

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

November 28, 1983

EVENING SESSION

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY (continued)

MR. YOUNG: — I left off, Mr. Speaker, at 5 o'clock, explaining to the members opposite the virtues of our oil program as compared to their subsidy program, and the benefits that it has provided this province by way of jobs and economic well-being. I hope that the members opposite take heed and . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, it's a possibility.

I'd like to point out some facts, Mr. Speaker, about our health care system as compared to how it was operated in the last 11 years of the Blakeney administration. We're presently, Mr. Speaker, at an all-time high in health care spending. We spend in excess of \$1,000 per man, woman, and child in this province on health care. We have, during our few months in office, spent more on nursing and special-care homes, Mr. Speaker, than the last seven years of the NDP combined. They, in their own words, and by their own documents, put a moratorium on construction of nursing homes. They put them on the back burner. And the member from Pelly noted in the House that he couldn't see why further nursing homes should be built when they weren't needed. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that his statements just epitomize the attitude of the NDP towards health care in this province. The fact that they did virtually nothing by way of construction of nursing and special-care homes when they knew full well, Mr. Speaker, that the population was ageing and that, certainly, crown corporations and government itself were not the priorities that the people of this province wanted. The people wanted construction of nursing and special-care homes, but again, Mr. Speaker, they failed to listen, and in April of '82 they paid the price dearly for their failure to listen.

With respect, Mr. Speaker, to government itself, our administration has reduced the size of government by 1,500 people. During the Blakeney administration's 11 years in office, they more, Mr. Speaker, than doubled the size of the provincial civil service. Big government is the name of their game.

I listened, Mr. Speaker, with interest a week ago today when the Leader of the Opposition gave his reply to the throne speech. As always, he had on his gloom and doom face. He talked about A teams and B teams and C teams. I had mentioned earlier in my speech, before our break for supper, the result that his type of administration received with A and B and C teams, and certainly that is not the way that this government is conducting itself, and certainly for the betterment of members and betterment of the province as a whole.

I would also like to just take a few moments, Mr. Speaker, to point out some facts for the people in TV land about liquor advertising. They've heard some fairly warped, factual set-ups presented by the member opposite, but I want people, Mr. Speaker, to realize that it was they, the members opposite and their government, that first allowed liquor advertising into this province. They had the ability to stop liquor advertising when it was coming in on the cable networks, and they failed to do so.

Also, Mr. Speaker, it's well known that they gave grants to malting companies to make beer. It was they and their party who received wads of donations from Seagrams and other liquor companies towards their campaigns. They were certainly a long ways from being out of bed with the liquor companies, Mr. Speaker.

Also, Mr. Speaker, a point that I don't believe has been raised so far in the throne speech. It was they, Mr. Speaker, who reduced the drinking from 21 to 18, and then later to 19 years of age. So certainly, Mr. Speaker, I do not see how they can be speaking so sanctimoniously about liquor

when, in fact, they reduced the drinking age from 21 down to the ages that it's presently at.

Despite the problems that the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, is obviously suffering within his own party, I feel that it is incumbent upon me to scold him for the very regressive position that he took on our labour situation. The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, is promoting militance in our labour force. Certainly I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, and I join with the Hon. Lorne McLaren in scolding him with respect to the position he has taken, he's not putting himself first as a Canadian or a Saskatchewanian. He's looking only to his own political future, trying to put himself at the head of the parade of the radicals on the labour legislation. I think that he should take a serious look at the position that he takes in promoting militance within the labour union. It certainly does not take this province or the country very far with attitudes such as his. And I hope, certainly, that he will not be leading this province into labour militance. It certainly is not something that we in this House want to see.

I would like to also point out for the people of Saskatchewan, and certainly for the member from Gravelbourg who makes great bones about the subject, why we have today the problem with the Crow rate. I would suggest to him and to all members of this House, Mr. Speaker, that if it were not for him and his counterparts in Ottawa, the five Saskatchewan NDP MPs who, on an NDP motion by Bob Rae, the NDP member from Ontario, threw out, Mr. Speaker, threw out a western Canadian prime minister. They threw out a minister of transport from Vegreville, Alberta, Don Mazankowski. And I know, Mr. Speaker, that they know if Mazankowski were still the minister of transport and if Joe Clark were still the prime minister of this province, we would not have the problems that we are experiencing with the Crow today. I put it to you, Mr. speaker, and to the members opposite that Mazankowski would not have done to the Crow what Jean-Luc Pepin and the other eastern Liberals have done to our Crow change.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG: — Their philosophy, Mr. Speaker, is different throughout. I ask the members opposite: where was their party, where were their federal counterparts, on the Grenada issue? When that matter came up, Ed Broadbent jumped out, running off at the mouth, condemning our closest ally. He condemned the Americans for sending the troops into Grenada.

It's known, Mr. Speaker, that the Americans did not confer with Trudeau prior to sending troops into Grenada. They did so with other countries, and I ask why. I think that, although it's never been said, Mr. Speaker, I think that possibly he was considered to be a security risk and, accordingly, was not advised of the American intentions in Grenada.

I can imagine, Mr. Speaker, the phone hanging up and Trudeau immediately off to the overseas operator with a call to Castro, advising them, and as such, American lives could have been lost. If that were at all a possibility, I think he would be duly considered to be a security risk and, accordingly, not worthy of prior notice of the American's intentions in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, it's known that in that country, rebels shot the Prime Minister and members of the cabinet, and then declared themselves to be law — set up martial law, curfews, etc. And I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if this sort of event would have happened in this country, what would have happened? Would we have wanted intervention? I think certainly that would be the case if something that heinous took place in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the CBC sent in an army of reporters into that country. They combed the hills — I put it to you — trying to find one Grenadian who would speak against the American intervention. They came back empty handed.

I recall Barbara Fromm from the CBC interviewing Grenadians living in Canada, attempting to find someone who could disagree. Again, she had no luck. She came up empty handed. When the dust settled, Mr. Speaker, the majority of Americans, who are quick to condemn themselves,

democratic delegations, etc., overwhelmingly supported the U.S. action

I would think, Mr. Speaker, that this is something where the New Democrats, through their federal counterparts, have demonstrated their trigger-happy approach. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, after 200 years in that country of virtually spotless decency and democracy, you would think that the NDP would give our closest ally the benefit of the doubting that situation. No, sir, they jump out immediately, condemning them before all the facts were in, and I think for that position the members across the room and the NDP in Ottawa should be severely scolded and condemned by the people of this country, who certainly were a little more patient in coming to conclusions on the righteousness of the American's move.

A party, Mr. Speaker, bankrupt of ideas, bankrupt of the knowledge of who's who in the world. Mr. Speaker, in April of 1981, and I would ask the remaining three members or four members opposite who are in the House at this time to take note of my remarks in this regard . . . In April of 1981, the Leader of the Opposition, the then premier of the province, make a shadowy pilgrimage to Cuba and I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what he was talking about in the first weeks in April of 1981. What was he talking to Castro about? What was he telling them about he Canadians, who his supporters were? We don't know, Mr. Speaker. He did not provide us with any reports of what he was doing in Cuba.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that at this time the polls show that if an election were called today, the NDP would be reduced to virtually a few stragglers on the Vancouver Island. I think that it only goes to show, Mr. Speaker, and certainly in light of their convention last week-end, that they failed to keep up with the times, that their norms and values do not change from day to day. They don't try to represent the people, but they try to indoctrinate the people into their way of thinking, as opposed to trying it represent the going thought of the community and the country. They stick to their dogmatic, socialist ideals. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there was no change this week-end at their convention. They had the same president. They had the same resolutions as last year. They have the same leader. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they are out of touch. They're out of office and out of hope. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, from my remarks, it's very obvious that I will be voting against their amendment and for the resolution. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WEIMAN: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's again an honour and a privilege to be able to speak in this House, and I would like to thank the constituents of Fairview for allowing me to do so. Before I get into my speech proper though, there are a few comments that I would like to make. When we resumed sitting last week, a great portion of the debate had to do with the double standards — the so-called double standards — and I think we can fully appreciate now that the government side of the House as finally put to rest, during debate, this myth of double standard and put the onus on the shoulders where it is deserved. In totality, it is finally the people of the province that finally determine which ones are telling the truth and which are not.

The last time I spoke in the House on throne debate, Mr. Speaker, I tried to appeal to the intelligence and the empathy of the opposition members now beside me, rather than opposite me, attempting to have them look at themselves internally, attempting to have them change their attitudes. It is with great regret that I report in the House this evening that I have failed. I made a New Year's resolution, Mr. Speaker, a few months in advance, and I promise my constituents and the people of Saskatchewan that I shall not fail again. I shall never in this House appeal to their intelligence and their empathy.

I suppose a lot of the feelings that they have, were brought about through that trauma, that culture shock, that they went through a year and a half ago, and they still haven't gotten over that — the culture shock of losing the general election. They haven't gotten over the idea that they professed to be a truism in their party, that they alone had the divine right to govern this province. Perhaps the fault lies in that they had to have endured with the type of leadership they

had. The facts are, Mr. Speaker, we have Devine; they have the other leader. And that's probably where their failure is, in part. I shall go on to explain some of their other failures.

What I would like to discuss though, Mr. Speaker, this evening is the role of government in the province, focusing particularly on the terminology "responsible." Responsible government. This is what the people asked for on April 26, '82. And that, I believe, is what they have received. A responsible government is a two-way street. It is not only members of the government-elect who must act responsibly; it also is incumbent upon the opposition to act responsibly.

I want to touch on a few instances, if I may. The PURC program — the public utilities review commission. Every time the PURC is brought up in the House, we hear howls of derision and laughter. The Premier spoke to it this afternoon. Why did we set up the PURC? Who are on PURC?

The commission is made up of a cross-section of leaders in our community to ensure that any increases in utility rates are legitimate. What did we have in the past? Arbitrary setting of the rates. Arbitrary setting of the rates at times when it was convenient, politically, to do it, and no mention of rates when it was politically inconvenient. That's what we did. To the people of Saskatchewan, you have to ask the question: who acted more responsibly?

Another instance, Mr. Speaker, is the MIRP program — the mortgage interest reduction plan, an opportunity for the householders of this province. And it's just a little while back when there was the real fear of losing their homes. We promised, and we delivered, that we would set the rates in such a way as to guarantee that they would not go any higher than 13.25 per cent. What was the response of the opposition, at that time the legitimate government? If I may quote to you, "We are not in a position to announce any new policies which will mitigate the effect of high interest rates" — the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, Allan Blakeney, in this House, 1980. He went on further to say, "Our position is that the first steps to be taken with respect to interest rates ought to be taken by the federal government." Is that a responsible reply to the people of this province when, as I indicated earlier, there was that real fear of losing their houses, losing their households? To make matters worse, what type of program did they offer to try to help these people when the pressure was on before the writ came out? The response, quite simply: "Don't worry about it. Don't pay your interest rates." Were they encouraging people to act irresponsibly? Again, I ask the people of this province: who acted responsibly and who acted irresponsibly?

Gas tax. There's another one that will bring those cries up. "Oh, no, not the old story of the gas tax. Not the gas tax again. You always bring it up. You always bring it up. It's the same old story." Mr. Speaker, it's not the same old story. It's the same new story. Let's put the gas tax in perspective. Twelve million dollars per month, \$450,000 per day that is back into the pockets of the citizenry of this province — disposable income that they can use to buy those items that are needed in the households. And where are they spending it? They're spending it in the stores, in the grocery stores, the small business men. They're buying the shirts; they're buying school supplies for their children, so much so that the private entrepreneurs had so much interest and so much encouragement by it that over 6,500 new businesses have come into effect since we took government — over 6,500 since we have come into power. That's what the gas tax means. That's what it means — money in people's pockets. But how do they interpret this? How do they interpret small business? How do they interpret free enterprise?

Again, if I may quote a past member of this House, past member of this House from The Battlefords, David Miner. Quote *Hansard*, November '81. Just a few short months before they went to the polls, November '81, and I quote: "Mr. Speaker, I don't believe in free enterprise." End of quote. And those people out there who have that disposable income, who have the encouragement of free enterprise, said basically on April 26, "I don't believe you." That's why they were turfed out.

Another one that we hear in the House, in which the members of the government are castigated for, is the open for business programs. What were we endeavouring to do with our open for business policy? Is it irresponsible for us to try to create a climate in this province where there would be investor confidence, and did it work? Of course it worked — 6,500 new businesses. Is that irresponsible? Is it irresponsible to set royalty structures that encourage the risk and the initiatives that are necessary to bring about new development opportunities? That's not irresponsible.

We heard the Minister of Energy, just last week, announce the success story regarding that. Who is being responsible in this province?

You know, you look at the Province of Saskatchewan, and it's been said before, there is an analogy there, the analogy that of a supermarket. We have people within this rural society of ours that are crying, begging, for the resources and the goods that we have in this province. It's like going into a supermarket where the shelves are all filled, and they want to come in and buy. They want to come in and purchase, but they're hesitant. They're very hesitant. They're afraid. They're looking at this supermarket door and they're saying, "Do I go in and purchase something, pay a fair price, only to be met at the door and have my goods confiscated?" because that was the mentality and the message that were sent around North America, and indeed the world, by the past administration. You'll pay a good price, a fair price, but if we don't like it we'll confiscate it. We'll confiscate the potash and we'll bring in laws retroactively to make sure that we do it. No wonder they're a little hesitant.

Would you not be a little hesitant, as my fellow colleague points out, from Melville, to come into this supermarket only to have your purchases redeemed for one dollar? A stated policy of the members opposite. Which is responsible, and which is irresponsible? To spread fear, not only fear and hesitancy to the people of your province, but to spread that malignancy throughout North America and then to berate our Premier or to berate our prime ministers, to have to go to different parts of the world to try to undo those doom stories, to undo that mentality. People of Saskatchewan, who is responsible and who is irresponsible?

And if the message is not clear enough about how far you're willing to go to keep that cancer alive, you have your own leader, at a time of restraint across this province and this country, at a time when fences are trying to be mended, when people are trying to pull together, you have your leader speak publicly and advocate militancy in the labour forces. Where is the responsible actions of the members opposite? As I stated before, the people of the province are the ones best to judge.

I couldn't let one comment go by from the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg. Maybe this will paint a picture clearer to the citizenry of this province. When you have a member in this House, whether a back-bencher, Legislative Secretary, member of the opposition, or a minister, stand up in this House and act in the name that is prescribed to all of us in this House, that being the hon. member. And that hon. member acts honourably by speaking the truth in this House, that being the hon. member. And that hon. member acts honourably by speaking the truth in this House. And the member from Saskatoon Centre, the hon. member from Saskatoon Centre, stands up and speaks a truism in this House regarding past reviews and reports on alcohol and legislation, and you have the gall to stand up in this House and say that anybody who speaks the truth is sleazy and slimy. They don't understand the truth. It has to be sleazy and slimy. Well, I would be very much interested in your definition of truth, then, if you think hon. members' definition of truth is sleazy and slimy. You do a disservice to the hon. members in this House and a disservice to your constituents.

Another topic that I could not let go by. There have been some accusations, in fact not accusations, out and out baiting. "You people back there, you 14 back-benchers, aren't you in a mood of dissension? Look at all the cabinet ministers. Look at all the Legislative Secretaries. They put you on the C team. Don't you feel bad about it? Don't you feel bad about it?" You know why they brought that topic up? Because they have no appreciation for what an MLA truly does,

because they never ever did it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WEIMAN: — Before I decided to get into politics in the city of Saskatoon . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I would love, Mr. Speaker, I would love to get into an intellectual debate with the member opposite, but it would be unfair. It would be unfair because he's insufficiently armed — insufficiently armed . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I wouldn't want to get into that debate with you. I would love to continue the discussion of the mental dexterity that you show. The only thing that keeps me back from it is I'm always a little frightful of dealing with people like that, who, when you say hello to them, are stuck for an answer.

At any rate, I want to come back to my pride in having those 14 colleagues of mine in the back benches. When I went into politics, going through Saskatoon, there wasn't a constituency office the people could go to. Oh, there was a little room in the Sturdy-Stone Centre. Part of responsibility is not only acting responsibly, but being responsible to your constituents. They have to be able to feel that you are accessible. They must be able to approach you with their problems. This is why they have no concept of what an MLA does. You did not continue on. You did not act responsibly when you were government, and that was another one of the reasons why you were sent out, why you were humiliated at the polls.

On this point of accessibility, on this point of the type of mentality that was built up in this province that my colleagues are trying so hard to undo, I want to repeat a telephone conversation I had last week in my constituency. A lady phoned me up with a particular concern, a need. And I talked to her on the phone. (She didn't complain about the 25 cents.) And I talked to her on the phone and I assured her that I would try my best. I may not be able to get her the answer that she would like; it may be the answer that she doesn't like, but I would try my best. Before she hung up the phone, I could tell that there was a little bit of hesitancy in her voice. I says, "Everything all right, Ma'am? Be assured, I will work on your behalf." She says, "Well, I'm a little . . . I don't know how to say this to you, but you mean you really will help me?"

I said, "Of course, ma'am, that's what I got elected to do."

She said, "You'll even help me if I tell you I was NDP?"

A mentality that says that if you want help and you need assistance, the only way you could get it in the past was if you were part of the club. Forget all those Liberals out there. Forget all those Conservatives out there; all those WCCers or any other faction. The mentality that was impressed upon this woman's mind was that if you wanted help or assistance from government, you had to be an NDP, and if you still were an NDP, no other person would help you. That's what my colleagues are doing out there — working in their constituencies, following up on calls and assisting their clientele, where you failed in all three aspects, and that showed up in April 26, 1982.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WEIMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I cannot say enough about my colleagues. I am proud to be within the same room as they are. But as much as I am proud, as much as I am proud, member opposite, I also have to report to the House that I am grateful and thankful. I am grateful and thankful, Mr. Speaker, that the supporters of the members opposite cared enough to send their very best. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, myself, my colleagues, the people of this province, I don't think, could long endure had they sent us their very worst. So I am grateful and thankful.

Where do we hear the greatest hoots of derision in this House? The budget, the deficit. I want to talk about those for a moment or two. The first thing we hear is the ridicule of the restraint program. It's already been brought up in this House that our restraint program is tame compared

to the NDP restraint program in Manitoba. But you know, in that same newspaper clipping that was brought to the House's attention, I think there was one aspect that was overlooked. The one aspect — and I may be corrected on this, but you may look it up in the *Leader-Post* or the *Star Phoenix* — was this: how caring are you for that poor wage-earner out there? Well, I'll tell you how caring your colleague are. They have imposed a 1.5 per cent employment tax. Let's tax these workers further, that's what you think of the hard workers, and yet you ridicule our restraint program. Which is more responsible?

We came down with our first budget in response to the sorry condition that we found this province in when we came to power.

The hon. minister, Robert Andrew, came down in the November budget, and what was the response of the opposition? The Leader of the Opposition holding a wad of bills in his hand, \$10 bills and \$1 bills, and saying, "This is what it means to you people; this is what it means to you." But did you notice the absence — the absence — of the bogus billion dollar betrayal of the heritage fund in his other hand? I didn't see him standing up there with a billion dollars worth of funny money — money that is not real, that did not exist. A betrayal to the people of this province? I didn't see him standing doing that. No, the \$10 bills, the \$10 bills.

They would have the people of this province believe that we should go out and act irresponsibly — build more capital buildings, put them up, increase this, increase this, increase this — but yet at the same time, say, "Don't do it without a deficit. Don't do it without increasing taxation." I hope that the message that I hear from the opposition when they use that kind of logic does not lead me or you, the people of Saskatchewan, to believe that they believe that the populace of this province are mental midgets, because you can only spend what you have.

You only have a few alternatives. You can increase taxation, but this isn't the appropriate time — if ever there is an appropriate time. Or, you can borrow, and this is what we chose to do. This is what we chose to do. I am asking you: who acted responsibly, and who acted irresponsibly?

And yet they say they have a better way. You can do this magic game of juggling dollars, dollars that don't exist, and still do all the things that they profess that we should do that they didn't do when they had the opportunity. And so what did the Minister of Finance . . . How did he respond to that? "If you guys are the brightest lights on the street, I invite you to sit down and join in with me in the budgetary process. Share your ideas with us. If it's any way that we can alleviate the problems and the concerns of the population of Saskatchewan, share it with us. We'll give you credit. We'll give you . . . "No, didn't want no part of it. This magic formula is still a better kept secret than the formula for Coca-Cola, and they are unwilling to share it. We'll give you the credit for it. Who is acting responsibly and who is acting irresponsibly?

Here's but a few of many, many instances, and of course you will see more in the upcoming days. Now as a rational person, I go back to my constituents and they ask me, "Why are those nice people saying such bad things about you?" And I have to try to understand that and try to explain it to my constituents. And I can't. It's a chicken Little syndrome. Running around, the sky is falling on their head, and therefore they're convinced it's falling on everybody else's head also. They just have not taken the time to look up and see that there really is a blue sky.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WEIMAN: — Let's stop the charade. Let's stop the charade . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The only time hon. member is . . . Just an aside about pink clouds, Mr. Speaker . . . is at sunset. That's right. And you have met your sunset.

But let's stop this charade. I guess that if I were in the same position, I might be inclined, might be inclined, to react the same way . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You have convinced me. I definitely would not react in the same way. But what is this reaction to? It's quite honestly and

quite blatantly a reaction to fear — fear of their party's fortunes. It's also a fear, a fear to the inevitable. A fear of the inevitable. Now, is the fear justified? April 26, 1982 — total catastrophe, humiliation. Last weekend — Saskatoon convention — dissension within their own party ranks. Future date, not known yet — panic over the federal election. Is that fear justified? You better believe that fear is justified.

There's another fear. It's a fear that's a clamminess that paralyses. And that's a fear to acknowledge your own kind, a fear to acknowledge your own kind — a fear of being found out. What is he talking about? What is he talking about? Mr. Speaker, never have I, never will I be afraid to acknowledge that I am a PC, or to acknowledge one of my PC colleagues. Never. Let me read: "The nearly famous Prairie Fire band went to North Battleford Wednesday, November 9." They had some great entertainment. I suppose I may have gone there myself. Frankie Yankovic, Captain Candle — you have to go see Captain Candle. Western Senators. Some western senators you might want to go see, but you couldn't miss this.

How can I go? The price is reasonable; \$7.50, lunch included. Where can I get a ticket? I want to go. I'm loyal. I love country music. Well, I can phone Wilkie. I can phone 843-2364. I can phone Spiritwood. Another good one, 883-2702. I can phone Meadow Lake, and on and on and on and on. I can phone and buy these tickets. You may not recognize the voice, but who is Wilkie? Please help me if I mispronounce this name, because I've had instances in the past where my name has been mispronounced. That sure I not Dwain. Delaine, that's it — Delaine Scotton. Wilkie. Lloyd Johnson, past MLA for Turtleford; Dave Bridger, Dave Bridger, NDP candidate last election. And not be proud of your own people and to be able to say, "this is an NDP function." Not being able to face your own kind, to stand up there and be proud and say, "I'm proud to be an NDPer." You have to resort to subterfuge such as this, and you can't face your own kind. Then you definitely do have a justification to be afraid. Definitely.

This fear will eventually manifest itself. It will manifest itself with the eradication and extinction of the NDP party in this province. You will place yourself in a display case in the Saskatchewan Museum of Natural History between that of a dinosaur and the dodo. You will be gone. Your own people will determine that if you are afraid to acknowledge them.

Why do I say the dinosaur? I think the dinosaur and the dodo is an apt parallel. We know the dinosaur has been gone. They ruled the earth for quite a long time. They're gone now. Why? They failed to adapt.

The dodo is an interesting comparison also. What is the dodo bird? A dodo bird is a squat-backed, little bird, with stubby little wings, and a big beak, that was hunted to extinction — hunted to extinction. And why? It got lazy and it forgot how to fly. That's what happened to the dodo bird. It forgot how to fly. It was so busy with its head down saying, "The world is coming down, the world is coming down." — the Chicken Little syndrome, the Chicken Little syndrome.

And to the people of the province, I want to suggest, the members opposite not only have acted irresponsibly, because, in all selfishness, if they'd acted responsibly, they would make the government even act more responsible. And if we acted more responsible, the second coming wouldn't let these people in. Not only have they acted irresponsibly, but they are bankrupt of ideas; they lack any kind of initiative, and, worst of all, they don't take heed of the electorate. They don't listen.

As I've mentioned, unless, and I don't like to beg, but I do beg you, unless you take heed, we will meet the similar fate of the dinosaur and the dodo bird.

Now, one has to be fair. Have we, as government, been letter perfect? No, we haven't. We haven't been letter perfect. We've stumbled — we stumbled in our desire and eagerness to move this province forward. We've stumbled in that eagerness and desire to make this province

a great province in this country to fulfil its full potential. Yes, we've stumbled. We've been tripped, too. We've been tripped. We've been tripped by those people who fear free thinking and openness. We were tripped by those people. Still got up. We still got up.

We faced roadblocks — many, many roadblocks. I've mentioned the pit to you — the pit — the billion dollar heritage fund in it. Yes, we've had roadblocks. When we opened the books and there was nothing there for us to fulfil your dreams. Yes, we've done that. We had not been letter perfect, but we have no intention of giving up, no intention whatsoever. Saskatchewan is now finally on the move, the momentum is there, the momentum to build this province, and we shall obtain our rightful destiny in this country. We are not giving up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WEIMAN: — What about fairness to the opposition? Obviously, they must have done something right in past administrations. I can't think of one right now. They must have done something right in the last administration because they returned eight — they returned eight.

I suppose that if I was really hard-pressed to come up with some of the great things they did in the last administration, I would have to quite literally count those good things on the fingers of my left hand, and there aren't very many fingers on this left hand.

As I've indicated, Mr. Speaker, we came to power because the people of the province believed us. They had high expectations of us. Those expectations came about because we had high expectations of ourselves. What I can say is, the job's not finished. We are not going to close up now because we've only been here a year and a half. We've just begun. We are determined not only to meet those expectations, but to exceed them.

Mr. Speaker, in conscience, in loyalty to this province, in service to my constituency, I have no other alternative to be voting in favour of the motion and opposed to the amendment. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. YEW: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to take part in this debate, Mr. Speaker, in respect to my response, my constituency's response, the response of this opposition, to the third throne speech presented to us by the Conservative government.

As I reviewed the throne speech itself, Mr. Speaker, as I have listened to the Conservative members in this debate, three things have become very obvious — three things, Mr. Speaker, painfully obvious.

First, the throne speech itself was barren, and it was empty. It is a disappointment to all Saskatchewan people, and it is particularly an insult to northern people, an insult to northern Saskatchewan in particular.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, that throne speech was just the latest example of a Conservative government's big business policy. Big business, double standard policy by this Tory government.

And third, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite, the Conservative members, the back-benchers, have become nervous and very defensive. They have become nervous, Mr. Speaker. They have become very defensive. The point here is that they are not talking about anything that relates at all to the throne speech. Nothing at all. They have nothing to present to the people of this province. They have absolutely nothing. They are attacking the individual opposition members of the House. They have a throne speech that is barren, that is empty, that has no promise, that has no future. So what do they do? They have obviously no reason for standing up and debating on the throne speech. Their only other option then is to attack the opposition members of this

caucus.

Mr. Speaker, they know, as well, that the people of Saskatchewan are also beginning to ask questions about this Conservative government. They are asking questions, Mr. Speaker. They are asking questions about this Conservative government's policy of restraint, and then they spend . . . This Conservative government preaches restraint and then they spend an extra \$3 million a year on a huge cabinet expansion, a huge cabinet expansion.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Only missed 13.

MR. YEW: — They missed 13, 14 back-benchers but they increased their cabinet. They increased their Legislative Secretary positions. They have increased . . . Another huge bureaucracy. They chastise the former administration for bureaucracy where they themselves have established a bureaucracy. They have established a bureaucracy of cabinet ministers that are not required, Legislative Secretaries that weren't there with the former administration.

How can they freeze, as well, the minimum wage? And then they turn around and provide an \$11,000 a year pay increase to their political advisers. And still they preach restraint.

People of this province are raising questions like: how can they totally ignore the issues and needs of northern people and then boast about their \$100 million royalty gifts for the big oil companies?

They preach restraint, Mr. Speaker. Right now, at the moment, the people of this province, the people that are unemployed, every man, woman, and child, every family in this province is paying \$66 million per year interest to the banking companies that money was borrowed from by this government. It comes to \$5.5 million a month, Mr. Speaker. I have statistics here that point those figures out very clearly. At this point in time we are spending \$1.3 million a week. That money, Mr. Speaker, could be well used to create jobs for the unemployed in this province.

Royalty breaks for the big companies, Mr. Speaker: \$100 million per year. And then they turn around and put a freeze on the minimum wage. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and the people of this province ask: is that fair? Is that a government which is fair, or is that a government which is so arrogant with its huge majority that it is determined to play double standard politics? And it is those questions, Mr. Speaker, which are making the government members very nervous these days — very nervous and defensive.

Across the North, Mr. Speaker, ordinary men and women now feel betrayed by the Devine Conservatives of this province. People in this province are feeling ignored, particularly the people of the North. They are feeling and they are feeling betrayed by this Conservative government.

They may search, the people of the North may search through 12 pages of the throne speech, search through its 12 long, dull pages, and, Mr. Speaker, they will find not one single reference to northern Saskatchewan — not one single reference, not one single acknowledgement of the special conditions and problems that exist in northern Saskatchewan.

The unemployment rate in northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, has risen with this Conservative government's administration — doubled. From October 1981 to October of 1983, it has increased by 43 per cent. And they talk about jobs coming out of the big oil companies.

The member for P.A.-Duck Lake mentioned some jobs that have sprung out of this big business philosophy of theirs, and I see that there has been an increase of 21 per cent unemployment in Prince Albert . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Boy, if you want some numbers, the member for Regina whatever, I'll tell you. In October of 1981 we had 1,103 people on the unemployment roll; today we have almost 2,000. We have 1,923 people, an increase of 43 per cent in the area of La Ronge. That's a huge increase and yet your Conservative government boast of new jobs, new

job options, new opportunities, and the selling out of Saskatchewan resources.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that there was not one single acknowledgement of the special conditions and problems of northern Saskatchewan. The high unemployment rates I have mentioned, and they are existent. The unemployment rates in the North are anywhere from 80 per cent to 95 per cent. The welfare case-loads, which are increasing as well, have doubled. The training programs which are required for northern residents have never been acknowledged or supported or encouraged from this throne speech or any other budget presentation presented and introduced by this Conservative government.

Northern people in communities across northern Saskatchewan look at that throne speech, and they ask: doesn't the Devine government understand that our communities are different, with special opportunities and special problems? Doesn't it understand that northern people are proud, proud of their communities, proud of their achievements of the 1970s?

The Devine Conservatives have no sensitivity whatsoever toward many people in this province. And let there be no mistake, Mr. Speaker, during the last 11 years of the Blakeney government, more was accomplished for the people of northern Saskatchewan, and by the people of northern Saskatchewan, than in any comparable period of any other place in Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Or the world.

MR. YEW: — Or the world. I thank my colleague from Athabasca for pointing that out.

No northern resident, however, will claim that the record was perfect. No one will deny that there was much left to do, but they will all agree, Mr. Speaker, that the special problems were recognized, that noble, genuine efforts were made, and that great achievements were made.

The former administration, the former government, brought about dramatic changes in northern Saskatchewan. Major infrastructures were built. We had new schools. We had new programs, new hospital and health services. We have improved transportation services. We have, as well, provided for new sewer and water facilities in many of the major communities.

We look closely at this throne speech, Mr. Speaker. We look closely at this Conservative government's budget. We look closely at their policies and programs for ordinary residents of the North. What we find is that this Conservative government has only one policy, and that is big business policy. The Conservative government has only one agenda, and that's their big business agenda.

They have no policy, no sensitivity at all for the working man and woman, as well as those people who are on the unemployment list, the people that are handicapped, the poor and the helpless.

They forget to acknowledge and recognize the hardships, as well, of northern people. They had talked about bringing about new policy, new programs. They had talked about bringing about an economic self-sufficiency package. But where is that economic self-sufficiency program that they talked about? To date, they have not initiated any major economic program. They have absolutely no policy for northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. This Conservative government has only one approach, the double standard approach, and one standard for ordinary people — trappers, fishermen, teachers, nurses, or miners — and a very different standard, a richer standard, for the big business friends of the Tories.

What the people elected this government to do, Mr. Speaker, was to govern our province, and to govern it in the interest of all. What they need, Mr. Speaker, what they called for is a positive vision of Saskatchewan — not the shallow slogans of the advertising man, but a positive vision, a sound plan, and a concrete proposal for Saskatchewan.

My constituent seat, Mr. Speaker, is some recognition by this government of the real needs of northern Saskatchewan. Where is this plan for developing employment in the North? Where in the throne speech, or in the budget, where is the plan for jobs for northern people? Where is its plan for training? Where is its concrete, positive proposals for ensuring that Northerners are able to become trained for the work-force, training that is required for us as Northerners to become productive and to contribute to the economic opportunities of our province?

And what about the Conservatives' economic development plan for northern people? Concrete positive proposals: where are those proposals?

The Conservatives are eager to sit down with the big natural gas producers and consult about ways to raise their price of natural gas. They are eager to consult with the big oil companies, Mr. Speaker, about plans to provide \$100 million a year in oil royalty breaks. They are eager to consult with developers, planning how to destroy the Department of Environment. Why, then, will this government not begin some honest consultation with honest planning, to begin some honest consultation, some honest planning with northern communities and their residents for positive economic development? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is all too simple: because economic development and jobs for northern people are not on the big business agenda of the Devine government.

The comparisons are truly striking, Mr. Speaker. Number one, \$95,000 a year in salary for a part-time job to a recent Tory appointee as chairman of the Labour Relations Board. But, as my colleague pointed out the other day, there are, at present, no doctors to staff the La Loche hospital.

Another example, they spent more than \$3 million a year to pay for additional cabinet ministers and legislative secretaries to expand another huge bureaucracy, but, instead, they have cancelled the proposed, the approved projects, the hospital and the nursing care home that was proposed for La Ronge. They cancelled that totally just to expand their government and their cabinet members and their legislative secretaries — to expand their bureaucracy.

Another example, Mr. Speaker, is their policies of restraint, and a double standard policy of this Conservative government. They spend an additional \$250,000 in new luxury cars for cabinet ministers and Conservative advisers. But they place less emphasis on the severe financial pressures of the education and health care services for the people of this province.

A hundred million dollars in royalty breaks for the big oil companies each year, Mr. Speaker, but no political will and no resources to enforce the Key Lake surface lease agreement.

At the moment, Mr. Speaker, the people of northern Saskatchewan have many hard times. They have hard times in terms of employment. They have had opportunities by the former government to be recognized in major projects such as Key Lake. But at the present time we have had little or no support or encouragement by this government in terms of the training, in terms of employment options. We have no encouragement or support or information or incentives coming from this government with respect to the Key Lake project.

And so, Mr. Speaker, as we review the Conservatives' throne speech, as we review this throne speech debate, let all members of this Assembly take a close look at the government's words, and at its performance.

Let us look for some evidence that it does understand the needs and aspirations of Saskatchewan people. Let us look for some evidence that even Conservatives can recognize the pride, the dignity, and community traditions of northern people and the people of this province.

Let us look for some evidence that the Devine government has a sensitive, positive vision of the

North — a vision of a better future for them, working co-operatively in their communities. A better future, Mr. Speaker. A future of employment or productive contribution to their communities and their province.

And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan are fair. I believe that when they examine the promises which have been made by this government, the promises which have been broken, I believe that when they review the Devine government's words and match them to its deeds, and I believe that as they review these promises, these words, those deeds, in fairness, they will reach one overwhelming conclusion: that the Conservatives have betrayed the people of this province, the people of Saskatchewan. They are betraying the people still. They have betrayed, ignored and insulted the people of the North in particular, Mr. Speaker, and the people of this province, the people of Saskatchewan, are forming their judgement.

With the performance of this throne speech, the content of the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, I therefore cannot support the motion. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased, and indeed very proud, to be entering the throne speech debate tonight. It's the first time in about two and a half years that I have done so. The last time was in 1981 in the reply to the budget speech in this House, and I will come back to that one in a few minutes, Mr. Speaker.

I don't intend to be very long this evening, and I hadn't really wanted to enter this debate tonight. But I have been listening to some of the speeches, and I have heard some of my colleagues on this side, I've heard some of my colleagues in the opposition, and I can't resist the opportunity and the temptation, Mr. Speaker.

There are four areas I want to cover tonight. The four areas are: the speeches that I just referred to a minute ago; I want to talk about the attitude of the members opposite, to my left; I would like to set the record straight in a couple of instances, Mr. Speaker; and then I would also like to discuss our accomplishments, or, better still, some of our accomplishments, Mr. Speaker, because if I talked about all of them, I'd have to run the clock out.

I want to congratulate, Mr. Speaker, the members on this side of the Assembly, those members who entered the debate, for the very positive manner and way in which they replied and in which they spoke. It is encouraging to listen to the speeches and to the members. They have a vision, and it's evident from listening to their speeches. They have a vision, Mr. Speaker, of the future of Saskatchewan. It's evident in their speeches, Mr. Speaker, that they are proud of their province. They are proud of their government. They are proud of their leader. They are proud of the Premier of this province, and they are proud to be a member of this Assembly. And that was very evident. And I'm proud to be associated with those members.

But I do want to speak about the attitude of the members opposite. In listening to their attacks, listening to their cynicism, listening to their remarks, in every instance, from the Leader of the Opposition down to the last member who just spoke and sat down, their reply to the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, has been an attack, an attack on the government — and that is fair enough, that's fair enough. I accept that. You're in the opposition, and I accept that. But when you lay that attack on the people of this province, or when you lay that attack on the province itself or on its economic development, then you go one step too far.

Mr. Speaker, in their replies, to a man they're attacked a business community, they've attacked farmers, they've attacked the civil servants. In short, Mr. Speaker, they've attacked the people of Saskatchewan, and I can't accept that. I can accept the attacks on the members of the government, the MLAs elected on this side. I can understand their bitterness in the defeat that they experienced a year and half ago, April 26, 1982. I understand that. But they forget, they

forget, Mr. Speaker, that they were elected, the same as the members on this side were elected — were elected to do a job. They were elected in their case to be in the opposition. And they have to accept the responsibility that they have in being a member of the opposition, and that responsibility they have not yet accepted.

Mr. Speaker, the role of the opposition, very simply, is to be the auditors of the record of government. I haven't heard very much from them in that respect. There is a role of the official opposition, Mr. Speaker, to be the voice of the conscience of government. And it is the role of the official opposition to constructively criticize the workings of government. I'll add to that as well; the role of the opposition is to offer some alternatives, offer some alternatives to the government if they don't like what we are introducing, and what we are suggesting, what we are legislating.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago I indicated that I would come back to a speech I made in this Assembly in 1981. And that was exactly what I did at that time. It was in reply to the budget speech, and at that time, rather than criticize and attack the Minister of Finance at the time for his speech, I laid out for the opposition — when we were in the opposition — a 31-point program that I suggested to the government of the day. Well, this budget speech had already gone by, it was too late to do anything about it that year. But one short year later, Mr. Speaker, those suggestions that I had put into that were introduced in the following budget speech.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the attitude taken by the members opposite has been a discredit — a discredit to the system, a discredit to this House, discredit to the province, a discredit to the people of Saskatchewan, and, Mr. Speaker, a discredit to their own party. We've said for a number of years they were bankrupt of ideas, and they still are. They are not taking their responsibilities seriously, and, frankly, I don't think they know how.

I want to say to the members opposite, that you have no faith in our province, from the remarks that you have made. You have no faith in the province; you are not proud of Saskatchewan. You are not proud of the people that live here. Frankly, I don't think you want to see people coming back — those people that you drove away.

The only concern that I can believe from the members opposite, that they have, is for their own party. Not the province, but your party. Not the people, but your own party.

And I think that was evidenced, Mr. Speaker, by one former member and one former chief executive officer of a crown corporation that worked for the government opposite, when, instead of believing in their province, took it upon themselves to travel the world to compete against Saskatchewan.

A man, David Dombowsky, who was paid \$150,000 by those members opposite — and I will come back to that later on — who went travelling across the world, trying to sell Manitoba potash, not Saskatchewan. Competing against his own province.

And if that isn't bad enough — if that isn't bad enough, Mr. Speaker — they have a previous cabinet minister who did exactly the same thing, a cabinet minister who stood in this Assembly, who sat in this chair, and hypocritically, hypocritically expounded the virtues of this province.

As soon as he leaves the legislature, as soon as he leaves the party, what do they do? Go out and sell, not our province, but Manitoba. And you know why? The only reason why, of course, is because in Manitoba there is an NDP party. When I say the members opposite are more concerned for their party than they are for the government, or their province, that is what I mean, Mr. Speaker.

Well, I could go on and on and on about their attitude, Mr. Speaker, but I hope — and I sincerely

mean this — I hope you get the message. Gentlemen, you are only eight, and you took a shellacking. You took a beating last year, but you'll take a worse one if you continue with the attitude that you have.

I am proud of Saskatchewan. I was not born in this province; this is my adopted province. And I believe in the future of this province, and I believe in the people of this province, and what you are doing to it is degrading this province. Mr. Speaker, I can't accept that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to set the record straight. I would like to set the record straight on a couple of issues. And I know my colleague, the Attorney General, indicated or responded to their vicious attack in this Assembly last Thursday, but I want to repeat it.

I was accused by the members opposite of having known about the closure of Intercontinental Packers before when we sold it — in Regina, the closure of the plant in Regina. And I want to . . . Again, I know this has been introduced in the House before, and I know it has been tabled, and I only regret, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition is not in the assembly this evening. But the letter I received from the chairman of the board and the chief executive officer of Intercontinental Packers sets out the truth about Intercontinental Packers. Let me read it to you:

I have enclosed a copy of I.P.L., Directors' Minutes from November 4, 1981 and June 10, 1982 (you were just in office a few weeks) 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, \$56,000 of a \$75,000 study completed on October 31, 1981, by Knud Simonsen Engineering which recommended closing the Regina plant (Study excerpts re closing Regina, plus consultant's letter to Saskatchewan Industry and Commerce attached).

And he carries on, and I just want to read this one more paragraph, Mr. Speaker:

For your information, 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.

There is hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker, and there is hypocrisy. For the members to take the attitude that they took with the closure of that plant is, again, inexcusable.

Mr. Speaker, they talk about . . . I want to touch on that for a second. They talk about the double standards of the wages paid to senior civil servants. In fact some of their ads indicate, Mr. Speaker, that we have given raises to 500 senior bureaucrats. They've said it in this Assembly; they've said it on various news media and talk shows.

Well, the first thing I would like to indicate to the members opposite, number one, is that out of the 500 that they refer to, 450 of them were the bureaucrats that they hired. They were their bureaucrats. So what are they telling us? Are they saying that we shouldn't give those people a raise — the people that they hired — are they saying that those civil servants are undeserving of a raise? And let's keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, what those raises amounted to. In the cases, for example, of deputy ministers, 4 per cent since we've been government — since we've been government — that's over a year and a half ago.

Four hundred and fifty of the bureaucrats that they are talking about, the civil servants that they are talking about, that they are attacking, that they are criticizing, were the very same civil servants that they hired, that worked for them. Now they are saying we shouldn't give them any raises. Well, when we fire some of these people, Mr. Speaker, they raise Cain. When we give them a raise, they raise Cain. Which way do you want it? Which way do you want it?

Unfortunately, there are only two members left on the other side tonight, so I'm not really perhaps going to get through to what I am trying to tell them.

We talk about salaries paid. It's unbelievable that they could criticize. First of all, they wouldn't tell anyone what they were paying their chief executive officers in crown corporations. I tried for four years to get the information from them. They wouldn't give it to us. They would not tell us what those people made. Mr. Speaker, they were paying a David Dombowsky, for example, \$150,000 a year plus — plus — all the perks that he received, and they were many. They paid some of the vice-presidents of CIC — and this hasn't come out yet — as high as \$135,000 plus the benefits. And I don't know where we are paying that kind of money. I haven't heard you talking about those salaries, because we're not.

So, Mr. Speaker, they talk about double standards. But when they do talk about those wages, they conveniently forget to tell about the wage, they were paying — conveniently. And, of course, the double standard of liquor advertising — and I'm not going to get into that one tonight, because I could be here for another half an hour just on that one subject alone — on that one subject alone. Mr. Speaker, when the Attorney General last week laid it out for you gentlemen what one Don Fairs, who was making the noises today, who's criticizing today, who was a member of your government at one time, and the position he took on liquor advertising in 1972 and '73, frankly, you should be ashamed of yourselves.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I said there were four areas I wanted to cover and I did. I've covered three of them so far. The last, certainly not the least important — in my opinion, the most important — I want to talk about the accomplishments of the government that sits in this Assembly today.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose if we have made a mistake as a government, one very serious mistake that we may have made is in not having told the people of Saskatchewan what we've accomplished. We could have taken a page out of their book and spent \$10 million in advertising, as they did when they advertised the family of crown corporations. Now, we could have spent \$10 million to tell the people — that's per year by the way — \$10 million a year in advertising the family of crown corporations. We could have done that to tell them how wonderful we are. And I would have said, then, that that was irresponsible. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that we should spend that kind of money to tell the people what we've done, but I believe that we should use this forum to tell the people what we're doing. Again, I will only highlight some of those accomplishments because, if I were to itemize them all, I'd be here for a long time.

And before I do, there's one little time that I forgot, and I want to bring to the attention of the members opposite. They are always so concerned about the people of Saskatchewan. They always indicate that they are concerned about their social needs, and their health care, and their education, and so on. I want to remind the members opposite of a meeting that was held on November 19, a week ago last Saturday, at City Hall. All members opposite were invited. And it was to discuss the housing needs of the disabled.

It took them 11 years to introduce in this Assembly a bill for accessibility standards for the disabled, and they only did so after I introduced one. I beat them to it. Well, Mr. Speaker, they had an opportunity to meet with 150 handicapped people, disabled people, at City Hall a week ago last Saturday. And every member, every member of this government, this caucus, and their caucus was invited. Not one of the members opposite showed up. And that's shameful. Not one of those members showed up to indicate the concerns that they have for the disabled of Saskatchewan. And that, Mr. Speaker, again is inexcusable.

I was there. I can name a couple of other cabinet ministers that were there if the member is concerned about it. But I can tell you that you should have been there, particularly the member for Regina Centre, particularly the member for Regina Elphinstone should have been there, and they were not there. And it started at 8 o'clock in the morning and went on until 4 o'clock in the afternoon. So they had all the time in the world to get there, but they didn't show up . . .

(inaudible interjection) . . . It's exactly the truth. And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly the truth if he's concerned about my telling the truth.

I indicated I wanted to talk about our accomplishments, and that's . . . going to highlight again what those accomplishments were. When we came to government, one of the first things we did was, we froze utility rates for one year. We removed the tax on gasoline. To date, Mr. Speaker, that has saved the people of Saskatchewan, from their pockets, some \$200 million, but it's also done a little more than that.

We always think of that gas tax as being 20 per cent of the price and going into the coffers and being part of the consolidated fund, but, you know, there is one area that hasn't been talked about. I want to talk about it a little bit tonight because it involves me. Twenty per cent of that money went to SGI as a subsidy to subsidize the insurance on the vehicles that they drive.

Now I have listened to the members opposite attack me and criticize me for a 3 per cent increase in the rates this year. Annualized, it works out to 1.5 per cent. And since we've been government, if you take it back to that time, it would work out to less than 1 per cent over that period of time. Now let's compare it to, Mr. Speaker, the last three years of their government, when they had a 55 per cent increase and receiving 20 per cent of that gas tax, which amounted to some \$50 per motorist. Well, when you consider that that motorist received that money and put it back in his pocket, we've had a significant decrease in the cost of insurance on automobiles — a significant decrease in the cost of insurance for automobiles in this province. Mr. Speaker, it works out to close to somewhere in the neighbourhood of 17 per cent decrease in the cost of insurance on automobiles.

Now, I'm proud of that accomplishment, Mr. Speaker. I am very proud of that, because in spite of that loss of revenue that SGI suffered in the compulsory insurance side of the insurance, we will be in the black. First time. They don't understand what that means, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, one of the major programs of this government has been the mortgage interest rebate program, a program intended to save millions of dollars to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, a program intended to save an individual's home where he might have lost it. And let's compare that, Mr. Speaker, to the anaemic home-owners' program that they introduced in 1981. No comparison. There was nothing in that program for the home-owner, absolutely nothing. We put a ceiling on interest rates, and we rebated, and to date, Mr. Speaker, some \$43 million has been rebated to the people of Saskatchewan.

I wish my predecessor in this department were here tonight, because I would like to congratulate her on the fine accomplishment of putting that program together when she was the Minister of Revenue. It was the most well-managed program that's ever been introduced by any government anywhere. It went smoothly. The people received their rebates on time, and in short, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan were able to save their homes from that program.

The farm purchase program. Well, the Minister of Agriculture touched on that not long ago — \$350,000 mortgages at 8 per cent for the first five years. Significant program. Something the members opposite couldn't understand and wouldn't know how to put together.

We lowered the taxes on oil royalties. Well, Mr. Speaker, just today in the *Leader-Post* . . . I want to quote, because coming from the particular reporter who is known for his political leanings, and John Twigg I'm referring to. And I want to thank John Twigg, and I want to congratulate him for this particular article. But just to quote from his article, Mr. Speaker:

The dramatic turnaround in Saskatchewan's oil and gas industry is one of the most interesting and important stories in the provincial economy, and perhaps the leading accomplishment of Premier Grant Devine's young government.

Well, he understands economic development, obviously. “The numbers tell some of it. The numbers (and this is John Twigg, for the member who just walked in): 1,537 wells have been drilled here as of November 16,” which easily passes the previous record set in 1980, Mr. Speaker. Now, I was pleased to see that happen today, just in today’s newspaper.

Well, let’s take a look at some of the other accomplishments of our government, and I won’t be too much longer . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, the member from Quill Lakes has just woke up. No, he’s just arrived, sorry. Just arrived. Unfortunately, I wish he had been here earlier because some of my . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I hope you do. I hope you’ll be able to read it in *Hansard*. I believe you could take heart with some of the words I’ve said this evening.

The sale of Crown owned land to farmers, land bank, and again I don’t have the figures that were passed on. One hundred and fifty years, as I recall, was the number of farms that were sold by the previous government in 11 years; and over 1,500 in the first 12 months that we’ve been government, that we have sold, putting the farm back in the hands of the individual, and not the state. We don’t believe in state ownership of farms or businesses, Mr. Speaker, as the members opposite do.

We introduced a Build-A-Home program, and 6,000 people participated, for \$18 million. Mr. Speaker, we had the best record in Canada for housing starts this year. In addition to that, an upgrader; announcement of the building of an upgrader.

Mr. Speaker, in the short period of time that we’ve been government, approximately 20,000 new jobs have been created through various programs: 3,800 through the Saskatchewan Jobs program; 4,200 through Opportunities ’83; 3,500 through a \$5,000 tax credit for small business programs, and, Mr. Speaker, all, all of these programs, all of these job creation programs, all of these tax rebate programs during a recession — one of the most severe recessions known in the history of North America, second only to the Great Depression. And all of these programs, Mr. Speaker, to provide jobs for the people of Saskatchewan, to provide a better economic development and economic climate for this province.

The natural gas program — rural gas distribution. To date over 3,000 farmers have received natural gas, thanks to a program implemented and introduced by this government.

Mr. Speaker, we ended the monopoly of government sale of telephones and telecommunication equipment.

Mr. Speaker, implementation of a major procurement policy to remove the requirement to offer ownership of resources to the government — a significant deterrent to the private sector investing in Saskatchewan, because why would they? Why would anyone in his right mind want to invest and risk millions of dollars for development of resources when, in the end, they would have to give half of that ownership to the government. They’d take the risk ;the private sector had to take the risk. The members opposite, when they were government, did not take that risk.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would love to carry on with many other achievements. I think I’ve highlighted some of the important ones. I could carry on. The total would run me well on. But I am responsible for two major areas: one is Revenue, and one is SGI.

I’d just like to take a minute or two, but, before I do, I want to get back to one point that I missed, and I want to make it now, and that is, when we talk economic development, when we talk open for business, they, again, spent the last year criticizing the open for business theme. And they don’t understand, obviously, what open for business means. That’s one of the things that is understandable, being what they are. They don’t understand what open for business means, because when they were the government, one of the things that they didn’t believe in that was supporting and encouraging local and Saskatchewan business. If any lucrative contract came up

by the government, it went to an outside. . . and mostly out of, not only out of province, but out of country.

I'd just like to cite a few, Mr. Speaker, and I'm going to start with the major ones. Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation, and this is in 1981, the year 1981: installation of a Konus-Kessel wood-waste energy system at Hudson Bays plywood plant. Mr. Speaker, a \$1.8 million contract went to a British Columbia firm.

Here is one — an odour-processing marketing support system went to a firm in Toronto for \$1.2 million.

Mr. Speaker, there's a couple here . . . Here we are. To perform — now listen to this — to perform engineering environmental studies for two potential coal mines at Rockglen and Fife Lake, an engineering study, environmental study, commissioned by the members opposite when they were government for the cost of \$3.6 million. Mr. Speaker, guess where it went? It went to a Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania firm.

Mr. Speaker, here's another one, another \$3.7 million contract to perform engineering environmental feasibility studies for potential coal-fired electrical generation stations. Guess again. Shawinigan Engineering Consultants from Calgary.

But in this list of contracts that I'm referring to, there are no Saskatchewan firms, and I could go on with that, and that is what they thought of economic development in this province. That's how they encouraged Saskatchewan business. That's what they thought of their own businesses in Saskatchewan. They didn't want them around, and they gave the business to someone else.

Well, as I indicated, Mr. Speaker, in the one and a half years that we've been government and I have been the minister responsible for SGI, I want to just take a few brief minutes to speak about its accomplishments . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And we won't bring Mr. Collver into it tonight. We won't bring that subject into it, but we'll just talk about what's happened there.

Well, in 1982 when I became the minister, we took a badly faltering organization. We set it on its feet again, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We got it moving towards a set of objectives that made sense, and gave it the leadership it needs to become a profitable business. I'm proud of those people that are managing that corporation today. We found a corporation with an excellent group of professionals, and I have no intentions of criticizing them, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I can only praise their accomplishments, considering how they were handicapped by the NDP administration.

Now let's look at what we've achieved there. We reduced the bureaucracy, the duplication of effort and services. We've created a very lean organization. It meant lay-offs and a lot of sacrifice, and no one regrets that more than I, but we had to take drastic action, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that there would be a future for SGI. We strengthened insurance-related services like claims and underwriting. We de-emphasized non-related areas. We ended the wild proposals about building body shops and about entering the life insurance business. We ended those proposals completely.

Mr. Speaker, we've examined SGI's products, and we've gone a long way towards establishing a fundamentally profitable product line — a product line which did not have a single profitable product when we became the government. We've put a rational accounting system in place that recognizes the difference between SGI and the government program that it administers — a distinction that the members opposite ignored when it was convenient.

We discovered the full magnitude of NDP dealings in the world of reinsurance. We accounted for it properly, despite the size of the loss we were forced to recognize. And because of proper management, the auto insurance fund will be totally out of the red for the first time since 1979, despite, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the smallest rate increase in four years. In fact, as I indicated earlier,

in fact, despite the fact that we reduced, we actually reduced the cost of insurance to the individuals in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, it's a record of accomplishment that all SGI employees and the people of Saskatchewan can take pride in.

AN HON. MEMBER: — We've launched our come-back.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — You've lost your come-back. That was very indicative from the convention that you left this week-end.

Mr. Speaker, I was going to . . . Here we are. I wanted to just touch on the Department of Revenue for a minute, because again I want to congratulate and indicate to the people how much we appreciate the people who are in that department. What a fine job that they doing, from the deputy minister down to all the people within that department. I want to congratulate them for their dedication to the service of this government.

Mr. Speaker, some of the accomplishments of that department in a very short period of time, and I am just only going to highlight what they are, without detailing them. But in that department, they handled the elimination of the gas tax, and given one day's notice to do it.

Mr. Speaker, it was that department that introduced the mortgage interest rebate program. They changed . . . Legislation was amended for the fuel tax act. They introduced E&H tax amendments. Tobacco tax amendments were introduced in this legislature last year, Mr. Speaker, with strength and enforcement provisions for purposes of facilitating investigations of tobacco smuggling, and increasing the penalties associated with the organized smuggling activities.

You know, that was something. And we recall (and the member opposite smiles) the criticism that was directed to their government when we were in the opposition. They did nothing about it. It didn't take us long. When we became government, we introduced it and plugged those loopholes: corporation capital tax amendments, the insurance premium tax amendments, the capital gains tax rebate, actuals tracking system, and education and health tax reporting frequency.

Now, Mr. Speaker, breaking it down to departments, it would take me another few minutes to do that. I don't intend to because I think I'm going to give someone else the opportunity to speak, debate this throne speech.

I want to thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thank the members of the legislature for the attentive audience. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am proud again, as I said earlier, of the members that have spoken in this Assembly for the throne speech. I warn the members opposite to change their attitude toward their province, toward the people of this province, toward the civil servants, and stop attacking them. Stop their direct attack on those individuals. Stick to the members of the legislature. Do your job, understand your role of government, and perhaps we might get some better question periods, we might get some better speeches from you, but understand it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd be very proud to support the motion, and I certainly cannot support the amendment to the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I won't be doing what I usually do tonight, and that is taking my time and going over the opposition's record. There's a reason for that. Their record is rather short and not all that imaginative.

I just want to be very quick, Mr. Deputy Speaker. There's a number of things I want to say, and I

want to say that, you know, the members here on this side of the House and, of course, our members on the other side of the House as well are lining up to speak and so eager to get into this debate that it just reminds me of a major international airport where the jumbo jets are just backed up waiting to take off. Our guys are waiting to take off, and the NDP, it would seem you're pretty well backed up against the wall, and you're down and out, and you're against the ropes and all those things. It brings to mind an old saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker: "Why kick an old dog?" and maybe, "Leave sleeping dogs lie." There's a few of them sleeping, so I don't really think I want to get into that.

But what I would like to do, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is to congratulate the mover of the Speech from the Throne, the member from Melville. The member from Melville is always entertaining and very witty and very quick to cut the NDP down whenever they raise their so-called ugly head, as the saying quite often goes in this House.

I would, as well, like to say congratulations to the member for Saskatoon Nutana, yes, who was the seconder of the Speech from the Throne. And I'd like to say, as well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that she did a very fine job in seconding that Speech from the Throne.

While I am in this congratulatory mood, I would like to, as well, express my congratulations and my best wishes to, of course, our new cabinet ministers, which not too much has been said about, at least not from our side of the House. I see that the NDP in opposition are making some bones about it, that it's too many in the Cabinet, or something like that, and I can appreciate their comments in that regard. I might get around to that in a few moments, but they should be lucky if I don't have time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to do which I most often do, and that is to centre my comments primarily on the Leader of the Opposition, because really, in fact, the other members don't really mean that much. What they have to say is really not all that important.

I think that the convection over the past week-end that the NDP had in Saskatoon has confirmed, at least temporarily, the current leader's position — the member for Regina Elphinstone. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I could just leave some of my comments with regards to the convention to later on, and just maybe bring to the attention of the members in the Assembly some of the contradictions that are so evident in the things that the Leader of the Opposition has been saying. And he talks, you know, of small business. What are we doing to help small business? And I think to myself, "Well, that's certainly ironic." Because I take some quotes that I just happened to put together that are rather interesting. And here is a quote from the member from Regina Elphinstone. It's *Hansard*, page 39, November 18, 1983. He says, "You people should go about and talk to some small business men." Now he's telling us we should do this? Conservatives should go and talk to small business men? We're being told that by the Leader of the Opposition, who for 11 years in office did absolutely nothing for small business, except almost drive them out of business?

I want to make a comment as it respects the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster's speech. And I think he summed it up rather well when he said that in a small business is big business. Because the NDP in opposition try to make the argument that for some reason or another that the Conservatives are for big business. And so I thought that was very well capsulized when he said that small business is big business. Very well put by the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster.

So let's talk about just for a moment what the NDP record is. When the NDP talks about small business that is exactly what it amounts to. It's just talk; it's window-dressing. And if you take a look at the real NDP policy on small business and free enterprise, what do you come up with? Well I want to enter into the record a quote by a former member of this House. It was a member for Saskatoon. His name was Paul Mostoway. He was an NDP member. It was back on March 9 of '81. And he says:

The gentleman talks about free enterprise. That's a myth. There is no such thing as free enterprise in this country.

And that came from an NDP member of this Assembly not so long ago. And yet, even today, we have the NDP Leader of the Opposition talking about, you know, what we're doing to assist small business. And really, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that doesn't make a whole lot of sense to this Assembly.

Let's use another quote from another former member of the legislature, David Miner. He says, "Mr. Speaker, I don't believe in free enterprise." That's what he said. David Miner. He said, "I don't believe in free enterprise." Well, at least there was a member that was speaking the truth on behalf of the party, because they don't believe in free enterprise.

Now if we take a look at our own record as it relates to small business or large business, the Department of Tourism and Small business has taken a number of new initiatives. There's been over 6,582 new businesses since our government took office.

AN HON. MEMBER: — How many?

MR. BIRKBECK: — 6,582. The small business employment program has resulted in the creation of 3,613 full-time jobs, and remember, the NDP talk about small business, but they don't believe in it.

AN HON. MEMBER: — They were against that program too.

MR. BIRKBECK: — That's right. They have been against that program. It goes on and on. I think that it bears a moment's time in the legislature to mention as well the NDP record as it relates to their attention to the water problems in this province.

The member for Regina Elphinstone, the current leader of the NDP, at least, just as I said, temporarily, took the government to task about the water policy on page 53 of *Hansard*, November 21, 1983, and he said, what was the record of the NDP with respect to water? "We certainly are not accepting any responsibility for water treatment," was his comment.

"The urban municipalities have that responsibility, and the city of Regina recognizes it has a responsibility to treat and deliver to its citizens a water supply. That's the responsibility of the urban municipality itself." Now who said that? Who said that? Ted Bowerman, NDP minister, in reply to a question from the proposed pipeline to Lake Diefenbaker, and that's what he said.

Now what have we done? Compare that now to the PC record. We have created a water corporation act to provide Saskatchewan with a comprehensive water management plan for the future. At least we have acted. We have done something, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as opposed to talk.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the theme, I would say, in our throne speech, was pretty much on the creation of jobs. It centred on jobs, and I really believe, Mr. Deputy speaker, that it's worth mentioning what we have been able to do in terms of the creation of jobs. I want to, if I could just bring to the attention of the House the presentation, "Challenges and Opportunities, the Saskatchewan Perspective," by the hon. Minister of Finance, November, 1983, a submission to the Royal Commission on Economic Unity and Development Prospects for Canada. You know, a paragraph or two. What does it say there as it respects jobs?

I would like to set the stage for our discussion by describing some of the recent economic developments in Saskatchewan. It is important that you understand our immediate economic concerns and the approaches we have taken to solve some of these problems. My overriding interest is to get the economy moving again, to create

more jobs and opportunities for investment and productive activity, and to keep the economy thriving.

That's all that needs to be said on that. The Minister of Finance:

This government recognizes the desperate need in this province at all times to create jobs and opportunities for the people of this province.

And we are doing that, as I've already indicated. Our members are hard at work all the time. If I could just . . . for the information of the House, again, I took the opportunity to go through one of our member's own brochures that he sent out. It's the member for Saskatoon Eastview, and it's done up, I might add, in a rather nice colour — our own colours, and it's been well put together, and it provides a lot of information, as well, as respects jobs and opportunities.

What does it say? (Sometimes I wonder if maybe we shouldn't send these to the members in the opposition so they'd be better informed and we might have better question periods than we had today.) It says that since January, 1983, the number of jobs in Saskatchewan has increased by 10,000 from 415,000 to 425,000 — the best winter record ever in Saskatchewan history.

What else does it say? It says that Saskatchewan has the lowest unemployment of major Canadian cities. And capital projects. A \$1.7 billion capital construction program will create approximately 11,000 person-years of employment through the construction of highways, education facilities, nursing homes, and other projects.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, here we have one of our members on this side of the House, as he said so eloquently today, a member of the A-team, getting the information out to the people of Saskatchewan about what this government is doing as it relates to job creation. Good information.

Furthermore, I see the NDP in opposition were even impressed with our little folder that went out to the people in this province to again highlight what we are doing in the area of job creation. Keeping in touch. Yes, a picture of a rather attractive individual on the front page, none other than our Premier, Grant Devine.

And what does it say? Job creation: in our last budget we allocated \$8 million for the continuation of the Saskatchewan Jobs program, and Opportunities '83 pays 4,200 students during the summer months, a \$5,000 tax credit program to create new jobs. To date, as I said, 3,500 jobs created through that program.

There is rounds of information, Mr. Deputy Speaker, at the disposal of all members and at the disposal, quite frankly, of all the people of this province as to what we're doing in terms of jobs. And I'm not going to go through it all as it's not, you know, as I said, an opportunity this evening when I have a whole lot of time.

You know, I think we should look at some bottom lines. And what has that done? What has a Conservative government done for the province of Saskatchewan? Through concentration and job creation, what we have been able to do is, through April 1982 to October of '83, we have been able to move into an area of about a 6 per cent growth rate compared with quite less than 4 per cent, about 3.75 per cent growth rate for the rest of the country. As our Premier has said many times before, while the rest of the country is struggling and many parts of the country going back, the province of Saskatchewan is going upstream, going against the trend and going ahead.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, certainly we, as a government, would like to take all the credit for that, but that's not possible, because all we have been doing is what should have been done for many years. We have created a climate in this province whereby free-thinking individuals in this

province can, in fact, progress. So I say as a government, no, we're not going to stand here and say we're the greatest thing that there ever was, no. What we have been able to do, though, is go out and, as the Premier said, keep in touch. We have been listening, and we've been putting together programs, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that are in tune with the wishes of the people of this province. And that has resulted in sound economic policies, sound policies as it relates to job creation, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker — I'm sorry — an economy in this province that is second to none in this country.

Now, I can say just a bit more as it relates to job creation. I believe earlier in the session the Premier identified the Conference Board of Canada and its prediction that the economic growth in Saskatchewan will again outstrip the rest of the nation. And this is a highly regarded non-government board, and it forecasted Saskatchewan will exceed the national growth rate again in 1983 and '84.

So those are pretty good indications, and we really like to hear that, you know, someone other than ourselves are being able to lay out the facts about the progress of this province and through its government, and through the government listening to the people and putting together the kinds of programs that they want to hear. Job creation will continue to be a top priority. That is the theme of the throne speech.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to draw to the attention of the House now, after having made the point that, in fact, job creation is the focal point of the throne speech, you will note that very few of the speeches coming from the NDP benches are talking about job creation. Are they offering any solutions? Are they talking about what we're doing? No, they don't want to talk about that. Rather, they want to talk about salaries, or some friend of theirs that got fired, or some issue that really has absolutely nothing to do with the major centre-piece, the corner-stone of the throne speech, and that's job creation. And that's what the people of Saskatchewan are concerned about — job creation and agriculture. And those are the two things you'll note, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that our members on both sides of the House have been talking about. And we have been constructive.

Now, if you go back again to some of the comments I made earlier. But I don't want to take the time of this House kicking a dead duck. What I would rather do is just what I've been doing, and that is to set out some of the very positive and constructive things that we have been doing as a government because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we don't have anything to defend. We don't have to defend our policies here. The NDP aren't mounting any attack. And I might add, that's contrary to . . .

You know, I was rather excited this year about the House opening, because I heard these comments about the NDP telling the media that they were ready to get this session open; they want to get in there and thrash those Tories and just tear that Tory government apart limb by limb. And you know we've been in here, I believe today is the seventh day, almost a day a member for the NDP and there hasn't been one of us got thrashed yet — not one of us.

In fact one of the NDP members today, I guess, felt that, you know, that speaking in the legislature wasn't effective, and he was willing to go and give his, outside. You know, I suggested to him that he shouldn't do that because, well, he'll be out of this legislature soon enough. He wouldn't want to go now.

In any event, let me talk about, just briefly now, I'll be very quick about it, just point form on the health issues. Health issues — I can be very quick about that. This government has set an all-time Saskatchewan record in health spending — all-time Saskatchewan health record. A billion dollars on health care. And that's \$1,000 per man, woman and child, \$1,000. Now what more do you want out of a government, than to do that? That, I might add, represents one-third of our provincial government budget. One-third of our budget! Now I think that that's pretty good.

Now I could go into great detail, but I'm not going to. The only thing I'm going to say, that falls under the Department of Health, is special care homes. It's something that I've had a very special interest in, and for 11 years in my riding alone, we never got one bed, not one bed. So I said to my people, "If I'm only able to get one, in one term in government, that would be 100 per cent improvement over what the NDP were able to do." Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as it turned out, in 17 months — in fact, in reality in the first seven months — the plans were put in place for the creation of more special care home beds than the NDP administration were able to place in this province in seven years, in seven years.

Now when you get a government that can do more in seven months than an NDP administration can, as it relates to special care homes for our seniors, in seven years, well, I'll tell you, you wouldn't want to turn back. You wouldn't want to go back to what you had before. And yet they still have the audacity to stand in the House and criticize us for not having, you know, made enough provisions in budgets for special care homes, when in fact we've just outstripped their record and made their record just look terrible. Absolutely dismal. So need we say anything more about health care, really? There's no point in flogging these issues. We said . . . I know I recall the leader of our party at that time saying, "We'll make health care number one." Well we're government, he's the Premier, and health care in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, is number one in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — Now, Mr. Speaker, if the NDP might like to get into those little goodies that they like to get into about, "Well, what about extra billing?" Extra billing in this province is not a problem. We're under 3 per cent, and well under 3 per cent in the province of Saskatchewan. What about user fees? What about those user fees? Our Minister of Health has said many times, as long as he's the Minister of Health there will be no user fees in the province of Saskatchewan.

AN HON. MEMBER: — And he'll be there a long, long time.

MR. BIRKBECK: — That's right. The members say, "He'll be there a long, long time." And, Mr. Speaker, that's pretty close to the truth. He's going to be there a long time. So I can understand why the members in opposition get a little squirmy on these issues, because they really have nothing left to go on.

Potash. I have what I guess is the best potash mine in the world in my constituency. It has the potential to be the greatest mine anywhere, if it isn't now. When we took office . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes, when we took office . . . Now the member for Regina Centre is saying, "Oh yeah, and it used to make money." Yes it used to make money. It used to make money, Mr. Speaker, when markets were so buoyant you could screw up in that industry and still break even. And that's what they were doing. Now, Mr. Speaker, what happened, what happened, very simply, was that the market started to be depressed on an international scale due to global economic matters, and the sales dropped, and these people weren't wise enough to scale their schedules and their employment numbers in the mines to the markets that were there. They couldn't do that. They didn't want to lay anybody off because it was just before an election.

Well, we took over. We had the bins jammed clean to the roof with potash, and we had to lay off a great number of employees. We had to do that right in my riding, right on my doorstep. Well, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I took a little flak for that. They wanted to know what was happening. Well, you know what, Mr. Member for Regina Centre. I told them the truth. I told them exactly what the previous administration had done. And you know, they were really upset about that. But, never mind all of that, that's gone under the bridge. Never mind the negativism which the NDP seem to dwell on. What did we do about that terrible situation? Well, I'll tell you what we did. We got the Premier out of Canada. He went out there and trotted around the world, and he went to Brazil, he went to China. He drummed up markets outside of the United States market.

Now, you have to understand that 60 per cent of our potash goes to the United States market. Now the PIK program in place is one where farmers are being paid not to grow grain. People don't tend to fertilize summerfallow, therefore it got a little tight down there in terms of sales. So our Premier was able to go out, and we did. We made sales to Brazil. We're confident in terms of building up sales into China. You know, I'm very optimistic about what may come next. What has been the result of that, Mr. Speaker? I'll tell you the result of that. The storage bins are empty now, we've recalled 65 employees, we've even moved from a three to a four shift system at the mine for work schedule.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is this: that while the NDP had the potash industry to deal with in buoyant times — made very little money; we inherited it during tough economic times and have been able to stabilize the industry. And that's the bottom line. So we have a stable economy, stable in job creation, stable in the mining industry.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm pretty proud, obviously, of the record of this government. Now then, where do we come to now? One other issue as it relates to this province's great resources, and I want to talk about energy just for a moment. Energy down in the south-eastern part of the province where oil wells were producing at the best, at the very best, 35 per cent of their capacity. After we took office, and very shortly after we took office, because of some very simple little changes that we made, regulatory changes, decreased the royalty structure a little, bang? Boom like that they got the oil industry moving, and it's producing at 100 per cent now. At 100 per cent capacity in those same oilfields.

And what do we hear the members opposite calling about? Oh, these terrible giveaways of money to these multinationals. Well, I'm going to remind you that 100 per cent of nothing is still 100 per cent of nothing and that's zero, absolute zero. Now, what we're able to do is to get that whole oil industry moving. The minister was proud to stand in the House . . . I'm sure he must have been proud. I would have been proud to stand in the House and indicate that we have now made, you know, a record number of oil wells and gas wells drilled. I believe the figure is 1,537. Is it? Something like that. Well, he says it's gone over 1,600 now, so it's just on the rise. So again, the oil industry has been levelled out. The potash industry has been levelled out, everything stabilized, and everything's fine during tough economic times.

So the NDP, recognizing this, that the Tory government has done an excellent job, what do they do? Well, they've got to create a diversion, so they moved today into discussions, and heavy discussions, the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, on the question of these beer ads and all of these things about the government, now that we've lifted the ban on liquor advertising.

Well, there's been a lot said about that, and there are members in this Assembly on our side of the House that want to make a lot of comments on that issue. But I'm only going to read into the record for the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg from the Swift Current *Sun*: "Antiquated Laws." Now the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg would want to listen to this:

The protest that's greeted the provincial government's decision to allow liquor advertising on television is confusing. In case those hollering the loudest haven't noticed, liquor advertising isn't some new concoction cooked up by Devine and his open for business cronies. Instead, liquor advertising pervades every median our society. It's on cable television, in magazines, and on billboards. It's even on the T-shirts we're all so fond of wearing. And yes folks, liquor has been around a lot longer than the fashionable trend to protest.

Opponents of the new legislation forwarded a number of arguments why Saskatchewan, which already holds the distinction of having some of the most

antiquated censorship laws in the country, shouldn't allow its residents to see liquor advertising on the tube. They say the advertising of alcohol will lead to increased consumption, which, although a valid point, can certainly be argued many ways. Free will and determination must certainly be more important than dictates from government and lobby groups. It would certainly not be our argument that all people can control the influences of advertising. But, if liquor advertising is banned for this reason, should we also not ban food commercials because there are compulsive overeaters. By further extension, should we not also disallow advertising of items such as skate boards, because they can cause injuries if not used responsibly. To say advertising itself is a sin cannot be a blanket statement.

Advocates of the ban tell us liquor commercials are offensive. But are they anymore offensive than commercials that praise the virtues of a certain tampon or sanitary napkin? The commercials we're plagued to sit through evening after evening.

Do liquor ads offend one's sensibility more so than a 30 second spiel on constipation cures, or the sermons on sure-fire remedies for hemorrhoids? Why haven't those guardians of the public good raised a whisper about these? No, the government must stand firm and not give in to the censors who would dictate that you or I are mature enough or responsible enough to watch.

That's from the Swift Current *Sun*, and I just say for the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, a little more food for thought, that the issue is not quite so clearly cut as you might like it to be.

Now then, I happen to be, Mr. Speaker, moving on fairly quickly because I want to say just where does this bring us to? Well, it brings you to a great number of things, and I'm not going to go through them. The Premier identified a number of them, and he listed at our convention, and I want to bring right down now as I've got seven minutes, and it won't take any more than that to make my point. But we had a fantastic convention. We had a fantastic convention in the city of Saskatoon. Just a great, great convention. And you know, Mr. Speaker — now look at Mr. Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, I've only got six minutes and I don't want you using up any, because this is really good stuff and you want to hear it. All right, you really do.

Our Premier, our Premier, the leader of our party at our convention in the same city, Saskatoon — all right — gave a very good speech, and he listed off. Now I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I recall if I might now . . . Oh yes, well, okay. That's fine. Maybe I won't recall . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, that's right. All right. He listed 35 things and I'm not going to list them tonight because there's something even better than I want to talk about.

But I'm going to recommend that maybe some of our members that are lining up on the little strip ready to take off to the NDP might like to take a look at those 35 points that our Premier raised at our convention . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, I've got something better for you. I've got something better for you and I want to leave this to one of our more well-armed, or I don't know how to put it quite frankly — our more respectable members.

We'll leave this. All I know, Mr. Speaker, all I know is that our party has enough good sense not to hold a convention when the Grey Cup is being played. In any event. Now then if the member . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I tell you I'd hate to have the division you boys got in your party, and I'm going to talk about that division, and now I've got five minutes.

You know, I just wonder if you've got enough courage to keep your mouth kind of closed a little. You know, and just so that it doesn't make big noises, just so that you could hear this. I wonder if you've got the courage to do that. Have you all got the . . . I know that the member for Pelly has that courage.

On the week-end, on the week-end, now listen to this, Mr. Speaker. All of this discussion that we

hear on the reports on the radio, the TV, the newspapers about war, about a nuclear bomb, “The Day After” program — peoples emotions are up. There are people in this country that have a lot against communist nations around the world. There’s a lot of friction. Our Prime Minister is out, Prime Minister of this country is out around the world now on a peace mission. I will refrain from making too many comments about that. We could be at war soon, you know.

But I was just reading the paper, and I had the *Star-Phoenix*, the paper and here it is. It’s the *Star-Phoenix* — Friday’s. what does it say? We’ve got to get to what it says:

Condemnation of U.S. among NDP resolutions. A condemnation of the United States over the Soviet downing of Korean airline flight 007, and a demand to withdraw Canada from NATO, are among the 226 resolutions to be discussed by the New Democrats.

The resolution dealing with the Korean passenger flight shot down by Soviet interceptors holds the United States partially responsible, claiming there is strong evidence it was being used as a spy plane for the US military.

Then, what does it say, Mr. Speaker? It accuses the U.S. government of manipulating the incident to increase its defence budget, and it rejects the action of the federal NDP — rejects the actions of the federal NDP — introducing a motion condemning the Soviet Union.

Now, here we have a situation where you people are at odds with your federal counterparts. All right. You’ve been at odds with them now over peace, over whether or not we should condemn the Soviets or not. You’ve been at odds with them over that. Odds with them over the energy issue. You’ve been at odds with the federal counterparts over the constitution. The only thing you are ever with them on was the ousting of the Joe Clark government. The only thing.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, I can only say this to the people of this province: if that isn’t enough to turn you off the NDP for the next 20 years, that these people are . . . And I raised this with people at home, and you know what they said? “Well, what are they? Communist sympathizers” And I said, “Well, I don’t know, but you’d have to think so.” You know, communist sympathizers. I don’t know. What else is it? What else is it when you condemn the best neighbour we’ve got, right on our borders — the very best neighbour we have, Mr. Speaker, the only protection we have in this time of trouble. And what are these people doing? Condemning them.

So, Mr. Speaker, to conclude, I suppose I could only say that the next time I fly commercial airlines, you know, I not only have to watch out for MIG fighters out the window, but I may have to watch out for the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, because, as I understand, he has a plane too, you know, and I could be flying American airlines.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, it’s a terrible thing, and I’ve heard, and I know that we’ve been faced with a terrible situation because we have a NDP party . . . I see the Leader of the Opposition is now in. It’s a shame you missed it because I wanted to get around . . . Well, you know, really it is a shame because I know that the NDP don’t like watching football, but I’m not too sure about the Leader of the Opposition, because I’m convinced he must be watching the Ottawa Rough Riders a lot, because he’s thinking of going federal, because he’s acting like George Brancant — he’s eating a lot of ice cubes lately. So I would say that maybe he’s been watching a bit of football.

In any event, the serious stuff really is, as I wind up and conclude, any party that sympathizes with the Soviet Union in terms of the downing of the 007 Korean airliner, and I’m sure that they’re likely in agreement with . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. It’s my duty under rule 13.3 to interrupt the debate at this point in time and to put all questions to dispose of the amendment to the main motion.

Amendment negated on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 7

Blakeney	Koskie	Shillington
Thompson	Lusney	Yew
Engel		

NAYS — 42

Devine	Dutchak	Myers
Muller	Embury	Rybczuk
Birkbeck	Dirks	Caswell
McLeod	Maxwell	Hampton
Andrew	Young	Gerich
Rousseau	Domotor	Boutin
Katzman	Folk	Schmidt
Pickering	Muirhead	Meagher
Hardy	Petersen	Sauder
Smith (Swift Current)	Bacon	Zazelenchuk
Baker	Sveinson	Martens
Schoenhals	Hodgins	Weiman
Currie	Smith (Moose Jaw South)	Sutor
Klein	Hopfner	Morin

MR. MARTENS: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I want to begin this evening by talking about some of the things that I think are good things in the throne speech. I want to first of all . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MARTENS: — I hope they are going to appreciate all of what I am going to say as enthusiastically as I go through.

I want to first of all congratulate the new ministers. I know that to take the province from what it was, to what it's going to be, is going to take all 25 of them, and I know that they are going to do a lot of work to get it going, and they're already done it, as I am going to prove as I go along. I think the Premier had a good deal of foresight in choosing them. I also want to congratulate the Lieutenant Governor on his speech. I want to congratulate him on his first one, and I hope that he has many more in the future.

The Morse constituency is a constituency that is basically rural.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Who did you defeat in the election?

MR. MARTENS: — Good question. I heard a comment here about who won the last election in Morse constituency, and I also want to know who . . . or they would like to probably know who lost the election in the presidential race for the NDP, but I don't want to go into any gross discussion of that.

I want to congratulate the mover. It's an honour to be chosen by the Premier to address the

throne speech on the basis of being a mover, and also a seconder. I want to congratulate the member for Melville, and the member for Saskatoon Nutana, who did an excellent job on dealing with the views of the throne speech.

We've heard a considerable amount of discussion here today, and in the past few days, about the part about the A, B, and C team in this government. Well, I'd like to tell a story about that. You know, the government is typical of an orchestra, for example. The conductor of a large symphony orchestra in the United States was asked a question after he had made a great presentation on a symphony. He was asked, "Sir, what do you assume to be the most difficult instrument to play?" And he thought a while and he said, "I'll tell you what it is. It's playing second fiddle." And I'll tell you, the members of this government, and the members in the government, and the Legislative Secretaries, and those that are supporting us are truly capable of demonstrating that they are one with us. And I think they've done that throughout the throne speech debate here, and I know that they're going to continue to do that, because we playing . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Thank you.

We're going to demonstrate to this government, not only in dealing with the things that we've got going presently in job creation and energy development, but we're going to demonstrate it in many more things to come. And you just wait and see.

Job creation — the first thing I have on my list as a positive thing this government has done: 4,200 jobs in summer employment for students. An excellent opportunity for young kids to learn what the people of the province do for a living. It's an excellent opportunity for those kids to go get some dollars to go to school. And I think it was an excellent amount of foresight on the part of our government that initiated that program.

The next thing I want to talk about is the \$5,000 tax credit. And I want to congratulate the ministers who were responsible for that. The member from Meadow Lake was the individual who initiated that, and I think it was an excellent opportunity. I had people in my seat, a rural seat with small towns, some hired two people, some hired one, and I think that that's an excellent opportunity for these small businesses to being to establish a number of things. And one of the things that I noticed, Mr. Speaker, about the responsibility that they were given was they started to do bookkeeping for those small businesses. They hired bookkeepers who they've neglected, or an area of work that they have neglected for years. They've had to do it on their own, and these small businesses, farm implement dealerships, have finally got somebody who cared about what they were doing. And they provided a way that these people could afford to develop on the job training.

Another thing I want to compliment the government about is the \$3,000 grant Build-A-Home program — 4,100 new homes and 7,000 new jobs. I think, Mr. Speaker, that's an excellent vision of what we need to do, and continue to do, in this province. For years the former government would isolate themselves from the federal situation, and we, in the province of Saskatchewan, were doing that all the time. We would not utilize the federal government funding and initiative programs to develop something on our own. And now we took a provincial program, matched it with a federal, and we started to move in the home building. And it was an excellent opportunity for us to expand our labour force, and it was an excellent opportunity for us to develop an industry.

These kind of things are typical of some of the problems that we had with dealing with water. And I'm going to touch on that later on. The PFRA in Canada have always wanted to develop water in Saskatchewan, but the initiative from the provincial government was never there. And, Mr. Speaker, it's been a pleasure for me to work together to try and develop a utility that's going to do that for us. And I'll enlarge on that at a later time.

I want to talk also about the growth factor in jobs as it relates to Canada. Saskatchewan had a growth factor of 6 per cent in its work-force, while all of Canada had less than a 4. Now, that's

figures on growth on the work-force. If you'd have taken Saskatchewan figures out of that, you probably would have had less than a 3 in the Canadian. And we've contributed an excellent portion of our fiscal planning to the development of employment for the people of Saskatchewan. And I think that's credible. It shows up on our figures of people moving back into Saskatchewan. And I think that's commendable. They're coming home.

And an interesting thing, in my responsibility to the Minister of Energy we went to visit some irrigation developments in southern Alberta. And I visited with quite a few of those people and when they found out I was from Saskatchewan they were convinced that they should perhaps think of moving back. Because they had grown up here. And I talked to one individual specifically who is the manager of the St. Mary's irrigation district, probably the largest one. In 1972, when the former administration took office, he moved out of here, because he couldn't see where they were going to develop any more irrigation. And it's been stalemated ever since. And look what's happened to the growth in Alberta. And he told me when he moved in there his first job was to negotiate a grant from the Alberta government and who was sitting across from him? It was the same people that had worked for the conservation development branch in Saskatchewan. Many, many people moved into the province of Alberta simply because the philosophy that they had didn't correspond with what these people had here. And we're, Mr. Speaker, going to change that, and we're working together with the various branches of government to initiate that.

I believe in every society, as it relates to jobs, you have to have stability — stability in the work-force. You have to have stability on the part of the economic development. And when I heard the Leader of the Opposition say that we needed more militancy, I was a little appalled. Does he want work, does he want production, or do we want stability? Does he want irrationality, militancy? And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it's time that we, together with, as government and as the economic community, that we work together, and I think we have. They wanted to have that, and I think we're doing that.

Our universities have been a part of getting the people in positions where they can be more accountable, and I commend the minister of continuing ed for his excellent job in dealing with those problems. We have high enrolment in the province in universities and technical schools, and I think that's only beginning to what we can have in the future. And I think that those things are important.

I want to touch just briefly on some things in agriculture, Mr. Speaker, and one of the things is the farm purchase program. I think it's been an excellent opportunity for the people of the province to take advantage of a program without a whole lot of restrictions, without a whole lot of red tape, and I want to commend the Minister of Agriculture and the former minister of agriculture, the member from Souris-Cannington, on their work in developing the program. Over 1,800 and almost 1,900 people have enrolled in that program. Over \$200 million has been put into that program, and I think, Mr. Speaker, it is a worthwhile exercise, and I'm proud to be a part of it.

We heard quite a bit about the Crow. I want to talk a little bit about what's in the throne speech about the feeder program. This government has recognized that there is a problem there. And we visited with people from Alberta, we visited with people from Saskatchewan, just to see where we can begin to work. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that's we're going to be coming down with some things that are going to be an encouragement to the feeding of livestock in the province. We had a negative attitude to contend with because it was initiated by the former administration. The former minister of agriculture said there was only one agricultural product that we need to worry about, and that's wheat. But I want to tell the members of the legislature, and the people of the province of Saskatchewan, we have a diverse agricultural in this province, and we have to work to maintain it. Even though we have commitments by other jurisdictions in this country, we have a responsibility, and we're going to see that we develop that.

The throne speech talked about the feeder associations guarantee act and I think that that's a

beginning step to a number of programs that the minister is likely to put before this House. And I want to compliment him on the work and the research that he has done into it.

I also want to take the time to talk a little bit about the kinds of things that a check-off can do. We've indicated that we're proposing a check-off to the industries that want it, and I think the concept needs to be clearly identified as to, if the people want it, let them have it. And so many times in the past, we've had, "You're going to take it, like it or lump it." And that's not what this government does. I'm proud to be a part of that government. We say, "Here's the options, you go do it," and they're doing it and they're going to do it well. They're going to do it far better than any government could, and I think that's an indication of the capacity of agriculture in Saskatchewan.

The Crow is probably a major issue. There's other people that have discussed it, so I won't do it at this time. But I know that the way it's set up that people from Moose Jaw and a line Moose Jaw North to Medicine Hat are going to have to start feed in their feed grains from now on. And that's why, when we talk about a feeder program in the province of Saskatchewan, feed grains are going to have to be a part of the program and the development of agriculture as an intricate part of development in Saskatchewan. It's going to have to be there.

So many times, Mr. Speaker, we have been told that Conservatives are going to get rid of health care, they are going to get rid of the health care as the people of Saskatchewan have grown accustomed to having it. And so many times the opposition has talked about it. I get rather ill when I hear them talking about it, and I remember a certain former leader of an administration shaking his finger at me and telling me they were going to take it away in one election. And that bothered me.

I grew up in an area where, from the first day that I went to school, medical care insurance was an integral part of the involvement that we had through the health care program. Swift Current health region was number one. But here's something that many people don't understand. It was not only the government of the day that put it in; it was the doctors and the municipalities that were also instrumental in putting it in. We've heard so terribly much about, "Oh it was the government," but we never hear about how the people, the doctors, and the municipal people put that program in.

I want to tell you something: how the NDP government in 1977 decided to put their thumbs down on health region number one. And what did they do? They wouldn't renew the contract to develop health care in Swift Current. Number one. They didn't want to have health care in the Swift Current any more like it had been done. And so what they did is, they forced the health region, Mr. Speaker, to put up \$400,000 of their money into the government that was taxed from the area. They forced the people there to give it back to the health region, or to the government. And it came out of the pockets of the people from the south-west part of Saskatchewan. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that was almost criminal. And it reminds me of one of their resolutions about taking back all of the stuff that is sold now, taking it back for a dollar. They expropriate. It's just a part of their philosophy.

And I'm proud of our Minister of Health who has demonstrated by his work and his diligence to have an expanded health budget — a budget that puts the dollars in, and it makes the people of Saskatchewan proud to be a part of the country, and also proud to be a part of a government that cares for the people of Saskatchewan. The health needs are met. I think it's important.

I want to deal a little bit about energy. There was an article in the *Calgary Sun*, October, deals with Saskatchewan's in the Money":

Saskatchewan's golden age is dawning at last, and the petroleum industry, as usual, is in the vanguard of ushering in the present in Canada to this perennial tomorrow province. Oil companies collectively dropped almost 29 million last week in the lap

of a provincial government that was expecting a good show, but nothing like what happened.

Mr. Speaker, this goes through the whole list of the things that happened to make the oil energy situation in the province of Saskatchewan turn around. And I know that it's impacted in my constituency, and it's going to impact in a lot of others. In the days of doom and gloom I could remember those oil well service companies — and they're small business. This guy drives a truck, and he's got two guys hired — they haul water. And the NDP never did like them. They forced the multinationals to come in and do that service because these guys were going bankrupt. And then they put \$40 million in to save them. And all they did was pour it down dry holes. And these people, these people who are Saskatchewan people, people working, they had to go to find work other places. And you know what the one fellow had to do? He had to water the ground to put up irrigation systems. That was all the work he could find. There was nothing in the oil patch. But you go today, and there he is working. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that's an excellent opportunity for the people of Saskatchewan.

I want to just make one reference to a resolution in the NDP convention. And it really upsets me. There isn't anything as negative to the agriculture community as estate taxes. There isn't any one thing that is more down on estate taxes. And I am told that I should maybe talk about this to some extent, and I will just briefly. It says here, "Be it resolved that we support the removal of, or support the development of legislation to have estate taxes." Mr. Speaker, I wonder, I wonder in this discussion whether any of these ever thought about the consequences that it would have. Why don't you ask somebody that dealt with it? I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, when it affected my family, it was costly. And what it cost us is, we had six children in the family, and it was just like putting a seventh one right beside you, because they gout just as much as any one of us did. And my father worked from sundown till sunset and sometimes through the night to accumulate that, and he put it down there, he paid tax on it, he paid tax on every dollar of that. And then when he passed away, we, as a part of that family farm, we had to cough up a whole bunch . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Cash dollars, and it was interest charged on six months after we were forced to pay. And they think it's good.

They've got other resolutions that indicate the same thing. They talk about a school trustees not being competent. And I think that those things are ridiculous. The whole thing is really poor.

Take NATO for example. Get rid of NATO. I think it hinges on being foolish.

For the record's sake, also, Mr. Speaker. I want to say one thing before we close this evening, and that has to do with a report that wasn't read here earlier this afternoon, and it's the Don Faris report on the final report of the special committee on the review of liquor regulations in Saskatchewan, and the speaker from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg read all of it except one paragraph, and I think that's key to the discussion that we have here today, and we've had from the opposition. And it goes like this, and this is signed by Don Faris. This is what he has reservations about. The speaker from Assiniboia read them, but he didn't read the paragraph that he should have, and it says this:

The report contains important recommendations in regard to rehabilitation, and in regard to education, and in regard to drinking and driving (and here's the key thing), but the pricing policy to cut back on overall consumption is the most important idea.

That's what Mr. Faris says in 1973. It's the most important idea. Which province in western Canada has one of the highest prices in their liquor? We've had four price increases since we took office — five I'm told — and that's what we think is a part of a controlling policy — plus education — but if you don't take and put the price of it up, you're going to have lot's of it sold, whether you advertise, or whether you don't advertise.

And you take a look at some of the things that *Maclean's* said about alcohol. It was the price

related to the no money in the country that has made the decline in the volume consumed in this country go down. And that's a part of the message that Don Faris had in the report that he gave, and I think that that needs to be identified.

I've a lot more things to discuss, Mr. Speaker, and I think that I probably will allow other people the opportunity, but I would like to beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:03 p.m.