

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### PRESENTING PETITIONS

**Clerk:** — The following petitions are presented and laid on the Table: by Mr. Swan of the trustee board of the Saskatchewan Conference of Mennonite Brethren Churches of Swift Current in the province of Saskatchewan; by Mr. Gleim of Millar Memorial Bible Institute of the village of Pambrun in the province of Saskatchewan; and by Mr. Johnson of the religious order of the Sisters of Charity of Montreal “Grey Nuns”.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It’s my pleasure today to introduce the Minister of Agriculture from Finland, Mr. Toivo Pohjala, and his wife, who are in your gallery seated beside my wife; and Mr. Nikkola, Assistant Minister of Agriculture and Forestry for Finland.

They are here to discuss, obviously, agriculture and food, and when I had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to visit with the minister in Finland, we discussed something that we’re both very interested in, the multilateral trade negotiations that are taking place in Geneva this year at the GATT (General Agreement of Tariffs and Trade). And it was very interesting for me to review the European approach, particularly from Nordic countries, and the minister was very co-operative and very candid.

And as you might have heard, Mr. Speaker, my grandmother was an immigrant and she was from Finland, so it was nice to go back and look up the family farm. And in comparing prices, we should have never left Finland because it’s worth about \$5,000 an acre.

So would all members of the legislature please join me in welcoming the ministers.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Toth:** — Mr. Speaker, allow me to introduce to you, and through you on behalf of the member from Souris-Cannington, the elementary group of grade 6 students from Redvers elementary school, numbering 22, who are in your gallery. They are accompanied by their teacher, Diane Dube; and bus driver, Aime Hardy. I look forward to meeting with the group for pictures at 3 o’clock, pictures and refreshments. And I’d like to ask the members to welcome the group to the Assembly this afternoon.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Toth:** — Mr. Speaker, could I also have a moment just to introduce another gentleman I notice in the gallery, a gentleman who I’ve learned to appreciate . . . come to appreciate. He happened to campaign against me in the last provincial election, but I think he deserves the honour of being recognized, Mr. Bill Sauter from Fairlight. And if you could just stand please, sir, we welcome you this

afternoon.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Toth:** — And I’d also just like to express, as I’ve expressed before, Mr. Sauter just lost his wife recently, but I know he’s a gentleman that’s really looked up to, and I say, thank you, sir.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Picking up on the comments of my colleague, the member from Moosomin, I’d like to introduce to you today, sir, Mr. Speaker, and through you to the members of the House, a small group of dedicated volunteers which make up the heart and soul of any political party and in this case the heart and soul of our political party, the heart and soul at the grass roots level. Mr. Sauter, referred to by the member from Moosomin, is part of the delegation who is here today. And I think that all of us, whether we’re PC or New Democrats or Liberals, understand that without those volunteers at the grass roots level nothing really very much happens.

And today what I’d like to do, sir, is to introduce through you 12 people from five provincial constituencies who have worked exceptionally loyally and effectively for my party, who are sharing the day with us here today as part of a leaders’ club which the New Democrats have established. They are five of the top constituencies in terms of memberships, financing, and organization.

They are — I’ll just introduce them and after I introduce them ask them to stand — from Humboldt, Glen and Isobel Jones and Kris Davenport; from the Battlefords, Irene Klassen and Jeanne Berscheid; from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, George Adamack and Mike Reda; from Moosomin, Yvonne and Ron Down and Bill Sauter, as mentioned by the member from Moosomin; and from Regina North East, soon to be Regina Dewdney, Lil Balfour and Margaret Barclay.

I’ll ask them to stand now, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, and be recognized by the members of the Assembly.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Pringle:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it’s my honour today to introduce two guests seated in your gallery. First of all, Carolyn Rebeyka, who is the president of the Saskatchewan Young New Democrats, and secondly is Steven Bobiash, who is the past president of this important youth organization. Both Carolyn and Steve are here on business. They have a very active interest in public affairs, as do many young people in Saskatchewan today, which is very healthy for all of us. And I would ask, Mr. Speaker, in our usual manner, that we extend a warm welcome to these important guests.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### ORAL QUESTIONS

## Investment Agreement with Cargill

**Mr. Solomon:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question this afternoon for the Minister of Economic Diversification and Trade, and it concerns some incorrect information given this House yesterday by the minister.

I would draw the minister's attention to today's Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* where Crown Management Board president Bill Gibson confirms that Cargill does indeed have a marketing agreement based on production, which will pay Cargill to market fertilizer produced at Belle Plaine.

Yesterday, Minister, you said, and I quote: "Not 1 cent will be given to Cargill." Not 1 cent will be given to Cargill. Mr. Minister, either you are so incompetent that you are not aware of the terms of the deal with Cargill, or you withheld that information from this House for political reasons.

And my question to you, sir, is this: can you tell this House just how many cents per day Cargill will collect from this marketing agreement, and will you table today that marketing agreement in this House?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Mr. Speaker, to make an allegation that I said something to this House that was incorrect, and then in his preface indicate clearly that nothing was incorrect, I quote him and I quote what was said in the paper: "Not 1 cent will be given to Cargill."

Now if someone markets a product and earns a commission, that is something the members opposite should understand — that people do not work for nothing. This is a company, Saferco. It needs to market its product. It will market its product through many agencies, and it will market its product in Saskatchewan through independent dealers and through any elevator company that wants to market its product. And they will also get a commission for marketing that product.

The members opposite do not understand commission, profit, work — none of those things that are valued around the world. That's what's wrong with the members opposite.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Not 1 cent will be given to Saferco or to Cargill.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Solomon:** — Mr. Speaker, another new question to the minister. Mr. Minister, yesterday you answered in response to one of my questions the following:

Rumours, rumours, rumours. The members opposite have been spreading (far) too many rumours about this plant and not enough fact.

Well given that answer and your answer yesterday and today's facts in the paper, I'm afraid Saskatchewan people will not be inclined to take your word, Mr.

Minister. It appears that yesterday it was we who were dealing with facts, not you.

And I want to address today another of your so-called rumours we dealt with yesterday, and that rumour that we dealt with yesterday that I'd like to get to the bottom of is the guaranteed rate of return for Cargill. Will you today confirm that there is a guaranteed rate of return on investment for Cargill, or table the full agreement to show this is not fact?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Premier has already taken notice that she would consider the tabling of that agreement, and she will answer that in due course. That will be answered.

What I'm saying here today is that this is a business deal between the Government of Saskatchewan and Cargill to build a plant operated by Saferco. It will be treated completely as a business deal. I repeat, not 1 cent will be given to anyone. And when the members opposite spread rumours about the government giving \$65 million, that is totally inaccurate. The government is investing \$65 million. Just as that government invested our tax money in potash mines to buy 100 per cent of those companies, we are buying 49 per cent so that there is still a market out there.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Solomon:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the same minister. Mr. Minister, your government has a strange sense of priorities when doing business. You enter into a business deal with the largest privately owned corporation in the United States, with sales of \$47 billion Canadian, and you make sure they get paid whether the deal works or not. You enter into arrangements, on the other hand, with farmers who are in crisis in this province, and they get hauled into court for the smallest failures.

From day one you have told us that the reason Cargill is putting up only \$65 million, while the province is on the hook for 370 million, is that Cargill is bringing its marketing expertise to this venture. My question, Mr. Speaker, is this: if we are paying for that marketing expertise on the top of everything else, why is Cargill getting this sweetheart deal? You can't have it both ways, Mr. Minister.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Mr. Speaker, let us examine the economic history of this province. The members opposite spent \$600 million buying holes in the ground — 100 per cent owned by the people of Saskatchewan — holes in the ground.

The members opposite took over a pulp mill that existed and lost the markets that Parsons & Whittemore had, and then cost us \$91,000 a day because they were running it and they didn't have any markets.

In this case, this government is joint venturing with a corporation that markets in the United States, that knows

how to market. Their only complaint is that our joint venture partner has been successful in the past, has made money. I hope they make a lot of money, and I hope the province makes money with them.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Solomon:** — Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the minister. Mr. Minister, it is well-known that Cargill has given to the PC fund of Canada \$71,000 between 1984 and 1988. Is that why Cargill is getting a sweetheart deal today?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Well the member opposite knows more about federal politics and who donates there than I do. I tell you there is no PC Saskatchewan donation fund. The NDP, I know, though, channel the money back.

What I'm saying here is that this is a business deal, Mr. Speaker. It is a sound business deal. The members opposite did not take this position when we had a joint venture with Co-op. They didn't think that was bad. They don't complain when we sell a government plant to the wheat pool and an American company who operated together.

But if the Government of Saskatchewan is building something, rather than buying holes in the ground, they are against it. That's how far behind they are. That's how out of touch they are, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

#### Executive and Board Compensation at PCS

**Mr. Mitchell:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Premier and it concerns the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Last fall, based on documents that had been filed with the United States Securities and Exchange Commission, we estimated the salary, total compensation payable to Chuck Childers to be about \$550,000. Your minister responsible at that time said that that was not correct and dubbed that estimate to be a political distortion.

Well we have today a document from Mr. Childers' own office, which is being issued in connection with the first annual meeting of the potash corporation, and it's called a management proxy circular. And it states quite plainly that the cash compensation paid to Mr. Childers during 1989 was \$549,760. We were almost bang on.

Now what does the government say to that, Mr. Premier? Whose political distortion was this? Is it Mr. Childers' political distortion, or was it the minister's answer last October that was a political distortion?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm not familiar with the document the hon. member has quoted from, but I would say this in general about executive officers of major private corporations like the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. I think certainly the average person on the

street sometimes wonders about salary levels that get into that 75, 100,000, 200,000-and-plus level when it comes to . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. I don't how see we can hear the hon. minister, regardless of what his answer is, if we can't hear him, if he's being interrupted. I'd like to ask for your courtesy in allowing him to answer the question.

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, I think the average public, when they hear salary figures of 100 and 200,000 and those kinds of numbers, sometimes do wonder about how some people can be worth those kinds of dollars. The reality is, we do know that private corporations all over the world, including in Saskatchewan — we have some very major ones — do pay those kinds of dollars to their chief executive officers. And to the average person, including myself, I think a lot of times those numbers do look very, very large.

The reality is, if you do want to have competent management, you have to meet the market-place. And I think certainly in the case of Mr. Childers where, and I don't pretend to have a full recall of all the history, but certainly part of my recollection of the history of that company since he took it over is he took it from a company that was showing massive losses to a company that showed a profit of over \$100 million.

I think probably the decision to hire him and with his appropriate recompense, has been a good one for that company and for Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Mitchell:** — A new question, Mr. Speaker. That is an incredible and outrageous answer, Minister.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Mitchell:** — You're talking about paying one man a salary which is more than the whole mines cost to buy in the first place. Outrageous.

**An Hon. Member:** — That's an outrageous statement.

**Mr. Mitchell:** — Yes, of course, I missed . . . but you get my point.

In addition . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. We will now listen to the hon. member.

**Mr. Mitchell:** — That was an outrageous and incredible answer, Minister. Anybody who thinks that anyone is worth a half a million dollars to be paid a salary to run a corporation in Saskatchewan is just dreaming in Technicolor. We learn from this document that in addition to the \$550,000 cash compensation, Mr. Childers also gets \$16,000 in 1989 in pension benefits paid by CIC (Crown investments corporation of Saskatchewan), and secondly, an adjustment based on the difference between Canadian and United States income taxes.

Now my question, Minister, is this: will you tell the Assembly what was the full compensation for Mr. Childers in 1989? Was it \$600,000? Was it more? Just how much was it?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — I would just reiterate what I said earlier about making sure that one has and can meet the market-place in terms of getting top-notch executives for large private companies, Mr. Speaker. And I would just say to you that all the people of Saskatchewan must be mightily impressed with the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan because 73,000 individuals wanted to get in on the potash ownership bonds that were put available and did take advantage of the bonds, Mr. Speaker. That tells me about how people view the management.

In so far as the exact details relative to the question the hon. member raises, I will take notice, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** — I would like to at this time draw to the hon. minister's attention that if he is about to take notice of a question, a relatively long, semi-answer, or any kind of an answer is not permitted.

**Mr. Mitchell:** — A further question, a new question to the same minister. The outrage continues in this document, Mr. Minister, because not only do we find Childers making about \$550,000 in 1989, but we find Mr. Doyle, the president of PCS Sales, making nearly \$300,000 in cash compensation, and Mr. Gugulyn, the senior vice-president of administration, making over \$200,000 in 1989, which means that your government has paid the top three people in PCS over a million dollars in salaries in 1989.

Now in the light of the situation in Saskatchewan, with farmers being forced off the land and children going hungry and business failing, how can your government possibly justify outrageous figures like this?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — As I said, I can't confirm or deny the figures the hon. member raises before the legislature, Mr. Speaker, except to reiterate that the market-place for chief executive officers, if we're going to have competent management, then we have to meet that.

And I guess the other thing, Mr. Speaker, that I would just lay before all members of the legislature, is this question. There's no denying that a lot of the public would wonder about the size of these salaries. The reality is, we do have some major private corporations in this province, and thank goodness the day has come when we finally do have some major private corporations in this province.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, I would ask all members of this legislature, can we not finally look past this cute-by-half politics that makes good media grist — that makes good media grist — but when the issue of the day is \$500 million for the federal government for our farmers, and this is the kind of stuff we have put forward for the media grist.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Anguish:** — I have a question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. It's no wonder when the Minister of Finance answers questions like that that he wants to cover up for the incompetence of their management over the past eight years. I have a question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Premier, in addition to the bloated salary of Mr. Childers, we see that he has a sweetheart deal for stock options as well. In fact he has a 10-year option to purchase at any time stock of 42,000 shares at a price of \$14.625 per share. Now, if he had exercised that option last week and flipped the stock over at \$15 a share, he would have turned a quick profit of an additional \$15,750. Considering you are already paying this individual a very handsome compensation package, can you tell us why you want to offer sweetheart deals like this, Mr. Premier?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't even know if there was an answer to the question. The Premier shows the same arrogance, Mr. Speaker, as Trudeau did just before . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. The hon. member puts the question; the government decides who answers it.

**Mr. Anguish:** — I'd like to ask a question again to the Premier. We note that the prophet of privatization in Saskatchewan, Roger Phillips, is a board member of PCS, and as such he collects an annual retainer of \$8,000 plus a \$500 per diem for meetings of the board and \$500 per diem for meetings of board's committees.

Now that's not a bad piece of change for a part-time position. And I was wondering if it would be fair to say that Mr. Phillips supports your privatization initiatives, Mr. Premier, because he's been bought and paid for by this type of tactics to your government.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Speaker, I can't speak to the details in terms of the remuneration for board members at the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan Inc. All I can say is that the numbers that the member has quoted relative to retainers and per diems for board members that sit on large boards, whether it's here in Saskatchewan or elsewhere across Canada or indeed elsewhere across the world, those numbers are quite consistent with the board of the magnitude and the company of the magnitude of the potash corporation, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Anguish:** — A new question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, given your government's history, can we assume that Mr. Childers and Mr. Doyle had some very comfortable severance packages as well as the compensation they currently get from the government. And I'm wondering if you could tell the House today what kind of a golden parachute package you have for these two individuals when the government changes.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — I would just take notice of that question, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, the document that the member for Saskatoon Fairview referred to:

The province has stated that it will deal with its shares as an investor and not a manager, and that it does not intend to exercise its right to vote at shareholders' meetings although it reserves the right to do so.

Now I'm wondering, Mr. Premier, if you'll instruct your representatives on the board that you'll take the Saskatchewan taxpayers' majority position and go to the next corporation board meeting on May 10 and vote to reduce the outlandish salaries being paid to Mr. Doyle and Mr. Childers. When Saskatchewan people are suffering, we don't think you should be bringing in these people and paying them millions of dollars in compensation packages and salaries.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Speaker, I think if we cut past the political rhetoric, it seems to me that when 73,000 Saskatchewan people want to get a piece of the action, so to speak, of the potash corporation and we had that many applications for potash ownership bonds, it tells me that the people of Saskatchewan must have some fair degree of confidence in the management and the operation of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

I think their confidence is well placed, based on the track record of that corporation, under the management and under the administration of this government in so far as our involvement when it was a public company, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

#### **Centres of Excellence Funding at University of Saskatchewan**

**Mr. Koenker:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the minister responsible for science and technology. Mr. Minister, currently there is \$8 million worth of federal funding for six centres of excellence at the University of Saskatchewan that is at risk because your government has not announced its commitment of funding for 2.4 million over four years, or 600,000 for this year in funding for these centres of excellence.

Can you confirm that you have in fact committed these funds to the centres of excellence, and tell us where in the recent provincial budget these funds are?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that we would like very much to participate with this federal initiative to promote science and technology,

especially in Saskatoon. And we will try to come up with as much money as possible to get as much research as possible in this province.

But this is a case much like agriculture, which the members opposite don't want to talk about or don't understand, and that is that the federal government puts up a sum of money, and they say to the province, this is wonderful; will you match it? Well we don't have the cash to match everything, and we cannot always match everything that the federal government puts up. We will struggle to find \$600,000 and, if at all possible, we will participate. But we are not flush with money in this province. Members of the opposition know that taxes would have to go up, and the federal government also knows that we don't have extra cash for anything.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koenker:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the same minister. Mr. Minister, that's not good enough, and the people at the University of Saskatchewan are owed more of an explanation than that.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koenker:** — Two years ago when the centres of excellence applications were made, your government submitted documents to the federal government, indicating that they would provide the infrastructure funding for the centres of excellence program. I ask you now: why is it that you can't, with your centre of incompetence in your department, or ignorance, tell the University of Saskatchewan where they stand today with respect to centres of excellence funding?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Mr. Speaker, if we can find the money, they can have the money. That's our position.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order.

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Let me repeat for the member opposite that money does not grow on trees, nor do people hand it to you on a platter as he may be used to.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I'm going to interrupt again. The hon. member is answering the question, and I think it's incumbent upon members to allow him to answer it rather than interrupt him each time they hear something they don't like.

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Let me tell the member opposite and everyone who may be listening, and I think most people understand this, that money does not grow on trees. It is not handed to you on a platter as he may be used to. Money has to be earned, and I told him earlier you have to earn it through commissions or profits or work — words they don't understand on that side of the House.

But what I'm saying is, Mr. Speaker, that for the members opposite and for everyone, any money we can find to promote science and technology we will put to use. But the bottom line is that this province, through the province

and the local taxpayers, spend in excess of \$1,000 per person on education. We'll continue to do that. However, there is a limit to how much money you can find.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koenker:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, Chuck Childers found a money tree.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koenker:** — Chuck Childers found a money tree, Mr. Minister, and Cargill has found a money tree.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koenker:** — And Bob Andrew and Graham Taylor have found money trees.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koenker:** — Mr. Minister, and I want to tell you that the federal Minister of Defence, Mr. Bill McKnight, has found a photo-op at the University of Saskatchewan this past weekend at the centres of excellence. And yet they want to know where they stand with respect to your commitment of funding. And I say you owe the people at the University of Saskatchewan an explanation as to when they will know whether the funding for centres of excellence will come through or not. When will you tell them where they stand?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Mr. Speaker, and you watch the questions from the opposition; that tells you the sad state of political division in this province. That's the sad state where you have 55 per cent of the people who understand you have to build and earn money, and 45 per cent, the people opposite there, who think that you can simply tax someone and poof! money will appear. You have to have someone with money to tax. They are opposed to anyone earning a profit.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Now it's going to take quite a long time to finish question period if you keep interrupting the minister, because it is incumbent upon me to give him an opportunity to be heard. You, ladies and gentlemen, are not co-operating to allow that to happen.

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Mr. Speaker, if money can be found for this worthwhile . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I'm going to ask the member for Regina Rosemont to either be silent or I'll have to take the appropriate steps. Now we've been reminding the hon. gentleman over and over to allow the member to speak without interruption. I expect that to be adhered to, or I will have to take the appropriate steps.

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The answer here is that if we can find money to assist with this worthwhile research, we will do our best to allocate it to that particular project. The bottom line is that you have to

pay leaders in this province, whether they're business leaders, people who are successful, who are paid the market rate, which the opposition doesn't understand. Then the opposition attacks these people for being successful. That's a sad state of affairs in this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day, I wonder if I might have leave of the Assembly to make a brief statement.

Leave granted.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

### Resignation from Cabinet

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Before I start my brief statement, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say hi to all the young folks from Redvers. Redvers has, as we all know, been a regular visitor to this Assembly. Each year, I think for the last several years, Mr. Speaker, we've had a class visiting the Assembly from Redvers and I hope that I have time to visit with you later, but in the event that I don't, my colleague, Mr. Toth, will be. So welcome to our Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a great privilege for me to serve in the Legislative Assembly over the last 15 years. I have been honoured with the support of the constituents of Souris-Cannington in 4 elections, in 1975, and in 1978, 1982, and 1986, and I might say, Mr. Speaker, each time with an increased plurality.

I have already announced several months ago that I will not be running in the next provincial election, and with this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I have reached another decision concerning my future that I want to share with you today.

I have been fortunate to serve in this House. I have had the opportunity to work with and confront some of the individuals who have helped shape Saskatchewan's political history: Grant Devine, Allan Blakeney, Roy Romanow, Dick Collver, Ted Malone, Davey Steuart, Gary Lane, and Joan Duncan, the first female cabinet minister in the history of this province, Mr. Speaker, to name only a few.

I've also had the opportunity to meet and work with many figures from the national political scene — Brian Mulroney, Joe Clark, John Diefenbaker, Pierre Trudeau, Jean-Luc Pepin, and others from across the country, Mr. Speaker.

And serving Saskatchewan internationally has allowed me to meet world figures, including President Ford, several governors and lawmakers from the United States, Mikhail Gorbachev, and François Mitterrand, and other political leaders from western and eastern Europe.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, it has been quite an experience for the lad from Oxbow — Oxbow, the town that I was born, Mr. Speaker, and where my folks live today.

Over all, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that I would

change. I liked many and respected most of those with whom I've worked. More importantly, Mr. Speaker, they all had a significant part to play in Saskatchewan since 1975.

I believe it was Joe Louis, Mr. Speaker, who said, I've been rich and I've been poor, and rich is better. To put that in political terms, I have been in government and in opposition, and I can say, government is better.

But on reflection, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure if that is entirely true. I've spent seven years in opposition, and those of us who have been around long enough to have seen both sides of the House, know that opposition can be frustrating and difficult. In opposition, the only real aspiration is to be government. The only way that that can be done is to outwork and outorganize and outclass the competition. Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, for us, when we were in opposition, that was not a difficult task.

Opposition did have its own rewards. It allowed more time to help constituents through difficult circumstances, to listen to and understand and develop lifelong friendships and contacts. And, in addition, there was more time for politics.

I'd like to take a moment to talk about politics, Mr. Speaker, because despite the criticism that politics and politicians receive, both are vital and necessary parts of our democracy. While the bantering and bickering of our system can frustrate and annoy, it is better to do battle with words, through the media and town halls or in the legislature, than to do battle as we have seen it done in many other parts of the world.

Although few of our critics will at first agree, I believe that even at our most raucous moments we are far more civilized than many other in the world who practise politics through violent means. That is not to say, Mr. Speaker, that we shouldn't try to elevate the level of decorum from time to time. I think we do get a little carried away.

But though I've enjoyed opposition and I've always recommended it to my political opponents — and in fact, Mr. Speaker, will be working every waking hour to see that they stay there — government is better.

Mr. Speaker, I have sincerely enjoyed the time that I have served in cabinet with Premier Devine. I've had the opportunity and the privilege to be deputy premier, minister of Agriculture, provincial secretary, minister of economic development and trade, and later economic development and tourism, minister responsible for SaskPower, minister responsible for the Crown Management Board, minister responsible for Expo '86, minister responsible for SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation), minister responsible for Agdevco and other responsibilities, Mr. Speaker, over the last eight years.

I've had a chance to play a major role in many activities, some with greater success than others. All of this, Mr. Speaker, during a time of rapid change and difficult economic times. I know that I will be remembered by some for GigaText and I accept that. But I must say, Mr.

Speaker, that I still believe that the concept of computer translation was, and is, a good one. It is a technology that is now being used in other parts of the world in defence applications, in systems control applications, and in translation applications, Mr. Speaker. We were at one time leading the world and I strongly believe that we have missed a great opportunity.

I hope that I will be remembered for other projects which had a greater success, a much greater success, Mr. Speaker, like irrigation projects and agriculture and Sask Water, new and innovative trade arrangements through the Department of ED&T (Economic Development and Trade) and Agdevco and many other industrial projects, Mr. Speaker.

(1445)

There is an additional project, Mr. Speaker, that I had no direct responsibility for but that is important to me. And I want to thank my colleagues for allowing my input into the Whitespruce youth treatment centre.

Mr. Speaker, since 1982 industrial output in Saskatchewan has increased by about 600 per cent. That didn't just happen, it took a lot of time and effort by many in the public and the private sector. The projects that generated this output range from paper plants and lime plants to boiler plants and cable plants to bacon plants and chicken plants and rendering plants and tractor plants to upgraders and fertilizer plants and the list goes on.

Probably the most successful diversification thrust ever is the Buy Saskatchewan thrust delivered through the Buy Saskatchewan agency and the Crown sector. For example, Mr. Speaker, SaskPower, under the leadership of George Hill, now sources over 80 per cent of all goods and services in Saskatchewan. In 1982, 80 per cent came from outside the province. Today, Mr. Speaker, there are more than 125 items used by SaskPower which are manufactured here in the province, previously manufactured outside of the province. And I have been proud, Mr. Speaker, to have had a role in that.

Mr. Speaker, I said earlier that I had an announcement to make and I want to do that now. I have decided that the time has come for me to give up my seat on the front benches of Premier Devine's government. As of today, Mr. Speaker, I am resigning my position in cabinet as Provincial Secretary, as minister responsible for the economic development co-ordination group, and as minister responsible for the Crown Management Board.

Why now? Well quite simply, Mr. Speaker, the time is right now. It was last October that the Premier asked me to take the responsibility for the co-ordination of economic development in this province. That mandate, Mr. Speaker, through the economic development co-ordination group, has been largely fulfilled and many recommendations have already been implemented. Consultations with the business community have taken place. The Community Development Bond has been designed. All departments involved in economic development are working together. In short, Mr. Speaker, I've worked myself out of a job.

I want to thank all of the people involved in any way with the economic development co-ordination group for their fine work.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, the time is right for me to step down and start my reintegration into private life. My decision provides the Premier with the opportunity to either down-size cabinet or offer a new challenge to one of my many colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to continue as a member of this Assembly until the next general election.

I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to express my thanks and appreciation to those who have supported me as a minister in this government. First of all I would like to express my gratitude to the Premier for allowing me to serve him and Saskatchewan in so many interesting cabinet posts.

I'd like as well, Mr. Speaker, to thank my colleagues in the government caucus and my friends across the floor. I'd especially like to recognize, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, with whom I've shared many frank and friendly discussions over the years. I would like to thank the people of Souris-Cannington and the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan for allowing me the opportunity to participate.

I want to let you know, Mr. Speaker, that the civil service of the province of Saskatchewan has always met my expectations. I have been served well by the members of the various departments with whom I've worked. I've enjoyed my contact with the media and would like to acknowledge the important role that they play.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge the people who have worked with me in my office. I've enjoyed the opportunity to work closely with a number of fine Saskatchewan men and women in my office. I have many special friends as a result of the efforts we've shared on behalf of government.

Thank you for your indulgence, Mr. Speaker. I am grateful for the opportunity I have had to serve this great democratic institution.

Thank you very much.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, might I just make a short, brief response. I know that the rules are being bended.

Mr. Speaker, I might say, first of all, to the member from Souris-Cannington that he says that he's, notwithstanding his announcement of today, going to work morning, noon, night, and day to make sure that we stay in opposition. My advice to him on a personal basis is that he needs his beauty sleep a lot, and I would recommend that he take some time off to sleep.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues, we'd like to acknowledge the contribution of the member from Souris-Cannington to public life in Saskatchewan. I think

it's fair to say that we would disagree with his government's policies, and as the weeks and months ahead for this current session and legislature wind on, I'm sure that those disputes will continue. But I think that it's also correct to say that the member has always approached his duties with diligence and dedication, ability, and a sense of humour. And that was again displayed today.

He has been of course a very successful politician. I can say on a personal basis I've enjoyed my interpersonal relationship with him. On behalf of the members of this side of the House, we wish him and his family well in his future endeavours.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my personal appreciation to the member from Souris-Cannington on behalf of me and my family and the members of this government.

Mr. Berntson and I have had a long and very positive relationship. As you know, Mr. Speaker, and some in the opposition will know, it was Mr. Berntson who approached me and asked me if I would enter public life and actually seek the leadership of our party, and campaigned with me on more than one occasion, and has been my constant political companion for my political career.

And obviously, as a result of that, he's changed my life and changed the life of a lot of people in Saskatchewan. And as the Leader of the Opposition acknowledges, we may not always agree, but certainly changed the direction of the province of Saskatchewan in terms of diversification, processing, manufacturing, and other things that he really believes in.

I want to thank him primarily for his unwavering enthusiasm. He is, as you know, Mr. Speaker, always prepared to be positive, and take those around him, lift them up, and say that there are many things that will get in your way but you can't stand on what you're going to lift; you've got to move ahead. And he would design, time and time again, instrumental strategies on economics — locally, nationally, and internationally — and on politics. And as a result of that, he's gained a reputation locally, nationally, and internationally.

He was one of the first ministers we've seen to have significant, and make significant, inroads into the Pacific Rim. And as a result of that, the Japanese now manufacture in the province of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon.

Same applies in the Soviet Union and in the eastern Soviet bloc. And he was one of the first to tell me and recommend to me that . . . advise me that there would likely be significant changes in the Soviet Union. Well, I think it attests to his political awareness.

Mr. Speaker, there are a long list of projects that would have never happened in Saskatchewan if it hadn't been for the member from Souris-Cannington. I won't list them. He's listed some.



But he's put his heart and soul into public life in Saskatchewan. He's made a difference — made a difference to me, made a difference to the province, made a difference to this country, as a matter of fact. So I want to personally thank him for his contribution, his loyalty, his help, and wish him and his family the very, very best in the years ahead. I am sure he will have a very exciting future outside of public life, no matter what he decides to do. Thank you, Mr. Berntson.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### MOTION UNDER RULE 16

#### Financial Crisis in Saskatchewan

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much. I will at the conclusion of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, be moving a motion which is . . . Thank you very much. The page has been kind enough to bring it.

Mr. Speaker, the motion deals with a subject which has been, I think, at the front and centre of most of the difficulties which the government has faced. Any government will have its problems. Any government will have members whose behaviour is sometimes not exemplary. On occasion they'll suffer from bad luck that they didn't deserve. This motion however, I think, Mr. Speaker, goes to the nub of why this government is in so much difficulty. It is because of its inability, sometimes tantamount to an explicit refusal to try, but it is its inability to manage government, the waste and the mismanagement which has been so apparent in this government.

Mr. Minister, and Mr. Speaker, this government came into office with what I felt at the time were a warped series of priorities and some very warped understandings of how government worked. They come into office in a position which most governments in Canada would have envied. They come in with a balanced budget, had been consistently balanced since the Second World War. The only government, apart from Alberta, which could so claim that. They came into office with a small surplus and a very competent public administration. Contrary to what they believed, Mr. Speaker, the public administration welcomed the change in government. They were glad to be rid of the government of which I was a member and thoroughly welcomed the change in administration. This government misunderstood that mood, felt that the public service was a nest of traitors and enemies and proceeded to decimate the public service by firing several thousand, actually.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, from the very beginning, most governments come into office with a certain idealism. They believe that they will be better than those whom they replaced. They will pursue higher moral purposes and will be free of the sins of greed which they saw in their opponents.

This really does not describe this government at all. This government came into office believing that the people

they had replaced had been thoroughly immersed in patronage and they felt it was their turn. And from the very beginning, Mr. Speaker, this government has made patronage a centre point of its entire approach to public administration.

Patronage is usually a sign of old age in a government, a sign that a government has been in office too long. It has ceased to worry about the public and began to worry only about themselves. This government, however, came in from the very beginning with almost as a motto, it's our turn.

(1500)

The result, Mr. Speaker, has really been tragic for this province. The result has really been tragic. During the '50s, '60s, and '70s under three different governments and three different premiers, this government earned the reputation of being the best managed government in North America.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a government which has a deficit which it really must be admitted as out of control. We have a government whose interest payments increased from \$380 million, by exactly 30 per cent in one year, to \$493 million. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to ask yourself what's going to happen if the interest costs continue to increase at 30 per cent a year. We assume, Mr. Speaker, you'd be doing nothing but paying interest.

Mr. Speaker, this government, if asked about their many and sundry problems, will always find someone else to blame. The member from Riversdale and the Leader of the Opposition often refers to these people as surf-board riders. Their view is . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — I've never heard it.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well one of the many problems suffered by the member from Rosthern is that you miss some of the best speeches given by this side. If you were to absorb a few more speeches, the member from Rosthern, your performance as a public official would improve immeasurably, I can assure you.

Mr. Speaker, this government believes that they are surf-board riders. The trick is to stay on your feet as long as you can. And they also believe that there is very little they can do to control their environment. Environment, as is the case of a surf-board rider, is beyond their control. The trick is just to see how long you can stand on your feet.

Mr. Speaker, the result has been tragic for this province. I said in the comments that I made on the budget speech that during the period of time this government has been in office, the cost of living, the consumer price index measured by Statistics Canada, the CPI (consumer price index) has gone up by 42 per cent. Their revenue has increased at a rate 25 per cent faster than that. It's gone up by 58 per cent during the period of time they've been in office. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, their spending has gone up by 72 per cent. That has resulted in us paying \$500 million in interest — \$500 million in interest which would have been largely unnecessary if this government had been able from the beginning to manage the public

affairs of this province in a more competent fashion.

Patronage, Mr. Speaker, has become a sore point with virtually all Saskatchewan people. No matter where you go in this province, if you stop to talk to people for very long, they are upset with the way that this government is helping themselves and helping their friends.

I have mentioned many times, and I'm not going to repeat the spectre of Mr. Taylor and Mr. Andrew who resigned their seat in the legislature, then went on to serve in some very dubious roles as ambassadors, trade commissioners for our province.

The member from Kinistino objects to it. Let me say to the member from Kinistino, who should have some understanding since your life, sir, has spanned more than one continent, should have some understanding that if one is going to operate effectively in another culture, you have to have some understanding of the language and some understanding of the culture. You, sir, mastered that.

I venture to say, and I'll tell the member from Kinistino, that I'll bet you that Graham Taylor never learns to speak Chinese. And I wonder if you could just get on your feet and actually suggest that someone can function in that environment without a knowledge of the culture and a knowledge of the language.

If there's an excuse, I say to the member from Kinistino and other members, if there is a good excuse, if there is some grounds for having people in Hong Kong — and I seriously doubt whether or not that is a proper role for provincial governments — then it ought to be professionals who are trained, who've spent their lifetime in this kind of activity, not people who have been in the provincial legislature — and I will make no comment about how successful they've been in the provincial legislature — not people who have spent their life in this provincial legislature. The qualities needed to succeed in a foreign location are very, very different than the qualities that are demanded here, and I doubt very much that either Mr. Taylor or Mr. Andrew have the background, the knowledge, the skill, or the training to succeed in those posts.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, during the period of time that I was commenting, the personage of the Speaker changed — Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we heard today another example of patronage, Tory style. An example of a . . . someone who ran a Crown corporation, Mr. Childers was, I think, handsomely compensated to run the Crown corporation. We find out that on privatization he took the opportunity, went out of the public eye to increase his salary to a level that I consider obscene, to take some \$550,000 in salary, another \$50,000 in benefits, plus stock options.

Mr. Speaker, the member from Weyburn, in attempting to justify such behaviour, stated that the large corporations pay their people that. Some do; some don't. I have noticed, Mr. Speaker, that the most successful corporations are not always those who pay their chief executive officers the highest salaries. Some of them — I would mention Hees corporation — some of them pay

their chief executive officers a pretty modest salary and expect them to earn their compensation as a share of the profits.

Mr. Childers isn't really going to have to worry. I also suspect, Mr. Speaker, that the same Mr. Childers has a golden parachute that is probably very, very objectionable. I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Childers, when he leaves, will be — if he does leave, and I'm not suggesting that's inevitable on a change in government — but I suspect, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he's pretty well taken care of.

It should shock the consciences of Saskatchewan people that we're spending almost as much on the . . . You can tell those who are worrying that I actually am able to see the clock from where I'm standing, sir. I don't think I'll run it by.

I say, Mr. Speaker, it must shock the consciences of Saskatchewan people to know that we are spending almost as much on Chuck Childers as we are feeding 64,000 hungry children. The figures are almost the same. By the time you add in the benefits and the stock options the figures are roughly the same.

All I can say is that a government and a society which pays a single person almost as much as you spend feeding the province's hungry children has a warped, distorted, bizarre sense of priorities — a warped, distorted, and bizarre sense of priorities.

Mr. Speaker, we find today, Mr. Speaker, that the government is . . . this government has failed to provide funding for the centres of excellence.

This is a government which has provided a quarter of a billion dollars in low interest money to Weyerhaeuser plus some very large grants; 40 million to \$60 million to Cargill, the world's largest grain company, but doesn't have the money to feed, doesn't have the money to provide an education for young people. That's really what the centres of excellence are all about, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We are talking about the education of our young people.

We have some 40 to 60 million for Cargill. We have large sums of money for other very rich concerns, but we do not apparently, Mr. Speaker, have enough money to educate young people to provide to centres of excellence. That is a tragedy, and that is a very, very warped sense of priorities.

Mr. Speaker, it is little wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the public of Saskatchewan welcome a change, as much if not more so than the people of eastern Europe.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the time is running by. I will therefore move, seconded by the member from Humboldt:

That this Assembly condemns the Government of Saskatchewan for its failure to respond effectively to the financial crisis facing Saskatchewan farmers, the waste and financial mismanagement of the government which has been a disaster for

the provincial economy, causing an alarming provincial deficit, shifting the tax burden onto the backs of local communities and property taxpayers, and dramatically reducing spending on health, education, social and employment programs.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Upshall:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to start out today by saying that in a war there are casualties, there's disaster, there's grief, there's suffering, there's loss of property and lives. And when I go around rural Saskatchewan and see the effect of a Tory government on rural families, rural lives, I can honestly say that there's a close analogy to war. In fact I would say these people are waging war on the people of this province, because they have the opportunity to do something about it, and they simply are not.

They are creating grief for farm families and for rural families in this province, but they are creating profit for Pocklington, Weyerhaeuser, and Cargill, and, as we learned today, for executives of Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Weyerhaeuser was given a deal where 12 per cent profit had to be made before they made any payments. At the same time, they had a deal with Saskatchewan farmers, through agriculture credit corporation, and they foreclose on those people without any, any lenience at all.

There are bankruptcies in small businesses around this province that are unprecedented, simply because this government shows no support for those people. And there are working people who are seeing forced lay-offs and loss of jobs because this government's priorities are in the direction of Chuck Childers and the likes of that, getting \$550,000 a year — \$550,000 a year, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when all they could come up with for hungry children in this province was \$750,000. Sixty thousand, 64,000 hungry children. That's the double standard that this government is working under, and it was shown very clearly today.

When you have a deal, you have a deal. And the deals, if you're Cargill or Weyerhaeuser, are very, very nice. As a matter of fact, in the last budget there was \$12 million, Mr. Deputy Speaker, cut off the Highways budget in Saskatchewan. But Cargill has a deal that the taxpayers of Saskatchewan every year, under contract, have to build roads for them. There's quite a difference between deals for Saskatchewan people and deals for multinational corporations that this government is tied so closely to.

If Cargill, under the deal that they got — \$370 million — doesn't work for them, they can walk away from it. They can walk away and the taxpayers of Saskatchewan are holding the bag. Farmers who don't make their payments on their loans, whether it be a production loan or any other loan of the government, they don't walk away; they're hauled away to court, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That is a damning indictment on this government.

We have seen, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the price of fuel increase by 33 cents a gallon since last year — 33 cents a gallon. And this government did nothing to stop that; in fact, they added to that by cutting out the farmers' oil royalty rebate.

We have seen a crop insurance program that has been twisted around so badly, misrepresented to the people of Saskatchewan, that now those people who thought they qualified under the multi-year disaster benefit program are not qualifying because the government saw fit to put a block of four RMs together.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I tell you that I don't know since when that rain followed RM lines. But the people who paid for that in increased premiums, who paid for that multi-year program in increased premiums, many of those are not getting the benefit from the premiums that they paid.

And I don't know how close that comes to going back on a contract, but I know I talked to lots of farmers in rural Saskatchewan, and those who are cut out of the multi-year disaster program say, why was I in the program in the first place? Why did I have my premiums increased from 1986, '87, and '88, and not get any benefit? And for those people who went to the individual coverage in 1989, they get no additional benefit even though they paid their premiums.

That is not the proper way to run a program because this government is not there to run it for the people of Saskatchewan; they're running that program now to see how much money they can save because they have made a mess of this province so badly that they're trying to pinch pennies in every corner.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, yesterday in this House and on Friday in this House, we spent the better parts of two days questioning the Minister of Finance on the spring seeding loan. And I recall listening to the radio going home Friday after we'd questioned the minister on the spring seeding loan to try to get some details, of which none have been provided, none of which he provided.

The Government House Leader on the radio saying, well we have to get the interim supply Bill passed so we can get this program delivered to farmers. I mean that's . . . talk about the cheap, silly politics that they're playing with this program. We have no idea of what the program is, no idea at all.

(1515)

And the farmers who are basically out in rural Saskatchewan now preparing for seeding do not know if they're going to qualify, how much they're going to get, what the repayment terms are. They simply do not know, so they can't plan. And how was that program supposed to benefit?

And I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, the people in rural Saskatchewan basically are laughing at that program because they said that this government who said they were so in touch with people, saying I will not take that program . . . and you know why? It's because I took a

production loan in 1986 that was going to supposedly help me out. And what have they done? — 18 per cent are in arrears, and they're hauling me off to court to get that money back, and now they want me to take another loan at ten and three-quarters per cent?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan, the farmers that I talked to, know that this government simply has lost touch with the actual needs out there of rural Saskatchewan.

And I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that farmers will not take that program. They would sooner seed fewer acres, even though this year there's a little bit of water around in some of the areas and we're always optimistic of getting rain; even though the chances are that we could get a decent crop this year, they won't put in extra acres simply because they won't put themselves in debt any more. And that is the bottom line here.

Why does this government want to give me more debt? They had promised, the Premier of this province had promised that he had a commitment of \$500 million to be paid to Saskatchewan farmers before seeding, from the federal government. And now we see that program again. In fact I was very surprised today. I was expecting to see the Premier get up in his place and have a ministerial statement explaining the details of the program, as he just came back from Ottawa, supposedly talking to Mr. Mazankowski.

But this is the dilemma that farmers are in. We on this side of the House, and farmers, have been asking for years and years now for a program that would establish some predictability so that you could plan the system. The only predictability in this system, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that you can predict, as we did, that Chuck Childers is going to get over a half a million dollars a year.

You can predict that the three top officials in the potash corporation are going to get over a million dollars a year. You can predict they'll get a sweetheart deal when it comes to share options. You can predict the Cargill deal will be moved along very quickly and in place so they know the details of their program so they can plan. But the farmers and the working people of this province simply aren't offered that same option.

And talk about walking into a money tree. Well I'll you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Chuck Childers found the money tree and several of his executive friends did. Weyerhaeuser found the money tree. Cargill found the money tree.

And I just want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I think I know why. Because when you study the Premier, the leader of the Tory party in this province, when you study the Premier of this province and you look back and research as to what exactly he's thinking and just develop that through — we saw that he got his degree in the United States; we see that he always in his university life talked about getting rid of the inefficient farmers, and he said about 80 per cent of them were inefficient; we see him living on south Albert Street, so far away from agriculture that he doesn't know, he can't see through his stained-glass windows the reality that's out there.

This is the reason. He thinks he is in touch with Saskatchewan; he claims he is, but all the while he's totally out of touch with rural Saskatchewan and totally in sync with Weyerhaeuser, Pocklington, Cargill, and the Chuck Childers of the world, because that's the way it's supposed to be. And I'll tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reason that is: because this Premier, this Premier was born on second base, — do you know that? — and he thought he hit a double. That's why he cannot relate to anybody in rural Saskatchewan. He simply cannot relate to them because he doesn't understand what's actually going on. But he understands Weyerhaeuser and Cargill and Pocklington and Childers, and they get deals very quickly.

Now this person, this Premier of this province, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has made a mess of things. He . . .

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Sorry, but the time has elapsed.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Britton:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, at the end of my remarks I will be moving an amendment to this motion.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, agriculture has been historically the most important . . . one of the industries in Saskatchewan. And today, Mr. Speaker, it remains true. More people are employed in agriculture and its related industries than any other industry in the province. More people are employed and the success or failure of Saskatchewan is related to agriculture, Mr. Speaker.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would go so far as to say that agriculture affects every man, woman, and child in Saskatchewan. Not all to the same extent, Mr. Speaker, but to some degree agriculture affects us all.

Unlike the 1970s, the last decade saw a drought as severe as the 1930s, grasshopper infestations likened to that of the locust plagues spoken of in the Bible, Mr. Speaker, and international grain subsidy wars.

Mr. Speaker, I know how it feels to watch the fruit of your labours be devoured by grasshoppers. And I know how it feels to watch your grain wither and shrivel and die, Mr. Speaker. I've been there. And I know, Mr. Speaker, how it feels to compete with American and European farmers who have the price of their grain subsidized by their governments.

Mr. Speaker, it is not fair and it's not right. Mr. Speaker, moreover, it doesn't make any sense. It doesn't make sense to pay someone to take your produce. The entire market system operates on the principle of the exchange of goods and services; an exchange, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to give one thing and in return receive something of equal value. That's the system. And in our system, Mr. Speaker, we use money.

But, Mr. Speaker, the American and the European governments are paying their prospective customers to take their wheat off their hands. And they are getting nothing in return, Mr. Speaker. And it's totally and

completely insane.

Even the Minister of Agriculture of the Soviet Union, when he met with our Premier, agreed that these subsidy wars were crazy. But, Mr. Speaker, whatever the reason, the actions of the American and the European governments are hurting our farm families.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I don't condemn partisan politics, especially in this House. I think the people of Saskatchewan deserve more than that, and when I say the members of the opposition don't have a clue when it comes to agriculture, it has nothing to do with politics, partisan or otherwise. It's the facts of life, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I remember how it was being a farmer back in the 1970s and that bunch across the floor were in government. Not once, not once did they come to the aid of any farm family, Mr. Speaker. Not once. Not one nickel, not one red penny did they have for agricultural Saskatchewan, not a nickel. And now they want to talk about shame.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they sit in their seats and pretend to know about farming and what it takes to keep a farm going. Mr. Speaker, they say they care about rural Saskatchewan. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I dare say that the members of the opposition know about as much about farming and the rural way of life as our Saskatchewan has knowledge in his little finger. They know nothing about it, Mr. Speaker. They merely quote lip service to the farm families of Saskatchewan.

Why do they think that they lost all but two of their rural seats, Mr. Speaker? Why do they think they lost them? It's inefficient to say they care and not to follow up with actions.

Mr. Speaker, this government does care and they do act. And that is why every rural riding in this province, save two, are held by the government members, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because this government cares enough to listen and to respond.

This year's budget introduced a Saskatchewan seeding program. This program will provide \$525 million in operating loans to the farm families of Saskatchewan. Eligible farmers will receive \$12.50 per cultivated acre, repayable at an interest of ten and three-quarters, Mr. Speaker.

In addition we have called upon the federal government in Ottawa to come to the aid of the farm families with \$500 million for spring seeding, \$400 million to compensate for unfair prices, and \$1 billion contingency fund, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the opposition should know this. Exactly 21 days ago we held an emergency agriculture debate, pre-empting the throne speech, which all members, government and opposition alike, unanimously supported. Other government initiatives include ACS (Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan) capital loan program, the ACS debt settlement financing, the ACS guaranteed vendor mortgage program, the ACS investment loan program,

and the ACS livestock cash advance.

But, Mr. Speaker, to put all your time and money into one area would be to have tunnel vision. Support for agriculture is not enough. It is only one aspect of the overall plan for Saskatchewan's future. Mr. Speaker, this government has held various formal and informal meetings with the people of Saskatchewan to discuss how best to lead Saskatchewan through the 1990s, and we introduced Consensus Saskatchewan.

You see, Mr. Speaker, we believe that we were elected to serve the people of Saskatchewan. That being the case, Mr. Deputy Speaker, why not listen to those very people and get their opinions. Mr. Speaker, I believe this to be of fundamental importance of any effective government. It is imperative to work with the people and for the people. You can't do that unless you consult with them, Mr. Speaker. Our most recent consultations with the people of Saskatchewan, they told us that they wanted us to tighten our belt, Mr. Speaker.

Prior to the budget our Premier announced several measures to do just that. Prior to the budget we restructured the mortgage production plan. Rather than subsidize interest rates at nine and three-quarters, we are now subsidizing at ten and three-quarters, Mr. Speaker. We eliminated the fuel tax rebate and we eliminated the home program, but, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one thing clear in respect to the fuel rebate.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, this government understands and sympathizes with our farm families. We know what the expense of fuel is for the farm. To that end we made the decision that any farm fuel used by our farm families for production would be exempt from tax, Mr. Speaker.

(1530)

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to make this amendment:

That the words "official opposition" be substituted for the words "Government of Saskatchewan" and all of the words after the words "failure to" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Remain united with the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, Western Canadian Wheatgrowers Association, and other Saskatchewan organizations, and the Premier of Saskatchewan and all western premiers, in their efforts to have the federal government fulfil the unanimous wishes of this Assembly, and that a \$500 million federal cash pay-out be made to Saskatchewan farmers immediately;

And be it further resolved that the Government of Saskatchewan be commended for its sound and effective management of financial resources that enables a greater and lasting commitment to be made to agriculture, health, education, and local communities.

Mr. Speaker, I so move, seconded by my colleague, the

member from Nipawin.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sauder:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's indeed a pleasure for me to be able to join in this debate, discussing some of the things that have happened in Saskatchewan, happened in the last number of years under this administration; to look at where we've come and to perhaps look at where we're going.

Perhaps, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I look at this motion that's been proposed by the member of the opposition, wanting to condemn the Government of Saskatchewan for our failure to respond to our situation here in Saskatchewan, I might go back and look a little bit at some of the things that have happened in the last number of years here.

I think back to the time, as a young farmer, when I came back to Saskatchewan from working in the oilfields to become involved in the family farm. At that time we were facing extremely low grain prices. There were some weather problems, production problems, world markets were flooded with grain, very low quotas, and we had an NDP government here in Saskatchewan.

Just prior to that, their solution to some of the problems had been they were going to put a moratorium on the collection of farm debt, which resulted in a complete drying up of credit available to people either who were on the farm or who wanted to start.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that over the last 18 or 20 years they haven't learned from that experience. As we face some of the same situations in agriculture, their solution would be the same, albeit throughout those years of their administration, many, many farmers, farm families had to leave, left Saskatchewan, moved off to other places and to other employment.

Mr. Speaker, a little later, as some of the glut of grain disappeared from the market-place, prices started to turn around, we had some better weather conditions, and things started to improve in agriculture and yes, I'd certainly agree, things did improve on the farm; many farmers' lot improved dramatically.

Mr. Speaker, what was their response at that time? It was to add more debt to the farmers there. Mr. Speaker, the other response was, instead of assisting farmers, they were going to buy the land and they were going to get into the farming business and speculate on farm land in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan became my competition and every other young farmer's competition as we wanted to expand or to build on our land base; as we wanted to grow and provide a better level of living and income for our families. Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan rejected that solution. They didn't want it then and they don't want it now.

Mr. Speaker, in the late 1970s and the early 1980s under the NDP administration in Saskatchewan, the Liberal

administration in Ottawa, another problem that agriculture faced — not only agriculture, our whole economy faced — was high interest rates. What was their response to that? Go find your own solution. Sink or swim in the market-place. They couldn't assist. They didn't want to help. Mr. Speaker, in 1981 and 1982 before the election, this party, the Progressive Conservatives, said, the treasury can help Saskatchewan people. It can help Saskatchewan farmers. It can help Saskatchewan home owners. It can help Saskatchewan business people. We were elected on that. Mr. Speaker, we did respond. We assisted the farmers, we assisted the home owners, and we assisted business people.

Mr. Speaker, I don't deny to anybody that agriculture is facing difficulties today. Mr. Speaker, we're facing different types of difficulties but they lead to the same result.

We're facing an international situation where we have the major economies of the world, the United States particularly, and the western Europeans who are pumping literally billions and billions of dollars into their agriculture. Mr. Speaker, we're facing the situation in India, China, countries who used to be major importers who are now, if not self-sufficient, coming close to it; in some instances, who are also exporters of agricultural commodities.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that the federal Government of Canada has to play a role in that in dealing with that situation and has to assist. This legislature passed a motion just three weeks ago calling for that assistance and I believe that it's incumbent on them for the health of our country that they do respond to the international price wars.

Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to touch on some of the other things that we've done, some of the things that we should have learned from the lessons of the 1970s and the early 1980s, that we can't depend totally on agriculture in Saskatchewan, and particularly we can't depend totally on a wheat economy in agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, this government has worked extremely hard at diversification of our economy to build another economic base besides agriculture. I'd just like to talk about a few of the projects that have taken place, some of the jobs that have been created.

We can all think of the major ones, and I think of the one that's very close to my constituency in Prince Albert, the Weyerhaeuser project there, taking a natural, raw resource . . . Yes, it was being turned into pulp and then exported. Mr. Speaker, by the further investment of Weyerhaeuser in that paper mill, they've taken that pulp one step further, converted it into paper, have created many more jobs there, and have added many millions of dollars to the Saskatchewan economy by that diversification project.

Mr. Speaker, they're currently in another project there to take it another step further, to cut that paper down to sheet size, to package it, and then to distribute it to the retail market. Mr. Speaker, again more jobs created, more value added to our resource, a renewable resource, and

more people employed, and a broader tax base, not only for the province but also for the local communities where those industries are and those people reside.

Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan here we've been blessed with several projects tapping our hydro resources for electricity. Mr. Speaker, we've always imported many of the major components. Recently we've had a project built in Saskatoon, a Japanese firm who've come over here to build turbines for those projects, not only for a Saskatchewan market but to export them to other places, primarily in North America.

Mr. Speaker, we've had an initiative that my colleague the member from Souris-Cannington talked about earlier today — a Buy Saskatchewan program, where instead of sourcing the raw material or the products that our corporations or the government needs from outside of Saskatchewan, they've made a very conscious and concerted effort to purchase in Saskatchewan and to deal with Saskatchewan suppliers.

Mr. Speaker, I think of Phillips Cable who built a plant in Moose Jaw to manufacture electrical cable to supply Saskatchewan Power but also to export to other places.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other projects that we can see. I think of one tied to the pulp mill in Prince Albert, Continental Lime, putting in a project there to produce the chemicals for the pulp project.

I think of the Austrak Machinery Corp. who're building in Weyburn — 20 jobs, a potential to go to a hundred jobs to assemble mobile hydraulic power units, small tractors, Mr. Speaker, here in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I think of another business in Regina, Ag Belting and Canvas, 10 jobs. But that job is important to those families, those jobs are important to the economy of Regina, and they're important to the economy of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** — Order. Member's time has elapsed.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koenker:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to speak against the amendment to this motion.

The government asks that they be commended for sound and effective management of fiscal resources here in Saskatchewan, and that's patently absurd. I want to talk about why that's absurd. I want to talk about the waste and mismanagement that we've seen from this PC government, about the alarming provincial deficit that's resulted from this waste and mismanagement. I want to talk about the shifting of the tax burden onto individuals, particularly students, and I want to talk about the reduction in expenditures for education and what that means for the future of this province.

Now the members who have just spoken are very fond of pointing their finger at all sorts of other circumstances that have affected the provincial economy. Grasshoppers

were mentioned, drought, international grain wars, all sorts of circumstances. But anybody who knows school-ground logic will know that when you point the finger at someone or something, there are always three fingers pointing back at yourself. And I think that's the way it is when this government points to economic circumstances, to climate or drought or grasshoppers or grain wars, that there are really three fingers pointing back at this government's fiscal mismanagement and its inability to make the right decisions that serve and protect the public interest here at home.

I want to talk this afternoon about what this means for education at the University of Saskatchewan. President Ivany has said to the government that he needs \$10 million to keep pace with things at the University of Saskatchewan. He asks the government for \$10 million. And what does he get? He gets \$3.6 million.

And the Minister of Education brings in a paltry recommendation in this budget which will result in double-digit tuition hikes for students and programming cuts and a down-sizing of the University of Saskatchewan. In fact, the situation is so bad this year that the University of Saskatchewan will be left with a \$2.5 million deficit.

(1545)

What this government is doing is really transferring its mismanagement now on to the backs of the University of Saskatchewan and on to local municipalities such as Saskatoon, with cuts to the transportation grants and the grant for Centennial Auditorium, which will only mean a shifting of the tax burden to local people in Saskatoon, for example, or students who attend the University of Saskatchewan, where they will see a 10 or a 20 or a 30 per cent hike in tuition. Because this Minister of Education cannot do adequate advocacy on behalf of the university community.

And we have his successor as the minister of science and technology say to the House this afternoon that money doesn't grow on trees. Well we know that this government has big money for its friends.

The Government of Saskatchewan, according to its public accounts that were just released last week, had \$7.25 million for three Regina advertising firms in the '88-89 fiscal year — 7.25 million for three advertising firms, and that kind of money isn't available for the University of Saskatchewan.

And what a mortgaging of our province's future this is, especially of the future for our young people, where Dome Media Buying Services can receive \$3.6 million from the Government of Saskatchewan, which is the same amount that this Minister of Education and Minister of Finance have for the University of Saskatchewan. What an inversion of priorities, where the same amount is given to one advertising firm as is given to the University of Saskatchewan as an increase in this most recent provincial budget.

This government has mismanaged Saskatchewan financial affairs. In every one . . . in every year its been in

office but one, expenditures by this government have exceeded revenues by \$300 million, each year for nine years minus one. They don't know how to manage public affairs.

And anyone in Saskatchewan, whether they're in a business or on a farm or in their own home, knows that if you spend more than you take in you're going to be in trouble. And what this government has done consistently is to spend more than it takes in, giving lavish grants and tax concessions to the oil companies and to the resource sector, giving tax increases to Saskatchewan people.

Interest charges now, on the accumulated deficit that Saskatchewan people now hold, the accumulated deficit of 4.3 billion, the interest charges alone will come to a half a billion dollars this calendar year. And yet in this same calendar year the taxpayers of Saskatchewan will build 20 miles of roads and bridges for Weyerhaeuser corporation and will do that for 20 years at taxpayers' expense. What an inversion of priorities. What wrong-headed fiscal mismanagement. And that's why there isn't money for education at the University of Saskatchewan.

There's more than half a million dollars, half a million dollars in salary for Chuck Childers and there isn't money for education at the University of Saskatchewan. There's no mention at all this year of a budget for capital improvements at the University of Saskatchewan, no five-year plan, and the university is left in limbo. But Chuck Childers can get half a million dollars.

And there's a \$100,000 for Bob Andrew and Graham Taylor when they go to patronage heaven in Hong Kong and Minneapolis. Friends of the PC government do okay. They get to go to patronage heaven and the rest of Saskatchewan people have to endure . . . I won't even say it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, will the Saskatchewan people remember the 85th birthday celebrations that this government concocted for this year with the Future Corporation? There was \$9 million for the Future Corporation to do political advertising and to bestow largess across the province of Saskatchewan.

And young people who need summer jobs experience cuts. Young people — our most precious resource, our most important resource for building this province's future — young people who need an education at the University of Saskatchewan are left to leave the province, to flee the province, not only because they can't get an education, but they can't find work.

And would you believe that the unemployment rate for young people in Saskatchewan is 14 per cent? No wonder they have to leave the province. The budget contains a \$500,000 cut in the only two youth job programs in this budget — the Opportunities '90 program and the Human Resources, Labour and Employment budget is cut by the Minister of Finance by half a million dollars, half a million dollars cut and he applauds that kind of decision. The summer student employment program with the Public Service Commission is cut another half a million dollars by the Minister of Finance and it's laughed at as

inconsequential. A million dollars less in this most recent PC budget for youth job creation and they don't care.

Well I'll say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan care. They care about the future of their province. They're tired of the half-truths from this government, the half-truth where they're told that the student aid funding in this budget will almost double, when the truth of the matter is that the doubling is related to the government's payments of bad student loans and interest payments on those loans. And there's no increase in extra money for students, just as there's no increase in funding for student job creation this summer.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order. The member's time has elapsed.

**Mr. Hopfner:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's my privilege to stand in this Assembly and take part in this debate. I want to indicate to you that I've listened to now three different speakers from members of the opposition: member from Regina Centre; the member from Humboldt; and the member from Saskatoon Sutherland. And I want to indicate to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when I looked at the content of their speeches, it said very little about waste and mismanagement of this government. I would suggest to you, sir, if you would read **Hansard** and you had taken what they had from their context and put it into actual waste and mismanagement, you'd have come up with one individual that might be questioned on the amount of money that he made in the potash industry, by the name of Mr. Chuck Childers and . . . or possibly rumour mongering going on from various different parts of this province.

And I want to indicate to you, sir, that the NDP say that there is such waste and mismanagement in this province. I want to talk to you about three different areas that this government has taken an initiative on through our just recent budget that we've had come down in this Assembly.

I want to indicate to you first, from the member from Saskatoon Sutherland as to when he was indicating about problems with funding in education, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to indicate to you that when this government took office in 1982, the expenditure in education was approximately \$640 million that the NDP had originally spent in the province of Saskatchewan.

I will say this to you, sir, that the expenditure today under our administration in this short eight-year period has doubled in the province of Saskatchewan. I want to indicate to you, sir, that they have condemned this administration for spending those kinds of dollars into education. Because, Mr. Speaker, those same individuals that have been speaking over there and that have been sitting across the way, the same NDP people have voted against the budget, have voted against . . . and by doing that have voted against the increases into education.

I want to indicate to you as well, sir, that if you look at the university and you look at the people going into university, we are, other than Alberta, the lowest tuition fees across this country. I want to say, I want to say, sir, that there is a lot to be taken into consideration when



members of the NDP Party stand up and pass such falsehoods and rumours and innuendoes about the government administration and the expenditures that they have.

The NDP take the people out there, the people of Saskatchewan, as ignorant fools. I want to say to you, sir, that the people of Saskatchewan are not ignorant. They are an intelligent bunch of citizens in this province, and they can read right through what those NDP people are saying.

One member will stand up and they'll say . . . they'll use one figure. The next one will stand up on the same subject and use a 10 times inflated figure, and the next guy will stand up over there, the NDP, and then they'll inflate the figure once more. And they don't personally care, Mr. Speaker, who believes them or whether anybody does believe them. They'll say it and they'll keep repeating it until all of a sudden, well, maybe the odd person might start scratching their head and start believing those kinds of innuendoes and falsehoods.

I want to indicate to you, sir, that I would challenge any one of those people into any kind of a public debate in my riding, and come up with those inflated figures and rumours that they bring to this Assembly and play it in front of the TV cameras.

I want to indicate to you, sir, that when I look at the tax base, when I look at the personal income tax base in this province, yes, we may be one of the highest personal income taxes in this province, across the nation. But I want to indicate to you, sir, that you take all the services aside and you lump that in along with the personal income tax base that we have in this province, like as far as education tuition and education costs and health care and social programs, you take that all into consideration, sir, and I tell you, Mr. Speaker, and I tell the people of this province, we have one of the lowest, lowest cost provinces right across this nation, as far as all those public inputs in public delivery programs are concerned.

I want to indicate to you, sir, that when they talk about being here for the people, one of the biggest crisis today is agriculture, Mr. Speaker. One of the greatest crisis today is agriculture. It's been on the front pages of newspapers right across this country for weeks and weeks and months. And yet, Mr. Speaker, the NDP opposition will not stand in this House, will not stand behind our Premier, will not stand behind this government and try and bring funds into Saskatchewan for our farmers and farm families in rural communities.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hopfner:** — Those people are not for the farmers. They are not for the local communities out there, the small rural communities. They, I say, sir, would just as soon be downtown, mainstreeting with the SGEU (Saskatchewan Government Employees' Union) than people walking the street with posters and signs saying, what about me for higher salary and wages and benefits when the poor farmers out there, sir, have had to take 100 per cent cut in their incomes.

And I want to say to you, sir, that enough's enough from listening to that kind of rhetoric coming from the NDP. I'll say to you, sir, that I ask members of the NDP, I ask the members all across the floor there to join with this government, as they so said they would have in the resolution that was passed, get behind this government, and let's work on Ottawa in bringing some dollars to our farm community and help diversify the economy here in the province of Saskatchewan, so that we don't only have to realize the need for agriculture, for jobs . . . and rely on agriculture for jobs, but to be able to rely on other industries as well.

They condemn the projects that this government has brought forth in the past years that have created many thousands of jobs. And I say to you, sir, that's an unfairness to the political system. It does an injustice as members of the opposition as well as it does an injustice to the people out there.

(1600)

I understand that politics is politics and everybody tries to score points. But if they're trying to score a point, I maintain this, sir, I maintain that any politician regardless of what stripes, if they're trying to score political points, that it should be done through truth. It should be done through facts. It should not be done through rumour mills. It should not be fed with a whole bunch of untruths.

I say to you sir, that when I look at this government and the economic conditions it has had over the years to work in, I congratulate our finance ministers in having to try to put together some sort of a budget because you didn't realize from one year to the next what oil prices were going to bring. You didn't know whether the market was going to crash. Same in potash, you didn't know what the prices were going to be.

Look at uranium and your forest products. Sir, when you take all the resource sectors and the dilemma that they faced in the world markets over these past years, I would suggest to you that under any circumstance, that any government would . . . They should be applauded instead of being criticized like this with a rule 16 that has been brought into this Assembly condemning the government.

I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, when I look at what the members opposite have said and try to put anything, any credibility to it, then I say to you it's impossible. I asked the members opposite, the NDP, I asked them: would they have had us stop building new hospitals in rural Saskatchewan; would they have had us stop building new education facilities in rural Saskatchewan; would they have had us . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Time has elapsed.

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am very pleased to enter this debate today. And in the outset of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I'd want to say to you that I'm always amused when the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster gets up to speak in this House. I'm not so convinced that the members of his caucus who have to spend the time to listen to him are that amused, but I suggest to you it's an amusing performance any time he

speaks.

In the outset of the member from Cut Knife-Lloyd's remarks he was apparently a little distraught at the fact that no one on this side of the House had talked through this motion. Anybody that had spoken to this motion had talked about waste and mismanagement. Well I don't want to disappoint that member, so I think I'll do just that.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons that this member will understand there can't be unanimity in this House is because of this government's record, because of their shoddy performance, and because of, in spite of the fact they talk about cutting waste and mismanagement, that's exactly what they continue to do.

And I tell you, if they'd be willing to clean their act up and govern this province in a fair and a reasonable manner, they wouldn't have problems with the members on this side of this House because what we're looking for is decent and sensible government and an end to the corruption and the waste and mismanagement of that government.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — Mr. Speaker, I have in my hands a list of 50 ways that this government could cut the cost and the mismanagement of this province, and for the member from Cut Knife-Lloyd, I'm just going to run through a few of the 50 quite quickly, because I've only got 10 minutes in this debate.

They spent \$17,423 from the Premier's office at the Saskatchewan Hotel in '86, or '87-88. They spent \$19,368 expenses of the Premier's office in the Regina Ramada Renaissance in '87-88; \$45,000 to former PC member of parliament, Stan Korchinski, to tell this Premier how to lobby Mulroney in Ottawa.

They spent \$46,000 in annual lease payments for the Premier's office in Prince Albert. They spent \$86,000 for the cost of renovations to the Premier's office in Prince Albert.

They spent \$1,343,495 advertising public relations for eight-month period in SaskTel to Poole Advertising, Roberts & Poole Advertising, close friends of the PC Party. They spent \$137,500 to purchase a condominium for Mr. Paillet, the fellow who was running GigaText for them, where they blew \$5.5 million on technology that everyone in this province knew wouldn't work.

They spent \$1,083 a month to lease this same Mr. Paillet a Mercedes-Benz. They spent \$51,000 to pay the salary of defeated PC cabinet minister Jack Sandberg. They spend \$41,900 to hire Keith Parker and give him a job with the Saskatchewan Liquor Board.

And today we find our suspicions were confirmed, that yes, Mr. Speaker, they're spending a half of a million dollars a year, \$550,000 a year, to hire an American to come up here and run our potash corporation when we've got expertise in this country and in this province with the ability to run that corporation and for a lot less than what this particular person's running it for.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I've got a list of 50. I'm not going to bother you with all of the details. But I want to tell the people of Saskatchewan, if they're interested in a list of the 50 ways they can recommend to their MLAs — if they happen to be represented by one on the government side — all they have to do is write me at the Legislative Building and I'd be glad to send them a list of the 50 and they can pass them on to the members on that side.

Mr. Speaker, this motion speaks to the kind of government which this Premier has delivered since 1982. It speaks to everything that's been wrong with this PC government in Saskatchewan. This motion, Mr. Speaker, speaks to the reason that men and women of this province are spending \$493 million a year now just to pay the interest on the debt that's been accumulated by this government, by this cabinet, since 1982.

Now, Mr. Speaker, today I want to say to you that I was really amazed when the member from Souris-Cannington got up to make a major announcement, an announcement that he was no longer going to act as part of this Premier's cabinet. He spent 20 minutes in this House indicating to the people of Saskatchewan how he had fulfilled and completed his role, his mission for economic diversification in Saskatchewan.

Well I tell you if that member is really convinced that the role that he set out to do, and that being economic diversification, has been accomplished, well I suggest to you that's just another reason, sir, why this province has got a four and a half billion dollar debt and why we've got a \$13 billion total provincial debt.

Mr. Speaker, this has been an interesting week. It's been an interesting week for government members. The new cabinet minister from Thunder Creek who's now in charge of the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation, the bank or the semi-bank that is supposed to be putting money into the hands of Saskatchewan business people in a responsible fashion — the first question we ask him after being the minister of the Crown for four months, he can't answer. He didn't know the answer as to how much money they actually blew and how much they invested in Supercart.

Supercart, if you'll recall, and if I can take you back to the election of 1986, Mr. Speaker, was the big flagship of economic diversification. I remember the announcement as if it were yesterday. They got up and talked about how this new economic diversification strategy was really moving us along and how they were on the right course.

Well you know what it did, Mr. Speaker? We find out later, when the minister had a chance to consult with his officials, he talked to the press people and you know, by golly, to the minister's surprise he found out that his government and a predecessor of his had helped to make the decision to blow \$400,000 of taxpayers' money.

And you would think, Mr. Speaker, you would have thought that these people would have learned their lessons from past mistakes. You would have thought that the Minister of Finance would be able to fulfil the promise of a balanced budget. You would have thought those

things could have happened by now after eight or nine years of experience.

But you know what, Mr. Speaker? There can only be two reasons, there can only be two reasons that the budget can't be balanced. And I think the one is, is because there's a lack of talent on the other side. That's clearly one of the answers. But the other one is, is the fact that they put their political future ahead of realistic, sound economic expenditures. And that's the problem.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, the forecast deficit for this year I don't think has any kind of a bearing on the real truth as to what the deficit is going to be, because I think the almost 400 million that they're forecasting this year is going to look to be a very pale figure when the light of day shines upon the true reality of this year's deficit.

And I want to say, the reason I would suggest that is because of the past performance of this Finance minister, one of his colleagues, when election year in 1986 he forecast 389 million in his deficit and it came in at 1.2 billion. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe any cabinet minister, even members that sit on that side of the bench, any Finance minister can err that much. And nobody else in this province does.

What you've got, Mr. Speaker, is deception. And those are the kinds of things that we've asked this government to change. They want consensus and they want us to work together with them. Well we'd like to do that, but I'll tell you, we're not going to support the kind of a government that they've been delivering since 1982, and neither are the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the riding of the former member Graham Taylor from Indian Head-Wolseley, they had a nominating convention. And by golly, one of the delegates is quoted in the paper as saying, no, he's very very unhappy; this, a lifelong Tory supporter, a man who blindly supports the leadership of this Premier. No, he's not happy with the fact that his former MLA was sent over to Hong Kong at a salary of \$100,000 a year. He's not happy about that, but he'll blindly follow. But you want to know something, Mr. Speaker? I believe that that citizen of this province that blindly supports this PC Party is very, very much in the minority.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the polling that has been done by national polling firms indicates very clearly that these people are running a very, very poor race in terms of popularity in Saskatchewan. And I know that the member from Rosthern is experiencing this when he goes home when he goes to Waldheim . . .

**The Speaker:** — Time has expired.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

## MOTIONS

### Resolution No. 1 — Fighting the Farm Crisis in Saskatchewan

**Mr. Gleim:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure today to talk about the crisis in agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan. All over the world Saskatchewan is known as the farming region for obvious reasons, Mr. Speaker. We are one of the world's top quality producers, Mr. Speaker, and I mean top quality producers. And when I say that, Mr. Speaker, is that there is nowhere else in the world that we grow top quality grain as we do here in Saskatchewan.

I guess that is why the grain in Saskatchewan is in demand. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we always use the phrase a lot of times that we are the bread-basket of the world. And I do believe that we are the bread-basket of the world for this reason, that we grow the top quality grain in the world. It is the livelihood of thousands of people who work directly on the land and it affects the lives of thousands more who depend on farm families to support their business, Mr. Speaker.

(1615)

It is simply not possible to overestimate the importance of agriculture to the people and the economy of Saskatchewan. Even those people born and raised in towns and cities know how important it is to the very survival of this province. The past few years of drought, the unfair grain subsidies, the economic hardship for the people of Saskatchewan are the proof how devastating a recession in agricultural sector can be in the province of Saskatchewan.

Almost every single man, woman, and child in the province of Saskatchewan has felt the effects of the recession to some extent, Mr. Speaker. I myself gain the major part of my livelihood from the land and I have certainly felt that effect, Mr. Speaker. My children have felt the effect, Mr. Speaker. My neighbours have felt the effect. Everyone from small independent business people have felt that effect, Mr. Speaker. I don't think there is a soul in Saskatchewan who would deny the far-reaching effects that an economic recession in agriculture has had on the province as a whole. It is for this reason that I am so pleased to be part of this debate today, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this government is and always has been committed to agriculture. The Premier himself has stated on more than one occasion that support for agricultural sector is so important that he is prepared to stake the entire budget of this province on it. And the entire budget of this province, Mr. Speaker, that is a very strong statement, Mr. Speaker. That is something that people across the way never did, never thought of doing. They did think about that, Mr. Speaker, about buying the land. This is not in our budget, Mr. Speaker. We want to help the people in agriculture, Mr. Speaker, because it is so important, Mr. Speaker, to rural Saskatchewan. Farming is the backbone of Saskatchewan.

Not only, Mr. Speaker, do I support and agree with it, I commend the Premier for taking such a strong stand. And, Mr. Speaker, it is not the first time that the Premier or the government has shown strong support for agriculture. When I say strong support, Mr. Speaker, it is so important to the province of Saskatchewan.

And when I'm talking about that, it's something I mentioned the other day about the tourism. Tourism has evolved with agriculture. Rural development corporations play a very big part. A new program, rural medical practice, plays a big part, Mr. Speaker, along with education. And that is the survival of rural Saskatchewan, when you tie and you knit these all together. One won't work without the other. We have to work together, Mr. Speaker.

Since the very day, Mr. Speaker, that we formed government, the member from Estevan has shown strong support for agriculture and the rural economy. He supports it, Mr. Speaker, and he understands it, because like myself and many other members of this Assembly, the Premier has also a rural agricultural background, Mr. Speaker — I repeat, Mr. Speaker, a rural agricultural background. That is more than I can probably say for a few other people in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker.

That background, combined with his expertise in the area of economics, made him an ideal candidate for the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. Since that time, steadily increasing demands, both financial and otherwise, led him to appoint a member from Morse as Associate Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, agriculture is so important that an associate minister was needed to accommodate the sector, agricultural sector, Mr. Speaker.

The member from Morse is very capable of that position, Mr. Speaker. He has the background, he has the knowledge to assist the Premier. In fact, Mr. Speaker, traditional throne speech debate was pre-empted in order to hold an emergency debate on the Premier's motion on agriculture; an emergency debate, Mr. Speaker, demanding the federal government to accept responsibilities to farm families of Saskatchewan, which members of this Assembly unanimously supported.

It is important, Mr. Speaker, to keep in mind when stressing the importance of agriculture to the Saskatchewan economy, that at least part of the reason that this is so important is because it touches all of our lives to some extent. No other industry has quite that effect, Mr. Speaker. No other industry influences the general state of the economy to the extent that agriculture does. In responding to the needs of our agricultural community, we are in effect responding to the needs of all Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker.

Recent federal budget announcements have made financial management and adequate funding even more important. On the other, sound financial management on the part of provincial government alone simply will not produce the funds necessary to provide adequate support to all areas of concern. The federal government, Mr. Speaker, in Ottawa, also has a responsibility to the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, recent initiatives by the federal government serves mainly the interest of central Canada, particularly Ontario, where the market-place is overheated. Policies whose aim is to curb the spiralling growth in rate in Ontario have been devastating to Saskatchewan and

other small provinces such as the Maritimes. We simply cannot afford policies aimed at reducing growth when growth is very important thing that we are trying to promote, Mr. Speaker.

High interest rates are the worst possible news for Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker. We can't control interest rates from Saskatchewan. That is the responsibility of the federal government, in particular the farm families of Saskatchewan whose livelihood has already been threatened by severe years of drought, grasshoppers, and artificially low grain prices.

Mr. Speaker, it is essential that the Government of Canada accept its responsibilities and come to the aid of Saskatchewan farm families with a long-term solution, Mr. Speaker. Short-term solutions are only effective in the case of periodic emergencies.

Clearly the agricultural situation has become more than a periodic problem, Mr. Speaker. It is an ongoing problem that has become steadily worse rather than showing signs of improvement. What Saskatchewan needs are long-term policies that lessen, if not prevent, the need for emergency funding and indeed emergency debates.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that I am a farmer myself. Being a farmer, I know firsthand that short-term solutions really are not the solutions any more, Mr. Speaker. Diversify, Mr. Speaker, diversification. I can speak for that firsthand, Mr. Speaker, more so than the member from Quill Lakes was just talking about.

I have a grain farm, I run cattle, I feed cows, I background calves. And I know, Mr. Speaker, that diversification is very important, more so important nowadays than it used to be with the programs that this government has implemented, Mr. Speaker, just in the diversification of the livestock feeding program, Mr. Speaker.

I know it's not the full answer, Mr. Speaker, but it is something I talked about the other day. There was just a few years ago that we only fed 12 per cent of our animals in Saskatchewan. You know where those animals went, Mr. Speaker? They weren't fed out in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, they were fed out every place but in Saskatchewan.

And I think that it's about time that we started processing where the jobs are right here in Saskatchewan, and that is what this government did, Mr. Speaker. It implemented a program so that we could do that in the province of Saskatchewan

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gleim:** — The member from Quill Lakes says, when did you wake up? Well I'll tell you what. We woke up; you guys never did wake up. There is a difference.

Mr. Speaker, I'm no economist, but you don't have to be an economist to figure that out, just what I was talking about, Mr. Speaker. You didn't have to be an economist to figure out what we did. You people didn't figure it out. All you need is pure, simple common sense.

That's another thing that I want to talk about. That's something . . . that's all it took. It took a bunch of people to sit around a table, with some common sense, that are in the business, that are in the business, Mr. Speaker, in the business of agriculture, Mr. Speaker. That's all it took — some people to sit around the table and come up with some solutions.

I'm sure they weren't all solutions that would accommodate everybody sitting in this Assembly or everybody in this province. But it was a change we needed and that change we did, and that change has helped this province, Mr. Speaker.

Some of these problems you may get away with in one year, Mr. Premier, you can maybe stand one year, perhaps maybe two years. But, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan farmers have experienced year after year the set-back, and neither we or they can afford it any more, Mr. Speaker.

Income levels for Saskatchewan farmers have reached a severe crisis situation, Mr. Speaker. Even with a normal crop in 1990, projected net income for Saskatchewan farmers is only 80 per cent of normal. Mr. Speaker, common sense is all we need to figure out that something just isn't right in this situation, Mr. Speaker.

People do not go into business to lose money; they go into business to make money, whether it be teaching, engineering, or farming, Mr. Speaker. Just think about the implications of this situation. How important, Mr. Speaker, is what I mentioned, what I talked about before, how important all these things are to the economy of Saskatchewan. And that's something we need in the province of Saskatchewan. We need all that diversification to keep our economy going.

I guess I already mentioned that the relative prosperity of the farm families affects the lives of many, many people, not only in rural Saskatchewan. It affects all the people across all of Saskatchewan. Small businesses, particularly those in small rural communities, depend on farm families, Mr. Speaker. Farm families simply will not, have not the necessary cash to support those businesses, Mr. Speaker.

It is for those reasons that we are asking the federal government to come to the aid of Saskatchewan families, to provide them with assistance to plant the spring crop, and to establish a contingency fund to counteract the effect of global grain subsidy wars, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan treasury simply cannot afford to take on the treasuries of the United States of America and the European communities, Mr. Speaker. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, we don't have that kind of treasury in Saskatchewan to fight those kinds of subsidies, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, in the United States and European communities.

We are ready and willing, able to do to our part, but we cannot afford to do it alone, Mr. Speaker. We need, Mr. Speaker, the farm families of Saskatchewan need the help of Ottawa, Mr. Speaker. We need the help of Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, and we need it badly.

Mr. Speaker, our own Premier has met with, among others, agricultural ministers, SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities), wheat pool, lending institutions, to try and come to some viable solutions, Mr. Speaker.

Among all of these groups there has been a general consensus. They all agree that it is time for Ottawa to show all of Saskatchewan, in particular our farm families, that in spite of the economic boom in Ontario, Mr. Speaker, I repeat, in the boom in Ontario, they haven't forgotten their responsibility to us out here in Saskatchewan, to show Saskatchewan people that they too are an important part of Canada.

It is time for Ottawa to show the farm families of Saskatchewan that they truly are working for them, and come through in the only way that really counts, Mr. Speaker, and that is dollars. In this year's budget the Minister of Finance announced a \$525 million spring seeding program which will provide farmers with an operating loan of ten and three-quarter per cent, Mr. Speaker.

And when I talk about a spring seeding program, Mr. Speaker, that \$525 million loan program at ten and three-quarters, that is a very important part of seeding, Mr. Speaker. That is an important part. That is a difference of probably 5 to 6 to 7 per cent interest rate, Mr. Speaker. That gives these people a chance to go into their lending institutes to get an operating loan and they know they're going to be able to put their crop in.

You can talk about drought, but I'll tell you, if you don't seed, the drought is even worse. And that is why that program is here, Mr. Speaker. And anybody that's been involved in agriculture can probably relate and probably agree with me that we do need a program like this. The understanding, what the people told us, the province of Saskatchewan need a loan program, not a forgiveable one. They need the forgiveable one from Ottawa, Mr. Speaker. And that is why we are debating this today.

(1630)

Mr. Speaker, I say to you that if the Premier of Saskatchewan can meet with lending institutions and if the provincial treasury can implement a \$525 million spring seeding program, then surely the Prime Minister of the country and the federal Minister of Agriculture can do a lot to help Saskatchewan farmers in helping along that way with coming to the aid of the farmers of Saskatchewan.

Because the farmers are the backbone, they are the people . . . if it weren't for the farmers, we probably wouldn't be standing up here today. Maybe we wouldn't have a place to stand today if it wasn't for the farmers growing, keeping feeding people all across the world with our cheap food policy. And maybe, I guess, maybe that's part of the problem, is our cheap food policy that we have in this world. I'm not talking just about Saskatchewan, but across the whole world.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you that if the Premier of

Saskatchewan can meet all these, we have to give the Premier of Saskatchewan credit for this, but we will not go around slapping people on the back because this is not what this is all about. This is about need. We are talking about the agriculture situation in Saskatchewan is no longer just a concern, Mr. Speaker. It has become a crisis and it is serious enough to warrant direct immediate national attention, Mr. Speaker.

In spite of the programs such as the western grain stabilization program, the special Canadian grains program, the Canadian crop drought assistance program, agriculture producers have been falling further and further behind each year.

Mr. Speaker, we can't grow any more. We need to be paid for our produce, Mr. Speaker, and until that time comes that we are being paid for our produce, I guess somebody has to come to our aid. And that is why we are asking the federal Government of Canada to come to our aid. And I ask you, Mr. Speaker, does this make sense? If there is anyone present in this House that can explain the logic behind such a situation, I do ask, Mr. Speaker.

Income generated by the market-place simply has not improved to the point where government payments are necessary, Mr. Speaker. In fact the very opposite is true. Mr. Speaker, we need action and we need action now, Mr. Speaker.

As I mentioned earlier, as many of my colleagues have mentioned, every aspect of Saskatchewan's economy has already felt the effects of recession in the agricultural sector.

We believe that the formula for solution should be related to the level of realized net farm incomes over the past few years when the situation has been steadily declining. This income level is representative of a minimum level of income and it should be adjusted to the 1990 dollars, Mr. Speaker. The average realized net income between 1984 and 1989 was 921 million, Mr. Speaker, in 1990 dollars. It is clear that a \$900 million payment is required to bring the 1990 realized net income to the average minimum level of the past five years, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, responsibility to the agricultural sector is shared by both federal and provincial governments. It is the belief of the Premier, my colleagues, and myself, among others, that it is time for the federal government to accept its responsibility. Many of the problems Saskatchewan faces are due to federal initiatives designed to help Ontario and central Canada at the expense of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. We cannot and we will not sit by idly, Mr. Speaker.

We interrupted the important proceedings of this House in order to have an emergency debate that was addressed in that situation because we believe, and I think it's safe for me to assume that the members from the opposition also believe, that we owe it to our farm families, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore have moved, seconded by the member for Moosomin, the following resolution:

That this Assembly, noting the extremely pressing financial crisis facing Saskatchewan agricultural communities, urge the federal government to provide immediate farm assistance to facilitate this spring's seeding, to establish a contingency fund to counteract global subsidy wars, to create a federal-provincial industry team to lobby in Europe for an end to the price wars, and to modify the federal farm credit policy to rewrite mortgage values at realistic land prices.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed an honour again to stand — or Mr. Deputy Speaker — to stand in this Assembly and to address the people of this Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan regarding the farm debt crisis that each and every one of us is aware of that is taking place in rural Saskatchewan at this time.

I want to say thank you to the member from Shaunavon for his qualified words and the motion that he has presented in this Assembly today, in support not only of the farmers and the farming community of the province, but of rural Saskatchewan in general.

Because I believe we are very well aware, Mr. Speaker, of the fact that as agriculture prospers and as agriculture is progressive, so too are the communities, small communities that most of us on this side of the House and some members on the other side of the House happen to come from. We know that the small economic development in our communities all stems around agriculture.

I don't think there's anyone in this Assembly will deny the importance of agriculture, the role that agriculture has played over the years in Saskatchewan. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you're aware of the important debate that took place shortly after the opening of this Assembly, when all members of this Assembly adopted a motion to be sent to the federal government, imploring them to send a cash injection of cash money into the coffers of the farm families and to the pockets of the farm families across this province to work along with the \$525 million commitment that the provincial government has made to the farmers of this province to aid them to put a crop in the ground.

Mr. Speaker, there's no doubt that agriculture has built this province and there's no doubt that it will continue to be the main aspect and sector of our economy that sustains the economy and continues to help Saskatchewan grow and expand.

I believe that the subject today here is very vital to this province, and because of that farm families right now are looking to the provincial government and to the federal government for some help in this time of low prices and in fact conditions beyond their control where they just do not have the product in the bin that they can move to market to establish even at their lines of credit.

Mr. Speaker, when I say that, there are many farm families

who are suffering right now, suffering because of conditions beyond their control. And I think that it is time we look beyond the political posturing and got right down to the essence of the matter that there is a need to work together to implore the federal government to provide the finances to, Mr. Speaker, give that cash and put that cash injection into this province, a commitment that they have made in practice, that they have voiced that they are going to be with us.

But, Mr. Speaker, as I talk to many farm people and many farm families, the fact that you can make a commitment in word is really measured on your ability to bring it to fruition and in fact show it through your deeds by handing out and putting that dollar out there.

There is no doubt that Saskatchewan agriculture is in dire straits and desperately needs federal assistance. And one of the members opposite just commented on the new low, and I believe the Leader of the Opposition just recently in writing the Premier asked that the province work together to put a low interest loan, make it available so that Saskatchewan farm families would have money at a low interest rate that would enable them to get seed and fuel and put a crop in the ground. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that farm families right across this province and over the years have been very ingenious in the way they have been able to believe that if you put a crop in the ground, sooner or later you're going to get a return; and with that, Mr. Speaker, pay your debts and make a very good life for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen over the past number of years conditions that every one of us have faced over the years. I remember hearing my parents and even my grandparents, before they passed away, I remember hearing many people talk of the '30s.

And we've lived through the period of the '80s, Mr. Speaker, where we have seen ups and downs, where we have seen certain areas of the province with a bumper crop. But in due respect, Mr. Speaker, the general factor that we've seen right across our province is the fact that when there was a decent crop in 1982, the prices weren't there; so that the decent crop just didn't weigh out, didn't meet the needs of the farm families, the farm communities, trying to work with the high land prices and high interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that drought in the recent three, four years and grasshoppers certainly haven't helped farm families in establishing their farming operations, in establishing the farm base. And this year, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we're also well aware of the fact that forecasters are setting farm income to be minus \$9 million — \$9 million dollars which small families and farm families and small communities across this province can ill afford.

In fact, it may be easy to say that farm prices have never been so low. Maybe they weren't even that low in the Dirty Thirties.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there's a real suffering behind these statistics. There are families who can't keep up with debt taken out in the late '70s, and they are losing their farms and their whole way of life.

And in my constituency I run into that every day. I run into young families who came back to the farm, who left the farm and went into business, or were out working, but they still look forward to the day when they could go back to the farm.

And so they came back. And unfortunately in some ways, some of them chose — you could say, well they chose the wrong period of time — they came back in the period 1978 to 1982 when land prices were escalating and inflation was rampant. And they got themselves in a position of high land values, high interest rates, which even in those days, Mr. Speaker, farmers couldn't cope with.

Mr. Speaker, it didn't matter what kind of crop was produced. There was no way they could meet those payments. The reason they couldn't meet those payments, Mr. Speaker, even with a top-notch crop, is the fact that grain prices were too low.

And we still face that problem today. In fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, just recently in talking with a number of farmers and farm groups in the area, there's no doubt that the farm community . . . as the farmers said to me, and there was a wide range from young people to older farmers, farmers who . . . individuals who just were getting into the field to individuals who wanted to retire. And what they were saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they were saying, give us a decent price for our product and we will not be pressing the government for an **ad hoc** payment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what they were looking for was . . . what most farmers are looking for is the ability to produce and receive a fair return on their production so that they in turn can carry themselves and make their farm operations viable. They are not looking to the taxpayer to carry them every year. They want the ability to carry and to work on their own.

But imagine the frustration, Mr. Speaker, when year after year you're not only facing drought, but even last year as we look around, there are pockets where there were good crops, and the frustration that a farmer faced when he maybe put a 35- or a 40-bushel crop in the bin and went to market that product, because the prices were not realistic with the values and indeed the costs, Mr. Speaker. Many comments I've heard, it would have been just as simple, in fact a lot easier, just to carry crop insurance or to have had a hailstorm come through or even have had the drought take over.

(1645)

And you may ask, well why would a person feel that way? Well a person feels that way, Mr. Speaker, because his input costs were greatly reduced. A person who didn't harvest a crop because of drought didn't have to run harvest machinery, he didn't have all the fuel costs, and he received the value that he took out through insurance which to a lot of farmers with a 30-bushel crop was almost more money.

Mr. Speaker, over the years I'm sure many farmers have seen conditions that would have caused them to look

back and . . . they can look back now and maybe throw their hands in the air and say, well I should have quit five years ago, I should have got out of farming 10 years ago, or just thrown in the towel, period, and gone and done something else.

But I believe, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan farmers believe that they have the ability and they have the resources, if they receive the price, that they can play a very major role in this province in the economic activity of this province. And I would suggest that certainly a fair return on their investment would go a long ways. However, because that return isn't there, Mr. Speaker, I believe we as a government, as we have shown over the past number of years, must continue to be with . . . we must continue to show that we are willing to support the farm community. And that support to the farm community then works its way through the system into the small communities, into the small businesses, into our educational facilities, into our health facilities, and even into our large, urban centres.

Mr. Speaker, we wonder why the price of grain is so low. We wonder why we have to continually work at trying to prop up grain prices. It's because of the senseless, wasteful, and timely destructive grain subsidy war being carried out by the Europeans and now the United States as well.

And that brings me to my second important point, namely, that the crisis in agriculture is primarily an international problem, and therefore it is up to the federal government to do its share to fight the crisis in agriculture. That does not mean that our government has no role to play. It doesn't mean, Mr. Speaker, that we're off-loading our problems onto the federal government. What it means, Mr. Speaker, and I believe this very sincerely, that a million taxpayers in the province of Saskatchewan should not be saddled with an international problem, that the farm families of this province have to face.

On the contrary, we as a government have a substantial role to play, and I believe over the years we have shown our ability and our willingness to stand behind the farming community. We have, I believe, fulfilled our role and fulfilled our end. This government has provided for Saskatchewan agriculture better than any in this province's history, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I would challenge anyone to prove that statement wrong.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, since 1982 our assistance to Saskatchewan farm families has been in excess of \$944 million. And if you add the production loan to it, Mr. Speaker, that's over \$2 billion. Programs like the ACS production loan, the ACS livestock cash advance, the cow-calf-to-finish market insurance program, and the Agricultural Development Fund have all put money into the hands of Saskatchewan farmers when they needed it. And we are continually helping Saskatchewan farmers manage their debt loads better, with the farming to win . . . and counselling and assistance for farmers programs.

And, Mr. Speaker, let me add a few words about the counselling and assistance to farmers. I just want to mention, Mr. Speaker, a letter that was written to the Premier that came across my desk recently, a letter from a

young farmer in my constituency, and I don't happen to have it handy here.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this young couple wrote about the difficulties they've had trying to establish the family farm. They wrote about the fact of the off-farm job, trying to keep the family farm going, working with the father to work his way into the family farm, and then the tragedy that ensued last fall when his father passed away.

And with a young family, he started looking at it and he said, there's no way he could continue to operate the farm and continue to work off the farm; and he asked himself, as he indicated in the letter, that him and his wife sat down and they said, what's the best thing for our children? And he realized farming was something that he really wanted to get into. He really loved farming, so he decided to give up his job.

And I don't think it was an easy job to give up because it happened to be a job working for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. And I dare say that PCS employees in my area receive a fairly good wage; in fact there are a lot of young farmers who are working for PCS to help supplement their farm income.

But he also indicated, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that he appreciated the work counselling and assistance to farmers had done for him and his wife as they established and worked to make their farm more viable, to provide a place where they could grow up and raise their children in a healthy atmosphere.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I also wanted to mention there are other areas where we have worked together to help the farming and the rural community. We've helped to cut costs by bringing natural gas service to 18,857 farms. We are installing underground power lines and individual line telephone service to rural Saskatchewan as well.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I could go on here again for several minutes, but the point is that this government has fulfilled its commitment to Saskatchewan farmers. In this year's budget we have continued our support of farm families with over \$400 million in spending — over \$400 million, Mr. Speaker. And on top of that, a \$525 million low interest loan program.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the opposition would criticize the loan as another debt . . . or farmers getting into deeper debt. I would suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that many farmers that would be looking at this loan are farmers who have no opportunity at this present time of securing an operating loan.

And right across this province, Mr. Deputy Speaker, farmers over the years have gone to the banks to secure an operating loan so that they could get the money to put the crop in the ground, to buy the inputs, the fuel, the fertilizer, the chemical, and the seed. And so they could plant that crop, looking forward to the day, nine months or so later, when they would put a crop in the bin and they would sell that crop and then go back and pay their suppliers and pay off their operating loan. And I believe at ten and three-quarter per cent interest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the interest rate isn't an incentive for those



who don't need it to take it and invest it, but the interest rate is certainly much better than having to go to your lending institution and borrow at 16 per cent.

I believe this is a sign that we're willing to put money on the table, and now it's time for the federal government to do the same. In fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just might make one other comment in passing. The cost of that program to the taxpayers is going to be to the tune of almost 40 or \$50 million in picking up the subsidized interest rate. I believe that is a significant commitment on the part of this government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Saskatchewan cannot compete with the treasuries of the United States and the entire European Economic Community, nor can we push for a resolution to these ludicrous grain subsidy wars with the same influence as the federal government possesses. On March 30 this entire House agreed that we need federal assistance. Farm groups like the Western Canadian Wheat Growers Association and SARM have agreed that we need assistance from the federal government, and I might also mention Sask Wheat Pool, United Grain Growers, and other groups across the province. And the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has agreed to do this as well.

And while it is true that members opposite have joined with us, Mr. Speaker, we must continue to work together. We must continue to co-operate in lobbying the federal government to initiate and to carry out their responsibility. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we talk about a cash injection into the province of Saskatchewan to the farm families, we're not talking of next October, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we mean today.

Farm families in Saskatchewan who are struggling need to know today where they stand. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have had many calls, and I just noticed as I picked up some notes today, there are some calls waiting for me to get back to, of individuals who are calling, wondering what's happening.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Saskatchewan farm families need immediate assistance for spring seeding to help with the debt problem. And, Mr. Speaker, one other area we must work at is working with farm credit and encouraging them to rewrite mortgage values to realistic land prices. And in the long term, we must work to bring an end to the grain subsidy wars. We must work to work at bringing down interest rates to a more realistic level. We must first protect our farmers by establishing a \$1 billion contingency fund, and we must form a federal-provincial industry team to lobby and fight for an end to the international grain subsidy wars.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we in this government have put our money down to help agriculture, and we will continue to provide all we can to help farmers in the short run and to bring an end to the subsidy wars. But we must have the help of the federal government to be successful. This is an international battle we are engaged in, Mr. Speaker.

Were it not for the subsidy wars, Saskatchewan farmers would not be in the position they are today. They would have had a few tough years of drought, but if they had

been receiving a fair price for their grain, they would not be facing the problem they are facing.

Now I know that what we have heard from the federal government so far does not come far near to fulfilling our needs, but we cannot nor must we give up. Farm groups and all the political parties in this province must be unanimous in the view that the federal government must come through for Saskatchewan farmers. The Saskatchewan treasury, as I've indicated earlier, Mr. Deputy Speaker, cannot possibly stand alone against the economic might of Europe and the United States. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we must again send a powerful unified message to Ottawa.

For this reason I call on all members of this House to put aside partisan considerations and vote unanimously for this motion. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am proud to second the motion presented by the member from Shaunavon.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have but five minutes before the end of the day. And I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it wouldn't take five minutes to analyse what has been contributed to this House by the other two members.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — The first one got up and indicated that he was pleased to be able to get up and discuss, talk about the crisis in agriculture. Well I want to tell you that I'm not proud to have to get up in this House and spend day after day talking about the crisis and the hardship that is encountered by agriculture by the inaction of two levels of Tory government.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — Do you realize that they have the audacity to come forward and start talking about a solution to agriculture, and just recently they brought down a budget here in the provincial budget. And do you know what they offered? They offered the farmers more debt. And in their resolution they say debt is the crisis. And their solution is more debt to the farmers of Saskatchewan.

Well it's just like the production loan as they used in 1985, prior to the last election. The only difference, as I said the other night, is that they're giving half the amount. The farmers are twice as bad off, so they offer them half the amount with twice the interest rate.

That's a great deal for the Tories, great deal for the farmers. You know what? In the "In House" produced by the Progressive Conservative caucus, if you can believe it, they give the highlights of what their commitment to agriculture is. And in order to get two lines, they had to split the one program. And you know what they say — \$525 million for immediate assistance to farmers for spring seeding. And then they have a second line, and it makes it look like it's another program — and a short-term operating loans of 12.50 per cent cultivated acres at ten and three-quarter per cent available to Saskatchewan farms.

Do you realize what they're trying to perpetrate on the farmers of Saskatchewan? And I've read it and I heard it today. They're saying, we've given a billion dollars to support Saskatchewan. And they're counting the 525 million as though that's costing the taxpayers and the government 525 million.

Do you know how much actually they're giving to the farmers as their total commitment in the financial crisis that they're facing? Well the federal government says that this will be considered as a new program, the loan program of 525 million. And you know what credit they'll give to this government as a new program? Not 40 or \$50 million as they're trying to perpetrate. The federal government have offered to consider as new revenue put into agriculture, \$20 million in respect to this loan.

Sixty thousand farmers across this province in desperate situation, I agree. And you know what this Minister of Agriculture and these so-called friends of the farmer came up and said? Well by gosh, we're going to again support the farmers. Debt, debt is the crisis; there's no doubt about it. So we offer them some more debt. And you know what? — the total commitment was \$20 million. Take their figures — say 40 million — but they'll have that up a little higher. But take their figures, 40 million. That is putting the treasury behind the farmers, isn't it?

(1700)

By golly, that's really doing the job. But what did they have for Cargill? Well for Cargill you know what they had? Three hundred and eighty million dollars for Cargill. That's what they had.

Yes, I agree that we have a major crisis, but I say the crisis that we have in agriculture is the crisis of having a Tory government in Saskatchewan and a Tory government in Ottawa.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — Neither one of whom are committed to resolving the agricultural problem that confronts us. We have said time and time again, and the Premier has said back in 1985 — what we need, he said, is a long-term agricultural solution.

And you know the member from Shaunavon stood up in this House and spoke today. And he said we need a long-term solution. And I look at the report that the members opposite submitted to this House — "Farm Finance for the Future." MLA committee. And I look inside and I find the smiling faces of some of the members opposite, and one of them is the member from Shaunavon. Member from Shaunavon. And he says we need a long-term solution.

And you know what? This was back in 1987, and in that report they identified the problem. And they identified that in 1987 that there was a major crisis and I agreed with them. They indicate under a poll taken by Reid that there was 11 per cent of the farmers insolvent, 28 per cent of the farmers in serious financial trouble. That was in 1987.

1985 the Premier said we need a long-term solution to the

problem. 1987 they identified the problem, and today they say again we have a major crisis, a major, major crisis confronting agriculture, a very major crisis in agriculture.

And I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we have no doubt about it that the farmers here have faced drought. They have faced low commodity prices, I agree. There have been some grasshopper problems. But I again repeat that the problems confronting the farmers is the hypocrisy and the deceit of the members opposite, the members opposite standing and indicating that they're fighting for farmers while farmers are being destroyed.

The Premier indicates 20,000 farmers are on the verge of bankruptcy, financial ruin. And he comes forward in his budget and all he will offer is \$20 million to 60,000 farmers across this province. What a commitment. Boy, are they committed to saving agriculture.

You know, they had no problems when they were dealing with the oil companies. In 1982, we had oil production in this province of \$1.2 billion, and we took in close to \$700 million to the treasury of this province. In 1985, exactly the same quality of prices, there was the value of oil produced was \$2.4 billion — \$2.4 billion, twice the value, and the oil companies took the profit because we took in slightly less revenue in '82 than we did in '85.

And they start talking now that, oh, we have to start to manage the affairs of this province. We don't have any money. Well you can't have money if you don't have priorities in which you're going to serve the people of this province.

You take a look at what has happened to agriculture in the last several years. We have seen the mammoth erosion of programs by the federal government, and members opposite have stood by and watched this erosion take place. We have seen that the Minister of Finance brought down a budget in Ottawa and not one single word was mentioned in respect to agriculture. We have now the Premier saying, well, Ottawa is off-loading onto the province. Well where has he been?

We find in Ottawa that the interest on free cash advances was eliminated. Not a squeak from the other side. We have seen the removal of the tax rebate on fuel from the federal government. Not even a word of protest. We've seen crop insurance, the share that was covered by the federal government, shifted to the producer and to the province. No protest. We've seen the two-price grain system which meant something like \$280 million addition to the farmers of Canada, and not a squeak. We've seen the transportation subsidy gone to west coast for canola, and no protestation.

We've seen now the implementation of the GST (goods and services tax), and not a word. In fact the Premier, when he's down talking to the Prime Minister, is in agreement with the implementation of the GST. Yes, and the Premier he says, I'm fighting for the farmers.

Well I'll tell you, the farmers no longer believe the members opposite. They can't believe the members opposite because last year he said he was going to put the

treasury behind the farmers. And he says, oh we're going to make ACS work for the farmers, farmers' bank. Now what is he saying? Well we've got to take another look this year at restructuring ACS to make it a farmers' bank.

Oh, and he says, I got another program last year to purchase the home quarter and boy, that'll work and that'll protect a lot of farmers. Never been used.

He said, I got another secret that will really help the farmers, and that's equity financing. And he came into this House and he said to us and gave us a commitment that he was going to set up a model of equity financing. Well I ask the members opposite: have you ever, have you seen equity financing?

This was supposed to be established over in Weyburn. Not a word. Because the farmers of Saskatchewan knew what the Premier, what the Minister of Agriculture was really up to. His solution to agriculture is to run farmers, family farms, out of existence and to turn them over to multinational corporations to run them, as they do down in the United States.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — And why do you think the Premier is cuddling up to Cargill, with the taxpayers supporting his cuddling up? Because Cargill, I think, works into the plan of the Saskatchewan Tory Party's agricultural program.

In fact people are saying now that the provincial government's involvement with Cargill and putting up the money that they have put up, may well be some land transaction, land turned over to Cargill as consideration for the provincial government's investment into the fertilizer plant.

That's out there, my friends. And this government won't come clean. But that's what the farmers are telling me, that they're hearing that the government is going to be giving a large grant of land to Cargill in order to make up for their part of their investment.

Now that's equity financing in . . . as the Premier required.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at the resolution that has been brought forward, where is the commitment in respect to agriculture of the provincial government? And at the conclusion of my remarks, what I want to do is move an amendment to this here, which will essentially, I think, put it into a proper perspective.

This motion that the member from Shaunavon introduced today, he said that this Assembly, noting the extremely pressing financial crisis facing Saskatchewan agricultural communities, urges the federal government — and he goes on.

We agree with his analysis that there is a financial crisis, but we want to . . . I am going to be proposing that after the words "communities" and recognizing that there are financial crises, is that . . . and I will be moving at the end of my comments that we condemn the Governments of Canada and Saskatchewan for failing to implement a long-term farm income stability program as promised as

far back as 1985.

We condemn them because they have not come forward, although they continue to talk about it. Restructure of farm debt by Farm Credit Corporation and the Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan — both of whom together collectively carry about one-half of the Saskatchewan farmers' debt — and they say, we're going to study restructuring of debt. Debt is the problem, but they're going to study it.

So we say that to make this motion, to give credence to what should be done, we have to implement a long-term farm income stability program. We have to address the debt question, and we could restructure it through farm credit and through ACS. And I think that we have to also provide adequate immediate farm financial assistance to facilitate this spring's seeding.

And as I have said, what a pitiful, pitiful performance by the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture when the best that he can put together in a budget, where the crisis is before our eyes, is a \$525 million debt. Half a billion dollars more debt is what the Premier of Saskatchewan says is going to solve agriculture.

Well I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that really we can, in fact, deal with this crisis. But it has to take a government that is committed to saving agriculture.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — We have to develop our priorities. We have to choose between 60,000 farm families or the people like Cargill or Pocklington or the upgrader over in Lloydminster where they're prepared to pump in couple hundred million dollars or the priorities of paying Americans to come over and make them millionaires running our Crown corporations.

Today, today we evidenced, I think, one of the greatest abuses of the taxpayers' money in the history of this province. I'm telling you the people of Saskatchewan deserve better government than what they're getting. Can you feature that they'll bring in an American to run our potash corporation, pay him \$500,000 in salary, give him other benefits, more benefits, and then privatize him, have him privatize it, and to give him a sizeable option on a large number of shares — 42,000 shares — that he can become an instant millionaire if those shares rise.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — That's the problem. There's a crisis all right, but the crisis is caused by the government opposite because of their lack of priorities — lack of priorities — and a federal government which is no longer committed to agriculture in Canada.

And so I want to say, in closing, because time is passing on and I have a lot more to say, I want to say in all seriousness to the people of Saskatchewan and to the agricultural community, we on this side recognize the seriousness of the time that you're going through. We realize that there are, on the verge of bankruptcy, 20,000 family farms.

(1715)

I have witnesses. I've gone across this province — suicides because of the strain and the loss and people losing their farms. People . . . They laugh. They think that's very funny. The crisis is so great that people indeed are indeed committing suicide.

And the boys across the way, they fold their arms in smugness and they say, we'll give it to the Americans and we'll give it to the multinational corporations, but by gosh we won't give it to the 60,000 farmers that built this province. That's where we're at.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, accordingly, I'm going to be moving, seconded by the member from Humboldt:

That all the words after the word "communities" be deleted, and the following be submitted therefor:

Condemns the Governments of Canada and Saskatchewan for failing to:

1. Implement a long-term farm income stability program as promised in 1985;
2. Restructure farm debt of the Farm Credit Corporation and the Agriculture Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan; and
3. Provide adequate, immediate farm financial assistance to facilitate this spring's seeding.

And basically, I should have added: condemns the government for wasting money and having wrong priorities in respect to spending.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I want to submit this amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Upshall:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in light of the time, I will just take a couple of minutes to make a few comments.

In light of what happened today, Mr. Premier, what the information that we received today, I would just like to ask the members on the opposite side of the House, the members from Rosetown-Elrose, Yorkton, Biggar, Wilkie, Cut Knife-Lloyd, Shaunavon, Rosthern, just ask yourselves, in your own heart of hearts, do you think it's right for Chuck Childers to be paid \$550,000 a year? Five hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year, coming up here to run a corporation, when you are letting farm families go down the tubes, when you give them, instead of hope, instead of hope for allowing themselves to get a crop in the ground, that you give them another loan, more debt. Ask yourself if that is right, and I would challenge every member, rural member, on your side of the House to walk into that Premier's office tomorrow morning, walk into his office and say, no more money for Chuck Childers, but

support for rural Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Upshall:** — And tell him, while you're in there, that we do not need more money for American corporations like Cargill.

You know, I just did a little calculating here. Cargill sucked \$444 million out of the U.S. treasury under the export enhancement program. You multiply that out compared to the population of the U.S., that's about seventeen and a half dollars a person that they're giving Cargill. You multiply out what this government of Saskatchewan, with a million people, is giving when they give \$370 million to the Cargill corporation, that's \$370 for every man, woman, and child in Saskatchewan. So when you're in the Premier's office, you tell him we don't want to follow the American lead; you don't have to beat them to it.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Upshall:** — And while you're there, members opposite, also tell the Premier that money shouldn't grow on trees for Chuck Childers and the boys. They found their money tree. But rural Saskatchewan farmers and small-business people and working people who don't have jobs, they don't have a money tree. In fact, the sad part of it all is they're expected to be the money tree.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Upshall:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, as I said, in light of the time, I don't want to go on too long. But I just want the members opposite, the rural members, to think about what they're doing, to think about the double standard that they, people representing farmers — who in my area, in the Carlton Trail (Regional) College, 80 per cent of them are low income, and it goes the same for many areas. People leaving the land. Ask yourselves, why are you doing it? And the next question you have to ask yourself is, why do I expect to be elected when I'm doing this to rural Saskatchewan?

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with that I would move to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:23 p.m.