

*Government Orders*

not think is recognized in this bill which I think we need to address specifically.

There are a few aspects to that which bear looking at. One is that there has to be a new look at how super priority applies to farmers. Second, I think there needs to be a special fund which farmers can draw on given the impossibility of identifying an individual farmer's production from other farmers' production of many commodities in the case of a bankrupt company.

Third, and I think most important, we have to stop the erosion of the orderly marketing process because the marketing boards, the Canadian Wheat Board and other similar institutions do not go bankrupt. They pay farmers in cash and on time, and offer a secure market for farm products that does not leave farmers vulnerable to the vagaries of small companies and fly-by-night operators and others who might go bankrupt.

I think the whole trend we have seen away from orderly marketing is one of the things that has made farmers much more vulnerable to the whole process of bankruptcy than they otherwise need to be.

• (1450 )

The second criticism I have of this legislation is one which was pointed out to me by the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association. It pointed out in a letter that the proposed legislation would cost education in Saskatchewan some \$130,000 to \$150,000 per year at its current levels. Certainly that is a large sum of money for school boards which are struggling in the current economic environment to absorb.

School-boards have been placed under increasing pressure through a number of processes. Obviously the whole process of downloading from the federal government to the provincial government to the local government has resulted in a situation where education and other public services, like municipal government services and hospital boards, are much more dependent on the local tax base and local taxpayers than they otherwise would have been.

Given the fact that those taxpayers and tax bases are being squeezed extremely tight at this time, it seems

inappropriate to me for us to be contemplating legislation that loads a new cost on to those publicly funded bodies.

It also is inappropriate to load this cost on those kinds of bodies because there is not even the remotest possibility of those bodies ever going bankrupt. These employers are forced to bear a cost for a situation which will never apply to their employees. A school-board has never gone bankrupt in this country, nor has a hospital board, nor have provincial governments, nor have federal governments, though they might if the present trends continue. If these government bodies go bankrupt everyone else will have gone bankrupt first.

It really is quite academic to contemplate a situation where these bodies would go bankrupt. It seems inappropriate to be applying this tax to those bodies.

It is inappropriate to fund the wage protection fund through an increased level of taxation. As other speakers have pointed out this would represent the 33rd increase in new taxes by this government since its election in 1984. The business community and consumers are saying: "Enough is enough when it comes to taxation".

Grant Devine found that out in Saskatchewan. He had just introduced a provincial sales tax harmonized with the GST to the citizens of Saskatchewan. Not only was he rejected by the consumers of the province but his actions were decisively rejected by the business community of that province as well.

Not only is it inappropriate in a time of recession and tough times for business to load on another tax but if this government has any regard for its political future it should be looking very closely at how much the consumers and the business community will bear when it comes to new taxes. The government should take a new look at how this is funded and ensure that it is funded out of general revenues as it should be.

**Mr. Hawkes:** Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to interrupt for just a second. Earlier today the member for Kamloops rose and raised an issue of conduct in the House. At that time I indicated that I thought he should look at his own behaviour in terms of Standing Order 36(7). That was followed by an intervention from the member indicating that he had done nothing wrong, that all he had done