

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
May 31, 1983
EVENING SESSION

MOTIONS

Resolution No. 14 — Agricultural Research

MR. DOMOTOR: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The motion that I would like to talk on,

That this Assembly urges the Government of Canada to place increased emphasis on agricultural research to ensure increased livestock and crop production and quality.

As seconded by the member from Arm River, has a lot to do with the way the federal government has been treating the West. It has reduced spending in the West on research which it knows full well that the people out here need to improve their quality of crop production or quality of livestock, so they can get sales and sell it on the market. And it's only due to extra additional research that this crop production or quality can be obtained.

The mandate that was given to the research department for the following: to ensure an efficient, stable, and profitable agricultural industry in Canada — an efficient, and stable, and a profitable one — to ensure adequate surveying, conservation, judicious use, and property management of natural resources essential to agriculture; to develop new knowledge and improved technology in order to ensure the efficient production of an adequate supply of agricultural products and food of the desired form and quality; to conduct research and provide support for our other branches, departments, and agencies in activities of national concern; to encourage and assist research programs in developing countries and help in the training of their technologists and appropriate disciplines.

The major emphasis of course is in the county of Canada — western provinces and in the East. As far as research with respect to cattle or be it barley, wheat, whatever you may have . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . or Bulgarian cattle that you might be selling there, sure — why not?

Let's take a look at some of the areas that they've been doing some research previously. The beef cattle was to improve efficiency of beef production and quality. Now, the production; if it's created enough jobs on the side because of the sale of beef products, the farmers benefit. The costs can be held down for the farmer. Consumers can benefit because if you have a good production of quality beef, and there is a surplus or an extra market for it, that means the consumer benefits in the quality and also in the fact that the prices may be maintained.

All the effect of that of course is to maintain the family farm because a lot of family farms depend not only on grains — they also depend on livestock; they may also depend on poultry and a variety of other production that they may have on their unit.

Also, we have research that has been carried on in the dairy cattle business. Milk production, for example — we have come to rely a lot in this country on artificial

production and artificial products. You have margarine; you have other kinds that have been artificially produced. It's time, perhaps, that we give the dairy industry the chance to do a little more research — to give them the research that they need, and therefore, increase the use of natural products. This reinforces the family farm and gives also the nutrition required for people that are in the country rather than running to a full fast-food outlet, and just utilizing production or using artificial products.

We also have cheese production. We have import cheese from European countries. We can get into a more competitive situation developing more cheese products. Manufacturing results out of this — creates jobs. And it doesn't necessarily have to be all the manufacturing done down East; we can have some of this manufacturing plants being done right here in the West, and in Saskatchewan. It creates jobs where the young people can stay at home and it also gives the opportunity for . . . branch off into other areas.

Swine production is another area that research development is used in the federal money that's being granted. The farmers' investments need to be able to compete with the other markets. You have Quebec in the swine production and hog production; you have Alberta, Manitoba, or whoever. The only way you can be able to compete is to give the research to the individual producers so that they can go ahead and do some experimenting, but the only way they can do this is to get some assistance from the Department of Agriculture on the federal level.

During the way years a lot of good bacon was sent out of the country and shipped over to Britain or to the western allies, and if that was the case then, I don't see why we can't do a little more of the export market now. With the export market development as such; it results in more income back to the federal treasury and it not only benefits the government as such, but it benefits the citizens within the province or within the country at large.

As a result we would have less reliance on imports. It's a sad state of affairs when we have to rely on imports for or food products, when we have all the capabilities and produce enough food in our own country. The other effects of this, of course, are meat packing plants and the side effects of this is creating extra jobs.

We not only have that, we have poultry production. We have production of eggs and poultry meats in the province. We have, for example, Kentucky Fried Chicken that uses poultry. Here we have a chance for good protein. It's maybe a fast-food outfit, but it gives the chance for the farmers that are in the production of chickens to go ahead and have a market. I understand also that there's some into the utilization of fast-food outlets even in the turkey business.

To develop the right kind of products you need research, and this is only resulting through federal funds. Of course, got to supplement it with provincial funds. The other benefits, of course, are the fact that it provides additional moneys to the province or through the producer, and the other effects, of course, are to the general public or to the consumer at large.

We also have in the province, for example, sheep production. The quality of mutton can be readily made better. Sheep industries in the province, not only in Saskatchewan but in Alberta or Manitoba, need to have more research. They can have the use, for example, of the mutton that they can sell, not only in Saskatchewan or in Canada, but they can export some of this and we do import a certain amount of mutton from

Australia, I understand, and some from the other countries. We could develop it to the point where we don't have to import it; we can be exporting it and increase our total self-reliance on our own industry. Not only that, but we have a certain amount of wool that comes off sheep and that can be done into the manufacturing, and side benefits of that, of course, is extra jobs within the western provinces.

Let's take a look at some of the areas in research that the federal government can assist the West or the farmers in livestock production. There's also another section that they can be looking at, and that is cereals. They have done some. Let's take a look at some of the wheat varieties. Over the years there is wheat varieties. Over the years there is wheat varieties that would not be resistant to rust and eventually they were able to develop varieties such as Neepawa, Manitou, Benito, that yield fairly good, and are disease resistant, not only to rust but also to leaf rust. Yields can increase and experiment with hybrids — for example, in corn production — the similar expansion can end up in wheat production. And the result is that the export market is there; all we have to do is take advantage of it. When we have people that are starving in different countries, we should be exporting it to them and letting them have it.

Oilseed crops is another area that the federal government . . . The assistance is in research. We have, for example, canola. The early varieties such as Target, Midas, and Torch had a high erucic acid, and the consumers in Japanese markets would not want to use it. And finally they came out with new varieties such as Regent, where the lower erucic acid, and it meant that it changed the name to canola and this has been more acceptable to the consuming public. Not only in that particular aspect, but we have it also within Saskatchewan or Canada itself where they use it in margarine and they also use it with respect to frying oils and to domestic use.

We also have development in research such as in mustard production. We have contracts with mustard, for example. And I've mentioned just before, Humboldt Flour Mills does a lot of contracts with mustard.

Different varieties have been developed, some of them with shorter growing seasons, in order to be able to grow the particular product in the north end, where there's frost hazard. And these types of varieties can be brought in and actually grown with a fairly good yield. The marketing process, of course, is handled by shipping it to . . . Germany happens to be one of the major markets, and some of the other countries. And this of course helps again in bringing to the West production, in the sense of sales, and helps the balance of payments. And I keep emphasizing this balance of payments to a certain extent in the federal treasury because we know what the federal government has a tendency to do with respect to the Crow rate. And they don't realize the importance that the West has . . . by withdrawing their funding for research for the farmers in the West and withdrawing the benefits that we have developed under the Crow rate. They keep on hammering away at particularly a very important industry that has helped Canada — not only the farmers, but has also helped the consumers.

Other varieties have developed over the years such as flax. Linseed oil competition is from two particular areas, Argentina and Europe. Over the years the varieties such as Dufferin has developed which can . . . You have higher yields, and is less resistant to disease. This, of course, is due to research, and as a result has helped farmers get more of a diversified crop. And rather than having a stockpile of wheat you can go ahead and grow a little bit of flax, you grow a little bit of canola, and you grow some barley, and you can move all your crop. And the result is that it only adds more money to the farmer.

When we know that it adds money to the farmer, he spends tenfold as much anyway, and therefore it goes right through the whole economy. So, therefore, I believe that the federal government, again, should be urged to go ahead and give more money into the research area because the only particular area that will benefit is them in the long term anyway.

In barley we've had, for example, different developments in different type of varieties. There was, for example, the Olli variety which was used in some of the areas. That was a very short growing season. You could seed it at the end of June and you could pretty well combine it by the end of August. But the yield was not there. And I understand they have another variety out that is able to outyield. It's called Otal barley, and it outyields Olli by quite a considerable percentage. And yet it's only three days later.

The further development, of course, can lead to such varieties that may eventually be smut resistant. We know we have to treat our seed in barley now because if you don't smut can certainly affect the crop and reduce the yields by 20, 30, or 50 per cent. The result is by adding more research dollars into that and developing hybrids, or a better variety, it will only return more money and more investment back into not only the province, but Canada as a whole. These are areas that it can help.

With respect to marketing is another area. For example, malting barley. There has to be more research in that particular area. A lot of farmers try to grow malting, but they don't seem to get it because the graders seem to be pretty particular about how they get it a lot of times, although when it comes to a point where they're tight supplied, they will just about pick up any kind of barley. So here's some more research that they could help with respect to the farmers and how to market their malting barley.

Feed of course is a different story. They've got a new variety I understand called Johnston barley which outyields Bonanza by about 15 to 20 per cent in some areas, and it certainly is a good quality feed barley.

Corn production, for example, has been developed over the years with hybrids that are very high yielding. At one time they couldn't grow very well in Manitoba, and now it's into Manitoba. And not only do we have corn production into Manitoba, but we've also got some of it growing in Saskatchewan.

Lentils and feed peas are another area that has been given some research, and of course the additional advantage of these particular crop production assists in the fact that they are nitrogen fixation. Therefore, a farmer may seed these particular crops, and then they have less reliance on chemical fertilizer because the nitrogen will be placed back by these particular crops — not only lentil or field peas of course, but forage crops besides such as alfalfa.

The development of these varieties has grown over the years and have been used in soups that are used for domestic purposes, consumer, and they're also used as feed for livestock. Forage crops such as alfalfa — we have pellets for production for feeding livestock; we have silage for feed developed from alfalfa. The use of the above two, lentils or the peas, and some of the forage crops have found to work well in some of the saline areas. And these of course . . . You can recover some of the areas of soil that may becoming saline, and make them productive again.

Along with this type of thing we have also soy bean production. Soy bean hasn't been very common out in the West. It's been more confined to the United States, and more to

the southern Ontario border, but over the years, due to extended research and development, they've founded different varieties. They've been able to shorten up the season on them, and now we see some production down even in the Manitoba area. And of course we import a certain amount of soy beans from the United States. The result of that of course means that when you import, you end up with less money within Canada, and you end up paying that money out. By being able to export that particular product, and processing a lot of these products here and selling them, we add not only the fact that we have a balance of payments, as mentioned before, but you also have jobs created here because you have manufacturing done within Saskatchewan or Canada and you can provide jobs for the people here.

There is also the research that they do in production doesn't necessarily have to follow with just particularly growing of the crops. They can also go with respect to the type of food safety and of course they've done a certain amount of that. I would like to refer you to the pamphlet *Progress in Research, 1981* and there they have a large selection and they talk about the different types of research grants to universities and the type of cereal crop productions that they've been able to manage. For example, I'd just like to take a look at page 32 in the *Progress in Research, 1981*, Agriculture Canada and some of the research accomplishments:

The mean yield of wheat on the Prairies over the past 20 years has been more than 20 per cent higher than mean yields before that time. The Lethbridge records show that wheat yields over the past 18 years of rotation were 29 per cent higher than those before that time. The higher yields are correlated with the introduction use of improved herbicides, particularly those providing more effective control of wild oats. Improved herbicidal controls result in need for less reseeding tillage with conservation of soil moisture and more timely seeding.

These are some of the type of things that the research development is able to do. The research stations, for example, at Swift Current, at Melfort, and Lethbridge — spotted throughout the Prairies — Saskatchewan and Alberta. I just mentioned a couple but of course there's some in Manitoba and in the other provinces. You have, for example, another variety that was developed over the years — Leader, a hard red spring wheat licensed in 1981. It provides producers with a cultivar that combines for the first time resistance to the wheat-stem sawfly with resistance to wet weather damage at harvest time. And of course this takes time. Leader was derived in '69 from a cross between a high yielding sawfly-resistant variety, Fortuna, and sprouting-resistant variety, Chris — again an example of what research can do and research can only function if there's money pumped into the area, into the research stations, giving the persons the opportunity to experiment with the different varieties, growing them on the different types of soils, growing them in different climatic soils to see where the yield is best and what the resistance is to different kinds of diseases and with respect to drought tolerance and also with respect to frost tolerance.

And there also on that particular page I mentioned about Otal barley. It was tested in Canada; an early maturing six-row feed barley was licensed for sale in May '81; it also was selected in Alaska and was advanced through the Canadian testing system by the Beaverlodge research station. Now there's an example or a good example of research that can be utilized and can help the consumer — not only the farmer, but can help the consumer at large.

On page 36 of the same pamphlet, you have for example the use of the soy bean breeding program . . . (inaudible) . . . the soy beans being grown.

The Ottawa research station's short-season soy bean breeding program reached an important milestone with the release of the cultivar Maple Amber, for example. In terms of short-season soy beans, this is a mid-season cultivar adapted to the 2,400 heat-unit areas of Manitoba, central Canada, and the Maritimes. So if it's growing in Manitoba, we can see it developing quickly into Saskatchewan, and the result is production out in the province of Saskatchewan, probably starting in the southern part and probably working its way out as they develop new varieties and shorter growing season varieties.

Therefore, I'd like to again urge the Government of Canada to place increased emphasis on agriculture research to ensure increased livestock and crop production and quality, and so I move this motion, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. When it comes to agricultural research for Canada, I have no objections. But, Mr. Speaker, there's a different story when we talk about Saskatchewan. When we compare statistics across Canada pertaining to agricultural research to Saskatchewan, I say Saskatchewan comes on the short end of the stick.

Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, plays a large part of Canada's agriculture. Saskatchewan produces 26 per cent of the cattle for all of Canada. When it comes to grain, Saskatchewan produces more than the whole of Canada. Also, we produce our share of hogs and our share of sheep. When it comes to poultry, I guess we're definitely outproduced by Quebec and Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to read a short paragraph here, a couple of paragraphs, in connection with agricultural research for Canada:

For nearly a century, agricultural research has supported commercial agriculture and related industries in Canada. Initially, Canadian agriculture faced the challenges of farming in virgin territory with limited resources. Early research focused on the cultural practices, adaptation of varieties and rudimentary pest control. As agriculture grew in importance, its needs become more complex and the solutions more sophisticated. Agriculture Canada more than kept pace with developments. Vision, imagination, and hard work were employed in ever-increasing amounts to offer the farmer greater production efficiency based on sound knowledge.

The central experimental farm in Ottawa was the first centre for agriculture research. But in 1986, four more experimental farms were developed in size and complexity until today the research branch of Agriculture Canada comprises 47 establishments from coast to coast, employing a professional staff of more than 900 scientists. These dedicated researchers ensure that the knowledge they generate is made available to the agriculture industry. They take part in field days and meetings of producers and trade associations. They are available for discussions at their stations and co-operate effectively with staff at provincial departments of agriculture members of the food industry. Sound research leads to successful transfer of technology to producers.

The point I'm making, Mr. Speaker, is that there are 900 professional scientists in the whole of Canada pertaining to agricultural research and only a handful of these 900 are from Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, we in Saskatchewan feel slighted by the federal government in the fact that our province is so productive when it comes to producing agricultural products.

I'm very proud that we have the University of Saskatchewan which has really had a great input into scientific research over the last 50 to 60 years in Saskatchewan, perhaps longer, Mr. Deputy Speaker. But what I'm saying is that how much more we could do if we had our fair share of funding from the federal government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have such great ambitions for Saskatchewan. I'm very proud that our government is going to proceed with irrigation in this province. I'm very proud that the statement made by our Premier when we were elected — one year ago approximately — that the Premier says that he has an irrigation dream for Saskatchewan, and we on this side of the House, and I hope on both sides of the House, are going to help this dream come true.

I want to say a few words about the financial help that we get from the federal government. We in Saskatchewan have approximately 1 million population. Now that's exactly how we're financed in terms of help. They finance us on the terms that we have a ratio of 1 million people compared to roughly 25 million in the whole of Canada. This will become the ratio of 1 million people compared to roughly 25 million in the whole of Canada. This . . . (inaudible) . . . will become short, Mr. Deputy Speaker, right here. We should be financed in Saskatchewan. When it comes to our share of the funds that we pay the taxes for, we should be funded on our production in this province and not by or population. This is a point that I feel very strongly on, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we are not getting our fair share of funding for many aspects when it comes to Saskatchewan agriculture in the West.

Where we need research specialists, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to mention a few points. Irrigation is one. In the past in this province, when it comes to irrigation — and I'll get to many other points that I want to bring up — but irrigation, all we do is go out there and we've just been going out there in the blind in the past. We need to have research done into proper methods of irrigation, proper soil studies, and what not. And what help have we had from our federal government? Almost nil. We have a department, PFRA, that's hooked up with Agriculture now, Department of Agriculture federally. The people over there are a fine bunch of gentlemen. They do everything they can to try to help us but they are cut short when it comes to funding. I have talked many times in this year to the fellows in this department and they keep saying themselves, there's so much more we could be and so much more we can do, but we haven't got the funding for Saskatchewan.

Grains. When it comes to most of our grains, it's not as . . . It's like or what varieties, our rape, flax, our barley. Now we have our research council in Saskatoon. They've done a remarkable job and I think we've kept up pace with the rest of North America with these main grants. But where I'm really disturbed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is feed grains. Why are we not having experimental stations in this province when it comes to, like, corn, and winter wheat, and winter feed grains that we could produce as good as United States? And they're doing it. There was a time I can remember as a young man when they did not produce corn in South Dakota. But they produce corn there now.

They're producing corn up as far as Manitoba now. Now why haven't we got research stations in this province funded by the federal government like they do in the United States of America, where they're funded by the federal government in that country, to help produce everything that can possibly be produced?

Now we have many, many farmers in Saskatchewan that has tried to grow feed corn, and they'll have one good year. Their second year will maybe be too bad, then for the next 3 or 4 years, it won't grow. It winter kills. So thus they just don't grow it any more. And also many feed types of barley, longer-term days of growing barley. We have 115 to 120-day barley that will outproduce our barley, but we can't grow it here because we need a different variety that will produce like it does in the United States.

We need to be much more advanced when it comes to new technology in our province, Mr. Deputy Speaker. When I speak on this motion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to just give you my solutions that I feel that could help solve this problem. We've had a problem in this country for a good many years. We've had the wrong government in Ottawa. So if we're going to get things done for the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We just don't need any comments from the other side, because I'm going to tell you further where that's where our problem is. That's the problem that we have — short of cash and funding from the federal government — is those people sitting right over there. I want' figuring on making a political speech tonight but they've invited me into it, so I think I'll just go ahead, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The most important thing that we have to do, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have to, in the next election, elect a Conservative government so the farmers in western Canada will have a fair shake. And unless, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that those people across there will join with the proper party this time, we're going to have a lot more problems. Our problems are going to continue, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Why? Why are we in this position? Why have we got a Liberal government in Ottawa? I'll tell you why we got a Liberal government in Ottawa, because the member for Elphinstone, the Hon. Mr. Blakeney, and his cohorts in Ottawa have been in bed together. There's what our trouble has been Mr. Deputy Speaker.

We can't get funding for western Saskatchewan farmers, or for Alberta, or Manitoba, or for the West in general. We're just not going to have it as long as we leave those Liberals in Ottawa. And as long as we have a party like across the floor, the NDP, that's going to help bring down a government like they did in the fall of 1980, then these tragedies are going to keep occurring in the West.

Now let me explain, Mr. Speaker, my feeling on Liberals in Canada. I don't want to be misrepresented here when I'm talking about Liberals. The Liberals in western Canada are a different breed of people entirely than the Liberals in eastern Canada. The western Liberals are a right-wing Liberal Party, free enterprise, and that's why that group over there is sitting over there in opposition with only four members. Mr. Deputy Speaker, when it comes to Ottawa, we have to move the Liberals to a real left-wing Liberal Party, which fits right in, hand in hand, with the members opposite — with the four members opposite. So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are not going to have funding for western Canada, for agricultural research. There's going to be no improvement until we tough out the people in Ottawa, and we need the people opposite to work with the West, instead of with the East like they did in the last federal election. So I invite the members opposite, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I invite them to join with the Conservatives and let's have something for the West, instead of going against the West like you did in 1979 . . .

(inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, I think that will happen too, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's been a pleasure for me to say a few words and it will be a pleasure for me to second this motion. Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. SAUDER: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's indeed a pleasure for me to join in this debate, on this motion urging the Government of Canada to place increased emphasis on agricultural research to increase livestock and crop production and quality. I think it's an area that needs a lot of attention, and I think there's a number of reasons why the federal government should be paying attention to it.

Number one, I think it's certainly in keeping with a cheap food policy to provide research so that we can have more production from the acres of crop land that we have. Better quality crops, better feed grains, could help to feed more people in Canada at cheaper rates. When we look at income from agricultural products in the world. It certainly provides money for our balance of payments for the federal treasury, and we could certainly use more of that. We see the world is facing a food shortage. We have the potential here in western Canada to contribute to the relief of that problem, but it takes research and technology to help alleviate it. We also would have the benefit to our western farmers of some relief from the cost-price squeeze and I think we would all be supportive of that issue.

I think there's a number of areas, my colleagues have gone into them, where more research is needed. Some that I see in the north-eastern part of the province, one is in the feed grains — we're not a great wheat growing area of the province, but the feed grains . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Can do that too.

As one of the former speakers said, some of the new varieties of barley are getting increased yields, more disease resistance, but we can certainly see a lot more research go into that.

We're facing competition from the Americans with corn which can produce much more feed per acre or a lower cost, and we could . . . We need more to be able to compete with that.

Another thing is feed wheats. We would be able to contribute to the need for more feed grains to produce more livestock. We have a number of alternate crops. We've seen benefits to the canola industry, the oilseed business. Research has contributed greatly to there. We've had low erucic acid rapeseed developed. There's still room for more developments in the future in that area, also in the flax seed and sunflower area. Sunflower is a crop which is barely getting a toe hold in Canada — Manitoba and south-eastern Saskatchewan, I understand. With more research money it could be made into a crop which would contribute more to our economy.

Another crop in north-eastern Saskatchewan that needs more research is the alfalfa, both as a feed crop. They have disease problems with it, such as the wilt. They need research dollars. Also alfalfa for seed — they could use money to help with their research on that to produce more seed to the acre, make it a more viable crop for farmers to produce.

Another area is, we see new technology. I think of grain-drying in the northern part of the province. There's developments coming there which with research could

contribute to that.

Another small, maybe not so small, area of concern on everybody's mind is the pesticides and herbicides. We see many changes in that over the last number of years. You see recently putting money into salvage of herbicide containers and what not. I think with more development and research we could get away from that problem. I see new chemicals coming on the market which, maybe in about a one litre container, will treat maybe 40 acres of crop, and with more research into that, we could get away from the container problem and the residual environmental problems caused by those.

Mr. Speaker, just from these few comments, the comments of the speakers before me, I think we pointed out that we need more money. I don't know of an area where the federal government could put money into which would return such high returns to all Canadians, not just to the farmers of western Canada, but to all Canadians; would benefit not only to the producers, but to the consumers as well.

I think that we shouldn't be looking at money spent on research as money that's being wasted. We should look at it as an investment. It's something that will return money somewhere down the road. There's many, many studies that have shown that research provides hundreds of dollars returns for every dollar that's spent. I think this Assembly should do all it can to encourage the federal government to put more money into research, and I'm happy to support a motion to that means.

MR. MARTENS: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to address a few remarks today regarding this issue of the research funding that the federal government is doing, and I want to point out some of the things that I think are inequities. I also want to point out a few of the things that they should be addressing, and with that, I think that we should start with some of the things that they should be looking into.

We've had some mention of research in various areas, and I'd like to probably re-emphasize some of them by repeating them. But I also want to outline some of the things that I think are necessary in their research development that they haven't done, and that they ought to be doing.

First of all, we have in the province of Saskatchewan very little grain through the winter, seeded in the fall and grown through the winter. We have rye which has relatively good winter-kill resistance, but our winter wheats have suffered a lot, and we need to in the south-west develop a winter wheat that would be winter-kill resistant in relation to the frost that gets into the ground and kills then by drying out the soils; freeze-drying. We need some emphasis in that area, because in the south-west we have enough moisture from the snow to blow. We need changes in the varieties. We need changes in the mechanization in planting these various varieties. We need also, Mr. Deputy Speaker, some research into the feed wheats that we should be developing in this province and in western Canada in order to feed more livestock and feed more people. I think that those two areas in wheat are desperately needed.

Another area I think that needs to be addressed is the area of feed grains, especially in barley. We need development in that area, specifically in silage. We have very little of it in Saskatchewan and in western Canada. We need to develop a greater degree of expertise in that area.

Corn was mentioned as a part of a grain that needs to be developed. We also need to

develop it as a part of silage in the livestock industry. We need to know how to set these silage plants up, how to cultivate them, how to fertilize — all of these things in production. We need to have a lot more research so we get a quicker maturing and a higher producing corn variety.

Dealing with other areas, we have one other area that I'd like to speak about and that's grasses. We have in the province of Saskatchewan, in the south-west, developed some very high-production drought resistant varieties of grasses. We have the crested wheat-grasses that have been developed through the research station in Swift Current. Through the years they've developed very good varieties through there. They've also developed the Russian wild rye-grass. In giving the development of the dry areas of Saskatchewan a little bit more forage production, then making the cattle industry a little bit more viable on a fewer amount of acres.

One of the things that they haven't done anything about — and I think that needs to be addressed — is the grazing of grasses on irrigated land. We have a serious amount of problems in dealing with this. We need to have the experimental farms and the research people look into developing the grasses needed for grazing the livestock. Get it out there and let the cattle eat it, and then you don't have to put the money into the vulnerable mechanical parts of the feeding of it in winter-time and throughout the year. We need to have a lot more of that. We need to specifically address it as it relates to the feedlots and silage in the feedlots. We need to be specific, and in dealing with that I think we need to look at some of the other jurisdictions who have, through the development of their feeding system, done it not by research, but have done it by experiment at the cost of the individual entrepreneurs.

I think it was mentioned earlier that Saskatchewan has 26 per cent of the livestock in Canada, and that we run about two-thirds of the total grain production in Canada. And I think that has to be something significant in dealing with what we should be allocated in return from the federal government, but I don't believe that it's being done.

I want to outline some of the areas that we, as a provincial government, are looking at working with. Increased production in Saskatchewan in grains and in grasses is extremely important to the producers. And I think that the soil testing lab in Saskatoon has developed that and I think it's a good thing. Farmers have utilized it; in fact they had sold samples standing on every shelf, in doorways, and in halls, and a new facility was absolutely necessary. The provincial government last year put \$400,000 into that, and I think it was money well worth spent.

Another program that we've worked together with, I think that is important, is the FarmLab program. There is an outline of some of the projects that we have funded through this. The total is \$3.5 million, and I think those dollars are well worth spent.

I'm just going to outline some of the things that the federal government could accent by funding together with us some of the projects that we have developed. Soil conservation is one. In soil conservation, we have had to deal with innovative farming systems where people have a chance to use their imagination to develop the system that they want to develop the system that they want to in relation to the various areas that we have in the province of Saskatchewan. The variable farming practices are due to extreme differences that

we have from the south-west to the northern part of Saskatchewan where we have a lot of rain, and in the south where we have very little. These systems of farming have to be adjusted accordingly. In relation to this, we have various problems relating changes in the soil structure, dealing with the bacteria that are in it — all of these things have a relationship to soil conservation, to the soil's ability to hold water. And these are many things that relate to what the federal government could be initiating research into.

Another one that I want to speak about is soil fertility. Soil fertility is probably one of the most important areas that need to be addressed and what effect does nitrogen have on these soils. For example, in the anhydrous ammonia, what effect does that have over the long term? I think these are very important issues that need to be addressed, and we're doing it. I think the federal government also ought to initiate more responses than they have been.

Soil salinity. Soil salinity is an ever-increasing problem in relation to the condition of the soil in the province and throughout the world, and we need to address it. The federal government needs to address it, and I think that they ought to be very concerned about it because it's a serious problem.

In developing grasses and grains that will be able to produce on salt soils, we'll have to look at those that first of all can grow, then those that will not carry a salt residue into the plant, so that the livestock can eat it and people can eat it. These are things that have to be addressed and I think that it's important that the federal government take a look at it. And I think they need to be encouraged to do it. And that's why we want to address this kind of subject in light of the responsibility that I feel they have.

Water management is another area. I think, that could be addressed quite extensively by the federal government. How does the water move in soils? It all has a relationship to the salinity problems that we have in a lot of parts of the south-west. And those things are assumed. A lot of the information that is available today is different than it was a year ago, and different than it was two years ago. And these areas need to have further study so that farmers can identify where their problem is and how they can work to solve it.

In dealing with another issue which we as a provincial government have funded, and I believe that we should be looking at areas where we could place some emphasis from the federal point of view, is inventory of soil — soil inventory and mapping it out in the province. I think that has to be dealt with. We need to research, first of all, how to do it, the depths that some of these soils are, and the kinds of soils and the problems that they will encounter. We need to identify that, especially as it relates to developing irrigation or intensive agriculture in the fertilizer area, in the area of how to regulate the amount of fertilizers that are needed. How do we handle acid soils? These are all questions that relate to things that are federal government ought to be involved in. Our government, through the FarmLab program, has contributed \$1.1 million to these areas, and we're asking farmers to co-operate in dealing with the various problems that we encounter in dealing with the ground and the soil in the agricultural portion of Saskatchewan.

Another area that I think needs to be dealt with — and we as a province are dealing with — and we need to identify that, is grain production. When the Swift Current research station developed its first varieties of wheats, like Rescue and those, it changed the whole atmosphere in the grain business in Saskatchewan. I think we need to continue to develop good wheats. These take a lot of funding from the various levels of

government and I think we need to continue that.

I pointed out earlier a little bit about the barley. The need for barley is feed grain to develop a feeding industry. We need oats to have the same quality so we increase our feeding potential. We also need specialty-crop development. In a province where you have mainly one or two varieties of grain, we need a lot more development in the special crops. There's a great deal of emphasis needed, and we as a province have funded, but we sure need the federal government to help us out. In dealing with this you need to address the area of genetics — how do genetics fit into the various parts of plant development? We as a provincial government are funding it. I think the federal government needs to go along with us.

Another area that has to be addressed — and I think we are doing some; I know that the farmers in the province are doing a lot — and that is in tillage practices. We have everything today from intensive cultivation to no-till, and we need to take a serious look at the various areas of the province that have the variety of climatic conditions and address them according to the kind of production that is needed throughout the province. The tillage practices have a relationship to the weed control, soil rest, and the ability for the soil to take on moisture so that it can work for better crops in the future. These are some of the areas that need to be addressed and our government is addressing them. We spent \$1.4 million on that program and I think it's an indication of where we think our priorities should be.

Plant production isn't the only area that needs to be looked at. I personally feel that the livestock industry in Saskatchewan and western Canada has to be addressed. I think, especially in Saskatchewan, it has been allowed to deteriorate and I think that it needs to be addressed.

How do we begin to do that? We begin to become efficient in our feed to the animals — how does the animal utilize the feed that it takes in? And we have developed a number of areas that I think need to be looked at in feed utilization. How do trace minerals affect the condition of the animal? How do things like phosphorous and calcium affect the breeding cycles of the animals that we have? How do you gain access to this information without a whole lot of research? And our government is continuing to work in that area to develop these feed efficiencies.

Not only in livestock do we have it. It's from the cattle point of view; you have it from the pork industry; you have it from the dairy herd — you have to have it from every area. How do you place the various kinds of feeds that you put into a dairy cow and which ones give you the best returns on the milk? These are all things that need to be looked at for higher production.

I think one of the things that I think are important in making an example of a development in Saskatchewan is the Veterinary Infectious Diseases Organization. I think that is an area that has demonstrated how government and private industry can work together to give the agriculture sector a window in the world. And that came . . . and developed scours vaccine that is used throughout the world. I think that's important. It's important for agriculture in Saskatchewan, but also it's important for agriculture in Canada because it is used throughout the world. I think that's something that needs to be encouraged. That's why agricultural research is important because it opens the door for investment; it opens the door for a high degree of technical expertise. Our government invested \$0.75 million in that program and I think that it's

again an emphasis on what we believe to be a good thing for agriculture.

In today's agriculture scene, the economic position is probably the most intense part of the production of agriculture products in western Canada. The economics, the feasibility, the narrow margins need to be looked at, and I think that when we take a look . . . We have to take a serious look at how do our agricultural people identify where their problems are in their economic systems on their farms, and how do they improve them. How do they improve them with the crops they raise, how do they improve them with the marketing expertise they have?

We also think that it's necessary to have increased production become a part of, a way of, increasing the economic capability of agricultural producers. We have allocated funding for that.

In dealing with a problem that was outlined by the member from Nipawin in relation to the toxic effect of herbicides and fertilizers on the soil, and what they have as a reaction to man, has also got to be addressed. I think it's vitally important. What effect do they have on animals? I think these all have to be addressed. What effect do they have on environment? And our government is also funding programs that relate to that. I think these areas that I've covered from FarmLab are important. I think they deal with some of the very basic methods.

Agriculture in this province has produced a wide variety of people and economic beliefs that I think need to continue to be researched, but that they need to be expanded and told to other people because I think the people in Saskatchewan have developed a high degree of technical skills when it comes to managing their farms and managing their fields and their production.

We have also assisted farmers with financial assistance in this for demonstration projects. We have 161 projects in 1982 and we funded them \$320,000. That's another area where the FarmLab has been encouraged by this government.

When you talk about the people of Saskatchewan developing a high degree of technical skills in relating to the manufacturing industry, it's our belief that we need to initiate that development and we have by that paid 45 per cent of the share of the Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute — 45 per cent of the operating costs — and that amounts to \$1.1 million and I think that is a commendable thing by our government.

In dealing with another area . . . The Saskatchewan agricultural research fund, I think is another . . . (inaudible) . . . area where we need to take a close look at the areas where we have funded individual research projects. I just want to outline some of them. I think that we want to acknowledge them, first of all, and then also place them as an integral part of what our government feels that agriculture can play in an economic development of the province.

One of those things is how and what effect do the rate and the date of pre-seeding fertilizer placement and post-seeding packing requirements . . . when using a pneumatic seeder. We've developed a high degree of technical skills in building these products in the province and I think that we have shown that we can not only use them, build them, but we can sell them throughout the world. I think we need to encourage that as much as possible.

We need to evaluate the reaction of nitrogen on wheat under zero-till farming systems. We've given that responsibility to Dr. Rennie and he's done a lot of work on that, and he will probably continue to do that. We need to work together to increase the information related to sprouting in various kinds of feed grains and wheat, and we've specifically identified barley. We've issued a good deal of funding for that.

Another area that we encountered last fall, and that's freezing of grain in the north-east part of the province. I think that was accented. And we need to develop the kind of plant that can handle a certain degree of frost. We need to deal with better uses of the rapeseed meal and rapeseed. We need to see about getting better production out of being able to grow it more continually on the same piece of land. We need to have a high degree of technical and research skills to provide that for us.

We need to have a little bit of biology and control of the blight in lentils. We need to have a little bit of help with that, and we have given that responsibility to the department of biology at the University of Saskatchewan.

Forage crops have — personally, and for me — been a very special kind of a product that I think needs to be developed, and we have to develop some of the areas related to that. Leaf cutter bees, for example, is almost an unheard of thing in the province of Saskatchewan and we have to develop these areas. We have Russian wild rye-grass; we need to develop that. We need to develop winter hardiness in our alfalfas. There's a lot of these things that need to be looked at.

We need to take a look at the problem that we have in . . . problems in relation to sheep industry in the province. We need to be able to understand them and have a way that we can intensify their production. The effect of sulphates that are taken when animals are sick and used extensively . . . These have to be addressed and they have to be addressed from the point of view that people eat the meat of animals that have been treated, and what effect that it will have. We've addressed that. The problem in relation transfers of embryos and the effects that they have on various part of the development in the cattle industry . . . these have to be addressed, and our Western College of Veterinary Medicine is looking into these. These all have to be addressed in a very specific way.

The hog industry is also an important part of our livestock industry. And we need to develop the industry so that the people who raise the hogs can have a better weaning rate or higher degree of live weanlings when they go to sell them, and that's extremely important.

The production of honey in the province I think is a very vital part. The area around the north-east is well known in the country for its production of honey, and we need to develop those kind of production things that can add to the income of the people in the various areas of the province.

One of the things that surprised me a little bit when I looked at what we've been funding, and it may come as a surprise to a lot of people, but it's the home range and migration in pest population of the plains garter snake on farms in southern Saskatchewan. We've run into a few problems with garter snakes moving into houses and people having to move out. I think that's something that needs to be looked at. What is the effect of the liquid manure in the hog business? What effect does that have on long, intensive use on

soils in agriculture? I think those are things that we have specific responsibilities given to specific people in relating to agriculture — how they can handle these specifics in detail. And that's, I think, important.

We have to deal basically with energy and equipment. How do we utilize these together; how do we make the most efficient use of the production in our agriculture equipment, the best use of our economic dollars that we have, or the available dollars that we have; how do we best use them in the tillage that we have? These are all things that I believe are important in relation to the agriculture production. And our government has put in \$500,000, almost \$600,000, into these specific areas. I think that's very important.

In dealing with agriculture as it relates to what we've done, we've only begun to address the issues. We know that there is a lot of room left to go, but our government last year spent over \$6 million in addressing specifics in agriculture. I think it's high time that the federal government of western Canadian provinces, they've been saying: we'll take it away from agriculture in western Canada, and we'll put it in production-oriented things in Quebec. I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that that is a bad move on the part of the federal government. I think it's going to be to their detriment as it relates to agriculture production in the West.

The whole area, I think, needs to address itself in very specifics. How do we relate to various areas of agriculture in detail? You can't generalize in agriculture; you need specific investments in each detail. I know that it's important for the people on this side of the House, and I know that we feel humbled by the responsibility that we've taken; but we also sense a bit of urgency in knowing that the federal government needs to get on with the job.

And so therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's a privilege for me to underscore and to relate to this motion. I think it's good; I think it's important; I think it's very vital to the increased production and the economic viability of agriculture in western Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Deputy Minister, I would just like to say a few words on this motion, before I move adjournment of it.

It's a typical Tory resolution, as I look down the order paper; another one where we are urging the federal government to attempt to solve the problems of Saskatchewan. I find this amazing after some of the statements that have been made in this Assembly not that many months ago, about how this new government was not going to be laying at the doorstep of the federal government all the problems that were associated with Saskatchewan.

In particular in this area . . . And I would agree with the members who have risen and spoken about research and the importance of it. I suppose it's not often that the member from Morse and I would agree on issues, but I think the problem associated with cut-backs in research —whether it's at the Swift Current research station or other areas of the province — by the federal government are a serious and important problem which we should be lobbying to see that staff cut-backs do not take place; and those that have, that those people are re-instituted and re-stated in their positions, because they do a very effective and a very meaningful job in plant breeding and animal breeding and other areas.

It also bothers me, that at the same time the federal government is cutting back in agricultural research, we are seeing much the same action by the provincial government, of the conservative government here in Saskatchewan. And you will know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the November budget saw a severe cut-back in the FarmLab program, a program that was established, I believe, in 1981, which was a joint project by local farmers, the University of Saskatchewan, as well as the provincial government through the Department of Agriculture. And this program did a lot of things about finding what was really going on out in the country, because members who are associated with agriculture, and others, will know that it's very hard to distinguish what is fact, from the time to time, in the agricultural business.

We have the chemical companies who put on a major push and promote no-till operations and they have a vested interest in that, because of course the chemicals they sell; and the more they sell, the more profits they make. And so we thought it was very important to get a project going where actual farmers were doing the research in conjunction with the university and the Department of Agriculture. And to that end, I believe the project that was announced in 1981 was a \$25 million project over five years. And the farmers in my area who were involved in it felt that they were doing a good job and getting some very meaningful research done on individual farms. While research stations are important and will always have their place, I think the research done on the individual farms was proving out very successful. And for that reason, I think all farmers were saddened by the cut-back in the FarmLab program, and have a feeling that this is the beginning of the end for a very diverse and very localized type of research program which was brought in by a previous government.

The members have talked here tonight about cut-backs in irrigation proposals and irrigation research by the federal government. And here again, in looking at the Saskatchewan budget we find no increase in agricultural research for agricultural budgetary spending. In fact the overall budget of Agriculture, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe was cut back by about \$10 million in the last budget. And so for members in the government to rise and condemn the federal government, which I feel is important because there are cut-backs being made by the federal government, I would urge those same members in caucus to stand up and to be counted when it comes to agricultural research, irrigation projects, the FarmLab, for example, or PAMI (Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute), or those programs that were started, and they have mentioned here tonight, but I must say, started by a previous government. I would hope that now that they admit what a great job we had done in that area, they would continue to insist that their government, their Minister of Agriculture, as well as the federal minister, would put the proper funding into agriculture to make sure that it stays number one, as it was for so many years.

With those few words, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have many more things to say about this motion and I therefore beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Sandberg that Bill No. 92 — **An Act to amend The Liquor Act** be now read a second time.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have a few words to say on bill No. 92, as amendment to The Liquor Act, which is involved in second reading at this time. First of all, I suppose it's fair to say that we are a little surprised at the double-talk that is going on about liquor in the province of Saskatchewan at this time. You will know, and members will know, that the bill that has been introduced here would promote, I suppose, in a sense, liquor and alcohol to a greater degree than what it is at the present time. I think that it's fair to say both Bill 92 and 93, while they are not radical in the sense of opening Saskatchewan wide open to the sale of liquor and increased distribution of liquor at Taylor Field in the one sense, and not only on weekdays but also on Sundays; and as well, the other act would also increase the number of outlets in the province which I think should be questioned.

The one thing on this bill that I am glad to see is that the number of outlets . . . Where the bill that was brought in — I believe it was Bill 48 — in the last session would have not put any limit on the number of outlets in the province of Saskatchewan, this bill at least goes some distance to taking up the advice that we gave at that time to limit the number of outlets, I believe to 160, throughout the province. I think that we have no great problem now that that limit is et in place, although the trend, as I mentioned, to increase the availability of liquor, and henceforth the consumption of liquor, was in the face of other things that are being done by this government at the present time.

And another bill that is before us at the present . . . And we have heard various sanctimonious speeches about the evils of alcohol and driving, and the problems associated with it. I would agree with the member for Wilkie, and I believe that he is sincere when he proposes that the problems associated with liquor and vehicles is a very real one and one that we should be dealing with, but I suppose the thing that bothers us the most is the hypocrisy that is involved where you have one minister bringing in bills that would allow more availability at Taylor field, not only limited to light beer, but also including any alcoholic beverages as the legislation now stands.

This kind of hypocrisy — riding the fence, and attempting to please everyone — I think is the kind of thing that people in the province will not only allow to go unnoticed. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think that the telling, the real storey to be told about these bills, will come when people finally realize that the whole story is not being told — that one minister will rise and talk about the evils of alcohol and how he is going to solve that problem, and another minister rises and introduces two bills which allow for a freer flow of alcohol in the province of Saskatchewan. And while I don't have a great deal of difficulty — there are amendments that we will be looking at — but it's the double-talk I suppose that's going on at the present time by this government attempting to please everyone — and I believe in the end, they will please no one — is something they should learn. In opposition they may have been able to get away with that kind of action, but in government it will be much more difficult, and with those few words, I will wrap up my remarks. I have other comments which I will refrain from talking about now and will leave it for committee of the whole.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Well, Mr. Speaker, just a few remarks to wrap this up. The

hon. member refers to hypocrisy in his comments. I say that he is the one and that the party . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order. I'm sorry, I didn't inform the House that the minister is about to close debate and if anyone has any comments that they want to make, they should make them now.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — To paraphrase my remarks again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I say that the member opposite and the party opposite are the ones that are being hypocritical on this matter. The amendments to The Liquor Act are minor amendments and they are changes that have been requested by the people of Saskatchewan. In no uncertain terms, they were requested of the previous administration. They were asked on countless occasions by many communities in Saskatchewan to expand the limit of special liquor vendors in this province. So this is what we are doing with the amendment in regards to special liquor vendors — moving it from 135 to 160, an increase of just 25, to give the people in various communities in Saskatchewan what they are asking for.

The other amendments are very minor. For example, we are providing enabling legislation for a duty-free store in Saskatchewan to accommodate both Saskatchewan people travelling out of this province to the United States and tourists who are coming in to visit our province and then leaving. The amendment for enabling legislation for the Saskatchewan Brewers Association to allow it to become legally an agent of the Saskatchewan Liquor Board is again another housekeeping amendment, and is one that was approved by the previous administration.

So, with those few comments, I say these are our requests that have been made by the people of Saskatchewan. And this government, being a responsible government and a responsive government, has moved these amendments to accede to the requests of the people of Saskatchewan. So with that, I move the passage of this bill.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Sandberg that Bill No. 93 — **An Act to amend The Liquor Licensing Act** be now read a second time.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the bill we are dealing with is The Liquor Licensing Act. The major changes that are proposed by the act are really the major change perhaps is a better way to put it, is to provide for the sale of beer, wine and spirits at Taylor Field. There are some minor changes dealing with the composition of the Liquor Licensing Commission that I will not comment on directly, and there is a change of some importance authorizing the licensing of municipally owned golf courses outside cities.

I wish to confine my remarks to the proposal to authorize a license to be issued for the sale of beer, wine and spirits at Taylor Field, and I want to make very clear that this bill — on any fair reading of this bill — permits the Liquor Licensing Commission of Saskatchewan to grant, subject to a referendum, cocktail licence at Taylor Field or in premises adjoining Taylor Field at which beer — beer light and beer heavy — wine and spirits can be served on any day of the week, weekday or Sunday. That is what the bill authorizes. And if anyone thinks that the bill authorizes something else, he or she has

not taken the old act, the proposed change and assessed what it will mean. There is no question about what it means. Once we pass this, then it's out of the hands of the legislature and without any further action by this legislature, there will be the law which authorizes the sale of beer, wine spirits at Taylor Field on any day of the week.

Now, I am addressing myself to that and suggesting that that is a bad decision for this legislature to make. I invite all hon. members to look at the report of the legislative committee of this legislature some years ago when they did an exhaustive review of questions surrounding liquor in this province. They reached the conclusion that an increase in the availability of alcohol would lead in Saskatchewan, as it has elsewhere, to an increase in the consumption of alcohol, and they reached the further conclusion that an increase in the consumption of alcohol will lead to an increase to the occasions for the abuse of alcohol and indeed will lead to the increase in and the spread of the disease of alcoholism. Those are conclusions which are almost universally accepted by persons who have examined this field and, while there are contrary views, the overwhelming rate of evidence is that if you increase the availability of alcohol, you increase the consumption of alcohol, you increase the abuse of alcohol.

Now the question then is whether or not we should make a move to have liquor and beer available at the major sporting events such as those at Taylor Field. Certainly, many people who are aware of the likely problems to be created, oppose the move. Members will be aware that over the week-end, the conference of the United Church of Canada for Saskatchewan has passed a resolution in opposition to the sale of alcoholic beverages at Taylor Field. Members will also be aware that the public school trustees of Regina oppose any liquor law changes which would allow the sale of alcohol at public sport facilities. I am sorry, I said the public school trustees of Regina — I should have, Mr. Deputy Speaker, said the public school trustees of Saskatoon passed this resolution.

There are many, many people who have looked this issue who take the view, that while the consumption of alcohol in circumstances of a small number of people, in an intimate circumstance, may not create particular problems, the encouragement of the consumption of alcohol by any large number of people gathered in one place is undesirable. Particularly is this undesirable at a sporting event where enthusiasms run high. At hockey games and football games, people are enthusiastic, and quite rightly so. How many of us have been at football games and have suddenly found ourselves on our feet shouting with great enthusiasm? And that's good. But that type of adrenalin which runs in a fan who is enthusiastically involved in the game does not need to be supplemented by further adrenalin running because he is encouraged to consume alcoholic beverages. And to combine the two and to have a large number — 25,000 or 30,000 people — in close proximity, very much revved up because of their involvement in the game, has real hazards if you combine that with the consumption of alcoholic beverages in any major way.

And I think all of us know that. All of us who have attended games where a number of the people present have been over-indulging, know that it makes it unpleasant for the other spectators, and know that it leads to over-boisterous fans who, while they appear to be having a good time, they certainly don't contribute to the large number of fans who

want to watch the game having a good time. And that's what we're dealing with.

In my judgement, it is not sound to make this move to provide for the consumption of alcoholic beverages at Taylor Field in a large way, as this will undoubtedly do. Certainly the residents in the area of Taylor Field do not wish this to be passed. Insofar as one can judge from public meetings held, at which residents were asked to come and express their views, they have expressed their views to a considerable majority in opposition to the free sale of alcoholic beverages at Taylor Field.

It happens, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that Taylor Field is in my constituency and those people who live around Taylor Field are my constituents, and they have left me in no doubt as to where the bulk of them stand. They feel that they have enough problems with parking and with large numbers of people who become enthused, either going or coming from football games, and they do not wish that to be added to by having these large number of people being even more enthused, if that is the appropriate word, by the consumption of alcoholic beverages which would be freely available at Taylor Field.

So, on the basis of what is fair and reasonable for the residents in the area who have expressed their view, in my judgement in no uncertain terms; in the light of the views expressed by people who have made a study of the problems which society has with alcohol, and none of us can deny that there are problems; in the light of the views expressed by such bodies as the public school trustees of Saskatoon and the United Church of Canada, I find myself unable to support this bill.

And once again, I say, let no one think we're talking about light beer in Taylor Field. If we have been talking about light beer in Taylor Field, it would have been child's play to draft a provision which would have permitted the sale of light beer in Taylor Field. But that is not what has been done. A provision has been drafted which will permit the sale of alcoholic beverages of all kinds that can be sold in any cocktail lounge in Saskatchewan, to be served at Taylor Field, without further act by this legislature. And that is the issue . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Some hon. members opposite are suggesting that because restaurants are licensed seven days a week, that this means that they can sell spirits. Those people are unfamiliar with the licenses, or they would know that licensed restaurants cannot sell spirits. This is not what we're talking about. It would, as I say, have been very, very simple to provide that the bill will be confined to light beer or perhaps to beer, but that was not done. What was done was to make this bill one which permits the sale of all alcoholic beverages legally saleable in Saskatchewan at Taylor Field. I underline that because it is one of the bases of my objection to the bill. In my judgement, this bill moves us in the wrong direction.

I make one other point. I've alluded to it, but I make it again, and that is what I call the mixing of sporting events and alcohol. I believe we should encourage young people to attend football games and hockey games. We should certainly encourage them to play football and to play hockey and to participate in team sports, but we should also encourage them to be spectators, because it is good and healthy, and it gives them an opportunity, if only vicariously, to participate in these games. But I do not believe that there should be any association between mass spectator sports and alcohol. I don't think we should link them. I don't think that it should be assumed that going to the ball game means going to the ball game and sitting in the sun and drinking a few beers. I don't think that that is the direction in which we should be going.

I'm well aware that elsewhere this is common pursuit. I'm equally well aware that I do not share the view that we should mix mass spectator sport and the consumption of

alcohol. And it is not only a case of mixing, but it's a very intimate mixing, since we have seen many, many brewers and many, many distillers become involved in promoting major sporting teams. I feel sure in order that they may sell more of their product. And while I have no objection to them attempting to sell more of their product while their product is legally marketable in this country, I do not favour the marketing of their products by the sponsoring of sporting teams, and the association in the minds of young people of the idea that to be a 'good sport,' one must be a consumer of alcoholic beverages on frequent occasions.

I make that point because while I am not here to urge a teetotal law, I am here to urge the encouragement of sporting events; I am here also to object to the merging of the sale of alcohol and the holding of major sporting events. I don't think that a major event should be one which is designed partly for the viewing of the game and partly for the consumption of alcohol. And because I hold that view, and because I think that young people ought not to be . . . that ought not to be held out to young people that this is society's view of what mass participation sport is, I will be opposing this bill. And I ask all hon. members to consider it, consider it carefully, and ask themselves whether or not it is what they want and whether or not they favour what I believe to be the major principles inherent in this bill.

MR. HOPFNER: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm not going to stand here today and chastise the member opposite for his views as far as alcohol related to sporting events are concerned. But what I'd like to say is that the member opposite does speak on two sides of an issue. On one issue their government, at the time they were government in the previous administration, the amount of licences and permits across the province of Saskatchewan has actually indeed gotten out of hand, and far out of hand. My letters are being served with special occasion permits that have gone out of hand. But the members opposite, they opened it wide open. They did not make provisions there, other than the fact is that if the RCMP had particular time that they would police these permits. What they did was they opened them up and they said it would be the responsibility of the liquor board. So what did they do? They put permits out in every vendor and every liquor board across the province, where a man or a woman could suggestively say that they were a club and go out and get this sale permit and go to work.

Well, they were making money hand over fist, and it took away from these various service clubs that were trying to do various good deeds for the communities in raising funds towards their sporting facilities, or community halls, or community efforts. And the member says there that we're trying to do something different. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we're not trying to do anything different. What we are suggesting is the same thing that the members opposite have suggested to the private sector, to the private clubs across this province — is that we're giving the city of Regina the opportunity to operate under the same basis. And we're not saying that we're not going to do that without scrutiny; we're going to analyse just exactly what repercussion there may be on this.

I've taken a great deal of surveys with other areas and I suggest that probably they are not going . . . One individual in that sporting event that wishes to drink a low alcohol beer does not necessarily going to have more than maybe two beers the whole game. Well, the two beers are equivalent to one regular beer. And so, in a period of an hour and a half or two hours within that stadium, that individual's going to walk staggering

out of the stadium into his vehicle and drive home drunk — I mean, the member opposite is totally absurd.

Talking about licenses, under their administration every pizza parlour across this province opened up. And they were allowed to serve liquor with children — little children from all ages — going into these pizza parlours with their parents. They can drink seven days a week in those parlours — seven days a week. And they can sit there for two hours, three hours, eating and drinking and their children are present with them. I mean, you can twist it any which way you want.

I don't think we're trying to encourage any brewery's product, or any distiller's product in this province. What we're trying to do is we're trying to do is we're trying to bring things about to the 20th century, and instead of playing father to all the people out there in Saskatchewan, we're saying, 'Look, as a government of today, we believe that you are responsible to suggest whether, yes, you do want a low alcohol beer, or you don't.' We're not saying that you aren't responsible enough to be able to handle that. Alcohol today is a part of life, and with that in mind, we want to educate the people. We don't want them smuggling alcohol into the stadium like they're doing today. And by making low alcohol beer available, maybe we will not have these mickeys and these 26-ounces, and these thermoses full of hard liquor, hard spirits, where they do go crazy.

I've been a season ticket holder of the Saskatchewan Roughriders now for many years. And I must suggest to you that I have yet, in my area, seen anybody disrespectful, other than the fact that maybe traipsing through the crowd every so often, there might have been an individual that was hauled out of the stands because of his situation. But does the member opposite honestly believe that everybody is going to be drunken, by the fact of being able to drink a low alcohol — a 2 per cent or a 2.5, 3 per cent beer? I would tend to think that he should think a little bit about that.

Encouraging kids and parents to go out to the football field and enjoy a football game, well, we have a full stadium every Sunday, and almost every weekday out of the 10 games that are held here in Regina. So I would suggest that through having beer available, it's not promoting more and more people to come on out and watch that football game. It is there if a person would sooner have that other than a glass of coke. And I would actually suggest to you: which may be more healthier for that person? I would suggest to you that when it comes down to the analysing of studies that have been done under the University of Saskatchewan, that actually beer is not an unhealthy product. These studies would have been done under your administration.

So, you know, when you relate to drunkenness, it is at our discretion. If there is a problem with it that we can pull this. And it's not like we really opened it up. We're giving the people of Saskatchewan the chance and the responsibility to prove themselves. And if they do prove themselves what other means and what other better benefit is there for these people by being able to have the product that they so desire? . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . The member opposite seems to be playing on motherhoods or something that he had maybe suggested on . . . I would think that these motherhood issues are dear to my heart as well and I, for one thing, do not condone drunkenness and I can relate from personal experience.

I have been in the industry for many years and have never condoned drunkenness and I have yet to defy anybody, and I challenge the members opposite to even suggest myself

as a licensee in this province. Our company is a licensee in this province but I have never condoned or pushed alcohol to a point where I've sent anybody out of my premises in a way that he couldn't operate his vehicle properly. If there was anybody in my mind, in my judgement, that could not make it home, I made sure he got home, either personally or had someone that was responsible that could get him home. And the next day he could come back and pick up his car or his truck or whatever he was driving.

So I would suggest to you that I understand the amount that a person can consume within an hour or two, and I can suggest that those people will not . . . or could not be served any amount to even become intoxicated within that period of a time, and if they could, they're drinking a lot more than 2 per cent alcohol content beer. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I was waiting for some of the members opposite whose views on alcohol are well known and who parallel some of the comments that have been made by the opposition. I see none of them in the House today. I see none of them taking an interest. I'll be interested in hearing the member from Rosthern.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have heard some strange speeches in my time, but the one I just sat through must take some sort of a gold medal. No one who doesn't sell beer in . . . I sit Maidstone? No one other than a licensee could come to the House and condemn the selling of beer in pizza parlours, condone the selling of beer in Taylor Field, and say it doesn't all matter anyway, because beer is nutritional and good for you. You have to be a licensee to put that sort of a proposition forward.

However, the member is perfectly entitled to proceed in a bizarre fashion because he's following the lead of the minister who began the interruption of this bill by assuring us, by assuring us that this legislation just allowed light beer and just on weekdays. And lo and behold, when we saw the bill, it appeared he hadn't read it, and that none of these officials had bothered to explain it to him. The member from Regina South is not the only one whose antics are followed with interest. I say to the minister in charge that I would be delighted, when you close debate, to hear your explanation for your bizarre and unusual introduction to the bill which bore little relationship to what was actually being done.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to oppose this bill on basically two grounds. I want to oppose the bill because of the idea of having a referendum in Regina to decide this issue; I think that's inappropriate. It is not every issue that the mayor of Regina and I agree upon, but we agree upon this issue. As I was driving out to the airport this morning, I heard him condemning, in terms that I might well echo, the idea of elected people avoiding their responsibility to make decisions and avoiding the consequences for what they do by passing it off on a referendum. As I say, it is not every issue that the mayor of Regina and I agree upon, but this one issue upon which we seem to find common ground. One might say when the mayor of Regina and I agree upon something, we have come to a pretty fundamental truth, because it isn't every issue that we see eye to eye on. I want to oppose the bill on that basis. I think it is inappropriate for elected members to avoid their responsibility and to avoid the consequences for the decisions which they make by passing it off on a referendum.

I think it's also in appropriate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this should be a referendum in Regina only. This is an issue which affects people from throughout the province. People throughout the province attend. People from throughout the province drive to and from the games, and I think the entire province has a right to voice in this. There is a simple, cheap way to give the entire province a voice, a province-wide referendum, and that is to handle this legislation as it has traditionally been handled — and that is a free vote of the legislature with each member speaking according to his conscience.

I have been associated with this Assembly in one fashion or another since 1971. I have not known an issue of this sort, where the issue of the expansion of alcohol is available, which has not been done on a free vote. I don't know what was done before that, but I understand the same practice was followed. I say to the members opposite . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Do you drink?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I didn't start drinking before I gave the speech. That's more than I can say for the members opposite, for you give the appearance of having something in your water that isn't available to me.

So I will say, at least, Mr. Member, I entered this debate sober. I entered this debate sober.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — I think the comments just made by the hon. member were clearly out of order, and I would ask that they be withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — I should warn the member from Regina Centre that these kind of comments cannot be condoned by this House. And I would ask him to retract them.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What did he say?

AN HON. MEMBER: — I didn't hear part of it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — I said I would like to warn the member from Regina Centre that these kind of comments in the legislature cannot be condoned by the Speaker, and I would ask you to withdraw the comments that you made against the member.

In the House of Commons a member will not be permitted by the Speaker to indulge in any reflections on the House itself as a political institution; or to impute to any Member or Members unworthy motives for their actions in a particular case; . . .

And I would ask the member from Regina Centre to take back the words that he . . . Retract; I would ask him to retract his words.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Chairman, I'll certainly withdraw the comments insofar as they might be viewed by yourself to be a breach of the traditions of this legislature.

I was intending to comment on the member's logic, not on his person or his reputation. But I was not speaking from a prepared speech and it is possible that they were misinterpreted. If you want to call another point of order on my retraction, feel free to do so. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wished I could get as exercised about this bill as some

members opposite are about my comments.

But I do feel strongly about it. I think the method in which this has been brought forward is inappropriate, but the sins of the members opposite in attempting to avoid the responsibility, as members of the legislature, pales beside what I view as the objections to the substance of the bill itself.

The last thing that this province or any western society needs is any encouragement to consume alcohol. I may say this has been an approach typical of this government opposite to encourage the consumption of alcohol, but to attempt to do so in a way which no one has to take responsibility. They have increased the number of outlets available; they have amalgamated the liquor board and the Liquor Licensing Commission — we have stated that in our view, that was an ill-conceived move — named as the chairman of the Liquor Licensing Commission someone who was not an independent person of stature, but a former leader of the Conservative Party.

All that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the context of a province which has, according to the alcoholism commission, 150,000 high-risk drinkers, 50,000 of whom are alcohol dependent. In this province alone, Mr. Deputy Speaker, more than 25,000 patients are treated by our doctors each year for alcoholism. In one year alone, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are 50,000 offences against The Liquor Act, facts as I stated documented by the Saskatchewan Alcoholism Commission. The consequences of this are borne not just by the alcoholics, which is tragic enough, but by all of society. I hope I don't have to recount for the Minister of Highways the cost in traffic accidents that this alcoholism brings to the province, as well as the broken homes; the social and psychological dependence; the depression that ensues — all of this in a province which is thought to have a fairly close attachment to traditional values which have not traditionally included high alcohol consumption. This has traditionally not been thought of as being a '5 o'clock martini' province, and yet even in this province we face these volume of problems with alcohol.

The last thing, Mr. Chairman, alcohol needs, and the last thing Saskatchewan needs, is any further encouragement to consume more alcohol. The level of alcohol being consumed by our society, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, has reached dangerous proportions.

The association of pro football and alcohol can only suggest to young people a certain kind of life-style which says that alcohol is part, and is a wholesome part, of a healthy life-style. I suggest that is inappropriate. I suggest that's inappropriate in any society, particularly one which has the alcohol problems that ours do. I'll suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the reason why these amendments are so broad, and they are very broad, is because this is indeed the nose of the camel poking in the door of the tent.

The minister may assure us — for whatever it's worth — but the minister may assure us that it is the intention of the government that nothing but light beer will be sold, and only on weekdays. But he has also said that it's basically a decision for the Liquor Licensing Commission, and not apparently a decision for this Legislative Assembly, or the administration of which he's a part. It is my view, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we will soon have agitation by all those who have an interest in having beer sold at Taylor Field for regular beer, and before that, we're going to have agitation for having beer sold on Sunday.

I remind members opposite that there are just four home games in Regina played on weekdays. All the rest are played on Sunday. I do not believe for one moment that those who promote the sale of beer at football games are going to leave the minister alone when they're only selling light beer, and only selling it for four games a year.

I suggest, Mr. Minister, you are going to be subject to the same pressure which you could not withstand. You're going to be subject to the same pressure to sell beer on Sundays, and to sell regular strength beer as you have been heretofore. I suggest, Mr. Minister, you're going to be equally incapable of withstanding the pressure, and it will not be very long until regular strength beer is being sold, and it is being sold every day of the week. I would be very surprised, Mr. Minister, if we go to another election without you having to take the time to explain how regular strength beer came to be sold at not just Taylor Field, although I suppose that may take an amendment, but all professional sporting events as is the case in other provinces.

I think that's in appropriate, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I think the way this legislation has been brought forward is in sharp departure with a very long tradition, one that I think has served this province well, of free and open votes in the legislature on questions relating to liquor. I suggest it is in appropriate to be trying to avoid the responsibility for our office by pawning off the decision on another level. But more important, I think the last thing that this province needs is any further encouragement. I will therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, be voting against the bill.

MR. KOSKIE: — Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to add some comments with my colleagues, in respect to the opposition of Bill No. 93. I want to say that first of all, I am disappointed, certainly in the minister in the way in which he presented to the public a position of only having a referendum and beer on, other than on Sundays. And then the next day, I believe I heard him say, 'Oh, but I was wrong, and I want to change that, and it really applies to all home games.' I want to say that really what is attempting to happen here, is that the minister was trying to slip one across the general public and not in fact disclose the facts as they were.

But most importantly, what I see is the total hypocrisy of the approach of the government opposite — hypocrisy of the highest degree. Yesterday we deal with the new Vehicles Act and they want to get all the drunken drivers off the road and stiffen it up. And they indicated yesterday that they went and consulted with the public, consulted with all of the public, the minister indicated. And here we have a major bill, a major policy decision, closely linked — closely linked with The Vehicles Act and could have been included in the white paper and the representation from various groups. But no. They want to, on one hand, indicate and try to represent to the public that they are in fact tightening up and they're going to get all the murderers off the highways, lock them up, tougher penalties. And on the other hand, they're catering to more availability of alcohol. Now there is no consistency. There is absolutely no consistency in that approach and you know it. I want to say the hypocrisy is so evident. I want to say that throughout Saskatchewan, the church groups, the United Church, have written — they've written to the Leader of the Opposition in respect to the position on this vital question. Here is a letter from the United Church of Canada, and this is to the Leader of the Opposition:

I'm writing to you at this time because I am concerned about the possibility of permission being granted for the sale of beer at football games at Taylor Field. The sale of alcohol at Taylor Field is just one more outlet for alcohol. I feel that the granting of such a permit will make for increased consumption of alcohol beverages and increased drunkenness. I'm also concerned about the increase in social problems, which may result and also add to the tax burden borne by the citizens of Saskatchewan.

And that's from the United Church of Canada. I could go on: from the Saskatchewan Safety Council — and this is written to Mr. Michael Hopfner, MLA, chairman of the liquor law regulations:

Dear Mr. Hopfner: Re increased availability of alcoholic beverages: (And they say) I would like to, on behalf of the Saskatchewan Safety Council, take this opportunity to draw to your attention the council's position about the increasing availability of alcoholic beverages to the general public.

And I have here yet another letter written to Premier Devine, and this is from the Reverend K. B. Clarkson, United Church of Canada, and he says:

Dear Mr. Devine: I write as a concerned citizen of this province, and also as a minister of the church who is frequently made very much aware of the serious problem created by those who cannot resist over-indulgence in the use of alcoholic beverages. However, one needs to make the effort, and it is for this reason that we urge your government to resist the pressures we know are upon you to allow the use of alcoholic beverages at Taylor Field in Regina, and also to allow the advertising of alcoholic beverages on the media.

And that's to come next — is the advertising of alcoholic beverages. And the minister said he's going to be expanding it further. By the next fall he intends to bring it in.

Here is another letter just to give an idea. We have the safety council; we have the United Church; we have the United Church minister from Weyburn — all of these individuals who, showing their concern, have no way to get to this government. There has been no white paper; there has been no referendum throughout the province of Saskatchewan. Here is another concerned individual, and writes to Premier Devine: 'I couldn't believe my ears this morning to hear the radio that the Saskatchewan Government is considering opening up . . .' Wrong paragraph. 'I understand . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, well, I can read the whole thing:

I understand the government is planning to allow liquor advertising and increased outlets in the province. And judging by the number of people, including young mothers with children, that I see patronizing liquor stores across the street from our home, I would not have thought advertising was needed to promote further sales.

It seems to me very short-sighted for the government not to realize that increased sales will inevitably lead to an increase in family problem breakdowns, motor accidents, with a further burden to our society, financially as well.

So I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is just a portion, a representative sample of those people — concerned people in this province.

AN HON. MEMBER: —Bring them all in and read them all.

MR. KOSKIE: — Well, I'll do that. And what I'm going to do at the end of my comments, I'm going to ask for an adjournment because you people won't listen to anybody, and I'm going to say that we are going to listen to voice of the people of this province. And certainly of . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I fully intend to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, try it.

And I want to say, as others have said here, that there is a tendency, a trend that is developing. And others have indicated it here tonight. And I am appalled — the mixing of sports and the promotion by breweries and liquor distillers. When we look at the professional hockey in Canada, we have the Molson's Breweries tied in and own the Montreal Canadiens. They have apparently the marketing rights for every Canadian professional hockey team in Canada other than one, and they were promoting the one — the main promoters of the Saskatoon endeavour.

And I want to say that I think that the tying of the two together is a direction that this society should not indeed be going. I think, as has been indicated, that sports should be done for the value of sports. And over and around our communities, more and more we find various events being promoted by the brewers throughout this province. And what I want to say is that the people of Saskatchewan, I think, were willing to take a look at the serious economic and social consequences of drinking, the terrible catastrophes on our highways, and I think that they were willing to go along with stiffer legislation and we're prepared to support that. But I don't think you can have it both ways. I think you have to be honourable in approaching this because certainly the availability of consumption, there is absolutely no doubt, leads on to further and further problems with the use of alcoholic beverages.

You know, I was really surprised with the minister — I heard him . . . (inaudible) . . . away about, in his confused way, in respect to the bill and he says, 'Well, in Taylor Field,' he says, you know, 'why should we have them coming there with thermos bottles and getting sick and puking on people?' And then you know what he said next? He said, 'Well, we can have beer at Taylor Field.' He says, '99.9 per cent of all the people that go there are responsible.' On one hand he says they can't come there and bring their own and be responsible, but if they had unlimited quantities at Taylor Field they are 99.9 per cent responsible. I mean, this is the logic of that minister, incapable of giving any direction. That's exactly what you said. And it was a totally ridiculous statement, and I agree that you made it.

As I said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have a mechanism to assess the position that the public of Saskatchewan want to take in respect to this very important decision. I want to say that because of our efforts and because of the people that wrote in, the government on the previous bill didn't go with unlimited outlets; they decreased it. We did have an effect on decreasing the unlimited number. I want to say that we view this with a high degree of seriousness, and I want to say that we're going to adjourn the bill and ask for an adjournment in order that we can fact discuss it with the church groups, with families, with all of interested citizens of this province, and I think that makes eminent sense.

You can't have it both ways — pretending that you are in fact consulting with the public,

and at the other hand trying to railroad this through the House without any representation made by the people of this province. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mrs. Duncan that Bill No. 78 — **An Act to amend The Tobacco Act** be now read a second time.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I have already spoken briefly on this and I will want to raise a number of other issues in committee, but the items of principle contained in this bill are items which I do not object. I've already indicated that I will be raising questions concerning the powers of seizure and the principle of having minimum fines for offences set out in regulations which none of us know what the regulation is, and I object to some of the major powers of seizure in the bill. But to the main principle of the bill I have no objection, and accordingly I will be supporting the bill.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mrs. Duncan that Bill No. 79 — **An Act to amend The Education and Health Tax Act** be now read a second time.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I've addressed a few comments to the House on this before. I have raised the particular points I will wish to raise in committee, more particularly the definition of fuel petroleum products and the distinction made between those products which are taxable and those which are not taxable. I've already indicated our agreement with the application of tax to promotional material distributed, and expressed my pleasure at the fact that the policy of the previous government on removing the tax on children's clothing and footwear is being incorporated in this bill. I will accordingly be supporting the bill.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:25 p.m.