

EVENING SITTING

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the address in reply which was moved by Mr. Martineau and the amendment thereto moved by the Hon. Mr. Blakeney.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm pleased to rise today and present my inaugural speech as a member of the Progressive Conservative government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Swan: — From April 1982 to September of 1986, I didn't have the opportunity to fully participate in the debates of the Saskatchewan legislature. I would say, though, that I perhaps listened to more speeches in four years than any other member here. So from that point of view, I think that it's time that I get even and I have a chance to make a speech.

I would ask you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to congratulate our new Speaker on his appointment to the Chair. I'm sorry that he's not here at this point. I'm sure that he will enjoy the opportunity to be Speaker of this Assembly, and he will bring a lot of class to that Chair, and will do a good job. I just ask the House to bear with him for a few days until he works into the job — and I'm sure he's doing that — and I look forward to a good four years with Arnold in the Chair.

At this time I also wish to congratulate His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor, for his excellent representation since being appointed in 1983. In my term as Speaker of the House, I was very impressed with the dignity and the enthusiasm shown as the Lieutenant Governor conducted his duties throughout the province. We are fortunate in this province to have such a strong, principled individual as the Queen's representative.

I would like to convey my thanks and congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the throne speech. As two new members to our Assembly, I congratulate you on a very fine job that you did in bringing your maiden speech in this legislature. You did a commendable job, and I trust that as the years roll by that we'll hear you many times representing the government of Saskatchewan and the people of your constituency.

I would now like to take the opportunity to thank the people of the Rosetown-Elrose constituency for their very fine support again in this election. This is the third time that they have elected me as their representative. I appreciate very much the opportunity and the honour it is to represent that fine constituency, and so I want to say to them that through the next four years I expect to be in their communities many times and to have the opportunity of rubbing shoulders with them and speaking to them and

hearing their views. And I will do my best to represent them through the term that lies ahead.

I would like to also congratulate our Premier on his fine visionary leadership over the past four and a half years. We are privileged to have a premier of Saskatchewan, a person with the fine qualifications and experience of our Premier, Premier Devine.

The Premier not only understands agriculture and the challenges associated with it, but he also has a solid grasp of the economy and its relation to both rural and urban Saskatchewan. With the Premier's background in farming and agriculture and with his educational training in economics and with his leadership qualities sharpened over the past five years, I am proud to be associated with him and with his government.

I would also like to congratulate the Premier on the direction that our government is taking and has taken since 1982. I am pleased that our government will continue to assist individuals, communities, and businesses in developing and diversifying the province of Saskatchewan. Our commitment remains as well in the protection of Saskatchewan people from events beyond their control.

Also, I look forward to doing what the people in this province want us to do — increase the efficiency and the effectiveness of government administration. And as a farmer in the Beechy area for more than 30 years, I know that Saskatchewan's greatest strength has traditionally been the agricultural industry. I have seen good years in agriculture and I have seen some bad ones, and we know that farmers have been seriously affected in recent times, whether it be by low commodity prices, unfair international competition, or as a result of drought, flooding, or grasshoppers. To highlight the importance of agriculture in Saskatchewan, we realize that agriculture and food processing industry produces over 40 per cent of the province's exports. That accounts for about two and one-half billion dollars annually. But since 1981, international commodity prices have declined, and by this year they were at a low point — one of the lowest in many, many years. The results of declining commodity prices have been significant.

The throne speech pointed out that a 30 per cent drop in world grain prices has cut billions of dollars from farm business revenues. Drought and grasshoppers have not made the situation any better. Tied to all this is a growing tendency on the part of foreign nations to restrict access to their markets and to subsidize their exports. We can see that this kind of protectionist tendency has already meant a drop in Saskatchewan farm incomes.

On that note, I'm glad that the Premier, as Minister of Agriculture, will be introducing legislation this session to extend The Farm Land Security Act and The Farmers' Counselling and Assistance Act. I believe it's important that Saskatchewan farmers are treated fairly and are not unreasonably foreclosed upon, and that they receive appropriate counselling and loan guarantees. This will ensure that the farming community has every opportunity to remain strong and viable.

I am proud of our Premier for he has taken the issue of agriculture and the food industry to the first ministers' conference for the first time. And not only that, but as Minister of Agriculture he recently piloted his idea for a national agriculture strategy to a successful conclusion at the recent first ministers' conference in Vancouver. I'm pleased that this strategy will address both the short-term problems and longer term opportunities for Canadian agriculture.

Agriculture has assumed a much greater role in our national economic discussion since 1982 because of a Saskatchewan leader and a government that understands the food producing industry and the importance of the farming community in our province and to the rest of the country.

I was indeed very pleased today with the announcement made by the Prime Minister of Canada and the federal Minister of Agriculture. A 1 billion payment to Saskatchewan and to Canada is going to mean more than most of us realize.

Remember that this payment comes on top of the regular amount that each one of us would normally receive for the grain that we sell. This grain comes at the top edge which means that it makes the difference in whether or not we make a profit or take a loss. Many of our young farmers are going to find that this payment that does not have to be returned is the type of payment, and the amount of money, that will likely make the difference for them whether they will survive or whether they will have to go bankrupt.

Along with that payment is some 850-some-odd million in grain stabilization that has been paid out in the past year. In the next few days people can expect a cheque from the federal government through the stabilization program. This cheque will average something like \$5,400 for those who paid the maximum amount in to the stabilization program. Any that paid the maximum amount last year will, during the year 1986, receive something in excess of \$16,000 each. That is a very significant amount of money and is much appreciated by the people in my community and throughout the Rosetown-Elrose constituency, and I might say, throughout the province.

I've listened with interest tonight, on different talk shows over the supper break, and I hear people saying, oh, \$5,000 means nothing to me, or \$15,000 would mean nothing on my farm. I think these people are not being very realistic. They're very much like what I heard the opposition saying today that \$420 million was really not meaningful in our society.

I think sometimes people have to pause and reflect upon what they're saying before they open their mouths. Here we have a very major payment coming into our province, one that is going to give many of our farmers the opportunity to show a real profit in the past year. I look forward to receiving it as a farmer, and I'm sure that all of you here who are farmers, or have farm members as family, are going to see a difference. And those of you who live in the cities, when that money comes into the

province and is spent within the province, it's going to mean much to Saskatoon, Regina, and to all urban ridings the same as it does in rural Saskatchewan.

You may well ask why I'm spending so much time on the area of agriculture, and the reason is twofold: one is because I am a farmer and farming has been my lifelong occupation. I believe that agriculture in our province will continue for some time to be the mainstay of this province and to carry the cities and the industries on its back. And for that reason I think that all of us may pay very close attention to what's happening in agriculture and to work and to do the best we can to see that the agriculture industry is stable and that the farmers are turning a profit on their investment.

Agriculture has been a part of our economy for many, many years and I look forward to it again becoming the proud industry without the need of government subsidies in the very near future.

I'm proud of our government's accomplishments in agriculture over the past four and a half years. Highlights such as the farm purchase program, providing 57,000 young farmers with low interest loans to start up or to expand; the production loan program, providing 6 per cent help to those young farmers that needed money to plant their crops last spring — and as I campaigned through this last election campaign, it was mentioned almost at every door how much they appreciate it, and how much they needed that kind of help at this time in their farming careers.

The introduction of the natural gas program in rural Saskatchewan has helped over 10,000 farmers at this point. And as they convert their homes and their dairy barns, their hog barns and so on, to natural gas as a heating source, many of them tell me that their cost of heating has dropped to about 45 per cent of what it was before. They appreciate the opportunity to be served with natural gas and as the program goes forward many more will have that same opportunity.

The farmers oil royalty refund program, providing farmers with 21 cents per gallon rebate this year, is a significant help in reducing the cost of farm inputs. It's much appreciated in all segments of the agricultural society.

Since 1982, thousands of acres of farm land have been irrigated in an effort to reduce the serious effects of droughts. This is an area I wish to talk about for a few moments because of my position as minister responsible for the Saskatchewan Water Corporation. Since the water corporation was established two years ago, it has proved to be a great asset to many towns and villages in developing effective and efficient water and sewer services.

The water corporation has done a fine job in managing one of the province's most valuable resources. Much of the credit must go to the staff of the Saskatchewan Water Corporation. These men and women have formed a strong and cohesive unit since coming together from a few different government departments in 1984, and they provide a great deal of technical assistance to farmers and municipalities throughout Saskatchewan.

(1915)

Saskatchewan Water also provides financial assistance through a number of popular programs. The well test drilling program assists individual water users to attain information on the availability of relative long-term ground water supplies before well drilling begins. In 1985 close to a half million dollars was provided to more than 500 people. Deep well assistance has meant \$102,000 to 112 water users as of December 1 of this year. The community well assistance plan helps rural and small urban municipalities in developing pump stations at existing water facilities, or the drilling of community wells. This program provided almost \$100,000 last year. Saskatchewan municipal waters assistance program allows towns, villages, and hamlets to develop capital water works and sanitary sewage facilities, and so far this year more than \$3.1 million have been used by 132 communities in the province.

Another major project announced and promoted by Premier Devine is the development of the Souris River Basin through the proposed Rafferty and Alameda dams. This project will not only provide irrigation for thousands of acres in south-east Saskatchewan, but also increases the recreational opportunities for people in Saskatchewan. We are working to maintain our water supply while helping our American neighbours with flood protection and a more constant flow of water. These negotiations have been proceeding for some time with a view to reaching satisfactory agreements on the issues involved as soon as possible.

But I'm most excited about the irrigation projects currently under way in our province, and about the five year, \$100 million irrigation agreement we recently signed with the federal government. This will give a number of Saskatchewan farmers the opportunity to participate in irrigation farming. I'm also pleased to say that the first project designed under this program is in the constituency of Rosetown-Elrose.

The \$20 million Luck Lake proposal is going ahead at this time. Some of the groundwork has already been completed and in the very near future tenders will be called for the necessary pipe to install the system. This new system is going to be quite a change in irrigation for Saskatchewan. This will be the first time that pressurized water has been delivered by pipe right to the farm. This will enable farmers to operate, I believe, at a more economical rate than if each one had to provide his own power and his own electric motors.

If this new program is as satisfactory as I think it's going to be — and we intend to have it up and running by 1988 — then I would see that many of the areas of the province are going to be looking at demanding to have the same kind of service.

I would like to point out that this irrigation that we're proposing at this time is not imposed by the government, but is farmer-generated. So it is only those groups in agriculture that see the need for irrigation, and that come to the government with their proposal and make a request that irrigation water be provided . . . Those are the only

ones who will be serviced. So I'm pleased to see it going that way, and the interest that's being shown by people out there. It's encouraging and I find it exciting.

I just want to mention the Luck Lake project again. A gentleman by the name of Roy King at Birsay is chairman of the Birsay Water Users Association, which is involved in the Lucky Lake project. And recently in the Outlook paper he said, and I quote:

Farmer interest in irrigation has been high in the Luck Lake region for several years. We're excited about the project design and about the potential for our area.

It is clear in these statements that our government strongly believes in working with the farm community before programs are started. This is the kind of spirit of co-operation and participation that Premier Devine was referring to in the Speech from the Throne.

I'm pleased that Premier Devine announced specific examples in the Speech from the Throne of promoting economic development and diversification; encouraging the local manufacture of agricultural chemicals and fertilizers, thereby reducing input costs for farmers and creating new jobs for Saskatchewan people; providing greater diversification through industrial incentives and venture capital. Loans to small business have been most valuable, and through the youth entrepreneurial program — providing Saskatchewan small business with 50 million over the next five years to equip themselves with the most effective and efficient technology available — a commitment to ensure that our students are obtaining the necessary skills to compete on the national and the international markets.

Since 1982, this government has taken unprecedented steps to encourage development of a strong industrial base. These steps will continue in 1987 and beyond.

Over the past four and a half years, Premier Devine and his government have made a determined effort to reward senior citizens for the contributions that they have made to our province and for the solid foundation they have built for us. So many of the opportunities and freedoms we now enjoy were provided for by the hard work and initiatives of our seniors. It's no wonder then that grants to low income seniors have been increased by as much as 100 per cent and new enriched seniors' heritage program is helping seniors throughout the province. Nursing home and enriched housing construction has been undertaken at a pace never seen before, and other programs relating to seniors have been upgraded and expanded.

In my own constituency of Rosetown-Elrose, I'm proud of how this government, under the compassionate leadership of Premier Devine, has helped literally hundreds of seniors — projects such as an enriched housing unit in Milden; a combined facility in Lucky Lake; and a new combined facility soon to open in Dinsmore; the promise of new nursing home to go under construction early in the spring of 1987 in Elrose; and a combined hospital and nursing home facility approved for construction in 1987 in Kyle.

It's no exaggeration to say that the health and welfare of our seniors is a top priority of this government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, ever since I've known the Premier, I've been impressed with his commitment to the family union. Premier Devine and his Progressive Conservative government believe that no institution is more important than the family.

An Hon. Member: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — State your point of order.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — I wonder, Mr. Deputy Speaker, whether you would advise the member about the rules of the House in not permitting the use of the name. I've heard it six or seven times, and I thought perhaps you might advise the member of the rule.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order, order. It's traditional in the House . . . I've heard it on both sides of the House today, and I think in our maiden speeches maybe it could be overlooked. The debate continues.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I appreciate very much having some liberties that others don't seem to have.

The Premier and his Progressive conservative government believe that no institution is more important than the family. Societies are only as strong as the individual family unit. With all kinds of negative forces bombarding families in this day and age, the Premier and his government are tackling the problems head on and are determined to protect Saskatchewan people.

More than \$1.2 billion is being provided in health care. A drug and alcohol rehabilitation centre is going ahead at Yorkton. An increase in education and university spending; the Saskatchewan pension plan providing retirement income for home-makers, part-time workers, and small-business employees.

Mortgage protection at nine and three-quarters per cent for 10 years — it allows people to move into their own home and know that they can afford to stay there because they have that kind of protection for long term. And helping owners through the home improvement grant and the low interest loan program — creating thousands of jobs for Saskatchewan's people. And that is not just in the cities but that spreads out through every town and village in Saskatchewan. Every business that is involved in the house construction and home repair program are finding that their biggest job is keeping up with the demand, and in many cases they've had to take on numbers of extra help to meet the need of the community in which they live.

The elimination of sales tax on clothing under \$300 has been a big addition to the help provided to many of our families and it's appreciated by all. An increase in the funding over the past four years to handicapped persons. Protecting families and protecting individuals — that's

what our Premier and this government is all about.

Our Progressive Conservative government sees the protection of our environment for future generations as a major priority of all Saskatchewan residents. We are responding to this shared concern by setting high standards of environmental protection throughout the province and by responsible development of our natural and mineral resources. As the Minister of Environment, I am pleased to see the high standards Saskatchewan has set in emission control. It's higher than most jurisdictions across our nation.

These are interesting times for a Minister of Environment. Just last month, *The Globe and Mail* ran a front page article stating that Canadians appear to be more concerned with environmental issues than job creation. That's indeed a change of direction in our time. It's clear to see that concerns for the environment did not disappear with the passing of the '70s, and our government is certainly aware of the importance of our environment.

Here in Saskatchewan there are a number of major projects in the works. The heavy oil upgrader here in Regina will help us become more self-sufficient in oil production, and in the process is creating thousands of jobs. This upgrader would not have become a reality if it wasn't for the Premier of this province and the Progressive Conservative government.

The Rafferty and Alameda dam projects were announced earlier this year by the Premier. This will provide Saskatchewan people with more electrical power, plus another source of recreation in the Souris Valley. Our government is working hard with people in the area and with the Americans to bring these plans to fruition as soon as possible.

Another major project that we are excited about is the Saskatchewan Power Corporation power line in northern Saskatchewan to be developed from Uranium City to Rabbit Lake. This is an effort to bring electrical power to people in an isolated area; something we all take for granted and even consider it a right. We are concerned that people throughout the province are treated equitably.

Since becoming Environment minister, I took the opportunity of visiting as many people in the department as I could. I was impressed with the quality of the professionals there — people who want to ensure that our environment is safe and workable for generations to come.

(1930)

I've also had the opportunity to meet a number of staff in the technical safety service branch which looks after gas, electrical, and boiler inspections as well as fire prevention. I mention this area because it has moved from the Department of Labour to Environment. The people in this branch carry a lot of responsibility in completing thousands of inspections each year. This has been increased somewhat as a result of our government's rural natural gas program, the burying of electrical lines, and

from our successful home renovation program. I've been impressed with the professionalism and dedication shown by these employees in keeping the safety of the public first and foremost in their minds. We will be monitoring this situation very closely to ensure that inspections occur as promptly as possible.

In conclusion, I am pleased with the Speech from the Throne and the direction that the Premier and the government is taking. The three themes stressed by the Premier, economic development and diversification, protection from Saskatchewan residents, and effective use of government resources, are ones supported by people throughout this province. It is this government's intent to work with people throughout the province to build a stronger and more secure future.

I urge all members to support the Speech from the Throne. Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the speech.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am going to describe to the House tonight the constituency that I represent, and I am also going to describe to this Assembly some of the views and opinions of my constituents as I have gleaned them in the last year or so of canvassing on my way to this Assembly.

Before doing that, though, I would like to compliment the mover of the motion, my friend, the hon. member from the Eastview constituency. I intend to refer to some of the remarks that he made as I talk to you about my constituents and how they feel, and I will be returning to that in due course.

The Saskatoon Fairview constituency is one of those that has grown considerably since the last distribution with the result that we now have over 13,6000 eligible voters. That, I think, is about twice the size of some of the voters eligible in the constituencies represented by members opposite, which is a situation that I believe is going to be corrected following the work of the electoral boundaries commission beginning next March.

There is a high concentration of ordinary wage and salary earners in Saskatoon Fairview. There are communities included in that constituency which do not have a great number of wealthy people among them, where there are many, many young people —many children, a very prolific group — crowded schools, and I might note in passing, no high school. Now I say that, feeling on solid ground, because my predecessor who was a member of the Conservative caucus in the last legislature raised that point again and again with his colleagues without success. And the House Leader is indicating that he remembers the representations and I want to redouble them on behalf of the constituents there, and urge this government and the new Minister of Education to petition the school boards in Saskatoon with a view to resolving that very, very serious problem. They are having to transport their children for miles and miles to go to high school. They take long bus rides which have to start early in the morning and which end well into the supper hour in order to attend high schools, and it's a situation that

simply must stop.

So again, I would urge the Minister of Education to take this representation at least as seriously as he took it from my predecessor, and see whether that problem can be resolved.

The high concentration of working people in my riding includes probably the largest concentration of trade union members in Saskatchewan, and it is with a great deal of provide, of course, that I represent those people, as all people, because of the particular kind of a law practice that I've been engaged in the last few years.

We also have a surprisingly high concentration of native people in the riding, and those native people have expressed views to me as I canvassed them which I'll be pleased to share with you in a little while tonight.

We have a relatively small but growing number of retired and elderly people in the constituency. We also have a large number of new Canadians, new citizens, and people who have recently come to this country and have received landed immigrant status and are looking forward to achieving their citizenship in due course.

Unfortunately in the riding we have a very large number of unemployed people. We also have an alarmingly high number of people who receive social welfare and I want to particularly address their concerns later on in my remarks tonight.

Now in 1982, the voters in Saskatoon Fairview voted for the government opposite in large numbers. The margin of victory for the Conservatives was over 3,000 votes, and that was rather a surprising result considering the kind of riding that it was. At least it was certainly a surprise to me as the candidate.

Now in 1986, however, we found the most massive turn-around, I believe, that occurred in the province of Saskatchewan. And rather than a conservative victory of in excess of 3,000 votes, I enjoyed a margin of victory of over 3,000 votes. There was a turn-around . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — I'm accepting that applause modestly. An exceptional turn-around, and it is because of the size of that turn-around that I chose the particular approach that I did tonight to try and describe to you just what these people in Saskatoon Fairview were thinking about as they changed their mind from 1982 to 1986.

Now I make these remarks in the context of the remarks of the hon. member from Eastview. Now in moving the motion that is before the House, the member said, I think, everything that could be possibly said by anyone in support of the record of the government opposite. And the question that ran through my mind as I listened to his remarks is, if that record was so good, why didn't it sell in Saskatoon Fairview? Why did the people in Fairview reject it so resoundingly?

And then I thought further about the voters in Eastview, and Saskatoon Eastview has been, I've been told by

Conservatives, regarded as a safe seat for the Tories in Saskatoon. And yet that safe seat for the Tories, when it came down to the wire on election night, was won by my friend by something less than — what? — 2 per cent? Anyway a very, very narrow margin of victory indeed. So it occurred to me that the voters in the safe seat of Saskatoon Eastview weren't really buying that message very resoundingly either, and indeed that was the case throughout the city of Saskatoon.

Why did this turnaround occur? I think that it occurred because the people came to one or more of three conclusions about this government. First of all, by the time I got there to canvass them, they had pretty much all come to understand that the government was no competent. Secondly, they shared to a very large extent the view that the government was not fair. And thirdly, and probably most importantly, they had come to the conclusion that this government did not represent their interests and their concerns.

Now let me just fill in a little bit of detail under each of those headings. First of all, the question of the competency of the government . . . and let me remind members that these are not my thoughts that I'm expressing to you but thoughts that were expressed to me over the past year. You may not have heard them; I'd be surprised, but you may not have.

By far and away the most important issue in my constituency was the issue of unemployment. It was an issue that overshadowed all others to the point where it was hard to find the second one. Everyone agreed that unemployment was the main issue. And that includes not only the people who were unemployed, because the people who are employed for different reasons feel insecure about their job. They feel insecure because the company they're working for may be getting into some economic difficulty. They feel insecure because other people who work in their work place have been laid off. They feel insecure if they work for government because they see people being fired and laid off for reasons that are not known to them. They have the opinion that this government has no idea how to cope with the unemployment problem.

Every once in a while they'll hear a government spokesman, a minister most usually, who will make a public statement announcing all kinds of new jobs, or announcing that unemployment in Saskatchewan is not as bad as it seems to be by the numbers, or that there are more jobs in November than there were the previous April, or there are more jobs in April than there were in November, or something like that — statement, after statement, after statement. But it just had no impact on the people because the people know that unemployment in their community is the major problem. Someone in their family, someone in their neighbourhood, someone known to them has become unemployed in the last short while. Some other of their friend will have been unemployed for two or three years, and have been looking for work constantly, and be unable to find work.

So they got the impression that this government had no plan, had no idea how to resolve the problem, and furthermore, weren't really very committed to the

resolution of the problem.

Now, the second major issue that bears on the competency of the government had to do with the deficit. Now I know some of the political insiders were saying that the deficit wasn't an issue. Well I don't know what the situation was in other constituencies represented by members of this House, but in my constituency the deficit was an issue.

The people had the perception that the government had bungled the finances of the province. The people had the impression that the government had created a public debt which would sap the vitality of this province for years to come.

Now when the government opposite took office in the spring of 1982, it inherited a budget surplus of \$139 million. After 11 consecutive surplus budgets under the New Democrats, the new PC government had inherited this surplus of \$139 million.

Now today that's just a pleasant memory. The unpleasant reality is that after five consecutive deficits brought in by the people opposite, Mr. Speaker, the cumulative budgetary deficit of this province is somewhere in the order of \$21.5 billion.

Now that's a lot of money for a person who depends upon their pay cheque as people do in Saskatoon Fairview. It's almost an impossible number for people to grasp. But it concerned them because when they thought about it, they realize that that's money that some day has to be paid back.

It's not an amount of money that just is magically going to go away. It's a mortgage on our future. It's a mortgage on the future of our children and our grandchildren.

(1945)

And while it has to be paid back, in the meantime we have to pay interest on it. Interest that is money flowing out of this province to the bond dealers and the banks, and is money that ought to, and has for years, been available in Saskatchewan in order to do things.

Now if you assume that our money has been borrowed at the rate of 10 per cent, we're talking about an annual interest payment of \$250 million, and I think that's an accurate figure. I think that the estimate in the last budget for interest was \$200 million on the deficit they were expecting at that time. And I think the deficit that we'll find is actually going to be higher than that.

So using a figure of \$250 million a year for interest, you can then think about how much that is each day by dividing it by 365, and you come down . . . you come out then with a figure of \$685,000 a day.

Now to a man earning \$30,000 a year, he can kind of get a sense of how much money \$685,000 a day is, and then he can relate that to the fact that five years ago there was no such payment necessary by the province of Saskatchewan to the bond dealers and to the banks. He can think about what could be done with that money if

we kept it in Saskatchewan.

He can think that with just three days of that interest, you could double your occupational health and safety program in the Department of Labour. And with just 10 days of that interest, you could provide high-quality, accessible day care for working families in every community in Saskatchewan. And with just one money of interest — if you hadn't rung up that deficit — with just one money of interest, we could provide about 700 additional nurses in the hospitals across Saskatchewan. With four months of interest — four months of interest — we could restore the property improvement grant for all home owners, renters, farmers, and small businesses. And one other number — with five months of interest, you could eliminate the flat tax.

Now the people blame you directly and entirely for getting us into this awful mess, and they regard you as incompetent for having gotten us there.

On the question of fairness, let me just briefly touch on the reasons why the people in my constituency came to the conclusion that you were not a fair government. First of all, they saw patronage being raised to an art form. Patronage in the hiring of people, in the promoting of people within the public service; reverse patronage in the firing of people — competent, career public servants wrecked because at some time they may have smiled at the Leader of the Opposition in the crosswalk.

They saw patronage in the awarding of contracts. They saw patronage actually happening in relation to places where they worked or people that they knew. And of course they saw the abuses in the tendering processes that went on for some time under this government, and they did not regard that as being fair. And the people, I tell you, are not prepared to put up with an unfair government.

The government opposite also hit the people in an unfair way with respect to their tax policy. The people felt that the cancellation of the home ownership grant was not a fair policy. And further, the imposition of the flat tax was not regarded as being fair to the wage-earners. They felt they were already paying their share, the increased taxation ought to be paid by people who could afford to pay it better than them. And that's a good point.

You know the reality is out there in the houses of the working people of this province, and these are the places that I now know best because these are the homes on which I'm calling. There isn't enough cash by the time they've taken their pay cheque home. They've had all the deductions taken off their pay cheque. There just isn't enough money to go around. They make their mortgage payment. They make their car payment. They buy their groceries. They buy the clothing, and they make a few other payments, perhaps, and there just isn't any money left. The people don't have money any more to do anything.

And in those circumstances when they get a surtax laid on them, like what happened in the budget with the imposition of the flat tax, the people just recoil from it. And naturally they do, because it's requiring them to put up what they don't have any more, and that is cash —

disposable income.

Another theme that was struck repeatedly was that this government gave the impression to the people of favouring the big guy, of favouring the people that didn't need favours done for them, of favouring . . . Pocklington's a name that everybody uses. It's a name that conjures up all sorts of things. But he's a good example and one that the people often use. And many other examples that the government would come with an announcement about some plant or something like that, and the people would see it as an example of the government helping people who didn't really need help.

And they, operating their small business — and I'm talking now of people who are in business — they just simply weren't able to turn anywhere for any real help at all. And they felt that that was not fair.

Now the trade union members have a particular axe to grind with this government in terms of fairness. And I harken back to the amendments to The Trade Union Act, which are known as Bill 104, which raised such a furor across this province. Whatever those amendments were intended by the government to accomplish, it was certainly not to make a more fair, collective bargaining system. And it didn't do that.

All it did was lay road-blocks, obstacles in the road of trade unions and trade union members as they try to make their way in the world, as they try to get adequate representation and resolve some of the problems that they encounter in the work place. Whatever those amendments were intended to accomplish, it was not to introduce fairness. And indeed, the amendments were seen as being grossly unfair, and that had a lasting impact among the people who live in my constituency.

So it cuts, Mr. Speaker, right across the whole piece. The working people, the people who many of whom work at the minimum wage and have seen the minimum wage increased by 25 cents in the last five years. You convert that to percentage terms and you get some laughably small figure that doesn't even begin to touch increases in the cost of living. And those people wonder why that happens. I mean if things are supposed to be so good in Saskatchewan, if this is supposed to be . . . things are rolling along the way my friend, the member from Eastview describes them as being, all up and away and we're all rolling along in high gear, then how is it that the minimum-wage worker is still earning 25 cents more an hour than he was earning five years ago? He doesn't think . . . that person doesn't think that this is a fair government at all.

I can't leave this subject without mentioning the attitude of many of the women in my constituency who did not see this government as representing their issues, their concerns, at all. I don't know who it is on that side of the House who is the most sympathetic to what we commonly refer to as women's issues.

The Minister of Labour has indicated by raising his hand that he is that person. I wonder whether there is anyone on that side of the House, for example, who supports the concept of equal pay for work of equal value. I wonder

whether there is anybody over there. I wonder if there is anybody over there who is determined to enrich the day-care system in our province and make that more accessible to the ordinary working people, particularly the low-income people in Saskatchewan. The people in my constituency were not able to think of anybody on the government side of the House who shared their views on these matters. Nobody. And as a consequence they came to the opinion that you did not share their concerns, and you did not represent their interests in this House, and so they did not vote for you.

And finally . . . Not finally, next to finally — I'm not finished yet — next to finally . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — The young people. Now in 1982 my experience was that the young people in my constituency supported the government. They went for the gas tax promise, I think, chiefly, but in any event they voted for the government. This year I'm proud to tell you that the young people in my constituency voted New Democrat.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — And they did it because one of the impressions that you were able so successfully to convey to them is that under your stewardship their opportunities were so severely limited that they practically didn't exist.

They were alarmed by the level of youth unemployment. Youth unemployment in my riding is at a staggering number. It's just really depressing the number of houses you go to where you find young people who have graduated from high school and have been hunting for a job for a year or two, or in one case, four years. Young people who are the kind of people who, in the 1970's, would have found a job just like that. And yet these people are not lazy; these people are not shiftless; these people are not unambitious. These people just simply can't find a job.

And they go downtown into Saskatoon day after day, month after month, some cases year after year looking for work and are not able to find steady work. Sometimes they can find a job for a short term; sometimes they can find a part-time job. But I say to you that it is just incredibly depressing to note how many of them are at home in the afternoons, having completed another few hours of searching for a job without success. And these are people who are approaching the age of 23, 24, 25 years old and some of them have never worked at a regular job.

Now what's to become of these people? Surely these people should be the number one concern of all of us in this Assembly, and surely it must be one of our most important priorities to ensure that something is done to ensure that these young people can get a useful, valuable work experience so that they have some chance of living a full, productive life.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — I'm not going to speak at length about the

problem of the native people tonight because I feel I've used up too much of your time now. So just let me sum it up this way: the native people who live in Saskatoon Fairview just simply gave up on you guys — they just gave up. They just felt that in no way, in their lifetime, were they ever going to get anything from you that might help them solve any of their problems.

I want to now talk about the social welfare recipients, the poor social welfare recipients, and I do that . . . I don't want to sound excessively negative to the members of this House. What I'm trying to do is to bring you a frank report from my constituents, and I regret that it's negative. It just happens to be that way.

With the social welfare recipients, I hope I don't exaggerate, Mr. Speaker, when I say that it is a crisis situation. I'm so glad to hear the minister responsible say, as he did in this House yesterday, that that situation was going to be reviewed, and I understood him to say words to the effect, that sympathetic consideration would be given to increasing benefit levels because they simply must be increased.

(2000)

People who are unemployable welfare recipients, who just have no way of earning any income at all, are having to live on allowances that would appal you, Mr. Speaker, simply appal you. Their general allowance to cover their food and their clothing and their incidentals and that sort of things is a pittance. And I think the minister knows this. If the minister was asked to go out to the stores in Regina and buy enough to feed himself and his two children on the allowance that he's paying to these people, he would just laugh. He would know that he couldn't do it, or having tried once he would learn that he couldn't do it.

The social welfare recipients are receiving, in addition, an allowance to cover their utilities. It is exactly the same allowance as they were receiving, I think, 10 years ago, Mr. Speaker. I could be wrong about my number, but it's really some incredibly long period of time in the past. And it creates . . . The minister shakes his head. It may not be 10; it may be six. I don't know.

But in any event, whatever it took to cover the utility bill back then no longer covers the utility bill. I haven't met a single welfare recipient who is able to pay for their utilities on the allowance that they receive for utilities. They have to pay for utilities out of their food allowance. They actually wait in dread for the day on which the utility bill — the electric and gas bill particularly — wait in dread for the day on which that bill arrives, and they open it in real fear because they don't know what they're going to see. If they see a bill that is \$15 larger than they expected, they're in a panic because \$15 off their food bill is a great deal of money.

These are people, Mr. Speaker, for whom \$10 or \$15 is an incredibly large amount of money, and is the difference between making it through a month and not making it. And I pass this on. I hope it does some good. And I hope that when the department's review is being conducted that it will be conducted with compassion and with understanding, and with a feeling for just how difficult it is

for these people.

I don't stand here bearing a brief for people who are abusing the social welfare system. I don't stand here with a brief for people who could be working and have elected not to work. I stand here with a brief for the people who are on social welfare because they don't have any choice and are starving — not to death, but they're just having a very, very difficult time. They're not feeding their kids properly. Their kids are growing up . . . not just a matter of growing up without any of the advantages, but growing up suffering from the effects of poverty. And we in this province, in this land of plenty, just simply ought not to allow that to go on.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — I think I could presume . . . Maybe presume is not the right word. I think I could try to sum up what I've been trying to convey by saying that in my experience, in the west end of Saskatoon, the people don't share the government's idea of how the Government of Saskatchewan should be run. The people just simply don't share your thinking. They don't share it on any of the particular issues that I've been addressing. They don't share it on the hiring of somebody like George Hill to be the president of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. I mean, you can make all the speeches you like about how well qualified George Hill is. And I've known him for 30 years. I know how well qualified he is. You can make those speeches in this House for as long as you like and the people are simply not going to buy it. It was a patronage appointment of one of your own to one of the top jobs in Saskatchewan, and the people will so regard it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — Now, I think that you know that what I have said is true. Mr. Speaker, I should be addressing this to you. I think the members of the government know that what I've said is true about the people not sharing their idea of how a government should be run. I think they know from their own polls that if they had gone to the people last spring or last summer, they would have been wiped out and this party would be sitting over there, and a small number of them would be sitting over here. But they didn't, and with some jiggery-pokery and a lot of smoke in a few mirrors, they managed to turn the situation around sufficiently so that we have the House as it's constituted right now.

But what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is if they don't clean up their act, and if they don't somehow convince the people of this province that they are behaving fairly and that they're competent to govern, and that they are reflecting some of the real needs and concerns in this society, then in the next election the result will be remarkably different.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to before sitting down to say one other thing on a personal note. I've no idea whether this is appropriate or not, Mr. Speaker, but I am here in large part because of my father, and my father will be known to many of the members of this House as Charlie Mitchell from Sturgis, and as I speak to you tonight, I am conscious

of the impression that he has had in my life. He died last January and I just couldn't sit down with put putting his name on the record. I think that members opposite and members on this side will know him for many years as a director of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities and its president for three years, and many, many, many other positions he discharged in the public service of this province. And his example was an example to me as it was to a lot of other people in our community.

I also am here because, Mr. Speaker, my six children are going to live in this world for a long time after you and I are gone, and their children are going to live after them. And it would be irresponsible of me not to do what I could in order to make things better for them and help ensure that they do have a good future.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — My daughter, Allison, who is the youngest of my six daughters said to me three or four years ago — or asked me — she said, "Daddy, was I born at the wrong time?" She said that after she had heard or read some disturbing piece of economic news or something like that, and I just answered it in a quick reassuring way without going into any detail, but I ought to have said that she was born in about the best time that she could have been born. She was born at the best time in our history where we have so many opportunities as a result of our mastery of technology and our increasing knowledge of how things work. And she ought to have the fullest life of anyone in the history of our civilization.

And all I hope is that we in this Assembly, and in other Assemblies across the country, are able to do everything we can to ensure that my daughter, and all of our daughters and all of our sons, have the life that it is possible for them to have if we bring enough wisdom to the tasks that are before us.

I will be supporting the amendment, Mr. Speaker, and opposing the motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is indeed a pleasure for me to rise in this House this evening to speak in favour of the throne speech which my colleagues from Eastview and Pelly so eloquently presented to this House the other day.

I'd like to take this opportunity to congratulate you, sir, on your election as our Speaker of this fine House. Being a colleague of mine for over a year and a half prior to the last election and having been on ag caucus and a few other committees with you, sir, I know that the dedication which you showed to your legislative duties then will surely spill over now into your duties as Speaker of this House, and you will acquit yourself with pride and dignity in performing the duties of the Speaker.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate all the new members, the newly elected members of this House, both on the government side and the opposition side.

Some of the members of the opposition are well-known to me. We come from the same neck of the woods, and my special congratulations to them.

I'd like to take this time to thank the people of Thunder Creek for re-electing me. I was very pleasantly pleased and surprised when that reaffirmation took place and had an extra thousand votes tacked on to it from the spring of 1985.

It makes one feel good to think that the representation which you have done on behalf of your constituents has been represented, that the programs of the government which you represented have meant something to your constituents, and that was indeed a pleasure for me to have that type of majority in my favour in the recent election campaign.

I might remind the member from P.A.-Duck Lake — I see he's left — but that was the other by-election in 1985.

My constituency, as almost everyone in this House knows, is a very large, sprawling agricultural riding. I think I have the distinction of being the only riding in Saskatchewan without some type of a newspaper. Some days that's good; some days, bad.

It ranges from the very fertile land of the Regina plains, some of the best wheat growing land in Saskatchewan, to the hills and ranch land of the Missouri Coteau, and to the advanced technology of our irrigated lands along Lake Diefenbaker.

And I like to think, as other members have said, that it is a riding which represents very well the overall aspects of rural Saskatchewan and indeed agriculture, because you can find in my constituency just about every type of agricultural endeavour that anyone in this province has ever tried, or probably ever will try.

It is for that reason that I really do take great pleasure in speaking in favour of this throne speech because it is a blueprint for growth in our province. And when I look at a constituency such as mine, I can see many opportunities for that growth. It means that we have to have optimism; it means that we have to look forward, that we have to come up with new ideas because to stand pat means stagnation. And for that reason, we need a blueprint; we need a four-year plan; we need to know where we are going.

I also liked, Mr. Speaker, the commitment to the security of Saskatchewan families that was illustrated in that document. And though others may ridicule and belittle some of the protectionist measures in there, I like to think that our mortgage protection for home owners is a renewed trust with the home building and the home owning public of Saskatchewan. It's a commitment for the next 10 years, and it gives confidence in that sector.

I like to think that The Farm Land Security Act which will be reintroduced in this session of the legislature is a continuation of that commitment which we made two years ago to the farm families of this province, that they would not be foreclosed without proper jurisprudence

and someone looking into their affairs and helping them out when they are dealing with both financial and legal institutions.

I like our commitment to the continuation of building of our medical services in this province. As some of my colleagues have mentioned, we are now up to \$1,200 per man, woman, and child in this province, and I don't think that anyone can dispute that our medicare system is as good now as it ever was in the province's history.

I would like to go for a minute, if I may, Mr. Speaker, to some of the commitments which our government has made to my riding in particular, and expand that to some commitments that I felt have been kept to the province as a whole.

I look at Thunder Creek and the obvious agricultural difficulties which have existed out there the last couple of years and I see a commitment by this government in 1986, through the production loan program of over \$46 million in my riding. That commitment paid a lot of bills; that commitment bought a lot of fertilizer; that commitment paid for a lot of chemical which ensured that the farmers of my constituency would grow one of the best crops which they have ever had in their history.

(2015)

I look at the commitment to the red meat industry in my province, a commitment since the middle of 1985 which has meant over \$6 million to the livestock cash advance system — a system that was long overdue because it helped take some of the humps and valleys out of the production of red meat. Most cattle men know that the big pay-day only comes once a year, when you sell that calf or feeder steer, and the next 11 months in between can be kind of lean at times. And I like to think that this program has gone a long way to stabilizing the red meat industry in my constituency and around the province.

I like to think of the commitment that was made in 1985 when almost all of my constituency was in the throes of a very bitter and severe drought. There was over a \$2 million commitment by the provincial government on top of the regular crop insurance payments which were made to producers in my constituency. And above and beyond that, Mr. Speaker, there was the over \$5 million which came from the federal drought assistance program, which I like to think was put in place mainly because of the representations made by our Premier to the federal government. And I like to think that only he, amongst Canadian premiers, could have helped institute a program like that in such times of dire need that meant so much to the people of my constituency.

I like to think of the oil royalty refund which will mean so much to the producers in my constituency as they go out to plant that 1987 crop. Twenty-one cents a gallon means a lot when you burn up 10,000 gallons of diesel fuel in a spring seeding operation.

And I would like to think of some of the long-term commitments which were made in 1982 which have meant so much to the people of my constituency. I think of the 214 farmers that are part of the farm purchase

program. They have an average yearly subsidy of \$4,500 under that and I contrast that, Mr. Speaker, with the land bank program which, in a far longer period of time, only placed 100 farmers — thereabouts — in my constituency. And I doubt, sir, that very many of those are owning their own operation at this time.

Over half of those 214 farmers that I speak of, Mr. Speaker, were intergenerational transfers, the very thing which we are attempting to do with that program. And if my constituency is any microcosm, if you will, of the province as a whole, then it is indeed a very successful program in that intergenerational transfer of land.

I like to think of the 1,300 kilometres of natural gas line which have gone into Thunder Creek in the last three years — a convenience, if you will, which so many people in urban Saskatchewan took for granted for so long. A cheap source of energy, a cheap source of heating their homes, and it is now available by and large to the people in my constituency. I think of one very large hog operation which in its first year saved \$60,000 in heating costs, Mr. Speaker, those kinds of savings mean money in the pocket of the producers in my constituency.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, when we are talking about commitment, about living up to the things which we said we would do as a PC government in this province, I suppose the crowning achievement came today. Because \$415 million, which will be Saskatchewan's share of a \$1 billion deficiency payment, has come home today. It is something which our Premier spearheaded and fought for and indeed was keeping the trust with rural Saskatchewan when it came today.

It will mean millions of dollars for producers in my constituency. It will mean millions of dollars to the small towns, to the people who have small businesses, to the people who supply the farm sector. It will mean thousands of dollars to the nearest urban centres, Regina and Moose Jaw. Recently there was a Statistics Canada report, Mr. Speaker, which said that 21 cents of every dollar which goes into a farmer's pocket goes to the nearest urban centre. And I would think that all the people in the urban centres of our province would be awaiting that \$415 million to our province because they are going to directly benefit from it.

And I like to think of my own nearest urban centre, the city of Moose Jaw. I was born there, in the union hospital, received most of my education there — and I like to think it was a very fine education. I lived there after my marriage in 1974 for eight and a half years, was a taxpayer in that city, and considered myself to be a Moose Jawian like the other 35,000 that habituate there. Many members of my family live in that city.

And it made me think and take issue a bit with my colleague across the way, the member from Moose Jaw North, who said in his maiden speech that this government had not done anything for the city of Moose Jaw. And I think that's a bit of an unfounded criticism because many of the problems which my nearest urban centre, my trading area, is now going through, I feel have deeper roots than what have occurred in the last four and a half years.

And I'd like to say to my colleague that from 1960 to 1982, a former member of the government when they were in across the way . . . He sat in the front bench, a very prominent minister for 11 years from the city of Moose Jaw. And I did not see the Phillips Cable factory built at that time in the city of Moose Jaw; I did not see the Bader Bin establishment coming to the city of Moose Jaw; and I definitely did not see a provincial Crown corporation taken from the capital city and moved to the city of Moose Jaw in an attempt to spread the government of our province to the citizens of this province.

I'm not saying that everything during that time period was bad, because it wasn't. There were things done for our city. But I think when we talk about what needs to be done, and if we are placing blame, that perhaps a sharing should be done rather than just the last four and a half years, because I am very proud of Moose Jaw, and I want to see it grow and prosper because the direct relation between Moose Jaw and the people of my constituency is very intimate and will not be changed in the foreseeable future. And I believe that that intimate relationship, for the good of all of us, must grow and prosper.

When you talk about building and development in this province, Mr. Speaker, I like to think that the initiatives made in the last four years were positive. I think of the Weyerhaeuser project for the city of Prince Albert, where we finally had an integrated forest products system in this province for the very first time, as being positive.

It may take a few years before those positive results become apparent to everyone in this province, but I believe it will come because we are taking an asset which has never been used before and we are going to build upon it. We are going to have people employed using an asset which was never used before. And any time you do that, you only can improve the quality of life and the quality of jobs in this province.

I like to think that Gainers, which will be the very first, if you will, totally value-added red meat system in this province, can only be a good thing for this province. And I know that the ownership of the Gainers plant has brought great derision and laughter from some people, but I once again will give Mr. Pocklington his due and see if he can produce.

I firmly believe that the private sector is the way that this type of value-added industry should be added to our province repertoire, and I feel that any time we can ship packaged bacon or hams into one of the largest grocery markets in the world that we would be foolish to do otherwise, because once again we are using a resource, Mr. Speaker, which we have never used before, to the advantage of the people of this province.

During the course of the throne speech, Mr. Speaker . . . I don't know why this is. I thought I had an original thought here, but I also am going to refer to my grandmother. And I've heard it from both sides of the House in the last few days, and I suppose the reason I'm doing this is because I'm fortunate enough to have two of them still alive, and I like to think that they're both great ladies, and ladies of some wisdom. They're people that I respect because

they've spent their entire life, if you will, in the province of Saskatchewan, and I would think in 92 and 88 years respectively, that you would learn some very valuable lessons over a period of time.

I like to think of Grandmother Swenson in particular because she was born offshore as opposed to my other grandmother who was born in Canada. Grandmother Swenson walked out of the belly of a cattle boat in 1908 in Montreal, and I'm sure that many members of this House had relatives and people who experienced a similar type of situation. And I had to think that that took a heck of a lot of optimism and dedication to walk out of the belly of that cattle boat and get on a train and go on a wagon from Moose Jaw southward to a point in the prairie which was 20 miles south-west of a place that came to be called Assiniboia, and there was nothing there. Nothing at all. And to be there as a 10-year-old child when you had grown up in a major area of England must have been a fair shock to the system. And I can only think that that optimism and that dedication had to be there from a very early age in order to withstand the type of things that were necessary in those days.

And there was definitely a dedication to building this province because you do not raise a family in the 1930s, Mr. Speaker, where you had to cover the table three times a day to keep the dirt out of the food, and wash the clothes that were constantly rubbed in that grime, and try to put three squares a day on that table when you could not grow anything in southern Saskatchewan. I think that took optimism and dedication.

And you know what? My grandmother thought a lot of the CCF regimes of the 1940s and '50s. And she thought a lot of them because they set about rebuilding Saskatchewan after the devastation of the '30s. And that was building. That was bringing power to rural Saskatchewan to make my grandmother's life a little bit easier — things that people in urban areas had taken for granted.

It meant a telephone, so that when sickness or joy occurred in the family, you could spread it around to your friends and relatives. Once again, something which was taken for granted by other people in our province. And that was why my grandmother was a great fan of the CCF. And that is why, today, my 88-year-old grandmother is a very strong supporter of our Premier because she still reads and listens and watches television, and she likes that attitude. She likes to think that we will not go back in time, but that we will have that optimism and dedication and we will build and grow in this province, Mr. Speaker.

We must take the strengths which so are inherently obvious to this province and we must build upon them. Because for us to do otherwise and for me in particular, the fourth generation on my farm, would be a disgrace to my heritage. And, sir, I did not go through two election campaigns and two nominations in the last 18 months to be a disgrace to my heritage. I am here to do a job, sir, and let's get on with it.

We must develop our oil and gas industry because it is there. It is a strength; it is something to build on. And until the recent downturn in the world energy picture, it was a very obvious strength in this province and to the 12,000

newly employed people which were there after 1982.

We must develop the fertilizer and farm chemical industry in this province because that is a \$550 million mega-project that occurs every year here in this province, Mr. Speaker, as you well know. We, in rural Saskatchewan, in the production of food, spend that much per year. And I find it ludicrous, Mr. Speaker, that we in this province would truck in water from Ontario to spray on our fields. And I know that we have not had a great water reputation in the south of Saskatchewan in the recent past, but we've taken measures to make sure that it is drinkable in the cities of Moose Jaw and Regina now. And I would think that it is at least good enough to mix in with our farm chemical in order to get those nice little 10-litre jugs in a saleable position.

(2030)

And I would think that for us to do otherwise, to not look at those two particular industries when they mean so much to our province would be foolish and ridiculous. I like to think of the optimism which the hon. member from Rosetown spoke about when he talked about the irrigation potential in our province. In my constituency of Thunder Creek that potential is vast and untapped. And I look forward to working with my colleague on tapping that resource and making it something that Saskatchewan can use and build upon, because, once again, it is a resource that has never been used in our province to its full potential and can add so much to the everyday life of Saskatchewan.

When you think of the potato chips which each and everyone of us consume in the cafeteria here in this building, and you think that maybe they came from New Brunswick and maybe they came from Idaho, there is no reason at all, Mr. Speaker, that those particular potato chips cannot be grown under irrigation along Lake Diefenbaker and be here for the consumer of our province at a benefit to him and at a benefit to the producer of that potato.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to mention a few words about trade. And I've heard quite a bit of negative comment coming from across the way on the trade matters which have been on the minds of Canadians over the last year. And I know, in this province, as a producer of a primary product, that for us to think, to even attempt to think about living within our borders without having comprehensive trade with our major trading partners would not only be foolish, it would be disastrous. And I think only of the red meat industry in this province, 80-some per cent of which goes outside of our province. It is traded either in Eastern Canada, or to the United States of America, or the Pacific Rim.

In my constituency, tomorrow morning there is a meeting, and I expect there will be several hundred people there talking about developing a 12,000 head feedlot. These 12,000 head will be turned over three times a year. They will use the natural assets of Lake Diefenbaker, the irrigation potential. They will use the feed grown there to feed the cattle to a fat-cattle status, a slaughter-cattle status, and that means many things. It means stability to the red meat industry in that part of my

constituency and indeed many of the constituencies around it, because it'll provide a market for those feeder cattle that are there every year. It will mean that Canada Packers in Moose Jaw and Intercon in Saskatoon may have to hire more people because they will have 36,000 head of cattle more to slaughter per year.

And it will mean that a very drought-prone area of my constituency which has had to rely upon grain as a way of living may be able to diversify and perhaps protect themselves from some of the ups and downs of the farming market.

And I think of that red meat industry, Mr. Speaker, and what would happen if that border were shut down to those producers when those cattle are finished out between 90 and 120 days. And if that border is shut down and that outlet is not there, Mr. Speaker, then this whole concept, which so many hundreds of farmers may be participating in, will go down the drain. And for us in this province as primary producers of products to think otherwise is disastrous.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that this throne speech, this blueprint for future development in Saskatchewan, is building on strengths. And we all know that when you use a blueprint, you have to use some foresight. You have to look into the future a little bit, and you definitely do not look into the past. And in this case we have a blueprint for building Saskatchewan.

I want to congratulate my Premier and his government for this blueprint, for the speech which my colleagues so elegantly delivered. And I want to say as MLA for Thunder Creek that I'll naturally be supporting this motion. I look forward to the many excellent programs which this government will bring to the people of Saskatchewan during its next four-year term. It's a Progressive Conservative blueprint, something which I am very proud of. And it is something that I want to be a part of for the next four years.

In my closing remarks, Mr. Speaker, I say this to the legislature. For those of you who oppose this Speech from the Throne and are saying no to building in Saskatchewan, and to those who are saying yes to this throne speech and who are saying yes to the future, then the future of Saskatchewan is ours. And on that note, Mr. Speaker, and on behalf of the constituents of Thunder Creek, I support the motion in favour of the Speech from the Throne. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I enter the debate today, I notice a happier occasion than the previous time when I entered debate. But I do want to take a moment to again congratulate you on your appointment to the Chair.

And I also want to take this opportunity to thank . . . not to thank, but to congratulate each member of this legislature and you, Mr. Speaker, for the honour the people of Saskatchewan have bestowed upon us.

As we begin our deliberations, it must be with a clear understanding that the people of this province have just temporarily delegated to us the authority to make rules regarding the administration of Saskatchewan — rules and administration, Mr. Speaker, which will best reflect the interests of the people who have elected us.

It is my sincere hope that in some way I can use the lessons learned while I was growing up on a co-op farm over 100 kilometres from the nearest city, which was Swift Current. I sincerely thank the people of Beechy and the district surrounding Beechy for offering me solid values which I was growing up there.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I hope that some of the things I learned over the past 12 years, while working for the largest agricultural co-operative in Saskatchewan, will help me better serve Regina North and the people of our great province.

My appreciation also goes to the people of Regina North for the honour that they have bestowed in me, the honour of representing so many good, honest, hard-working and sincere people that make up the constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I wish not to offend any other MLA because I am sure that there are many Saskatchewan people that could fit nicely into Regina North, but the fact is that Regina North has the finest people in all of Saskatchewan. Regina North residents go daily about the job of keeping our province going by working in manufacturing industries, service industries, small businesses, in the public service and in agriculture, either directly as farmers or less directly as owners and employees of agricultural related businesses.

Sadly, we have disproportionately high unemployment in Regina North, as trades people who have worked many years at Ipsco and in building trades are finding jobs all too few and farther and farther between.

In Conservative Saskatchewan there were 2,000 fewer jobs in November of 1986 than there were in November of 1985. Saskatchewan was the only province in that one-year time period that had fewer jobs at the end of it than at the beginning. It is just simply not good enough. Sadly, many of the jobs lost have been lost to would-be working people of Regina North.

The people of my constituency do not want anything more than a fair portion of jobs and opportunity for working people today. We don't want anything more than a fair shake, but we will not accept anything less.

Students and young people are facing the toughest times we've had for many years. Youth unemployment has been at crisis levels for much too long. Mr. Speaker, if we don't address the unemployment crisis we will soon have adults in their mid-20s being offered their first jobs and them saying, what, me work? And they won't understand that you have to appear at a certain time to go to work — through no fault of their own. We have to address the unemployment crisis. We must do a better job at creating permanent job at creating permanent jobs for a permanent future.

Mr. Speaker, as I've mentioned, I do look forward to

representing Regina North residents in this legislature. As I have also stated, jobs and job creation is the first priority. We have seen the number of small-business bankruptcies escalate and grow to three times the number of bankruptcies that there were in 1981. Yet the Conservative government doesn't see or hear the problems of small-business people and working people. They don't hear or see because they are too busy with self-congratulating hoopla.

Part of the problem, Mr. Speaker, results from the people in our society who are least able to defend themselves being attacked again and again by the government. How can any reasonable person or any reasonable government expect any one of the approximately 50,000 Saskatchewan workers working for minimum wage to survive? Assuming a 40-hour week, 52 weeks a year, these people earn just \$9,300 a year.

I know that the Conservative rhetoric is, oh, but it's only a starting point. But the sad part is, for most of these 50,000 working men and women it is a long, long starting point. How long is it reasonable to be "a starter"? Is it one month, is it one year, or is it a lifetime?

Members opposite by their actions and by the actions of their party, and the government in its first term, have shown nothing but callous contempt and disregard for minimum wage earners. The Premier, on the other hand, has recently hired a principal secretary at a cost to taxpayers of over \$69,000 a year. Simple mathematics shows this is more money than 10 people working at minimum wage. And single parents on minimum wage don't have expense accounts to further inflate their earnings.

There are other examples, Mr. Speaker. I wonder how many minimum wages could be paid with Mr. Hill's new salary. Do you think the Premier will ever disclose the amount? Is it more than when he was a judge?

The point is, we have people being attacked and being held down and reduced to permanent poverty while others bask at the trough.

We are entering the first session of a new legislature, Mr. Speaker, and in doing so I hope we appreciate the importance of this opportunity for a fresh new start. It is a time to review our priorities and give serious consideration to new ideas.

This is particularly important for the government with respect to its policy regarding urban Saskatchewan. The massive condemnation of your old solutions by people in cities, towns, small towns, and villages, and the reduction of your support in rural Saskatchewan, should provide the government with clear evidence that their tired and old, worn solutions simply will no longer work, if they ever did work.

(2045)

When talking of old solutions, let's look at the similarities between the Thatcher Liberal government and the present Conservative administrations.

Both offered sweetheart deals to their big-business friends with no regard for the fact that Saskatchewan people would have to pay the final bill. Both set aside principles to engage in rampant patronage — patronage to line the pockets of wealthy friends. Some of this patronage eventually found its way back to the PC and Liberal party coffers.

Thatcher's was, and Devine's is, characterized by public service staff cuts and a tax on the wages of people employed by the government. Both are characterized by their attacks on people receiving social assistance.

Both have failed to properly fund our hospitals. The Liberals opted for deterrent fees while the present Tory government underfund hospital expansions and then they give lottery licences to make up the shortfall. Mr. Speaker, health care is no gambling matter. We must be serious about it.

Both subscribe to a strange law of the jungle, where the government makes allies of the strong and attack the weak.

And finally, both appear to be governments more preoccupied with their own political fortunes than those of the people they were elected to serve. The Liberals gerrymandered constituencies to maintain power; the conservatives appear ready to grant-mander constituencies to maintain power.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we're living in a new world with new circumstances, new problems, new technologies, new social dynamics, and new challenges — a new world which can't be governed by reincarnating the right-wing policies of R.B. Bennett or Ross Thatcher. Taking the worst of R.B. Bennett and the worst of Ross Thatcher and calling it Devine conservatism doesn't make it any easier to take.

The Premier has talked a lot about Expo '86, and it was a good show. But do you remember Expo '67 and the great sense of optimism that we Canadians felt at that time about our future? There were displays which gave us a glimpse of the high-tech future: a society of robots, computers, increased leisure time and widespread wealth and comfort. It's a future which can still happen, but it is off to a rocky, rocky start.

People are not being protected, and workers are coming in second to corporate profits. So today, Mr. Speaker, we see lay-offs, increased unemployment, calls for wage cuts for working people and larger profits for corporations which own the machines. The work week has not shrunk, but the work-force certainly has. The benefits of technology haven't been shared fairly within our society. They've gone directly back to the multinationals, leaving working people more and more disadvantaged.

There are major concerns occurring in agriculture. There are two sizes of Saskatchewan farms growing in number — farms under 325 acres, and farms over 1,500 acres. Both have different needs.

Obviously, the smaller farms are now — smaller farmers, I should more correctly say — are now earning off-farm

income. For the larger and still growing farms, machinery is getting more and more complicated with each passing year. Finance and administration of all sizes of farms is much more complex now than at any time in our history.

Business people are finding the world changed also. There are fewer and fewer independent retailers. Bulk buying and bulk merchandising by franchisers and chain stores mean the true independent retailers are becoming an endangered species.

People involved in food processing and small manufacturers have their own unique problems.

The innovator may have a great idea or a great product, but it is unlikely to survive in a world where success or failure is determined by marketing giants like MacDonald's Consolidated.

Children are looking at a shrinking job market. I mentioned earlier StatsCanada had reported the loss of 2,000 jobs in Saskatchewan between November 1985 and November 1986. These young people are facing increased pressure of all sorts — to succeed in school, to find a job, or even to survive at all in a world threatened with nuclear arms.

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, for us to take control of our destiny; to chart our own course. We can't solve the fundamental issues which we face today by having an unquestioning faith in what is, or what used to be.

We can't assume that the best interests of you or of I or our constituents is served by allowing the current imbalances in our economy to continue. It won't serve the average business man, the farmer, or the working man very well.

So let's talk seriously about robots and computers to do the back-breaking and mundane labour. Let's talk seriously about a shorter work week for working people. Let's correct the rocky start to our future world, and distribute the benefits of technology widely.

Let's talk about agriculture and the need for machinery co-ops so farmers can save literally thousands of dollars each year and get their work done faster in the bargain.

Let's talk seriously about helping Saskatchewan vegetable producers form co-operatives to process and market their products.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — And let's have increased Saskatchewan Research Council funding to help producers make the transition to processing. Let's introduce legislation that gives our people a fair chance at market access.

Why aren't we doing research and development on import replacement of foodstuffs to ensure food quality, freedom from dangerous chemicals, and jobs here in Saskatchewan? Farmers and small-business people need our attention and assistance to make their future, and ours, more secure.

Big business, the multinationals, take care of themselves.

They go where the greatest profits are. Their commitment is to the profit-loss column, not to the needs of society. It is a fact of life which we accept.

But we are in the business of caring for people, meeting the needs of society. We must set the conditions for these powerful institutions to deal with our citizens, on a one-on-one basis or collectively. We must also be prepared to accept a mix of private and public investment.

Publicly run companies have a much greater sensitivity to the needs of our citizens and their employees. They offer us the opportunity to undertake new and innovative projects for the benefit of the people of this province.

And when I speak of public enterprise, I speak of proud companies that have done much to unify Saskatchewan and help people socially and economically. Any move by the present government to sell off Crown corporations like SaskTel or Saskatchewan Government Insurance or Saskatchewan Transportation Company or Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan would be short-sighted and not in the best interests of the people of our province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — Our future, Mr. Speaker, may, in fact, be enhanced by new forms of public enterprise rather than the direction the members opposite seem to want to take.

Our children today are under an incredible amount of stress. They feel that they lack control of their future, and they do now. They face increasing pressure to excel in school, uncertainty about their chances for finding work even if they get a university degree or their journeyman's paper, and uncertainty about the future of this planet which has far too many nuclear weapons. We need to do everything we can to free our children of this threat and to free ourselves of the threat of nuclear war.

We should be telling the federal government to stop the cruise missile testing. We should be telling the federal government it is unacceptable that Canadian soil or Canadian territory should be in any way tainted with nuclear weapons.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — We can manage our economy, Mr. Speaker, through that mix of private and public enterprise that I mentioned earlier, to ensure that the jobs are here. Now the members opposite may find public enterprise distasteful, but if you give a young person a choice between unemployment and working for SaskTel or SGI or PCS, they'll take working for a Crown corporation every time.

We can use public enterprise to manage unemployment, and we can follow through with talk of compassion for our young people in preventative medicine by giving them better recreational facilities and health classes at school which teach them how to handle stress and other things.

First and foremost, however, we need governments

which are committed to peace. For our part, the testing of cruise missiles, as I've mentioned, over Saskatchewan has done nothing to ease the minds of young people — certainly not the young people I have talked to — and we need to negotiate disarmament somehow. That's got to be more realistic than preparation for war.

If we take the initiative, we can ensure that there are more and better opportunities for working people, for Saskatchewan small-business people, farmers, and for students who hope to join the work-force in the future. It could be the kind of society where each and every one is able to take a greater measure of control over our own future — a less stressful, more satisfying, a more co-operative society. We can build it, but we have to start by building on the foundation. The foundation is there. It has been shaken during the course of the last four and a half years, but it remains intact. We can indeed use it.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have problems and we have opportunities. The problems are solvable and the opportunities are great. It's a situation which gives us reason to feel very optimistic about the future of this province and the people, if we choose to govern wisely.

But where are we now, Mr. Speaker, and how does this throne speech prepare us for the challenging new future which awaits us? It offers more give-aways of non-renewable resources to what are largely out-of-province companies, companies which have a greater obligation to profit, as I mentioned earlier, than to the well-being of the people of Saskatchewan — companies which will pack their bags and leave when our finite supply of resources runs out. Resources and resource revenues can be used and should be used to help finance our social programs.

The throne speech offers more tax on the needy and the unemployed through further reviews of our social assistance programs and there is little doubt in my mind that this government will be stepping up its attacks on the needy. There cannot be any justification for attacking the people that this government has failed to protect in the past.

The throne speech offers hope of a preventative health care program, an objective which I support, Mr. Speaker. But somehow I question the government's dedication to this cause when it encourages alcohol advertising, cancels the fresh food subsidy for northern people, and lays in the same bed as Brian Mulroney, a Prime Minister who is putting the wishes of multinational drug companies for inflated profits ahead of the health of Canadians.

It is a throne speech from a Premier who four and a half years ago led the people of Regina to believe that he would solve their water problems and the water quality problems with a pipeline from lake Diefenbaker. Instead, we see continuing water supply problems. We've seen a partially effective carbon filtration plant. We also have seen massive unemployment and laid off employees at Ipsco. So much for long-term planning, so much for social planning. We need a secure water supply for Regina, and we need it soon.

It is a government which talks of its business sense, but is unable to balance its books or even to accurately forecast the size of its deficit.

This government also dispenses patronage freely and with no apologies and no remorse. The present government went into an advertising frenzy with public funds before calling the recent provincial election, and that same government has already shown its disregard for the legislative process and intends, I believe, to flaunt its regard for democracy by rewriting the electoral boundaries of this province in a manner which they hope will give them a chance to survive in the next election.

(2100)

With respect to the areas I will serve as a spokesman for my party, let me make the following observations: the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development had a staff of 75 people in fiscal year 1981-82. That is now down to 59.3 in fiscal '86-87. While I have no trouble with governments finding efficiencies and cutting the fat, I must wonder if these staff cuts are part of the reason for the lack of accomplishments by this department. The need for co-ops has never been greater than it is right now.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — SGI has been run into the ground by the members opposite — rate increases, service cuts and inattention to pressing problems like liability insurance are only the tip of the iceberg. Automobile owners, businesses, home owners, mobile home owners, school boards and municipalities have spoken out, but their concerns keep falling on deaf ears. What has happened, Mr. Speaker, to the promise in the previous throne speech that we would have a "made in Saskatchewan" liability insurance rate for our school units and our municipalities. Where is it? Nowhere.

There is little doubt that Saskatchewan Transportation Company has not grown to more effectively serve the people of this province. The number of buses owned and the routes served have decreased under the Conservatives, while the average age of the buses has increased dramatically, and the reason for the age increase of the fleet is that the present administration has chosen to direct Saskatchewan Transportation Company to sell some relatively new buses and trade them in for older units. I just don't see the business sense of that. If the government wants though, I've got . . . Well I have a vehicle that I'd be glad to trade with them. Let's put it that way. And I think I could do very well.

In Wascana Centre, Mr. Speaker, Regina's showpiece has not been given the financial or the moral support it needs. It could become the magnet which attracts more tourists to our city and our province and it could provide even better recreational opportunities for the people of this community. We will be watching to see what happens over the next term of government in that area.

We have a wealth of new opportunities before us, Mr. Speaker. We have a province and a people full of promise

and hope; together we can make a better Saskatchewan. Let's just remember that we are here to serve the people of this great province.

Just before I close, Mr. Speaker, I too would appreciate the liberty of acknowledging some family that has been very supportive of me. My wife Lorna is up in the visitors' gallery at this moment, and she has been my best critic, my best supporter, and a real help to me as I've gone through my political career.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — I would also be remiss if I did not mention my grandmother, who was the first woman elected to represent my party back in 1944, along with Tommy Douglas.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — Thank you. And I am sure that if my grandmother were alive today she would join me in heartily welcoming the three proud New Democrats we have — the three proud women we have representing the New Democratic Party today. And I take my hat off to our three good MLAs that we have now, today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the amendment to the motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise from my seat for this evening, for the very first time in this Assembly to represent the constituency of Moosomin in support of the recent throne speech presented by His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor.

And I, too, say thank you to the Moosomin electorate for a new and enlarged mandate for a Progressive Conservative MLA to represent them here in this legislature in this term.

As well, I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election as Speaker of this House, and I am confident that you will administer the office of Speaker fairly and effectively.

I also take the time to congratulate all members on their success in the recent election campaign.

I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge the strong and able representation provided to the Moosomin constituency since 1975 by the former member, Larry Birkbeck.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker, I believe today is a rather significant day in the history of our province. Before I was elected to this Assembly, I was quoted in a newspaper article with the following comments:

The leadership of the Premier, the member for Estevan, has been one of the main strengths of the

Progressive Conservative government since its election in 1982. He has led the government with vigour, determination, a positive attitude, despite the economic hardships of the last few years. And he has gone to the wall for Saskatchewan farmers.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Premier best exemplifies the qualities required to take this province into the 1990s.

Mr. Speaker, I do not pretend to be a prophet, but I fully believe that statement has been borne out here today, with the announcement of over \$400 million for the pockets of Saskatchewan farm families, an announcement that many of my constituents will welcome and even now are saying, thank you for thinking of us.

The delivery of the \$1 billion deficiency payment for Canadian farmers facing the unfair subsidy programs of the United States and the European Economic community is in a very big way due to the efforts of our Premier.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this great province made a clear decision on October 29th of this year to say no to the past. It was a clear and conscious decision and with it went any support for confrontation and negativism.

The farm families of this province do not want rhetoric. They want delivery, and today they got it. I cannot emphasize this enough, Mr. Speaker, the importance of today's announcement. The people we represent are rational and realistic people. As producers in an industry that is the lifeline of this province, they are not, nor have they ever been, looking for handouts.

Yesterday, for example, while stopped at a service station in my constituency, a farmer approached me and said, "Thank you for your help and let the Premier know that we say thank you." He also added, "We do not want handouts, but we want a government that cares when we are in need." And I was proud to assure him that we do care, and we will continue to listen.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — His message was simple, Mr. Speaker. Farmers simply want some protection from a situation they are neither responsible for nor have control over.

Again, Mr. Speaker, today they got it. And, Mr. Speaker, they have received that protection alongside new opportunities since your Progressive Conservative government was formed in 1982.

Mr. Speaker, talk is cheap. A responsible government must protect the livelihood and prosperity of its people. And it must provide a vision for the future. Your Progressive Conservative governments track record speaks for itself. No government in this province has ever done more, and as outlined in the Speech from the Throne, we are going to continue building on what is now a strong and stable foundation.

To make my point, Mr. Speaker, let me highlight a few

examples. The introduction of the first ever Saskatchewan pension plan for home-makers, small businesses, farmers and part-time workers;; exemption from education health tax on all clothing, footwear and yard goods under \$300; creation of the senior citizens' heritage program providing almost \$40 million for our elderly; a 100 per cent increase to the Saskatchewan income plan for senior citizens; construction of 540 senior citizen housing units; the revitalization of nursing home bed construction program, which approved over 1,500 new beds since 1982 and eliminated a 6-year moratorium; creation of the Saskatchewan Home Program to provide new opportunities and provide increased security and a better life for home owners and their families.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, today while having lunch I had the privilege of talking with a tradesperson involved in home construction in this city. This is what he had to say regarding the home program. This home program is one of the best government programs any government has ever come up with. And of course it was very easy for me to agree with him.

Mr. Speaker, just a few examples.

One of the major concerns of people everywhere is employment. Since 1982 our Progressive conservative government has consistently been among the leading provinces with the fewest unemployed and the most new jobs created.

Our success, Mr. Speaker, has come as a result of our commitment of government resources and our encouragement of small business and a diversification of our economy.

As indicated by the Speech from the Throne, these efforts will continue and will be combined with new thrusts in tourism and the development of manufacturing for agricultural chemicals and fertilizers, support for technological advancement, and further efforts to secure new industry in our province.

We proved to the world through Expo '86 that we have the capabilities, the resources and the people to compete at the very best levels. As our Premier said recently, we simply cannot afford to stand still.

Mr. Speaker, I feel the magnet again pulling, and I'm again drawn to speak on our accomplishments in agriculture. I know they are many, but I'll do my best not to run out the clock.

The constituency of Moosomin is like most in this province. We depend almost exclusively on the fortunes of farmers. When our farmers suffer, the businesses in our communities suffer, and that is what I got from every business person in our constituency — was to do everything we could for agriculture, because it meant a lot to them. To put it simply, the money stops flowing.

Mr. Speaker, through the efforts and direction of our Premier, agriculture has survived its worst attack in 50 years. As a result, the farmers and their families who are so vital to the communities they represent are still in

operation today, despite the grasshoppers and the drought and low commodity prices and many other problems they have faced.

Mr. Speaker, while many of my colleagues have already mentioned a large number of the programs that have protected our producers, I too must highlight these initiatives because of their positive impact on the farmers in my riding: the production loan program which provided over \$19,000 per farmer; the farm purchase program which 5,700 farmers, mostly young, took advantage of; the farm fuel program which was created through oil royalties; the farm land security program for which our government will propose legislation that will extend its provisions for another year to further protect farm families, and, Mr. Speaker, many many more.

Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that in your Progressive Conservative government's last budget, agriculture increased by \$118 million — more than double that of the previous year. And the largest increase in the history of this province.

Mr. Speaker, that is not rhetoric — that is commitment, delivery, and genuine proof that your Progressive Conservative government cares about the farm families of Saskatchewan.

(2115)

That same caring and commitment has been displayed to every sector of this province. Our commitment to education and health care came at a time when almost every other province in the country was cutting back. Instead our government believed that we must build our future by providing security against illness, and new opportunities for our children.

Mr. Speaker, as the people proved on October 20th, we do not have to apologize for these commitments. Nor do we apologize for the construction and renovation of schools in the Moosomin constituency: Churchill and McLeod schools — \$824,000; Wapella school — \$273,000; Parkland High School in Wawota — \$875,000; McNaughton High School in Moosomin — \$32,000; Langbank school — \$166,000; and Rocanville school — \$131,000, plus an additional two projects at the Rocanville school, totalling \$195,000.

Nor, Mr. Speaker, do we apologize for the new 30-bed special care home in Wawota or the 32-bed special care home in the communities of Whitewood. And both communities expressed over and over and over again how pleased they were with this government in finally listening to them and giving them a service they so badly needed.

Your Progressive Conservative government, Mr. Speaker, is listening to the people of Saskatchewan. We hear them when they tell us that we must make more efficient and effective use of government resources. We hear them when they tell us that they want our government to continue building for the future through further economic development and diversification.

Mr. Speaker, we hear the people tell us that they want this

government to continue providing protection against difficult economic times. We hear the people when they tell us we must continue co-operating and consulting with individuals and groups in order to fight drug and alcohol abuse, especially amongst our young people.

Since 1982, your Progressive Conservative government and its representatives have been listening. I stand before you today as a proof of that statement. And I must repeat, Mr. Speaker, that it has been the leadership of our Premier that is behind every accomplishment accredited to this government.

I am indeed extremely honoured, Mr. Speaker, to lend my support to the Speech from the Throne, and I am eagerly awaiting all opportunities to serve the people of the Moosomin constituency.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — I appreciate the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to participate in the throne speech debate this evening. I would like to say that I'm rising in support of our leader's amendment to the throne speech.

I would first like to congratulate the newly elected members of this legislature, and to congratulate those that have been returned.

I know it can be a very trying time. I'm sure members who were in very close election campaigns, like Regina Wascana and the Turtleford constituencies, can appreciate the nervous moments during election night when they're watching television or listening to the radio as the returns come in as to whether or not they've actually retained their seat in the legislature. I recognize that members work very hard during their term, that they are elected members of the legislature, and are anxious to become re-elected.

I would like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, and the Deputy Speaker, on your election as Speaker of the Legislative Assembly.

I notice that you approached your Chair with some reluctance, Mr. Speaker. But even this government, I want to assure you, does not hang the Speaker any more as they did in tradition in the older days.

Don't be sure of that, one of the members is saying.

I would also like to congratulate the government on their re-election. I say that with some hesitancy, but I do believe that we'll have a much better government than we had between 1982 and this election, where you have a stronger opposition in the legislature. And a stronger opposition always makes for better government than a legislature that has a reduced number of opposition members.

I would like to welcome the Pages to the Legislative Assembly. I know that it will be a good experience for you. And I'm sure that through your endeavours through your lifetime you'll look back on your time here as being a pleasant and learning experience with, I'm sure, some frustrations, the same as many of the members of the

Legislature go through from time to time.

I would like to dedicate my speech this evening to a long-time friend of mine, Jim Murdock, who is in the Regina Plains Hospital this evening. I'm sure that my colleagues here, at least on this side of the House, will know Jim well and wish him a speedy recovery from Regina Plains Hospital where he has undergone surgery. And we do wish him a very speedy recovery.

The throne speech, Mr. Speaker, was hard to recognize as a throne speech, coming from the same government that has just some six or seven weeks ago gone through a provincial election campaign and that the province was very, very prosperous in the month of October and in the month of September of 1986. And now that the throne speech comes down the month of December, they say that the province of Saskatchewan continues to face difficult economic conditions.

I find this a little hard to reconcile with the exuberance about the economy just a few short weeks ago, and I refer to it more as an illusion of prosperity that we experienced through the media and through speeches, through work of members on the government side.

During the election campaign it was reported in the media and by members on the government side that all eyes of the province, in fact western Canada, were on the Battlefords. And certainly many of those eyes were on the Battlefords, but the Battlefords did not return an incumbent to the legislature, and I am privileged and honoured that I was able to gain the confidence of the electors in the Battlefords constituency and take my seat here in the Legislative Assembly for the province of Saskatchewan.

My commitment is to give long and dedicated service to the constituency of the Battlefords through this Legislative Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — I see that members of the government side are very happy to see me here as well, and I'm pleased to be here with you, many of whom I know quite well.

One of the things that happened during the election campaign with the Battlefords constituency was that the people of the Battlefords constituency actually proved that it was a constituency that could not be bought. And I'm sure you're disappointed in the results of the Battlefords constituency, as a very few people I would say are disappointed in the Battlefords as well, because of the great illusion of prosperity that was there in the Battlefords.

There are many things that we promised, many things that were actually under construction, but the people that make the difference in election campaigns said that things weren't so great in the Battlefords and they wanted to look at something a little bit different. They wanted to look at an opportunity for jobs in their home communities, in North Battleford and the town of Battleford. And they wanted to have an appreciation for

some compassion. And one of the things I think that will happen over the term of this legislature is that there will be more compassion from this government than what we've seen during the period from 1982 until the election that we've just gone through.

The Battlefords, Mr. Speaker, is a totally urban constituency. We don't have any rural area in The Battlefords constituency; it's a self-contained riding. You don't have the situation like you have in Prince Albert, or like you have in Saskatoon, or Regina where you have other urban constituencies within the same centre. And it's a very easy riding to represent in that the people have many common interests — it's very compact. And I have some appreciation for members who represent large rural ridings or northern ridings where you have great miles to cover and many, many people to see in many, many communities with a diversity of interests that's even greater than that of the Battlefords, Mr. Speaker.

The mainstay, of course, in The Battlefords is agriculture. Agriculture has been number one in the province overall for as long as we've been a province, and likely will continue to be for many, many years into the future.

We had some hopes for the oil industry in the Battlefords area. In the Battlefords area many activities concerning the oil patch came in to the Battlefords under the administration of the Leader of the Opposition, who was formerly the premier of Saskatchewan. I think of companies like G L M Tanks in North Battleford, who came there and started to produce tanks for the heavy oil fields. I think of Gulf Oil, their heavy oil division that came to the Battlefords during the term of New Democrats in the administration of the province of Saskatchewan and are still there today. They sometimes say that if the government changes they'll have to move, but I believe that to be more political rhetoric, Mr. Speaker, than I do actual fact.

We also have had some disappointments in the oil industry around the Battlefords. Recently, just prior to the election campaign, we had an enhanced oil recovery project that the community of Meota, and although that is outside of the constituency of the Battlefords, it certainly had a very large impact on North Battleford and the town of Battleford. Many of the employees lived in the community of the Battlefords but worked on the heavy oil recovery project.

Canterra was the operator of that project, and I think they got a bit shaky when the world oil price dropped. And I can appreciate that some of those things are beyond the control of a provincial government or even a federal or national government, in that world oil prices are a difficult thing for provincial and federal governments to have any control over or to actually do anything about.

But one of the reasons I think that Canterra actually moved out of the heavy oil recovery project at Meota was the fact that this government opposite didn't show the confidence through Saskoil, which is a provincial Crown corporation, to maintain the majority of their work, the majority of their exploration and development within the province of Saskatchewan. When Saskoil was given, I would call, an extension of their mandate to move

outside of the province of Saskatchewan, that gives very little confidence to the private oil companies — oil companies in the private sector — to remain in the province of Saskatchewan and develop our resources here.

And I would think that a provincial Crown corporation has more to do than to look at the bottom line profits. I can appreciate that companies in the private sector have to look at their bottom line. They have to look at if they're profitable, whether or not they're going to be able to exist over the long term, whether they're going to be able to pay dividends to their shareholders, and so the profit margin is a very important factor to them. But Saskoil — although I would hope that Saskoil would always be able to pay their own way, make a profit for the people of Saskatchewan and to give us a window on the oil industry — Saskoil has more than that mandate. They have a mandate, I think, to show confidence in the resources of the province of Saskatchewan.

And lo and behold, when Saskoil started to move major portions of their operations outside of the province of Saskatchewan, all of a sudden Canterra, the operator of the heavy oil recovery project, also moved away. They closed down the Meota field. Families moved out of The Battlefords and there was a great void left there.

I would like to go back to the election campaign just briefly. The Conservative Party and, in fact, the former member of the legislature seem to be very bitter from the election loss. I can understand people being deeply depressed, deeply upset about losing an election campaign because all of us, regardless of which political party we represent, we put our heart and soul into an election campaign, and we put our heart and soul into the job that we do. And so the feelings are much the same. If you win, you're happy, you're jubilant, you feel that you have been given a new mandate by the people in the constituency that you represent.

(2130)

And the same is when you are defeated, you feel depressed, you feel let down because you have put so much into the election campaign and you lose it because the voters of the constituency make up their mind as to who it is they want to represent them. And I do pass on my condolences to the former member of the legislature, but I would also provide a word of caution that when he refers to — or his organization, I should say more accurately — refers to illegalities, discrepancies during the election campaign and on election day, I would remind him that it is the party opposite in government who appoints the election machinery, and I would like once for some of the people who are making accusations of illegalities against myself and against the people who work for me, as to what that is. If one continues to cry "sour grapes", I think it is a negative factor towards them if they ever again want to seek re-election.

And I'm happy to get on with the job of representing the people of The Battlefords in this legislature, and I pledge myself to do my utmost best to represent them fairly and in an unpartisan way, as you, Mr. Speaker, in your role is

taking the Chair of this very prestigious House; and the prestigious role that you have is that you have to deal non-partisan. You have to assure freedom of speech and freedom of the activities within the rules of the legislature, and I want to commit myself to performing that same role to constituents of The Battlefords constituency.

And I want to have people feel free to call upon me, whether they are New Democrats, or whether they are Liberals — not many of them around mind you, Mr. Speaker — or whether they're Conservatives, or whether they're people who have given up hope on our institutions and our systems, to call on me to have me provide them the service as best I can as their member of the Legislative Assembly.

One of the members in speaking this evening, Mr. Speaker, referred to their heritage; in fact a few members have done that.

I'd like to point out to the credit of Meadow Lake that we actually — and one of the member opposite who's actually representing the Meadow Lake constituency thought that I should mention this this evening — that we actually this evening have three home-grown members of the Legislature that were born and grew up in the town of Meadow Lake.

So the town of Meadow Lake feels very well represented, and I wouldn't want the member from Meadow Lake to take all the credit for this. There's two members on the opposition side of the House now that will keep an eye on Meadow Lake as well.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — So, in fact, we do have the member that currently represents Meadow Lake, the member that currently represents Regina Lakeview, and myself representing the Battlefords constituency that are all home-grown people from the town of Meadow Lake. At least there are some people that feel they have raised us with good morals and given us good influence to carry forward and perform a meaningful role in the Legislative Assembly in the province of Saskatchewan.

I would also like, Mr. Speaker, to touch briefly on my major critic role which is the Department of Highways. I look forward to working with the hon. member from Melfort — he's here in the House this evening — and I would like very much to meet with him and members of his department, the public employees, to discuss the highway program in the province of Saskatchewan.

I look very much to revamping the Gardiner golf course of the province, more commonly in some cases referred to as the 18 holes per mile over the provincial highway system. And I'm sure the member from Melfort wants to correct that as much as I do, and I look forward to working with him over this term of the 21st Legislative Assembly for the province of Saskatchewan.

Some of the things that happened in the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, were a little disappointing to me. There were a couple of things that I think warrant some mention that were not touched on in the throne speech and, granted,

may come up in the next session — the throne speech prior to the next session.

One, in particular, is the freedom of information Act that was promised during the 1982 election campaign, and I would like to see come about during this 21st Legislative Assembly for the province.

I know that we've had laid before us, by the hon. member for Meadow Lake, the documents concerning the Weyerhaeuser agreement and we do appreciate that. Although they are very complex set of documents, we are going through them with some diligence to determine whether the people of Saskatchewan have got a fair deal out of this government.

We tend to think that they haven't, at this point in time, and we will be putting forward some alternatives that we think would be better than the situation that we have now. We do not think, on a very brief overview looking at the documents, that giving away some \$240 million worth of assets in return for the promise of possibly, maybe, likely a paper-mill in the province is actually worth the risk. I think that we've actually got a poor deal out of the Weyerhaeuser agreement. The people in Prince Albert, I guess, are starting to refer to it as the P.C. pulp deal, and I hope that we can work in a more meaningful way in this new Legislative Assembly.

Also I think, Mr. Speaker, under the freedom of information Act, something that's very dear to me in the Battlefords constituency is the deal with Gainers and Peter Pocklington. Of course some people in the Battlefords are referring to that now as the P.C. pork deal, and a lot of people view the P.C. pork deal with a lot of scepticism.

The deal that was launched seemed to be a diversity in the economy of the province of Saskatchewan where we were getting into more processing, which in turn should help the agricultural industry. And that processing would provide jobs for people in the Battlefords and the Battlefords are, but several deadlines have passed. It didn't open in July, and it didn't open in August, and it didn't open in September, and it didn't open in October, and never opened November, and some people feel that scepticism more strongly now than they did a few months before.

Several hundred people have applied for jobs working in the bacon processing plant, and they're disappointed that those jobs are not coming about, Mr. Speaker. We don't know the reason why it hasn't opened. Freedom of information at least would give us some insight as to what the deal was that was launched between Peter Pocklington, Gainers, the province of Saskatchewan and the city of North Battleford. But much of what we have to do is a little bit of guesswork, filling in between the lines what we hear from the members of the government, and that's not enough. Freedom of information would provide us with those details.

For example, Mr. Speaker, the information that the people in The Battlefords look for is that they wonder . . . A plant that operates at full capacity would require 50,000 pork bellies per week to go through that

processing plant. Well there's only 13,000 pork bellies produced in the whole province of Saskatchewan. They are currently taken up by Intercontinental Packers in Saskatoon and a few other meat processors around the country and within the province. Where are these pork bellies coming from? They would have to import 50,000 pork bellies a week. Are they available? Do they not have the money in place to purchase the pork bellies?

Another thing that goes around The Battlefords, Mr. Speaker, is that Gainers doesn't have the funds to put up front to get the state of the art equipment to put into the bacon processing plant. And if that's true, and if they can't get credit, I think it's a disastrous situation in terms of planning that you can't put your plant and your equipment in place to make the system operate. And that disturbs me a little bit, and it disturbs the people of The Battlefords.

Freedom of information would also, I think, give us a bit more of an idea where the other plants are going. When the Gainers deal was first announced, they talked about the bacon plant which has graciously —and I'm appreciative of it — has come to The Battlefords. And we have great hopes for that bacon plant and great hopes for diversity in the agriculture industry in terms of our economy in the province of Saskatchewan. But where, in fact, is the slaughtering plant going? Where is the processing plant going? And where is this . . . Pardon me, the member from Meadow Lake says it's going to Meadow Lake. I doubt that very much, Mr. Speaker.

The people of Saskatchewan deserve to know more about what's going on in government, Mr. Speaker, than what they do. And I think that freedom of information would overcome some of that.

The other thing that was omitted in the throne speech that I want to refer to is there was no mention of a department of seniors or an agency for seniors. Many seniors' organizations within the province would like very much to have one department or one agency where they can go and bare their grievances and express their desires and wishes to government, without having to go to the Department of Social Services, Department of health, Department of Supply and Service, Department of Highways, the whole broad range of provincial government departments.

I think that our pioneers, the people who have built this province and done a very good job of it, should have that. It's something that members opposite on the government side have supported from time to time and I'd like to see — if not in this throne speech which it wasn't, at least in some throne speech — that that situation will, in fact, be addressed. Of course there are many other things that were not addressed in the throne speech, but those are two that came to me immediately that I wanted to mention in my first address to this Legislative Assembly, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to go back to the very beginning of the throne speech. When I talked earlier about this illusion of prosperity during the campaign, and now that we're actually into the nitty-gritty of things — the government has to govern, and the opposition has to provide some

constructive criticism — that a lot of the blame for our difficult economic conditions is blamed on world commodity prices and protectionist measures. And granted, there is some problem with that, and again I state, as in the oil industry, there are some things about our agricultural industry — or any time we have to export anything that are beyond the control of our government here in Saskatchewan or on behalf of the Government of Canada. But it can't all be blamed on that. It can't all be blamed on the subsidies from the United States to their agricultural producers and to the European economic community who subsidize their farmers very heavily. We can't always control that, but what we can do is we can have a little better planning in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

I know that one of the members this evening mentioned the problem of the deficit, and formerly, when I was a member of parliament for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake constituency, I spoke against the deficit that was being created by the federal government. And I don't speak against deficits for the sake of speaking against deficits themselves. It seems to me that there's nothing wrong with going into a deficit position, Mr. Speaker, if it's some investment in the future that you're going to get back a return, or that that investment will be there for a long period of time and you have some plan to pay for it.

The member from Saskatoon Mayfair, or Fairview I believe it was, who spoke this evening, pointed out that in 1982, the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982, the last full year that New Democrats were responsible for in the province of Saskatchewan, there was a surplus of \$139 million in the province of Saskatchewan in terms of the general operating revenue of the province. Well, between then and now, under a Conservative administration, Mr. Speaker, we've accumulated a very large deficit, in excess of \$2 billion. Now I could even accept a deficit of \$2 billion if it had been a planned deficit, but it's not a planned deficit. Granted, the ministers of Finance projected deficit budgets every year that they brought in a budget in the province of Saskatchewan under a Conservative administration. But when the books were tallied, the deficit was much, much larger than that that was projected. And what that tells me, Mr. Speaker, is that the government has no plan. And if they don't have any plan, how do they know that what they're doing is successful or not. Or if they do have a plan, they're not sticking to it.

And it seems to me that the government over the past four and a half years has ruled by public opinion poll. And I'd ask you to stop that. It never does a government any good to rule by public opinion polls. Every time there's a problem, a shift in the public opinion polls will show up, and the government over the past four and a half years has seemed to throw out some money over here and throw out some money over there.

And it seems to me that the government over the past four and a half years has ruled by public opinion poll. And I'd ask you to stop that. It never does a government any good to rule by public opinion polls. Every time there's a problem, a shift in the public opinion polls will show up, and the government over the past four and a half years has seemed to throw out some money over here and throw

out some money over there.

So, of course, when it comes to the end of the fiscal year they can't evaluate their program because they've never stuck to any plan that they've put in place as a government. And that's a disastrous situation to get in, and I say that in a non-partisan way, whether it's a New Democrat government or whether it's a Conservative government. If you've got a plan — you've got to have a plan — but if you don't stick to that plan, you'll never know if it's worked, and you'll get yourself into increasingly difficult situations which we will never be able to pay off.

(2145)

Just in the last fiscal year, Mr. Speaker, or I should say in the current fiscal year, there were some \$200 million allotted for interest, just to serve the debt of the province of Saskatchewan — the debt that was not there under New Democrats. And for \$200 million, Mr. Speaker, the government could have built 33 Gainers bacon processing plants in the province of Saskatchewan. Over half the constituencies in the province could have had a meat processing plant of some kind just in what you allowed to be paid for interest in this fiscal year.

I think there's something wrong with that economics that's there, Mr. Speaker, and I think it's a dire situation that we're getting ourselves into. So for heavens sakes, if you're going to deficit finance, invest in something that will bring us a return. Don't get into a situation of perpetually deficit financing to please the people of the province of Saskatchewan, because you can never please all the people all of the time.

And the true test of the pudding is whether or not you can stick to a plan over a period of a complete legislature, a period that you are in government. You've made your decisions; you've stuck to them; you're compassionate; you show that you're good planners; you show that you're good administrators; then the people will elect you if that's the fact and case. But people will not continue to support you if you continue to get us into the situation that we're in today.

I referred earlier, Mr. Speaker, to agriculture. Agriculture is the number one industry in Saskatchewan and, again I say, likely always will be the number one industry. I don't know that we can continue to give blanket coverage to everything. I think that we sometimes have to start targeting agricultural groups in terms of their special needs, and the needs of one agricultural group are not always necessarily the same needs of another agricultural group. Because although we traditionally think of wheat and livestock in Saskatchewan, our agricultural economy is much more diverse than that, and has many more ramifications throughout all of Saskatchewan's economy.

Mr. Speaker, I noticed that in the throne speech, that the government is taking some credit for, in co-operation with the federal government, irrigating an additional 250,000 acres of land over the next 15 years. I provide some caution. Again it goes back in terms of planning. There have been extensive studies done in western Canada recently on fresh water supplies in western

Canada, and if our current rate of irrigation continue at the rate that it is going at today, without such large increases as this, we're going to be in very serious situations in terms of fresh water supply in the province of Saskatchewan.

And as I say, it's well documented that at current consumption, 15 to 20 years, unless there are major fresh water diversions from northern Saskatchewan, northern Alberta, that we will be in a serious situation.

So when the government puts forth something like irrigating a large number of acres — and I don't begrudge that to people that want to cultivate and grow in drylands within the province or to enhance marginally agricultural lands — that there's longer term planning always attached to short-term decision that are made by the government.

I notice also under agriculture, Mr. Speaker, that there's now talk of Gainers and Intercontinental Packers investing \$50 million in the province of Saskatchewan, although most of that is taxpayers' money, especially in the Gainers' situation.

We've paid very handsomely for that investment, and I don't think we should be calling it the investment of Gainers. It should be the investment of the people of the province of Saskatchewan, because we're a lot more on the hook than the private entrepreneur, Peter Pocklington, is on the hook.

And the thing that amazes me is that we're now talking about 2,000 jobs created — 2,000 jobs created by this investment. Well, that's a gross exaggeration of how many jobs will be created. Even during the election campaign they were talking about 600 jobs being created if Gainers went ahead with their three plants — the bacon processing plant, the slaughtering operation, and the processing plant at locations in the province of Saskatchewan.

And when I look at this 2,000 jobs, I'm sure it's a misprint, Mr. Speaker, because there's no way that 2,000 jobs are going to be created out of that industry and out of that kind of investment in the province of Saskatchewan, even though large numbers of jobs are needed. They're needed by the people who are unemployed, the people who have been relegated to welfare roles in the province of Saskatchewan, those people that want to go back to work and don't have the jobs available.

Mr. Speaker, I notice that one of the answers for helping out the agricultural sector in the province is the local manufacturing of agricultural chemicals and fertilizers. I agree with this concept, Mr. Speaker. I think we can produce much more in the province than what we are producing at the present time. But I don't know that that's the actual route to go. What you're saving there is actually transportation costs and hopefully some local investment — getting people of the province to invest in local industries within the province.

But one of the things that I wish that the government of the province would rethink their position on is that of generic chemicals. We know that they aren't in support of generic

drugs within the province; they support the Mulroney plan to back the pharmaceutical companies. I think that there can be some sort of a median at least met where we can supply generic chemicals within the province of Saskatchewan for farmers, instead of paying for the brand name or the trade name on patents that have expired — that they can be produced generically. They still have a useful life in terms of their cycle, in the province of Saskatchewan, and it would be a great saving to people within the province of Saskatchewan that are actively engaged in farming, Mr. Speaker.

I think the something else that is lacking is that we have to look very closely at the transition of family farms. To me, family farms are very important. I can't profess to come from a strong farm or an agricultural background. Although I was born on a farm, we moved off at a very early age, but my spouse's family is actively still engaged in farming. They have a truly family farm operation and they're hesitant to transfer that land to the next generation because they don't know whether they want to burden them with the problems that small family farms seem to be encountering in this day and age.

And I for one, and I hope certainly my colleagues on this side of the House, do not want to see large corporate farms or a few large land holders where you almost go back to the serf system that happened many, many years ago. I would hope that members opposite don't want that to happen either. If a large farmer wants to expand, fine, let that Saskatchewan farmer expand. But also, at the same time, it should still be possible in this day and age, Mr. Speaker, to make a living off of a half-section or a section of land. And there are very few people that are starting into farming today that can make a living off of that small parcel of land. It just seems that they have to get so much larger and larger and increase their production many, many times over if they want to make a go of it. And it seems to be draining the population of rural Saskatchewan.

And I think that if not the Minister of Agriculture, who also happens to be the Premier, at least the Minister of Rural Development should be looking at the repopulation of rural Saskatchewan, how we keep people in rural Saskatchewan so that we maintain our unique way of life in this province. And I think we do have a unique way of life in the province of Saskatchewan.

Today, Mr. Speaker, on the agricultural scene, we heard about the deficiency payment that was announced in Ottawa today by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister. I believe it was \$415 million that the farmers of Saskatchewan are going to receive. There is no doubt in my mind that this government promised the farmers of Saskatchewan — not the farmers of Canada — the farmers of Saskatchewan were promised a billion dollars in deficiency payments.

And what does deficiency payment mean? To me deficiency payment, Mr. Speaker, means the difference between your production costs, what it costs to produce that product, and the return that you get when you sell that product. Well that deficiency payment, if it just applied to wheat and to barley, Mr. Speaker, we need a deficiency payment of about \$2 billion, not the \$415 million dollars that was promised today for Saskatchewan

farmers.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — If you want to look at more commodities so that we put our agricultural people on an equal scale to those in the United States that are heavily subsidized, and those in the European Economic Community that are heavily subsidized, we're looking more at \$5 billion, Mr. Speaker, than the \$2 billion or the \$1 billion that was promised, or the paltry \$415 million that was actually delivered today.

And so, these are short-term measures. Farmers appreciate getting the help they can because they are in very difficult times, and I encourage this government again to look at the fact of planning. We have to know what's happening a year, or five years, ten years down the road in Saskatchewan agriculture because the band-aid measures will help, but it only forestalls the inevitable that we are in difficult times in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

There are a couple of things in the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, that I'm kind of excited about. I don't want to seem too exuberant because it might excite the members on the government side of the House, but I am very excited about the words in the throne speech that talk about creating a tourism and hospitality institute.

And I would think that tourism is about number three for the economy of an area like The Battlefords and north-western Saskatchewan. Many, many people come there as a tourist destination passing through on tourism on the Yellowhead route. The Yellowhead route is something also I want to deal with the hon. member from Melfort about. We have a federal government commitment there, and I'm anxious to see what the provincial government commitment is to twinning the Yellowhead — or at least certain sections of that — which I think will enhance the tourism in the province of Saskatchewan, especially in the north-west corner of the province.

And the tourism that comes there, Mr. Speaker, the local entrepreneurs that are involve din tourism don't want to grab that dollar one time and have the tourists go away. They want those people who come as tourists to be repeat customers, repeat tourists to north-western Saskatchewan, or wherever they come, wherever they come to Saskatchewan. If they come from the United States, or they come from Europe, or if they come from the Pacific Rim countries, we want people to come back and feel that they've been treated with good hospitality in the province of Saskatchewan.

To date we've not been able to provide training to people that people need that are involved in the industry so that they can increase their expertise in the tourism industry.

Mr. Speaker, I see it's approaching close to 10 o'clock. I do have a few more remarks I'd like to make on the throne speech, but I would beg leave to adjourn debate for this evening.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:59 p.m.

CORRIGENDUM

On page 62 of the Hansard of December 8, 1986, in the fourth paragraph of Mr. Petersen's speech, the last sentence of the paragraph should read as follows:

They deride the programs that we've tried to put into place trying to improve the processing industry.

We apologize for the error.

[NOTE: The online copy of *Hansard* has been corrected.]