

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
November 24, 1983

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PETITIONS

MRS. CASWELL: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of 16,875-plus citizens in the province of Saskatchewan, I would like to present this petition which urges the members of the Legislative Assembly to consider stopping funding of medicare funds to abortion. The purpose is that it is a violation of many people's conscience to have . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, I was not entitled to make a speech, so I'm wondering why I'm being allowed to be harassed as if I'm making a speech.

On behalf of the citizens of Saskatchewan, I would like to present this petition to stopping the medicare funding of abortion. The reason why the citizens wants this is because it is contrary to the dictates of their conscience to have medicare funds used for the destruction of human life. They want to see medicare funds restored for its original purpose: that of curing and caring. It is because of their great concern for medicare . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please! The hon. member is only allowed to present the petition and not to make a speech in its defence. Would you proceed with it.

MRS. CASWELL: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to clarify the purpose. I will not make a speech.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. Order. The hon. member for Shaunavon will please retain silence when the Speaker is on his feet.

NOTICE OF MOTION

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall, on Tuesday next, move first reading of a bill, an act respecting the Department of Science and Technology.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: — This morning I would like to introduce to you the Hon. Speaker Jenkins, from the Australian House of Representatives. Mr. Jenkins is seated on the floor of the Chamber, and I would like him to stand and be recognized. I'm sure that all hon. members would like to welcome him to our Chamber.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Accompanying Mr. Jenkins this morning, and seated in the Speaker's gallery, are Mrs. Jenkins, Mr. Ian Harris, and Clerk Assistant Miss Gleeson. Would you also welcome them to our Assembly this morning.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Rise in Utility Rates for Farmers

MR. ENGEL: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, this has to do with the rise of utility rates introduced by your government, and the impact that these utility rates will have on Saskatchewan farmers: natural gas rates, 13 per cent; power rates up 15; telephone rates up 19, and STC express rates are up 18.5 per cent. The cost of farm vehicle coverage has increased because your government has removed windshield breakage, and most farmers have to drive on gravel roads. In light of all these increases, my question is: what will these various utility rate increases cost the average Saskatchewan farmer over the next 12 months? What is the impact on the pocket-book of the average Saskatchewan farmer?

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — I thank the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, for his question. I would remind him, of course, that insofar as farmers are concerned . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I thank the hon. member for his question, Mr. Speaker. And I think my buttons are okay. But if he likes it better, I will do them both up.

But as it relates to utility costs for farmers or for home owners, I would suggest that once again this government has written the book insofar as having fair and sensible adjudication of rates to the public utilities review commission that this government established, that the people of Saskatchewan and the farmers of Saskatchewan asked for, for some good long time, while you were in power and never brought in. And in fact the NDP opposed it.

And if he wants it examined further, Mr. Speaker, input costs for farmers in general, I would suggest, as well, and I remind the member again that this government, as well, has written the book on controlling those interest-input costs, because interest-input costs were identified as the biggest single source of headache for farmers out there. And through programs like the farm purchase program, our Crown land sales program, we've reduced those kinds of costs.

The expanded . . . the new, never mind expanded, the new rural natural gas delivery system is one that is being very, very, very well received out there. And that is good news for Saskatchewan farmers.

As well, programs like beef stabilization have done a lot to assuring some sensibility and stability in what they receive for some of their commodities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The question I have isn't a new question or a supplementary. It's the first question. What impact is the increased utility rates going to have on the farmer? I wasn't looking for a long dissertation of where the farmer can spend more money. You know, he can spend more money if he's going to buy more land. What . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. Order, please. Order, please. It's out of order to ask a question that has previously been asked. Now there's no compulsion on the minister to answer.

MR. ENGEL: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I suppose we can learn to operate under the new rules that the minister doesn't have to answer a question.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. Order. The rules are not new. The rules have been around for a long time, and it states in the rules that the member can ask his question, but there's no compulsion for the minister to answer, and a question which has previously been asked should not be asked again. Those are the rules of the Assembly.

MR. ENGEL: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize for attempting to appear to go after the Speaker when I'm really after the minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — Do you mean to tell this House, and the farmers of Saskatchewan, that the Minister of Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture doesn't have any idea of the dollar impact that the additional costs and the production costs that will face Saskatchewan farmers, because of increased electrical rates? You have no answer, that a dairy producer that uses a lot of electricity, what this impact is going to have on his production costs? Is this what the minister is telling the House?

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Mr. Speaker, I think I could quite simply say that as it relates to utility costs, PURC does a fair and sensible adjudication, and especially as it relates to things like natural gas. As I've already pointed out, the rural natural gas distribution system that's going in out there has been very well received by farmers. And so it should be, because costs there are about 6 per cent of conventional sources of fuel. And that is a fairly dramatic impact on their pocket-books, and a program that is very, very heartily and well received, and I commend the minister in charge of SPC for the aggressive way in which they've delivered that program. And I know there are several communities . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — There are something like 37 farms in my constituency that have benefited from that rural natural gas distribution program.

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the minister. My new question to the minister is this: he has 37 farmers in his constituency that put in natural gas. I'm saying I've got thousands of farmers in my constituency that can't up with up-front money for natural gas. They're facing a cost-price squeeze today where their power rates, their utility rates, everything is going up and they haven't got the money to pay the increased rates. What is your government, with the generous announcement in the throne speech, going to do? And you don't even know how much it's costing them, or what this extra burden is going to help them. The farmer that can put in natural gas isn't facing a cost-price squeeze. He's got the three or four or five thousand dollars now to put in. what about the guy that's facing a cost-price squeeze that hasn't got the money for his grocery cheque next month?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Mr. Speaker, in response to the minister's question, and his thousands of farmers in his constituency that he points out don't have money to buy grocery bills. I empathize with every farmer in Saskatchewan today because of the price of wheat. But I would also like to tell the hon. member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, that there are thousands of farmers out there today enjoying the benefits of the farm purchase program, which has reduced their biggest input cost, and there has never been a program like it in Saskatchewan's history.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Something like 1,300 young farmers, beginning farmers, have just had their rebate cheques mailed to them in October, totalling several million dollars, and that is substantive aid and is reducing their number one input costs. That's the kind of help that we give to thousands of farmers in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Speaker, a new question. A farmer that can afford to get his son started on farming can get some low-interest money which is good to expand in already well-established unit. I'm talking on behalf of the farmers that can't . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. Do you have a question? This is not time for speech making.

MR. ENGEL: — Question, Mr. Speaker. I want to ask a question on behalf of the farmers that can't afford to expand their units, that can't afford to put their families into a position to borrow an additional \$350,000. They are facing a cost-price squeeze. How much extra is it going to cost the small dairy farmer, say in Duck Lake, Saskatchewan, that's milking 70 cows? How much extra is it going to cost that farmer on a half section of land with the increased electrical costs? Tell me that. What have you got for him?

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. In fact what we have for him is a milk control board who looks after his best interest, and if the member will recall, on November 1st they just got an increase in the price of milk. That's what they got.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — And I want to share with the hon. member some comments that were passed along to me by way of a letter from a recipient of the farm purchase program, showing just how valuable that interest rebate is insofar as helping them with their costs, and I'll just read part of it. I'll just read part of it. It goes on to say:

Dear Mr. Minister. Today . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Today I received the cheque \$5,038.63 as part of your government's policy to reduce the interest on my loan with FCC to purchase land.

And get this, Mr. Speaker:

Even though my payment is not due until spring, it was a great help. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: —

I did have some concern about the way the rebate would be operated. It appeared I would have to make the total payment and then apply for a rebate. In the spring, with other costs, the waiting period for the processing would really hurt. You and your fellow colleagues must be commended for this foresight. It is like a breath of fresh air not to have a number of papers to fill out as other administrations do.

That's how we help farmers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Farm Purchase Plan

MR. LUSNEY: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture. I'd like to ask the Minister of Agriculture how the farm purchase plan is helping the many farmers that didn't get into the plan, that haven't purchased land at the 13 or 8 per cent interest rate? How is that helping them where they're faced with the high utility costs of power for drying grain this fall? And the hog producers who have to keep their plants going, the dairy producers who have to keep their refrigeration units going. How is that farm purchase really supposed to help them?

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Well, those same grain dryers are probably operating on natural gas, and thanks to the good wisdom of this government that the rates, number one, were frozen for a year; and number two, public utilities review commission has put fair and sensible rates, adjudicated by that commission, in front of the Saskatchewan public.

Insofar as how many farmers we've helped and how many more we could help, 1,800, Mr. Speaker, is only the beginning. The program has just been running a mere 10 months, and we are going to be well on target to rebating something like \$350 million in land transactions out there by the end of next March.

Now if you want to bring up comparisons as to how many people this administration has helped, and how many people you hurt with that vicious, despicable land bank legislation, I'd be only too happy to provide you with those numbers. In 10 months, we have put 1,800 beginning and young farmers on the way to farm ownership. What was your record in 10 years? 151. Now you tell me which program the people out there prefer. Farm purchase by a mile, a million miles, because not only do they have the ownership of their land, but as well, the other fantastic feature about that program is it's accomplishing exactly what the people out there wanted. It's assisting in that transfer from the fathers, the uncles, to the nephews, to the sons, and the older fellow across the road who wants to sell out to the young, beginning farmer.

I'm happy to report, Mr. Speaker, that between 50 and 60 per cent of those transactions are within the family tree, number one. And as well, 50 to 60 per cent of those transactions are for first-time beginning farmers, exactly what we wanted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LUSNEY: — Well, Mr. Minister, I don't think anybody objects to the farm purchase plan for those people that have used it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LUSNEY: — And I think the majority of those people are probably people that have plenty of money to get into it.

Mr. Minister, my question is: how. . . And I asked you how that plan would help the farmers with their utility rates, and you stated natural gas that they have for drying grain. Well, Mr. Minister, how many of those farmers out there today that haven't got natural gas and are having to use electricity to dry their grain with are being helped by your department? How many of them?

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. member trying to suggest that the 2,300-plus farmers out there that have been served by the rural natural gas distribution system have not been helped? Is that what you're trying to suggest?

Hog Marketing Commission

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture, or the minister better known as the minister of leafy spurge. It does not deal with utility rates, but another important matter that he may have some control over. I would wonder if the minister is considering setting up another hog marketing commission to control the mad rush to the trough that is occurring, of Tory supporters and candidate at this time in the Saskatchewan government.

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Mr. Speaker, I would ask the member to state his question again or rephrase it because, quite frankly, I didn't see the question.

Fibre Optics Industry in Saskatchewan

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the minister in charge of Sask Tel and has to do, Mr. Minister, with an industry that's capable of being a growth industry and making a significant contribution to the Saskatchewan economy. I refer to the production of coaxial cable by Northern Telecom, and I refer to the minister's statement quoted in the

November 22 edition of the *Leader-Post*, in which you stated that the production of fibre optics in this province by that company for Sask Tel was likely to be a losing proposition, such statement given at a PC convention.

My question to the minister is: does the minister think it's appropriate to cast doubt upon a legitimate Saskatchewan industry for what is purely in the interests of petty partisan politics?

HON. MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that the question is worthy of an answer. However, let me put it in perspective. The previous government commenced a fibre optic network which will cost, by the time it's completed, well over 100 millions of dollars. The fibre optic network will primarily be utilized in most communities for the movement of cable television signals. We run the very severe risk, with the changing technology in cable television — primarily direct broadcast satellites, or satellite communication, which may bypass the fibre optic network. Should that happen, we will probably have to write down the total investment in the fibre optic network, which will mean a loss of about 100 millions of dollars. That is precisely what I said.

I did not in any way criticize Northern Telecom. As a matter of fact, we've had several meetings with Northern Telecoms and Northern Telecom since. As a matter of fact, very recently. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to note that Northern telecom, since this government has taken office, has doubled its staff, doubled its number of employees in the city of Saskatoon. That's the record, Mr. Speaker, not the record that's trying to be portrayed by the member opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Will the minister admit that forecasting a future of high tech industries is a formidable task for the expert, and should have no place in the comments of a minister who has direct control over the industry, and who is attempting nothing other than to ingratiate himself with the delegates at the PC convention?

HON. MR. LANE: — I will be the first to admit that the changing technology, particularly in communications, is difficult for anyone to predict, which also may question the capital investment of \$100 million of taxpayers' money into the investment in the fibre optics network. However, you made that decision.

So, you can't have it both ways. You can't stand up and say that I shouldn't predict technology, and yet you make a substantial capital investment on it and say that it's all right. I suggest to you that that is a double standard of the highest order, and indicates the lack of awareness that that previous government had in terms of dealing with the communications industry. You couldn't keep up with cable television. If we had've had a CPN today, with the competition from First Choice and Superchannel, it would have been a bigger loser than it had. You couldn't keep up with the changing technology. You couldn't talk, and you talked about stopping beer ads. You couldn't produce on that one, because you couldn't keep up with the technology. I suggest that it's going to be very difficult for any government, any regulatory agency, to keep up with the changing technologies in cable television, and I suggest to you that that is one of the difficulties that the CRTC is having today: that every time it makes a ruling, that technology changes the next day.

It's going to be very difficult for everyone to keep up with the changing technology, and I simply suggest to you that that's all the more reason to be extremely cautious with major capital investments.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — New question, Mr. Speaker. Let me remind the minister that that industry is in Saskatchewan because the former government was not extremely cautious but was prepared to take some risks. I remind the minister that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Does the member have a question for the minister? This is not time for speechmaking.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — My question is: in light of the fact that the industry is in Saskatchewan because they received a large contract to produce coaxial cable for Sask Tel, and in light of the uncertainty of that industry, will the minister admit that he doesn't really know what he's talking about? Will he withdraw his remarks, and will he hereafter undertake to use a little more discretion when addressing the delegates at the PC convention in the future?

HON. MR. LANE: — Unfortunately, the difficulty the hon. member opposite has is that I know what I'm talking about and he doesn't. First of all, it's not coaxial cable that we're talking about; it's fibre optic cable. There's a big technical difference.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. LANE: — Secondly, as you produce fibre optic cable, particularly the single mode fibre which is now being produced, the demand for coaxial cable or copper cable being produced in Regina is dropping. You didn't realize the impact of that on your decision, or if you did, it will be interesting to hear your comments about that. So technologically and technically, I don't think you know what you're talking about.

Secondly, we have indicated now that that industry is there, and we have indicated to Northern Telecom and have made some firm financial commitments to Northern Telecom as to future development of that industry. We intend to honour that commitment. We intend to proceed and do whatever we can to assist in the development of that particular industry. Let me tell you that, with the admitted co-operation of the officials in Sask Tel, Northern Telecom was successful in obtaining the MCI contract between New York and Boston, which was the largest fibre optic contract yet awarded, of approximately \$100 million, and Northern Telecom will be the first to congratulate and acknowledge the support and assistance that Sask Tel has given.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

SGI's Suit Against Mr. Collver

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister in charge of SGI. It has to do with the apparent perversion of justice created by the termination of the suit against your former leader, resulting, I may say, in a potential loss of \$1 million to the taxpayer. And I remind the minister that several of the board members who made that decision . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, I'm sorry. Mr. Speaker has been diligent enough in his duties this morning that I thought I saw you standing up. I remind the minister of the fact that several of the board members had been candidates under the leadership of Mr. Collver. Others had been campaign manager and lesser lights. My question to the minister is: did Mr. Collver's former candidates, campaign managers, and other campaign workers on the board of directors show sufficient respect for the public trust imposed in them to declare a conflict of interest and absent themselves from that vote?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder how much respect the members opposite showed for the taxpayers' dollars when they filed a claim in 1978? I want to give a little background on this, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You asked a question. Do you want an answer? You asked a question. Do you want an answer? Mr. Speaker, the cause for this . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. I can't hear the minister, and I'm certain that you can't. Proceed, Mr. Minister.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this cause for action arose in

1976. The statement of claim was filed in 1978, Mr. Speaker, for the reason for political persecution of one individual. That statement of claim at that time, Mr. Speaker, was \$1,297,303.35.

If they had a case, why would they wait . . . In an amount of that size, why would they wait six years, and sit on it for six years, without proceeding with the case? Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the largest lawsuits ever, ever handled by SGI in their history, and an amount of over \$1.25 million, and they sat on it in 1978 when they filed claim.

Mr. Speaker, let me add another little bit of information for the hon. members opposite. From March of 1979 until they were defeated, in that period of time it was never once brought up at a board meeting of SGI, and I've searched the minutes of those board meetings.

So all of a sudden it was so important. Before 1978 – before the election of 1978 – it was a very important case; it was a large amount of money. But after the election, Mr. Speaker, after the election of 1978 they forgot all about it. Nothing happened after that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just to add a little more to the responsibility. The members opposite, I will remind them of contradictions and of political motivations, and the political persecution of this particular case. In May of 1978, when that statement of claim was filed . . . Mr. Speaker, that leader at the time, Mr. Blakeney, the Leader of the Opposition today, stated, when asked by reporters on a Friday, May 12 of 1978, that the matter had been brought up in cabinet several months ago. It was a political discussion. It was a political decision.

But, Mr. Speaker, furthermore, on that very same day, on that very same day when asked by reporters, the Minister of SGI at the time denied that it had ever been discussed in cabinet. I wonder who was telling the truth? Who was telling the truth at the time?

One more thing, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order please.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker, I believe that you called ministerial statements. I think . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I called ministerial statements and nobody moved. Now perhaps you couldn't hear. With permission of the House we'll revert to ministerial statements.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Job Creation Programs in Highways and Transportation Department

HON. MR. GARNER: — Mr. Speaker, I have an announcement I would like to make today to the Assembly that is proof of this government's commitment to creating employment.

Of late, members opposite have charged that we, as government, have done little in creating jobs in road construction and maintenance. Well, today I would like to refute those comments.

Today the Department of Highways and Transportation has released details of a \$24 million winter tender schedule that will create 275 jobs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. GARNER: — This winter tender package, Mr. Speaker, includes 25 grading, paving, and crushing projects, and the majority of this work will be done in the first three months of 1984. After April 1, the impact of the tendering program will mean as much as 600 additional jobs will be created during the summer of 1984.

Mr. Speaker, as this Assembly well knows, this government is committed to the private sector. I am pleased today to say that the road building industry of Saskatchewan will benefit directly from the release of this tender schedule. I know members opposite will not be pleased, Mr. Speaker, to hear this, especially the Leader of the Opposition. We have heard him harp of late on the need to create jobs. If his track record, Mr. Speaker, is any indication, that would mean expanded government work crews in the Department of Highways and Transportation.

Inasmuch as some in-house construction capacity is necessary, our government work crews should not be so large that they threaten the market-place and the balance of the road building industry. Our road builders in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, have the expertise and desire to give the people of Saskatchewan the best roads at the best price. The work we have scheduled for the winter months will provide the road building industry in Saskatchewan with the opportunity to keep people working in our great province. It will also give our road building industry the opportunity to plan their work schedule for 1984, and will afford them the opportunity to maintain an even operation throughout the winter months and the year ahead.

Further, the Department of Highways and Transportation will have good supplies of crushed gravel on hand when the summer construction season begins in 1984.

Mr. Speaker, this concludes my statement to the Assembly today. This government is committed to crating employment opportunities. This government is committed to a healthy private sector. Today's announcement, Mr. Speaker, is positive proof that the private sector, in co-operation with the provincial government, can now lead the way in providing jobs for Saskatchewan people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LUSNEY: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I find it very interesting that the Minister of Highways is announcing, in this House, in a ministerial statement, some work or some tendering that he is going to do this winter — work that has been budgeted last spring. The budget money was put in place last spring, and now he's going to tender that work out this winter to be done next year. He is not telling this House anything new. He is not telling the people anything different. It's something that's done on a yearly basis. Every government in the past has done the same. They tender a certain amount of work during the winter. And yet the minister uses this House as a publicity chamber, rather as a chamber to produce some definite type of programs that are going to help the people out there in Saskatchewan.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. LINGENFELTER: — On a point of order, Mr. Minister, on ministerial statements. I wonder if I could just bring to the Speaker's attention and that he would take the time to look at the script of the so-called ministerial statement made today and yesterday to see whether or not it fits within their purview and the rules of this Assembly, which in part state that statements by the minister in fact should be brief and factual. And I wonder if the statements being made in this House are in fact that, that are being made to help out the electorate and the population of Saskatchewan, or whether they're being made to promote political words and political thoughts and political views. If that were the case, I wish that Mr. Speaker would look at it and make a ruling on this issue.

MR. SPEAKER: — I'd be very pleased to look at the two ministerial statements that are mentioned, and I'll bring in a ruling on Monday.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the address in reply, which was moved by Mr. Schmidt.

MR. MORIN: — Mr. Speaker, I'll continue along in the vein that I was going yesterday, when we were beginning to talk about the development in the oil and energy sector in this province.

When we took government last year, or in 1982, Mr. Speaker, we heard the Leader of the Opposition stand up in this House say, in his squeaky little voice, "when will Saskatchewan . . . (inaudible) . . . the level of drilling activity that we enjoyed in 1980?" Now often, often in this House we've had people comment on the drilling activity in 1980, and those people in this House who are aware of the facts, who are aware of what took place in 1980, recognize that there was an increase, a record year in drilling activity in every jurisdiction in this country, and in fact world-wide, Mr. Speaker. And we're aware of that because of the future that people saw in the oil industry.

Well, in answer to that question — when will we reach the level of drilling production in 1980? — my colleague, the Minister of Energy, stood up here on November 18 — a week ago — and announced that we had broken that record of 1980. We broke that record and set a new one at a time when every other jurisdiction in the country, and in fact most jurisdictions in the world, are facing incredibly tough times in the oil industry. Every day, with every well drilled now in this province, we set a new record. The former premier asked when we would eclipse that record that had been set here in 1980, in spite of the government in power at that time, and our answer was: within the first full calendar year that we were in government.

In the area of natural gas drilling, there had been only 16 wells drilled in the 18 months prior to the election. There had been four drilled in the first three quarters of 1982, and what happened . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We were busy throwing the government out of power, that's what we were doing. In the first 10 months of 1983 there were 1237 wells drilled in the gas industry.

And what about land sales? You couldn't give away drilling rights in this province under the former government. We've had three land sales. We are headed to a fourth on the 8th of December, and we had record after record after record: 15.2 million, 15.3 million, 29.8 million. It's incredible, the interest in the oil industry in this province now.

AN HON. MEMBER: — How is the average citizen doing?

MR. MORIN: — Considerably better. They're working. They're working, for a change. Already there have been a thousand jobs created in the oil industry; \$500 million worth of economic investment. Half of that, half of that, fully \$250 million, stays in the province.

We've heard the opposition talk about the revitalization plan that we have, where we introduced the novel idea of royalty tax holidays, and they suggested that that would cost the people of this province \$100 million. Well, to begin with, their figures are wrong. If you protract the figures that we would have enjoyed, had activities stayed at the same rate as it was when we took government, that tax holiday would have cost \$40 million.

Now compare that to what they had in place. They had in place an oil field stimulation program which allowed you to write off your capital cost or your expenses against your production. The cost of that program ranged from \$40 million to \$60 million per year. And what was the effect of it? Who did it help? Firstly, who did it help? It helped the big guy, Mr. Speaker, not the little guy. If you and I and any members of this Chamber wanted to get together, form an oil company, and go and drill for Saskatchewan oil, did it help us? Not a bit. Not if we had no production to write

off our cost against. So who did it help? It helped the Imperial Oils of the world, the guys that could afford to punch a hole and write off the costs against all the production they already had. It didn't help the little guy in Saskatchewan. It didn't help the local oil industry, and 30 per cent, a full 30 per cent of the wells that they drilled were dry holes, which they paid for. They were rewarding the failure of the industry.

Who benefits, and who pays the cost of our program? It only rewards success. If you don't hit oil, you don't get anything. And look at the activity that we've got – 1,000 jobs in the province in that short period of time, and the capital investment, and people working all over. There's been talk about drilling up all over the country. Well that's just not the truth.

Drilling rigs in Alberta are up 12 per cent. Here in our province they're up 123 per cent. Land sales in Alberta are up 48 per cent. Here in Saskatchewan they're up 218 per cent. In *Hansard* on November the 18th, the Leader of the Opposition said that there were more oil wells drilled in Alberta, that every one is doing terrifically well, and they're all doing better than Saskatchewan. And yet, in the *Star-Phoenix* on November the 22nd, the headline is, "Alberta Oil Drilling in a Holding Pattern", and I'll read part of that article. This is out of Edmonton on Canadian Press:

Oil drilling in Alberta held up in 1982, while drilling for natural gas continued to nosedive. The 1982-83 report of the Alberta energy and natural resource development department shows: a release of the last year's annual report means provincial government figures now are complete for the first two years of activity under the national energy program of October 1980. They show oil activity in a general holding pattern, gas activity collapsing under pressure of energy policies, and weak markets.

And then the final paragraph of that article, they talk about total wells drilled in Alberta fell to 5,122 last year from 5,834 in 1981, and from 7,048 in 1980.

Successful oil development wells, whose production not necessarily qualifies for world price, were down from the 1980 peak reports showed.

And they go on and on talking about how terrible the industry is in Alberta. In Manitoba they show a bit of an increase. They're up about 20 per cent, but that's about like making the argument that the increase in the phone rates is 150 per cent. It's still only a 15-cent argument.

What about production in our province? In 1982 production averaged 140,000 barrels a day. In 1983 production is up to 160,000 barrels a day, and climbing.

You know, yesterday morning as I drove to the legislature, I heard the news, and one of the issues on the news was that Ipsco (Interprovincial Steel and Pipe Corporation Ltd.) was doing quite well. There was talk of a \$4 million profit, and they related it to activity in the Saskatchewan oil industry. And, coincidentally, right after the newscast, what should come on but an ad placed by the member for Regina Centre saying, "why doesn't the government do something to help Ipsco?"

AN HON. MEMBER: — We did, we did.

MR. MORIN: — Again, the members say that there's nothing in major papers about Saskatchewan. There's no good news. Well the *Calgary Herald* is a fairly major paper, particularly as it relates to all business. I'd like to read just the final paragraph from an editorial on the 5th of November.

Alberta would be wise to consider the outcome of the Saskatchewan experiment before it attempts to balance the books by reducing incentives which may still be necessary to help the recovery in an ailing industry.

Out of *Oilweek*, “Premier Devine’s Royalty Holiday,” talking about Saskatchewan:

From 1975 until December of 1982, Saskatchewan’s heritage fund awarded grants of up to 75 per cent of the total cost of drilling for all oil and gas wells. The results were generally dismal. The government paid from 40 million to 60 million annually to companies which drilled dry holes 30 per cent of the time.

Turnaround, Saskatchewan style.

Overall industry and government have benefited from the changes and will continue to do so. In talking about Saskatchewan, the provinces crown revenues are increasing while industry is being allowed to earn a reasonable profit to ensure these benefits can continue through future reinvestment. The Saskatchewan experience is truly an example for other governments to emulate.

What do we see when we read the good quality magazine, the good quality paper, that the gentlemen opposite read – something called the *Commonwealth* which most of us are not familiar with? On page 15, they’re talking about resolutions, and they say:

Be it resolved that an NDP government in Saskatchewan would sue public sector investment in the resource development to get the resource industry in the province moving once again.

That resolution comes out of Saskatoon Mayfair. I have a very good colleague from Saskatoon Mayfair. If that’s the type of resolution that the opposition can bring out of his riding, then I think he’ll hold that riding for as long as he wants it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MORIN: — I’d like to turn for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to the riding of The Battlefords. Anyone in this House who has had the opportunity to travel through that region will know that it’s probably the most beautiful area of the province. People up there are rather unique; they’re free thinkers. They tend to stand on their own feet and don’t look to government for too much help.

What benefit has there been to the riding of The Battlefords through the change in government, and what benefit is there for the riding of The Battlefords in the Speech from the Throne? Well, certainly every member of my riding benefited from the reduction in gas tax; 148 people in my riding qualified under the Build-A-Home program; 62 jobs were created through the small business tax credit in my riding; 143 jobs were created through Opportunities ’83 – 143 of my young people working that wouldn’t have been working under the former government; 59 people working under last year’s winter works program; and from January 1, 1983 until September 1, we had 26 new businesses open, and they employ 47 people in my riding.

Now, the members opposite think that anybody that doesn’t hire more than five people, any business like that, that’s not worth talking about. Well, I think it is. If we had 1,000 people come into this province, and each one wanted to open a business, and all they employed was one person, I think that would be worth talking about. This is a radical change from having to build walls at the border to keep your people at home.

Where would they like to take us? Who were their friends, and what did they do? You know, reading the resolutions to their convention just makes me happier and happier that we did what we did in 1982. We hear them complain about the economic policies they see around them, and around the world, and yet they seem to be the only people around that haven’t woke up to reality.

In China, they're giving incentive bonuses to the people to encourage production; 15 per cent of the land in Poland is privately held, and it produces, proportionately, considerably more than 15 per cent of the output. And even in Russia, Mr. Speaker, where they subscribe to Mr. Marx and Mr. Engels, and their theory that, you know, from each according to ability, and to each according to need.

I quote from *Maclean's*:

Andropov's war on alcoholism is lost. On paper, the policy has a ring of fairness. (And they're talking about Mr. Andropov's new policy.) Andropov recently said of his plan to tie wages to productivity: . . .

A novel idea, tying wages to productivity.

. . . from each according to ability; to each according to work.

Now isn't that a novel idea? But the gentlemen down here haven't heard about it.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, what do we really need in this province? I think we have no lack of opportunity. We are among the most fortunate places anywhere in the world. The real challenge that we face is the wise management of our resources, and the commitment to make everything that we can out of those resources, to see the development that could be here in this province.

I'm sure that the members on the government side of the House would be happy to work co-operatively with the members of the opposition, if they'd just quite playing jiggery-pokery with numbers, and quit trying to score political points, and admit that in certain areas we have done a terrific job, that they are envious of our record. And, Mr. Speaker, when they are, I'm sure that we'll be prepared to co-operate for the betterment of the province.

Mr. Speaker, I'll be supporting the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. LANE: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it's with a great deal of pleasure I join to participate in the throne speech debate. It's particularly opportune today, as the members opposite are embarking on a foray to Saskatoon, where I gather from what they've said some very weighty measures will be discussed, debated, and argued. Mr. Speaker, all of the province will watch the NDP convention — except that part that's on during the Grey Cup, or the part that's on in the evenings, or the part that's on Saturday morning, or the part that's on Friday afternoon, or the part that's on Friday morning, and many people will be watching the church services on Sunday morning. So, Mr. Speaker, it's only the politicians that perhaps have an interest on what's going on in Saskatoon.

There's some humorous events going on. We've heard some indication that members opposite are going to be involved in a presidential race, and after the debacle of a year ago, a year and a half ago, the New Democratic Party dug deep for someone to take charge of the Party, to lead the Party out of the wilderness and on to bigger and better things, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Well, they went and talked Harry Van Mulligen into running. Now, Harry Van Mulligen . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — He's not political.

HON. MR. LANE: — Now, that's a little difficult for the Party after, because here they have, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Mr. Harry Van Mulligen. According to what Harry Van Mulligen tells the government, he's just a recent convert to the New Democratic Party. He was never involved

before the government put him out onto the streets, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Here they have a newcomer – didn't have a membership until after he lost his job and had to turn to the New Democratic Party for a little work.

So then they found Mr. Reg Gross. He can't keep a job in politics, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Every time he gets his head above water, the people wake up and throw him out of office. And then their third choice is Delaine Scotton, who got them to where they are today. Mr. Deputy Speaker, those are the choices that the New Democrats have facing them this weekend.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they have another side issue that some of them over there are hoping doesn't come to the fore. I gather I was threatened with lawsuits the other day because I happened to find out about a fishing trip – a fishing trip that the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg had in northern Saskatchewan with another NDP MLA. I want you to picture the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg and another NDP member sitting in their little boat out there, with that 2 horsepower putting away in the back, a couple of cans of beers, fishing rod over the edge, discussing a little politics. Says the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, "I think . . . I think Blakeney's got to go." Immediately, the other member says, "I agree with you. Let's catch some fish." That was the sum total of the discussion.

So then he hopped in his little aeroplane, did a little visiting to some of the MLAs. He said, "Blakeney's got to go. We've got to get rid of our leader." Oh, that's what's going on up there, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that when they go up to their convention, they've got this triumvirate, triumvirate of people that can't win elections, can't keep a party membership, or don't get one till late, or bring them to election defeat. But underneath, underneath, the big news that this convention is going to be to the group of MLAs over there: dump their leader – dump their leader, get rid of the now Leader of the Opposition and former premier of this province. Oh, yes.

We look at the campaign that's going on, and all of a sudden it's becoming well noted during this session, Mr. Deputy Speaker. All of a sudden we find out from around the province that the member from Regina Centre has been holding secret meetings, trying to get delegate support around the province, for the last year. We find the member from Shaunavon has got his hand-picked candidate, formerly the member from Morse, Mr. Gross, running for president. He's going to lead the campaign, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Really, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the issue of the campaign, the issue at this convention, is going to be whether all of those people holding their secret meetings can screw up their political courage and come forward and stand up and address the Leader of the Opposition on where they stand on leadership. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't think they've got the political fortitude to tell him to his face what they are doing behind his back.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. LANE: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, we take a look at what is happening to the New Democratic Party on the national level. We get the member from the west side, Meadow Lake, Mr. Anguish, NDP member. He wants to dump his federal leader. His provincial members want to dump his provincial leader. It got so bad down there, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that Mr. Broadbent was in the hospital a week ago for a back operation. They said it was a slipped disc, but it was suturing his back from all the knife wounds from the New Democratic Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. LANE: — And I strongly suspect that two or three weeks from now, and I hope it's not over Christmas, that the present Leader of the Opposition is going to be hospitalized from back wounds from his own MLAs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's what's going to be happening. It will be very, very interesting. It'll be very, very interesting if we see the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, who's been touring

this province saying that Blakeney has to go, whether he's got the courage to stand up at that convention and say, "I'm for dumping the leader." I'll betcha, I'll betcha he doesn't. But I caution the members opposite, I caution the members opposite of what your party members are going to think of your activities. And I don't think they're going to be very, very happy, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I strongly suspect that when the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg goes into that convention, it's going to be spread all around – he's here to dump the leader. He's here to dump the leader. The member from Shaunavon . . . The word is going to be all around, he's here to dump the leader. Mr. Gross is going to be spreading the word, "I'm not really dumping the leader." Mr. Van Mulligen is saying, "I'm not really here to dump the leader, but maybe we should take a look at it." Delaine Scotton is going to stand up and say, "It's not my fault we lost the election. It's not my fault; it's the leader's fault." That's what this convention is going to be, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I indicated that the convention was going to discuss some very weighty topics. And I think I've indicated primarily what's going to be going on. And I'll tell you why I can suggest that with a degree of authority, because I read through the list of resolutions. I read through the list of resolutions.

Here is a party that is the spokesman for the left – the socialists as they call themselves. These were supposed to be the party of ideas. That's what they told us. You'll notice that so far in this session they have not come up with one single, new idea. Every time in question it's been negative; it's defeated; it's depression. That's what they want, is they want a depression. But not one single new idea has been brought forward by the New Democratic Party. And let me tell you why. And let me tell you why. Let me tell you, here are some of the new ideas in the NDP convention '83.

BE IT RESOLVED that the NDP press for controls on the import of produce, especially from the U.S. . .

Well, here they have a new idea. They want the kids to stop eating U.S. oranges. They don't want the children to eat B.C. apples. They don't want the children to eat bananas from another country. This is one of the weighty resolutions that the NDP are going to debate during this campaign. Don't even buy orange juice, for heaven's sake. Don't even buy orange juice. They don't want their kids to eat or drink oranges.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, here's a proposal that the NDP have. Now it's not new, because they had it in this House before, but they think they made a mistake.

BE IT RESOLVED as NDP policy that an inheritance be introduced . . .

Oh, an inheritance tax. Succession duties. Death taxes. Death taxes will be brought back by the New Democratic Party. There is the resolution. Here is the interesting thing. Here's the interesting thing about that: who is proposing the resolution? Last Mountain-Touchwood, the home of the former minister of agriculture, Mr. MacMurchy. He wants death taxes, succession duties, and inheritance taxes brought back. And we all know that he's still controlling the puppets opposite at this convention, and I suggest that that will be a matter of deep concern to the people of this province who are concerned about increasing taxes, and particularly already have thrown out death taxes in this province.

The NDP are also going to spend hours debating the installation of seat belts in school buses. The NDP want to spend a great deal of time . . . Now this is weighty. This is important, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I ask hon. members to listen to this, because I know that this is important.

BE IT RESOLVED as NDP policy that each driver's licence have a photograph of the driver on it.

When people are talking about jobs and employment and job creation, they want to make sure

that each driver's licence has a picture of the driver on it.

This is also weighty. This is also weighty, very important. Very important, because I know that the hon. members opposite don't like to hear this.

BE IT RESOLVED as NDP policy that stricter enforcement of laws governing licensing of out-of-province vehicles be adopted.

Also very important when we're talking about jobs, employment. The NDP are on record. They don't want fairness for the workers. They want to repeal Bill 104. Here they are, hiding behind Nadine Hunt's coat-tails. They want Bill 104 repealed. Oh, but this is important. This is very, very important. We all know that the socialists don't like to work. Everybody knows that. Everybody accepts that – that 'hard work' are two four-letter words that they don't like to use. We all know that. So the NDP are proposing at their convention that we now drop to a 32-hour work week. That's the NDP policy.

The NDP policy don't want the private sector in the parks. I have a resolution to that effect. Oh, they also don't like government efficiency. They also don't like government efficiency, because the NDP are going to pass a resolution wanting to stop this government from requesting the employees to fill out the efficiency questionnaire that we submitted. That's what they think of government. If government isn't big, fat, bloated, and lazy, the NDP aren't happy, and they make that quite clear at their convention.

These are some of the weighty, weighty matters. They don't like liquor advertising, and I've got some comments I'm going to make on that, Mr. Speaker, which I think the hon. members opposite will find very enlightening. Oh, oh, oh – here's a big one. Here's a biggie. Now, the NDP in their wisdom, sitting out in Last Mountain-touchwood, I guess or . . . No, this is Thunder Creek. Some NDP in Thunder Creek, who's got his ear to the ground of international diplomacy, has got some information that the U.S. military . . . the Korean jetliners was used as a spy vehicle for the military. So he doesn't like that. He doesn't like that, so that they are now going to condemn the federal NDP, which failed to condemn the United States for using this secret information that this prominent supporter in Morse has received from some, some, some source.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Whose side are they on?

HON. MR. LANE: — Well, they've got some more. They want us out of NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization). They want Canada out of NATO. Whose side are you on? When the former premier was over in Russia, he never mentioned nuclear disarmament or disarmament once. When he comes here to talk and berate the United States, he wants the United States to fold up, give up everything, pack it up, and let the Russians take over. That's the NDP policy – unilateral disarmament.

So they want freedom of information. Now they were in government for how many years? Eleven long, lean years. They want freedom of information. Why do they want freedom of information? Because, according to the NDP, we live in a society in which information is controlled by capitalist interests, which manipulate it to promote their own ends. That's why the NDP want freedom of information, not so that the average person can make informed decisions – because the capitalists are manipulating the system.

I'll talk a little later about the press and manipulation. I may have some comments, but I am sure that what I have to say indicates, and will give irrefutable proof, that it ain't the capitalists that are benefiting by some of the press.

Now here's another one. Here's another one. I think it's very important that the public get an idea of what the NDP are talking about, because this is very, very important. We now stop the produce coming out of California, the apples from B.C., and bananas from wherever, and the

watermelons. They don't want watermelons in here.

So now what are they going to do? They're going to expand their horizons. They're going to support an embargo on all products from Chile, South Africa, the Philippines, Argentina, and South Korea. That's the international scope. If you aren't a left-wing fascist government, you don't get the support of the members opposite. That's precisely what the members opposite stand for.

Oh, oh. But they've really learned. They've really learned since the last election. The last election was not the fault of the previous government. No, no. Here's the problem with the last election. They've analysed this now for 18 months, and they've come up with the solution in why they lost the last election.

I'm sure the political scientists are going to be happy to read this one because I'm sure this is something that they missed. This is from Humboldt:

Whereas spring elections cause a great inconvenience to the rural sector, and whereas it would appear that elections are more difficult to win during the spring, be it resolved as NDP policy that no more provincial elections be called in the spring.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. LANE: — That's what they're talking about. That's what the next three days are all about.; Oh sure, that's the reason. You know, we had some misconceptions as to why we won the election. We thought we had better policies, better organized, better people, and more and better in tune with the people of the province. But here we were wrong. Here we were wrong.

Well, I'll be very pleased to see the doctoral thesis of the former member from Wascana, talking about this explanation of why the previous government was defeated.

But then they fine-tuned their policy. They fine-tuned it. Not only they don't want any more spring elections because they're difficult to win; they now have chosen the date. They have now chosen the date when elections are prime for the NDP. Maybe we should listen to this:

BE IT RESOLVED as NDP policy that the provincial legislation be amended to provide an election be held on the second Wednesday of June every fourth year.

That's going to solve all the problems, let me tell you. Keep thinking that way. Keep thinking that way. I'm certainly hopeful that the political scientists that advise you . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, this is NDP resolutions, 1983. I know the hon. member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg is a little touchy about this. Trying to dump the leader. He hadn't read the resolution. He spent all his time flying around, dumping the leader. He hasn't spent any time reading what's coming out.

So then we look at some of the others that . . . Oh yes, the NDP policy . . . And those that supported the former leader in his constitutional endeavours probably weren't aware of the NDP policy which says that Quebec has a right to self-determination. That's a great resolution in the interests of national unity, but many of us have known where the NDP have stood for some time.

They support the right to freedom of choice on abortions. We all have known that. And then they support Canada's withdrawal from NATO. They want child care centres: you know, nice little communal centres where they can bring their doctrine down to the children of the province of Saskatchewan beyond the school system. That's what they want.

Mr. Speaker, to show you how alert they are, to show you how alert and how much attention they've been paying to the session, and to the government policies that have been coming out . . . Saltcoats. The NDP wanted: resolved that the NDP support the senior citizens' initiative to have

foot care included under medicare – already having been done and announced in the last budget by the Minister of Health.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. LANE: — But they want medicare expanded. The NDP want medicare expanded, because the next resolution says: be it resolved as NDP policy that the cost of services of a licenced masseur be included in the provincial medicare plan. That's their new ideas for health. Massage parlours around the province is their idea for health.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. LANE: — Mr. Baker, we're talking about a party bankrupt of ideas, bereft of ideas, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's gotta be a little bit depressing for the people of Saskatchewan when they get a chance to read through the NDP resolutions.

They want to expropriate any crown corporation sold by the present government for \$1. And as things develop over the future, we will remind the people of Saskatchewan as to their policy of expropriating back for \$1 assets sold by this government. Because I suggest to those who have brought their land bank land back, that should the NDP ever be re-elected, they will expropriate it for \$1. And that is precisely what the NDP policy is.

Oh, but somebody out there . . . I think we missed one, because somewhere there's a businessman, and he resides in Souris-Cannington. He resides in Souris-Cannington. There's a businessman, because there may be one sane voice. Be it resolved . . . They decided that maybe they're out of touch with business. They spend half their convention resolutions kicking business – big, small, and medium size – kicking them, wanting to take them over, nationalize them, wanting the workers to go out on strikes on the small businessmen. But one of them says: be it resolved that a committee within the party organization be selected to meet with business groups, such as bureau of independent business, local chambers of commerce, and trade organizations, to hear and discuss their concern. Someone. Someone.

But are they happy with the way the NDP have run things in the past? Obviously not, because now they want secret ballots. Now they want secret ballots. We bring them in for the trade union movement. The NDP are against them. But their own party now want secret ballots because they know how they have been whipped so hard and manipulated in the past. A rather double standard, isn't it? A rather double standard when this government brings in secret ballots for the workers of this province. The NDP have fought it and opposed it, but now they want a little of that inside because some of them are afraid to stand up. I'll bet you the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg who's been sneaking around the province probably had that desire for a secret ballot so he didn't have to stand up and be counted.

Are the NDP dissatisfied with the approach taken by their caucus members? Certainly. Listen to this:

BE IT RESOLVED that the NDP election advertising be more positive and informative about NDP policy and platform.

Mr. Speaker, their own party members are fed up with the negative approach taken by their MLAs.

Mr. Speaker, there is a couple of other topics I would like to address. One of them is the question of hypocrisy, and it's going to deal with the hypocrisy of a prominent spokesman for the New Democratic Party, Mr. Faris, former member of this Assembly, former cabinet minister, member of the treasury benches. And it's also going to deal with the hypocrisy of the stand of the New Democratic Party on beer and wine advertising.

I'm going to read some of the items from the Faris report, and I'm going to ask the people in the press gallery when they listen to Don Faris in the future, that they ask him some questions because some of them actually believe Don Faris is being a concerned citizen in this matter.

Don Faris chaired the committee that recommended that the drinking age be reduced from 19 to 18. Don Faris chaired the committee that legislative provision be made to allow liquor board stores in major urban centres to remain open till 2 a.m. The NDP Don Faris proposed that the Government of Saskatchewan review the forenoon hours of opening of liquor board stores with a view to providing more convenient service. They want an extension of the hours of service in licensed premises. And I'm going to run through some of them.

The NDP Don Faris was the one who stood up and proposed that low alcohol content beers and wines be sold in the grocery stores, and that's in the Faris report. That's in the Faris report: that beer kegs be available for sale; that self-service be allowed on an optional basis; that off-sale in beverage rooms and cocktail lounges and dining rooms be allowed. That's the Faris report.

I'm going to summarize Mr. Faris' position. I'm going to ask those that perhaps run into Mr. Faris on occasion . . . You'll see him at the convention; you'll see him at the convention. Because what does Mr. Faris say in the Faris report? And this is an addendum, an appendix, appendix (f): "Reservations to the Report" by Mr. Faris. These are his own comments, his own views, and what he say about beer and win advertising, or what he doesn't say, and I urge the hon. members to listen because Mr. Faris is going to be eating his words over and over and over again by the time that this government is finished unmasking him for the hypocritical positions that he has taken. He said there is one way and one way only to stop consumption of alcohol:

Only sharp and steady price increases will reduce cigarette consumption, and alcohol consumption.

Only steady price increases will reduce consumption – not advertising. He made no comment, and I urge those that hear Mr. Faris to sit down and unmask him themselves, and ask him is he taking his position for cheap, partisan, political gain, because if he's now changed his position he had ample time to study it in the past. I think he needs to be held to public account. And I'm prepared, I'm prepared publicly, because he can't be here to defend himself, to take that issue out to the public where Mr. Faris can defend himself before the public.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. LANE: — He goes on further, goes on further, page 95:

But the pricing policy to cut back on overall consumption is the most important idea.

That's Mr. Faris' stand in 1973.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Did you read what he said about minors?

HON. MR. LANE: — Yes. Yeah, we could talk about the extension of liquor sales to minors and access of liquor to minors. We know where the NDP in Manitoba stands on booze – introducing same day home delivery service. Their idea of rural natural gas, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is to ship the booze out around the province by taxi. That's what they want: C.O.D. – cash on delivery. That's where the NDP stands, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I'll take it a step further. I'll take it a step further. I went back and checked some of *The Commonwealth*. For the public information, *the Commonwealth* is the NDP party paper published, in many cases, with out a great deal of relevancy and objectivity. But I found the 1955, December 21, *Commonwealth*. What do I see? An ad by Drury's, the Manitoba division,

Western Canadian Breweries Ltd., an ad in *The Commonwealth*, a beer ad in *The Commonwealth*. I go back to December 21. Look at page four of *The Commonwealth*, the NDP paper – Shea's Winnipeg Brewery Ltd. advertisement.

The NDP, I suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are either taking a stand that is hypocritical or they're taking their stand for cheap political purposes. None of it, Mr. Speaker, none of the words uttered by the NDP and its henchmen have any ring of credibility when we go back and we take a look at the record of the NDP in office – wanting price increases; nothing said about beer and wine. Mr. Faris says the way to stop consumption is higher prices. We look to their colleagues in Manitoba that believe in cash on delivery, home delivery of booze, and then we take a look at their historical record in *The Commonwealth*. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the public will be made well aware of the hypocritical position of the New Democratic Party.

The public will also be made aware of another area where the NDP have shown a considerable degree of hypocrisy. And I'm going to table some of these documents because I want not only the public today to know that these are now public records, but so that future generations, when they try and find out what caused the disappearance of the NDP, when they're looking historically as to why did the New Democratic Party fall off the face of the political and electoral map of Saskatchewan, they can read some of these records. I suppose I could send them to archives. It would probably be better in archives. They won't need them for 20 years. But I'll put them on today so the political scientists can see, and so that the press, the press can see. The press can see . . . I'm going to table first of all a confidential letter, a copy of a confidential letter, to the Hon. Allan E. Blakeney, then premier and president of executive council, and members of the council, from the former minister in charge of SGI, Mr. Whelan:

The purpose of this memorandum is to inform cabinet that the board of directors of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office will be requested to appoint Don W. Cody to a position on the executive committee of the corporation. Mr. Cody was employed by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office from the years '63 to '67, and upon leaving the corporation was an adjuster in the claims service, stationed in Saskatoon. He was then employed by Co-op Insurance Services Limited, achieving a supervisory level in the claims division.

He ceased to be actively appointed by the Co-op Insurance Services Limited when appointed a member of the executive council in 1973.

For the public what that means, of course, is Mr. Cody was appointed to cabinet, obviously on a temporary basis. Mr. Cody couldn't find work after he was defeated in 1974. So what did the NDP do to a defeated cabinet minister? A supervisor, an insurance adjuster, he got the quickest and biggest promotion in the history of the insurance business anywhere in North America. He went from being an adjuster to the boss, right after the election.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cody started in 1975 at \$2,018 per month. No credentials whatsoever, except that he was a defeated NDP cabinet minister.

I'll read some of the other. I'll read some of the others, and I'm going to put a list of them in. I'm going to list some of the others. This is what the NDP did in the office, and I caution the public to remember that because the NDP are trying to leave the impression that they never appointed a friend of theirs. Who do they expect the Tories to appoint? Harry Van Mulligen? Harry Van Mulligen? They want us to keep Harry Van Mulligen on. Nadine Hunt – committed to defeating the Conservative government? Are these the people that they want appointed? Or do they want us to appoint John Burton? Because they had hired Mr. John Burton, defeated NDP candidate, former NDP member of parliament, executive director of transportation agency. He was making nearly \$63,000 a year.

Linda Dufour, executive officer of the provincial NDP, was supposed to become assistant chief electoral officer until the government changed. Don Faris. Don Faris was appointed – defeated NDP cabinet minister – was appointed as director of communications and education, department of co-ops, for a salary of \$3,500 in 1981. Margaret Fern, defeated NDP candidate, appointed intergovernmental officer 3, paid \$9,700 as an honorarium for special services, plus being hired in the government.

Defeated federal NDP candidate, Jules Friesen, was hired as co-ordinator of adult education information. David Henley, defeated NDP candidate in the federal election for Moose Jaw, given a job with Saskoil at \$2,500 per month, plus raises, subsequently manager of community and public affairs, \$3,078 per month.

Don Keith, defeated NDP candidate, appointed general manager of Sask Development fund. Jim Leggett, defeated NDP candidate Bengough-Milestone, given position in transportation agency. Howard Lucas, appointed senior industrial relations officer, Department of Labour, defeated NDP candidate 1978, Rosthern. Kimberley Lusney – we've had that name before – daughter of the present NDP member, given a job with the government. Gordon McNeill, defeated NDP MLA, hired as northern liaison officer, SMDC. Holly Ann Knott, defeated NDP candidate, hired as solicitor by the potash corporation.

Louis Roy, defeated NDP candidate in Prince Albert-Duck Lake, given a job with the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. Len Warwick, sought NDP nomination in Saskatoon Sutherland, given a job with SMDC, corporate affairs department. Chris Bahnman, defeated NDP candidate Rosthern, Saskatoon Nutana, appointed to a board commission by the NDP government.

Ted Glover, special assistant to Edgar Kaeding, former minister of rural affairs, federal NDP candidate for Milestone. Bill Knight, former NDP MP, appointed assistant provincial principal secretary to the former premier.

Ted Koskie, appointed executive assistant to the Minister of Consumer Affairs, brother of Murray Koskie, former NDP minister. Barbara Kramer, daughter of Eiling Kramer, former NDP cabinet minister, executive assistant to the former minister of industry and commerce. Alex Kuziak, defeated NDP member, cabinet minister, appointed to the boards. Allan Oliver, former NDP MLA, elected 1971, defeated '75, appointed to the highway traffic board.

Aden Owens, Alex Taylor, defeated candidates, appointed to various government positions. Alex Taylor couldn't find a job. It's amazing how defeated NDP cabinet ministers can't get work in the real world, isn't it? Every time they get defeated they can't go out and make an honest living. They can't go out and find a job getting their hands dirty. They can't go out and work like the average citizen has to do. They can't go out and run a small business. No, the government has to bail them out and hire them, and the NDP had to put their defeated cabinet ministers into full-time paid positions – not even boards. They had to put them into full-time positions because they can't get a job out there.

I go to Marjorie Cooper. Her son did very, very well. She was a former CCF MLA whose son was assistant to the minister of transportation. Helped Struthers get several contracts from the NDP. Terry Hansen, former defeated MLA, was given an honorarium for special services from the Department of Agriculture, Louise Simard sought the nomination for the NDP in Regina North West – received honorarium as the assistant chairman of the human rights commission. Howard Leeson, former deputy minister of intergovernmental affairs, was paid \$65,000. He happened to be president of the New Democratic Party in Alberta – brought here at \$65,000 a year. Don McMillan, former special adviser to the minister responsible . . . the NDP had proposed to make the former chief electoral officer and organizer deputy minister of communications — \$63,000. Martin Semchuk, former NDP MLA, defeated, got employment contracts with the Department of Highways from 1971 until 1982. I'm going to table those, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I have several others. I won't take the time of the House, but we will table them as well.

I want to make sure that the press . . . Some of them are getting the impression that this is something new; it has never been done before. The NDP had more people at the political trough than any other party in the history of this country. The NDP did more to politicize the civil service in every province in which they have attained government than any other political party. Mr. Speaker, their record of politicizing the civil service and their record of patronage is something that other political parties learn from – not the other way around.

I frankly have some reservations, quite bluntly, about the press coverage on the double standard. I remember the press coverage and the decision of the press that the appointments to the human rights commission were political. There was a herd instinct in there. They weren't prepared to write it any other way. I do give the CBC a little credit because the new chairman of the human rights commission, in whom I think the public of Saskatchewan if they don't already have soon will have a great deal of faith, has gone from being a Tory political appointment to a very remarkable individual, because that he is.

We made appointments to the human rights commission because there were groups out there, disadvantaged groups, that didn't have representation before. We didn't do the political blood test that the previous government did, as admitted by the now Leader of the Opposition, but still the press insisted that it was to be political. Some of them are starting to come around, Mr. Deputy Speaker. To them I give credit. But I take a look at a story that wasn't written, about the closure of Intercontinental Packers, by the *Leader-Post*. The editorial said:

The government denies it had any forewarning of an anticipated Regina closure when it sold its shares at a loss, or that the government gave up its equity to escape the political heat the province is facing . . . (inaudible) . . .

No, we didn't have the forewarning. I'll tell you why we didn't have the forewarning because the NDP burned the records of the crown investments corporation meetings. And it wasn't till subsequent decisions to close the plant that we got the information, and we got it from Intercontinental Packers. But what did the NDP member Mr. Shillington, the MLA from Regina Centre, say? "this is a straight betrayal of 140 workers and a straight betrayal of the city of Regina by this government." Do you stand by that statement?

AN HON. MEMBER: — I sure do.

HON. MR. LANE: — He stands by that statement, because I'm going to table some records. I'm going to table some records. If there is a betrayal, the hon. member should resign his seat if he calls it a betrayal because here's the truth – here's the truth, of the Intercontinental Packers closure. I'm going to table after I've read it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the record from Intercontinental Packers' board minutes.

I'm going to put it in perspective because with 40 per cent government ownership, the government, the previous government, had some of its appointees on the board. They were Stephan Barg and Garry Beatty, formerly head of the crown investments corporation. They were at this meeting. They were at the meeting which in fact indicated the pressures that the NDP had put on, but they also endorsed and carried the resolution, reviewed a report and recommendations pertaining to construction of a distribution building in Saskatoon to enable the current Regina operations to be moved to the Saskatoon plant. That was a 1981, November 4 meeting.

The NDP . . . and we're going to send a copy of this to every one of the workers laid off, that the NDP made that decision in 1981 when they were on the board. The NDP made the decision. The NDP made the decision and then burned the records. There should be a story as to the records that were burned by the previous administration.

I'm going to add a little more, because they may come up and say it didn't go to cabinet, that he didn't know about it even though he was in the cabinet at the time. I'm going to table a copy of a letter, a copy of a letter from the now president of Intercontinental Packers Ltd. It's dated November 128, 1983.

I have enclosed a copy of the Intercontinental Packers Ltd. directors' minutes from November 4, 1981 and June 10, 1982 which indicate the former government directors agreed to the closing of the Regina plant as shown in the June minutes. As well, they funded, through Industry and Commerce, \$45,000 of a \$75,000 study completed on October 31, 1981, by Knud Simonsen Engineering, which recommended closing the Regina plant.

Not only did they know about it and kept it from the people of Saskatchewan, they helped pay for the study that resulted in the closure of the Regina plant. That's what the NDP did.

I'm going to table as well the letter because Mr. Mitchell said we could table the letter.

For your information, I personally informed Mr. Blakeney in his office . . .

I think the hon. member should hear this.

For your information, (this is Mr. Mitchell) I personally informed Mr. Blakeney in his office, in the fall of 1981, that we would close the Regina plant in 1983, and he concurred it was a right decision.

That's the truth about the NDP and Intercontinental Packers and not one of the members – not one of the NDP members – was prepared to stand up and tell the truth. No. What did they say? They accused this government of betraying the workers.

The betrayal and the cover-up went back to 1981, and I suggest we're getting very close to privilege. If that hon. member was in the cabinet and had full knowledge when he made that statement, he obviously misled certainly the people of Saskatchewan, and particularly the people of Regina, with his statement attempting to put the blame on the government.

I am going, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to table the documents. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm not sure I'd put the blame, because we didn't have the records at that time either. I'm sure, however, that a phone call by the press to Saskatoon could have got the true facts.

I look at some other activities in my favourite newspaper here in Regina. That's not the *Commonwealth*. The *Commonwealth's* my second favourite newspaper because I get lots of information from the *Commonwealth*, information . . . The hon. members are a little embarrassed. And it's too bad, with colour cameras and what not, that we can't have the cameras on the NDP right now because the people of Saskatchewan would see a deep blush of embarrassment and shame of the NDP for the records that are being brought forward.

All of a sudden I see a legislative notebook. The pomp and pageantry that went outside the marble palace cost \$20,000. I was in this House since 1971 and I never saw an article by the *Leader-Post* about legislative notebooks, and I never saw an historical record of the cost. One could get the impression that that was a costly venture. It was no different than any other legislative opening, and I think in fairness that that should have been said.

I take a look as well at an article in the *Leader-Post* the other day about the record oil and gas: "Record oil and gas well drilling record set," and it's from a ministerial statement by the Minister of Energy – record wells drilled. What he said in his statement, however, because it's an important political issue . . . Now we can debate it back and forth, the rightness or the wrongness, but I think in fairness that our position should have at least been stated, because it

was in the statement.

It's a political issue as to whether we're, as a government, giving give-aways to the oil industries, that the supposed cost . . . It turns out in the ministers' statement, in the minister's statement in this Assembly, he made it abundantly clear to the people of Saskatchewan that the Progressive Conservative royalty tax structure is far cheaper than the NDP grant program, far cheaper than the NDP give-aways to the big oil companies.

Is there any mention of that in the article? No mention of that in the article. I will attribute that to an oversight, but I think, when the political issue is there . . .

As I say, one can debate it back and forth whether it's good, bad, or indifferent, but when the issue is so obvious to everyone, I think in fairness the position should have put in. I find, as well, in the *Leader-Post* the other day an article that they are now going to recommence a column called "Under the Dome." Now that was an entertaining article, and it used to run in the early '60s, early 1970. Someone will have to convince me, someone will have to convince me of the independence of the *Leader-Post*, when shortly after the NDP government is elected in 1971, the *Leader-Post* quit running "Under the Dome." They quit running the political analysis because they didn't want anyone to start to do an in-depth look at the New Democratic Party. And someone's going to convince me that it's fate that the *Leader-Post* today, after the NDP are defeated, decides to resurrect "Under the Dome." Now that's obviously their right, I have no criticism. They can do what they want. But let's not try and convince the public that there's not a bias. And let's not try and convince the public that that paper is doing an equal service or disservice to all political parties. All I suggest to the press is: you made the rules when we were in opposition; apply the same rules. I can live with them. I have no problem living with them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. LANE: — But don't go changing the rules in midstream.

The NDP now criticize a couple of more items. The NDP criticize the deficit. Let me indicate what the NDP said about the deficit back in 1973. Here's what the NDP said about a deficit. And it's the then minister, provincial treasurer before he became minister of finance, at page 547 of *Hansard*:

However, Mr. Speaker, our government (that is the NDP government) is by no means bound to a balanced budget. Indeed should the economic situation warrant expenditures in excess of revenues to create employment and opportunities for the people of the province, we would not hesitate to deficit finance.

That's what the NDP said in 1973 before they got lucky with the oil revenues. And today, because the NDP stole the heritage fund out from under this generation and future generations, this government has to deficit finance to create the employment, to create the jobs, to create the programs, and to maintain the programs that the people of Saskatchewan have indicated that they want to keep.

So Mr. Speaker, let's look at the record. Where do the NDP stand on deficits? It's been stated. It was stated most clearly that in fact the NDP support deficits. Where do the NDP stand? The deficit — we would not have a deficit today if the NDP had left any money in the heritage fund. The NDP used the heritage fund — \$500 million for potash, \$300 million for uranium. You threw a great deal away. You wasted a great deal of money under the heritage fund. But in fact, Mr. Speaker, the heritage fund . . . We were told, the public was told, the press was told, that the heritage fund was to be for future generations, and it was to be there for a rainy day, that when the economy dropped . . . And that's what the NDP said from 1971 to '81 and '82, that there would be something there. The crops were bad; times got a little tough. There would be money there. In fact, they lied to the people of Saskatchewan. There was nothing in the heritage fund,

and it's that deficit in the heritage fund, that destruction of the heritage fund, that expenditure of the heritage fund that the NDP did, that causes the deficits today. And everyone knows it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear

HON. MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I'm going to bring a couple of other facts to the public's attention. I'm going to talk about health. The Hon. Minister of Health has indicated some of the programs, some of the activities. These are going to be widely distributed, so the hon. members should listen because it will do them good.

Here's what the former minister of finance, Mr. Smishek, said in 1976:

In Saskatchewan, we have the highest hospital utilization in Canada – 220 citizens per 1,000 population are admitted to hospital as compared to the national average of 154. There is no evidence that the people of Saskatchewan are more often ill than anywhere in Canada, but we are deeply concerned about hospital utilization. There has been discussion about the reduction in the approved hospital beds in the order of five per cent. That may not necessarily represent a five per cent budgetary cut.

In 1976, the NDP cut hospital beds, shortly after the '75 election – 5 per cent. Then they took 400 positions, nursing positions, out of the health care system in 1976. They don't even know today that there's a chiropody program. They don't even know it. So where's their commitment to health?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the NDP put their well-known moratorium on nursing homes. And I'm going to table for the public, I'm going to table what the NDP position was on nursing homes. And we've referred to it on numerous occasions. I'm going to table it so that no one forgets this. If anyone says, "What was the NDP position on nursing homes? Where do I find that information?", we will be able to tell them, "You just go to the legislature. It's sitting right there; it's a public record." It wasn't public record until we took office, because some documents you happen to miss. But you forgot to burn this one.

Treasury Board. This is the NDP in 1976:

Further decision in the level of funding to be approved for this activity pending the review of more detailed information in all committed budgets.

Committed. I'm sure that they're referring to committed during the '75 election.

Until such time as the need for additional beds can be clearly identified and a suitable construction policy defined, a moratorium on further commitments should be enforced.

That's the NDP record on nursing homes . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, even today. Now, we finally have the admission. Even today – and I wish the cameras could shift over to the member from Pelly who just today said, "why build nursing homes when you don't need them?" That's what he said, and when there's no need for them he's not going to build them. And the NDP policy today is exactly as it was in 1976. They will not build nursing homes; they want a moratorium on nursing homes. They want to stop nursing homes for our senior citizens, the handicapped, and the mentally ill. And I say that that is the true fact of the NDP health program. The big myth.

That is where you really stand, that in fact, in fact the NDP have finally admitted that their 1976 moratorium policy applies today, and I say to you that you've declared war on the senior citizens. I hope you go into the convention, and take your position, "why build nursing homes?", because I think even some of the NDP out there may be very, very upset with your

position of why build nursing homes for our citizens. I find that despicable, and I find it an insult. I find it an insult to the senior citizens of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to table as well, I'm going to table as well, a secret cabinet memorandum that the NDP had in 1981, April 3, 1981 – continuing care. Now we couldn't find the cabinet document that approved this, but we did find the cabinet information item that reiterates what cabinet approved. Cabinet had previously approved a range of \$390 to \$500 per month charges to the residents of nursing homes — \$500 a month. The NDP had approved charging our senior citizens, in 1981 – 1981. You hid it during the election, but I'll bet you, had you been re-elected, that there would have been a catch up, and it probably would have been closer to \$600 because you delayed for the year, because you didn't have the political courage, you didn't have the political courage to stand up and tell the public what you planned in secret to do to our senior citizens — \$500. I'm going to table for the public, both of those documents.

So, Mr. Speaker, what have we seen during this session from the NDP? We've seen their secret fights over a leadership. We've seen question after question, and everyone is just pleading for a depression. They have no faith or confidence in the future of this province, and they have no faith or confidence in the people of this province. They've been negative. They've been negative. They've been cheering for a depression, and they've been talking about the poverty in the poverty of ideas that they have. You know, I would like to be the one that coined the phrase, "the nattering nabobs of negativism." Unfortunately it's been utilized in the past, but we see the prime example of that in that motley little crew that was elected in 1982, the NDP. When the NDP say that the public shouldn't have spring elections, I think it really comes from an inherent dislike of the people of this province.

Let's take a look at the record. The positive commitment to this province by this government has resulted in 25,000 new jobs in Saskatchewan – in a recession – in the last 18 months.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. LANE: — That we've created hundreds of jobs with the rural natural gas distribution system – in a recession. We've created 3,800 new jobs with a \$5,000 tax credit – during a recession. We've created 4,200 jobs through Opportunities '83 – in a recession. We've created 1,000 new jobs with record oil drilling – in a recession. We create 2,500 new jobs with a heavy oil upgrader, that the NDP couldn't get – in a recession.

Mr. Speaker, in a recession we built a new cancer clinic, a new geological sciences building, a new Wascana Institute Technical School in the city of Regina. We've created new businesses in the private sector, a net increase of over 1,600 new jobs. Small businessmen who are excited about the potential of the province. We have new buildings going up in Regina and around the province: Pioneer, McCallum Hill. We created thousands of new jobs with the \$3,000 Build-A-Home program – in a recession. We've cut taxes – in a recession. The cheapest gas in Canada. We've had record health expenditures – in a recession. We've had record education expenditures – in a recession. And record technical training expenditures for the youth of our province – in a recession.

It's a record of performance of which the people of Saskatchewan are proud, that every member on the government benches is supremely proud. The pride and commitment that this government shows in the people of the province is worthy of everyone supporting the throne speech motion.

We made a positive commitment to the people of Saskatchewan, we made a positive commitment to the youth of Saskatchewan, and we've made a positive commitment to the workers of Saskatchewan. We're not going to get caught up in the negative backward looking of the socialists opposite, Mr. Speaker. We're for the new Saskatchewan, a positive commitment, and we evidence the pride that people of Saskatchewan have in this great province. I will be

supporting the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of honour and it's a privilege to enter this throne debate. I think the throne debate this session has been one that is extraordinary. I don't think in the history of Saskatchewan we've heard speeches like we have during this throne debate, particularly from the members of government — particularly from the members of government. And most particularly, Mr. Speaker, the disappointment was when I listened to some of the cabinet ministers, the treasury benches, participate in this throne debate.

During the opening I heard remarks from people saying that the tradition, the pomp, and the ceremony is great. We like it. I heard a visitor that was down visiting one of the Saskatoon members and he said that today we can set aside a day specially to honour democracy and to respect the traditions of this House, and I agree with that. But how soon the members of the government forget those traditions. How soon we let those traditions fall down because of the way the law, the rules of this legislation are stretched, the way we've missed . . . I don't like the way you're using the rules. I really don't. We have a situation today where a questioner can't quite finish a sentence that starts with what, and yet a minister can stand up and speak for 5 and 10 minutes about a copy . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. I think the hon. member is challenging the Chair, and in the throne speech I don't believe that there is any permission for that challenge. I would ask you to get on with your speech, but leave the Chair out of it.

MR. ENGEL: — I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for doing that but I feel that the decorum here could be improved on, and I want to do my part to help raise this back to an elevation that is worthy of the tradition of the democratic process.

I regard it as a great privilege to take part in this throne speech. This debate presents members with an opportunity to present the viewpoints of their constituents on the affairs of their province, and I say this, Mr. Speaker, because I have been disturbed by some of the things that I've seen in this past year and a half, which suggest that the government is down playing the legislative process and the role of this Assembly.

The legislative process is a key to democracy and it's a key to make democracy work in Saskatchewan. When the executive arm of the government, the cabinet, increasingly bypasses and ignores the legislation to serve its own narrow, political purposes, it hurts all the people of Saskatchewan and it hurts a democratic institution.

Mr. Speaker, there are many examples that I want to share with you this morning to substantiate that argument. The farm purchase program was approved by the legislation this past winter. It was going to be run through the Farm Credit Corporation. Suddenly there was an announcement that the banks and the credit unions would be involved in the program. That's a fairly major change. The legislation has no chance for a say on this matter. You don't know if I'm against it or for it, Mr. Minister, because you didn't give me a chance to debate it. You didn't give me a chance to debate it. And this legislation had no chance to say or make any comments on this matter, even though the session had just been adjourned prior to the announcement being made, weeks after the announcement being made.

But the government will say the FCC ran out of money and farmers would have to be left stranded. I ask: didn't you have the insight to make sure that this point was negotiated with an agreement with FCC? Didn't you get the assurance from them? If they didn't, I can only conclude that this Conservative government is even more inept than I had previously thought.

You know, there's a quotation I could make about somebody that builds a house and doesn't

count the cost before he starts and how foolish he is, and the Speaker knows from where that quotation comes.

Many changes have been made in the handling of the liquor affairs over the past year. But legislation was completely bypassed on these matters. The only conclusion is that the Conservative government hope to pay off their friends in the liquor industry with as little fuss as they could get away with, with as little fuss as they could muster.

Just this week their Minister of Agriculture made another announcement of a new program outside the legislature, while the House was in session. But not a word in here. Not a word in here.

But I guess you can't expect any more of a minister when you look at the Premier's actions. What has been his attitude towards the throne speech debate? In the first one, he didn't even take part in the debate at all. He still had butterflies in his stomach. Last year he spoke and only very late in the debate. Each year . . . And I don't know what he's going to do. But traditionally, the Premier stands up and speaks on the throne speech. He's a lead-off speaker, right after the opposition leader starts, and this procedure has been in place and has been a tradition for years. But this government sees fit to thumb their noses at it.

It's not just because it's a tradition, Mr. Speaker, but rather because the Premier has a job to do. It is the Premier's job to lead the government and to elaborate on the thrust and the philosophy of the throne speech. His speech helps set the tone of the debate. But no, he sneaks in at the last minute when nobody else can get a chance, and after we all spoke, so none of us can get in on the debate. That's when he sneaks in, so that nobody can qualify. His speech helps set the tone of the debate. He should fill in on some of the things left out in the speech, and that's a big job in the this throne speech, but apparently we have a premier who doesn't think it's all that important to provide leadership in the House and to play an adequate role.

Maybe if the Premier would have gotten involved first, some of his ministers wouldn't have made the sleazy, slimy remarks they did in this throne speech . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, apparently that has hit a sensitive note. When a minister can stand up and call a former member of this legislation a pious hypocrite, that's not a slimy remark? That's not a slimy remark? He's afraid to say it in the hall.

One further indication of the government's attitude to the legislation is its decision to stop the legislative radio broadcasts. The excuse used by the government members is that they can watch it on cable TV.

But I've got news for you. Cable TV. isn't in my riding. There are thousands of people in rural Saskatchewan that don't get cable TV. I believe there are other constituencies. Kelvington-Wadena doesn't have cable TV. And yet the radio broadcasts have been cut off.

A lot of these people listened diligently and religiously to the legislative broadcasts. They didn't miss a word. And they are no longer able to tune in and listen to the members opposite and the stances they are taking. They can say one thing in here, and go back to their constituents with another story.

During the summer, Mr. Speaker, the Premier announced some changes in his cabinet. He did some amazing things. He did some amazing things. He appointed nine new cabinet ministers. Now we have a cabinet of 25 members, by far the largest of any previous cabinet Saskatchewan has ever had – 25 cabinet ministers with small, tiny cupboard portfolios that are so small they don't even get a cup hanger in the shelf, let alone a cabinet. And yet those 25 cabinet ministers need an additional 12 legislative secretaries – 12 additional helpers for 25 cupboard holders.

And if that isn't enough, Mr. Speaker, you need another nine chairmen of boards to help the

cabinet ministers out who can't run a crown corporation. You need nine additional helpers. You know, here we had . . . why such a size? Why so large? It's only two things, Mr. Speaker. The Premier puts some people into his cabinet, and they can't perform, and he adds a few more. And if they can't perform, he adds 12 legislative secretaries. And if they can't handle jobs, you bring in nine more great people to help.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Engel, don't you worry about it. You and I don't have to worry, right?

MR. ENGEL: — The member for Moosomin says I shouldn't worry about it. I am him didn't have to worry. Well, I don't think the member for Moosomin was left out of cabinet because they felt he couldn't handle the job. I think they are afraid he couldn't take the heat. That's what I'm afraid of. I wouldn't have questioned a modest increase in cabinet, but an increase of nine members surely shows that things are out of control and that the Premier is desperately trying to patch things up.

I feel particularly sorry for the members that were left out, Mr. Speaker. There's members that were left out that really bother me. The two members for Moose Jaw, for example, must surely feel very uncomfortable that their city was bypassed and wasn't recognized. Either members like the hon. member for Melville who did a memorable job moving the throne speech – and I commend him for his efforts – which started this debate, and he thought he could get some recognition by his rhetoric against the NDP. Maybe it's his background that hurt. Maybe it's his background that hurt.

I also have to express some surprise that the Minister of Telephones, Mr. Currie, highly totted before the election, and doing a reasonable job in education – and I think one of the best ministers, and I've told him so . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — But when the Premier got shuffling the cards, his almost fell on the floor. His almost fell on the floor. He just about got lost in the shuffle. He just about got lost in the shuffle.

The nine additional members and the retainers they're paid, and the recognition they're getting, and the job they're doing for the cabinet ministers that can't handle the chairmanship support, don't bother me quite as much as some of the real people that are in power in this party.

I think in caucus we've maybe neglected to mention some of the people that really are holding the cards and are calling the shots. Quinlan, for example, brought to this government by the trained by the Regina chamber of Commerce – a man that came from the right place.

I'm not sure what the minister in charge of SGI is indicating by his shaking of the hands and pointing to me. If that's where you're getting your advice, Paul, then I know why you've got so much trouble. Then I know why he's got so much trouble, Mr. Speaker, because here is the man that was supposed to be in touch.

The Roughriders were a part of the back-on. Here's the man that was doing the PR for the Roughriders. Maybe they won three games while he was in charge, I'm not sure. And his saying with the Roughriders was, "Keeping in Touch." Keeping in touch, that sounds awful familiar to a theme that the Tories used at their last convention – "Keeping in Touch." If you're going to do as good a job with Quinlan in keeping in touch as the Roughriders did, that's why the telephone polls were what they were this morning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear

MR. ENGEL: — I heard about members talking about listening to the telephone on the way in. Well, I listened, Mr. Speaker. The number one radio station in Saskatchewan was doing a little

phone-in poll before our convention, and it just so happens that 13 people on that phone-in who were keeping in touch voted for the NDP. Six were bold enough to say, "We vote for the Conservatives."

You know, they were committed to the cause, unknown to you guys, no matter what. Six – one was a rhinoceros. And two – I'm happy that they weren't long distance calls – that weren't long distance calls, I want to show you, said they're going to vote Liberal. Now, I kind of hope they weren't from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg because we've got Liberals down there.

But Sean Quinlan's message is "Keeping in Touch." I think the next thing we'll see in this legislation – and I'm not sure which one of you is going to have to don the uniform; I've got a couple of candidates that I'd maybe recommend to Sean – but the next thing I can see is going to be the gopher. We're going to have the gopher come in and do a little advertising for these guys. This gopher is going to come in and he's going to be carrying a sign that says, "Open for Business."

You know, the father of Roughrider Pride and the thousand volunteers failed you guys. Sean Quinlan's little key, catchy ideas that won us three Roughrider games in his term, won you six votes out of 20. He got you six votes this morning out of 20. And I'd suggest you take the father of Roughrider pride, and do with him like the Roughriders did; do with him like the Regina chamber of Commerce did; do with him like a lot of other places where he tried to make it go in his high-pitch advertising campaign, and send the guy over to Austria and make your backbenchers happy. That baker's dozen that didn't get into the cabinet would really go somewhere if you could get rid of this guy that comes up with those great ideas.

He took away your budget for advertising. He froze your minimum wage. He went over to Europe and to Georgia, and I wonder what he's going to come back with his open for business campaign. I'm looking forward to seeing what Sean Quinlan's got to offer this new Tory government, this aggressive government. You've got a couple of other guys in that team that's running this party that our caucus really didn't get too involved in. I could talk about Michael Leddy and his claim to fame, and why Michael Leddy made it into this operation.

You know, I think the minister that gave that wonderful speech on liquor the other night and portrayed his true character and his golden qualities, maybe had some friendship when they were both Liberals, and this was arranged. This was maybe a way to bring him in. Maybe the bathroom scandal that he exposed qualified him to get in as your . . . (inaudible) . . . giving you the political advice. I'm not sure what it was, but as far as I'm concerned, I'd take the word of some of the Saskatchewan MPs. And what's left of Leddy, I don't think that the administration is gaining an awful lot from him. I don't think there's an awful lot to gain there. I'd suggest to the beer and pizza club that you take care of this guy; I really do.

There's other members, the real boys in the backroom, that I could talk about, but the Attorney General in his address has taken so much time that I feel that I've got to get onto the rest of my speech.

The Premier exercised his prerogative and he made the changes, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad he accepted by advice and one change, when he moved the member for Souris-Cannington from Agriculture to Economic Development and Trade. And I'm glad the Premier listened to me when I pointed out the weaknesses and the disaster that that person was for Saskatchewan agriculture.

Finally, he moved, but he kept the responsibility of the Crow rate, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, that's the number one disaster that hit Saskatchewan. That's the disasters people are going to remind and hold over your head, and Devine and Anderson are going to be in the same camp. I make a little prediction backed by the little phone-in poll this morning that you're going to get just as many seats back as Anderson did. I make that little prediction.

The former minister of Agriculture was charged with the responsibility for keeping the Crow, and until it was destroyed, and that will please the government's friends in Palliser; his friends in Palliser were happy. Now he's in his new post and he appears too busy re-inventing the wheel. I just hope he doesn't get to do as much harm as he did in the government's two-faced stance on the Crow.

In spite of the overall situation concerning the cabinet, I can still offer my congratulations to the nine new appointees to cabinet. I won't review all their names one by one, because it really gets to be quite a lengthy litany. I do, however, want to offer my congratulations to a former constituent of mine, the new Minister of Agriculture.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — Talking about constituents, Mr. Speaker, the other night, when we were having dinner, I knew there was a reason why one of the members from Moose Jaw South was a little bit special as far as our caucus was concerned. But he farmed in my riding for a long time too, and I'd like to also say that and repeat that I'm disappointed that you were overlooked when the cabinet was decided, because it is quality and ability to do a job and to do it honestly.

I know and the Minister of Agriculture knows that there's a big job to do, in view of the unfolding events affecting agriculture at this time. During this session we will no doubt have numerous exchanges on agricultural questions. I hope he accepts, as I accept, that regardless of the difference of our view that we are both working for a sound, healthy, agricultural industry in this province.

I also want to say a special word to the member of Arm River who was appointed Minister Without Portfolio in charge of crop insurance. I'm sorry he's not here. I congratulate him, as I did the others. And just one short comment for the minister of crop insurance. No doubt he's looking for things to do, but he shouldn't solve that problem by sticking his fingers into an operation that was running well and doing fine, thank you. He fired a competent manager. He interfered with other personalities, sticking his fingers into the operations, and I wish that the Premier would give him something a little more important to do. But it appears that even with a cabinet of 25, they needed to water down their jobs even more.

Recently, nine non-ministerial appointments were made as chairmen of crown corporations and boards. Apparently this was to reduce the political influence in running of crown corporations. In part it stems from the wolf-pack report, but who does the Premier think he's kidding? He appoints a non-ministerial chairman and then leads a pack of ministers of vice-chairmen. He hasn't really changed anything except to reward some of his Tory friends. That seems to be the chief qualification for most of the recent appointments to the chairmen of boards. It certainly didn't have anything to do with the qualifications for the job.

For example, I see a retired urologist was appointed as chairman of Saskatchewan Mining and Development Corporation. That's the corporation engaged in uranium mining. Now I don't know how uric acid is used in uranium processing, but the only other credential s that this individual has is that he was a national vice-president of the Tory party, chief bagman for the Saskatchewan Tories and a major antagonist in the medical association's efforts to stop medicare in 1962.

Some of the members talked about old news. Why didn't you tell the Attorney General that when he was taken back to 1955? Regardless of what Wolfgang Wolff says, or the Premier says, crown corporations are still instruments of public policy and were established to serve public process. Attempts to deny this fact can mean only one of two things. It's either, Mr. Speaker, they don't understand what government and crown corporations are about, or they are trying to undermine and destroy crown corporations which have been of immense benefit to the people of Saskatchewan.

So now, Mr. Speaker, we have a swollen cabinet, a slew of legislative secretaries, and a raft of board chairmen. The member gave us a long speech the other night asking me how many there should be. Well, I think if you look back at the history of Saskatchewan you'll know how many cabinet ministers it took – 19. If it takes that to shut you up – 19.

Mr. Speaker, I just said that we had a swollen cabinet, a slew of legislative secretaries, and raft of board chairmen. That must have hit a sensitive note. But that isn't all, that isn't all. Each of the nine new ministers will have an entourage of support staff and all of the expenses associated with the office.

Each new cabinet minister has an entourage of support staff. A cabinet minister's salary is about \$27,000, extra on; staff salaries average over \$215,000; office expenses, in excess of \$33,000; other expenses, including auto and air travel – I have a little number here that says 26, but if you think of the new jet aircraft, should be \$126,000 – executive aircraft and so on. And you multiply this by nine, Mr. Speaker, and you have a bill of over \$3 million a year added cost. If you add the legislative secretaries to this cost you get another \$100,000. You add to that the board chairmen and you get another \$100,000. Mr. Speaker, we've got a bloated government here that doesn't mind spending money on themselves and on new jet aircraft.

So it's open for business . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, Jack was in this debate the other night. The minister in charge of the liquor board had a chance to make his speech.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order please. The House has been very unruly all morning. I'm going to ask that members simmer down a bit and start to pay attention. As well, I'm going to ask all hon. members to stop calling members by their names. You're to address members by their constituency, and that's not only the member that's on his feet now, but rather all members have been abusing that rule.

MR. ENGEL: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Attorney General started that last year. When a guy gets into the heat of debate it's sometimes hard to remember the constituency or the portfolio, and I apologize to the Minister of Co-ops.

But this open for business government, this gang of 25 and their entourage, and the special plums for retired urologists, put . . . but they have precious little for the ordinary people – the low income people, the needy people, and the average worker. This is a government with a double standard. It's open for business for cabinet ministers and their entourage and their highly paid staff, and their liquor interests, and the breweries, and the oil companies, and the friends of the Tories. It's a different story for farmers and workers and teachers and nurses, and especially Northerners, especially Northerners.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Speaker, I heard the Attorney General stand up on a news report and say, "It's been reported to me." Now, I don't know what kind of facilities the Attorney General has to spy on the members of cabinet or the members of this caucus, but I want to tell this House that I love going fishing with my partner and my seat-mate. I'll go in a boat with this member from northern Saskatchewan any day of the year, and I enjoy my boat ride, and I enjoy the fellowship. But I wonder which one of you guys would get in a canoe with the Attorney General. I wonder which one of you guys would go in a boat with that guy. I don't know if it's the smell they don't like, or if it's the sleazy criticism he does of other people. All I know is that he's a loner, and if anybody goes with him they're conspiring. If anybody goes with him, then they've got a conspiracy going.

Well, I want to tell you that that Liberal's job is on the line. I heard from a very reliable source that that Liberal member better get himself some friends in a hurry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — It's nice to see a couple of guys put up their hands, and maybe the Attorney General should have been looking around. And I you want me to have a show of hands again, I can ask for it again to help him out. But I think that Attorney General isn't fit to shine the shoes of the former attorney generals of this province. He isn't fit to shine the shoes. I've listened to attorney generals from Davey Heald's days on, that as a member that trained this man — and I've listened to all the attorney generals since that time, since I've been following politics — and I've never heard the likes of this member. Never! Never! And he's on the way out for a very good reason.

There's another member, and I'm getting to you a little later on down the line, after I get through some of this material. There's another member that better watch his remarks and better clean up his act or he'll move another step further, and I don't know where you'll end, Mr. Minister.

It's an open for business government, and the business is pretty serious when I'd want to talk to the members that have a track record of being Liberals. And I'd caution all of you that got a track record, if you're an NDPer, or a former NDPer like the member for Melville was, or like the member that is most prominent in that caucus . . . If the member for Kelvington-Wadena who's got a little trait of NDP hidden in his background, you're in trouble. There isn't another reason in the world why you were overlooked for a cabinet. And that is something that maybe the Attorney General is laughing about, but it's a pretty different story.

I was particularly disappointed with the treatment of agriculture in the throne speech, Mr. Speaker. True, there were some pious words and some tidbits. But there was absolutely nothing that addresses the central concerns and the problems facing agriculture in Saskatchewan. True, the Minister of Agriculture doesn't have to answer the questions I put to him. True, you can stand up, and the people are watching you on TV, and you can talk about everything else to avoid the questions. But the people of Saskatchewan know the obvious truth that you're avoiding and you want to avoid drawing attention to.

The throne speech made no reference to the Crow rate and sloughed over the issue as quickly as possible. The government obviously wanted to avoid drawing attention to the Crow rate. Let me read this section of the Crow rate:

The future of grain producers in Saskatchewan is clouded by the insistence of the federal government on passage of a bill to repeal the guarantee of the Crow rate despite the strong opposition of a very large majority of producers and the unanimous opinion of this Legislative Assembly.

Sounds good. Sounds good. It almost sounds as if the government wanted to save the Crow. But if you read it carefully, it doesn't really say that. What it really says is that the government opposed Bill C-155 as presented by the federal government. Opposition to Bill C-155 is far different thing than saying we want to keep the Crow, period. The Tory government can apply their position by expressing opposition to Bill C-155. That was easy. What they didn't say is: we want to keep the Crow. As far as they would go was to say that keeping the Crow was better than Bill C-155. The insidious effects of this stance was that it signalled a message to the federal Liberal government. It told the federal Liberals we've got to say some nasty things about bill c-155. But when all is said and done, the Saskatchewan Tories agree the Crow should be changed. If anyone doubts this fact, they should look at the brief that the minister from Cannington presented to the government, on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan, to the House of Commons transport committee. I was in Regina in August . . . (inaudible) . . . Page 48 of this excellent brief . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The Minister of Agriculture said it was

excellent. Let me read into the record a paragraph from page 48.

Considerations of any changes to the Crow rate must recognize that Saskatchewan's potential for grain production has not yet been fully realized.

Did you get that, Mr. Speaker? That's page 48, page 49. To the baker's dozen that are left outside of the cabinet, I want them to take a special interest in this one.

Implementation of Bill C-155 is not only detrimental to Saskatchewan but is also detrimental to Canada.

Page 56:

Saskatchewan has concluded from its review of Bill C-155 that the seven principles established by the federal government to be used for the construction of a bill to change the statutory grain rates must have not been uniformly followed. We therefore conclude that Bill C-155 is not an adequate or proper mechanism to implement the federal government's policy on western rail transportation.

Bill C-155 wasn't adequate, but they didn't say, "Keep the Crow."

Page 58:

Saskatchewan has concluded that Bill C-155 is inadequate to meet the federal government's own policy statement regarding grain transportation.

Further on page 58:

We offer a substitute set of policy elements, and ones that we suggest are construed around three matters of concern: adequate transportation and handling capacity, reasonable producer returns, and a development package for Saskatchewan agriculture.

Does that sound like a government that's trying to save the Crow rate?

It is essential that any changes to the existing statutory rates contain the following statutory obligations.

It's followed by a list of eight conditions. I'm not going to read them all.

On page 62 they go into the conclusions.

The Saskatchewan government has concluded that: (1) the current federal legislation does not need a great many of the policy elements identified above, and therefore Saskatchewan cannot accept Bill C-155.

Why didn't they say, "Saskatchewan does not accept any change to the Crow rate?"

(2) Saskatchewan submits that the policy elements identified above should be the basis for any legislation designed to change the present statutory grain rates.

A lot of fancy footwork, but not once did the Saskatchewan government say in its brief, "Keep the Crow." The Saskatchewan Conservative government helped Jean-Luc Pepin put the skids under the Crow rate. They also know their federal party friends would have done the same thing had the Clark government survived. The Saskatchewan Tories' betrayal of the Crow rate was a bitter pill served up to Saskatchewan farmers beneath a lot of sugar-coating.

Mr. Speaker, farm indebtedness and the burden of interest cost is a major problem for Saskatchewan farmers. On the subject of interest rates, I notice that the throne speech contained the same sort of double talk we can expect from Tories – double-talk on the interest rate. On the one hand, when they were talking about their investor friends, they said, “A continuation of high interest rates will weaken the incentive to invest and may impair the strength of the current recovery.” On the other hand, when talking of agriculture, the speech says, “Farmers generally have benefited from a fall in interest rates and fertilizer prices.” That won’t be a lot of consolation to the farmers from where you come, Mr. Minister of Agriculture, when they are paying their bills this fall. The fact is that many farmers can barely hang on now with the level of interest rates and their costs. If higher interest rates are continued, many, many of the farmers across Saskatchewan would now be in bankruptcy. Many people anticipate a new round of higher interest rates. Saskatchewan farmers are in a very precarious position.

Over the past year, I have urged on a number of occasions that the government undertake a study of farm costs and what can be done to reduce these costs. I again urge the government to look at the numbers. Today I asked the Minister of Agriculture what impact has had the increase of utility rates, and he talked about something. He talked about something else. He wouldn’t give us an answer.

One specific step that could be taken by the government is to introduce a farm fuel rebate program. They promised it. It’s all through the legislative . . . During the campaign, the promises were made. I’ve urged them to keep their promises. The Minister of Agriculture anticipated that I’d urge him to keep his promises, but what’s he doing about it? He laughs about it. He laughs about it. The number the farmers are using down south . . . And I don’t know how it affects the rest of you, but any farmer I talk to today tells me it costs him about \$1,000 a quarter for fuel — \$1,000 a quarter. Now if you can farm a little cheaper than that, then you maybe have a Deutz tractor, but if you’ve got a John Deere tractor and average sized equipment, and you work your summerfallow six or seven times, it’s going to cost you about \$1,000 a quarter for fuel. I can remember, since I’ve been an MLA, my entire fuel bill wasn’t much over \$1,000. Today it’s \$1,000 a quarter, and you laugh at the thing that we should help the farmers or the fuel bill. You laugh at the farmers fuel bill.

I note that the FarmStart program is going to be changed. Speaking to the Sask Wheat Pool, the minister told them first that the FarmStart program is going to be changed. Further steps to help farmers are welcomed by this person, but I’m concerned that the thrust of the new proposals will largely help big operators and farmers, while the present program was designed to help the small and starter farmer. Of course it is difficult to understand how the government on the one hand wants to help farmers get into more livestock production, and on the other hand they sell off their interests in Intercontinental Packers. On one hand, they tell you to get into it and, on the other hand, they sell their interests, probably knowing that they’d shut down the plant before they ever sold it. The NDP government took an interest in this company and we took an interest in the company to ensure that they stay in Regina, and as long as we were in government and had a control, that company would be open in Regina.

The minister, the Attorney General, today tried to cloud the figures and all he did is expose himself, that you knew they were going to move out. You knew they were going to move out and that’s why you sold your interests. You knew why. Those decision were brought before cabinet, but the cabinet said, “You’re staying here.” And that’s why we had 40 per cent interest in Intercontinental. If the Minister of Justice thinks that that is justice and that that is the truth, he is using a different word, Mr. Speaker. He is using a different word for the truth. Here we have a Minister of Justice that clouds the issue. He brought up an issue that pointed out right on the nose why he sold it. We were suspicious that they sold it so that their friends could move it out, and now today he made it evidence that they knew. And he evidenced the fact that they knew they were going to close it. He didn’t use his 40 per cent option and say that this plant stays in Regina, and the baker’s dozen should know that he did. The baker’s dozen should be aware of

his trips. They should be aware of his trips . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Either, Mr. Speaker, our friends over there are sleeping at the switch, or they deliberately wanted to duck the responsibility. Mr. Speaker, I'm standing up here today and saying that they are deliberately ducking the issue.

Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The Minister of Agriculture talks about their abattoir that was built on the No. 2 Highway just north of Assiniboia. I compliment those young fellows for moving their abattoir down to that point. When our government was still involved, we were talking about locations. That plan was in effect long before you dreamt of running for a seat and you know it, Mr. Minister. And you're just the kind of minister that would like to take credit for things that were done in '81 and '80 and '79 and '76. That abattoir was operating very well and they were doing a good business. I buy my beef from them people. Do you? Have you bought your beef locally? Or do you butcher the ones that die on your operating table?

Mr. Speaker, I want to get to a very serious matter. I want to get to a very serious matter and I want to take a few moments now to review the decision made recently by this conservative government, which has a lot of Saskatchewan people concerned and upset. It's a decision which points up a glaring inconsistency in the way this government approaches public policy.

I am speaking of the conservative government to lift the 58-year-old ban on alcohol advertising in the province. This remarkable decision was incredibly inconsistent with the number of publicly stated priorities of this government. It makes a sham of many of this government's most important policy announcements.

First, it makes a sham of the conservative government's claim that it's concerned about controlling and reducing drug abuse, including alcohol abuse, in our province. How can a government make a claim when it has lifted the 58-year-old ban on alcohol advertising, and has now allowed the big breweries to be pushing their product at all hours of the day and night? It's totally inconsistent.

Secondly, this government's decision makes a sham of the government's claim that it plans to get tough and crack down on drinking drivers. It's a sham. When this government introduced the new Vehicles Act in the legislature last spring, Mr. Speaker, it bragged loud and long that the new law was just the first step in the government's plan to reducing drinking and driving. How can this government still make that claim, now that it has lifted the advertising ban and has allowed these alcohol ads to flood the Saskatchewan air waves? It can't, Mr. Speaker, because the two positions are totally inconsistent.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, this conservative decision makes a sham of the government's claim that it is concerned about wife battering and child abuse. The Minister of Justice suggested in this very House yesterday afternoon, the Minister of Justice had the gall to stand in this place and cry crocodile tears about the increasing problem of wife battering and child abuse and other family-related violence. He claimed that the Conservative government was getting tough with these kinds of violence. He told us that the government was going to crack down on the serious social problems, but today he stood in this House and defended his decision to push alcohol and to allow more alcohol advertising. This government's actions are inconsistent with their hollow words, Mr. Speaker. I commend my colleague, the member for Quill Lakes, for making that very point so well in the House yesterday, Mr. Speaker. When the government talks about its concern for family violence, it's talking about the symptom, but it ignores the cause. It ignores the cause.

What are the two main causes of such family violence? The first is high unemployment and the economic stress which high unemployment creates, and the second is alcohol abuse – and not necessarily in that order – which this Conservative government is promoting through increased alcohol consumption, which is the number one impact of alcohol advertising. So the Minister of Justice claims to be concerned about a social problem which his own government has

aggravated by its failed economic policies and its ill-advised decisions to allow advertising. The inconsistencies and the hypocrisies are really quite incredible.

I want to take a moment to put on the record just how this Conservative government went about making this decision to lift the ban on alcohol advertising. I want to do that because its methods broke with tradition in this province. For at least 50 years, there have never been major changes to Saskatchewan's liquor laws without the involvement of an all-party committee of the legislation. The Conservatives broke with that tradition. Instead of an all-party committee of the legislature, they appointed a conservative caucus committee. Instead of public hearings, they met behind closed doors. Yes, one-party committee did not hold any public hearings on this issue. If you would have, I'd have come to them.

Some of the recommendations made to it have become public. I want to put some of these recommendations into the record today, Mr. Speaker, because this will be one of the few opportunities that Saskatchewan people will have to find out what this one-party caucus committee was told, and one of the few opportunities for Saskatchewan people to judge the kind of job this one-party caucus committee really did.

Let me begin by putting on record a letter dated May the 13th of this year addressed to the Conservative caucus committee from the Saskatchewan Safety Council, Jack Lax. The safety council letter expresses concern with suggestion being made at the time that alcohol should be served at major sporting events and that the Conservative government is about to lift the ban on alcohol advertising. And what did the Saskatchewan Safety Council tell this Conservative government, Mr. Speaker? Let me quote from their letter:

The increased visibility and availability of alcohol conveys a message, especially to young people, that alcohol should be an integral part of their future lifestyle.

I could read from the entire letter, but . . .

In summary, the Saskatchewan Safety Council is opposed to any measures that will make alcohol more available, such as mass media advertising.

Mr. Speaker, that's the opinion of the Saskatchewan Safety Council with respect to the Conservative government's decision.

But there are others who spoke out against lifting alcohol advertising. There were a lot of others, Mr. Speaker. I have here a brief presented to the Conservative caucus committee by Dr. Saul Cohen, the chairman of the Alcohol Commission of Saskatchewan. What did Dr. Cohen have to say about alcohol advertising and alcohol abuse? Let me place some of his comments on the record, Mr. Speaker. Dr. Saul Cohen, Chairman of the Alcohol Commission of Saskatchewan.

The seriousness of alcohol abuse cannot be overstated. Nearly 150,000 people in Saskatchewan drink at high-risk levels, one-third of which, or approximately 50,000, are alcohol dependent. Heavy drinking has negative consequences for both mental and physical health (Dr. Cohen says).

He goes on to say:

Alcohol abuse also surfaces in the courts. There were 50,000-plus reported offences under The Saskatchewan Liquor Act in 1981. Nearly 40 per cent of these offences involved public drunkenness. Since alcohol acts as a sedative in the body and impairs judgement and reflexes (and maybe that's what happened to the cabinet when they decided to lift the ban), it severely affects driving ability. It is well-known that half the fatal traffic accidents are alcohol related, yet people continue to drink and drive.

Liquor policies and regulations (he goes on to say) have a profound influence on alcohol consumption, and attendant attitudes and behaviour.

Another quote:

The ban on media advertising stems from the negative consequences such as advertising is likely to promote, especially among young people. Furthermore, (Dr. Cohen says) media advertising of alcoholic beverages fosters integration of alcohol as part of everyday lifestyles and this results in an increased use and abuse of the substance.

The Alcoholism Commission of Saskatchewan therefore recognizes the merits of not permitting the media advertising of alcoholic beverages (and your caucus had this information at their disposal before they made the decision).

The result and the impact of advertising is a net increase in alcohol consumption which is therefore an additive effect.

I have a number of more quotes, Mr. Speaker, from Dr. Cohen's report to your caucus that I'd like to read into the record. I think those of you that watch some TV and watch the mass crowding of trying to buy a cabbage doll will agree with this one:

However there is evidence that youth are the most influenced by alcohol advertising. Youth are at a very impressionable age and are readily influenced by their environment. In this regard, the role of advertising is significant. One only has to reflect on the tremendous impact that advertising of toys over television has upon children, especially at Christmas time. There is a reason to believe that alcohol advertising messages will have similar influence on people's attitudes and behaviour towards the use of alcohol.

Given the fact that 84 per cent of Saskatchewan adolescents drink, the potential for alcohol abuse among the age group is a major concern. Many young drinkers already experience problems with alcohol, as evidenced by problems which surfaced in schools and in the courts.

Twenty-five per cent of convicted impaired drivers are 20 years and under. This age group also accounts for 11 per cent of addicted clients on the alcoholism commission case-load. Promoting the merits of drinking through advertising and its association with lifestyle activity is likely to exaggerate the use and abuse of alcohol, especially among young people in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I have only one more quote that I'd like to read into the record from this here, if I may:

Society also has a responsibility to protect and enhance the collective health and well-being of its citizens. From this perspective, media advertising of alcoholic beverages introduces unnecessary risks, especially for young people. For it is our youth who are our most precarious resource and link to the future.

The continued prohibiting of alcohol advertising in Saskatchewan, complemented by effective education programs, provide a long-term strategy in promoting responsible attitudes and behaviour towards alcohol use and in countering abuse.

Just one final quote, Mr. speaker, before you call it 12 o'clock. He commends, as a windup of his report (and this is a report that's made to your caucus, of which you were the chairman), recommendations:

On the basis of the foregoing information, the alcoholism commission makes the following recommendations: number one, that the present legislation and regulations prohibiting the print and broadcast media advertising of alcoholic beverages be maintained.

Why didn't you listen to somebody on the alcoholism commission?

Mr. Speaker, should I adjourn or call it 12 o'clock. I can do either one. I adjourn.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 1 p.m.