

the desperate plight of prairie farmers is met? Or is their problem in terms of being left almost totally exposed on the world market to competition from the EEC and the United States just going to be ignored by the Government?

Mr. de Jong: Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank my colleague for that question. My interpretation of what has been happening is that the Government has no clear idea or program worked through to deliver deficiency payments on the level which is needed by western grain producers.

There was no mention at all in any of the answers that this program will be a deficiency payment program. There was no clear indication that this money will be new money but, rather, it seemed to me to be reshuffled money. There is no indication it is to be zeroed in just on western Canadian farmers. My sense is that the planners, the bureaucrats and some of the larger farmers, the tight groups represented in this Conservative Party, believe that the family farm is a dead entity and should be allowed to die and just fade away, and this is an opportunity for getting rid of some 20,000 or 30,000 farm families in Saskatchewan.

I genuinely believe that some of the thinking behind the Tory inaction emanates from the notion they have that family farming in Canada is not a viable operation and, therefore, we should allow them quietly to die away.

Mr. Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to put a couple of questions to my colleague, the Hon. Member for Regina East (Mr. de Jong). I am mildly confused by some of the rhetoric I heard from him. I confess to not having heard all of it, but I heard enough to pique my curiosity. I believe I heard the Hon. Member going on at great length about what he called the "mismanagement" of the provincial Government in Saskatchewan, how it had ruined the economy, how it had gone into debt, and so on. At the same time it appears that here in Ottawa it is all right for the Hon. Member and his colleagues to call at every opportunity for massive government borrowings in order to assist every area of the economy. Of course, that would have the inevitable effect of raising the deficit and bringing about the kind of irresponsibility the Hon. Member ascribes to the Government of Saskatchewan.

I am curious as to how the Hon. Member can expect to have it both ways. It seems to me he fails to recognize the fact that the Saskatchewan economy is based mainly on agriculture and somewhat on energy. He ignores the fact that both oil prices and grain prices are at historically low levels owing to world prices and to conditions outside of Saskatchewan, conditions over which we have very little control. The Hon. Member knows very well that these historically low prices are not the fault of the Government of Saskatchewan or, indeed, the fault of anyone inside this country. Therefore, I am curious as to how he can gloss over these things and ascribe all sorts of

misery and mismanagement to the Government of Saskatchewan.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order. I will give the Hon. Member for Regina East (Mr. de Jong) a minute to answer the question before I call it 5.45 p.m.

Mr. de Jong: Mr. Speaker, the reason we have the deficit, which we have been trying to explain over and over again, and the reason the Tories managed to run a \$2.5 billion deficit in Saskatchewan in less than five years—the fastest growing deficit in North America brought about by the Tory Party in Saskatchewan—is that it gave the tax breaks to the rich and to the oil companies which is costing the Treasury of Saskatchewan hundreds of millions of dollars.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. It being 5.45 p.m. it is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 62(3), to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the amendment to the amendment. The question is on the amendment to the amendment. Mr. Broadbent, seconded by Mr. Riis, moved:

That the amendment be amended by adding the following words:

"and specifically, that this House condemns your Government for failing to indicate its intentions with respect to,

1. protecting the interests of Canadian workers in bilateral trade negotiations with the United States, particularly in the forest industry;
2. positive initiatives to encourage economic growth, improve employment prospects, and provide for greater fairness for Canadians in those economically depressed areas of Canada; and
3. improving the accessibility of affordable daycare for all Canadian working parents."

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment to the amendment?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion, the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Call in the Members.

The House divided on the amendment to the amendment (Mr. Broadbent), which was negatived on the following division: