjusted, over time, to maintain a naturally sound plan. Payments will be made to participating producers when the selling price does not meet the cost of production support levels. Cost of production will include components for labor and capital. The plan will be administered by a stabilization board, which will also market the cattle on behalf of the member producers. This is necessary because the investment in the animal by both the province and the producer requires that the best price possible be obtained. As with the SHARP plan for hogs, a

minimum period of participation in the plan will be set. Producers joining in the first six months will be eligible for full benefits, while those joining later will have delayed benefits. The plan will apply only to slaughter beef, but both cow-calf producers who retain ownership of the calf-to-slaughter weight, and producers who purchase feeders and finish them over a period of time, will be eligible. The board will be appointed, made up of producer representatives.

Now, the hon. member for Maple Creek and the hon. member for Rosetown-Elrose said that I should go to Washington to ask whether we should implement this plan. And I've been following, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reporting of Nancy Russell in the *Star-Phoenix* on the beef situation. She writes that more beef has come into Canada this year from the United States than the total slaughtered in all of Canada. And they say I should go to Washington to talk about beef stabilization; Mr. Deputy Speaker, I've never been to, nor planned to go, to Washington. I thought the policies for agriculture were set here in Saskatchewan. I'm not like the federal Conservative governments and the federal Liberal governments, which have had to go to Washington to set their economic policies. Mr. Deputy Speaker, maybe I should go tell Washington about the interest in the plan expressed yesterday by the delegates of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, on the convention floor and as I mingled with them in the halls; about the interest expressed by the members opposite; about the support expressed by Bill Marshall, president of the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, and Evans Thordarson, on behalf of the Western Cow-Calf Association; and the outright enthusiasm of producers who have been phoning my office saying, "When will the forms be ready, so I can join?"

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this year's budget also contains a major increase in funds to provide veterinary service to rural areas. For some time we've had discussions on a vetericare plan. In fact, this morning I met with the Saskatchewan Veterinarian Association, and we talked about such a plan. Although one has yet to emerge which meets with the general approval of the public, we must not give up on this. In the meantime, we are pleased to provide an 80 per cent increase in the grants to veterinary services. The increase from \$200,000 to \$460,000 will go toward a doubling of the travel grants, from a minimal \$2,000 per district to a maximum of \$5,000 per district. The clinic maintenance grants will increase from \$1,000 per clinic to \$2,000 per clinic. The new provision to include multiperson practices is being set up to include a \$3,000 per practice addition. This provision is a straight grant, and does not have to be matched by the municipalities.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the stabilization systems in place to protect the producer on the weather side and on the market side will lead to the stability of the beef industry in Saskatchewan over the long term. But beef, pork and poultry are different from grain. Livestock is a perishable product. Automatically, one is faced with the question of processing. There is no question that the multinational food chains will resist produce involvement and processing just as they resist marketing boards.

I congratulate the hog marketing board in Alberta for getting into the processing industry. I know when they are trying to put their management board of that processing plant in Red Deer together, they are very nervous. They are not putting on any producers. They are putting on accountants, politicians and lawyers as if they knew something about hog processing and hog marketing. You see, they are nervous because the multinational food chains very much want to keep the producers divided so they can purchase their raw products at the lowest possible price. There is no point in attempting to tell the multinational food chains that eggs in Canada, which are

marketed through a national marketing board, are a better price than eggs anywhere else in the world. The only way to deal with the multinational food chains is to have a product available in the form they need and have it in quantity to have clout in the market place. In livestock that means the processed product. I encourage all members to look at the experiment in Alberta and to consider what is going on here in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want the hon. member for Rosthern to hear this. Last spring, the Saskatchewan government agreed to participate with producers and retailers to develop Plains Poultry Plant in Wynyard.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — That plant is the province's largest poultry processor, handling 70 per cent of the chickens and 100 per cent of the turkeys produced in this province. It employs up to 300 people and means \$3.2 million a year in labor payroll in this province. The government is involved, with the ability to make some long-term commitments, in this case with a \$4 million loan guarantee with preferred shares. The producers are involved, with a representative on Plains Poultry Board of Directors of both chicken and turkey producers in Saskatchewan. The retailers are involved, with two representatives on that board of the Kentucky fried chicken franchise which retails a large percentage of the product in Saskatchewan. The Saskatchewan way seems to be working very well. When this partnership of government, producer and retailer took charge of the plant last spring, it was bankrupt. Losses continued into the summer but by fall, new directions and decisions made by the board resulted in a financial turnaround and the plant is again operating in the black — making a profit . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — . so much so that the board tells us the plant merits new investment and we are going to provide new investment. The structure of the board now makes it possible to plan for the future with confidence. Producer representatives speak for the supply of the product. The government can assist with investment commitments and the retailers can assure a market for the product. This Plains poultry model may well show us the way to the future in building a processing industry in Saskatchewan in the livestock area.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, those of us who speak for rural Saskatchewan are proud of this budget. All members on this side of the House speak for rural Saskatchewan, since that's what this budget is largely about. It recognizes the fundamental issues in the agriculture industry, and deals with them in a constructive way. As we know from our experience in resource development, once the structural issues are taken care of, growth and development will take care of themselves. Producers with outside impediments out of the way will gladly do what they do best — produce.

The hon. member for Thunder Creek whom I welcomed back a moment ago, is great with statistics. I want to put to him a statistic which was released today by Statistics Canada: Saskatchewan's 1981 farm cash receipts for the month of January were up 41 per cent over January 1980. This is the largest increase of any province in Canada. More significantly, Saskatchewan's farm cash receipts amounted to 41 per cent of the total of all farm cash receipts for Canada. Add Alberta, Manitoba and Quebec together and they still don't get as much as Saskatchewan does. Add Alberta and Ontario together and you don't get as much as Saskatchewan for January 1981.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Saskatchewan is the clear leader in . (inaudible interjection) . Mr. Deputy Speaker, would the school principal from Indian Head-Wolseley allow me to finish? I will be just a second.

Saskatchewan is the clear leader in agriculture today; it is the clear leader in every way. This is just the Government of Saskatchewan; however, we've been very much a part of it. This budget is also very much a part of it, not only because of the 30 per cent increase in dollars. With the thought and the planning that was put into it, I will support the motion. I am opposed to the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I had not planned to enter this debate until the Minister of Agriculture insisted that I do so. In a very hurried fashion, I was able to make the odd note. I do hope the Minister of Agriculture will stay around for a moment because I do have some comments, particularly with regard to the statistics which he cited at the conclusion of his speech.

Normally, I would proceed and ignore the unruly heckling from across the way, but I have a very bad throat and I simply cannot afford to extend myself. Since you are going to hang onto every word I say, I know you don't want me to falter. I know you do want me to conclude, so I'm going to stay in a very relaxed vein. I must ignore any unruly behavior on that side of the House, simply by necessity.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, before I move into comments on the 1981 budget, I feel I must comment, on behalf of some members on this side of the House, on the unruly behavior that greeted the President of the United States in Ottawa the other day. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it was a grossly unfortunate thing that occurred because, bear in mind, some 220 million Americans probably saw that demonstration on television and those 50 or 60 people brought shame on all 22 million Canadians. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am no fan of Pierre Elliott Trudeau, but as a Canadian, I would take great offence were Prime Minister Trudeau treated in that fashion in Washington, D.C.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — I would take great offence if Premier Allan Blakeney were treated in that fashion in North Dakota or Montana because I would regard that as an affront to the people of Saskatchewan. I say to those 50 or 60 demonstrators who put on this atrocious display, not in opposition to Ronald Reagan, but to the United States of American (which I would point out to you very pointedly is far and away our largest customer and most important customer), that I would take that as an affront were I an American.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have to point out that the biggest disgust of all was when I heard the news clip where Mr. Broadbent, the federal Leader of the New Democratic Party, the third largest political party in Canada and an individual who, regardless of how remote his possibilities may be, aspires to be the prime minister of Canada, in some fashion supported this demonstration. I was disgusted and I was shocked, and I am sure, privately, many of you over there were equally because there was simply no excuse for that . (inaudible interjection) . I heard the answer no over there. I will accept that. I think it is an appalling, disgusting thing that someone who would aspire to be the

prime minister of Canada would, in any fashion, aid and support that disgusting demonstration against the people who are our largest customers. And with that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what else can I say?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, before I move on, I wish to comment very briefly on some remarks that were made earlier by the member for Canora. I want to concur with the member for Canora (and I hope I have the constituency correct) when he made reference to some of the disgusting morality that is on television today, and I wish to support his comments. And while I attempted to get the member to be a little bit more specific in what direction he was aiming his comments, (I was making the directions from my seat and he chose not to take notice), I would assume that this disgusting morality, as it is displayed on our TV screens, was in reference to what is being viewed by our children at prime evening hours on Teletheatre. Now Teletheatre is a medium which is owned 60 per cent by the Government of Saskatchewan. I concur fully with the member for Canora when he suggests that some of the explicit sex scenes, etc. are disgusting, degrading and whatever else. Again I would like to point out to the member for Canora that the medium displaying these is 60 per cent owned by the Government of Saskatchewan. The decisions as to what will be seen on that medium is 90 per cent made by representatives of the Government of Saskatchewan. I sincerely hope that the member for Canora, when his party is in caucus tomorrow, will be raising that issue, and I sincerely hope your caucus will be instructing the people responsible (since you are the governing party) to get this medium under control. That is prime-time viewing of movies such as "North Dallas 40" and there's a really dandy on right now — I'm not even sure how you pronounce it, but I think it's "Cheech and Chong". Now what is that one? That particular one, Mr. Member for Canora, in case you missed it, was on last night at 9 o'clock on Teletheatre. It was about two people in search of better marijuana, higher quality marijuana. Never mind the explicit sex and that every second word is a four-letter one, most starting with "f"; never mind that, but advocating marijuana, advocating the use of drugs! . Mr. Member for Canora, I assume that tomorrow you will bring this to the attention of your caucus. No doubt next week we can expect an improvement in what is to be seen on this medium.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — And no doubt, Mr. Member for Canora, you will also want to point out that since you take such great offence to this . I agree with you. I agree with you because I believe that you are also a father and you have some children, and I agree with you that this should be removed from the air. I hope you'll say to your Premier, the leader of your party, "Instead of preoccupying yourself with this red herring, these harmless, innocuous beer ads that appear from time to time," which I think most members of any political party will agree are probably the best ads on television and the most harmless . But I hope you will say to the Premier, "Quit this hypocritical stand of yours; quit this red herring; stop this red herring about the beer and wine ads that have been here for a couple of years and haven't done any harm, haven't increased consumption and are not going to increase consumption. Let's get on to morality and let's get this tripe off prime time. If not off the air, then get it off prime time, get it off 7 o'clock and 9 o'clock." I trust, Mr. Member for Canora, that we on this side of the House can count on you to bring this up in your caucus. I'll be looking at the appropriate channel next week to see if you have had any impact in this area.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I regret that the Minister of Finance isn't in the Assembly because I wish to congratulate him. And I do hope the Minister of Agriculture will stick around for a few more minutes — my voice isn't really going to last that long. I'll get to you after a

few moments because I have some comments for you.

I regret that the Minister of Finance isn't here because I truly wanted to congratulate him. I wanted to congratulate him very sincerely for being smarter than his predecessor. You know, his predecessor wasn't very bright. His predecessor used to bring down a budget in which he would forecast a deficit. For, I think, four straight years his predecessor said, "I'm going to spend more than I've taken in." And he was dumb enough to say so and call it a deficit budget. Dumb enough, honest enough — call it whatever you want. But that's what his predecessor used to say. "I will spend more money than I'm going to take in." But the member for Humboldt is smarter than that. You know what he does? He says, "Folks, I'm going to balance your budget. I'm going to bring in more money than I'm going to spend." Now, in actuality, you know what he does? He goes out and just spends like the same drunken sailor who we've become accustomed to in the NDP. The only thing is, he says, "I'm going to balance it." He then goes and follows the NDP philosophy, the NDP procedure.

Mr. Minister of Agriculture, I'll get to you in about five minutes. Come back. You have time for a cup of coffee.

He then goes right ahead and spends in the same fashion we have become accustomed to with the NDP government for the past 10 years — spends more than he takes in. But his predecessor used to tell the truth. His predecessor used to say, 'I'm going to have a deficit. I'm going to spend more money than I'm going to take away from you.' He did that for so long he was turfed; he got bumped. Now, the new minister says, "I'll balance it." But he proceeds to overspend, in 1980, by \$60 million, and he still has a deficit. Mr. Deputy Speaker, why would anybody think he is serious in balancing his budget for 1981? His credibility is zero. Everybody in this Assembly, especially over there, knows very well this was no more a balanced budget than the 1980 budget. The only difference may be that at this time next year, the \$63 million deficit from last year may look merciful — may look merciful — in comparison to what we're heading into.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that I have heard, in this Assembly, this budget being termed a deceitful budget — and why not? You know, when you use the term "deceit," it makes you think back to a couple of days ago when a real little gem came out of the corner over there from the member for Nipawin — a rather shocking little gem.

Of course, the word 'deceit,' and the question from the member for Nipawin automatically bring up the name C. M. Fines. You know, really, isn't that wonderful? Now, is there anybody who doesn't know who C. M. Fines is? Well, the C. M. Fines of the present is the millionaire who is being brought up from Florida, given a paid-for house in Gryphon's Walk, and is going to write the history of the Canadian Co-operative Federation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Clarence Fines is a gentleman who I recall very well as a youngster, because he used to spend a fair amount of time in the living room of my house, and I'm ashamed to admit that he patted me on the head once. I still remember Clarence telling the story to my father. He would talk about being, in the 1930s, a typical schoolteacher of the depression years — greatly maltreated. There is no question; they were. But he used to tell the story about his move to Regina, after his election as an MLA in 1944 and his subsequent elevation to the position of provincial treasurer. He used to say, 'Ross, when I came, I came in a Model T. I had my furniture piled on to the back of a hayrack. And do you know what, Ross? That hayrack didn't have rubber tires — it had steel tires.'



Now, for those of you who are not familiar with rural Saskatchewan, I ask you to envisage what a hayrack with steel tires pulls like. Do you have any idea what it's like?

Clarence did make such a fantastic story out of the Model T pulling his furniture on the back of the hayrack, on steel tires, into Regina. He made such a great story out of that.

Sixteen years later, Clarence Fines left Regina in a Cadillac. He went to Florida as a millionaire. That was a pretty good trick for a cabinet minister back in those days, who maybe grossed about \$10,000. That was a pretty good trick. Many people in Saskatchewan knew Clarence Fines. Every person who ever applied for a liquor licence knew Clarence Fines well. Every person who ever applied for an SGI agency knew Clarence Fines very, very well. There is no question about it; he was a financial wizard. He took that cabinet minister's salary of \$8,000 to \$10,000 and parlayed it into \$1 million in 16 years. He was a financial genius.

As Clarence sits in Gryphons Walk and dictates his memoirs to that recorder to be typed up, do you think that Clarence is going to tell the truth about the Rawluk case? Do you think Clarence will tell what really happened in the Rawluk case, when a legislative committee made up of a majority of CCF members said in a majority vote that no criminal action was required? That legislative committee, in its unbiased fashion, made up with a preponderance of CCF members, said that no criminal action was required. Do you think Clarence will tell what happened in the Rawluk case? I'll watch his memoirs with interest.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I feel it appropriate, since I've already talked about one-half of the team which was professionally known as the dynamic duo of that era, that I should make a comment or two on the present status of the other half — one T. C. Douglas. Or should I say, the oil executive, the director of Husky Oil? Or should I say, more specifically, Glenn Nielson's private little trophy?

Now, who is Glenn Nielson? He is just a pretty hard-nosed, rough, tough businessman. He'll deal with anybody. He'll even deal with you birds. Glenn Nielson and Husky Oil, as you all know, are interested in building a heavy oil plant in conjunction with this government. Glenn Nielson is a toughie. So, Glenn Nielson and Husky Oil, in order to make their image acceptable to the NDP government, needed a private little trophy to hold up and say, "Here's our private little socialist." So Glenn Nielson bought T. C. Douglas for three or four rides a year in a Learjet and a weekend at a board meeting and he plucked T. C. Douglas and set him on a mantlepiece, and he said to the oil industry, "I've got my own private little socialist, and I got him cheap." And that, ladies and gentlemen, is the story of the up-to-date history of the dynamic duo, both of them doing reasonably well, one sitting on Glenn Nielson's trophy case, the other one sitting in Gryphons Walk pouring out his memoirs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we talk about deceit, and we talk C.M. Fines, obviously we must think of the newest Taj Mahal in the city of Regina, that being the SGI building across Lake Wascana. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if there were ever an example of deceit, if there were ever an example of incompetence by a government agency or a Crown corporation, that building is the living testimonial to it — because you people that perpetrated this building could not afford it. You built that building at a time when SGI was in trouble. The magnitude of that trouble was not apparent to the general public, namely, the driver of Saskatchewan. You simply couldn't afford that building, and you

know, and everybody in this province now knows, that if SGI were a private company, they would have gone into receivership several months ago. Mr. Deputy Speaker, given the fact that SGI was so deceitful, I believe it was appropriate that they chose to name it the C. M. Fines Building. Nothing could be more appropriate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, SGI has been a grossly, grossly mismanaged company, one that would have gone into receivership if it were in the private sector. But because you are in the monopoly position you will survive simply because you take it out on the backs of Saskatchewan drivers and taxpayers. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the most deceitful thing of all in that C. M. Fines Building had to be when, under the guise of cleaning up the mess, you fired 13 people. By the broadest imagination, the most far-fetched imagination, could it be suggested that they had some impact on SGI policy? Mr. Deputy Speaker, I suggest that it was disgusting, shameful, and as we were discussing earlier, deceitful to attempt to hang the problems of SGI on these 13 employees who were far, far from the top. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I suggest to this Assembly, respectfully, and I truly regret that the minister in charge of SGI isn't in this Assembly, that that minister did not have the nerve to fire the head of SGI, to fire the top level people in SGI and replace them with people who knew the insurance business.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — Order, order! The hon. member for Thunder Creek is speaking. He should be allowed to speak without interruption.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as we were saying, it was deceitful of SGI to attempt to hang that mess, that ring of incompetence, on 13 people.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — Further, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was a gross error on the part of SGI to replace these people with the people on whom they ultimately decided. I suggest that it was a gross error to place Murray Wallace into his capacity as head of SGI. That is not meant to belittle Mr. Wallace's ability. Mr. Wallace is very bright, very able, and certainly has a place in the public service.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me say categorically that at that time, SGI needed somebody who knew the insurance business. They didn't need hacks; they didn't need the people who didn't know the insurance business and who got them into this trouble. Mr. Wallace may be an able individual, but you needed somebody from the private sector who knew how to run an insurance company, and that's what you don't have. I suggest that until you face up to the fact that you have serious top-level problems at SGI, the problems and the heavy increases are going to continue. Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the Minister of Health, might I respectfully suggest that you had the floor yesterday and I think the bulk of us listened to you very politely . .

**AN. HON. MEMBER:** — No, you didn't. You weren't here.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Yes, I was here. You're quite wrong. I left in the middle because I was bored to tears. Nonetheless, we did listen to you rather politely. If you have some notes, perhaps you could give them to the speaker who is going to follow me. Even though it is

out of your character, perhaps you could pretend that you are not uncouth, although that may be expecting too much.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to move briefly into the field of agriculture. If the Minister of Agriculture is still here, I do have some comments for him . (inaudible interjection) . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — Order, order! If you want to carry on a conversation, go behind the rail. Don't carry them back and forth across the House. The member for Thunder Creek.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm becoming afraid that having to raise my voice like this will cause me to lose it. I know the Minister of Agriculture wants to hear these comments and I would ask if some of the more uncouth types there could just hold their . (inaudible interjection) . You'll have your opportunity.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that it is a fair assessment to say that the decade of the '70s has belonged to the NDP, as far as government is concerned in Saskatchewan. You have had 10 years now to put your agricultural philosophy into effect. And 10 years later, I believe it is fair to say in this Assembly that it is now counting-up time. You've done some things which were radically different. You've done the land bank, the hog commission and foreign ownership. Now it's fair to ask what the results are, some 10 years after you proposed these and brought them into effect.

Mr. Minister, even though you've only been the minister for the past year or so, I don't think it's an unfair statement to say that the decade of the '70s, as far as agriculture is concerned, has been a decade of failure in Saskatchewan. I don't say that based on philosophy, because we have listened a great deal from you in the past hour, Mr. Minister, and the bulk of it was rhetoric. One compares the figures 10 years later — the hard, cold facts. What could be harder or colder than net cash farm receipts? What is more appropriate than this? Mr. Minister, when you brought in the land bank, the avowed purpose was to stop the exodus, to stop the reduction in the number of farms in Saskatchewan. What's the result? Ten years ago you have 85,000 farms in Saskatchewan, you have 67,000 farms now. How do you add that one up? In other words the land bank has not stopped the exodus of farmers from the land.

Secondly . (inaudible interjection) . Now, if the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg will just hang on, we'll get to many of those figures.

Mr. Minister, the next avowed purpose of the land bank was to get the young farmers started, to give them a vehicle whereby they could get onto the land and get started. Mr. Minister, when you estimates come up, I will document a case to you . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker, may I have my coffee back please?

**AN. HON. MEMBER:** — You made a deal with him, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**MR. THATCHER:** — He took my coffee.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Can he have it back, Mr. Deputy Speaker?

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — I'll take care of this later.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Minister, when your estimates come up, I intend to document a case for you, where the land bank outbid a young farmers for his uncle's land. They paid \$60,000 for it some years ago. They ultimately gave it to the nephew on a land bank basis. Five years later, the option was exercised to purchase the land, and the land bank very benevolently sold him that land for \$360,000.

Mr. Minister, I ask you; did you do that young fellow any favor? I really don't think so. Five years ago he could have had a mortgage on that land for \$60,000, and in late 1980, after buying it from you, he's now sitting with a mortgage of \$360,000. The land bank did very well, but did you really help that young farmer? Mr. Minister, I suggest to you that the land bank hasn't helped young farmers. If you had brought in a program that was going to get these young farmers owning their land from day one, think of how much better off they would be five years later, if it had been their name on the title. Sure the land bank has done well on it — anybody who has owned land and survived on it has done well. I suggest to you that the young fellows, who have farmed land for five years and then bought it from you, have received no favors from you.

Thirdly, Mr. Minister, when the land bank came in, one of the purposes was that we were going to keep land values down. You were going to control land values. I suggest to you that today, as the facts point out irrefutably, the biggest buyer in the market and the biggest contributor to land inflation in Saskatchewan has been the land bank. Compared to the impact that buyers from West Germany or Italy or wherever have had it is infinitesimal compared to the impact that the land bank has had.

Mr. Minister, I say to you, categorically, the number of farms has continued to decrease. You have failed there. The price of land has continued to escalate, much of it because of land bank bidding. And secondly, you have done our young farmers no favor by forcing them to wait five years for an opportunity to buy the land and letting inflation benefit the Government of Saskatchewan instead of the young farmers as it was intended.

Now, Mr. Minister, the proof of whether your agricultural policies have been successful or not lies in the farm cash receipts for 1980 because that gave you pretty well your 10 years in office. I want to say to you that these farm cash figures from Statistics Canada for 1980 are an indictment of the NDP agricultural philosophy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in Saskatchewan we have 40 per cent of the arable farmland in this country. Our neighbors in Alberta have 15 per cent. Certainly our neighbors to the west have a few things going for them, as do we in Saskatchewan. I think it is a tragic indictment that when the NDP government came to power, Saskatchewan was far and away the province with the largest farm cash receipts. Ten years later, with the NDP having a free hand with its agricultural philosophy, we now rate a very sick third. We rate third behind Ontario and we were passed last year by the province of Alberta. Bear in mind, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have been passed by a province that has 15 per cent of the arable land when we have 40 per cent of the arable land. And what has happened? What's wrong?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the problem does not lie with our farmers. It doesn't lie with our operators because our farmers can compete with agricultural people anywhere in the world.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — The fault lies with the NDP government and its political philosophy toward agriculture. You've had your own way for 10 years and what have you done? Instead of proceeding to expand our agricultural economy, what have you done? You have politicized it.

Mr. Minister, I want to say to you that your deputy minister is regarded by members on this side of the House as a partisan politician. He has entered the political arena of debate and when your estimates come up, I want to serve notice that he will not be accorded the normal immunity given to public servants. He has chosen to enter the political arena of debate and is fair game. Another individual who will be treated as a partisan NDP politician is your chief statistician, Henry Zim. He has entered the political arena of debate. He will be treated, during your estimates as a partisan politician and I serve notice of that fact. Any time a public servant enters the political arena of debate, he's fair game. If they don't want it and they don't want to get banged up — stay out of it.

Mr. Minister, I think this is fair and is a question that should be thoroughly evaluated by the people of Saskatchewan as well as this legislature. What has happened in this province? Why has a province like Alberta, with 15 per cent of the arable land, been able to pass us in farm cash receipts?

Now you brought forward the pathetic figure for the month of January about the dramatic increase in farm cash receipts for Saskatchewan. Mr. Minister, that was such a cheap, shallow one that I would have given your research people credit for a little better. I would replace them if I were you. Obviously, it's that difference in the wheat payment. You don't need to be a Ph.D. in economics to figure that one out. The price of wheat went up and that's the best you could come up with for January. Your research department is pathetic.

The reason for that, Mr. Minister, has been the difference in philosophy between the province of Alberta and the province of Saskatchewan because Alberta has had access to an awful lot of money from its resources. In Saskatchewan, we have, too, on a reduced scale, but still, in comparison to other governments, to past governments, we've had access to a tremendous amount of money. What have we done with it in Saskatchewan? We've bought what we already own; we've bought the land; we've bought potash mines; we've bought back what was already here — and what do we get for it? It was already here; it was already producing. We bought the potash mines supposedly to get rid of the multinationals; then we jumped in bed with the multinationals in the North. We jumped in bed with the same multinationals in developing the uranium industry.

What do they do in Alberta? They took their money and put it into secondary agriculture. They put it into irrigation. They put it into feedlots. They put it into packing plants. They put it into secondary agriculture industry that intensified that 15 per cent of the arable land.

What is your track record in irrigation in this province? I notice quite a bit of silence over there. What is your track record in irrigation? Mr. Deputy Speaker, as my colleague for Rosetown-Elrose said the other night, "it has to be a tragedy to allow a river such as the Saskatchewan River to flow virtually unimpeded out to disappear into the ocean."

Mr. Minister, do you know how far the Americans take water for irrigation? They take is hundreds of miles. Can you imagine what they'd do in Arizona or Texas or in parts of California or in New Mexico if they had a river like the Saskatchewan River? They would irrigate, and it would be so green that it would be appalling. But we let it flow aimlessly into Hudson Bay. Mr. Minister, do you know what they've done with irrigation in Alberta? It can be done categorically in Saskatchewan. Then I think of the tragedy; the mere pittance that is being used from the provincial budget to promote irrigation in the province of Saskatchewan is a disgrace.

Mr. Minister, I suggest to you that the province of Alberta did not allow the provinces of Quebec and Ontario to steal its livestock industry. It simply didn't allow the feedlot industry to vanish to Ontario and Quebec. It didn't allow the packing industry, the secondary packing industry, to vanish to eastern Canada.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I say the reason that Alberta has passed us in farm cash receipts is purely and simply a difference in philosophy. What did Alberta do with its money? It developed something new, used it to bring something new, something to intensify its acres. What did we do in Saskatchewan? We bought land; we bought potash mines; we bought Ipsco (Interprovincial Steel and Pipe Corporation) or 20 per cent of Ipsco, and goodness knows what else we bought. That is the difference, pure and simple.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — But you know, Mr. Minister, an even bigger indictment is the rate of increase in the farm cash receipts. In Saskatchewan, it only went up 8 per cent. In Manitoba, it's up 9 per cent. In Ontario, it's up 13 per cent; 12 per cent in Quebec; 12 per cent in New Brunswick; even Prince Edward Island, 19 per cent; B.C., 15 per cent; Alberta, 14 per cent; 8 per cent in Saskatchewan. Mr. Minister these figures are an outright indictment because they are the results of ten years of NDP agricultural philosophy.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — I want to repeat again that they are an indictment of the NDP philosophy, because your philosophy in agriculture has been one of stagnation, for, in terms of cash receipts, which are the ultimate measurement of productivity, have declined. We have declined because your philosophy has held us back.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Minister, I heard you refer briefly to a program of drought assistance and a program of bringing screenings back. And I am going to repeat something else to you that I said a year ago when you introduced that program. I can think of nothing more stupid, nothing more ridiculous, than our farmers paying the cost of sending their screenings to the Lakehead or to the West Coast. They are docked for these screenings as they deliver to the elevator. They then pay the freight to either place and then give it to the elevator companies — and you are going to subsidize bringing those screenings back. Mr. Minister, I have said it before — those screenings, that under your philosophy go out of this province to be wasted and given away, are sufficient to winter our entire livestock industry for one year.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — The numbers indicate that they are. And I can repeat again, that must be the most stupid, asinine program — a direct result of NDP philosophy — that I can think of.

Mr. Minister, I want to make some comments on your beef stabilization. Frankly, I was a little bit shocked at some of the comments you made about whether you should go to Washington to plead our case. Now, Mr. Minister, I will acknowledge that you were making a political speech, and I think you are a trifle more cognizant about the beef situation than you indicated tonight. At least I sincerely hope, for the sake of the beef industry, that you are. Mr. Minister, it is a well-known fact that a month or so ago there were huge numbers of American fat cattle coming into Canada. No question about that. Mr. Minister, I am sure you must be aware — at least I assume some of your agricultural people in the gallery must have told you — that the only thing that saved our cow market at the corresponding period of time. Would my friend please not divert the Minister of Agriculture. I have something that he should know about, and obviously by his speech he doesn't know. I'm sure you can talk to him in a few minutes, but this is for the sake of the cattle industry. Don't divert his attention, because the minister has shown he can't do two things at once.

Mr. Minister, the only thing that saved our cow market was the volume of cows that were going to the United States. Had it not been for Americans buying that volume of cows, there would have been a total collapse in that market. Mr. Minister, the Americans have said so many times over that there will only be an open border if there is non-subsidization of Canadian beef. If you don't know the ramifications of the Americans closing that border, then I suggest to you that you are not in the cattle business. Those ramifications are horrendous; they are catastrophic. And, Mr. Minister, if you don't know that, then for God's sake talk to somebody in the cow business who knows something about it. And I hope that you talk to somebody outside your department because their knowledge is suspect at the very least.

Mr. Minister, I was surprised at your ignorance of that subject. I sincerely hope that you will talk to people in the stock growers, even the Western Canada Cow-Calf Association, and I'm sure they will alert you to the fact that closing of that American border to Canadian beef is catastrophic. It's simply this way. If you're a cattleman, would you rather be locked into a market of 22 million people, or would you like access to a market of 240 million? You don't need a Ph.D. in economics to figure out that answer.

Mr. Minister, as a cattleman, I have a great fear that even a hint of subsidization of Canadian beef will give some proponents in the United States who favor closing the border to Canadian beef (make no mistake, allowing Canadian beef into the United States does not have the overwhelming acceptance of American cattlemen and I hope you consider that point) a chance to run to their senators or congressmen and say, "It's subsidized Canadian beef. Close the border." Boy, they'd love an excuse to do it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, since I've seen the Attorney General arrive in the Assembly, I have a couple of comments I'd like to direct to him.

Yesterday, the Minister of Health made reference to the fact that 1981 is the Year of the Disabled. I sincerely hope that the handicapped will do better under the Minister of Health in 1981 than children did in 1979 when the UN dubbed it the Year of the Child. I sincerely hope the Minister of Health will do a better job than the Attorney General did as far as children's rights were concerned in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Attorney General, I'm sure every member in this Assembly and probably every person of Saskatchewan is aware that my family is a living example of the fact that children have absolutely no rights in this province. I'm sure my case has shown you very clearly that children have no rights before the law or before the courts.

Mr. Attorney General, I ask you very sincerely that in this coming session of the legislature, legislation will be forthcoming that will ensure children some right of their own self-determination before the court. At the very least, I hope that legislation will be forthcoming from your department, that will enable children who are capable and who have been deemed capable to have some input into their own destinies.

I suggest to you that some of the recommendations from your law reform commission, that were forthcoming last year, are inadequate. The amicus curiae concept is not the answer. I suggest to you that the time has now very clearly arrived that the adversary system, in family court disputes, is outdated and doesn't work. I think everyone in this Assembly should acknowledge the fact, regretfully, that family break-ups are not going to decline and they are on the increase everywhere else. I'm sure they're on the increase here. I think it is time that we rapidly acknowledge that the number of family disputes is going to increase and we must deal with them in another fashion.

Mr. Attorney General, maybe we have left this to lawyers far too long. Maybe it's time other people became involved.

Many of you in the back can snicker if you want. You can say: "Well, this can never happen to me." Don't be too sure.

Mr. Attorney General, I think there has to be a better way to resolve these family disputes than lawyers going at each other with broadswords. One individual sits up there, views each parent for an hour, and never sees the children or the circumstances, and yet is treated as omnipotent. I suggest to you, Mr. Attorney General, that there has to be a better way. There must be people who can go out and evaluate the parent, the home and the situation. I suggest to you that there is an improved fashion. I think many of these things have been left to lawyers for far too long.

Again, Mr. Attorney General, I propose to you that it's time to remove the adversary system from family disputes. I point out to you that, as the number of divorces increases, these problems will accelerate. In fact, I would even go a step further and I throw this out as a rhetorical question: since we have chosen to make it much easier to break up a family or a marriage, perhaps it would not be inappropriate to make it a little tougher to get married. Perhaps you should have to go through a little bit more than you presently do in order to get married. Make no mistake, this is a problem that future Assemblies, if not this one, are going to have to come to grips with. I believe that is essential. I intend to pursue this very heavily with you during your estimates. As a result of broken marriages, children should definitely have some input into their own destiny.

Mr. Attorney General, I'm going to sit back for a few weeks, hoping that some legislation will come from you in this area. If it doesn't come from the Attorney General's department, I intend to introduce a bill of my own. Now, you can say: "You are suspect, because you have been through that conflict of interest." Go right ahead. I hope that none of you ever have to be the father of children who have been through what mine have been through, and that no other child has to go through what mine have gone through.



Mr. Attorney General, you're the one who calls the shots in this area. I sincerely hope that you will take some of these comments under advisement. They are very non-political comments. What has happened to my children could not have happened in Ontario or British Columbia. It happened in Saskatchewan, and I hope you will not allow any other children to go through what mine have had to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rambled on a little bit longer than I should have, and I feel my voice going. It is my intention to vote for the amendment and against the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. DYCK:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to take part in this budget debate. As a member of this legislature for the last 10 years, I would like to say that it has been a privilege and an honor to participate in passing some of the most effective and humane legislation to be presented in any legislature in Canada. It has been effective in dealing with Saskatchewan's economy, and humane in providing services and a particular concern for people.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I consider the good effects of this budget and the nine previous budgets of the Blakeney government, in relation to what happened in Saskatchewan before 1971, and what is occurring throughout our society in general. I realize how far we still have to go in building a better society. Saskatchewan, as this budget clearly shows, stands tall, in stark contrast to much of the rest of Canada and to much of the rest of North America. Our experiment, which began in Regina in 1933, is not finished. In fact, it has only reached the opening stage. This society, conceived in the minds of our pioneers in the '30s — a time of terrible need, a time of great deprivation — stands ready, and those aims stand ready to be fulfilled in the years ahead. Their goal, as stated in the Regina Manifesto, to seek a proper collective organization of our economic resources to make possible a richer individual life for every citizen, is attainable. That goal is attainable.

It is possible, Mr. Speaker, as this budget shows, to build a more compassionate society, a more co-operative society, a society in which people treat each other with common courtesy. Today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to express some thoughts about our society in general, and our probable future as we try to make a place for ourselves, a haven, if you will, in this failing capitalistic system. This movement and this party were an answer to the incredible suffering brought on by the capitalistic system and by a government, a Conservative government, which did not care — or if it did care was prevented by its own ideology from doing what was needed in order to correct the situation during the 1930s. Indeed, the Conservative government of the day acted in collusion with those who wielded economic power in Canada for private gain. In those days, Mr. Deputy Speaker, wheat was selling at local elevators for 20 cents per bushel, eggs were traded at local stores for 3 cents or less per dozen, and farmers who shipped cattle to Winnipeg were billed for the balance of the freight rate charges because the sale price was less than the cost of shipping the cattle to market.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, people fought back in Saskatchewan. They founded the pools, the co-ops, the farm organizations, the labor unions, and eventually they came to realize that all these efforts would come to nothing as long as there were governments opposed to their goals, governments dedicated to a system that bred gross inequality among people. They realized that if they were to really change things, they would have to change the political system itself. They would have to challenge the established

order in a way that it had never been challenged before. And they did it, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Years of hard work resulted in a co-operative, political movement. For them, the challenge was not just to build a better society and to have better services such as medical care. More than that, they wanted to build a society which would allow all citizens to participate fully and to the best of their abilities and talents without fear of wants, without fear that they would be struck down by a brutal, impersonal economic system.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I could go on at length about the accomplishments of successive CCF and NDP governments in this province since that time — accomplishments culminating in this fine budget. But I want to reiterate and elaborate on two points. The challenge is still there to create a society where a richer individual life is possible. Mr. Deputy Speaker, that challenge is even more important today when viewed in relation to the breakdown of western capitalism.

Some things never change, and when we briefly review the lessons of the great depression, we find so many similarities to our social and economic situation in Canada today. In October, 1929, the main source of capital suddenly dried up. The collapse of the New York Stock Exchange caused a shortage of capital in the United States. Credit became difficult to obtain. Foreign investments shrank, and by 1932 they were only a small portion of what they had been in 1929. Many European banks and businesses had extended credit beyond their capacity or had relied on the currencies or securities of other countries that now went bankrupt. In the process, they pulled down other banking and commercial institutions. Trade declined. Most countries carefully guarded their limited reserves of gold and hard currencies. Between 1929 and 1932, world trade declined in value from \$68.6 billion to \$26.6 billion. Productivity declined, since there was no point in manufacturing goods that couldn't be sold. Workers were laid off or fired in large numbers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in 1932, when the depression was at its worst, an estimated 22 per cent of the world labor force or 30 million people were jobless.

Western capitalism had failed. It broke down, destroying with it a great deal of human dignity. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there was another effect more serious than the economic failure of western capitalism. The depression occurred at a time when confidence in liberalism and progressive ideas were already seriously shaken. Liberalism had already shown itself incompetent to cope with post-World War I political and social instability. Now it showed its economic impotence. In the early 1930s, the only way out of chaos seemed to lie in a strong, purposeful, total authority. The depression discredited liberal-progressive ideas, and gave the critical impetus to totalitarian regimes of the likes of Stalin's Russia and Hitler's Germany.

I am sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the evolution of reactionary rule at that time must sound very familiar in today's terms. Apart from economic and social blows, the people of today have suffered a serious loss of self-confidence as well. The motive that had inspired working people was that they were doing well. The world would be a better place by creating more employment, producing wealth, raising living standards, and increasing production. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, inflation and a morality which preached the unrestrained enjoyment of the present, and surrender to anything that happened to gratify the senses, resulted in a loss of confidence.

Today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we find ourselves beset by the same destructive economic, social and political forces. Here is just a thumbnail sketch of our present situation, Mr.

Deputy Speaker: still, today, almost a million Canadians unemployed; an inflation rate of 11 per cent and rising; our dollar worth a fraction in U.S. currency; many of our industries no longer competitive on world markets; a widening gap between our energy resources and our energy demands; low prices for many of our food products and mineral exports. These are just a very few of the economic problems facing us today created by a corporate capitalistic society and corporate investment that creates and fosters useless individual consumption at the expense of social needs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if there is a difference between the excellent budget introduced in this legislature and those budgets of Conservative provinces and our federal Liberal government, it is that this government has a deliberate and continued concern for people. The contrasts between this budget and those of international conservative budgets, particularly in England and in the United States, is astounding. Yet, while this budget helps to insulate Saskatchewan people from some of the more severe effects of our failing national and international economies, I fear for the future.

I'm afraid, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I see the giant auto industry falter and stumble along even though receiving a little help from Liberal and Conservative governments. It is an industry whose very economic decisions are tied like the Gordian knot to ultimate catastrophe and failure. Solutions based on such destructive bases as planned obsolescence (building hundreds of different models, styles and ranges of cars that change every year), over-consumption of energy and high costs for repairs, are just a few of the almost insane solutions pursued by the private auto industry.

I have not talked here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about many other industries which have pursued similar policies. For example, I have not talked about the newspaper chains, the trust companies, the food chains, the banks and other financial institutions. I have not talked about land developers and the steel industry, and the oil industry or industry propped up by government handouts and using for its justification saturation advertising costing multimillions of dollars just to build profits. All of those corporations function on that basis.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the whole thing is not working. People have lost confidence in western capitalism's non-solutions. Money has lost its value and credit has taken its place. And, the impulse peddled to the consumer in a thousand different ways is to buy now and to pay later. Because we have been so used and so abused by our economic system, we believe now that whatever we deny ourselves today, will surely cost more tomorrow.

The destructive effects of that kind of thinking are enormous, Mr. Deputy Speaker. One of the worst effects is that so much of the talents and abilities of our people is siphoned off to feed that economic monster that we support — to feed the large profits of lending, insurance and other financial institutions. So many bright, inventive minds are involved in activities which only serve a failing economic system.

The financial costs are fantastic. Some of them we cannot truly gauge, like the \$12 billion scam by the oil companies just recently revealed, and the endless list of examples of rip-offs, price-gouging and pay-offs that are an essential part of private enterprise corporate capitalism.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the financial costs are fantastic, the human costs are staggering! There is the human waste of people employed in merchandising,

advertising and bookkeeping — all for profits. Instead, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of this being allowed, these people should be working in our schools, in our universities, in the arts, in recreation and a thousand other ways that would be of value to themselves and to our society. But, they can't be blamed. Capitalism doesn't necessarily reward what is essentially good or useful. It rewards what is profitable. It rewards that which makes money. It is a grotesque, unreal end for humans to strive for. This is the sickness of our times. Western capitalism can no longer justify its continued existence for people. The idea that it is senseless to continue to support the image of a society which is dedicated to constantly increasing production and to a greater subservience to technology is growing among people who disagree with this ideology.

The rise in our GNP (gross national product) over the last two and one-half decades has accelerated along with the increased demand for consumer goods. Yet, that increased wealth still has no impact on the pools of poverty and material want which persist in our industrial society. The GNP is not increasing as rapidly as in the past. Seen in the light of human conditions, we appear to be running as quickly as possible in order to stay in the same place. We are breaking down, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We are beginning to feel the harsh chill of failure in the capitalistic system — the slums. Chrysler corporation, the floundering dollar and, perhaps most frightening, a government to the south whose single purpose, while standing hip deep in public poverty and squalor, is to achieve arms superiority and support any well-disposed dictatorship in the western world. A conservative Republican government there recently brought in a budget in which the only increase was \$33 billion in military spending at a time when economically nothing works. Cities in the United States are being abandoned by the fortunate and left to the unemployed and the unskilled. Vast areas of urban America have tens of thousands of people living in poverty and squalor. Yet we in Canada continue to avoid the signs and the portents for us.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in such a society as that which is foisted on us by a bankrupt economic system, poverty breeds anarchy in which rights of law enforcement become the catchwords of competing demigods.

Conservative, reactionary economics and outdated conservative policies are dividing our country by building barricades constructed of mistrust, fear and a litter of abandoned promises of western capitalism.

There's a personal side to all of this for each and everyone of us. To some extent, in Saskatchewan we have recognized what everybody feels — that a life integrated in the productive system of western capitalism is not one of ultimate value. There's a sense of doubt abroad. Our so-called modern, industrial society has developed by undermining and sapping the strength of the traditional foundations of solidarity, group loyalty, and allegiance to honest and positive social values of our fellow man. Without a widespread sense of solidarity, the whole of our system is in danger of breaking down. This breakdown of dependence is real in the sense of the simple lack of trust in our everyday dealings with one another. Reputation doesn't seem to matter anymore. What really matters is your social insurance number on a file in some credit bureau. As a consequence, many people just don't care about how they are regarded — leaving personal credentials to the mystery of the unseen computer.

Today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, our system has made us suspect of one another. Day after day, in uncounted, numbing, trivial incidents, people are confronted by the presumption of guilt — as a potential forger, bankruptcy, theft or credit risk. Day after day, people are obliged to provide proof of their innocence.

What our so-called free enterprise system has done is destroy the presumption we used to have about one another — that most people are reliable, honest and trustworthy. Now that idea has been succeeded by the destructive, profit-motivated approach that there are too many untrustworthy people around to trust anyone.

But perhaps the most insidious aspect of the effects of our failing economic system is that it insists that people not think for themselves. Whether it is the mindless K-Tel ad for a record on television, or the illogic of some other useless demand on our consciousness, we are urged and driven to not think, to not read, to not question, but to agree with these siren offers of instant gratification.

We are told, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to live in a world of things, rather than in a world of thought. Our strength, inventiveness and essential decency are destroyed as we crawl over one another in the futile pursuit of a second car, or a bigger home, or a cottage at the lake or a painted van.

In Saskatchewan, we are at the crossroads. As this budget clearly indicates, we are at a time when we must ask ourselves what kind of society we wish to have when we have achieved some measure of economic security. We in Saskatchewan have led the fight in Canada for economic independence and social responsibility. I think the people, in particular those who have fought so hard for that human balance, deserve something more than empty promises of a failing industrial economy, aided and abetted by Conservatives and Liberals.

A tired, worn out economic, social and political system is made comfortable in its demise by a very monopolistic press; a press locked in the faded liberalism of the past and uncertain of how to interpret the present; a press more interested in peddling a new weekend supplement or a new dressed-up, manicured anchor person for the news, than in dealing with the problems of racism, alienation, prejudice, and torture, which exist in our country whether we like it or not; a press seemingly insensitive to the erosion of our political and economic freedoms; a press that finds easy distraction in a royal wedding, but little significance in the murder of the archbishop of El Salvador who was an outspoken critic of human rights violations.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in Saskatchewan we have some indication of a better way. We know a planned economy can work. This budget shows how well it can work. We know that ordinary people owning the means of production is a better way, a more humane and a more efficient way. The growth of the heritage fund and the good uses those benefits are being put to show this to be true. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we know we must go further in this direction in future years.

In closing my remarks, I would like to share some of my thoughts about the future direction in light of what I've just said. I believe we should move further in the field of ownership of production by the people. Certainly the small and medium-sized entrepreneur should be able to exist, but the large private corporations that wield massive power must be, in the longer term, dismantled. Their centralized ownership must be dismantled before they dominate our lives totally, before they destroy the last vestiges of our human freedom. Thousands of people need to get out of the banks, the trust companies, the insurance firms, the ad agencies, and the merchandising firms. These same people need to get into a more important role in our society. We need their brains and their talents in our schools, in our universities, in our hospitals, in our recreational centres, in the arts, in support programs, and in other areas. We don't need

that many people in advertising, or sales, or as clerks, accountants and lawyers, or in the hard-sell merchandising firms. These people need to be given some initiative to take a bigger part in other activities, such as being paid on an equitable basis to get involved in those things which will build a better society. Give them the recognition they deserve in a civilized society.

Of course, we need a planned economy. While large corporations plan 5, 10, 15, 20 years into the future, when governments mention economic planning they are severely criticized by the private sector. Yet, the benefits of planning, even in this budget, are readily obvious. Mr. Deputy Speaker, a civilized society is one which creates an environment that maximizes individual freedom, but just as importantly provides a situation in which each citizen may develop himself or herself to the fullest — intellectually, spiritually, and physically. We must continue to fight against the western capitalistic society, characterized by a class system, low levels of intellectual achievements, materialistic thinking and competitive, intolerant and wasteful ideals.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, with this budget, we have made a beginning. I live in the hope for our future and in so saying, I want to indicate my support for the main motion and oppose the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. JOHNSON:** — Mr. Speaker, noting what time it is, I would like to . . . Mr. Deputy Speaker, I understand that the members opposite think that it was a good speech, and I'll give them a few words before I beg leave to adjourn debate.

I'd like to first of all, Mr. Deputy Speaker, quote just a part of what the member for Meadow Lake had to say in his speech. I wish he hadn't mentioned the Turtleford constituency in it, but then since he did that, I'd like to comment on it. He said that St. Walburg community should have its natural gas all down that line. He said, "The member for Turtleford whose constituency would directly benefit from that as well, was questioning us and heckling and so on the other day when we were calling for natural gas distribution in that area."

Mr. Speaker, what I was asking when I was tripping across the floor, was just what the cost was going to be, because I have a figure in my head of about \$20,000 per hook-up. And if you do that across the province of Saskatchewan, it would be far more economical, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to just simply pay for all the fuel costs of the farmers and the people in the small hamlets and towns.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with that, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:05 p.m.