

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

April 10, 1984

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

HON. MR. SWAN: — I'd like to welcome today a school group from my constituency. They come from the Rosetown Division III School. There are 37 students, and they're accompanied by three adults, Mr. Wiebe, Mr. Button, and Doug Sim.

I'll be meeting with this group following question period, about 3 o'clock, in the rotunda for pictures, and later for drinks in room 218. I'd like all members to welcome the Rosetown students to our Assembly.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SMITH: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you, a group of students from the Prince Arthur Elementary School in Moose Jaw, and their teacher, Debbie Blash, and their chaperon, and I hope that . . . there are grade 4 and 6 students, and I hope you've had a pleasant forenoon around the city, and in the legislature, and I ask all members to welcome you here this afternoon. Thank you.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOUTIN: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you, and through you, a group of 37 grade 12 students from Birth Hills in the Kinistino constituency, accompanied by Mr. Grant Getz and Mr. Bill Yeaman and Mr. Terry Toews.

I'd like to say I'll be meeting with you shortly after 2:30 at the rotunda on the second floor for pictures and for refreshments in the members' dining lounge downstairs.

I hope that your stay here will be very educational to you, and I'd ask all members of the House to join in and welcome them.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to welcome a group of students from Osler High School, grade 8 students, 22 of them, visiting in the gallery today. I will be meeting with them later, and I wish all members to join me in welcoming them here. Thank you.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. YEW: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you, and through you to members of this Legislative Assembly, a colleague of mine from Manitoba. My colleague is the member of the Legislative Assembly for Rupertsland. His name is Elijah Harper. Elijah was elected to the Manitoba legislature on November 17, 1981. I also should note that he was the first treaty Indian elected to the Manitoba legislature. Elijah was also a chief for a good number of years for the Red Sucker Lake band. I wish Elijah Harper a pleasant stay in the city of Regina, and I'd like to invite all hon. members to join with me in welcoming Elijah Harper.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Initial Grain Price

MR. ENGEL: — I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture today. The federal cabinet is planning on setting the initial price for grain. My question really is two-fold. Does your government oppose any move to reduce the initial price of grain, and would your party support a joint resolution, which we might pass later today, to urge Ottawa not to lower the initial price of grain?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Mr. Speaker, I support anything that would result in either maintenance or, in fact, an increase in initial prices that farmers would receive for any of their grains. And in so far as supporting the joint resolution, I would want to see that before I'd made comment on it.

MR. ENGEL: — A new question, Mr. Speaker. I sent a telex to the Senator Hazen Argue, minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board, calling on him to reject any recommendations to lower the price. Could I find out from you, Mr. Minister, just what official things you have done, and what kind of representations you have made to maintain and have the federal government maintain the initial price of grain?

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — I have, and I don't know the dates exactly — sometime in late March, I think, for Senator Argue and, as well, the same for Minister Whelan.

But I've met with both ministers in the last two or three weeks, and I raised a number of issues with them at those meetings — everything from quota levels to what we could expect relative to anticipated prices; the cost-price squeeze that farmers are in; removing the federal taxes off farm fuels; a pay-out of the western grain stabilization fund.

So the short answer to your question would be yes. And I've discussed not only that issue, but several other weighty issues facing Saskatchewan farmers today.

MR. ENGEL: — Just one supplement. In your meetings with both ministers, do you feel that some pressure from this legislation will affect their decision as to the move by some, that they shouldn't be supporting a base line for grain, because they want to — the quotes are that they want to lower the price? With your meetings with them, have you suggested, or does it sound as though they could be flexible on that issue?

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — The only answer that I got from Senator Argue was that he advised me that this officials had advised him, the typical political Liberal jiggery-pokery, that things did not look good.

But I impressed upon him as aggressively as I could, if you like, the seriousness of the situation —that if ever there was a time when farmers needed a cash injection and the maintenance of, or, in fact, the increase in what their receivings are for their commodities, now was the time.

Essential Problem of Farmers at Present

MR. KOSKIE: — I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I would like to . . . In your analysis of the problems that the farmers are having in Saskatchewan today, can you indicate, from your analysis, what is the essential problem that you see that the farming community is having at the present time?

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Mr. Speaker, the member's question as to what I saw as the most pressing issue facing Saskatchewan farmers today: the short answer would be, as I see it, is the

cost-price squeeze.

And I thank the hon. members for their renewed and, in fact, new interest in the viability of farmers in Saskatchewan. This is definitely a flip-flop from what we saw yesterday, when not one member, not one member, not one agriculture member, the most notable of which was the agriculture critic, did not stand up in defence of the farmers of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Request for Legislation to Assist Farmers

MR. LUSNEY: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, you continue to talk about the cost-price squeeze that the farmers are facing. And we understand that they are having some problems out there.

Mr. Minister, what is your feeling towards debt moratorium legislation? There has been some legislation introduced in this House of that nature. Are you prepared to, at this time, accept . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order please. The member is referring to legislation that is on the order paper and could quite possibly be raised later today, and I believe that the member's question is out of order.

MR. LUSNEY: — Mr. Minister, what is your opinion of debt moratorium legislation to assist farmers?

MR. SPEAKER: — Your question is out of order, sir.

MR. LUSNEY: — Mr. Minister, the farmers in this province are facing some difficult times. Are you going to assist farmers by passing some legislation in this House that will provide them with a guaranteed loan that they can get from the bank in order to get their crop in this spring? Will you introduce, yourself, if this is what you want to do, in this House, legislation that will protect the farmer from repossessions and seizures of their equipment, and to provide them with some money from the banks, that they could get their crop in?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — The hon. member's questions relative to the cost-price squeeze, and what this government or what I am prepared to do about it, I think are fairly evident in the recent budget — a renewed commitment, if you like, for the first time ever, in this province, where agriculture has got something more than lip service. Mr. Speaker, for the information of all the members here, and I don't suppose it's any surprise to any that were here yesterday, that cost-price squeeze was further exacerbated yesterday when those members opposite cost dairy farmers in this province hundreds of thousands of dollars.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. Order please.

MR. LUSNEY: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A new question to the Minister of Agriculture. It seems quite obvious that you're not prepared to look at the situation as it is. Do you not agree that at this point there are some 20,000 farmers in this province that are facing bankruptcy, or are not able to get money this spring to get their crop in, which is coming very soon? Do you not agree that that problem is out there, and you should be dealing with it now? What are you . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — I acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, that there are some farmers in Saskatchewan that are facing difficult times. However, having said that, this province here — the

April 10, 1984

farmers in this province – if statistics are anything to go by, are probably in a lot better condition than virtually every other province in Canada. For example, the hon. member mentions bankruptcies. In this province here we've had something like one per 1,400 farmers. I'm not happy about that. But you've only got look at the province to the east, Manitoba, where the bankruptcies, the farm bankruptcies, number something like one for every 500 to 600 farmers.

Also, one has only got to look at the agricultural outlook conferences, the statistics that came out of there. It suggested that Saskatchewan's net realized farm income is going to increase by 16 per cent. In Manitoba, the same prediction was for a decrease of 26 per cent. So I'm not happy about the cost price squeeze that farmers are facing today, but certainly it could be a lot worse. It could be like it is in Manitoba.

In so far as what we are going to do about it, and I don't like to get into lengthy answers, but I think one has only got to look – one has only got to look at the kinds of things that we've done. We can talk about interest rate relief, tax relief, insurance programs in the hog and the beef industry, a counselling and assistance program for farmers – a \$4 million fund –and I could go on, and I could go on, and I could go on, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSNEY: — A question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, do you not agree though, that many of the programs that were introduced in your budget are not going to assist those 20,00 farmers that are facing bankruptcy, that cannot get a loan to put their crop in? And if they don't get their crop in, the bank will foreclose on them. Do you not agree that any of your other programs will not assist these farmers, and that at this point there is only one solution – and you know what it is – is to introduce legislation that will protect these farmers?

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Well first of all, the numbers the hon. member uses, I'm not sure where he's getting them from. If he wants to table a document that he has that I don't have, in so far as the number of farmers facing bankruptcies, I certainly have seen no numbers like that.

I only have to remind you, if there's a farmer bankrupt in Saskatchewan today, it's probably because of what you cost the dairy farmer yesterday in sitting on your hands. Where were you yesterday?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — “NDP will attempt to improve image.” I guess this is what you are trying to do. This is the press headlines. And now you're trying to reverse that with this kind of new-found interest in the farmers of Saskatchewan. Yesterday you sat on your hands. Today you're trying to make out like you're the new saviour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSNEY: — Question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, three hours in this House did not bankrupt any dairy farmers, but we are talking, Mr. Minister – would you not agree? – about farmers that cannot put their crop in, that cannot get loans to get their crop in, and are facing foreclosures by the banks. Do you not realize that to be a problem? And have you had any representation from farmers or farm groups regarding this problem that's out there?

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Because, Mr. Speaker, we recognize that there may be some farmers facing financial difficulties out there, we have announced in this budget the setting up of a \$4-million fund. And for the second time in this House, I will read to the hon. member what this would do:

It will be established to assist financially troubled farmers with viable operations who

need temporary assistance. It will be a government-funded by farmer-run program.

MR. LUSNEY: — New question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, the \$4 million that you're talking about . . . If a farmer that is facing bankruptcy is not able to get a loan from the bank to get his crop in this spring, is that, in your opinion, a farmer that is viable? Who would decide on who is a viable farmer and who isn't?

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — The details of this will be made available as quickly as possible. My officials have been working feverishly to get the legislation worked up and ready, and it's my belief that, in fact, the scenario you've proposed probably would be covered.

MR. KOSKIE: — Question to the Minister of Agriculture. As the Minister of Agriculture will know that the crisis in respect to the cash flow of farmers did not, in fact, occur overnight . . . they have the particular crisis right today, and you have brought a budget, and you are indicating clearly that you are not in a position to implement even the meagre help that you have in the budget. It's going to take weeks.

The farmers, Mr. Minister, are in a crisis, and I'm asking you specifically: will you re-examine your position and come in with some legislation as has been proposed by the member from Assiniboia?

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — We'll be coming in with legislation, and it will do something to solve the problem. It will be something more than rhetoric, which is all the hon. agriculture critic from that side of the House has ever offered. It just absolutely intrigues me that we have this new found saviour of the Saskatchewan farmer, when yesterday you sat on your hands. You fiddled while Saskatchewan farmers burned.

And the kinds of cash injections that Saskatchewan farmers need to put the crops in this year are the kinds of things that I discussed with the Hon. Senator Argue and the Hon. Eugene Whelan in the last couple of weeks. I would hope that the Liberal member sitting to your left — tight and cozy with you over there — would raise it with his colleagues and see a 3 or 4 or \$500 million pay-out out of that Western Grains Stabilization Fund, and see the taxes taken off farm fuels, so that farmers have the kind of cash they need to put this crop in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The minister has finally come clean. He has admitted that he can't do anything, and he wants to blame the federal Liberals. That's great. That's what that resolution's about today. The question my colleagues are asking is: are you going to do something for the farmers that have emergency troubles, or are you going to do something for the viable farmer in temporary trouble? That's your problem. Your program is for the guy that wants to expand.

Mr. Speaker, the question I have for the minister is: what about the guy that's in trouble? What about the average farmer — the 20,000 farmers that aren't viable in your books — that the Premier's written about that we can do without? Those are the ones we're worried about, because you've written them off. What about the 20,000 farmers? What about some debt moratorium legislation so that they've got a chance to pick up on your programs and maybe on what the Liberals are going to do?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Yesterday the dairy farmers of this province were facing a crisis. You were putting dairy farmers on the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. Give the minister an opportunity to answer.

April 10, 1984

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Yesterday you . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please! I've called for order. Before I'm even sitting down you're blasting away again, and I'm going to ask the member to be a bit cautious of his actions.

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Yesterday, by your very inaction, hon. agriculture critic, you were pushing dairy farmers to the brink of bankruptcy in this province. Today you've got the hypocrisy to stand up and pretend to be the saviour of Saskatchewan farmers.

MR. SPEAKER: — I'm going to ask for order on both sides of the House. Proceed, Mr. Minister.

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Mr. Speaker, as I've already indicated, and I could go through the agriculture budget in detail, outline the kinds of things we have done and are going to do: the \$4 million assistance program for Saskatchewan farmers, the \$11 million school tax rebate off the home quarter, the new and better crop insurance, the new and better beef insurance, the new and better hog insurance, the interest rate relief through the Ag Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan, the interest rate relief for farmers through the farm purchase program, the interest rate relief through crown sales policies, the rural natural gas program. I could go through all of those, but it would never get through your thick head, I believe.

MR. ENGEL: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Agriculture has again sang the same song to us. They've got it for the big guy. You've got money to expand. You've got money to buy pasture leases. You've got money for all the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Does the member have a question? He's making a speech.

MR. ENGEL: — My question is: what are you going to do with the 20 per cent of the farmers that are in trouble? You have no money for them. They aren't expanding. They want to buy their fuel this spring. They want to put in their crop. They can't buy cattle. They can't buy it. They're not even buying fridges and stoves. Go down to Main Street and see what they're doing. They haven't got any money, Mr. Minister. They're afraid of the banks because they might lose their land before it's time to seed. What are you going to do for them?

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — I'll give the hon. member full marks at trying to reshine his tarnished image because of his inaction yesterday. However, that kind of very much a window-dressing approach is not what Saskatchewan farmers need today. I would ask the hon. member: have you sat down with the senators?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. The minister is on his feet to answer a question, not to ask questions.

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I would hope that the hon. members have taken the time, as have I, to meet with the federal ministers with a view to seeing if we can't get the kind of cash injection so very much needed in this province to put in this spring's crop. The cash injections I'm thinking of are a pay-out of the Western Grain Stabilization fund. I mean, it's the 3 and \$400 millions that we need. It's the removal of the federal farm fuel taxes that we need in this province. Couple that with our initiatives, and Saskatchewan farmers will fare just fine.

MR. LUSNEY: — Question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, would you not agree that it does very little good for you to stand up in this House and criticize what the federal government isn't doing, when you have an opportunity to do something in this province, as a government? Do you not agree that you can, today or tomorrow or sometimes this week, introduce – if this is what you want to do – your own legislation that will provide a loan guarantee for farmers and will give farm security act protection that they cannot be repossessed? Do you not agree that you can do this for the farmers of Saskatchewan in this House, and save a good number of those farms from going bankrupt, and keep them producing

as good citizens, hard-working citizens of this province?

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — I will be shortly introducing legislation that will do just what the budget speech of the Minister of Finance outlined some two or three weeks ago. We're a party of action, not rhetoric.

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. The minister will be aware that in Alberta they have the same basic complaints with the federal government that you have raised, that is, pay out in the stabilization program and the interim initial price of grain.

In Alberta, I want to say, Mr. Minister, they faced the same inaction by the federal government. But they have, in fact, introduced a fuel rebate program of 31.5 cents a gallon. In the crisis that the farmers are in today, why won't you at least follow the steps of Alberta . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. I'm going to cite to the member, paragraph 359, point (8), and it says that:

A question that has previously been answered ought not to be asked again.

And that question has been asked in question period, not today, but several times in the last . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Order, please. Order, please. That question has been asked in question period a number of times during this session, and it's that thing that I am saying shall not be asked again. Your question is out of order.

MR. KOSKIE: — I want to indicate, Mr. Minister, that other provinces have put in programs which have been very beneficial in the crisis during the time of a very tight cash flow. You can look at Alberta's program. You can look at the Manitoba program. They are direct actions taken on behalf of the farmers who are in very difficult situations. You sit there, and all you do is criticize the federal government. What are you going to do for the crisis that the farmers are facing today? That's the question; answer it.

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — For the farmers that are in a financial crisis, those that are suffering what they believe is an irreversible, if you like, cost-price squeeze, we will be putting in place that is government-funded, farmer-operated \$4 million fund. And details will be forthcoming shortly when we introduce it to the House.

And in so far as what other measures are in place, once again I could cite the numerous interest rate relief programs that we've got in place. And I can think that, not only do we have less farmers in Saskatchewan going bankrupt, but we started more new farmers in the last year.

And we've had more land transactions take place, more intergenerational transfers take place, virtually, in this province than in any other province in the country, because of imaginative programs like the farm purchase program.

And I could go again into the interest rate relief programs, and the tax relief, the rural natural gas, the beef insurance, the hog insurance — but you don't listen.

MR. LUSNEY: — Mr. Minister, do you not agree that by the lack of actions of this government, the lack of any action to protect the farmers in a time of serious crisis that he has — do you not agree that what this is doing is just showing that you do not care about what happens to agriculture, and to many of the farmers — the 20,000 farmers that are in trouble — and that many of these farmers are going to be forced onto the welfare rolls by you if you don't take some necessary steps to protect them?

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — The simple answer is no, I do not agree, and the public are not impressed by your flip-flop. Yesterday, you were prepared to let farmers go down the drain.

April 10, 1984

Today, you pretend to be their saviour.

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Minister, by your very statement that you just made, what are you indicating when you're saying in the last year you've had more land sales, more land transactions? What does that indicate to you? What does that indicate? Why is all this land on the market all of a sudden? Tell me that. Why is all this market . . . They're avoiding bankruptcy, and selling to the big guy, and that's who you've got your money for.

You've got \$350,000 for a guy that can borrow it at 8 per cent interest to expand his unit. But show me a young farmer . . . How can a young farmer get that kind of money?

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Mr. Speaker, our track record, in so far as of having the provincial government facilitate what the young farmers and the dads and the uncles want out there, is second to none in the country. Our track record is so good here, in fact, that even the Alberta minister has received some bad press, if you like, because articles were appearing in the newspapers in Alberta suggesting that Saskatchewan is the friendliest place for farmers. And why you see that kind of thing, and why you saw a copy, an imitation of our program pop up in Ontario, is for this reason: in a mere 14 months we have put something in the order of 2,500 young farmers in the position to own their own land.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — And that compares, and that compares very favourably with your administration's approach where the state should won the farm, where, in fact, in a 10-year period — not a 14-month period, but a 10-year period — you ended up only putting 100 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

PRIORITY OF DEBATE

Grain Prices

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, I would ask leave to move that this Assembly give priority of debate to a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely:

In view of the news report suggesting an imminent federal government decision on initial grain prices for the '84-85 crop year, it is urgent that this Assembly make known its view, that the initial grain price for '84-85 should be set at a level no lower than the prevailing initial prices in '83-84.

MR. SPEAKER: — The member has asked for leave. Is leave granted? Proceed.

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Speaker, at the close of my remarks I wish to make the following motion, that this Assembly give priority of debate under rule 17 of the following matter:

In view of news reports suggesting an imminent federal government decision on initial grain prices for the '84-85 crop year, it is urgent that this Assembly make known its views that the initial grain prices for '84-85 should be set at a level no lower than prevailing initial prices in the '83-84 year.

Mr. Speaker, there are several news items that I would like to refer to, and one was found just yesterday, or this past week, in this last *Western Producer* and it's titled, "Change payment philosophy?".

If the federal government lowers initial prices in '84-85, it should make up the difference to farmers with a deficiency payment, says the Canadian Wheat Board's producer advisory committee.

What they're suggesting is that if the world market price, the Canadian Wheat Board's advisory committee suggests, if the world market price falls below, then they should make up the difference.

In the face of the predictions of a big drop in initial prices in the new crop year, the committee last week sent a message to Ottawa urging that the prices be maintained at the present level, if at all possible, with the government assuming a greater risk.

And I think what we're trying to do here today, Mr. Speaker, is we, as an Assembly, should urge the federal government to take that risk.

A *Leader-Post* article, "Higher grain prices," hinted at Ottawa:

The federal cabinet may well decide this week to permit higher than warranted initial grain prices for the crop year beginning August 1, Senator Hazen Argue in charge of the wheat board reported. While he didn't place (and I'm quoting) a monetary figure on the possible reduction, speculation has it that a decrease of as much as a dollar from the \$4.63 bushel could happen. The minister pointed out he'd been subject to criticism because the barley pool was in a deficit by \$5.5 million (is what they subsidized barley with last year), a sum paid from the federal treasury.

Further in the article,

Argue was vague on the possibility of introducing amendments to the Act during the current session of parliament. He said he hoped this would happen, but such action required the co-operation of all parties.

So the resolution before us today, I'm urging that all parties be notified, and that a copy of this be sent to the leaders of all the parties so we get their full support. And I want to quote from one more article – "Income signals don't look good," in the *Western Producer*.

On the prairies there is a growing possibility of static or falling income levels. As of a March 16 news conference on commodity price and supply outlook, department officials said, "Lower than expected crop prices, and higher than expected input costs, increases were reduced to earlier predictions slightly."

The article goes on to say that on March 15: "The Bank of Canada increased the trend-setting bank rate to 10.56 per cent." And what happened? It was the highest level in 15 months. Within hours, the Bank of Commerce and the Continental Bank increased their prime rates 11.5 per cent from 11 per cent.

The article goes on to say that, "Farm income prospects on the Prairies look particularly uncertain. Agriculture Canada officials predict that increased grain stocks will depress grain prices this year by between 5 and 10 per cent, and some even predict a drop of as much as 20 per cent."

Mr. Speaker, I prepared a Telex yesterday, and I sent it off this morning to the Minister of Agriculture, personally. And I wrote this:

I write to urge you to reject recommendations for lower initial grain prices in the new crop year '84-85. On behalf of my New Democratic Party caucus colleagues in the Saskatchewan legislature, I call on the federal government to maintain, at a minimum, initial grain prices at their current level. A reduction in initial prices would be a severe blow to Saskatchewan farmers, and to the hopes for a widespread economic recovery in our province.

April 10, 1984

Farmers have already been hurt by the announcement Monday of increased interest charges from the Farm Credit Corporation. We urge you not to hit farmers with a double whammy of bad economic news.

I sent that off this morning, Mr. Speaker.

No doubt, and I agree that possibly Senator Argue is playing a cute game of his own – I agree with that. He's trying to make himself look like a hero if the federal government agrees to hold the prices up. But we can't take that chance. We can't let him play the political game. We have to insist that the federal government stabilizes the price, and stabilizes the hopes of Saskatchewan farmers.

As was discussed in the question period today, when we've had agreement from the Minister of Agriculture, that the farming economy is in a depressed mood; the farmers are hurting across this province. And for Ottawa to make a political football out of the grain stabilization fund, and for Ottawa to give Hazen Argue a chance to play his cute little political game out here in the West, isn't good enough. The answer is that the farmers are strapped for money.

I think the world situation, Mr. Speaker, indicates that there are surpluses of grain. There are surpluses of grain. Australia and Argentina crops have rebounded after a drought in the last year. U.S.'s restrictions that have been lifted off the amount of acreages they can seed will likely cause a larger than normal winter wheat crop. How much wheat Russia and China are going to buy is uncertain, but things in that market can change dramatically, and they can change quickly. Winter-kill on U.S. wheats could substantially reduce the harvest. We don't know what that harvest is going to be yet.

But the nature of the pricing of the grain in Canada has been . . . Canada has been isolated from the world countries that are marketing their grain abroad. The Canadian farmer has, in the past, had to go it alone, and I think with this one step with the federal government guaranteeing the initial price, the farmers, by putting in their crop this spring, will know and will have some assurance and some hope that there will be a crop. They have to take that chance.

Agriculture doesn't have the same structure in place, as do the large corporate companies and the commodity producers that can regulate and set their own price. We have producers dispersed across the country that have to take their chances, but thank goodness that there is a corporation like the Canadian Wheat Board, from this article I've quoted earlier. We appreciate the members that are on the advisory committee and the pressure they're putting on the federal government. They're doing an excellent job for farmers. They give us a little bit of clout in the world market, and we, as farmers, have something that we have to stand behind.

I don't like any suggestion by any commodity group that would hint at undermining or weakening the role of the Canadian Wheat Board in our society. Cargill Grain and Pioneer Grain Company, and even the Palliser Wheat Growers have hinted at going back to the jungle-type society we had under the grain exchange in the past, when I was first a little fellow, and I can remember the prices of grain.

We don't need to go back to that. Our party stands four-square in support of the Canadian Wheat Board and in support of orderly marketing. We want to endorse that concept.

The federal government's strings that are attached to the Canadian Wheat Board at this time are very minimal, and I think we have to make a case for the Canadian Wheat Board in this resolution and the one thing that the farmers have to stand behind.

The second case we have to make here today is the case for maintaining an initial price. That is the guarantee we, as farmers, have. The federal government picked up the shortfall in the barley

crops. Down in our country barley isn't a big crop, but I think in a lot of the members opposite, barley is a big number. And the federal government picked up that difference. It cost the treasury \$5.5 million, and that was a real shot in the arm for the barley growers.

I think we need that same kind of guarantee. If all things fall in place like I suggested earlier, that the price, the crops, and the winter wheat crop in the United States is up there, we could have a depressed price. And I think that we need to get that guarantee for the farmers.

This spring the farmer has to plant his crop. He doesn't know what he'll get for it. He doesn't know how much he will produce. And if he does harvest a bountiful crop, he doesn't know how much of that he's going to sell.

We're trapped into a situation, Mr. Speaker, where one of those unknowns have been – an assurance has been given to farmers in the past. The Canadian Wheat Board has told us in the past, before we put our crops in, what we'd get, and they're going to be making that announcement very shortly.

We can't turn off the tap on the costs of some of the other things we're doing. We can't control what we're going to get, and we can't control our input costs. Bankruptcies, receiverships, and foreclosures are going to be on the upswing this coming year. We know that is a trend.

The minister has indicated that many, many land transactions have taken place, since he's the Minister of Agriculture, than ever have before in the history of our country. That isn't a sign of his programs working, Mr. Speaker. That is a sign that things are tough, and people are selling and liquidating before they go bankrupt.

If we don't get some immediate help for the serious problems facing farmers, we'll have to face economic and social consequences. So, Mr. Speaker, to solicit the debate from other members, the colleagues of mine, and from members opposite, that we'd have this resolution jointly, it gives me a great deal of pleasure today to move first reading, seconded by my colleague, the member for Pelly:

That this Assembly give priority of debate under rule 17 to the following matter:

In view of the news reports suggesting an imminent federal government decision on the initial grain prices for the '84-85 crop year, it is urgent that this Assembly make known its view that the initial grain prices for '84-85 should be set at a level no lower than the prevailing initial prices in '83-84.

I so move.

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to make a few remarks on the motion before the House, and certainly I think . . . I know myself, and I can, as well, speak for a few of my colleagues on this side of the legislature; this member and my colleagues have made representations to the federal minister to see if, in fact, all the problems that Saskatchewan farmers today can't be addressed – whether it be farm fuels, pay-outs on the western grains stabilization, and not the least of which is the initial prices he receives for his grains and, as well, quota levels.

All these things are a concern out there today. And I probably will just take a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, and outline for the hon. members exactly what initiatives I have taken personally, outline them for them, to show that we have been on top of these issues for some good long time. And I can go right back to last August when, in fact, I wrote the Hon. Eugene Whelan, at that time, relative to a very severe problem facing, I know, probably, at least a couple of the constituencies of members opposite.

April 10, 1984

The serious problem they were facing at that time, of course, was gloom blotch and wheat midge. We recognized that and made representations to the federal minister asking that he would provide whatever support he could, necessary to develop control techniques to ensure that this crop year and this future crop production in Saskatchewan not be severely curtailed.

And as well, in September I wrote to Senator Argue at that time, asking him to support at least doubling the current maximums allowed under the Prairie Grains Advance Payment Act. And I think we've had some success on that one.

And because we do enjoy a very cordial relationship with our neighbours to the west, the Hon. Leroy Fjordbotten and myself on September 15 of 1983 sent a telex to the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board relative to initial payments for barley. And I think we had some success on that one as well. It's unfortunate that we didn't have the support of the members opposite, but certainly it's nice to have the support of our sister province to the west.

As well, in October of '73, I wrote the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board again, Senator Hazen Argue, October 17th. I thanked him for his announcement relative to the initial prices for oats and barley, but I pointed out to him that there was some room to move, as well, on the initial prices for spring wheat and durum – pointing out what were some historical levels, and the fact that I thought that probably there was some room to move up there. And part of the letter went on to say: "that there are serious cash flows being experienced today, and I think it is imperative at any time that producers receive the maximum amount at the time of delivery." Unfortunately, we've had less success with that one, but certainly we've made the representation.

Then again, in December, an additional letter to Minister Whelan, relative to the wheat midge problem, and I'm sure the hon. member from Pelly, and perhaps Quill Lakes, would share my concerns on this one. Representations again, in that our department had identified a couple of chemicals that might possibly be used . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And the hon. member from Shaunavon, once again today, has not been on his feet in defence of Saskatchewan farmers, not was he yesterday, but he's quite content to snipe from the sidelines – never in defence of the farmers – on his feet.

As well, in February, in February, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wrote again to the Hon. Minister Whelan relative to the changes, the implications of Bill C-155 that are facing Saskatchewan farmers, outlined for him some of the sorts of things that had been promised, if you like, during that debate, and that we were looking for. And of course, they included things like the \$20 million for soil and water conservation research, the 5-year 175 million agriculture development package, and I went on to list other things as well.

As well, in March of this year . . . I think, as the members can appreciate, we've almost been in constant contact. As well, in March this year I met with both Senator Whelan, or Senator Argue, rather, it's not as . . . I apologize for the slip of the tongue there – he's not a senator yet as my hon. colleague says – I met once again with Senator Argue and Minister Whelan, pressing a number of issues to their attention, including things like: financial problems facing Saskatchewan farmers, disaster assistance of the Hudson Bay area farmers, the issue of farm fuel taxes, initial prices, quota levels and, in fact, it was at that meeting on March 21 that I laid on the table \$4 million. This was the indication of our commitment to Saskatchewan farmers that might be facing financial difficulty — \$4 million on the table.

Senator Argue, as I understood it, had been at a meeting in the Hudson Bay area and suggested that if the farmers came up with some . . . if the province came up with some funds, they might be prepared to look at matching it, or a proposal.

And so, in fact, we put a proposal on the table. And it's unfortunate that the Liberal member for the legislature is not in his seat, because I would ask him to use his good offices to expedite that

assistance that his colleagues have indicated might be forthcoming.

But let there be no question, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This government here is committed and behind every farmer in Saskatchewan. And we put our money on the table. We do something. Our rhetoric is not hollow, such as the members across the way.

And as well, after that meeting, I followed it up. I followed up my conversations with Minister Whelan in a letter dated late last month, urging him once again to provide assistance. And the final line in my paragraph was, or the last line of the letter was, "As spring seeding is quickly approaching, immediate assistance would be most beneficial."

So as I think the members can see, our dialogue – representations, correspondence – with the federal ministers has been ongoing from the day I stepped into this office, and it will continue to be that way. Unfortunately, it's not always as responsive as we'd like. But certainly on this issue here of initial grain prices and in quota levels, both were discussed with the ministers when I met with them, as was federal fuel taxes on farm fuels, and as well, the western grain stabilization model.

Because quite frankly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's my belief that the kind of cash injection that Saskatchewan farmers need to assist with this seeding of this billion dollar undertaking of the spring seeding that happens – this mega-project, if you like – that happens every spring in this province, the kind of money that these farmers need out there is in the hundreds of millions of dollars. And where is that money? It's sitting in a Western Grains Stabilization Fund that's proven to be less than sensitive, and tied up in taxation measures imposed by the federal government . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

And the hon. member from Quill Lakes, who today roars from his seat, and yesterday sat on his hands while the dairy farmers were being forced into bankruptcy, suggests that the oil companies have it.

Well I want to tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the kind of tax holiday we put in place for Saskatchewan farmers will do the same thing for the livestock industry as our oil royalty program has done for the oil industry – the same kinds of things. I would be most interested to hear the member from Shaunavon get up and talk about how good oil royalties are in this province.

But of course, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's not just enough for us to talk about what the federal government could, or maybe, or should do. And certainly I realize that the hundreds of millions of dollars that would help solve this cash crunch this spring are in the hands of the federal government and could be forthcoming. But at the same time we accept our responsibility and have put in place, ever since our election, a number of measures to assist farmers on their input side, and as well, a number of measures to rev up the agricultural engine.

And unlike the NDP, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are not faced with press such as they get. In fact in yesterday's *Globe and Mail*, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the headline read, "Leader dismisses four NDP polls." They are down to the point where they are almost eliminated from people's conscience, down lower than they've been in the last 24 years, and I can see why – because they have one-track minds; they have no imagination; they have nothing to offer the farmers out there; they have the blinkers on; they have the traditional, historical, socialist dogma.

But what are we offering the farmers of Saskatchewan? Our initiatives have been varied and many. To top the list, to help farmers through the cost-price squeeze they're in, and one that touches every farmer out there in Saskatchewan was our announcement relative to removal of the school taxes off the home quarter – an \$11 million cash injection into rural Saskatchewan . As well, we've put many and very successful programs in place relative to addressing the number one input cost that farmers faced when we took over, and that was interest rates. In 1982 that was their number one input cost, and since then we've addressed it with some very successful

April 10, 1984

programs: the Farm Purchase Program, the Agriculture Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan, our Crown land sales policy.

Just to give you an indication, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of what you can do in terms of helping the farmers of Saskatchewan if you put a little imagination in place, let's compare the Farm Purchase Program and land bank. Let's compare those two programs.

So the first question that one would ask himself: how many young farmers did the land bank program help? How many young farmers did land bank help? How many young farmers were helped to own their own land through land bank in 10 years? In 10 years, Mr. Speaker, how many did they help? Well the answer is 151. Okay. How many young farmers did the Farm Purchase Program help in 14 months? – 2,500 or very close to that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, 2,500 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The hon. member from Shaunavon wants to know if that's 2 or 3 per cent. Well what that is, is about 5,000 times as many as you helped in 10 years. That's how many it is, hon. member for Shaunavon. It's about 5,000 more than you ever helped. Five thousand times more . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

I can see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I've hit a nerve. And I challenge the hon. members across the way to stand up in this House . . . I challenged them the other day, and the agricultural critic never said a word. I've challenged every member across on that side of the House. I've challenged them to stand up and tell the people of Saskatchewan: what do you stand on land bank? Where do you stand on land bank? Tell us. Tell the people of Saskatchewan that you love that socialist stupidity. Tell us. Stand up. Stand u, hon. member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg. Stand up and tell the farmers of this province that you're going to bring land bank in. Stand up and tell them. Stand up and tell them. I challenge you. You're noticeable by your silence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — In a mere 14 months we've helped 2,500. And when we set out with that program, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we had two or three goals in mind. Number one is: we didn't want to help the rich, necessarily. We wanted to focus it on the young and the beginning farmers. And have we done that? Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The average age is 26 – 26, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The young farmer.

And secondly, Mr. Speaker, we recognize that in Saskatchewan the intergenerational transfer, the family farm transfer in Saskatchewan, is very much a part of the fibre of this province. And as a result of that, 50 per cent of our transactions are within the family farm. And over half of those young people are first-time owners. Clear proof that we can address input costs for young farmers.

And I could go on, Mr. deputy Speaker, and talk about tax relief and other areas, about our counselling assistance for farmers. And I've detailed at some great length the representations and the discussions that I've had with the ministers relative to quotas, initial grain prices, farm taxes.

But before I take my seat, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment to the motion and add that Rule No. 17 be amended, the motion be amended by adding the following:

And further, that this Assembly, once again, urge the federal government to recognize the valuable economic contribution made by western farmers to the Canadian economy by abolishing the federal tax on farm fuels and facilitating a pay-out from the Western Grains Stabilization Fund.

I move that, seconded by the hon. member from Last Mountain-Touchwood.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order, order, order, order! The motion, moved by the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg and seconded by the member from Pelly, is very specific and the initial

grain prices is the . . . and the amendment does not focus on the initial grain prices, so I find the amendment out of order.

The debate continues.

MR. TUSA: — Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to rise this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, to enter into this debate. May I add at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that I agree with the intent of the resolution. But we see this afternoon a most dismal performance by members of the opposite party who stand here in the legislature, and posture before the people of Saskatchewan, and pretend that they care about the farmers of this province.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at the record because records speak for themselves; posturing does not. Let us look at the record of this government. Let us see how much they cared about the farmers of Saskatchewan, and let us review some of the legislation they passed in this province.

They talk, Mr. Speaker, about reducing the costs to farmers, and let us look at how they reduced the costs to farmers when they were the administration, how they played cynical politics — they played cynical politics with the farmers of this province.

It wasn't many years ago, Mr. speaker, that the members opposite sat as a government and brought in a fuel tax rebate to help reduce the costs to Saskatchewan. Until the election was over, until the election was over, Mr. speaker, at which time they immediately took off the fuel tax rebate. That's a cynical way in which . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order, order! Order! The priority of debate is for the purpose of discussing a definite matter.

MR. TUSA: — Mr. Speaker, in order to make my point that I'm indeed in favour of protecting farmers against falling grain prices, I think it's important that I point out some of the policies of the people that moved this resolution. And I know they don't like to hear it, Mr. Speaker, so they object. However, I felt it incumbent that the people of Saskatchewan know just where this resolution is coming from. Let me continue.

There's no question, Mr. Speaker, that we, as a government, stand for keeping prices as high as possible to farmers in the initial coming crop year. The Minister of Agriculture of our government has endorsed that. However, Mr. Speaker, when we were talking about saving farmers a few cents per bushel — saving farmers a few cents per bushel — may I remind the members who sit over there that the farmers in Saskatchewan will not forget how they helped the Liberal government overthrow the Crow rate in this country.

Mr. Speaker, they don't like to hear that either, Mr. Speaker. But that, that will be remembered long in the history of this province. That will be long remembered. It was the NDP, Mr. Speaker. Five members from Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, five NDP MPs, sitting in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, who voted with the Liberals to do away with the Crow rate. They were the ones who threw out the Joe Clark government, Mr. Speaker. They were the ones who gave the opportunity to the Liberals to be back in power to remove the Crow rate. And now they sit here, Mr. Speaker, fostering before the people of Saskatchewan and bleating about how they care.

Mr. Speaker, may I add that yesterday the people of Saskatchewan saw very, very clearly what these members feel about the farmers in this province when they stood in this House and voted against the farmer — the dairy producers.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order! I must warn the member again that priority of debate is for a definite matter, as put out in the motion. And I would ask him to stay on the motion.

MR. TUSA: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me make a few more remarks. In concluding my

April 10, 1984

remarks, which is directly related to our government's position — The intent of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, is to have the initial prices in this province maintained at last year's levels, at least.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the intent then was to demonstrate our government's concern for the farmer's costs. And, Mr. Speaker, I would then like to list off a few very, very positive pieces of legislation which our government has brought in to help the farmers of this province, to help the farmers in this province.

First thing we did, to make sure that the cost-price squeeze does not affect farmers as severely in Saskatchewan as in other provinces, was to bring in a farm purchase program — a farm purchase program, Mr. Speaker, — which assists the young farmers in this province to get into agricultural.

Let me compare this to the previous administration. Under the previous administration, Mr. Speaker . . . Mr. Speaker, under the previous administration farmers in Saskatchewan were pleading for a method whereby they could pass on the family farm from one generation to the other.

Our government responded immediately, on becoming government, and brought in the farm purchase program. And our Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, has pointed out clearly the benefits of 2,500 farmers in this province.

We have brought in several other things, which I'll briefly mention. The \$25 livestock investment tax credit, which will help untold beef producers in the province. We're introducing a \$4 million fund to help farmers who are in dire need of assistance. Mr. Speaker, another measure we have taken is to remove the education tax on the home quarter.

All these policies, Mr. Speaker, combined, will help to protect the farmer in this province. And that, Mr. Speaker, is the intent of this resolution,.

Let us now look at some of the federal Liberal policies that are affecting farmers in Saskatchewan. They were the ones, Mr. Speaker, who combined with the five Saskatchewan MPs in Ottawa to overthrow the Clark government, and overthrow the Crow rate.

They are the ones, Mr. Speaker, who imposed a capital gains tax on the farmers of this province. And I get calls daily from people who cannot pass on the family farm because of this onerous tax.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order, order! The member from Last Mountain-Touchwood seems to be getting off of the main motion, and I would ask him to stay on the motion.

MR. TUSA: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by focusing on the Liberal Party. And I would like to ask the new Liberal member here in this House: where do the federal Liberals stand on this issue? Where is their spokesman who is not in their House this afternoon? The people of Saskatchewan are very, very concerned about federal government policies which do not protect the farmers of this province, but which, indeed, manipulate the farmers in Saskatchewan.

We see the spectre of the federal government manipulating a pay-out to Saskatchewan farmers from our stabilization plan — \$900 million in the stabilization plan, \$300 million of which belongs to farmers.

We see the spectre, Mr. speaker, of the federal government manipulating a national red meat stabilization plan, once more trying to move it towards closer to a date with the federal election.

Those are the things that the federal government does, and those are the cynical things that the farmers in this province watch, and the farmers of this province will assess in the next federal election.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I ask once more the member from Regina North West, I ask once more the federal Liberal representative in this House: will he please speak out for the farmers in this province? Will he please urge the federal government to act immediately to make certain that the initial price of grain is kept to at least last year's level in the upcoming crop year?

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSNEY: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the Minister of Agriculture and the member for Last Mountain-Touchwood with some great interest. Listening to their debate on a very specific motion regarding initial prices for grain for the farmers, they seem to avoid trying to address themselves to that resolution and talk about everything you could think of: the land bank, the oil companies, the Crow rate. We know that all of this affects it. It affects what farmers are feeling today, but it had very little bearing on the motion that was before us.

Farmers today are concerned because there has been some talk about the initial price of grain going down. And they are in a financial situation today where they could not afford to lose any more money than what they're losing now. They cannot afford to continue farming if the price of wheat went that far below the cost of production. They're far enough below it now, and the farmers are scratching and scraping and surviving out there, doing so in a way that no other industry would ever do. But the farmer is a survivor, and he continues to struggle, and he continues to survive.

And this government had an opportunity today to talk about how they could provide some security for the farmer — provide some security by passing a motion that would assure the farmer that he will not get less for his grain than what he is getting now. If anything, they should have been talking about asking for an increase. That is what the farmer needs. But this government is no different than the federal government. They are not concerned whether the initial price of grain stays as high as it is, or if it goes down. It is not a concern of theirs.

There is no difference between the Conservative government in Saskatchewan or the Liberal government in Ottawa. They both have about as much concern for the farmer in Ottawa as this government has in Saskatchewan. Because, if they were concerned about it here, they would push on Ottawa to implement more programs for agriculture, and they would move resolutions that would urge the federal government to make a payment on the grain stabilization plan, which would help.

Initial prices are something that are important to the farmers, and they are concerned about it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And the members are saying I have to stick very closely to what the resolution says. Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that one should speak to the resolution, but when you hear many of the comments that were coming forward regarding Bill C-155 and oil companies and land bank and everything else . . . Well, Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult to stick to the resolution without answering some of the comments that were made in this House, because it's very obvious that this government does not intend to do anything to assist the farmers today.

Many of them are facing difficulties because the initial price of grain is too low now. They are facing bankruptcy out in the rural areas of Saskatchewan. They can't borrow any more money from the banks to put their crops in because the return on the product that they produce was just not sufficient to pay the expenses. And these farmers are facing those difficulties out in Saskatchewan.

It's not only Saskatchewan; it's a problem to other provinces. But some of the other provinces are taking some positive steps to resolve the problems that the farmers have. And this

April 10, 1984

government talks about a \$4 million program that they've introduced in a budget that does very little, very little to assist the farmer – very little to assist the farmer.

Because their initial prices have been too low in the past, and because they should be getting more for their grain, is what is forcing some of the farmers into bankruptcy today. They don't get the price for their product that they should be getting.

This government could assist them. They could pass two pieces of legislation that won't cost them a cent, but it would support those 20,000 farmers out there that are on the verge of shutting down; 20,000 farmers that will wind up on welfare because the only people that will profit from that will be the banks, and not the farmers. The loss will be to the taxpayers and to the poor farmers. And yet this government refuses to take any positive action – any positive action whatsoever – to try and assist the farmers of Saskatchewan.

It's an industry that not only produces food, but it's one that really improves our economy, if it's healthy. It keeps our small business places going, and it's not only the farmer that's facing bankruptcy today. I think we're going to see the same thing in small business. Many of them are going to go bankrupt because of the inaction of this government, the inaction of this government over the past two years, and the very visible inaction of this government for the coming year.

The minister talked about farmers that are viable and how their program is going to assist those farmers. And he talks about land bank which they've done away with. There is no land bank program any more, so he says we should be talking about it. It doesn't make much sense to talk about something that doesn't exist any more.

Let's talk about something that does exist, and that's the problem that the farmers are facing in Saskatchewan. Let's talk about what we can do to help those farmers, and let's do something to help them, because talk is cheap and we've heard a lot of that from this government. They continue to talk day after day, week after week, and, it seems, year after year, and refuse to take any positive action. Not only to help the farmer, because by helping the farmer it would help the small business person; it would help everyone in this province. It would keep people working.

So a start could be made by helping agriculture, but the minister is not really interested on how you can help agriculture, how you can improve the situation that exists within agriculture today. The minister, instead, feels that it's more worthwhile to give a \$100 million tax royalty holiday for the oil companies, rather than make sure that the farmers are going to have a decent price for their grain, that they will continue to receive at least the initial price for their grain, at least the same price that they've received last year. And this is what this government should be looking at.

They should be making sure that the farmer is not going to suffer any more than what they have caused them to suffer to this point – no more than what they are making him suffer now – because there are many, many farmers out there who are going to suffer if the price of grain goes any lower. And if the price of grain goes any lower than what it is today, it won't be only 20,000 farmers that will be going bankrupt, but we'll probably see 50,000 farmers going bankrupt. And if that happens, we're not going to have very many farmers left in this province.

And it seems that that's where this government might be heading – that everything they do will cause more and more farmers to go out of agriculture, to go out of farming, more and more farmers getting onto the work-force. We need assistance for those farmers.

We don't need larger farmers out there, because even the large farmers are finding it difficult to continue in agriculture and continued farming. They all say that they cannot afford to have the price of grain lowered any more. They cannot afford to have even 10 cents off that bushel of grain, and to 50 or 60 or 90 cents, as what is being talked about. They can't afford any of that.

They need positive action by this government by passing this kind of resolution and sending it to Ottawa. And they need positive action from this government to see that they stay in business in this province and not see the kind of action that we've seen from this government over the past two years, where all it does is put more farmers off the farm, off the land, and support nothing else but the rich, and the people that don't need it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PETERSEN: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll be very brief in my remarks, because I'm kind of sick . . . it really makes me sick to watch the flip-flop of the members opposite, and their posturing and parading today on how they are so concerned about the farmers of Saskatchewan, when yesterday they let thousands of gallons of milk go down the drain.

This particular motion is one that I have to agree with, and it's one to which we alluded last week, under rule 16. It's quite easy to see why we need an increase in the price of grain. If you sit down and take a look at the costs of your inputs into agriculture today, fertilizer is running you at 18 to \$20 an acre. Sprays are running you around 15 to \$20 an acre. Seed costs you 6 to 8 bucks an acre. Repairs cost you maybe \$8 an acre. So on and so forth. When you sit down and you add up your input, costs are well over 65 to \$70 an acre.

When on figures the capitalization cost of one's land, or the rental of one's land, plus a little bit of time for one's own labour, your over 120 to \$125 an acre has to be raised out of that crop simply to meet your expenses, Mr. Speaker.

And I concur with the members when they say that we should have a higher price for our grain. And I've agreed with that theory for a number of years. I'm a farmer. I came home farming in 1975. And in 1975, Mr. Speaker, the initial price for wheat in my area was \$2.02 a bushel. In 1974 it has been \$3.74 a bushel, I believe, though I'm not certain of that. But I do know that in '75, when I came home, it was \$2.02 a bushel. And I'd like to ask the members opposite where they were in 1975 when I came home — farming — I came home to farm. Where were they in '75? I didn't see them standing up in this House in '75 calling on the federal government to increase the initial price of grain. What did they do? Absolutely nothing. It stayed \$2.02. I almost starved to death, thanks to them.

And today, Mr. speaker, they sit in opposition, and they condemn us for inaction. And the Minister of Agriculture has pointed out the number of good programs that we have initiated as a government. We don't just go the federal government on our knees, and say, "Please do this; please do this." We initiate good, solid programs.

So, Mr. Speaker, having said that, I have to say I agree with the motion. I will support the motion. But I think the members opposite should remember where they're coming from and remember a little bit of their past history. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak just very briefly on the resolution that was moved by the member for Assiniboia and seconded by the member for Pelly.

I would like to concur with a number of members who have said that, in fact, there is no need to lower the initial price for grain. And I have here today's *Leader-Post* which lists the grain prices, export prices from Thunder Bay, that would indicate that the export price of No. 1, 13 per cent wheat, is \$212 per tonne, which would work out to about \$5.80 per bushel.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think what all members in this Assembly must realize is the game that is being played by the Liberal government at this time with money that rightfully belongs to the

April 10, 1984

farmers of Saskatchewan and western Canada.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's my belief that the Liberals are in a turmoil as when to hold the next federal election. And what they would like to do is lower the initial price for grain, even though the export price has increased by about 50 or 60 cents a bushel since earlier in the year. And I think there's a reason why they will do this.

Use the scenario: if they're calling the federal election for next April or next May, I think it would be nice for them to have an interim payment to set out in the early part of 1985. This is a trick that has been used a number of times, and I suppose it has something to do with the fact that the Liberals have been in government for quite some time. But I think members of this Assembly should be well aware of what the federal government is doing, and why they are doing it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to say, as well, that I would question some of the comments made earlier by the Minister of Agriculture when he talked about the programs that he has brought into place to assist the farmers in Saskatchewan. He went on at great length in this debate, talking about the farm purchase program and how hundreds, in fact, thousands of farmers have been helped by the farm purchase program. He mentioned that about 2,600 farmers had been helped by the farm purchase program, and he may be right on that, but I would like to tell the people of Saskatchewan what percentage of the farmers that is. We know that there are a little over 60,000 farmers in Saskatchewan, and yet that program has helped between 2 and 3 per cent of the farmers in the province. It has helped those farmers who have been attempting to, and expanding their farms, at the expense of those farmers who are going broke.

What we on this side of the Assembly would like to see is a program, both by the federal government in keeping the initial price for grain as high as possible, in the area of \$5 a bushel, but also a commitment by the provincial government in the area of fuel rebate programs, a loan for operating, to farmers, that would be reasonable, in order that the small farmers who are finding themselves in difficulty would be able to carry on. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would be encouraged if the minister would take a more positive approach to those farmers who are finding themselves in difficult times. I have a quote here from Jim Wright, a Regina area farmer who is quoted in the *Leader-Post* as saying that:

Jim Wright, a Regina area farmer, told the minister that he was glad to hear the minister says he wanted a dialogue with farmers, because we've had problems getting a hearing and a meeting with your provincial government.

I think this is indicative of the opinion of this government towards the farmers of this province. In fact Norm McFarlane, the Saskatchewan NFU co-ordinator, said in an interview following the minister's speech, that:

The program, such as farm purchase program, makes young farmers go deeply in debt so they can get into farming.

Now Mr. Deputy Speaker, you being a farmer, and I being a farmer, that encouraging young farmers to go into the purchase of land at this time, when we know full well the possibility of farm prices being eroded over the next two years, may not be in the best interest of young farmers in this province. You and I both know that if you purchase land today at \$120,000 and are locked into interest rates, and the price of land drops to \$70,000, the times will, indeed, be very, very tough; and I think this government has ill thought out a plan to protect the young farmers.

I listened closely, as well, as the minister talked about how he had tried and tried so hard to talk to the federal government. He sounds like a couple of steers I have out on the farm who are in that position as well – they try a lot. But I think the minister is going to have to do more than that. He is going to have to do some very solid programs to help the young farmers. And I will say

to the minister that we would be encouraged if he would bring in a debt moratorium program that would protect the farmers of this province, and we would give the guarantee that we would support him in that action.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to say, in closing, that I support this resolution that was put forward by the member from Assiniboia that the initial price for grain be maintained. In fact, I think that most of us would believe, who have watched the grain prices, not only should it be maintained, but it should increase by 20, 30, or 50 cents a bushel.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARTENS: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's an honour again for me to rise on this debate and discuss with the House and with the people of Saskatchewan, some of the views that I have in relation to the motion under discussion.

The motion deals basically with grain prices, and I want to relate my remarks to that. I want to make some comments in relation to that on some of the remarks that were made earlier in the discussion regarding the input costs.

There were discussions made by the members of the opposition that input costs are an intricate part of the total cost of the initial price in relationship to what the farmer receives. Initial costs are a variety of costs – or initial prices are a variety of prices. You have an initial price on barley; you have an initial price on corn; you have an initial price on wheat. These have a way of changing in this country.

Ontario sometimes gets a dollar more than we do in their initial price. We market ours on the foreign market. We market ours on the domestic market at sometimes a dollar less. And I can recall listening to the discussion about that.

And I think that that's the kind of federal politics that is played in this whole country. They treat one section of this country different than another. And it's been ever since I was a little boy my dad taught me those kinds of things, because they were real. And the federal Liberals always have done that. They've treated western Canadian people different.

And I just want to outline some things in relation to that. They never recognize the costs involved in production. They never do. And last year they took the Crow rate away on us. They have the initial prices adjusted by the grain stabilizations. They have the initial prices adjusted by the cost of the Western Grains Stabilization Plan, and they're not prepared to put it back.

In fact, the Prime Minister, in a question period in the House of commons, indicated that: we'll do that in time when we think it's necessary to be done. And when we think it's appropriate, we'll do that. And that's reducing the initial prices on our grain every time he does that, and it's strictly a cost factor. That's one input cost that is directly related to the initial price. They raise the price. One time it can be \$550 that you pay out as a farmer. The next time it's 960. The next time it's over 1,200. And then they say, "Oh, we'll be good to them. We won't charge them as much. We won't reduce their initial price as much as they said before"

The one fact they have done is they have that storage of funds that they're not prepared to pay out, when it's ours as part of the initial price that we paid in the first place, and an agreement that they made with the farmers of western Canada.

And that's why, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is relevant to the discussion that we have here today, that the initial price on western grain stabilization is affected. It's a direct relationship to what we get and what we don't get.

April 10, 1984

In dealing with maintaining the initial price as it relates to other things, for example, the return from stabilization that other provinces have gotten and we have not . . . Corn is an example. Manitoba producers never got any return on their corn stabilization. Their beans – they never got a return on that. They paid in that on the initial price, but they didn't get a return back because they . . . (inaudible) . . . We take the black beans and the white beans and we make a difference here. That's the way they play politics, so that their people in Ontario get the right to get a reduction in their initial price. And I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that that is a part of the problem that we have, dealing here in western Canada. It's because they try to ignore us, and that's a problem.

Another thing they don't recognize is the stability that is created by giving the initial price early enough so that the farmers can have some input into what they're going to put into their land. Am I going to put fertilizer in at \$100 an acre or \$40 an acre or \$50 an acre, when I know that the return on my investment isn't going to be there? Because if the initial price isn't stated early enough, then there isn't a reasonable enough time for them to develop it. And in my part of the country, people are already out on the field and they haven't even gotten the initial price established yet.

Another thing about the initial price in this country is that the federal government has always initiated a cheap food policy. A cheap food policy, Mr. Deputy Speaker, indicates to me that there are a number of problems related to that. It does not give agriculture in western Canada the initiative and the development strategy to be able to motivate things on their own, develop their products, to market their products, to create activity in their own areas. And that's a part of a cheap food policy related directly to the initial price that they established, and I again say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that that's a part of their philosophy in Ottawa, and they've done that through the years.

They don't believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in giving the western Canadian farmer enough money so that he has the competitive edge in his working in his fields and in his livestock production. They don't believe in giving him enough funding to allow him to generate income so that he can expand his farming practices into other areas, as the member for Shaunavon has already done in the oil patch.

There is lots of places where agriculture could promote more agriculture, more economic diversity, if they had the initial price established so that they could demonstrate some concrete attitudes towards the western Canadian farmer. What would it do in trade, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if we had an initial price that was established so that we could market our product with a cost factor that was in line with some of the others costs?

In dealing with some of the initial prices in other countries – the European Common Market is higher than ours, and just recently, discussing some things with Saudi Arabia . . . The initial price on wheat in Saudi Arabia is \$28 a bushel, and wouldn't we like to have that? And that's the kind of thing that we need in western Canada, in order to get some of our product . . . give us the competitive edge, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and we'll compete with anybody in the world.

Research is another example where initial price has an impact. What can we do in research, when we haven't got enough money in our initial price to get it going?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to just, in conclusion, put together a couple of things that I think are important. As it relates to history and dealing with initial prices for wheat, I just want to quote the former minister of agriculture, from December 12, 1980, and he says:

A question to the Minister of Agriculture. I am sure the minister knows that our dollar is in the worst shape that it has been since 1934. Operating loans for farmers in Saskatchewan, as of today are, on average, 18 per cent. In light of the fact that world price for Spring wheat is around \$7 a bushel, and Durum wheat around 9, and that

initial payment to farmers in Saskatchewan is 4.25, would the minister indicate whether or not he has made any representation to the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board to have the initial price of wheat raised? If not, would he join with this side of the House in lobbying the minister responsible for the wheat board, to get the initial payment for wheat up to, say, 6.25 a bushel, to help farmers during this time of severe cost-price squeeze?

The then minister of agriculture, Mr. MacMurchy, said:

Mr. Speaker, no, I have not, in a formal way, sent a letter to the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board.

We had our minister just indicate, from August of last year, when he has been trying, and working together with not only the Minister of Agriculture, but the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board, in order to get that done. Their former minister said:

I haven't sent, in any formal way, a letter . . . (Very interesting) . . . for the Canadian Wheat Board asking for an increase in the initial price for wheat. I will certainly be glad to join the hon. member in forwarding to the minister a joint communiqué indicating our position on the increase in the initial price. I think now that we have joined together in addressing the issue of the embargo . . . We are looking forward to a response from the federal government on the Russian grain embargo and compensation to producers for that. A good step would be to join together in asking for an increase in the initial price for wheat.

I want to, Mr. Deputy Speaker, indicate to you and to the House that I will be supporting this resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to with unanimous consent.

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd like to make a motion:

That this Assembly make known to the Government of Canada its view that the initial grain price for '84-85 should be set at a level no lower than the prevailing initial price in '83-84, and that Mr. Speaker transmit the text of this resolution to the Right Hon. Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Prime Minister; Hon. Hazen Argue, minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board; Mr. Brian Mulroney, Leader of the Opposition; and Mr. Edward Broadbent, leader of the New Democratic Party.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 03 – An Act respecting Crown Trust Company and Central Trust Company

MR. GLAUSER: — I would move that bill No. 03, An Act respecting Crown Trust Company and Central Trust Company be now read a second time, and referred to the standing committee on private members' bills.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and referred to the select standing committee on private bills.

MOTIONS

Resolution No. 15 – Development of Northern Saskatchewan

MR. THOMPSON: — When I'm through with my remarks today, I will be moving the following motion, Mr. Deputy Speaker,

That this Assembly condemns the Government of Saskatchewan for totally ignoring the social and economic development needs of northern Saskatchewan, and urges that the government implement a positive development plan for the benefit of all northern residents.

Seconded by my colleague from Cumberland.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, while I am pleased to speak to this motion today, we must all understand that such a resolution should never come before this Assembly. Unfortunate that this Conservative government would so badly neglect the North that we have to bring such a resolution forward.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, our time in this Assembly today is simply too limited to permit me to review the entire long, sorry list of ways in which this government has ignored the people, and the communities, of northern Saskatchewan.

But, let us consider the major ways in which this government has betrayed the North. All members will recall that in the throne speech last November, there was not one single reference to northern Saskatchewan, a region that is looking for help for the problems that they have, Mr. Speaker. And the problems, I indicate to you today, are very serious. Not one single reference to the severe social and economic conditions being faced by Northerners. A 1,200-word throne speech, and not one word on northern problems.

This government has boasted at great length that it is open for big business. It has boasted about its economic development policies, and its job creation success. But that is not the reality being experienced by men and women in northern Saskatchewan.

They hear the Conservative slogans, Mr. Speaker, but they don't see the results. Instead, what they see are depressed communities. You can go into any community in northern Saskatchewan today, Mr. Speaker, and we find 80, 90, and up to 95 per cent unemployment, and this is just not tolerable.

Deteriorating health and social services, unemployed men and women who desperately need jobs, and there are just no jobs to be found. Troubled families, families who are uncertain of their futures, families who have been fired from this government when they took office. Individuals who have had seven months to go before they could take early retirement, and fired. This is the type of cloud that residents of northern Saskatchewan are living under.

And young people losing their hope for the future. Young people who were being trained in community colleges, and once the training is over, no jobs to be had. And this is taking place all over northern Saskatchewan, and is continually expanding: absolutely nothing going on.

Tragic situations, Mr. Speaker. And I speak of the young people, the tragedy that they're facing in northern Saskatchewan today.

I know that the Premier has given this open for big business speech in Toronto and Chicago, in New York – his only speech. But, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if he would come to my constituency in

the North; if he would come to Buffalo Narrows or La Loche or Ile-a-la-Crosse, and visit communities where there is 80 and 90 and 95 per cent unemployment; visit with northern families who have been forced by his policies into desperate circumstances; families and individuals who are desperately looking for some way out of the doldrums that they're facing in northern Saskatchewan; individuals who are looking to this government to provide them with jobs—full-time, permanent jobs.

What we see now, Mr. Speaker, is the job creation program that this government has brought forward in the budget, and most of it is just temporary jobs and summer jobs – nothing permanent.

Can he explain to them, Mr. Speaker, why the welfare case-load in northern Saskatchewan has increased by 60 per cent over the past two years because of his government's abandonment of the North? Can he explain to them why he has created no jobs in the North, why the unemployment among northern people has increased by 55 per cent over the past two years under this administration?

Can the Premier explain, Mr. Speaker, to the small businessmen throughout the North, and to the trappers and fisherman and outfitters, why this government insists on policies which benefit big business, but refuses to develop a positive economic development plan for the North?

What is needed, Mr. Speaker, is action, not more empty talk by this government. What we need is compassion from the Tory government in Regina, not more excuses.

When the Premier gets up in the House, Mr. Speaker, he talks about northern Saskatchewan becoming equal partners with southern Saskatchewan. And I agree with that philosophy. We want to become equal partners. But to become equal partners we have to have equal opportunities, and that means jobs and security, and . . . (inaudible) . . . No way that northern Saskatchewan can become equal partners with the South, when they have a 95 per cent unemployment rate in the North, and southern Saskatchewan enjoys an 8, 9, 10 per cent unemployment rate. This is just not acceptable.

And the Premier, when he was in Meadow Lake earlier on this spring, he indicated that nothing was going to change in northern Saskatchewan. It was going to be left the way it was, and the reason that he gave was that the government just had no money. And that's what we are seeing in northern Saskatchewan today: absolutely no money being spent. The problems remain the same, and there's just no solutions coming from this government. What northern people need is a positive development plan for the North, not a betrayal of their hopes.

There's many things that this government could be doing to solve the problem. Our forest industry – nothing is being done. What little forest industry was taking place in the North now is being done by private entrepreneurs from southern Saskatchewan, and not hiring one individual from the North.

A housing program – a housing program is desperately needed in northern Saskatchewan. Nothing has taken place. No houses are being built, no repair programs. And I ask the government to take a serious look at this.

And that is why, Mr. Speaker, I must urge all members of this Assembly to join me today in supporting this resolution, in order that conditions and needs of Northerners can be recognized and in order that they will be addressed.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I move:

That this Assembly condemns the Government of Saskatchewan for totally ignoring the social and economic development needs of northern Saskatchewan, and urges

April 10, 1984

that the government implement a positive development plan for the benefit of all northern residents.

Seconded by my colleague, the member for Cumberland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. YEW: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleague from Athabasca in supporting this resolution. I want to say that it is an important resolution, one that serves recognition that the North, in this instance, is, in fact, being ignored by the Conservative government.

I want to go on and say, Mr. Speaker, that I certainly hope that all the Tory government members will join in supporting the resolution presented by my colleague from Athabasca, as well.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution expresses the Assembly's regret that the government has ignored the needs of northern Saskatchewan, has ignored the needs of northern people and northern isolated communities, communities that are isolated, that have substandard transportation and communication systems in their areas. And it also urges, Mr. Speaker, that the government implement positive, concrete development plans for northern Saskatchewan.

I would just like to make a few points in support of this resolution, Mr. Speaker. Number one, back in 1982, on July 16, a letter was drafted from the minister of northern Saskatchewan, the hon. member for Meadow Lake, assuring his staff of the day that his government would pursue a policy for northern Saskatchewan, a policy to develop a comprehensive economic development plan for Northerners. Today, Mr. Speaker, we have seen neither.

He talked about an economic self-sufficiency strategy for Northerners, and he talked about meaningful self government for northern Saskatchewan. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of that letter with me today, and I can just read certain excerpts that pertain to local government, that pertain to economic development. For the information to members of this Assembly, I will read out certain excerpts that have been promised by the minister that is responsible for the administration, responsible for the delivery of appropriate policy and programs for northern residents. He goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, that this government recognizes the valuable service that the DNS, that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan has provided to Northerners over the past 10 years; however, the government also recognizes the need for greater emphasis of local self government and a development of an economic self-sufficiency program.

The hon. member for Meadow Lake wrote a letter to the members of his staff in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan assuring them that his government would deliver an economic self-sufficiency strategy to help alleviate the high unemployment in northern Saskatchewan Mr. Speaker. And to this point in time, after three budgets presented by this government, we have seen neither one of those commitments met by the Conservative government.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, all we have seen for northern Saskatchewan is neglect and abandonment. We have seen a budget deficit, a huge budget deficit totalling \$829 million, which the province of Saskatchewan now owes to the bank dealers, the bond dealers, the financiers from the East. A huge debt of \$829 million that we, in Saskatchewan, have to pay back at a rate of \$11,000 per hour, at a rate of somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$100 million a year in huge interest payments to banks and bond dealers – wealthy organizations that don't need assistance of that nature.

That \$100 million, Mr. Speaker, could very well be spent towards job creation, towards meaningful training and job creation in this province. We have an unemployment rate now in this province somewhere in the neighbourhood of 44,000 unemployed people . .

MR. THOMPSON: — And rising.

MR. YEW: — And rising, like my colleague from Athabasca just mentioned. We also have increased welfare reliance in this province. We have somewhere in the neighbourhood of 60,000 people on welfare. That \$100 million could be well spent towards job creation, towards training, towards promoting some major capital construction projects for Saskatchewan — assets today, jobs today, assets tomorrow.

Right now we are being faced in northern Saskatchewan with an outrageous, a disastrous predicament. Our people in the North are subjected to unemployment rates of 90, 95 per cent. In the majority of the 43 communities that we have in the northern administration district, they are subjected to unemployment, outrageous unemployment statistics of 90 to 95 per cent. I want to tell the minister . . . I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the North wishes it had 9 or 12 per cent unemployment. That would be great for the people in northern Saskatchewan.

I want to take this time out, as well, Mr. Speaker, to criticize, not only the conservative government for their neglect, for their ignorance, for their arrogance, but also criticize the media. They highlight on petty controversies that happen in this province, but they don't highlight on major issues, or issues of high importance that affect the lives of people in northern Saskatchewan. They don't even recognize, and can't comprehend the fact that we have . . . (inaudible) . . . and 90, 95 per cent unemployment in northern Saskatchewan. Why don't they print the facts, the realities of the disparities that we face — that 28,000 people that live in northern Saskatchewan are subjected to high, unfair, disastrous unemployment?

And again, Mr. Speaker, we look at the welfare rate, the welfare reliance rate in northern Saskatchewan, and we see 55 per cent increases on high welfare reliance. Sixty per cent of our people are on social assistance. That is a crying shame, Mr. Speaker, and I sit here from day to day and look at the gloating faces across the government side of this Legislative Assembly, and I wonder, and I kind of wonder, and I look, and I wonder to myself the mentality of these people.

And again, Mr. Speaker, we come back to that promise of an economic self-sufficiency program that the hon. member for the Meadow Lake constituency assured the people of northern Saskatchewan. He talked about a local government, self-government program, and to this point in time we haven't seen neither . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I have that letter. I have that letter, hon. member from Meadow Lake, and I have to say that Northerners are pretty well fed up with your promises.

The second item I want to discuss briefly, Mr. Speaker, is the question that Northerners have on local government. The Northerners, way back from '72, have tried to organize meaningful involvement and participation in terms of local government development. The government opposite, today, has enacted a Northern Municipalities Act. Much of the work was done — initiated from the former administration. The former administration had a steady, consistent fund allotment — a funding allotment strategy for \$54.9 million to accommodate local government development over a period of five years. It was just a beginning. It wasn't a fund that would have resolved all the problems in northern -Saskatchewan. However, it was a beginning.

Since this government took over — took office — they have since enacted a northern corporate boundaries commission, Mr. Speaker. But the northern corporate boundaries commission, Mr. Speaker, is restricting and not extending any local government development opportunities for Northerners. I know that as a fact. I have travelled with the northern corporate boundaries commission in several communities throughout the North. I have heard, and I have maintained communication in contact with the members on the northern corporate boundaries commission.

And I have also met with the Saskatchewan Northern Association of Local Government, and they advise me, Mr. Speaker, that the northern boundaries commission is a farce. It's a one-man show. It is a one-man show. The chairman of this northern boundaries commission is the one

April 10, 1984

that is making decisions . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, come on. The member for Meadow Lake disputes that. I've hit a sore note, Mr. Speaker, but the facts are they have lost a member.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that one member that sat as a member on the northern corporate boundaries commission has since resigned because of the fact that he has nothing but a window-dressing type of role in the northern boundaries commission. He has resigned because he has been embarrassed to the point where he can't advocate the type of policies, the type of things that the northern local governments want to see in terms of the expansion of responsibility and jurisdiction for the local governments in northern Saskatchewan.

In terms of the local government development policy as well, Mr. Speaker . . . The third item, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to get into . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . the member for Meadow Lake wishes to distract me in terms of petty items. Like he's talking about politics, trying to create a conflict between my colleague from Athabasca and myself, and I want to tell the member opposite, the member for Meadow Lake, that he's deliberately doing this but he's going to be damned well disappointed because I'm not going to be getting . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order please. That type of language is not permitted in the Chamber, and I'd ask the member to withdraw it.

MR. YEW: — My apologies, Mr. Speaker. I withdraw that remark.

Mr. Speaker, I want to continue on the line of local government development. The Planning and Development Act is an important item towards development of local government, development of self government for Northerners and for their locally elected officials. Northerners at the local government development level were elected by their people, by their communities, to do a job. They were given a responsibility to oversee local government development in their respective jurisdictions. They were elected to do a job. They were trusted by their electorate to do a job on behalf of the community as a whole for the welfare and the socio-economic needs of that particular community. Now since the communities got involved with this administration, they have been given nothing but lip service. They have not been given any sympathy. They have not been given any meaningful role to develop their role of responsibility, their role of jurisdictions in northern Saskatchewan.

One of the things that they had looked forward to was the enactment of district planning committees, an enactment of district planning committees that would oversee the resources outside of their jurisdictions, a route that would enable them to play a meaningful role in the development of their renewable and non-renewable resources. They wanted to see . . . they wanted to take an opportunity to become a part of that development — a part, it turns out, outlying the type, the terms of references, in terms of forestry development, in terms of mining, in terms of the fisheries development, in terms of tourism. They wanted to play a meaningful role in this area.

They knew full well that many companies, corporations, outside investors (and by outside investors I mean from out of the province investors) are coming in and taking those resources from their back yards, without any local involvement, without any local participation. Those Northerners want a part of that action. They don't want to see people coming in from Alberta. They don't want to see people coming in from other outside provinces, or outside companies and corporations from the States, ripping off their resources. They want to play a part in the development of those resources.

Don't misinterpret my statements. I'm not saying that we should alienate ourselves from our neighbouring provinces. What I'm saying, in fact, is: Northerners ought to be given a fair, and the same opportunity that is given to other companies from outside of this province. In fact, there ought to be consistent local labour clauses with respect to the development of our resources.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn for a moment to the Tory policy with respect to tourism. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that members on this side of the House agree that tourism can play a major role in the economy of our province. But as well, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to you that this ought not be done at the expense of the existing traditional industries that we have in northern Saskatchewan.

I want to say that there should be emphasis placed, there should be encouragement and support given, to the traditional resource industries, such as commercial fishing. I have a paper here that was a report that was published in the P.A. *Herald* last November 28, '83, and it talks about how the department of tourism and renewable resources of the day would try to enhance tourism at the expense of the commercial fishing industry in northern Saskatchewan.

He talks about the \$100 million that was brought in by some 230,000 anglers and sports fishermen in Saskatchewan in 1983. It also talks about the meagre income that the 1,400 commercial fishermen brought into the province in 1983 – somewhere in the neighbourhood of 3 to \$4 million. And then it goes on to talk about the drafting of a policy paper suggesting that Northerners ought to be transferred into other jobs and training programs.

Well, Mr. Speaker, at the present time we have unemployment of 90 to 95 per cent in northern Saskatchewan. And I want to ask the minister responsible for northern Saskatchewan: where are those jobs and training programs that you and your administration talked about in this policy paper that you referred to during your study of the tourism and commercial fishing industry in northern Saskatchewan? Where are the jobs, the training programs, that you promised to replace with in terms of the objective that your department took to diminish the size of the commercial fishing industry in northern Saskatchewan?

I'll tell you, and I'll tell the hon. member from Meadow Lake, that you are going to have to come up with some pretty constructive, suitable jobs if you want to do away entirely with the commercial and trapping industries of northern Saskatchewan. Certainly the commercial and trapping industries in northern Saskatchewan don't provide us with a life of luxury, but they at least supplement some of the meagre incomes that we get from some of your provincial programs that we have in northern Saskatchewan.

Last fall I questioned the minister responsible for the Parks and Renewable Resources about the funding that ought to go to the Saskatchewan Trappers' Association. And at the time, if I recall correctly, the minister said that they would consider funding the annual convention of the trappers' association. But it turned out, Mr. Speaker, that they were going to offer the Saskatchewan Trappers' Association – and they did offer – a grant of \$500. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that that was like a slap in the face to the traditional trapping industry.

What I did, following that debate in this legislature during question period . . . I talked to the executive of the Saskatchewan Trappers' Association, and they told me that they were really upset with the provincial government. They said to me that it was like a slap in the face to their organization. In fact, the executive told me that they would turn this money back to the provincial government.

They were very upset because they realize the fact is that this government is giving money to the wealthy, to the rich. Their policy and their philosophy is to give away hundreds of millions of dollars to the oil companies, hundreds of thousands of dollars to the banks, to the bond dealers in interest payments. That is their policy. They have no compassion at all. They have no sympathy at all for the people in northern Saskatchewan. Let's face it, Mr. Speaker, that is the truth; that is the reality of life. That is what the people in northern Saskatchewan are saying. This government cannot be trusted. This government is ignorant. It's arrogant.

I talked about the letter that the member for Meadow Lake issued on July 16, 1982, whereas he talked about an economic self-sufficiency program. What are we getting today, Mr. Speaker? All

April 10, 1984

we're getting today is newspaper headlines that read, "No goals for native economic development for northern Saskatchewan". And it's got a picture of the Hon. Sid Dutchak, the member for P.A.-Duck Lake, the member responsible for the Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat. No economic development strategy for northern Saskatchewan, where the rate of unemployment is up to 95 per cent, where the welfare reliance is up to 60 per cent.

And again, I pick up another paper and what do I see, Mr. Speaker? "Northern Saskatchewan is now classed as a third world country." A third world country. And that is getting very serious, Mr. Speaker. It is the reality of life in northern Saskatchewan. People are very oppressed.

I would like to invite any member on that side of the House to come with me to places like Sturgeon Landing, Cumberland House . . . (inaudible) . . . Wollaston Lake, and I'll invite that member from Lloydminster-Cut Knife to accompany me for a couple of weeks in my constituency visits, and I'll tell you that you'll come back with a different tone in your voice and a different attitude towards your government's policy and philosophy of the give-aways to the multinational corporations, the banks, the bond dealers, and the oil companies.

Mr. Speaker, I look at the Nipawin hydro project. And how many people do we have employed from northern Saskatchewan? Five, a meagre five people. We have two communities living downstream from this major hydro project. A year or so ago, the Minister of Labour, and the Minister for Environment, the Minister for Northern Saskatchewan, and the Premier assured us that they would give preference to local labour.

Well, I was into Cumberland House, Mr. Speaker. I spent four days in Cumberland House just recently, and I had a public meeting. I held a public meeting to hear the issues and the concerns of that particular community, and Mr. Speaker, you want to know what they told me in terms of employment at the major hydro project in Nipawin? They told me that they only had five people employed. And they also told me that they weren't involved in the environmental monitoring of that project. They weren't involved in the environmental monitoring of that project.

The major impact that that project will have on communities living downstream, and yet they're not even consulted in terms of environmental disruptions. They are not consulted in terms, and hired in terms of training and jobs. A meagre number of five are hired.

Speaking of environmental concerns, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn for a moment to the Key Lake mining corporation. On January the 5th we had a major spill, a catastrophe, in northern Saskatchewan. Northerners have since called for a full public inquiry.

But what do we get from this Conservative government, Mr. Speaker? What do we get? Irresponsible policies that tell us they can be trusted. They have mismanaged our economy, Mr. Speaker. We are now \$829 million in the red. This province now owes that much money to the eastern banks and bond-dealing companies. And they expect us to trust them. No way, Mr. Speaker.

We heard, during the Key Lake mining corporations' controversy of the major spill, we heard the workers' standpoint, and also the government's. But we had very, very little input by the Northerners themselves – very little, or . . . In fact, in many areas, we had no input by the Northerners themselves, because, Mr. Speaker, this government wouldn't allow them to have input.

One way that Northerners could have input is by way of a full public inquiry into the consequences of that major spill at Key Lake. But will this government endorse that full public inquiry? No way.

I agree with a full measure public inquiry into this major spill . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We

asked for public involvement. We asked for involvement on issues and policies affecting northern Saskatchewan.

And in terms of involvement by Northerners, Mr. Speaker, I might add that the monitoring committee has been disbanded by the Conservative government – a monitoring committee, Mr. Speaker, that would have ensured that Northerners would have had input in terms of overseeing the health and safety aspects of the workers; a monitoring committee that would have ensured us some participation in environmental aspects of that project; a monitoring committee which would have assured us that we would have had some input into the training and hiring of Northerners, to see that the job quotas were being met.

But what does the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan do, Mr. Speaker? He's put thumbs down on that monitoring committee, the little bit of input that Northerners had in terms of "oversee major developments in northern Saskatchewan."

Another thing that the minister for Meadow Lake did, the minister that is responsible to look after the health and welfare of Northerners, the minister that is responsible to advocate and encourage economic development in the North . . . What does he do? He does away with the manpower secretariat. He has dismantled that manpower secretariat, a branch that was there to oversee the training and the jobs for Northerners. He dismantled that manpower secretariat branch.

Another item that shouldn't be missed, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that this government has decreased their budgets for the mines pollution control branch. That was an important aspect in terms of ensuring that the North was developed in an orderly manner, and that we were left with the North being in some natural state, as it was before the development proceeded. Right now, many members, members who have travelled through the North years back, as far back as '71 and '72, or say, in '75 and '76 . . . I would invite those members to accompany me in some of my trips throughout the constituency. And I would like to have them look at the North as it was, say, five or six years ago, or eight years ago, and see the difference.

We have a forestry policy, referred to as the clear-cutting policy, and what is happening, Mr. Speaker, is that many portions of our North now looks like the barren desert. The reforestation projects are just not in line with the type of development, forestry development, that is taking place in northern Saskatchewan. In many, many places, Mr. speaker, you can see for yourself, or members that have travelled the North, they can see for themselves, the big difference that the state of the North is at in terms of the clear-cutting policy.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that just the other day a few trappers stopped into my constituency office, and they told me, "Lawrence, we don't want to . . . We're not here to plead or to beg for social assistance. What we are here for is to try to give you some encouragement to talk to the members in government, to talk to the provincial government, by way of ensuring that northern trappers and fishermen, the ones that are losing – the ones that are losing their traditional occupations, traditional incomes, from trapping and fishing . . ." they asked me to pass the messages on to this government that they ought to get fair and equal opportunity to participate in the reforestation projects that are available in northern Saskatchewan.

They said to me, "Lawrence, we are the ones that are losing our income. We are the ones that are losing our resources. We ought to be given preferential treatment for taking advantage of those contracts – those reforestation contracts – that are going elsewhere."

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude my remarks today by saying to members of this Legislative Assembly, and to the people of this province, that we are still, that Northerners are still waiting for that promise that was given to us in 1982 by the Conservative government. We are still waiting for that self-sufficiency economic program that the minister of Northern Saskatchewan had talked about. We are still waiting for assistance, for some sympathy, for some compassion

April 10, 1984

from this government.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the North has some 43-odd communities; there is a population of approximately 28,000. The unemployment is growing. Welfare reliance is up 60 per cent. This government hasn't done a thing since 1982. And that the North is in a dire situation – a disaster situation.

I want to end my presentation, Mr. Speaker, to request that this government start recognizing the dire situation that we are faced with in northern Saskatchewan, and to act upon the dire situations that we have – the high rates of unemployment, the lack of training, the high reliance on welfare – and start doing something, instead of just placing emphasis and preference and priority for your wealthy friends, for your banks, your bond dealers, your oil companies, and start concentrating on the people that need help, the people of this province.

You say that you want Northerners to be a part of southern Saskatchewan. Well let's make them a part of southern Saskatchewan. Let's not alienate them. Let's give them a fair and equal opportunity in the social and economic development of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. YEW: — I want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, and tell you and members of this Assembly that I am proud to second the motion that was placed in this Assembly by my colleague from Athabasca. And I wish that all members of this Legislative Assembly will support us in this resolution.

Thank you very much.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Speaker, it wasn't my initial plan to get into this debate, but as a result of the last hon. member who spoke, I feel it's extremely important that I do. I must say that I appreciated the comments and listened carefully to the comments of his colleague, the member from Athabasca, who laid out some serious concerns on behalf of his constituents in the North. They are the same people that I know that do their trading in my own community of Meadow Lake, and many of whom I know very well.

I must say that for the first two years this government has been in office, and for the first two years that the hon. member from Cumberland has been here, I have listened carefully to what he has said. I have had some admiration for the member in terms of the way in which he's presented himself, and the way in which he tries to present his concerns for his constituents, and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's time that some of this was put into a little bit of perspective. The hon. member from Cumberland . . . I just want to trace a little bit of his political career in northern Saskatchewan, just so that we'll understand just exactly where he's coming from on this thing . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Of course it's in order.

The hon. member . . . As some one of my colleagues was mentioning while he was speaking, he was talking about the big, bad multinationals, and the major American companies – like the Meadow Lake sawmill, and like the Bodmin mill owned by Sask Forest Products – what he calls big, bad multinationals in their forest-clearing policies in the North, and so on . . . It's all straight nothing but NDP rhetoric. That's the same, old, NDP rhetoric that we've been hearing all across Canada for an awful long time, in this province for a long time. It puts me to wondering, Mr. Speaker, what rhetoric would come out of the mouth of that member had he gone along with his original plans. And let me take you back now to 1977, Mr. Speaker. Let me just draw the scenario.

In 1977 . . . This relates very, very closely to northern Saskatchewan, which is what he talked about. In 1977 . . . I'm not sure of the exact date, but we can find the date. The date was the day

on which the Lyon government was elected in Manitoba. There was a meeting in Meadow Lake. The former leader of the Conservative Party was in Meadow Lake, and I was there. That individual, Mr. Speaker, proposed to the then leader of the Conservative party: "I'll run for you guys in Athabasca against him" — against the member from Athabasca who is a present member from Athabasca. And a week prior to that, the proposal was put to Ted Malone, who was then the leader of the Liberal Party: "I'll run for . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — If the member would like to speak on the resolution, I would ask him to proceed, but you're a long ways from the resolution.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — The resolution, Mr. Speaker, as I read the resolution, relates to northern Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the resolution relates to northern Saskatchewan, and as I began my remarks about economic development in northern Saskatchewan . . . I began my remarks in speaking about economic development, and the concern, or lack of concern, of the members who represent those two northern constituencies. Those things are relevant to this debate, no question about it. And as I said in the beginning of my remarks, the hon. member for Athabasca represents those concerns in a very sincere way. The hon. member from Cumberland leaves a good number of questions in my mind, one who knows the story and the individuals involved, no question about it. Now, Mr. Speaker, to the resolution; to the resolution.

One of the things that we notice in the hon. member's remarks, and he talks about all of the things that have not happened, when he says, "Well, I'll say to the hon. member that we take a great deal of pride in the way in which the former department of northern Saskatchewan which was, as Judge Noble said a long time ago, "a bureaucracy run amok" — a bureaucracy of which that hon. member was a part at that time, of which he was a part at that time."

AN HON. MEMBER: —No proof.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Proof that he was a part of the DNS staff? Of course he was a part of the DNS staff. The member was a special adviser to the former minister of northern Saskatchewan, at the same time as the Hon. Judge Noble said the bureaucracy in DNS had run amok. We, as the Progressive Conservative Party, at that time said that the department of northern Saskatchewan would no longer exist when we became government. It was one of the major planks of our program . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! Order, please. With the hollering that's in the Chamber at this point, I'm sure that no one can hear what's going on. I can't hear it, and I would ask for some decorum.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — So, as I was saying, Mr. Speaker, all the previous functions and responsibilities of DNS have been transferred to the respective line departments. That's a plan which we said we would implement. That's a plan which we did implement, Mr. Speaker, in less than two years. They said . . . People in the department of northern Saskatchewan at that time said, "It can't be done in four years." It's been done in . . . Two years have not passed yet, and it's been completed. The job was done, and it was done very, very well.

AN HON. MEMBER: — And that's performance.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — And that's performance, as my colleague says.

If the hon. member wants to talk about a positive development plan as a single document, if he wants to suggest that there should be a single document for a positive development plan for the North, he should know very full well—having been a part of that bureaucracy in the former DNS — he should know full well that that plan doesn't exist. That's true. But he should also know that in all of the 10 years of the existence of the former department, no such plan existed under

April 10, 1984

their government – no such plan. And you can't point to one; and if you can point to one, do it today.

On the other hand, if we assume such a plan to be a collective efforts of the various sector departments, which is what we are doing with all my various colleagues who have visited northern Saskatchewan more often than any other ministers ever did under that former administration, to find out just what the problems are, our people are being a part of the northern Saskatchewan. They're reasonable people, who are being represented, I might add once again, by the member from Athabasca, and certainly not by the member from Cumberland in the same way.

And they want to talk about forestry. I'll tell you, as the hon. member from Athabasca raised the other day . . . Our program in forestry, our reforestation and silviculture in northern Saskatchewan, is a more ambitious program than any single-year program that was ever, ever put into the North and into the forested area by that former government.

He wants to talk about tourism. Our last budget talked about tourism, and where in this province, Mr. Speaker, can tourism be more relevant than in northern Saskatchewan? It certainly is more relevant in northern Saskatchewan than in any other part of the province, and our initiatives in this budget address that.

He wants to talk about mining. I heard him mention the word mining when he talks about the . . . What did that party do in that same NDP socialist rhetoric that we're heard coming from them? What did they do about mining? They spent \$600 million into the uranium industry. And they think that they can go to a convention and still call themselves a responsible political party. They think they can go into a convention and suggest to the people of this province, to the responsible people of this province, that you just take the \$600 million out, shut down the mines that we invested the taxpayers' money into, and that's supposed to be some kind of reasonable response. It certainly is not.

The hon. member wants to talk about unemployment. Unemployment in northern Canada is certainly a problem. We recognize that, that unemployment is certainly a problem in northern Canada. And I say "northern Canada" from Labrador to the Yukon Territory and including northern Saskatchewan. And the reason there's an unemployment problem is because of a major training gap, and the hon. member knows that — a major training gap.

What does this government, and how have we responded to that? By putting more money into training, and training of young people, than any government in this province has ever done — more than any government in this province has ever done, Mr. Speaker. And that's extremely important. An that's the long-term solution to unemployment. And those members, if they're honest with themselves, or with their constituents, will admit that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. McLEOD: — The hon. member . . . And just as I was speaking about training, Mr. Speaker, the whole thrust of the former government, with their big bureaucracy, they built a Taj Mahal in the North, in La Ronge, that every member should see, the building that they built, the big Mistasini Place, a beautiful building, and filled it with bureaucrats, Mr. Speaker; that building that we inherited along with a lot of the other bureaucratic maze that we took over from that government.

But what have we done with the building now? A good program that was in existence — and I'll acknowledge that — before, the NORTEP program: a good one, northern teacher education, young northern people being trained to go back into the class-rooms and train other young northern people who are coming along for the jobs of the '80s and the '90s . . . that's the program, a good program.

Where is that program located now, under our government, and where was it located before? It was in La Ronge in a back room sort of a thing in a small building because the bureaucrats were strutting around the big Mistasini Place. What have we done? We've put NORTEP into the big fancy building, and the bureaucrats out of the big fancy building . . . (inaudible) . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. McLEOD: — So, Mr. Speaker, it's extremely important that we put into context just the way in which the members who represent those constituencies . . . The one member, I will say again, Mr. Speaker, who represents his constituents in a very sincere way, and the one member who portrays himself in a very sincere way. But as one who has sat here for two years now, and watched that hon. member suggest that he's sincere about his concerns for the North, and myself knowing his political background and the background of where he wants to run, who he would run for, who's got the best offer . . . My suggestion, Mr. Speaker, is that we learned when that member, first of all, went to work for my predecessor, Mr. Hammersmith, and when he ran for the NDP . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. Order. I'm going to cite to the Hon. Minister paragraph 316, and I would ask you to listen carefully. It's paragraph 316 (f), and it says that "a member may not make a personal charge against another member," and I would ask you to refrain from that kind of remark.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Speaker, all I will do is wind up my remarks by saying that the concerns of northern Saskatchewan are the concerns of a lot of very good folks; are the concerns of this government; are the concerns of governments; and to be quite frank with you, they're the concerns of governments across this country — the major training gap that exists. We all know that. We know that's the problem.

Mr. Speaker, there's no question that what I'm outlining here, and the long-term solution to unemployment, which is the only solution, is a solution on the long term, is being addressed by my colleague, the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, and was addressed in the budget that was presented by my seat-mate, the Minister of Finance. And, Mr. Speaker, I know one of my colleagues has an amendment to propose to this motion and it will be an in-order motion, and it will more clearly reflect the concerns of the people in northern Saskatchewan. Thank you very much.

MR. BOUTIN: — Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Following my remarks today, I'd like to make that Resolution No. 15 be amended by striking out all the words after the word "Assembly", and by substituting therefore the following:

commends the Government of Saskatchewan for the emphasis that it has placed upon developing such northern industries as tourism and forestry in the 1984 budget, and for the benefits that will be derived from these innovative programs.

Mr. Speaker, if we look at northern Saskatchewan, the lakes which have been improved in the North which brings tourism — it creates; it brings people out to see. What does that mean? It creates jobs: that's what it means. So that would create more jobs in the North. Expansion of the Big River saw mill, Mr. Speaker, which is logging over 10 million board feet, and using all the wood for reuse; 6 million board feet at Green Lake; new forestry agreement which will put \$35 million over the next three years; 7.6 million trees were planted by the former administration in '82-83; and in '83-84, 12 million trees were planted.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like that Resolution No. 15, seconded by my colleague from Rosthern, be amended by striking out all the words after the word "Assembly" and by substituting therefore the following:

April 10, 1984

commends the Government of Saskatchewan for the emphasis that it has been placed upon developing such northern industries as tourism and forestry in the 1984 budget, and for the benefits that will be derived from these innovative programs.

The debate continues concurrent on the motion and amendment.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise and second this amendment. I listened with interest to the members from northern Saskatchewan speak earlier. I listened carefully as the member from Athabasca spoke and the member from Cumberland spoke. As the minister responsible for DNS indicated, one member spoke very sincere, and always does; the other one likes to get into political rhetoric. That's part of what happens in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go through what the member said, just to check the verbatim of what he said, and correct the misnomers that were laid upon this House. I've had the opportunity to spend some time in the North. I've had family work in the North, assisting to run a business in the North employing the local people of the North under the former government, and still having business enterprises in the North.

The member seemed to forget that northern Saskatchewan is part of Saskatchewan. It is not a world on its own. They want to be included in all of Saskatchewan, and have the benefits of all of Saskatchewan. Since the government has changed, the intent is to bring them into the mainstream of what is happening in all of Saskatchewan, not leave them out there as an indemnity, all to themselves, and not be concerned with.

Mr. Speaker, the member from Meadow Lake spoke about the Taj Mahal up there that was made for all those DNS employees. It is now being used for a good cause. It's being used to train teachers from the North to teach people of the North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN: — The results of that didn't happen overnight. You know, I heard members talking from their seat, and I only wish they would stand to their feet and show us how little they actually do know, but we'll leave them remain on their seat.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to, as I said earlier, wish to study the words that were made by the two members that spoke. But I really am concerned with one members' attack on what I believe to be misnomers. He seemed to indicate, for an example, that the people of Nipawin had no right to the jobs in Nipawin. And I've talked to the member who represents that area, and he tells me that most of the people working there, are from the area, and have residence there. That member seems to say only five. I always thought Nipawin people were people who deserved the jobs in the area.

He seemed to think that the people of Cumberland House – that nobody's been there from this government. Well, Mr. Speaker, I've spent some time there. The Minister of Highways, which I work with, has spent some time, and so has other members. There is no doubt that, under the former government, all they treated them like was as if they were welfare people. They didn't want to develop the North, and have it become substantially on its own, and be able to look after itself.

The minister that just spoke before me, indicates that's the intention. And after I study the remarks of that member that spoke, seconding the motion, I would like to challenge some of his statements, and bring in the corrections, so everybody know the facts. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I wish to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.