

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

November 28, 1983

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PETITIONS

CLERK: — I hereby lay on the table the petition that was presented to the Legislative Assembly by Mrs. Caswell, last Thursday. I have examined the petition under Rule 11(7), and find it to be in order.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, it's with a great deal of pleasure that I introduce to this Assembly, through you, some 20 grades 7 and 8 students from the town of Pense in the constituency of Thunder Creek. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Glen Kozey, and Della Anderson. I sincerely hope that you find your time in this legislature useful and worth while. Frankly, I hope things liven up for you today. I hope you enjoy your stay in this Assembly, and I hope you enjoy your stay in Regina, generally. I look forward to meeting with you at the end of this question period. Thank you.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Unanswered Questions

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the government House Leader, and it has to do with the promise of this government that they would be an open government. It also has to do with this being the seventh day of the third session, and in looking at the questions put on the order paper in the last session, we find that only 16 out of 114 have been answered, and in fact 11 of the questions put on the session before still have not been answered. I wonder if the minister would tell us why, and when, the questions and answers will be forthcoming from this government, if you claim still to be an open government. When will we receive the balance of these answers?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Soon.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I think the answer that the minister gave was straightforward, but what it shows and indicates is that this is a government that is not open, that is arrogant, and I would like to get a definitive answer as to when we will receive the answers from not only last session but the session before. When will they be forthcoming?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I indicated to the House, Mr. Speaker, that they would be forthcoming very soon.

Executive Council Airfares

MR. KOSKIE: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Premier, and indicate that among the written questions left unanswered from the first legislative session is one dealing with the commercial airfares paid by the Premier's department, the Executive Council. What I ask the Premier: what has he got to hide? Why in fact is not this information begin given to the opposition in order that we can provide the information to the public? What are you hiding? Why haven't these been answered from the first, and from the second session,

and in particularly the commercial airfares that have been paid by your department?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, the opposition has asked for a great deal of information in terms of the questions that they posed to the government. Our staff is involved in pulling it together, and as soon as it's available we'll present it to the House.

Legal Fees

MR. KOSKIE: — A supplemental, Mr. Speaker. We, in the opposition here . . . One of the methods of obtaining information from this secretive government is through questions put on the order paper. I want to say, as a supplement, that also not answered, Mr. Premier, is the question from the first session, is the information on legal fees that have been paid by the government to various firms. Why have you not been able to provide that information to the opposition and to the people of this province?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, we will be presenting the information as quickly as we can get it together, and it's my understanding that a great deal of it will be coming forth very soon.

Cost of Premier's Out-of-Province Trips

MR. KOSKIE: — Well, I want to ask a new question to the Premier, to indicate the nature of the questions which we have asked and sought for information. Also among the unanswered questions, Mr. Premier, from the first session, is the question on the cost of the Premier's various out-of-province trips. And I want to say, does the Premier's office not know the cost of these trips, or are they, in fact, hiding the information from the public? Why isn't that question answered from the first session?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, we will be providing the information as soon as it's available.

MR. KOSKIE: — Supplement to the Premier. Mr. Premier, in the interest of running a government in order that the public has access to information, do you think it is reasonable that questions have gone unanswered since the first session of this House since you formed the government?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, when the people of Saskatchewan elected our government, they wanted a government that would provide them with information. We said we would provide, at the request of people in Saskatchewan, a public utilities review commission, as an example, as an example of information for the people in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, never in the history of the province of Saskatchewan have people been able to get information about utilities like they have since we brought in the public utilities review commission, or have they ever been able to get information like we provided on salaries. Individuals from all levels of government, the crown corporations, or information about Intercontinental Packers, or information on any kinds of things. And I'd like to give you some examples, Mr. Speaker.

We look at . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, the question was with respect to open government and information. The public utilities review commission provides the people of Saskatchewan with an example of open government and information. The crows apply to the public utilities review commission; it's debated in public; it's in the media every day, as an example of the kinds of things that cannot be done without the public being involved.

Let me give you an example of the kinds of things that could be done, that weren't, didn't have the public information, and didn't have the input of the public. Let me give you some examples,

Mr. Speaker, with no public input, which would have been public in a public utilities review commission.

I want to review some cabinet decisions – some cabinet decisions with respect to rates that were not public, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible) . . . gas rates. In 1980, Mr. Speaker, a cabinet minister from the former administration raised gas rates 4.6 per cent in February, 8.7 per cent in September, 13.3 per cent in November, for almost a 30 per cent increase – with no input from the public at all.

The next year, Mr. Speaker, 5.8 per cent in May, 5.5. per cent in July, 18 per cent in February – almost a 70 per cent increase in gas rates in this province – not reviewed by a public utilities review commission. But now we've got something that can review it, and for the first time in history they're complaining about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Travelling Expenses of Former Minister of Energy

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, at the risk of precipitating another speech, perhaps on highways or something equally irrelevant, may I direct a question to the Premier on a specific subject? This has to do with the travelling expenses for out-of-province trips of the former minister of energy, the member for Thunder Creek, who had a certain predilection to spend a good deal of time in other places on this continent. The question I ask you is: will you give this information to the House, and will you give the House the assurance that the answers, which you have so far kept hidden, had nothing to do with his demotion from the cabinet?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, we'll provide the information as soon as it's available.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Premier will repeat his answer. Unfortunately the member from Moosomin took over the floor, and I couldn't hear what the Premier said.

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, I said that I would provide the information as soon as it's available. From what I understand, it's coming in, and will be available very quickly, and the members can have it.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, is the Premier telling us that he does not know the reasons for the demotion of the member for Thunder Creek from the cabinet?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — I gave the reasons for that decision at that time, and they haven't changed.

Employment of former Conservative Candidate

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Agriculture. It has to do, Mr. Minister, with someone who knows about as much about agriculture as I do; it's Jim Petrychyn. An order for return, filed in this Assembly late Thursday, says that Mr. Petrychyn, the former Conservative candidate in Regina Centre, has a contract with the Department of Agriculture to provide advice and service to the minister. My question is this. What advice and service does the former Conservative candidate from Regina Centre – “a native of Regina,” he says in his campaign literature – what advice and service does he render to you on farm policy?

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — I'm flattered to have the question from the hon. member, Mr. Speaker. The contract, or whatever he's referring to, I presume was under the previous minister of agriculture, but I'd be happy to take notice of his question.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — New question, Mr. Speaker. I'm surprised that the minister doesn't know what a Conservative candidate is doing in his department. I thought you would have been aware of them. Will you also, Mr. Minister, find out and report back to the House on what the total benefits in salary and fringe benefits are, for this farm policy adviser?

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to undertake that for the hon. member.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Would you also undertake to provide the House with the per diem salary rate contained in the personal services contract of such an experienced and trusted adviser on farm policies?

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Mr. Speaker, I'll endeavour to provide everything the member's heart desires.

Women's Secretariat

MR. SHILLINGTON: — New question, Mr. Speaker. I'm delighted to hear that. You will then undoubtedly provide us with his qualifications to work in the Department of Agriculture. I take his former answer to be an answer to that question as well.

A new question to the minister in charge of the women's secretariat, and the question has to do with the fact that the Conservative government has finally seen the error of its ways, given in to the public disgust and outrage which followed its decision to disband the women's division, and now the government is creating a women's division and calling it something else.

My question, Madam Minister, has to do with whether or not the new version of the women's division will have the authority it needs to do the job properly. The minister claims that the secretariat will co-ordinate legislation, policies, programs, and ensure that women's views and interests are fully represented. Let's test that. Will you and the women's secretariat be urging that the minimum wage freeze be lifted, an item of concern to women in Saskatchewan, since they make up most of the people who earn the minimum wage?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. I'd like to read two citations to you. The question that has just been asked I believe is not in order for the question period since it's seeking opinion. The other one that I would like to read to you is from paragraph 359(5):

The matter ought to be of some urgency. There must be some present value in seeking the information during the Question Period rather than through the *Order Paper* or through correspondence with the Minister or the department.

And I find that these questions are really not urgent questions, and I would rule them out of order.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I follow Mr. Speaker's ruling. Is Mr. Speaker ruling that questions on the women's secretariat legislation that's coming up this afternoon are not . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. What I said was that your question was seeking an opinion, and I don't believe, therefore, qualifies as a question.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Then let me rephrase the question for the benefit of Madam Minister. Will the women's secretariat be given the authority to make recommendations on issues of serious concern to women, such as the raising of the minimum wage?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the hon. member wait until the legislation is passed — that is, if you're going to be voting for it — before we get into the

specifics of the authority of the secretariat.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — New question, Mr. Speaker. The true test of how autonomous the women's secretariat will be, will be whether or not the secretariat is free to publish material expressing concern about government policies and how they impact on women. Will the secretariat in fact publish public reports?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Well obviously, Mr. Speaker, I'm not getting through to the member. You are going to have to wait for the specific details after the secretariat is established in order to find out what are the specific details it will be doing. I would suggest that it would be very premature of me to say what they are going to publish at this point in time, and what they're not, before they're even established.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — New question. Will Madam Minister inform the public (which is the purpose of question period, not to deal with legislation), will Madam Minister inform this House, and through this House the public, whether or not the women's secretariat will be a free-standing agency with its own legislative authority, a separate budget, and a direct reporting relationship to the minister responsible for the status of women?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Speaker, I suggest the question is still premature, but the fact that they are even having their own legislation to come here in setting up a secretariat answers your question for you: as a free-standing agency. And perhaps we could get into that after first reading of the bill.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — New question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Did the minister, in fact, hold a press conference this morning which informed the public, before you informed the House, of these very issues? Did you not hold a press conference this morning?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Speaker, we had a press conference this morning that was under embargo, and I believe that that happens often with many pieces of legislation and many issues.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Then will Madam Minister explain to the House why you will give information to the press that you won't give to this Assembly?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Speaker, the press conference this morning was under embargo until after the first reading of the legislation . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, then, may I question the minister on her press release? I'm simply trying to get some information. I'm trying to get some information for this Assembly which is available, apparently, to members of the press, and I ask the minister again: will this be a free-standing agency with an independent relationship and a direct reporting to the minister?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the answer again will be forthcoming after our first reading and it has been introduced in this House.

Collver Lawsuit

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. The question relates to the Buildall, or Collver, lawsuit, and relates to whether or not you obtained a legal opinion from Mr. Silas Halyk, Q.C., the counsel for SGI on this issue until you removed him. May I ask you that? I believe you already indicated that, but may I ask you that again as a preliminary to questions?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, Mr. Speaker, that's the third question or fourth questions period now that that question has come up. They sat silent for six years on that issue, and now I'm going to hear their chirping for the next six years over the same issue. If it was such an issue, and if it

was such a solid claim, and the amount indicating more than \$1.25 million, why didn't they proceed with it in all the six years that they were fooling around with it. Mr. Speaker, they sat silent. Now we're going to hear them for the next six years about why it was dropped. Why didn't they do something? You had the chance. Why didn't you do something when you had that chance? Why did you sit with it?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. I gather from his previous questions that he did not obtain an opinion from Mr. Silas Halyk. That's the only thing I can take from the previous answer.

I ask the minister, is Mr. Halyk . . . Was he counsel for SGI when a statement of claim was issued on May 4, 1978? Was he counsel for SGI when the demand for particulars was replied to by Mr. Halyk on May 24, 1978? Did he deal with the garnishee summons issues on August 30, 1978? Did he complete the statement of documents on behalf of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office in January of 1979? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, do I have the floor?

Was he counsel, Mr. Minister, when Mr. Collver was examined for discovery in 1979 and 1980? Was he counsel when the SGI was examined for discovery . . . Was he counsel for SGI when SGI was examined for discovery by Mr. Collver's lawyers, and did he conduct on behalf of SGI a pre-trial conference with then Chief Justice Johnson? Did all those things happen?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition would have been better to ask a previous minister that question. It all happened during his term. Why is he asking me? Mr. Halyk was the legal counsel for the case until we became the government.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I take it he does not deny any of the statements I have made in the form of a question. My question to you is this: in view of all of these activities right up to pre-trial conference with the chief justice, did you obtain a legal opinion from him as to the merits of the issue, and will you make that opinion public?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, as I recall it, the legal opinion that the member is asking for was obtained by the previous government prior to 1978. As a matter of fact it was in 1977, as I recall it, — prior. It was during the term when he was the premier of the province, when they were government. They sat on it for six years; they sat doing nothing. They didn't take it to trial in that six year period. We reviewed it, after we became the government.

Mr. Speaker, there was only one reason that that statement of claim was ever filed in the first place. It was political persecution, continued on for six full years, and now they're asking . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Now they're asking. Now they're asking, when they had all that time to do something with it. As I say, I don't know, this is the third or fourth time in question period that it's been asked. It will be asked again for many years, I suppose. They want to make up for the six years that they lost while they were fooling around with it.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary. Do you then admit, Mr. Minister, that you did not obtain any legal opinion from Mr. Silas Halyk, for fear that he would recommend that the action be proceeded with, and that you, in fact, took it away from him, and gave it to a lawyer who would give you the opinion you wanted? Do you admit that, Mr. Minister?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order please. Order. Mr. Minister.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I hardly see the point, Mr. Speaker, of the question. First of all, as I admitted, and said to the Leader of the

Opposition a few minutes ago, we obtained . . . or they obtained the opinion in 1977. And at that time we were told there was a case. But, you know, Mr. Speaker, that was in November of 1977, and they sat around with it until May 1978, just prior to the election. I wonder why . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes, we did appoint new counsel. Yes, we did ask for a legal opinion from someone else, and I already had the other one. You got it. You received it back in 1977 and sat on it.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. Did you not feel it appropriate, having obtained a legal opinion from leading counsel, having seen him carry this action to the very door of the court-house, did you not feel it appropriate to get an opinion from him — a fully qualified counsel who carried the action to pre-trial, to discussion with the Chief Justice — on the details of the trial? Did you not feel it appropriate to get an opinion from him so that the people of Saskatchewan would know why you were proposing to drop this action against your former leader, whose candidate you were?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to understand how the Leader of the Opposition can, in good conscience, stand in this legislature today and ask such a question. When he was the premier of this province, he had a duty to the people of Saskatchewan. That was one of the largest claims that was ever introduced by any crown corporation in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, he had a duty to the people of this province to see that that claim got to trial, and it never did. It never did in all that period of time.

You want to talk about competence. I believe you said something about that. Well, we also have competent legal counsel at SGI as well. They were also there when you were there. They also received it. Mr. Leader of the Opposition, if your conscience is bothering you to that degree today, I say to you that it's too late. You had your chance. You had six years that you sat on that. If you couldn't complete it at that time, if you couldn't find reason to take it to trial, then that should tell you why we didn't, why we dropped the case.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 1 – An Act to establish the Women's Secretariat

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to establish the Women's Secretariat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and the bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

Point of Order by Member for Shaunavon

Before orders of the day, I would like to make a statement.

On Thursday, November 24, 1983, a point of order was raised by the member for Shaunavon to the effect that recent ministerial statements have not conformed to the rules or practices of this Assembly, in that they have been neither brief nor factual, and I deferred my ruling.

I have examined the record, and find it difficult to rule on the veracity of the ministerial statements in question. However, I would like to take this opportunity to remind all hon. members of the accepted guidelines for ministerial statements.

It has long been an established practice of this Assembly for ministerial statements to be made under routine proceedings before orders of the day. And it is a tradition that members of the Executive Council should, as a courtesy to the House, if the House is in session, make any major policy statement or announcement in the House prior to announcing the same outside the House. Such statements should be brief, factual, and specific. No debate can take place.

The opposition is permitted a response to each ministerial statement. And these responses should also be brief, factual, and specific. I would like to emphasize that both government and opposition contribution should be brief and factual, not to encourage debate.

I am concerned that the recent ministerial statements and opposition responses have not conformed to these accepted guidelines. I find that the point of order of the member for Shaunavon is well taken, and I urge all members of this Assembly to review the guidelines for ministerial statements.

I would refer members to *Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms* (5th Edition), paragraph 262 on page 87, and to decisions of this Chair dated March 22, 1967, April 4, 1979, and March 9, 1983.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Canadian Western Agribition

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, if I could, please, I would like to bring to your attention, and through you to the attention of the Assembly, notice of an event taking place in our province and in Regina, on which are focussed the agricultural eyes of the world. I'm talking, of course, about the Canadian Western Agribition.

In little more than a decade, Agribition has become the foremost agricultural exhibition in Canada, and indeed one of the top agricultural shows in North America, and recognized throughout the world. It is a world class show, and this is attested to by the fact that representatives from some 25 nations are expected to be at this year's event. Although it started out as a livestock show, Agribition is now a full range agricultural exhibition.

Another major segment – it has Mexibition, with more than 200 exhibitors, and that's recognized across Canada and throughout North America as a foremost show-case for agricultural technology.

Another major segment of Agribition is the grain show. This was established in 1980 as a special-interest feature of Agribition to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the exhibition, and each year it has grown in size and scope, and no grain farmer – in fact, Mr. Speaker, for that matter, no person interested in the grain industry – can afford to miss seeing this year's grain show. The theme is “the World of Oil Seeds.”

And, of course, the livestock shows and sales continue to be the backbone of Canadian Western Agribition's success. They continue to break new ground, and this year there are expected to be some 5,000 entries, and that includes, Mr. Speaker, the first ever, the first ever show and sale in North America of the Piedmontese breed of beef cattle.

And I think Canadian Western Agribition assures its own success in years to come because of their focus on the youth of today, whether it be on the 4-H livestock judging competitions, or junior competitors in the co-op sector. These people today represent leaders in the agricultural community tomorrow.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend all those who have worked so long and so hard, plus the dedication and the foresight that they've had, to bring Agribition to the pinnacle of success it

now enjoys, and I'm proud that our government, and my department, has supported Agribition both financially and in spirit throughout its growth. I would urge all members of the Assembly, and all people of Saskatchewan, to support Agribition, and I would recommend to all members of the legislature to visit Agribition during this week. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to comment on the minister's statement that Agribition has been a great success in Saskatchewan. I appreciate the fact that it's continuing to grow. I enjoyed a banquet with them, with international guests, in the past, and the association has been a good one. I'm looking forward to seeing his department continue to pump the necessary funds in that it takes to keep Agribition as successful as it was when we first had the vision to start to this great organization., and I don't think either the minister or myself should be patting ourselves on the back for what Agribition's doing for Saskatchewan, but I think all of us should get out, and get our boots a little dirty, and just see what the people of Saskatchewan are doing in agriculture, and the tremendous impact this show is having on our ranchers and show people in particular, that have that world stage to show their prize cattle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. LANE: — A ministerial statement, Mr. Speaker, if I may.

MR. SPEAKER: — We've passed that point in the day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SPECIAL ORDERS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

MR. ENGEL: — Last week, Mr. speaker, before this House adjourned for the weekend, I was in the middle of my address in reply to the throne speech debate and in the process of talking about the government's decision to lift the ban on alcohol advertising. Just before we adjourned, I was reading from this brief that was submitted to the liquor laws and regulations review committee by Dr. Saul Cole, chairman of the alcohol . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Cohen, chairman of the Alcoholism Commission of Saskatchewan, and just to set the stage before I get into the balance of my remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to read the last recommendation he makes. I went through some of the report earlier, and the recommendation he makes: "On the basis of the foregoing information, the Alcoholism Commission makes the following recommendations." And the first one on the list was that the present legislation and regulations prohibiting the print and broadcast media advertising of alcohol beverages be maintained. This submission was made, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in Regina on January 21st, 1983, to your cabinet that is sitting to your left.

To summarize the remarks that I made to this point: the government in their anxiousness to be the best paid government in the world, decided to lift the 58-year-old ban on alcohol advertising. I said in my remarks to this point that that decision was inconsistent with the number of publicly stated priorities of this government. It's a sham of many important policy announcements. There are announcements to fight drug abuse. There are announcements to get tough and crack down on drinking driving. The AG's considerations and contradictions that he made and was crying crocodile tears about the increasing problem of wife battering and child abuse. I'm saying it's double standard. Those are hollow words. Family violence I mentioned in my remarks last day are a result of increased alcohol use. And the one-party inquiry that was led

by your caucus, Mr. Deputy Speaker, heard the views of people – heard the views of people like Dr. Saul Cohen and the Alcoholism Commission of Saskatchewan – that spoke out against the Conservative's government decision to lift alcohol advertising ban.

This is just some of the advice, the solid advice, that was given to this government in advance of the decision, Mr. Deputy Speaker. But the government saw fit to . . . and chose to ignore this advice. It chose instead to do the bidding of the big breweries and some of the large media corporations in our province, and it's easy to understand why. If you believe the old saying that he who pays the piper calls the tune, over the last five years the big contributors to the Tory party have been the large breweries. \$261,000 to the Conservative Party of Canada was contributed to your party — \$261,000 over the last five years. This past year, and during the last election year, \$51,000 according to the report we got after the . . . from the election contributions were made to the Conservative party in 1982 alone — \$51,000 by the breweries, and now these people have their reward. The best government that money can buy has come through for the big business.

Of course the Conservative government's lifting of the ban will also benefit the large out-of-province media corporations, such as the Saskatoon television station owned by John Bassett of Toronto, CFQC. Last year CFQC contributed \$2,500 to the Conservative Party of Saskatchewan. Even more interesting in light of that, is the local Toronto television station owned by John Bassett, CFTO, contributed \$5,000 to the Conservatives in Saskatchewan last year. So a total of \$7,500 from that one source alone. They, too, have their reward, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

One other point that I want to make about the Conservative government's decision, Mr. Speaker. It was not preceded by an all-party committee of this legislature, as I mentioned. It was not preceded by public hearings across the province to listen to the views of the concerned public, as I mentioned. Even worse, the decision to lift the ban on alcohol advertising was made by a cabinet order behind closed doors. It has never been brought before this legislation where the tradition is to allow a free vote – a free vote so that all members in all parties could express their personal views without constraints of party, or without constraints of party discipline . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It seems to be touching a little sore note on the member for Meadow Lake. You've got to ask yourself, Mr. Deputy Speaker, why would this Conservative government change such an important law in such a sneaky way? Why wouldn't it allow a free vote so that its members could stand up in this Assembly and state on the record where they stand, like votes on the liquor legislation have been over the past history of this province until you came to power?

I'll tell you why, Mr. Speaker, because those Conservative MLAs lack the moral courage to stand up in his place and speak out against the decision. That's why it was done by a cabinet decision. They didn't have the guts to stand up to the big breweries, and to the Conservative cabinet, and to say no, so they begged the cabinet to get them off the hook. When the decision was made, they ran for cover. And do you know what really gets me, Mr. Deputy Speaker? What really gets me is the way so many of these Conservative MLAs are now running around their constituencies (off the record, of course) telling their local clergymen, and telling anyone else who is concerned about this decision, "Oh, you know how I voted in caucus. I was opposed to this decision. I'm against alcohol advertising. But I was outvoted," they say. Talk about hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker. Talk about a lack of moral courage.

Maybe we should think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, maybe we should think about how we could give these members an opportunity to stand up and vote, to give the public testimony where they really stand on alcohol advertising, so you may vote for it or against it. Your constituents have a right to know. What about my friend, the member for Morse? Where does he stand on this issue? Are you in favour of increased alcohol abuse? Did you vote for this flood of alcohol advertising? You can't run around your constituency telling people that you're opposed to the idea . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I don't know if you ever were to Egypt or not, but when you

see a sphinx sitting there not moving very much and . . . That's what the member reminds me of. Have the courage to stand up in this debate and put your position on the record.

What about my friend from Arm River, the minister in charge of hailstones? What's your position? Don't tell me that you don't have plenty of free time to think about it. And the member for Rosthern, and the member for Regina Rosemont, and the member for Saskatoon Westmount where do you stand on this issue? Let's see how many Conservative MLAs have a spine, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Let's see how many of them will put their position on the record in this debate.

Now after the decision was made to lift the ban on alcohol advertising, the government had three sales pitches to attempt to convince the people of Saskatchewan this wasn't such a bad idea. First, increased advertising would not increase consumption, they said. The government claimed that it had studies to prove it. Yet they have to release the studies. The only study that I've seen in print points exactly to the opposite decision. I have before me, "Content and Effects of Alcohol Advertising, Report No. 1, Overview and Summary of Project." It was done by Charles Atkin, for my member's information, and Martin Block – real good supporters of mine, and right in our back pocket; they happen to work for Michigan State University.

This is a final report submitted to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, Federal Trade Commission, National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, and the Department of Transport in 1980. Executive summary of alcohol advertising – I'm going to read several of the quotations from this report into the record. The first one is on the exposure to alcohol advertising. Let me put into the record a quotation from here, Mr. Deputy Speaker:

It is estimated that network TV carries more than 5,000 beer and wine ads per year, and that the 41 major magazines aimed at general and specialized audiences carry more than 2,500 liquor ads per year. From survey research, it can be estimated that adolescents and young adults notice a large number of these ads while consuming the mass media and pay attention to between one-fourth and three-fifths of the messages encountered.

If you want to question it in your own home, just start listening to the jingles the young people, six-seven-and eight-year olds, are starting to sing, since liquor advertising has been banned, and the ban's been lifted in Saskatchewan.

Point number four – attitudes towards drinking.

By depicting alcohol consumption as attractive, acceptable, and rewarding, advertising leads to somewhat more favourable values regard in the amounts, situations, and benefits of drinking.

Another point on youth drinking:

Advertising appears to have a positive influence on drinking behaviour during adolescent years. The impact is greatest for liquor. For 11 brands studied, an average of 31 per cent of the highly exposed youth, versus 15 per cent of the less-exposed youth, had tried each one. There is also a substantial effect for beer with (listen to this number, Mr. Deputy Speaker) 62 per cent of the highly exposed, versus 30 per cent of the less-exposed, drinking at least one beer per week.

That's adolescents. What about the rest of the population – those that would fit into a heavy or excessive drinking category? The survey said at exposure to advertising is related to measures of excessive drinking behaviour and problem drinking.

What about drinking and hazardous activities?

Alcohol advertising affects attitudes and behaviour regarding drinking in the context of driving, but not for other hazardous activities such as sports. Those heavily exposed to ads more often drive after drinking, and drink while riding or sitting in a car.

I have a couple more quotes that I'd like to make from the summary section of this particular report. In conclusion it says, Mr. Deputy Speaker:

There is a substantial quantity of television beer commercials and magazine liquor ads readily accessible to mass media audiences, including youthful segments who frequently watch and read those vehicles carrying the most advertising.

The second conclusion they reach is:

The findings suggest that advertising exerts a major influence on audience cognitions and various brands of alcohol.

Third conclusion:

Those who report seeing the most ads tend to perceive the typical drinker as somewhat more fun-loving, happy, and good-looking. Other positive traits are ascribed to in a lesser degrees.

Fourth conclusion:

Response study evidence indicates that advertising may contribute to the feeling that alcohol provides an escape.

Fifth conclusion:

Compared to other effects of advertising, the impact on brand preference is much weaker than brand awareness (just opposite to what the former minister in charge of alcohol used to say), and slightly weaker than the impact on product consumption levels.

Sixth conclusion:

The evidence from the field survey indicates that advertising has an influence on drinking behaviour during the adolescent years. The relationship between exposure to ads and liquor drinking is strongly positive.

Seventh conclusion:

There is little doubt that alcohol advertising exerts an influence on the frequency and quantity of adult alcohol consumption. The evidence is based on both correlational and self-report methodologies . . . shows that the advertising is effective in stimulating consumption.

Just the opposite to what your government is saying that would happen with liquor advertising.

There's only two more conclusions, Mr. Speaker, that I'm going to read into the record. The eighth one is:

Exposure to alcohol advertising is clearly related to measures of excessive drinking behaviour, but tests with specimen ads do not produce indications of immediate impact on excessive drinking attitudes. There is also a positive association between exposure and problem drinking.

The last conclusion they made is found on page 22 of the report:

The results suggest that alcohol advertising affects attitudes and behaviour regarding drinking in the context of driving.

And here we have a government that is claiming to get tough with drunken driving, and they open up a double standard where they know, from studies made all over the world, that alcohol affects the amount of drunken driving . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I read every one of them, my good friend. The government claimed that no ads would be running during periods when young people were likely to be watching, no ads were going to run when young people were likely to be watching. Anyone who has sat through CFL football games, and on this week-end again on television, knows the phoney claim that that was – knows how phoney that claim was.

The government's final claim was that it would be tough with big breweries, and would require them to pay at least 15 cents of every advertising dollar for educational messages – a tough claim. But about a week after the ban was lifted, the breweries told the government "No way," and now Saskatchewan broadcasters are paying for these educational messages. They're giving a 15 per cent discount to their friends, the breweries. As a result, advertising rates for other clients will no doubt be on the increase. Each of these claims was as phoney as a three-dollar bill, Mr. Speaker.

Since their decision was announced, the Conservative government has also tried to downplay the public reaction to the decision. It has claimed that few people are interested in the issue. That hasn't been my experience, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I sent a letter out to some members of the Saskatchewan clergy a few months ago, or weeks ago, asking . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'll read it into the record. I wrote a letter, and I asked them for their views, and the views of their congregations, and let me read a couple of answers and replies into the record. Let me read a couple of replies that I received into the record.

I have a letter here from the First Pentecostal Assembly in Moose Jaw, dated November 15:

Thank you for your letter of September 29, 1983 pertaining to the Conservative government's regrettable decision to allow the advertising of alcohol on radio and TV and in newspaper and magazines throughout Saskatchewan. On behalf of the congregation of First Pentecostal Assembly in Moose Jaw, we would like to request that you convey to Mr. Devine and the cabinet our strong objection to this decision. Clearly, the only parties to benefit from this decision will be the breweries, distilleries, and advertising industry.

Surely the problem of alcohol abuse is severe enough in this province without encouraging and persuading the public to consume even more. We believe that a responsible government could do no less than reverse this unfortunate decision to allow the advertising of alcohol. Again, thank you for expressing your concern in this issue. Respectfully, Pastor William Pipkey.

This letter was read to and unanimously passed by the congregation of First Pentecostal Assembly (is a footnote).

Southey Baptist Church:

In reply to a letter which I received dated September 29, '83, I would express my deep concern regarding the provincial government's decision to allow the liquor industry to publicly advertise alcoholic drinks. This decision will increase the moral problems which we now have. There will be an increase of accidents on the roads, resulting in injury and deaths. There will be a further demoralizing of our society. I

express my concern, and register my opposition to the legislation.

Being a member (he goes on to say) of the Southey and area ministerial, which consists of the ministers of Cupar, Earl Grey, Markinch, and Southey – that is, Baptist, Lutheran, Roman Catholic, and United churches – I wish to inform you that this body passed a motion Wednesday, October 5, registering its concern and its opposition to the decision of our provincial government. We are informing our congregations of this decision and expect their full support.

I know that the Southey Baptist congregation can be expected to fully support it, and I expect letters to come from individuals to the local MLA, Mr. Tusa. I pray that God will strengthen our hands in building the lives of our people positively. In Christ's name, Rev. Bert E. Milner.

I have a letter here from Dalmeny Bible Church:

On behalf of the Dalmeny Bible Church, I would like to express our regret that the government of this province, by lifting the ban on liquor advertising, is promoting the increased consumption of alcohol in Saskatchewan. When I see liquor ads on TV, I sense no warm feeling of pride that we, as a province, have come of age. I have, in fact, the same feeling that I have when I see a drunk on the street; or the same feeling that I have when I recall that my own brother, by alcohol, has been robbed of his wife, his family, his health, his youth, and every nearly his life.

In August of '81, another brother of mine was involved in a head-on collision on the outskirts of Regina. All seven occupants of the other car was intoxicated.

It gives me no pleasure or glow of satisfaction to realize that Saskatchewan is getting into step with the times, and that more alcohol will be consumed in our province. Somebody else's brother will be crippled or killed in an alcohol-related accident; somebody else's family will break up because of alcohol.

We wish you every success in your efforts to see the government reverse this dangerous and costly decision. (Written by) Elwood Larsen, Associate Pastor.

The Esterhazy Baptist Church, whose pastor is Jim Church, wrote:

As a lifelong citizen of Saskatchewan, I was quite proud that our province did not allow liquor advertising. I find it refreshing to turn on the TV and not be subjected to those sinister commercials that never show the ugly and devastating effects of alcohol.

As a pastor who has to deal with the heartache and the sorrow produced by the abuse of alcohol, I am further distressed because now advertising is allowed. If the government could sit in my office and see the tears and anguish that alcohol produces, then they could only be described as callous and uncaring if they would refuse to re-ban liquor advertising.

I would, therefore, urge you, an MLA, elected by people such as myself and my parishioners, to do all in your power to get this decision reversed. (It's signed): Sincerely, Pastor Jim Church.

Circlebrooke Drive Alliance Church, 259 Circlebrooke Drive, Yorkton, Saskatchewan.

I am writing you with great concern regarding the provincial government's announcement to lift the ban against alcohol advertising. As a pastor, many people

who come for counselling come as a result of alcohol-related problems. It is my conviction that an open door to the liquor advertising will increase alcohol consumption, inevitably leading to increased alcohol abuse. I fear the consequences this will have on our society, socially, morally, spiritually, as well as contributing to family break-downs.

I would urge the government to reverse this negative policy decision. Sincerely, Pastor J. M. Mulholland.

Discovery Baptist Church, right here in Regina:

I wish to express my own dismay at the lifting of the ban against liquor advertising by the provincial government. It is very upsetting to me and members of the Discovery Baptist Church. Please be assured of our backing as you seek to reverse this negative policy decision. I personally have spent a great deal of my life ministering to the victims of such aggressive alcohol advertising in the USA, and know that anyone who knows the truth knows that such advertising will increase alcohol consumption. I have lived during the era when such advertising was forbidden, have seen it legalized, and have seen the way it has affected almost all persons to their hurt. Anything I can do to assist you in your efforts please let me know. Sincerely, J. Lindsay Nimmons Jr., Pastor of Discovery Baptist Church.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm not going to read all the letters I received on this issue because it's more than 400, but I picked out a sample that would let the members opposite know that there's a general consensus from church people. I'm going to read one now from Territorial Drive Alliance Church in North Battleford, and I mention this one expressly because the North Battleford church sent me a lot of letters on this one. Very, very many of their members wrote as concerned members, and I'm reading one from the Pastor Al Walters.

As a concerned citizen, I am deeply grieved that our Saskatchewan government has made the decision to lift the ban against liquor advertising which has been in place for 58 years. As this has opened the door for aggressive advertising of alcohol on radio, television, newspaper and magazines, I know this will have its devastating effects upon our youth and adults. I am totally against such advertising in that it will only encourage our youth and adults to start drinking alcoholic beverages, but also increase liquor consumption which results in destroying people and homes. I would strongly urge our Conservative government to reverse this negative policy decision, and that it restore adequate funding support to help promotion programs. Yours sincerely, Pastor Al Walters, Territorial Drive Alliance Church, Box 1336, North Battleford, Saskatchewan.

For those of you who wish to argue with him, Eyebrow, Saskatchewan:

We are thankful that there are those in parliament who are truly concerned for the well-being of the people, and are anxious to do all in their power to protect and help especially our young people. We are concerned with you that this advertising will again be removed from the television screens as well as elsewhere. May God grant you the wisdom and strength to do your part.

From Arelee, Saskatchewan:

We, as a church oppose the liquor advertising that the present government is promoting on radio, television, newspaper, magazines throughout Saskatchewan. This will lead to more alcoholism, more highway accidents, more expense to hospital and medical health care which we cannot afford. We advise the present government to give this matter every consideration on their part. Thank you. The church board,

Stephen J. Matiko, Church Secretary. P.S. this letter is also sent to Premier Grant Devine, Harry Baker, and George McLeod.

Loreburn, Saskatchewan. From Loreburn, Saskatchewan:

We thank God for you and other Christian men in government who are concerned for the welfare of our country. We, too, are strongly opposed to such advertising, as it would not only add to the existing trouble but multiply in starting new cases of alcohol abuse. It is nothing but a curse to our country that we can well do without.

If our government thinks it brings in revenue, they should look at the expense of it broken lives, in crime, in accidents, in family breakups, costs of court cases, the prisoners to feed and care for, etc. The revenue they get is a tiny drop in the bucket to the huge expenses involved in all its costs.

We wish you god's blessing. We will pray for you, too, in your fight against such legislation. Henry and Agnes Martens. We thought maybe a personal letter to Premier Grant Devine would help, too, so we wrote him personally.

Lanigan, Saskatchewan:

I would like to be counted on the side of those who oppose the lifting of the ban on liquor advertising in Saskatchewan. I encourage you in your stand against the government's decision in this, especially since statistics show how destructive alcohol abuse is in our society.

There's another one from Lanigan:

I am writing concerning the lifting of the ban against liquor advertising on TV. The purpose of advertising is to increase the sale of what is being advertised. No doubt the sale and consumption of alcohol will now increase with this advertising, and also will the problems associated with alcohol.

We live in the country and receive no cable TV, and until recently we received no alcohol commercials on the two stations we watch.

I am concerned only about other people, but also my own children as they grow up. I understand you would like to have this decision reversed. We, my husband and I, agree with you. We would encourage you to pursue this matter and have the ban reinstated. Mr. And Mrs. Lance Gunther.

I'll read one more that I just opened this morning, from Kindersley Alliance Church.

Dear Sir: This letter conveys to you our strong opposition to the lifting of the ban against liquor advertising in Saskatchewan. At the same time, we affirm the strong need for programs such as Aware programs.

Aggressive alcohol advertising places undue pressure upon young people who have obviously not arrived at the level of maturity to responsibly decide on the issues, but instead succumb to the prevailing pressures. The consequences to the family resulting from alcohol abuse are tragic enough without the added pressure resulting from advertising of liquor. It is our prayer that God will give you success in your commitment to see the reversal of this decision by our government. Peter Bergman, Pastor, Kindersley Alliance Church. Carbon copy to Mr. Bob Andrew.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, and there have been many letters to the editor on this subject. I found one

of the most interesting to be a letter published recently in the *Estevan Mercury*. Under “Letters to the Editor” in the *Estevan Mercury* dated the 9th of November: “Liquor advertising shouldn’t be allowed. (Editor’s note: The following is a copy of a letter submitted to Premier Grant Devine by the Estevan Christian Businessmen’s Committee.)”

Dear Sir:

Recently you announced a change in the laws to allow the advertising of alcoholic beverages in the media.

For those that were talking while I read the introduction, this letter was written by the Estevan Christian Businessmen’s Committee to Premier Grant Devine, and it’s an open letter in the *Estevan Mercury*:

Dear Sir:

Recently you announced a change in the laws to allow the advertising of alcoholic beverages in the media. To those who expressed concern that it would create a higher incidence of alcohol-related problems, i.e. more traffic accidents and fatalities, increased family problems and divorces, and a great number of youth offenders, the answer was that because of American TV advertising of alcoholic beverages already in Saskatchewan, there would be no charge.

To make such a statement is to imply that everyone watches U.S. television, in which case it would be futility for anyone to advertise in Canadian stations. They, in fact, might as well be closed down. We do not, however, I believe that everyone watches U.S. TV. Some are not able to receive American stations because they do not have cable nor a satellite. Others do not watch these stations because they choose not to. Now into these homes will come alcohol ads that will reach, especially, the impressionable youth.

We need to ask ourselves if the increased revenue will offset the cost of caring for the victims of alcohol-related crimes, and the cost of incarceration, correction, and rehabilitation of the offenders.

We feel the decision to allow the advertising of alcoholic beverage was a mistake, based on bad advice. Sincerely, Chairman, Vern Drader; Secretary, Roy Memory; Mervyn R. Rae; Estevan Christian Businessmen’s Committee.

That was an open letter to the Premier of this province from the Estevan Christian Businessmen’s Committee.

So this isn’t an issue which will quietly go away, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It’s an issue which is concerning a lot of people. As I mentioned earlier, I could read here for hours and hours because I’ve got a large stack of letters – I’ve got a large stack of letters. Particularly concerned are parents with young, impressionable children, who are not subject to the constant flood of flashy, slick ads from the big breweries.

Since the decision was announced, the Conservative government has also tried to downplay the public reaction to the decision. It has claimed that few people are interested in the issue. That hasn’t been my experience, Mr. Speaker; that hasn’t been my experience.

The Conservative government knows it has a weak case and members opposite – including the baker’s dozen who didn’t make it into cabinet – members opposite know that it can’t justify its decision on moral grounds, so it has engaged in some sleazy politics. Perhaps the best, or should I say its worst, example came in this Assembly several nights ago, and I’m glad the Minister of

Co-ops is here. The Minister of Co-ops engaged in a sleazy, gutter politics, the worst of its kind, the worst I've ever heard in this session, and I've been in here a long time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — There are only two members in this House that have been here longer than I have. The message that came from the member of co-ops was the sleaziest low-down attack I've ever heard. As is so often . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member for Meadow Lake should wait. I'll get to your comments. I'll get to your report, Mr. Minister of Co-ops.

As is so often the case, this minister hid behind the immunity offered by this place. He doesn't have the courage to step out in the hall and make those remarks about my friend and former colleague. He doesn't have the courage to repeat his statements outside the House where appropriate legal action could be taken. I dare the minister to have the courage to do that. Repeat your statements outside the House.

Right after he was through his message, I asked him for permission to have a copy of the videotape. Did he say I could have it? Did he say I could use that videotape? No, he didn't. He sent a note back three days later and says, "I'm sorry. I'm sorry I can't give it to you." Well, I wish he'd stand up in this House and say, "I'm sorry for what I said." I wish he'd stand up and say he's sorry for what he said. If you'd step outside of the House, you'd be slapped with a legal action so fast you wouldn't know what hit you because what you told this House the other night was a bold-faced lie, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The minister latched on a personal attack on one Don Faris who used to be a member of this Assembly and is now involved in a citizens' committee which is opposed to the government's action and government's decision to allow advertising of alcohol. The minister called Don Faris a pious hypocrite. He went on to accuse Don Faris of having supported recommendations in a 1973 legislative committee report which called for the increase in access of alcohol. I know that the minister owes Don Faris and this Assembly an apology because the minister wasn't telling the plain truth, plain and simple. The minister misled this House deliberately, Mr. Deputy Speaker – deliberately or otherwise.

I have before me a copy . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member for Meadow Lake and the member for Moosomin are getting very sensitive. I have time to let them get it off their chests . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Deputy Speaker, have I got the floor?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order, please. Allow the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg to make his comments.

MR. ENGEL: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I have before me a copy of the 1973 report. Anyone who can read, and I assume that includes the Minister of Co-ops, would find that there is a minority report included in this document. That minority report is signed by Dr. Don Faris. That minority report rejects and speaks out against each of the document's recommendations to increase access to alcohol. You, Mr. Minister, owe this House an apology for your shoddy treatment of the truth . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure who has the floor. The member for Rosthern seems to be fairly sensitive. The Minister of Co-ops accused Don Faris in this House, and we all have the records in *Hansard* of his accusation. He says that Don Faris, and he read from this report and the recommendations the report made, and he didn't have the courtesy in this House to say that Don Faris personally – Don Faris personally – submitted Appendix F under reservations. By Dr. Don Faris, MLA. And, he submitted an entire appendix.

This minister completely overlooked the whole truth of the matter. Just because his name is on as chairman of this committee . . . And I know and I was present in this House when those

recommendations were discussed, and he tried to make an analogy, and he accused Don Faris while saying he read from the report. But he didn't read the reservations that are listed. He didn't read the reservations.

I believe that we must reduce (and this is Don Faris' words in this report), I believe that we must reduce alcohol consumption in our society if we hope to stop the increasing non-medical use of other drugs. Anything less can quite honestly be labelled hypocrisy by a generation who are more influenced by what adults do than by what they. I am therefore opposed to a good number of the proposals for further liberalization.

Let me give just three examples. Number one . . . And he wrote right into the same report that the minister failed to read, and he knew it was there because it's listed in the Table of Contents that there's an appendix there, and he failed to read that Don Faris said:

I am opposed to drinking at sporting events. Reason: I want my children to be active in sports and inactive at drinking. There are already enough social situations where drinking is abused. This will be just one more. Strict enforcement at footfall games has been shown to work.

Number two. I am opposed to drinking in automobiles. Reason: I do not believe that when everyone else in the car is drinking, the driver will be able to resist the pressure to have a drink. We'll have more bottles and cars in the ditches. I don't want drinking in cars parked on the streets of our towns and villages of Saskatchewan.

And the minister stood up and said Dr. Don Faris was for drinking in automobiles.

Here's the final one.

Number three. I am opposed to the sale of alcoholic beverages in grocery stores. Reason: in Quebec we visited a supermarket with beer stocked up six feet high by every check-out counter. They pushed it like a special on butter. They can't and don't control its sale to young teenagers.

This report was signed by Don Faris.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, I challenge the member from Saskatoon Centre to go outside and say his remarks. I will go outside and I'll read all the letters that I read today. I'll go outside, and I'll repeat my entire speech and every word I've said about the member. I'd like to challenge him to do the same. If we want more reading and more speaking, I wish the members responsible when the decision was made to increase alcohol consumption in this province would go outside and do so. I wish they'd stand up and be counted in this House, when it comes time to be counted, where they stand on alcohol advertising.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative government's decision to allow advertising in Saskatchewan is a bad decision. It will lead to increased alcohol consumption, particularly by young people. It will lead to increased alcohol abuse. It will aggravate already serious social problems like family violence – and all to help the Conservative party of Saskatchewan pay off its ad campaigns that it made during the breweries.

There are a couple of number of ads I could refer to. There are a couple of number of ads, and I think this one here, the last one that just came out this weekend, "Booze is no joke . . ." I'd like to read that ad into the record because I think the committee is doing a tremendous job. The article shows a little girl crying in a corner, and in the shadow you could see the parents fighting, "Booze is no joke if you are a victim . . ."

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. I don't believe there is any need for the amount of yelling that we're having in the Chamber. I'm going to ask the members to return to some form of decorum. This has gone far beyond what's allowed.

MR. ENGEL: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The ad says:

Booze is no joke if you are a victim. Some comedians have made a good living by pretending to be funny drunk, but real alcohol problems are no joke if you are a victim. Did you know that alcohol is a major factor in family violence? Over 55 per cent of wife beatings and 65 per cent of child abuse are alcohol related. Over 10 times as many work days are lost due to alcohol than to strikes. Alcohol is a drug related to violent crime. 70 per cent of assaults, 72 per cent of robberies, and 86 per cent of murders involve alcohol. 50 per cent of traffic fatalities, 60 per cent of drownings, 70 per cent of accidental poisonings involve alcohol. 25 per cent of the Canadian health dollar is spent on alcohol-related problems. As many as one in 200 children may be affected by fetal alcohol syndrome, brain damage which may occur when expectant mothers drink even moderate amounts of alcohol. No wonder that experts agree that alcohol is Canada's number one drug problem.

It's too bad the members opposite aren't experts and are promoting the increased sale of alcohol.

Mr. Speaker, before I take my seat I'd like to move a motion, seconded by my colleague from Pelly:

That the motion be amended by adding the following after the word "session" appeared on the fourth line:

But regrets that, notwithstanding the fact that unemployment and the cost of living are the two key problems facing the ordinary citizen of Saskatchewan today, the legislative plan for the third session of the 20th legislature:

1. It fails to provide concrete proposals to help more than 50,000 Saskatchewan people who are searching for work this winter to find jobs.
2. It fails to address the problem of the rising costs of living, particularly with respect to rapidly rising utility rates and high interest rates.
3. It fails to provide relief for those at minimum wage who have had their incomes frozen for two full years.
4. It fails to provide Saskatchewan farmers relief from a severe cost-price squeeze caused by high interest rates and the rising costs of farm fuel.
5. It fails to help the people of northern Saskatchewan who are in desperate need of an economic development plan for this government.
6. It provides countless concessions to big business at the expense of Saskatchewan's ordinary citizens.

Debate continues concurrently.

MR. LUSNEY: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am very pleased to enter into this debate today, and not necessarily because I think that there was any real content in this throne speech. In fact, I think that the people of this province realize that there was no content whatsoever in this throne speech. It was a real big disappointment to them. It was barren. It was just a rash of old

announcements, and it had no real positive proposals for the people of this province.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, I think it was a very weak and disappointing throne speech. And this, coming from a government that was just about 18 months ago bragging about how they were going to make everything so good in this province. It's come from a government that, at this point, I think is feeling a little uneasy, uneasy and afraid of some of the things that they have done and some of the promises they made, and the fact that they've got a deficit in this province that's over half a billion dollars.

That, Mr. Speaker, I think is becoming a problem for them and they don't know just how they can go about telling some of their friends to back away from that trough so they can try and leave just a few scraps for the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I think one of the most notable things in this year's throne speech debate, is that the government members know just how empty it is. They know it is a weak throne speech, and because of it being so weak, what do they do when they get up to speak? Well, Mr. Speaker, they have decided not to talk about the contents of the throne speech. They have decided that the only thing they can do is try to attack the NDP opposition. That is the only contribution that they have put into this debate.

The Minister of Justice on Thursday spoke for over an hour, and what did he speak about? There was no mention of what was in the throne speech, or what they were going to do for the people of Saskatchewan. No, Mr. Speaker, all the Minister of Justice can talk about is what the NDP didn't do back in 1975 or '76, or any other year he can gather some little information about. But he would not talk about their programs, and he would not defend the things that they are doing. No, he would not do that.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, he decided to go on a little rampage of attacking the NDP and spent all his time doing that. In fact, he decided to go through the resolutions of the upcoming NDP convention. That, Mr. Speaker, was the content of the Minister of Justice in his throne speech debate.

I think the people of this province know exactly what is happening. They know what this government isn't doing, and none of the members there have the courage to get up and say that they should be changing direction, that their government is not going in the right direction, and they should be proposing some programs that will help the people at a time, because of the mismanagement of this government, has become to be some hard times in this province.

But then, again, I guess you can't blame them for not wanting to talk about their programs. They can't talk about them because they have no way of explaining how come they can't keep some of the promises they made. They have no solution to the problems that are out there in Saskatchewan and how to deal with them. They are a government that is misdirected at this point, misdirected because when they took office they decided that it was their friends that were more important. Their friends were the more important issue of the day and not the people of Saskatchewan. That, Mr. Speaker, is what happened to this government.

One would have to go to some of the facts that the Minister of Justice talked about. He would quote a memo back from 1976, and as usual, he would never completely read the memo, but he would quote just a half a paragraph of it as he did. But if he had gone down to the rest of the memo, the next paragraph, he would have read in it that the departmental officials were instructed at that time, in conjunction with the Department of Health and the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation, to develop a co-ordinated policy to meet the housing needs of senior citizens.

And the minister continuously said that we were not interested in helping the senior citizens, we were not interested in nursing homes, we were putting a moratorium on all construction. Well,

Mr. Speaker, nothing is further away from the truth. It just indicates that the members of the government only say what they think the people might believe as long as they don't give them all the facts about it.

One would have to go to see what is happening in this province at this time and what the needs are, especially in the health care field. We look at hospitals. There is a need for construction in hospitals, but they have deferred plans to build or to renovate hospitals in this province. They have not gone ahead with plans that should have been in the making over the past 18 months to provide more level 4 care facilities in this province, because that has become a real serious problem. It has become a real serious problem in many rural hospitals. And one can go to a hospital constituency, and that's the hospital at Canora that has 17 level 4 patients in it. They only get paid for about four of them, but they have to keep 17 level 4 patients in that hospital because there are no facilities in this province which they can send them to.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the problem. There is a level 4 facility in Yorkton, but there is no way that you can get any patients into it because they are full up and they have been for a long time. So the hospitals are stuck with the extra cost of having to look after these patients within their hospitals.

And yet, this government sort of decided that they were not going to address themselves to that problem. However, they have. And after the comments that the Minister of Justice made the other day, the office of the Minister of Health sent me a little memo and a news release that stated that they are going to spend \$237,000 per year for the next couple of years to get together a home care pilot project within the home care districts, and that is to try and provide service for some of the people that require it out there in rural Saskatchewan, and to try and keep them out of nursing homes.

I hope the minister's project succeeds. I really do, because we need those kinds of programs out there. But he also says that the home care districts are going to have to provide a portion of the costs from their existing budgets. Now, Mr. Speaker, the home care districts in this province do not have a large enough budget to look after the people that are out there now, and yet the minister decides that he is going to propose another program for them to look after but not provide the funding to do it with. That, Mr. speaker, I think will be a disappointment to all the people of Saskatchewan. It will be a disappointment to the home care boards because they will not be able to properly look after the people that will require that care.

And one can go, Mr. Speaker, to some of the other problems in the province, some of the other problems that face just about everyone, and that is the huge utility rate increases. Those rate increases, Mr. Speaker, in the past 18 months have gone up so high that many, many people out there are starting to wonder just how this government got into power. Because, Mr. Speaker, one would have to look at the increase in power rates. Increase in power rates have gone up some 15 per cent – 15 per cent in power rates. They've gone up 13 per cent in natural gas rates. The telephone rates have gone up about 19 per cent, Mr. Speaker. And in some instances, especially the long distance calls, have gone up a lot higher than that, and I would suggest probably in the range of about 60 per cent.

And who is that going to affect? It's going to affect the smaller communities of this province – communities like Kamsack and Togo. Anyone from Togo, only about 20 miles away, would have to phone long distance to Kamsack. And that is the people that are going to have to suffer those large increases. That is what this government has put into place with their rate increase, Mr. Speaker.

And they try to hide behind a smokescreen of saying that it's the public utilities review commission that's to blame for it. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that any people, or anyone in this province, is gullible enough to believe that because they know that this government controls the crown corporations. They know that the public utility review commission only looks

at what is provided to them by the crown corporation and they know if the government was sincere about holding down utility rates, they would not make a proposal that would require a 19, or an 18, or a 15 per cent increase.

But they would make a proposal that would only ask for half of that, if an increase was necessary at all. But they do not have the considerations of the people, Mr. Speaker. Their considerations are how they can get more money so that they can continue to help the friends that they have out there that supported them in the past election.

One would have to look, Mr. Speaker, at just who really does benefit in this province, and make a comparison of what it is costing us, the taxpayers of this province, in utility rates, in other increases, and what it is costing the huge oil companies.

The huge oil company royalties have gone down something like \$100 million. That is what they save by having this government in power. But what do the people of Saskatchewan save when they get insurance rates that go up to \$500 on the deductible from \$350, and when they have all the other increases that have taken place? Mr. speaker, I think it would be quite easy to understand that the people of this province did not benefit, but it was the large multinational corporations that operate in this province that get all the benefits.

One would have to look at what happens in highways, Mr. Speaker. We can look at the Department of Highways and say, Mr. Speaker, that we have a minister responsible for highways who has done really nothing more than push a lot of paper. I think we should just about call him the paper king, because I think he has a large reputation out there as the minister of pot-holes, and I think it's a title that he very well earned.

If you go around the province, and if you listen to some of the things that are being said, you would have to realize that he had not in any way, no matter how he tried to make it look as though he had, increased his budget for highways. The figures, if you look at them closely, only indicate that the budget for highways did not go up. Because in highways last year, there was an overall increase of only about 3.7 per cent, and if you look at the combined budget with Northern Saskatchewan, which was brought into Department of Highways, you'd see that there is about a 2.4 per cent decrease in his budget. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what the Minister of Highways has been able to do for the people of this province.

He did not have the power with his cabinet and his colleagues to get enough money to at least repair some of the highways in this province. His budget was cut down so much that all he could do this year was just put out press releases and talk about trying to do something, but not really being able to do it.

A good example, Mr. Speaker, would be looking at a news article that was in the Moose Jaw *Times-Herald* regarding Highway 363 south of Moose Jaw. Mr. Speaker, the people south of Moose Jaw that have to use that road wrote to the Premier of this province; they wrote to their MLA, the member for Thunder Creek, and they have received no action on their problem. It's a road that they say is full of holes, that the people have to use side roads and gravel roads to get to Moose Jaw on. They can't haul cattle; they are afraid to haul cattle on that one road because of the many pot-holes in it.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the condition of the highways in this province. That is what is happening on many roads in this province – many of the highways. You drive around the province and you listen to what people are saying, and they are saying that that is about the worst that they have ever seen, the worst condition that these highways have ever been in in this province. We had some of the best roads at one time in this province, but that is no longer the case. That is no longer the case.

We have a highway south of Kamsack, another one that I am well aware of as it's in my

constituency. It was a good road. It was due to get resurfaced, but in this past year, with all the rain that we had, the highway crews were not able to keep up repairing it. They did not have the funding, I would imagine, to be able to continue repairs on it and to hire more crews on. So that highway has become another highway of pot-holes, Mr. Speaker. If it isn't fixed up, it'll be much like the highway south of Moose Jaw where the people will have to use side roads and municipal roads to be able to get to towns on.

That is the situation that we're facing in this province today. Yet the minister brags about some contracts that he has let this winter. Well, he should have let those contracts last June or last May, and maybe we could have had some roads fixed in this province.

What has this throne speech really provided for rural Saskatchewan and for agriculture, Mr. Speaker? Well, I think if you go through the throne speech you wouldn't find much in there that would indicate just what programs are going to be provided for rural Saskatchewan. But I think one thing for sure: we can say that the Tories of Saskatchewan have virtually abandoned the farmers. The first indication of that is the fact that they didn't put up any fight to try and save the Crow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LUSNEY: — That, Mr. Speaker, I think is a very clear indication of what this government intends to do for the farmers of Saskatchewan. They did a lot of talk, and they said that if they even had to they would use the provincial treasury to put up a fight to try and save the Crow. But, Mr. Speaker, the provincial treasury wasn't used to save the Crow, and the talk that came from that group opposite sure didn't have any impact on the federal government. Today we don't have the Crow, not because there was no opportunity to save it, but because we had a government in this province that decided that they were not going to even put any effort into it other than talk. That, Mr. Speaker, is what this government provided for the farmers of Saskatchewan.

They've put in some programs. One was the farm purchase program. Well, they say it was a real good program.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Wasn't it?

MR. LUSNEY: — Well, it was a good program for some people, but it sure wasn't a good program for the people that they said it was supposed to help, the starting young farmers of this province. Any young farmer that was on land bank land — if you look at the percentage of them that took u their land or bought their land under this program, I think you would find that there is a very small percentage, a very small percentage, that was able to take that loan and buy that land. It helped those that possibly could've found other financial arrangements. The ones that it did help . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . This is fine. But they have not addressed that one problem with the young starting farmers. They are still out there not able to purchase any land or to develop any kind of a base that they could continue farming on.

They scrapped the family farm improvement branch. Mr. Speaker, if there was one program that was important, and was useful to the young starting farmers, that, Mr. Speaker, was a good program. Because any young starting farmers that wanted to put in waterworks, that wanted to go into maybe a livestock operation and needed to do some trenching, and to get some piping, and to get some water pumping equipment were able to do it at a reasonable price through the family farm improvement branch. That was another program, Mr. Speaker, that this government decided was not to be there. The farmers didn't need it, and we would let the private enterprise look after those farmers. Now they have to pay double for the equipment that they were able to get before.

That, Mr. Speaker, did not help either for the cost-price squeeze that the farmers are feeling out

there. The high interest rates are one of the problems that they are facing today, and that is one of the problems that they are facing, the high fuel bills that the farmers are facing. They are really having an impact on the farmers. And many young farmers, because of the government's, I suppose one could say, method of trying to get their message out, really made them believe that somehow they were going to get that 40-cent decrease in their farm fuel. They made all kinds of promises during the election, and even the farmers, some of them did believe that they were going to get that discount . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

But, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite say that they are believers today. But I can tell you, you talk to any farmer out there, and you will not find one believer that would say that what the Tories were saying then was true, because every one of them knows today that they did not benefit anything from the removal of that gas tax, except to save a few cents on the gasoline they use in their car, but that in no way compensates for the increase of power rates, the increase of their farm fuel, the increase of their insurance on their vehicles, on their cards, on their trucks. That, Mr. Speaker, is not a benefit to them and is not a saying to them. It was just a propaganda item by this government to make them believe that somehow they were going to get something, but they didn't. And they realize that now. They realize that now, and this government is going to have some problems in rural Saskatchewan. All they'd have to do is call a provincial election. They would find out just how the farmers of Saskatchewan believe them.

Mr. Speaker, this government is nothing more than talk – talk and no action. That is what the people of Saskatchewan have been getting from this government.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . (inaudible) . . . come from you, Norm – talk and no action.

MR. LUSNEY: — The member from Moosomin says that all that's been coming out of the opposition here is talk and no action. Well, I might be able to say that, yes, right now we're doing a lot of talk, and our action is out there with the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LUSNEY: — And all we can hope to do is to try to get this government to realize what the problems out there are, and to try to get them to do something about the problems that exist in this province, the problems that they have created, and not problems that were there. That, Mr. Speaker, is what the situation is in this province.

They talk a lot about that gasoline tax removal of theirs, and they still continue to mention it as though it was a real big item. But who did that tax removal on car gasoline really help, Mr. Speaker? Well, I think if you look at it, who really benefited out of that? Did small business benefit that much out of it? I think you can talk to small business in rural Saskatchewan and ask them just what the benefit of that gas tax removal was to them, and I think that there would be very few of them that would say that there was any great benefit for them, because when they started to add up the cost of licence on their cards, the amount of power increases that have been placed on them, the telephone rate increase, the STC bus freight increases . . . Mr. Speaker, if those small businessmen added all of that up. I think they would say that if anything they lost a lot of money from the programs of this government and from the removal of that gas tax.

That's what it did for small business in rural Saskatchewan. What did it do for working people? Well, I think maybe some of them save – an average person would save maybe \$100 to \$200 on the removal of that tax. But what has it cost them since? Again, the same thing applies: power rate increases, deductible on car plates increases, package policy increases, their heating cost increases on natural gas, telephone rate increases. And one can go on and on about the increases that exist since this government has been elected.

That, Mr. Speaker, is what the people of Saskatchewan realize today. They realize it today, and I say they will remember it for a long time. They will remember the promises, and they will

remember what has not been done for them. The ones that really benefit from that, Mr. Speaker . . . When this government removed that gas tax they knew who the benefits were going to go to and one of them was the CPR. They were the ones that stood to benefit the most, Mr. Speaker, because if you look at what's happening in this province today, you see the CPR is starting to buy up small trucking firms in this province.

This government was supposed to try and keep small business going, but what's happening? Small businesses having to fold up and sell out to the CPR. Small trucking firms: they bought up about four of them now. We don't know how many more they'll buy up, but that is what is happening. That's who's paid by the decrease in the gasoline tax, and it's the only ones that have been saving on it, Mr. Speaker. And why would this government do that? Why would they want to help the CPR? Well, I think that is quite evident. If you look at the lists of donations from the large corporations to the PC Party, it's a long one – it is a long one, all right – but one that you can look at. Look at the contribution that was made to the PC Party of Canada by the CPR: \$50,000, Mr. Speaker. And in addition to the PC Party of Canada, the CPR gave another 14,000 to the PC Party of Saskatchewan. Well, I can see why they would want to remove the gas tax for them. And they did.

But what did they do for the farmers? What did they do for the municipal governments? None of those stood to benefit anything, Mr. Speaker, none of them whatsoever. A clear indication of that is a letter that I've got here from some people around Hudson Bay. They've had a problem in that area for two years now. The farmers around Hudson Bay last year got froze out. This year, because of the wet weather that we've had, they wind up with another loss of crop. First they couldn't seed it in the spring, and next they couldn't get it combined because of the wet weather. Some that have cattle had problems getting their hay up. The hay that they did get up is of poor quality. They have asked this province, this government, for assistance, for some help to keep them in operation. They have had two years, two successive years of problems in there. And has the government addressed that problem? No.

They've met with the Minister of Agriculture and they've told him what their problems were, and they asked him for any kind of assistance. But they just totally ignored the problem out there. And that includes something like about 128 farmers in that area. That is a large number of farmers. And they are farmers who, a number of them this year, is very likely going to have to go bankrupt. They are going to have to declare bankruptcy, because they cannot continue; they will not have the money to put in next year's crop. And this government has even not gone to them and said, "Look, maybe we can give you some interest-free money or something, to get your crop in, and hope that next year will be a better year."

AN HON. MEMBER: — Nothing!

MR. LUSNEY: — "Nothing" is right! Nothing from this government that is going to help the farmers, Mr. Speaker. That is the way they have been operating since they became government. And I would suggest that is probably the way they will be operating for the next two or three years, or however long they'll be in government.

And what are they doing on the other side? And we've talked about the double standard, Mr. Speaker. And one would have to look at the problems that faced the people around Moose Jaw with their highway – where they couldn't get enough money to repair it – that they have to use side roads. And we look at the problems that the farmers in northern Saskatchewan are facing, facing bankruptcy.

And who is this government helping? Have they helped them? No, they didn't help any of those. But when you look at a list of the money that they've been paying to some of their people . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — To their friends.

MR. LUSNEY: — As my colleague mentions, “to their friends”. And that is true, it is their friends — the chairman of the liquor board getting \$95,000 a year; that, Mr. Speaker, a position that was getting less than half of that before. And here we have people that are getting high salaries, where if they would cut those salaries in half, it would be a reasonable salary for those people working there. And they could use some of that money then to help those farmers that are going bankrupt, and to help build some of the roads in this province, and to help some of the senior citizens with some nursing home beds. That is what they could do with some of that money, Mr. Speaker. But no, they choose instead to help their friends, and to pay them high salaries to make sure that their friends are well looked after, because those are the people that are going to support them, Mr. Speaker. That is what this government believes in . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And the member from Moosomin says, “why build nursing homes if you don’t need them?” Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LUSNEY: — . . . I think it has been very clearly established that at this point in time there is a need for level 4 beds in this province. There is a need for them, Mr. Speaker, and this government should address that problem, and they should see that there are some level 4 facilities built in this province to look after the patients that are now spending their time in hospital and are not able to leave that hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I ran across an interesting little folder here that was a householder, I believe, and it says, “Keeping in touch.” One would have to look at the last little article here that says, “Keeping in touch with you,” and it’s signed by the Premier of this province. I’d just like to read what it says;

When you elected me as your Premier, I made a pledge to always keep in touch with you. That is the purpose of the special report on the Speech from the Throne of your Progressive Conservative government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it also says:

I would like you to keep in touch with your government. If you have any ideas, suggestions, comments, or observations on how we can make Saskatchewan a better place, then please write a letter to me or your government member. We want to keep in touch with you.

Well, Mr. Speaker, again we see what the government is saying, we hear what they’re saying, but we don’t see any action because people have been writing letters to them. They’ve been writing from Moose Jaw. They’ve been writing from Hudson Bay. They’ve been writing from Bjorkdale. They’ve been writing from all over this province, and they’ve been keeping in touch, but have they been able to get any assistance from this province? Have they been able to get any help from this government when they were in trouble? No, Mr. Speaker, they weren’t able to get any help from this government.

So it doesn’t seem that it helps very much to keep in touch with this government. It just seems that what they want to do is try to make believe that they are really out there interested in the people, and the more publicity they get out there, maybe, the more people will believe that they’re really sincere about what they’re saying. And maybe a lot of them do believe that; I don’t know just how many. I shouldn’t say a lot, because I don’t think that would be the case right now, but they still have some people that do believe in them. And I think the ones that believe in it . . . There’s maybe some of the media that might believe some of that.

And in one instance . . . And I would only have to say that I’m aware of only some of the media that might believe that, and one would be the owner of CKOS in Yorkton, Ron Skinner. And why would he believe that what this government is saying is maybe right and that he should

somehow get that message to the people? Well, he would believe it because they put him on the SGI board. That's why he would believe that. So, consequently, since he's on a board and he is one of them now, it would be difficult for a member like myself to get any publicity out of CKOS in Yorkton. In fact, it's almost impossible because, since this government was elected, there's no way that I could get an interview with CKOS Yorkton.

And another person that they put on the SPC board is Ed Laurence, owner of CJGX Yorkton. Well, there's two media people that believe in what this government is saying and feel that they should get that message forward. And what about CJGX? Well, I think in the beginning of this government's term I was able to get two interviews – two interviews with CJGX. But shortly after that second interview, what happened to the person that interviewed me? He is no longer with CJGX. He is no longer with CJGX; they made sure that they moved him out of Yorkton. That is what happened to that reporter, Mr. Speaker. That is the way this government operates. They use what media they can, and they try to put that message across. But fortunately, Mr. Speaker, that is not always the case.

There is one more media person that they do have. They have one by the name of Richard Champlone, or a name something like that. He's got an alias though, an alias of Dick Richards, and I think everybody knows him. He used to be with CJGX, but he sold out his interest because this government went and rented some space in the building that he had a partnership in. And so he decided to sell out his interest then, and as a reward for doing that, what does this government do? Well, they hire him and put him to work for the Minister of Labour. So they do look after their friends, especially someone like Dick Richards, who before the last election made sure that he got the message out of how bad the NDP government was and how good the Tories were.

But like I say, it is very fortunate that we have media people in this province that do the kind of jobs that they're supposed to do, and that is report everything that is being done, whether it's by the opposition, by the government, or by anyone else, and the people still have the opportunity of getting the right message out there. It is fortunate that we have weeklies and daily papers that will get the message out, and we have some radio stations and some TV stations that cannot be bought by this government and never will be bought by this government or any other government. And it is fortunate for the people of this country that that is still the case.

Mr. Speaker, I can only say that I, along with many other people in this province, am very, very disappointed in this throne speech, very disappointed in the actions of this government and in the things that they have not been doing, the things that they have been promising and just continue to ignore. I think a lot of people in this province are not only disappointed, I think they have give up hope on this government, and along with them, I will continue to fight on their behalf to see that they get some advantages at least and get some assistance from this government. And in the future, I'm sure that those people out there will remember what they did not get and the hardships they had to suffer under a Tory government, and they will make that change in the next election. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MEAGHER: — I consider it a great honour and privilege to rise today and make a few comments on this throne speech debate. I had a foreboding premonition in the past few days that I may be opposing any amendment that was put forward by the opposition. And after hearing the long dissertation today on alcohol abuse, and the poor roads, from the members, I was right. I won't be able to support that amendment.

The member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, for an example, put forward the question: where do we stand on the question of alcohol abuse?

AN HON. MEMBER: — We know where you stand.

MR. MEAGHER: — You do? So do most of the people of the province of Saskatchewan. We have an interesting proposition here by the members of the opposition. They are now attempting to wrap themselves in a kind of a hypocritical pious cloth that makes the political suggestion out there that they are the experts on alcohol abuse, Canada's No. 1 drug problem. It just started a few weeks ago with the Progressive Conservative government being honest. Well, I can suggest to the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg that many, many people in Prince Albert know where I stand on the question of alcohol abuse. It is a serious problem. It is one that I've had some personal experience in, and worked in the area of alcoholism for a number of years, and I've never met a drunk yet that went out and got drunk because he saw a television advertisement.

If you carry their argument to its proper conclusion, they are the ones that need to get honest. Are they prepared to stand and say that they want to blanket the province of Saskatchewan totally from any commercials on beer or wine, or any other alcohol? Do they want prohibition? They know it doesn't work. They know that they weren't applying that same standard when they were government. In fact they increased the access to alcohol many, many times over and they are now attempting to turn it around. That is a double standard, Mr. Speaker. The reason they fail to recognize our policy on beer and wine advertising is because it is honest. They have a difficult time recognizing honesty.

Having had a look at some of the amendments that came out of their convention this past week-end, I would suggest that their strongest argument against alcohol abuse is those amendments themselves.

I'd like as well to congratulate the members for Melville and Saskatoon Nutana for a job well done. If the throne speech or the Speech from the Throne could be summarized, and it's been suggested it could use a little summarizing, it would be in my opinion described as a declaration of common sense – common sense and moderation. That is the reason that the NDP can't understand the throne speech. It might as well be written . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MEAGHER: — It might as well have been addressed to us in classical Greek, because common sense and moderation is not the bywords of the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan. In fact our policies outlined in this speech are creating a very serious political dilemma for the New Democratic Party. It's forcing them to reveal more and more of their radical left-wing philosophy, the real philosophy, concealed for many, many years from the people of Saskatchewan rather effectively.

But we have an obligation, Mr. Speaker, to expose that philosophy, expose socialism for what it is. It's a philosophy based on hatred, envy, and sold by deceit, and it's alien to the people of Saskatchewan. They are masters of deceit, but being pragmatic politicians they don't want the people of Saskatchewan to know what their real philosophy is. They actually have nothing but contempt for our system, our parliamentary system, our judicial system – those very systems that so many people in Saskatchewan hold dear.

A good example of their attitude toward our judicial system, I think, is the Collver case that they are now attempting to raise again in the House. They bring frivolous arguments in to the courts for crass political motives. We have some experience with that in Prince Albert – in Prince Albert-Duck Lake, as a matter of fact. We've had a number of occasions to deal with the NDP in the courts. Their arguments have been so strong that they not only lost every case with the Tories, they've been ordered to pay costs.

A recent example is a little brochure I would like to share with my colleagues in the House, which was distributed in the constituency of Prince Albert during the recent by-election in the Prince Albert-Duck Lake riding. This, of course, also demonstrates their contempt for their own Election

Act. They distributing in a neighbouring constituency with the view, of course, of having it as a political tool in their election without having it declared as an election expense. But it was an interesting little publication, and I think it demonstrates the radicalism of this party and where they really come from.

I showed the picture of a Nazi storm-trooper on the front, with a PC arm band, blocking the admittance of civil rights demonstrators to the Legislative Assembly here in Saskatchewan. Well, that's just an insult to a lot of people in Prince Albert who voted Progressive Conservative, and others who have members of their family overseas, some of them not to come back, fighting National Socialism.

But that's not all. Inside this little gem of NDP moderation is a comment that a racist Tory ad was pulled during the last general election after a storm of protest was raised. Well, the Tory ad, the racist ad they refer to, wasn't pulled in the first place. No ad was pulled by any candidate in the general election. the storm of protest was a visit by the past attorney general to Prince Albert – Mr. Romanow, I believe his name was. He called on us in Prince Albert, and he asked Grant Devine to renounce Meagher as a candidate because of his racist, the tone of his ads, election ads. In retrospect, I think it would be fair to say that he would have been well advised to stay in Saskatoon Riversdale and do a little more campaigning.

But, we are about to take some action. While they may be able to smear Mr. Collver with frivolous and political judicial games, they're not going to do the same thing to the member for Prince Albert. They are going to be compelled in a court of law to demonstrate that tying the NDP into the federal Liberals, and the federal Liberals' dictatorial way of handling a matter in Prince Albert, is racist, or else they'll pay for that, Mr. Speaker.

A classic example, the personification of the kind of deceit that socialists practise, I think, is our current Prime Minister. He's like a chameleon. He changes his cloth for whatever he thinks the unwashed masses will accept on any given day. His current charade, Mr. Speaker, is a world-wide peace trip, complete, I suggest to you, with a pilgrimage to his shrine in Moscow. I understand, as well, that he's going to come back to Canada with a peace plan. It will include some brand-new initiatives from the comrades in Moscow, and he'll be presented to the Canadian public as the greatest statesman that ever lived. How can an ungrateful electorate ever turn out such a man, bringing peace to the world? The whole exercise, the whole trip, has absolutely nothing to do with peace at all. It's got a lot to do with trying to re-establish a devastated political profile herein Canada – a political profile that was devastated by socialist economic policies that he's implemented over the years, and that have been actively supported by the NDP, both federally and by their provincial comrades here in Saskatchewan.

The real irony of it, Mr. Speaker, is that these very socialist economic policies that have brought Canada to the brink of economic ruin and the greatest recession since the '30s, are being advanced by the NDP as their most effective argument against our open for business philosophy that was introduced by the Progressive Conservative government and is outlined in this throne speech. They're suggesting that this socialist depression is the reason that we should reject our open for business philosophy. Well, it's not working in the province of Saskatchewan. It's a shallow argument. People are seeing through it, and it isn't even working in . . . The practical application is not working.

In the city of Prince Albert – that is a community I can assure you that is not participating in this socialist recession –the construction activity alone is simply tremendous. Construction of single-family dwellings this year now totals \$10 million, a 252 per cent increase over last year. The Build-A-Home program has made a phenomenal increase possible. With respect to multi-unit dwellings in Prince Albert, \$6 million this year – and in that case the member for Quill Lakes is right – compared to nil last year.

As for other construction activities, there's a \$25 million new technical institute now under way;

a \$3 million new city hall; a new hotel, the Inn on the Park, now in operation; \$5.5 million senior citizen's high-rise; an \$850,000 Bassett home; \$16 million expansion to the Saskatchewan penitentiary; a \$1.5 million new airport terminal under construction, which is badly needed, Mr. Speaker; three new strip malls are now under construction in Prince Albert.

New businesses licences in the city of Prince Albert for the first nine months of 1983 totalled over 100, compared to 118 for all of 1982. Retail sales re expected to reach \$239 million this year, compared to \$191 million in 1982. Natonum Community College is now operating out of their brand new building, opened this summer, built by private enterprise, on time, after that facility has for many, many years in Prince Albert been scattered all over the city in a number of various locations. The National School of Dental Therapy opened this year in Prince Albert, which trains young dental therapists for all over western Canada.

There have been four businesses in Prince Albert that have been able to be assisted by the new Department of Tourism and Small Business. The Best of Seven Games, employing about 20 people, is manufacturing recreation games that are being exported all across the country and, as well, to the United States; Sask Crafts Ltd., which makes local souvenirs and gift items that are also sold in Prince Albert and in tourist facilities throughout the North; Pine Industries, now making truck campers and employing 20 people; Western Custom Built Products Ltd., now manufacturing commercial quality playground equipment – all opening this year in the city of Prince Albert, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to conclude by suggesting that as far as the city of Prince Albert is concerned, and as far as my constituency is concerned, we indeed are not going to participate in this socialist depression. We're not going to buy the argument that, because of the bankruptcies and the unemployment and the problems arising out of these socialist economic policies, our open for business philosophy is not working. We're not buying that argument. It is some depression, indeed, in the city of Prince Albert, I am pleased to report. So I will be supporting the motion, and opposing the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PETERSEN: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to begin by congratulating the Leader of the Opposition for remaining the Leader of the Opposition. I see he managed to retain his very, very slim margin once again. And I'd like to start my remarks with a quote from the Leader of the Opposition, in his reply to the throne speech. November 21, on page 55 of *Hansard*:

Now comes more bad news, more bad news. In the face of these pressures on farmers there is nothing in this throne speech that offers any help of any kind to our farmers in Saskatchewan. No help of any kind.

Well, Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. The throne speech definitely points out agriculture as one of the major areas that we are concerned about in the province of Saskatchewan. It acknowledges that research is an important element in the agricultural sector, and in reply to the statement that nothing has been done or will be done, I'd like to quote some of the programs that we have instituted and funded in the past year – the agricultural research funding.

One example is a soil testing laboratory, University of Saskatchewan, \$400,000. FarmLab, \$3.5 million. Soon and so forth. I could go on all day. We've had a market development fund. In 1982-83 we had a lentil evaluation and market development project; the commitment was \$26,100. We had a yellow-seeded flax market study on behalf of the flax growers of western Canada to the tune of \$3,000. We also funded research into the production of wild rice, to the tune of \$12,000 for the promotion and development of a harvester, and \$12,500 for a habitat study.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Tell us more about wild rice.

MR. PETERSEN: — You want to hear more about wild rice? Okay, okay. Now, the harvester that was developed has been widely acclaimed throughout the province. And the *Northerner*, September 21, 1983, shows Alberta officials check on La Ronge wild rice:

Several Alberta government officials, equipment manufacturers, and prospective wild rice growers paid a visit to La Ronge last week. They visited the Mercer River wild rice operation operated by Ken Auckland, examining the harvesters, the crop, and the methods of culture and transportation.

Mr. Speaker, our programs are gaining attention in other provinces. We're a leader in that area.

Now, in question period a few days ago, I believe it was the member for Athabasca who brought up the question of how much does a rice producer make in northern Saskatchewan. I believe he questioned the Premier on that matter, and the Premier couldn't give him an exact figure because there are no exact figures. It depends, as does farming, on how large an acreage you have, your equipment costs, and so on and so forth.

So, for the benefit of the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, tonight I am going . . . Pardon me, this afternoon I am going to tell them about wild rice — the production of it, the costs involved, and the returns from it.

And, Mr. Speaker, if I may point out, I will probably be one of the few speakers who sticks to one direct theme out of the throne speech — wild rice production. Members of the opposition have delineated from that, and have gone wandering all over, and have not talked about the throne speech at all. That's terrible.

But I, Mr. Speaker, will content myself to sticking to the throne speech and wild rice production. The harvesting of wild rice on provincial Crown lands — actually it's on water — is administered through the Department of Parks and Renewable Resources. They issue the permits, licences, and dealer's licences, and it's done under the authority of The Forest Act regulations.

Are you listening to this, over there? Listen up close. Applications for annual permits may be obtained from the DPR office responsible for the area which the water body is located in. The conservation officer will assist you in filling out the application form. Take note of that. He will also assist you in selecting a suitable site, and giving you as much information as he has on hand.

Permittees may acquire harvesting rights to a maximum of 400 hectares. That's about 1,000 acres, Mr. Speaker — 1,000 acres. And the cost, Mr. Speaker, is \$2 for the permit — \$2 for 1,000 acres.

Then, once you're in production, there's a 5-cent-a-pound royalty — 5 cents a pound. Mr. Speaker, we've kept it at 5 cents a pound. We haven't raised it. We've made sure that we're promoting wild rice in Saskatchewan by maintaining a low royalty rate to wild rice producers.

And you've heard the opposition members on other days complain about royalty revenue in other areas of endeavours in Saskatchewan. So if you take a look at the wild rice production, Mr. Speaker, an enterprising farmer, and I call them farmers or rice producers, for a \$2 investment — for a \$2 investment — can become a fairly large producer.

Now, I'd like to go into a bit of the background on wild rice because I see the opposition members are listening very attentively and probably want to hear more. I'd like to tell them about how wild rice grows; the rice plant itself; the habitat requirements; how to go about planting wild rice; factors that could limit growth production; harvesting techniques; and processing of it; finally, marketing.

And, Mr. Speaker, if I may, for the benefit of the opposition, I may even throw in a few wild rice recipes on the way by to help promote it on my own . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . they wouldn't know what to do with them. Perhaps you're right.

Now, wild rice is of the genus *Zizania*. Now, it's the only cereal native to Canada. Of all the wild grasses in Canada, it's the only one that grows from seed each year, and produces a grain of sufficient size to be used as food by man. Now listen up close.

Just think, the member from Quill Lakes could promote wild rice on Quill Lake and make a fortune for the farmers of that area, but he has not done that in the past. He's done nothing but sit on his seat over there and condemn the government for good measures like we try to introduce. Listen up close.

Now, wild rice is found mainly in shallow water – and there's plenty of that around the Quill Lakes – along the shores of rivers, streams, and in lakes. Now, in lakes, where wild rice is usually less abundant, stands are generally concentrated at the site near the inlet and the outlet where the current is more or less constant. Its lighter green colour distinguishes the wild rice from bordering stands of cattails and other shallow-water plants, but close examination is always necessary to establish the identity. I wouldn't want the member from Quill Lakes making a mistake between wild rice and cattails and boiling up a batch of it for supper. It wouldn't be the first mistake he would have made, Mr. Speaker, but we'll let that go.

Now, the possibility of cultivating wild rice has challenged farmers for over 1200 years that we know of. There's no logical reason for the relatively limited range of wild rice, absolutely none at all. The natural habitat extends from northern Canada to Florida, between the Atlantic Ocean and the Rocky Mountains. If local conditions permit, Mr. Speaker, there's probably little to prevent the introduction of wild rice throughout all the temperate zones of the world.

So there we have established, Mr. Speaker, export market for our seed. Successful plantings, Mr. Speaker, have been achieved in England, Germany, Norway, and Mexico. So far, poor results have been reported in the southern hemisphere, however. Now, failure to establish wild rice stands in natural waters has been blamed on insects, disease, birds, animals, and the chemistry of the water, poor storage of seed, and water level fluctuations. There are many things that can affect it, so I hope the members opposite are taking close note of them and have written them all down.

Now, I'd like to go into a bit of the history behind it. In prehistoric America, wild rice was eaten and relished by the Sioux and Chippewa Indians. Wars that lasted hundreds of years were fought between some tribes over rights to prime rice lands. The first European explorers to penetrate the wilderness quickly learned the value of wild rice from the Indians, and of course they would. They relied on it for food in their travels, and even bartered it as part of the fur trade.

Wild rice grew in an area known as the wild rice bowl, Mr. Speaker, in central North America, which includes the states of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and other parts of Ontario and Manitoba. Now, over the years, wild rice found its way here and there throughout the countryside, either by accident or by design. Now, good yields of lake rice normally occurrence in four years, followed by a poor crop and then two average crops. In years of abundance, the rice was relatively cheap and the demand grew. In years of short supply, the price was high of course and this had a depressing effect on the market.

Now, in the '50s, Mr. Speaker, attempts were made in the United States as growing wild rice as a field crop in flooded, man-made paddies. Production in the paddies during the '60s was successful. After two or three years, however, diseases reduced the yields. Now, when varieties of non-shattering rice, which is a paddy rice, were developed and introduced in 1968, the paddies were drained in the fall. Large combines with tracks on them were used to harvest the

wild rice. Production from the cultivated fields in Minnesota exceeded that from natural wild rice stands in 1971.

Today, with the use of insecticides and fungicides to control disease, herbicides to control weeds, as well as fertilizers and other earlier maturing shatter-resistant varieties, the paddies in Minnesota and California supply 60 to 90 per cent of the wild rice harvested. Well, Mr. Speaker, there they have the situation where they have to dike and flood and back flood, and so on and so forth – drain it all off, let it dry up, put tracks and cleats on combines, go out and harvest it. I've heard of them dragging combines through the fields with a D-7. Today, with the use of insecticides and fungicides to control disease, herbicides to control weeds, as well as fertilizers and other earlier maturing shatter-resistant varieties, the paddies in Minnesota and California supply 60 to 90 per cent of the wild rice harvested. Well, Mr. Speaker, there they have the situation where they have to dike and flood and back flood, and so on and so forth – drain it all off, let it dry up, put tracks and cleats on combines, go out and harvest it. I've heard of them dragging combines through the fields with a D-7 cat. Here, Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to promote wild rice in its natural habitat. We have an abundance of lakes, an abundance of rivers. Water is no problem for us. Even around Quill Lakes, water is no problem.

Now, although wild rice is not native to Saskatchewan, it has been produced here and been produced here successfully for some time. It was originally seeded in the 1930s, Mr. Speaker, by resource people as a muskrat feed. It has benefits to wildlife, Mr. Speaker. Think of it: an agricultural product worth \$200 to \$250 an acre every year that has benefits for wildlife as well. Think of the possibilities, Mr. Speaker.

Now, a wild rice program under the direction of Don Neilsen, Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture, in the '60s, resulted in some commercial stands around Pinehouse, La Ronge, Stanley Mission, Deschambault, Pelican Narrows, and the Denare Beach areas. That was the first commercial production. There's been little expansion until the present time.

In 1980 the Saskatchewan Indian agriculture program became involve din wild rice industries when they decided to expand their field of activities, into northern agriculture. Today, Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan 27 per cent of all the wild rice that we harvest is harvested by people of native ancestry. Think of that, Mr. Speaker: opportunities for our native communities in the North where the opposition claims unemployment is high, where we have an abundance of lakes, streams, rivers that will support wild rice, where for the sum of \$2 that person could become a wild rice grower. Hear that? Their MLAs, I'm certain, have been telling them all about it over the years and will continue to do so, I hope.

Wild rice production in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, increased from about 45,000 lb. Per year in 1970 to over 500,000 lb. In 1982. Now, at today's prices, Mr. Speaker, a grower can realize \$200 to perhaps \$300 per acre. Mr. Speaker, that may account for the fact that wild rice permits have gone up by 800 per cent in the last year since we took office. We've promoted it, Mr. Speaker. People have heard about it, Mr. Speaker, and they've gone out and they've done something about it. Wild rice is becoming a very, very lucrative crop.

Now, for the benefit of the opposition, maybe we should tell them how wild rice actually does grow. I've given them a little bit of background and some history. In the early fall, Mr. Speaker, the ripe seeds from mature wild rice plants fall into the muddy bottoms of the shallow lakes and the streams. The seeds lie dormant at near freezing temperatures all winter. In the spring, the sun warms the seeds, many of which germinate at temperatures of about 5 degrees centigrade. The seed sends out a root sprout which attaches itself fairly loosely to the soft soil. It also sends out two long, ribbon-like leaves which look like coarse grass. These do not reach the top of the water, but do take the plant to the next stage where several larger, floating leaves reach the surface of the lake or the stream. These leaves utilize sunshine and collect other nutrients. As the stem develops, it send sup stiff leaves which stand upright in the water, Mr. Speaker, which I'm sure the members of the opposition will have seen.

AN HON. MEMBER: — But didn't know what they were.

MR. PETERSEN: — Perhaps you're right – they didn't know what they were.

Wild rice generally sprouts in mid-May. The submerged leaves appear by the latter part of May and the floating leaves are out by early June. The stems and emergent . . . Pardon me, Mr. Speaker. And then most of the plant growth takes place in July. The height of wild rice varies greatly, Mr. Speaker. It can grow from 6 to 18 inches, 2 feet, as high as 8 feet in some areas. The depth of water, Mr. Speaker, that is required is generally about 2 feet. It can grow in 4 feet of water, however, so its area can cover many varying depths of water.

Mr. Speaker, being a farmer yourself, you're probably quite aware of how plants that we grow in southern agriculture develop. The wild rice plant develops a little different. The flowers mature from the tip down, Mr. Speaker. The female flowers, being nearest the tip, are in bloom first and must depend upon receiving pollen from other plants because the male flowers below are not yet developed. The flowering season is usually the first or second week of August, depending upon locations of course, weather conditions, and so on and so forth, and the strain of rice.

After pollination, it takes two to three weeks for the seed to fully develop. The grain goes through the milk and dough stages, as it normally does with our wheat and barley crops, and finally reaches a more solid stage when it's greenish-brown or greenish-black inside the husk. When mature, the seed detaches easily from the stem, hence the name "shattering rice" and the designation of "non-shattering rice" for the paddy rice. Now, the stem of the wild rice plant itself, Mr. Speaker, is a hollow cylinder that supports the leaves and the flowers. The stems are ordinarily erect and they're about a quarter of an inch to an inch in diameter. This, of course, depends on the water depth, the environment, and so on and so forth.

Branch stems, or tillers as you and I would know them, come out low on the plant and are usually shorter than the main stem, hence you have a stooling effect. The stem is fortified, well-marked, bank-like joints or nodes. The nodes are covered with very small hairs and are solid through the stem. Leaves, branches, roots, and flowers arise from these nodes. Growth in length takes place in the soft tissue immediately, Mr. Speaker, above the nodes. I notice the opposition is listening again – is divided at more or less regular intervals by thin, parchment-like diaphragms. These cross-partitions are readily seen when the stem is sliced lengthwise or viewed against strong sunlight. These chambers make the whole plant buoyant and uprooted plants float quickly to the surface, never to regain their foothold.

Now, the roots of the wild rice plant, Mr. Speaker, are a very interesting topic. Wild rice seed produces only one root at germination while most grasses have three. A cluster of rather straight, spongy, thick, and generally whitish roots arise from the first node of the shoot above the seed. The wild rice root, Mr. Speaker, does not have the same type of small hair-like filament roots that you find in normal plants that you and I know. The roots grow into the mud diagonally and anchor the plant firmly against the lifting force of waves and side currents, Mr. Speaker.

I could keep going for hours and hours on wild rice and I'm sure the members opposite are just waiting to hear more. But now that I've given them how the rice germinates and how the root system develops, they should just about have enough knowledge, Mr. Speaker, to go out and try it on their own because after it germinates, it pretty well takes off and away it goes. However, Mr. Speaker, if you're going to talk about wild rice and how it grows and the seed and all that, you have to tell them where to plant it.

Now, very seriously speaking, wild rice should be purchased from a nearby grower if you're going to go and plant it because wild rice develops in an area and, through natural selection, varying types and strains of wild rice are produced that have acclimatized themselves to the water,

the wind, the wave action, and so on and so forth. So make sure you do that. Buy it from a neighbouring wild rice producer.

The rate of seeding, Mr. Speaker, is also something that they should know about. About 20 lb. of wet seed per acre will give you an adequate stand – about 20 lb. And you can seed it from a boat or a canoe. No problem at all. You don't have to buy specialized equipment. Hop in your boat; go across the lake; throw out wild rice as you go. That's how it's been done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the harvesting of wild rice is probably one of the most difficult areas that a wild rice producer has to content with. The old conventional method of harvesting wild rice, Mr. Speaker, was to take a canoe and a couple of sticks or flails and go through the rice patch, bend the rice over, and gently sweep the rice off the stems. Now, that was fine if you had four or five acres, Mr. Speaker, and you were doing it for your own use.

But just as technology has caused us to go away from using the horse in our southern agriculture, technology has forced the advent of new machines. Mr. Speaker, those machines have been developed over the years. A number of designs were tried. In Manitoba, in the '60s that again was tried in Saskatchewan. Then they decided instead of using a reel, since it was shattering rice, they'd just go through it, the rice would bend back, the rice would fall off the stems onto a platform, and you would catch it. That worked fine, except you get your prop caught in the weeds and in the rice. So they went to the air boat idea. Works excellent. Several types have been developed. The most common and successful type has been the two-pontoon air boat with a catch bucket on the front. It's operated at speeds of 12 to 18 miles per hour. A good operator can take off 1,000 pounds of wild rice in an hour, Mr. Speaker.

After it's harvested, Mr. Speaker, you have to watch out what you do with wild rice because it's harvested partially green, and it'll tend to spoil on you. It may dry out on you. It may mold or it may mildew. So you have to get it into the processing as fast as possible. Now, the processing of wild rice, Mr. Speaker, in past years has been a difficult thing, for all the wild rice in Saskatchewan had to be sent out of the province for processing. Can you imagine that, Mr. Speaker? In all those years of socialism they never developed a processing plant – a processing plant for a product that can return \$200 to \$300 an acre. Think of it, Mr. Speaker. Absolutely no foresight, no vision. They've contented themselves with doom and gloom so long it's a wonder that they are continuing to present it to us today. Doom and gloom all the time. No foresight.

But, Mr. Speaker, our government has foresight. In conjunction with several groups, a processing plant was built. And where was it built, Mr. Speaker? It was built at La Ronge, Mr. Speaker. And I believe that's in an opposition members' seat if I'm not mistaken, Mr. Speaker. We care. We care. We play no favourites.

And since I've mentioned the processing plant, Mr. Speaker, I think I should go into the processing process, but enough material is available on the market for anyone who is taking the time to go out, invest \$2 to become a wild rice producer, and has spent enough time growing it, and has spent enough energy looking into it, that I'm sure the members of the opposition will be able to figure out the rest of the story themselves.

But before I close, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to share with the members of the opposition and with all members present some uses for wild rice. As well as a muskrat feed in the '30's, it was discovered that humans could eat it too. You can use it as a summer salad. You can use it with mushrooms. You can use it in dressing with turkey, ducks, fish, so on and so forth. Geese, too, no problem there. You can use it with meat rolls, Mr. Speaker. And you can make a fruit dessert out of it, Mr. Speaker. The variations are endless, and I would like to share them all with you, but there are so many of us who wish to say a few words on the throne speech that I think I should conclude by saying I will be supporting the motion and opposing the amendment. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would first off like to, in my reply to the throne speech, extend my congratulations to the Queen's new representative in this province, the Hon. Lieutenant Governor, Fred Johnson. I would also like to thank him for delivering his first throne speech to our legislature.

I would also like to, Mr. Speaker, congratulate the new cabinet ministers on their appointments. I look forward to working with all of them for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan and my constituents of Saskatoon Eastview.

Government, Mr. Speaker, in the broad sense of the word, has received an overall change since April of 1982. In law college we were taught that government consists of three different heads — the judiciary, the Crown, and the legislative branch. The cabinet ministers, Mr. Speaker, since April of 1982, have all changed. Accordingly, together with them and the Lieutenant Governor having changed, the entirety of what we know as the Crown has changed.

Certainly, the legislative branch, as well, has received a considerable change. There are some members who were also members during the last government. However, as a whole, we have received a very substantial change in the legislative branch.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that as a legislator, I do not work for the government as does a cabinet minister who, as a minister of the Crown, wears both the hat of a minister of the Crown and also that of a legislator. However, as a legislator, I am part of the process of law making which the judiciary interprets. However, although it is actually the role of the ministers of the Crown to introduce new legislation and set policies for the government, we here on this side of the House are part of a team where, through caucus, all members, government members, are involved in reviewing and promoting changes, which the ministers bring forward into the House. And as such, Mr. Speaker, we are all part of the A team, as has been referred to. There are no B or C or D teams, as the Leader of the Opposition a week ago last Monday set out in his speech. I think that, Mr. Speaker, it's probably something to do with the fact that he, in his government for 11 years, had an A, B, and C team that brought him to such an abrupt halt in April 1982.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we just have one B team, and it's the eight members opposite. The rest of us here are all involved in government decision making and policy making and legislative change. And, accordingly, I would like to set things straight for the Leader of the Opposition as to just how things operate over here. They certainly do not operate the way things operated for 11 years under his administration.

I would say that they're members of the B team because they only get to see legislation once it's been tabled in the House, as was our new women's secretariat tabled this morning. That's the first time they get to look at it and, in that respect, we are on the A team; they are on the B team. I'm confident that, as a member of the A team, Mr. Speaker, I can work with the government and with the cabinet ministers for effective representation for my constituency.

I would point out that in the throne speech and in the Leader of the Opposition's reply, it is very evident that diverse philosophies between our government and that of the previous NDP government. The NDP philosophy set the government and crown corporations first. Our months in office to date, and again in our throne speech, set out very clearly that we put people first and not government as such or crown corporations, which was the pitfall of the previous NDP administration.

This week, Mr. Speaker, representatives from the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce, together with the member from Souris-Cannington in his ministerial capacity, will be going abroad internationally to promote Saskatchewan goods and produce. Businessmen will be speaking to businessmen with respect to Saskatchewan goods. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker,

that the NDP would not have stood for this. If they were still in power, I would venture to say that the group from Saskatchewan would not be on its mission internationally to promote Saskatchewan goods, as everyone knew that only the government then in those days could pick who and who was not going to be carrying on business in Saskatchewan. The government was hand-picking the types of people who could come here. Our government will not, Mr. Speaker, require a blood test as a pre-entrance exam to this province. We're open for business. They did everything in their power to close doors to business in this province.

I would point out that, despite the NDP's efforts to reduce private investment in this province, things have really taken a hold lately. Even from their position as a weak opposition and a small opposition, they tried desperately to close the doors to Saskatchewan business. They have, through the resolutions at their party conventions, come up with resolutions, Mr. Speaker, whereby if they were re-elected they would expropriate, for a token \$1, any portions of crown corporations that the government thought were in the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan to turn back to private enterprise and, accordingly, nothing more than an attempt to blackmail potential investors in this province from doing business in this province. It really shows, Mr. Speaker, that they have learned very little from their past mistakes and are still, along their dogmatic lines of socialism, trying even from a position of opposition to keep the doors of this province closed. For that, Mr. Speaker, they must be condemned individually and as a whole.

In their years in office, if a company were coming into this province and it looked like it was doing good, they would, through taxes or take-overs or expropriations or regulations or royalties or something to that effect, implement legislation and regulations that would drive them out of business. Profit was a dirty word and was something that they could not stand to see taking place in this province. Accordingly, investors did stay away in droves from this province. We, through our speeches and conferences and policies and pronouncements, are sincerely trying to express to the business world that we're open for business. I think we've been very successful in that to date, and certainly more so in the future. I think we can look forward to seeing investment, and accordingly the whole economic well-being of this province, continue to rise under the Devine administration.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that any threat to potential business is only a threat should they come back to power, and by the looks of things, the by-elections we have had and the polls, there's very little likelihood of that party coming back into government for a long time to come. And accordingly, I am hopeful that their threat is a remote threat and will not be taken seriously by any potential investors. Certainly, we will do everything in our power to leave this province open for business.

Our philosophy, Mr. Speaker, is working. The NDP spent \$60 million in their oil program, paying subsidies for each drilled well. Our program, by their own admissions, has cost us \$40 million in lost royalties and taxes. However, notwithstanding the fact that we spent approximately \$20 million less than what they spent on their programs, our program has been an overwhelming success. We've had more wells dug in this province by November of this year than in any other year in the history of this province, and certainly that has to say a lot for the type of program that was introduced by our government. Besides saving the 20 million, we have increased the number of jobs in the oil patch. We've increased the activity as a whole. Our labour force, by virtue of that program and other programs, Mr. Speaker, has been increased.

I might then, Mr. Speaker, being it's near 5 o'clock, beg to adjourn my address and commence again later.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.