

April 8, 1986

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Saskatchewan Population Trends

**Mr. Koskie:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct my question to the Deputy Premier, and it has to do with the Saskatchewan population drain. We had a series of questions yesterday but, as I indicated to you yesterday, you seemed to think that it was not a big matter in respect to the drain of population from Saskatchewan. Well, Statistics Canada reports that in 1985 Saskatchewan had a population loss of more than 6,000 people — 6,040 people. And your own internal government figures show that the population drain for the first two months of this year is even more dramatic.

So I ask you again, Mr. Minister, have you any specific plans to provide work opportunities and job opportunities to these people who are fleeing from the province?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, February over February, '86 over '85, 17,000 more people working today than were one year ago. And, Mr. Speaker, over the next weeks and months there will be many, many more added to the rolls of the employed in Saskatchewan because, Mr. Speaker, we have projects like the paper plant coming on in Prince Albert that the NDP are against.

We have, Mr. Speaker, an upgrader, and a fertilizer and ammonia plant coming on in Regina that the NDP are against. We have a Rafferty-Alameda-Shand project coming on in Estevan that the NDP are against, and we have a bacon plant in North Battleford, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP are against. We have a Dupont plastics plant in Saskatoon that the NDP are against. We have a Canada Packers chicken plant in Saskatoon that perhaps the member from Regina Centre should take a look at, Mr. Speaker. The NDP are against that. That particular plant is protecting over 120 jobs that would otherwise be lost because of the existing plant in Saskatoon being shut down.

We have the Shackleton engineering plant in Cut Knife. We have the Canapharm pharmaceutical organization in Wolseley, and I don't know how many more, Mr. Speaker, but I could spend a lot of time — Supercart here in Regina. And the list goes on and on and, Mr. Speaker. And we've only just begun. These projects will be up and running; some of them are; more of them coming on — 17,000 more people today, Mr. Speaker, working than there was a year ago, and those people, the doom and gloomers of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, are against every project that we bring to Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — I'd like to ask a supplement to the Minister, the Deputy Premier. I want to say to you, Mr. Deputy Premier, that the people that are leaving this province, and the young people that are unemployed, the 47,000

unemployed, the 65,000 on welfare, are not looking for press release projects. They're looking for concrete jobs, my friend. And what I'm asking you — there were 57 people leaving this province each day during January and February — have you any specific job creation programs that will come on immediately in May, in June, in July for these people to have an opportunity to find a meaningful job, rather than the press release job creation projects that you're going around the province somewhere down in the future?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, members opposite take some delight, I guess, in making fun of the upgrader and the ammonia project, and of the wheat pool and the federated co-op, and of the CdF Chimie organization from Paris who are investing considerable sums in this project, and as they did with Weyerhaeuser when Weyerhaeuser came to Prince Albert to invest in the pulp mill, and the fine paper plant that will create significant numbers of jobs in that area.

I just point out, Mr. Speaker, a couple of things, Number one, we have the largest labour force in our history; number two, Mr. Speaker, today we are tied for second place in Canada — latest statistics — second place in Canada for unemployment numbers. It's the best in Canada; tied with NDP Manitoba. And I point out, Mr. Speaker, that consistently over the last four years we have led the nation — led the nation, Mr. Speaker, as having the best unemployment record in Canada.

Now as it relates to an immediate program that is designed to help young people find employment over the summer, Opportunities '86 — isn't that what it's called?

Now I'm going from memory, Mr. Speaker, but I believe the last day that I answered this question in the House . . . the last day that I answered this question in the House — because it seems to be the only question that hon. member has, and he keeps asking the question in hopes, Mr. Speaker, that he might get a little ink. But the press gallery aren't interested in what . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — But to answer the question . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please.

**Mr. Koskie:** — The Deputy Premier seems to take this very lightly, but I'd like to indicate to him that during January and February, Saskatchewan, are you not aware? suffered the loss of population of more than 3,400 people, an average of 57 per day. How can you stand in this Assembly and indicate that everything is going well in Saskatchewan?

You have also the third worst job-creation record in the history of Canada. Newfoundland and P.E.I. are the only two provinces that have a worse record. What I'm asking you, will you be serious and indicate: are you not concerned with the massive exodus of people from this province and the lack of opportunity forcing them to leave?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, I am concerned with any exodus — not for any reason, but with any exodus. And if the exodus — if one exists, and I've long ago learned, Mr. Speaker, that I don't take the figures thrown around fast and free by members opposite as gospel — but, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that our Opportunities '86 program — I think there have been 5,400, if my memory serves me right, applications made under that program by something over 2,000 companies and organizations in the province of Saskatchewan for 5,400 positions to date — to date, Mr. Speaker — and the advice that I gave the other day on that particular program when this question was asked, that if there are any other interested organizations to apply under this program, that they should do so quickly because it would appear that that program is going to be over-subscribed.

#### Employment of René Archambault

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Education. It has to do with the matter of this expenditure of taxpayers' money. The taxpayers are not only concerned about the level of their taxation, but the way this government is spending their money.

My question the minister is: can the minister tell the Assembly whether one René Archambault, the Premier's brother-in-law, is still employed by her department in the Official Minority Language Office, and if so, is he on permanent staff or on contract as a consultant?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for the question. It's the first one I've had in over a year. There are two components to the question, Mr. Speaker. One the issue of taxation levels, the good member from Regina might be interested to know that once again this year the provincial share of the cost of education is going to increase, which indeed is a very positive sign.

As it relates to the gentlemen in question, I do not have that information with me. It is my understanding that he is still with the OMLO (Official Minority Language Office), but I will take notice of the specifics and bring them back to him.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. That really isn't good enough. Let me tell the minister something that she ought to know. I'm going to ask her a question, and then she's going to have to respond to the public of Saskatchewan.

Two years, Madam Minister, there was an order for return put in this legislature — two years ago — René Archambault, employment from May 8, 1982 to March 22, 1984, and it continues. The return was ordered by this legislature in 1984, and you still have not provided the information. What is the problem here? What prevents you from answering a straightforward question? Is this gentleman employed by your department, or is he not? And if simply you are saying that you do not have that information, I question the validity of that, because this question has been around for two years.

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, let's make it clear what was said to the member, if he would listen. I said it is my understanding that he is indeed employed with

OMLO. But there was a second component to the hon. member's question: was he full-time, temporary, on contract? I do not have that specific information with me; therefore, I took notice and I will get it back to him.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad that the minister has finally clarified that. It has taken two years and finally we do get an answer. I have a further supplementary.

In 1984-85, the *Public Accounts* which were just recently tabled, it is shown that the Official Minority Language Office, Mr. Archambault's employer, also gave him a grant — besides his salary — of almost \$1,000. Can the minister explain how this works? How is an employee of a department or a branch of a department in which he is an employee, also able to arrange for himself a grant of nearly \$1,000? Will you explain that, Madam Minister?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, what we will have to do is clarify the member's first question, and that is: how is employed? Is he on contract? Perhaps he's on contract with College Mathieu, which comes through federal grants along with provincial grants. And then we will clarify his second question for him.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It does not matter whether an employee or a department is an employee on salary or on a contract. The fact is that this person, this brother-in-law of the Premier, was working for the Official Minority Language Office. How does the minister justify, regardless of how this person is paid, a grant for this individual of nearly \$1,000? There is something wrong here, Madam Minister. It would appear to me as if somebody knew somebody and was able to arrange something. And I really think that's a questionable procedure.

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Well firstly, Mr. Speaker, it does indeed matter as to how he's hired. For instance, if he is in fact on contract, it could be a component of that contract. I have given my word I will bring that information back to the member, and that stands.

#### Premier's Trip to Ottawa

**Mr. Engel:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Deputy Premier, and it deals with the Premier's panic trip to eastern Canada. The Premier claimed he was going there to get some action on low prices. Well just a few minutes ago he got his answer when the Canadian Wheat Board announced initial prices for this coming year. Those prices are going down, down, down, and the predictions that we were reading about were even very modest.

My question is this: since the price of wheat has dropped by 81 cents a bushel; or \$30 a tonne, during little Grant's trip to Ottawa, is there any way — is there any way, Mr. Deputy Premier — that you can convince him to come home right away, early? The farmers can't afford that kind of help.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, if that doesn't break new ground in stupidity, I don't know what does. We have the Premier, the Premier of Saskatchewan, this

very day in Ottawa meeting with the Minister of Agriculture, meeting with energy people, meeting with the Prime Minister, meeting with a federal, Mr. Speaker, a federal Conservative government . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And it obviously bothers . . . And it obviously bothers . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please.

**Mr. Engel:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the Deputy Premier. The Prime Minister of Canada is in Florida, likely going to take in a ball game in Georgia, the Expos' opener, on his way home Thursday. That we know.

The minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board, Charlie Mayer, was in Saskatoon just at 2 o'clock making the announcement of the wheat board. Who is meeting with and talking about low prices if that is the case? What is he doing? What happened with his meetings that this serious a drop would be effected? Why is Canada not concerned, and why is the minister not raising that issue?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of Saskatchewan is in eastern Canada, lobbying for a healthy . . . an understanding for a healthy energy sector and a healthy agriculture sector for all Canadians, Mr. Speaker.

Now I know that members opposite don't take this seriously. They're back into their old doom and gloom mode, Mr. Speaker. But yesterday I understand the Premier met with the Premier of Ontario, and talking about energy and some security of supply and self-sufficiency, and trying to avert a potential problem, Mr. Speaker, of becoming victims of the predatory nature of the pricing régimes that are in place today.

Now I understand, Mr. Speaker, that that meeting went quite well and that the Premier of Ontario understands that a healthy oil sector or energy sector has certain benefits flow to it, the province of Ontario. All Canadians benefit from that. In addition, the Premier of Saskatchewan is meeting with officials of the federal government in Ottawa — officials, ministers, and McKnight, MP for Kindersley-Lloyd. And I expect, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier will report fully on his trip when he comes back.

Now the kinds of things that he's been asking for is an increase for the domestic price of wheat. He's ask for, Mr. Speaker, a half a billion dollars to flow to western Canada out of the western grains stabilization fund.

And I know those members are against that, Mr. Speaker. Those members are also against the 6 per cent money that we provided for Saskatchewan agriculture; they're against the support we gave to our beef sector during a drought; they're against the support we gave to our farmers and R.M.s when the grasshoppers and the drought were here last summer. They are a bunch of doom and gloomers, Mr. Speaker, and of course they wouldn't appreciate the efforts of our Premier in Ottawa.

**Mr. Engel:** — Mr. Speaker, we heard a lot of words but no comment on the question. The question today facing farmers is: what should we do? Eight-one cents a bushel drop in the price of grain — 81 cents a bushel, Mr. Speaker. We've been encouraging you to go down and ask for a deficiency payment. You came up dry. For 18 months, Lorne Nystrom had a Bill before the Parliament of Canada, before your friends, on a two-price system. You haven't said a beep to this day on agreeing with either one of those two. When is the Premier going to do something?

Will you now admit what Saskatchewan voters have been saying for months, that this Premier couldn't run a corner grocery store, let alone a province? And it's time for him to call an election and face the music. Will you admit that? And in your role as Deputy Premier why don't you do the honourable thing and call an election now?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — The Premier, Mr. Speaker, trusts me with a whole lot, but he's not going to trust me with the responsibility of calling the election. He wants to have that very distinct pleasure for himself, and I think that that's right and proper.

When we compare, Mr. Speaker, when we compare the support given to agriculture and small business by the Premier of this province and this government, compared to any other government in Canada, and certainly compared to any place of that particular ilk, the people of Saskatchewan, when they are given a chance, Mr. Speaker, will see that this government is returned, and returned with a very comfortable majority. And my bet is, Mr. Speaker — or my speculation is, because you can't bet under the Elections Act — my speculation, and I predict that the member for Shaunavon will not be back, the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg will not be back.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please.

#### Price Drop in Initial Grain Payments to Farmers

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I address this question to the Deputy Premier, and I will try to get him to address the problems of farmers instead of the very real political problems faced by his party.

In the face of an 81 cent a bushel drop in initial payments, will the Deputy Premier give this House an assurance that he will contact the Premier and urge him to urge the federal government to eliminate all federal taxes on farm fuel? That would cut nearly 3 cents a litre, or 12 cents a gallon, and would at least partially ameliorate the very serious problems that will be faced by farmers who are seeing our initial prices drop at the behest of the federal government by 81 cents a bushel.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Two points to be made on this question, Mr. Speaker. The first point is, I've just saved you the price of a phone call because the Premier went down to Ottawa fully aware of the problems of farm input costs, and all of those things, I'm sure will be on the table as part of the discussions.

The second point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, is the question of removing taxes from fuels coming from that member who had tax on fuels in this province for years and years and years, Mr. Speaker, and only after 1982, when the Devine government took office in this ... (inaudible interjection) ... Well, he says that's not true. He says that's not true. The fuel tax impacts right across the province, Mr. Speaker. It did then; it would now if they ever got back in. Because, Mr. Speaker, they have made it very clear in all kinds of public forums that in fact they would be putting that fuel tax back on.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the Deputy Premier have any other comment with respect to the cut initial payments of 81 cents a gallon, other than to talk about fuel petroleum taxes and their action four years ago?

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake would read it for you. My question is this, Mr. Deputy Speaker: do you have any other comment on the announcement of an 81 cent a bushel drop in the initial payment to farmers — 81 cents a bushel? Do you have any other comment other than to refer to actions of your government four years ago?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — I think an 81 cent a bushel — yes, 81 cent a bushel — decline is very bad news indeed, Mr. Speaker. Very bad news indeed. Now they sit there, they sit over there, Mr. Speaker, acting as if we sit here in Canada and consume all of what we eat.

So, Mr. Speaker, they have no appreciation — no appreciation — for market pressures, market influence, etc. None whatsoever. Our Premier, Mr. Speaker, has made it clear that we, in Saskatchewan, cannot survive on \$3 wheat. We cannot survive on \$10 oil. And I add this: we cannot survive with the NDP.

But, Mr. Speaker, our Premier is in Ottawa today — our Premier is in Ottawa today — and on his way by Ontario, stopped to get another ally to call for, in addition to other things, \$10 a bushel for domestic wheat, a \$500 million payment out of the western grains stabilization fund ... (inaudible interjection) ... I know, Mr. Speaker, that those people are against the efforts of our Premier.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS

At 2:32 p.m. His Honour the Lieutenant Governor entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the throne, and gave Royal Assent to the following Bill:

Bill No. 19 — And Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year ending on March 31, 1987.

His Honour retired from the Chamber at 2:34 p.m.

### MOTION UNDER RULE 16

#### Protection of the Oil Industry

**Mr. Birkbeck:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At the conclusion of my remarks, I will be moving the following motion, seconded by the member for Morse:

That this Assembly commends the Government of Saskatchewan for the program and policies it has adopted to stimulate our oil industry and create thousands of jobs for families in this province, and further expresses support for the position of the Government of Saskatchewan that the governments of the oil-producing provinces and the Government of Canada must move to protect the jobs of workers and the welfare of families whose livelihood depends on a viable Canadian energy industry, and further supports the view that all Canadians should be concerned about the implications of OPEC regaining its stranglehold on the world-wide oil industry thereby threatening Canadian energy self-sufficiency.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear at the outset what this debate is all about. We are enjoying the lowest fuel prices in the country. The Premier knows the industry. Only a short while ago he predicted 30 cents a litre for prices at the pumps, and he was right on, Mr. Speaker. The Premier, Mr. Speaker, is responsible for fuel prices sharply reduced because of his actions.

The Premier and the government are determined to build confidence and growth and are further prepared to defend vigorously what we have built over the last four years. The Premier is determined to press relentlessly into the future for Saskatchewan in terms of growth and expansion for all sectors of our economy. He is further prepared, as is this government, Mr. Speaker, to defend and secure jobs created in the oil patch and to further job expansion throughout Saskatchewan.

The Premier and this government are known to consult with people, to listen, and to act. Examples, of course, where we're prepared to build, after listening and consulting: in the areas of agriculture, small business, tourism, industry, and of course, energy. The Premier is a man the people of this province trust. They believe in him and they trust in him, Mr. Speaker, and they believe in him because the Premier of this province believes in the people of Saskatchewan, and he trusts the people of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Birkbeck:** — Mr. Speaker, it's very obvious that of course the same could not be said for the NDP members in opposition. The people do not trust the NDP in opposition, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we're just about seeing a free-for-all in oil prices these days. It's almost fun to go to the gas station. But underneath it all there's a feeling of chaos. There's a feeling that it can't last, and of course it can't last. Sooner or later, and perhaps sooner that we realize, OPEC will again pull itself together. Once it does this, it may well fight to recover all the money it thinks it lost when prices fell.

A year or so ago OPEC oil was costing about \$40 a barrel. Now it's \$10. If OPEC gets a stranglehold on the market again and moves to recover its lost revenue, it may double that \$40 to \$80. Imagine paying over \$1 a litre for gas. Remember when OPEC was building up its muscle, it threatened that one day gas would cost \$100 a barrel to buy. Think of the vengeance it will wreak when the bickering finally stops, Mr. Speaker. We already know that unrealistically low prices do large segments of our population lots of harm, and no one any good. Look at our farmers. Low grain prices are threatening their very existence, yet low grain prices have never meant cheaper bread, cheaper cookies, or cheaper pizza.

The Saskatchewan oil industry funds fully one-quarter of all government services. One-quarter of all revenues needed to fund schools, hospitals, and other services comes from the Saskatchewan oil industry. Without the oil industry, either taxes would have to climb significantly or services would have to be cut. Without the oil industry thousands of jobs would be lost. Without the oil industry many small businesses in rural areas and urban centres would be in trouble because the oil industry, either directly or indirectly, buys goods and services.

How can we ensure that Saskatchewan consumers pay fair prices for gasoline, and also ensure that the oil industry in our province prospers and protects us from some future OPEC grab? This government has a record of stimulating the oil industry and assisting drivers. Not only did we revise the industry but, by cutting the provincial tax on gasoline, Saskatchewan drivers have saved \$650 million since 1982. That's right. When drivers in other provinces were paying high prices for gasoline, Saskatchewan drivers, because of this government's actions, were paying the lowest gas prices in the nation.

We want our drivers to continue to pay the lowest prices in Canada for gasoline. One way we can do this is to ensure that the oil industry in our province doesn't either wither away and die but prospers and gives us the security we need.

The price of oil has dropped by about 75 per cent in recent weeks. Obviously it won't stay that way. No producer will continue to sell his products at a cut-rate price of 75 per cent.

So what might be a fair price for oil, fair for the producers and consumers? Well a cut of 50 per cent would be a boom for consumers, and it would keep the industry happy. At \$20 a barrel for oil, consumers would have been given a 50 per cent cut from the highs of \$40 a barrel, and because the industry could manage with a \$20 barrel oil, that cut would last for years, not just weeks or a few months, but a long-term 50 per cent cut.

So in a very real way with a realistic \$20 a barrel for oil, consumers would lose absolutely nothing in the long run; indeed, consumers would gain in the long run because they would be assured that when OPEC recovers it could not charge whatever wild-eyed sum it wanted for its oil. It could do that if we let our oil industry die.

As long as we keep our oil industry prospering we can keep out of OPEC's grasp for ever. We can enjoy realistic

and fair oil prices and never again face \$40 a barrel oil costs. But we can't do these things unless we plan sensibly and act quickly. We can do this by showing OPEC that we intend to support our own oil industry and make it grow. All we have to do is use our common sense. We need the same tenacity and determination that we have used to solve problems and face challenges in the past.

After having saved Saskatchewan drivers \$150 million every year since 1982 because of the gas tax cut, we must now make sure that such cuts become permanent and that a fair and reasonable gas price is established. Ironically the shambles that is now OPEC has given us that opportunity we have always needed. Now we do have the chance to break OPEC's grip for ever. To do so, we must offer, not only the oil industry, but consumers, fair, stable and long-term security prices. No driver wants to roll up to his or her gas station and see gas at 30 cents a litre one day and maybe \$1.30 the next. Drivers want a decent, fair and steady price for gas. Drivers want to know how much they'll have to pay for gas, not only today, not only next week, or months down the way.

(1445)

No one would rent a house if he or she did not know month-to-month what the landlord was going to charge for rent. Remember what happened when mortgage rates sky-rocketed. Again, thanks to this government, mortgage rates were stabilized in Saskatchewan.

We can stabilize oil prices too. We can prevent a horrific roller-coaster ride on oil prices just as we safeguarded residents from the roller coaster ride on mortgages. All we have to do is stick together, Mr. Speaker, and that's what Saskatchewan people have always done. By sticking together we can have everything we want. We can have low but realistic prices. We can have long-term security from the ravages of OPEC, and we can keep our jobs going. It's entirely up to us, Mr. Speaker. It's entirely up to us, Mr. Speaker. We can stick together and win. If we want to, Mr. Speaker, as a legislature, stick together and face the problems that this province has to deal with, then we can solve them.

The Premier of this province, Mr. Speaker, has that tenacity; he has that determination. He has the trust and he believes in the people of Saskatchewan.

That is not something, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition obviously has. If he still had it, he would still be on this side of the House. He would still be the premier. But he's not. He's not the premier in this House anymore. He's not the premier of Saskatchewan. He's the Leader of the Opposition; he's the Leader of the Opposition.

And there's a very solid and real reason why we have a Devine government in the province of Saskatchewan — because the people of this province believe in our Premier and they trust him. He is a person, as I said at the outset of my remarks, who is prepared to consult with people, to listen to people, to work with them to bring about resolutions to problems, to deal with them fairly. That's what he's prepared to do.

He's not prepared to sit in his office here in this legislature, Mr. Speaker, day after day after day as the former premier did. He's prepared to get out of the city of Regina, move around this country, move around this province, visit with the people, to deal with the very issues that affect their daily lives.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of Premier we have. That, Mr. Speaker, is why I support Mr. Premier, and I support this government. And that's why, Mr. Speaker, I say the people of this province will continue to support the Premier of Saskatchewan — because he has the will, as I said, the tenacity, the determination, the wherewithal to go out and resolve the problems. He has that, and I admire him for it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by saying that we can be like the OPEC Arabs and fall apart in chaos — like the NDP, falling apart in chaos, without caring about what happens tomorrow. Happily, Canadians, and especially Saskatchewan people, are not like OPEC Arabs. Saskatchewan people are intelligent people. Saskatchewan people are fair people, Mr. Speaker. And Saskatchewan people look to the future together.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I therefore move the following motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Martens:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to deal with this resolution in a number of areas, and I want to just point out the five different things that I see in this motion that have significance.

There deals here with five, I believe, different comments about the various areas in this motion as it relates to the energy policy of this government. We have, first of all, the kinds of programs that we have dealt with, the policies that we've dealt with. It talks in this motion, Mr. Speaker, about job creation. It talks about the power of the OPEC countries. And it also talks about the threat to the Canadian energy self-sufficiency.

I want to deal in a number of areas on these various topics. And at the conclusion I'm going to just talk a little bit about how it impacts in my constituency in this oil business and in the overall sector of energy. Oil isn't the only part of this that we're talking about. We have to deal with it in the broader scope of energy, and that included oil and gas as it relates in particular to the south-west.

First I would like to commend the Government of Saskatchewan, as it indicates in the motion, "for the programs and policies it has adopted to stimulate our oil industry and create thousands of jobs for families in this province." And that, Mr. Speaker, is a fact.

Since 1982 the oil and gas industry has undergone dramatic changes. Investment and production have reached new heights, breaking records each year. Employment, both direct and indirect, has increased, and the oil and gas sector has become a key source for provincial revenues. All this has occurred as a result of

new policies and initiatives undertaken by the Saskatchewan Conservative government.

Three basic objectives were established for the oil and gas sector, which were to be realized through policy changes: first, a revival of the oil and gas industry; second, an increase in provincial oil revenues; and third, creation of new job opportunities.

Keeping these in mind, the oil industry recovery program was brought into effect in 1982 and a gas pricing policy in 1983. Both these programs resulted in activity levels that surpassed everyone's expectations, Mr. Speaker, including those who set the policy.

Oil and gas drilled in 1985 totalled 3,848 wells, an increase of 30 per cent from 1984, and 476 per cent from 1982. That is a dramatic increase. Due to this phenomenal increase in new drilling, investment increased dramatically and amounted to over \$1 billion, or 25 per cent of the total capital formation in the province in 1985.

Land sales totalled a record 184 million in 1985, an increase of 335 per cent from the 1983 levels. Crude oil production, which had decreased since the early '70s, increased to 72 million barrels. And, Mr. Speaker, that was a record in the province of Saskatchewan for production. At the same time, due to phenomenal drilling activity, the remaining recoverable reserves of the province also showed a steady growth.

Our own provincial revenues from oil and gas increased by almost \$270 million from the fiscal year of 1981-82 to the 1985-86 fiscal year. More than 400 new oil companies were established in the province since the beginning of this program, Mr. Speaker. And I think that is a significant step forward. It also did one other thing, Mr. Speaker. There were 137 service companies established in the oil industry. These are very important to the private development and initiative of individuals.

Direct jobs in the oil and gas industry have doubled since 1981 to over 7,000 workers in 1985. Also, due to growth in the service and supply companies, indirect jobs were also created. Reinvestment rates have approximately been more than 100 per cent of industry cash flows. And, Mr. Speaker, the opposition criticized time after time regarding the various areas of our oil policy. They said that the oil industry had just taken it out and put it elsewhere. But no, sir, they weren't. They were putting more than 100 per cent of their cash flow back into the development of the oil patch in this province. And that, I believe, is the reason why we had the record number of job creation in this province.

Besides bringing in its own policies and programs to aid the oil and gas industry in the province, the government also played a pivotal role in the signing of The Western Accord, the petroleum sector is no longer subject to discriminatory tax policy.

Nineteen eight-five also saw the start of the construction of the co-op upgrader which will guarantee a market for

the heavy crudes. And in particular, Mr. Speaker, I want to relate that to the south-west part of the province. The south-west part of the province produces roughly 35,000 barrels a day and, of that, about two-thirds of that will be available for development through the upgrader here in Regina.

The people in the south-west really have appreciated two very important things in the oil industry. Number one was the fact that it could grow; and number two was the fact that we initiated through a very common interest with the Federated Co-op a development of a new upgrader here in the province of Saskatchewan. I think that is the number one factor. The third thing as it relates to the upgrader, is the energy sector in the use of natural gas as it relates to the fertilizer plant that is going to be but together with it.

Mr. Speaker, those kinds of job creation activities is the reason why we put a motion in our House today of this nature, because it wouldn't been there under the former administration. And I know that, because I've lived in this province all my life and I know that that's the kind of energy policy that this government would initiate, and not that government.

In 1985, as I said, was the beginning of the co-op upgrader. The project will require an investment of 650 million, plus 200 million in the fertilizer plant, creating 3,000 person-years of employment, 80 permanent jobs, and roughly 200 permanent jobs in the fertilizer industry. That, Mr. Speaker, is very important in this discussion, and I believe that it's the kind of thing that we need to have.

In 1983 a new pricing policy for gas was introduced, aimed largely at revival of the industry. It was nothing, because of some of the initiatives that had been taking place under their administration when they didn't give an opportunity to invest and drill our own wells and get our own gas and oil industry going.

In 1985 further changes took place. A new gas price, a new royalty formula for gas was established. The royalty provisions which incorporated sensitivity to well productivity greatly improved the economics of marginal production of gas. Besides changing the pricing of natural gas, increased markets were also secured under these policy changes. First, more of our own gas will be supplied to west B.C. Their government took and got it all from Alberta, and we paid Alberta Heritage Fund for it, and now we have an opportunity to put back into our own province.

Second, projects using natural gas as feed stocks are being encouraged, like the fertilizer plant here in Regina. Third, gas exports are being allowed under the condition that significant exploration commitments are met. And, Mr. Speaker, that is a very important feature in the kind of a national energy policy and a provincial energy policy that we have adopted.

As a result of these pricing activities, activity in the gas industry in Saskatchewan has risen dramatically. In 1985 the number of gas wells drilled increased to 437, as compared with nine. In 1982 there were nine gas wells

drilled; in 1981 there nine gas wells drilled; and in 1985, 437.

Here is another important feature, Mr. Speaker. Reserves have increased dramatically from that point on. And I believe that, in my opinion, the people of the province of Saskatchewan recognize the importance of the oil industry in our province. Every one dollar in four was supplying hospitals for this province, was supplying schools for this province, was supplying . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. It's my duty to inform the member his time has elapsed.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to enter this debate and I want to at least comment on the member for Morse in the sense that when he was talking he was at least talking about oil. The earlier speaker, I didn't detect the subject matter of the resolution during the course of his remarks.

I want to direct my attention to the resolution, and I want to point out that this resolution arises because of the débâcle in the government's oil policy. And I hope they don't deny that their oil policy is in a shambles. Otherwise, why would the Premier be going to Ottawa yesterday to urge the federal government to reverse the policy which this same Premier was urging upon that federal government short months ago?

There is no question but that the government is now saying what we said last year was wrong. What we wanted last year was wrong. We now want regulation. A year ago we said the oil industry should be regulated. Government should stand back. The market should set the price. That was the policy of the government opposite a year ago.

And they cheered The Western Accord. I cheered some things about The Western Accord — the removal of federal taxes, which had been opposed by all provincial governments, not surprisingly, but certainly all provincial government, including the one in Saskatchewan. But I certainly questioned the total removal of any price control on oil. And I particularly questioned the total removal of the price control on old oil which allowed the major companies to have a veritable bonanza and gave very little to the independents.

(1500)

And it's the independents which should have received the concern of the government opposite, and the independents who didn't receive the concern of the government opposite. No one denies, and anyone can read the literature, and no one denies that The Western Accord was a bonanza for anybody who owned oil that was found in the '60s. But for people who had just entered the industry in the mid-70s it was not a bonanza. And yet the government opposite said: hurray for Esso, hurray for Texaco, but never mind the independents.

And then they launched their own policy. At a cost of \$300 million a year they stimulated the oil industry. And they certainly did. They certainly stimulated the oil industry at a cost of \$300 million a year. And what was

their justification? Long-term permanent jobs. Long-term permanent jobs, they spoke of last year, based upon a régime of unregulated prices and low royalties.

Today they're saying: oh, oh, we didn't do too well. We now don't want unregulated prices because the jobs which we said were long term and not permanent are not long term and not permanent, and in fact are being lost by hundreds of Saskatchewan people. And if they weren't being lost by hundreds of Saskatchewan people, this resolution wouldn't be here.

So we have a government that favoured The Western Accord and is now saying, wrong policy. They had an oil policy of low royalties to create jobs, long-term permanent jobs, and they're saying: oh, oh, yes we spent the billion dollars, but we don't have the long-term permanent jobs. Think what would have happened if they gathered in that billion dollars and spent it elsewhere in Saskatchewan to build other enterprises; there would have indeed been long-term permanent jobs.

Now let's take the other thing they were saying last year. Last year they were saying, we believe in free trade. We believe that there shouldn't be tariff barriers. We believe that oil prices should be set by the market. What are they saying today? The Premier is going to Ottawa to say: I don't believe that any more. I don't believe that any more. We don't want prices set by the market. We are not talking about free trade. We do not want free trade in oil. That is the basic message of the Premier in Ottawa. We do not want free trade in oil.

And he is saying about wheat: we do not want free trade in wheat. In fact, we need some sort of a subsidy for our wheat growers. He is right today on the latter. He's right today. We need a subsidy for our wheat growers. But he was wrong last year when he was saying, we want free trade. Now he can't be for The Western Accord last year and against it today; and for his policy of stimulating the oil industry in order to get permanent jobs last year and admitting they're not permanent today; and being in favour of free trade in oil and agricultural products last year and saying, we've got to have subsidies for one and tariffs for the other today. How can one have any confidence in a government which advances policies that are merely months in duration.

We have a mention of the co-op upgrader. Six months ago I was at the sod-turning of the co-op upgrader, when sod one was turned. What I want to know is whether or not we're going to have another ceremony when sod two is turned, because it's not turned yet in six months, not turned yet. Notwithstanding the fact that sod two is not turned, the government opposite is announcing a fertilizer plant which is going to be built after the upgrader is constructed.

Now, Mr. Minister, there is a very, very serious credibility gap. A government which is noted, and notable, for its indecision, for its governing by polls, for its government by panic, and latterly for its cold feet in facing the real issues of Saskatchewan . . . We have to face our problems but, as the *Leader-Post* editorial of today says, "The province wants action. But if action is to be taken, it may as well be done by a government with a fresh mandate . . ."

— instead of by the Devine government which has a limited remaining lease on life — and they're dead right there — a very limited one.

Since the resolution before us fails to address the central issues before the people of Saskatchewan today: long-term jobs, I mentioned that; fair taxation, I've talked about; the massive give-aways to the oil companies; sound economic policies; and sound and decisive leadership, I therefore move the following amendment, seconded by my colleague, the member for Shaunavon. It reads as follows:

That all the words after the word "Assembly" in the first line be deleted and the following be substituted therefor:

Regrets that the economic policies of the provincial government have failed to create long-term jobs throughout Saskatchewan, but instead have created a boom and bust cycle in some sectors;

Regrets that the taxation policies of the provincial government have been short-sighted and unfair;

and further, that this Assembly expresses its lack of confidence in the provincial government and urges it to call a provincial general election at once.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

The debate continues concurrent.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to rise to debate rule 16, which is being put forward by the government and, Mr. Speaker, I think it stands as an indication of where this government is coming from. Today we have announced the reduction in wheat prices of 81 cents a bushel, the biggest decrease that I have ever seen since I started farming in 1970 — the biggest decrease. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is the lowest price for grain, when you factor in inflation, since 1931.

And what we are dealing with here today is the price of oil. Now I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that a government that is out of touch with the reality of Saskatchewan is one that should be turfed out, and will be, as soon as they screw up the courage to call an election. Because I say to you, when you have members from Morse and other members that get up and try to protect the oil companies, their buddies in the oil companies, who last year wanted the policy that now exists — the day the price of oil goes down they get up and defend them and ignore the farmers of the province who are facing 81 cents a bushel reduction in their grain prices — is a government that's out of touch with reality.

They're out of touch with reality, Mr. Speaker, because we have many farm families who are going to go broke as a result of what we are facing here today with the cost of the grain going down 81 cents a bushel.

Now I'm not denying that the price of oil is going down.



I'm not denying that the price of oil is going down, and it's down to about \$12 a barrel in New York . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — 14.50

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — . . . 14.50 in New York, which is over \$20 a barrel in Canadian money. I'm not deny that the price of oil has gone down from \$35 a barrel to \$20 a barrel, Canadian. But I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that that's as high as it ever was during the term of office of Allan Blakeney and the New Democrats, the price that it is today.

And I want to tell you that the crisis we had in the '70s with the price of oil, with less production, wasn't a crisis at all. We balanced the books. We balanced the books, we paid our bills, and the oil companies made money. The question is, Mr. Speaker, is how much money the oil companies are making.

Yes, the oil companies aren't making as much today as they were making last year. That's true. The oil companies are not making as much money this year as they were last year But the question is, Mr. Speaker, is one of fairness, and whether they were making too much last year when they had increases of 142 percent increase.

Now I say to you that the government that rushes out to protect those oil companies, who were making 142 per cent increase in profits, the day the price goes down, and ignores farmers who are benefiting from the price of oil going down, is one that's way out of kilter with what is going on in the province. Because I can tell you, there's many farmers who appreciate the price of oil going down. Many of them say that the one saviour to their problems is if all the costs could go down.

The price of their grain has gone down 81 cents a bushel. Not a peep from this government what they're going to do about it. But a small token is the fact that the fuel we're putting in our tanks right now is down ever so slightly. What these birds suggest, Mr. Speaker, is that they want the price to go up. They want the price to go up. Well, we have been using the word "birds" with these people, and yesterday they proved it: they were chicken when they didn't call the election.

But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that these people who want the price of fuel oil to go up even higher than it is now, to protect their friends in the oil industry, I say to you is a government that doesn't deserve the respect of the farming community.

I know there are many farmers, including many good friends of mine, who voted Conservative last time. They voted Conservative last time and I don't blame them. I think that many of the things that were put out to the people of the province looked attractive. They looked attractive.

But, Mr. Speaker, what I say to the farmers of Canada and the farmers of North America is to study history and find out when farmers are in the most difficult time. Every time we have Conservative governments in the United States and in Canada, where we have right-wing governments

which force the price of grain down . . . and I'll tell you that you want to look back to 1931 and find out who was the government in Canada, in Ottawa.

Who was the government when we had the lowest price until today? The price today is lower than it was in 1931 in constant terms, and we had a right-winger in Ottawa then by the name of Bennett — that old right-winger who they turfed out shortly afterwards when the farmer realized that he wasn't working for farmers. And in Saskatchewan, we had a right-winger by the name of Anderson. He was going to solve the farmers' problems in 1929. Things were booming up till '29 till those characters took over. Then we had the worst depression in the history of Canada until today.

And once again, who do we have in government in Ottawa? We have a right-winger, by definition, Brain Mulroney, who today is in Florida. In Florida? The day they announced the price of wheat going down to 81 cents, he's on a little jaunt down to Florida. He's down in Florida; Grant Devine's in Ottawa looking for him; and Charlie Mayer is out in Saskatoon announcing a reduction of 81 cents a bushel.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. Order. Members are taking liberties by calling other members by their names, and I'm going to ask the member to cease to do that and to use the position or the constituency that the member represents.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — The reference to the member from constituency and the Premier, Mr. Speaker, I will use his constituency or his title and office.

The point that I'm making is that a government which puts farmers in the worst position they have been in since 1931 at the federal and provincial level, are two governments that deserve to be slapped on the wrists and now kicked out.

(1515)

We see this in every area. Rushing to the support of the oil companies . . . And I see the Minister of Health is here. The Minister of Health is here, who has no money for nursing staff. We have the Premier in Ottawa fighting for more money for oil companies. I say to you, does that make any sense?

Does it make any sense when you look at the profit margins of oil companies last year who were making record profits and who are we going to the defence of? Not the nursing staff; not the farmers; not the working people of the province; not the welfare recipients. We're kicking them around. Who do we go to support? Who do we rush and take the taxpayers' money and fly to Ottawa to support? The oil companies who aren't big enough to defend themselves.

Now I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that a government that will take on the welfare recipients and go to bat for oil companies is not a fair government, and the fact that we're wasting the time of the Assembly today talking about defending the profits of oil companies rather than the profits of farmers stands in stark contrast to what a

New Democratic government under a newly elected premier, Allan Blakeney, or the member from Elphinstone, would do — would do for the farmers and working people of Saskatchewan.

**An Hon. Member:** — Just as he did before.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Just as he did before. And I can remember a time in the '70s when our wheat prices were \$6.50 a bushel. They have now dropped to about \$3, and I don't see anyone on that government side rushing off to defend the price of wheat.

But the oil companies drop from \$30 to \$20 a barrel, and there's a panic on. The Premier has to fly away. He says he's going to attack Saudi Arabia and Sheikh Yamani. And what I hear is that there's massive suicides over in Saudi Arabia of oil people jumping off tall buildings because the Premier has threatened to do something to stall them.

Yes, he announced in Estevan, with a partisan crown, that he's going to take Saudi Arabia on. Well I'll tell you that that guy is a joke. To have a Premier who is so ridiculous, looks so stupid, so ridiculous, on national press makes me embarrassed to have that individual representing me as Premier.

Because I want to say that when you have an individual who, in front of a partisan crown will say such ridiculous things — that he's going to take on Saudi Arabia, take on Saudi Arabia and defend his oil companies, Imperial Oil, Husky Oil, Gulf Oil, protect those small players against the Arab countries, and not say anything about farmers — is a Premier that I think is totally out of touch with reality

And I think he has been . . . I don't know what he's been doing, but maybe listening to some of his back-benchers, maybe listening to some of the former cabinet who are advising him. I don't know who he's listening to.

But I want to tell you that when I talk to nurses, as we did today out on the steps of the legislature, who are protesting for the first time in the history of the province . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. Order.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Weiman:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me a great deal of pleasure and honour to be able to speak this afternoon on the motion and my opposition to the amendment. There are a few brief comments I would like to make in terms of the motion presented earlier by my colleague from Moosomin.

However, before I go into that, I would like to state and on the record that this is one of those few and rare opportunities that a member has, to be able to stand in the House and speak to a motion that is truly bipartisan, truly nation in scope, and not just provincial.

And I find it very interesting that the games that would be played by the members of the opposition in dealing with jobs and job security for people of this province, in

dealing in terms of security nationally — and I will go into that further — that they would try to make that a political football rather than have the opportunity to speak in a bipartisan way.

I find it interesting that, rather than talk about the critical needs of the people in the oil patch, that they would denounce a Premier who has made an effort to try to help these people and the families that are dependent upon them. I find it hard to believe that they would condemn a Premier for falling oil prices that are not controlled by the province of Saskatchewan; they are not controlled by the Government of Canada, nor indeed by the great power to the south of us, but that are controlled by a group in the Far East, the Middle East, of which we have no control over.

I find it very disturbing that the member for Shaunavon would have the audacity to stand in this House and say to those peoples in his area who are drilling in the Estevan area who are drilling, in the Lloydminster area who are drilling, that this is not a crisis. It's not a crisis, he went on saying, if you read *Hansard*, because it wasn't a crisis for them; they admitted it when prices of oil were down at this level during their administration. And that's the type of myopic vision that they had for this province. Something was happening wrong and they said: it is not a crisis.

I find it embarrassing that a colleague in this Assembly would tell those people, in those areas of Saskatchewan, that losing their jobs is not a crisis; that not being able to feed their families is not crisis; that the rigs may be pulled out is not a crisis, because we never saw it as crisis when we were in government. And the member for Shaunavon is on record as stating such.

The member for Shaunavon ranged awfully wide in his diatribe against the Premier for going down east to help the people of this province. He did indicate agriculture. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that this government does not look at issues in isolation. It does not look at just the oil situation; it does not look at just the agriculture situation, the urban situation, the business sector, in isolation. As I stated earlier, Mr. Speaker, they have a preponderance and a fondness of looking at problems within this society with myopic vision. We tend to want to look at the whole picture, and when problems arise we will address those problems as best we can, looking at the total fabric of this province and not in individual isolation.

I can say, along with my colleague on the side of this House, that we can stand proud and have nothing to be ashamed of in so far as the programs we brought forward for agriculture, and they full well know that. That we can stand proud for any of the programs that we brought forward for small business, and they know that. What they are attempting to do with this motion and their amendment is make it bipartisan.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak about the nature of OPEC and what it can do to this province, to this country and, in fact, the western fabric. I think what we shall have to do, Mr. Speaker, is look what transpired during the '70s. The NDP would not have us remember what happened in the late '70s, and I will stay bipartisan; I will stay away from

the province of Saskatchewan.

How many of us can remember the rising oil prices in the late '70s by OPEC when they strangled the market? How many of us can remember car line-ups at the pumps because of the strangulation of shortages, first of all, the manipulated shortages? It got so bad in the United States that in cities, if your licence plate ended in an odd number you got to get gas that day, and if it was in an even number you got to get gas that day. That is the type of way OPEC plays.

How many of us have failed to remember what happens when a cartel gets together that can strangle, not only this province, this country, the western world, indeed all the world: when they use that clout and that power to blackmail European nations, blackmail European nations which allow them to suffer of their own internal security — either you do this or we turn off the taps. But they would not have us remember that.

Why is it an issue of national security? And I believe national security is not too strong a term when we're talking about self-sufficiency in our oil, in our gas production. The type of climate that we have that locks us in a wilderness of snow for nine months a year demands that we have to have control of our own heating and transportation fuels. Our geography demands that, Mr. Speaker.

We are rarity among nations in the world. We are an anomaly of nations in the world, where our nation, the second largest nation in this whole sphere, is strung out over a long narrow ribbon across North American. We need self-sufficiency in our transportation fuels and we cannot be held up to blackmail by OPEC. And this is what members of the opposition fail to understand through this motion. They are trying desperately to make it bipartisan for political motives rather than for the goodwill of the people of this province and this country.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Weiman:** — As I stated earlier, it is not just a provincial issue. Oil is found in Saskatchewan, granted. It is found in Alberta. But it is found in the Beaufort; it's a Maritimes situation too — and wherever else oil may be found. And wherever oil is found there are jobs as witnesses by our laudatory reports over the last three years in oil production, of which I know my other colleague who will be standing this afternoon will more than praise on my behalf and on behalf of the government of this province. But as I stated, I wish to stay non-partisan on this issue.

I wonder how quickly, or how slowly, that amendment would be withdrawn if this was not happening in the sector of oil, if this was happening in the sector of water, where another nation could hold Canada ransom for that water that came out of our taps. Oil is analogous to water in that it is one of the life-bloods of this nation, as I suggested to you earlier in terms of our climate, our economics, and our geography.

How quickly would the members opposite stand and praise the actions of the Premier for going down East and saying, we must develop, we must safeguard our water supply for the people of this province? It is the same issue, Mr. Speaker, exactly the same issue.

Now members may say that perhaps the picture that I have painted is paranoid, the picture that I have painted is to the extreme. I will suggest, Mr. Speaker, that history does repeat itself, and that by the actions of the OPEC nations in the mid-70s and the late '70s, and what they are doing now, will once again manifest itself in that same type of action.

And I will suggest also that the prices of oil will be much more burdensome down the future. And I'm not willing to peg a price at it but again, looking at history, much higher and much more of a burden on the backs of Canadians than it ever was, because it does two things. It puts a type of fear and anxiety in the market-place. It does that. Number two, it stops those types of initiatives that can make us self-sufficient. Witness the upgrader in Regina, the upgrader in Lloydminster . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. I advise the member his time has elapsed.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I am shocked that we're standing in this legislature today and that members opposite, one after another, are standing up in the defence of the oil companies of this province.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this government came into office on the slogan of big business. Big business was going to develop the economy of this province. They say, we'll have a free enterprise economy. And today, member after member of the government side are congratulating their Premier for having run down to Ottawa to see if he can get some help for the oil companies.

Well let's take a look at what the oil companies have got from the members opposite during the last three years, up until now. I want to say that this was the most massive hand-out to the oil companies that this province has ever seen. We find that there has been \$300 million annually of royalty holidays. And you know what we have for the people of this province? A massive debt. And the oil companies receive the forgiveness of taxes and royalties.

(1530)

We saw, Mr. Speaker, in the oil industry, that in 1982 the value of oil produced was \$1.2 billion, and the revenue to the people of this province was 700 million. And you know, last year the value of the oil produced in this province, the value of the oil, was \$2.4 billion. And do you know what the people of Saskatchewan got for double the production in dollar value of oil? Six hundred and fifty million dollars.

So this is the situation that we have now — the members opposite coming to this legislature and saying, we have to do something for the oil companies. They said that what

was going to be their show case of economic development was open for the big oil companies here in Saskatchewan. That was going to be the economic engine in Saskatchewan. And do you know what? They also said, wait until we get a federal counterpart; wait until we get a Tory government in Ottawa; we'll get rid of all the . . . deregulate all of the oil industry across western Canada. And he said, we'll let those oil companies go on the market value of oil and just watch the development and the profits those companies will make.

And do you know, less than a month since the — a month and a half — that the oil prices started to decelerate across the world . . . And do you know what? These same people that have handed out millions and millions of dollars to the oil company — and the federal counterpart, the Minister of Energy in Ottawa, gave to them a \$1.3 billion package to the oil industry — are now sending their Premier, their leader, down to Ottawa to ask Ottawa to help these poor multinational oil companies.

I can't believe it. Today we are looking at a crisis in agriculture the like of which we have never seen since the last Tory government back in the '30s. Today the news is devastating to the farmers of this province. And do you know what the Tories, the members opposite, are raising to discuss in this legislature? They're discussing the poverty of the multinational oil companies to which they have handed millions of dollars during the last four years.

I want to say that their economic policy has been a bust — total and unequivocally, Mr. Speaker. This province is in disarray. This province is in economic ruin. And I say to the members opposite, if you have any nerve, go to the people of Saskatchewan, give them an opportunity to vote and kick you out.

I want to say that panic has set in on the government side as a result of the direct consequence of a boom and bust policy, their total dependence upon the large multinational corporation and the activity they were producing. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, they permitted the boom and they boasted about the boom in Saskatchewan. But their performance has been a bust — and a bust, I must say, for the treasury and for the people of this province.

At a time when oil prices were high, they gave \$300 million per year to the big oil companies. They gave them subsidies when the oil price was high. And now when the oil price is low, they send their Premier to Ottawa and said, well, we've got to help the oil companies again. Now this is some kind of perverse thinking. They have to be tied to the oil companies to be able to think in that manner. We'll give them help when the oil price is good; give them lots — 300 million a year incentive — but also when the oil prices drop we've got to go to the federal treasury and to the people of Saskatchewan to help these poor oil people.

Well I would think that if they gave them a whole pile of money during the three and a half years, that they should be able to ride through the ups and downs of the oil industry. But not the oil companies, because the oil companies — let's be fair — the oil companies are dictating the policy to the members opposite. They aren't

writing the policy. The Premier has now been sent by the oil companies to eastern Canada and told to come back with a package, because they control them. They finance them. They're in their pockets. They're puppets for the oil companies.

No one would give away \$300 million. No one would give away the resources of Saskatchewan, if you weren't controlled by the oil companies. That's exactly what you are. You're puppets for the oil companies. And I want to say that they bragged for three and a half years about how great this oil policy of theirs was.

Well, let's take a look at Saskatchewan. There's a 90 per cent increase in the number of unemployed over the past four years, from the average unemployment in 1981 of 21,000 to an average unemployment in 1985 of over 40,000 — 90 per cent increase. And that's when their economy was booming under the give-away to the oil companies. Forty-seven thousand people unemployed in Saskatchewan today; 65,000 people on welfare. I want to say that if we look at several of the economic indicators, we know that their policy of the boom and bust, of tying their start to the multinational oil companies, is not working here in Saskatchewan.

And we look and see what has happened in Saskatchewan. We find that the oil company and the economic policies of the government opposite is not the answer. We indicated, Mr. Speaker, that the population during the last year, of Saskatchewan, went down some 6,000. We found in Saskatchewan during this so-called boom that these members opposite put in place, that retail sale growth in '85 was the lowest in Canada. And over the past four years there has been actual decline in the real per capital GNP in Saskatchewan. The total level of real investment in Saskatchewan has been less since they took office, less every year since 1981 — decline in the real levels of investment. In 1985 the average earnings for Saskatchewan workers actually declined — a decline in wages.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, there is a legacy that the policy of the members opposite is going to leave behind. Here in Saskatchewan, because of the direct consequences of their oil policy, we find that the people of this province are burdened with a \$2 billion deficit; 2 billion . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. It is my duty to advise the member his time has elapsed.

**Mr. Young:** — Mr. Speaker, every time I have the occasion in the last while to rise in this House and follow in a debate where I happen to follow one of the NDP members, I usually end up starting out my speech with amazement at how they continue on their same negative path that they've always been on. We have here, Mr. Speaker, we have first of all the routine proceedings which we all in this House know. The motion by, it says, "Mr. Birkbeck, to move the following Motion:" This motion under rule 16 was moved on Friday. It begins as follows:

That this Assembly commends the Government of Saskatchewan for the programs and policies it has

adopted to stimulate our oil industry and create thousands of jobs for families in this province . . .

Now we had here in question period, Mr. Speaker, the NDP, particularly the Leader of the Opposition, up howling about jobs — howls about jobs. Now when we get into this situation he takes the stand and he says here that the jobs in the oil patch will be lost. But what he's doing, Mr. Speaker, is assuming that he's going to be the next premier.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Young:** — Now I will tell you that if that short little man is the next premier of the province, then I will predict that the jobs that he stood up and said will be lost, will be lost. He stood up yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and he said, if I get back into office, I'm going to cut the funding. He said, I'm going to cut the funding to the St. Paul's Hospital in Saskatoon. Now he says that if he gets elected the jobs in the oil patch will be lost.

Now my point, Mr. Speaker, with respect to this, is this motion was filed on Friday. I have yesterday's *Star-Phoenix*. Headlines, first page: "Devine seeks Ottawa action on wheat and oil."

Now certainly the prices of wheat were announced today. The only person who was surprised with the drop in wheat prices was the NDP agricultural critic. The guy, the former owner of Engel construction, who buys himself a giant Lincoln Town Car — which I would assume, Mr. Speaker, would buy the largest gas guzzler that the Ford Motor Company puts on the market — he buys it. He's pretty sure about the stability of gas prices, or he's got a lot more money than he lets on to have. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that with a car like that he figures that we're going to take care of the gas prices. And reluctantly I have to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that probably we will do a very good job of looking after the jobs in the oil patch and the price of gas. And I think those two can work together, Mr. Speaker.

The NDP, in their speeches, tend to suggest that helping by this government to save jobs in the oil patch — jobs that certainly I acknowledge wouldn't be there, Mr. Speaker, if they would have remained in office . . . And so accordingly, Mr. Speaker, we're in a situation, we're protecting jobs that I can say proudly for the most part we created by our policies in oil. And they wouldn't be there to be saved but for the Devine government and its policies.

Now under the NDP, they can say, well if we'd have been in offices we'd have had no jobs to save. And I must agree with them, Mr. Speaker. But certainly I think that I had the occasion, for instance, Mr. Speaker, to be in the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster's office on Friday. And I was in his office. He was down the hall. A call came in. It was a call from a man in Maidstone. I'll leave the name out in this situation. He called from Maidstone trying to reach the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster, who, I say, was down the hall while I was in his office. I took the call.

Mr. Speaker, it really got to me. I could hear kids crying in the background, and it reminded me of calls that people

must make to my house in Saskatoon and my kids will sometimes be in the background. But I am fortunate, Mr. Speaker, to have the availability of a number of occupations to me. But I assumed, Mr. Speaker, that this man was counting on his job in the oil patch. And he related to me the nature of his call and he was wondering, Mr. Speaker, if we were going to do anything to save jobs in the oil patch. And I assured him that the Premier was down in Ottawa seeking assistance on wheat and oil, and that with the member that he had, and with the government he had, that there was a very good chance that most people in the oil patch would be saved, Mr. Speaker.

And I cannot believe that the member from Shaunavon — who I happen to know represents a constituency that has a considerable amount of activity in the oil patch — would stand up here in this legislature and carry on the way he did this afternoon. If he thinks that the jobs of the people who work in the Shaunavon area in the oil patch are unimportant, I think that he's going to get the biggest surprise that he can imagine come the next election, because those folks will line up in great lengths to work to defeat that man if he carries on condemning the jobs and the opportunities that we have made available in the oil patch, particularly in Shaunavon. There's certainly other constituencies, but I think that he should have stayed glued to his seat this afternoon in the House, Mr. Speaker, if that's what his thoughts were about the oil patch, and particularly from his constituency.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that what we have done here is taken the proper approach. We've got a country out there, Mr. Speaker — Saudi Arabia. It's got 25 per cent plus, of the world's known oil reserves. We can all remember as kids, Mr. Speaker, we'd hear of Red Adair going out there and putting out an oil fire in Saudi Arabia. Well the reason that those things happen is that the stuff comes out of the ground without much coaxing. It's under pressure. They presumably — and I have heard this on two occasions — that they can make money at 53 cents a barrel the way the stuff comes out of the ground. It's so light and it's so pure that with an additional filter you can run a turbine engine right off the oil well.

Now we are competing here in this country, particularly in Saskatchewan, with wells that produce 18 barrels a day on average in Saskatchewan versus about 80 barrels a day in Alberta. Alberta has light crude. We have a lot of oil here that's heavy and is contaminated with sulphur. And we have, despite the position that we find ourselves in by virtue of mother nature, did very well in this province in developing an oil industry under those obviously hampering facts about our oil. But I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that without the policies that we have put in place, we would not be here today. We wouldn't have an oil industry to protect if the NDP had remained in power since '82.

(1545)

Now certainly, Mr. Speaker, since Leduc in 1949, 1947, whatever it was in Alberta that they discovered Leduc, their government and their people in that province have a different attitude towards oil than we do here in Saskatchewan. Oil is something new that has really found

its own since the Devine government was elected. But in Alberta, as I say, they've been doing this since . . . certainly 1950 at least, it's been part and parcel of their economy. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that the new developments, the drilling companies, the service companies and the like that follow the oil patch around are something somewhat new to a lot of the old-time residents of Saskatchewan, and accordingly we have here a situation where the NDP, who are operating their entire provincial campaign out of a time bubble . . . I had the occasion to be at the teachers' annual Easter convention at the Sheraton.

And the Leader of the Opposition stood there, amongst all these people, and suggested that he would outspend us on education — which I suggest is virtually impossible — but he said that he was going to put 300 million more dollars in education. He was asked by one of the speakers there, he was asked where the money would come from. So the little guy comes out with the old pat answer. He says, I'll get it from the oil companies; he's going to get 300 more million.

At the same time, that very same day, I saw a *Globe and Mail* paper, the very same day Alberta who, as I have mentioned, has a different attitude towards oil certainly than the NDP in this province, that day announced a \$400 million relief program to save jobs and save their oil industry. At the same time, this little guy is down here on Victoria Avenue in Regina, suggesting that he'll milk them for another \$300 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that goes to show you the difference in attitude between the NDP and a Conservative government when it comes to oil and the jobs that it produces. I think, Mr. Speaker, as pointed out by the member from Fairview, that we really have to be careful not to allow the Saudi Arabians to get us under their thumb on oil prices. They say, and if I'm correct, if they can produce oil at a profit of 53 cents a barrel, we certainly may not have seen the bottom of it yet. What they can effectively do, Mr. Speaker, is shut us right down. We'd rust right up, at which point they could turn on the screws and charge anything they wanted for oil.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that for the benefit of Canadians, in order . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. It's my duty to inform the member that his time has elapsed.

**Mr. Katzman:** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Point of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** — State your point of order.

**Mr. Engel:** — Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding, being on the same committee as you are, that the rules of rule 16 debate is it goes from one side to the other, and the alternating, at least on this one, alternate. Because the member was on his feet for three times before and he's on his feet now. My point of order is this: I think it's the

member from Pelly's turn. Because they had a speaker; we get a speaker. Why do they get two in a row?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. The rule states nothing of the kind. If the member will read the rule, the opportunity to put debate on the Table alternates every second week between the government and the opposition. When it's time to speak, it's the first man on his feet, and the first man on his feet was the member for Rosthern.

**An Hon. Member:** — Point of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** — State your point of order.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I was in the House when the last speaker was recognized, the member from Saskatoon. At that time there were two people on their feet, the member from Saskatoon and the member from Pelly. You recognized the member from Saskatoon, and I appreciate and agree with your decision. I watched closely this time, and I noticed very clearly the member from Pelly was on his feet first, and the member from Rosthern rose second. You never took the opportunity to look . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. Order, please. The first man on his feet was the member for Rosthern, and the member for Rosthern is recognized.

**Mr. Katzman:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to enter this debate on an issue that is important to the consumers of Saskatchewan. The motion indicates that one of the concerns is that OPEC should not be able to hold the citizens of Saskatchewan, the farmers of Saskatchewan, to blackmail. That's really what we're talking about.

If the production of Saskatchewan and Canada were to fall by the wayside and rust in the pipes, as was indicated by the member earlier, then what would happen, Mr. Speaker, is that the citizens of Canada would be held to blackmail by the countries of OPEC. We lived through that, Mr. Speaker, in past years. We can never let it happen again.

The prices that were crippling our farmers in the costs of their tractor fuels and diesel fuels was there because of OPEC, not because of Canadian policy. The decision was, we must make Canada self-sufficient. We should not be at the blackmail of a country, of the OPEC countries. That's what this motion is saying. It is not saying more than we must protect the jobs of those in the industry and the people of Canada.

How do you protect Canada and the citizens that use the production of the oil fields? By making sure that oil can be produced as cheaply as possible and the benefits are passed along to the consumers, and yet the industry is allowed to live. That's what it's all about. It's not to be that the artificial prices and costs of OPEC should be able to strangle our industry, and when we are at least able to protect ourselves, because we have an inefficient supply, that they can hold us up for ransom.

The member, in moving his motion, indicated his concern for the future of the Saskatchewan citizen, and

that the oil prices should be stable. Many a people today in business, who have been on contracts for the next year with in mind the cost of fuel for the job that they must do — and that is normal — so they must consider what the cost of fuel is. If fuel is going up and down like a rocket, they have problems. And therefore we do not have a stable and sensible economy.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, when the member from Moosomin stood to his feet and made the motion, he was very clear in saying we must protect the consumer. We must protect the jobs of those working in the industry. We must not allow OPEC to blackmail us. We must have stability in the industry, stability in the work-force, stability for our farmers. It is important for the farmers to know what their costs will be as much as ahead. It is important, Mr. Speaker, that all of us understand that no OPEC country or any other should blackmail us.

Mr. Speaker, that's why the members on this side of the House are supporting this motion and not supporting the opposition's amendment. That opposition's amendment is not dealing with reality, Mr. Speaker — the reality of stable markets, stable energy, and a stable, known future for our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the only way that we can protect ourselves is to have production in Canada — Saskatchewan, Alberta, and elsewhere. But we must try to keep that production at a level that is affordable, and so that the citizens using the product can use it.

Mr. Speaker, I wasn't sure how much time I would get in this debate when I rose, but I think that . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. It's my duty to inform the members that the time under rule 16 has elapsed.

## MOTIONS

### Resolution No. 3 — Job Creation and the Unemployment Rate

**Mr. Myers:** — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a lot of pride to stand here today to talk about youth employment in this province. We've heard a lot of rhetoric from the opposition, and we will hear a lot more — but that's all it is, is rhetoric.

This is the Opportunities '86 kit which has gone out to the employers. And it's creative . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — What about jobs, though? What about jobs?

**Mr. Myers:** — Oh, the opposition wants to know about jobs. They want to know about jobs — a new story for them.

In 1983 and 1984, Opportunities '83 and '84 created 9,200 jobs for summer students — 9,200 jobs. And last year, with the co-operation of a new federal government, we created over 10,500 student jobs — students who need these jobs to go back to university, to further their education, and generally create a better society for us.

And this year, with this application kit which has been sent out to the employers, there will be 8,600 student jobs. And that is a Saskatchewan program alone, not dovetailing with the federal program. So we're quite proud of this program — 8,500 jobs which might not have been there if that group of ragtag politicians had been in power. They don't believe in doing what they say; they just believe in saying what they're not going to do.

We've just gone through a debate on rule 16, and we've heard what they're going to do with the oil industry. Many of the people have heard the Premier's, the member from Estevan's comments when he was in Calgary. Well I was in Calgary with the Premier at that time. And we went there and we talked to the oilmen. Lo and behold, who sat at the next table to me? Tommy Douglas . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . He's on the board of directors of Husky Oil. And prior to the dinner I had a conversation with Tommy Douglas. And he recognized that the NDP party of today is not the CCF party of yesterday . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Not the CCF party. Two different faces, two different faces.

The CCF party of the 1930s and 1940s was a party that wanted to create jobs. They were a party of the farmers . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . But is the NDP a party of the farmers today? It's a party of the unions, the eastern union bosses, the Bob Whites. And lo and behold, Ed Broadbent, leader of the federal NDP party, what does he say on CTV? He says, I would like Bob White, leader of an eastern union, to succeed me as leader of the NDP party federally.

So who's speaking? Is it the people of Saskatchewan or the eastern union leaders. Lo and behold, it can't be the people of Saskatchewan when you hear comments like that on national TV . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm quite proud of the fact that we took the initiative in 1983, after becoming government in 1982, to develop jobs for students and I have talked to them. I had the opportunity last year to visit with some of the students in my riding who took advantage of the Opportunities '85 program. And I will repeat for the members, 10,500 summer jobs for students last year. Now that, that is action.

(1600)

We have heard about the action from the former government. They created only 2,000 full-time jobs in the last year they were government versus 6,000 part-time jobs. We know that they're not a party of action; rather a party of inaction. As Joe Borowski would describe them, the now dead party.

We know that they are against students. They are against students having the opportunity to go out and establish their own businesses with incentives form small business. They never came up with that. They're against business completely. They believe the only place that you can employ people is in a bigger government; a bigger government which creates a larger tax burden on the taxpayers.

And as the Deputy Premier has said yesterday and today

in question period, we have 17,000 more people in the work place than we had last year at February. That's the February to February stat. We have more people in the work-force. We have 30,000 more permanent jobs since 1982. And a lot of those positions have been filled by persons who were summer students, who had the advantage of working and obtaining experience, and now have a job, a permanent job, in the work-force.

Eight per cent of the jobs in this country are created by small business, businesses under 100 or under 50 employees — 80 per cent. But who do they come out against? They come out against business. They don't know the difference between small business and big business. They would have you believe that all business is bad — totally bad.

When we had . . . Last year, when we were undergoing a very difficult period of time for the south-western part of the province, we saw them criticize the action. But if we turn the calendar back, we look back during the 1970s when there were times of drought and we saw nothing, nothing from the former government that was put into agriculture. Yet, under Opportunities '85 program, under the Opportunities '86, those small businesses who need assistance — and this is an assistance to small businesses — can hire a summer student. This program is designed to assist small businesses; assist farmers; assist those people who are on the edge of going one way or the other. In many cases this program will keep the businesses viable. Yet you would hear from the opposition that this program is detrimental — detrimental — to the province of Saskatchewan. The only thing it's detrimental to is the re-election hopes of several MLAs sitting across the floor.

Mr. Speaker, we have to look to the future. We have to build for the future. We cannot look back in the past. We cannot be negative. We must be positive, positive that we sit down, determine the programs for students, for the young, that are required to make them part of the work-force.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour:

That this Assembly commends the Government of Saskatchewan for creating jobs and opportunities for the people of Saskatchewan and for maintaining, on average, the lowest unemployment in Canada since 1982.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, as the Minister of Labour, it gives me great pleasure to rise and speak with respect to the creation of jobs and the record of this government in the last four years.

And first of all, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what we've had in the last four years in this province is a change in attitude, an attitude towards employment rather than an attitude towards hand-outs. And the former government's attitude towards unemployment was that the government would hire more and more people, that they would raise taxes continuously to pay for the more and more people, and that this cycle would never end. And it ended in 1982

with the election that elected our government. That cycle of taxation ended, and their cycle of taxation to create jobs has ended.

And we have given it a new emphasis, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The emphasis and the motivation of this government is quite simple. The motivation is that we allow the people to go about their business and the only time that the government interferes is to referee when necessary. But ordinarily you let the people go about their business, owning their land; owning their businesses; running corporations, large and small; running co-operatives; and creating jobs. The government does not create jobs.

The members opposite try to tell me that the government creates jobs. How many people are working in your box factory and how many people are working in your shoe factory that you started years ago, and are now forgotten? How many people are employed there? None — absolutely none. Because the government does not create wealth; the people create wealth; And the wealth of this province in opposition is that you spoiled the people and you ruined their attitude, till they became dependent on the almighty government to survive, dependent on the almighty government that you tried to portray, to create wealth and happiness for them.

The situation we have here is that our government has created 17,000 jobs in the past year. And that, I am pleased to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is primarily jobs for women, something that the members opposite have talked much about but have done very little about. Just in the last year our government has created 17,000 jobs. About 80 per cent of them are for women. This is the fastest growing sector in our society and the greatest area of increased employment, and most of them are full-time jobs.

And in addition, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am pleased to say that the jobs that have been created for women by the people going about doing their business, have primarily been jobs in management. The increase of women in management in business has gone up dramatically, and the number of women who are self-employed has increased dramatically under our government.

And to encourage women to be self-employed and to start their own businesses, we are now starting a Saskatchewan pension plan. The Saskatchewan pension plan will help in particular women because they have to go in and out of the job market by the call and the nature of their situation in life, that women and only women can have children, and many of them prefer to have children.

So this puts them in a difficult situation where they have to leave the job market and requires them to lose out on pension benefits. So not only are more women working but we will increase the benefits to women and improve their pension situation.

In addition, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are more people working now in Saskatchewan than there ever have been in the history of this province. And the only reason that unemployment in the statistics has increased is that more



and more people want to work. And why do they want to work? Because there is hope for them to get a job so they apply for jobs.

When there is no hope to get a job, more and more people sit back and say, ah well, I won't even bother applying. But there has been hope in the last few years. Because there has been that hope, more and more people have applied, and the participation rate is now well over 65 per cent. That's 65 per cent of all people between the age of 18 and 65 have applied for and wish to work.

So that is a very, very tremendous record on behalf of this government in difficult economic times throughout the western world. I'm not saying that times are completely difficult, but there have been problems in western society. And the problems that have developed have all developed from one simple reason, Mr. Deputy Speaker — a lack of a proper work attitude in the western democracies.

And therefore I am pleased to say that no longer in Saskatchewan do we have the work attitude that had developed in Britain under the socialists. We now have a proper work attitude. We do not have the work attitude that developed in Sweden under the socialists. We now have a work attitude where people say, I will go out and I will do my part, I will do my share, and accordingly everyone in society will benefit.

So there has been tremendous improvement in jobs. And not only that, in the permanent sphere of jobs and employment, but also for youth. Last year under the Opportunities '85 program there were at least 10,000 additional jobs for youth created in this province. This was done by the provincial and the federal government co-operating. For once we have co-operation and we have seen the benefits — of 10,000 youths applying. Youth employment has improved so much that this year I find very, very few youth in my constituency who cannot find a job.

And I would say that is partly due to attitude. The attitude in my constituency is that now there is hope, that now that small business has a fair opportunity, that we've extended employment programs to farms, that everyone in my constituency has an improved attitude. And it has very, very little to do with the attitude of the people opposite.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in addition, I want you to consider the type of job creation and the attitudes that exist in this province. We as a government have concentrated on building this province. We have concentrated on building jobs. The members opposite have concentrated on whining. And every time we build something, the members opposite whine. And when we announce a fertilizer plant in Regina with 200 additional permanent jobs and 600 jobs in construction, does this ring a positive bell with the members opposite? No, it does not. What we have from them is whining, continuous whining.

And that kind of attitude is what is breaking this province, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's the whining attitude of the members opposite. And that really is the difference between this government and that party, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Because I recall in my younger days — and

some of us are foolish when we're young — I was a member of that party. And I never saw such a losing attitude in my entire life. The attitude was that the world was going to crush us, that somebody evil was going to prevent us from doing good.

And you have to have an attitude that we can build this province, that the people together can build. Instead they're saying, well the people are oppressed and they need the socialists to save them. From what? The people do not need to be saved from themselves, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

(1615)

Therefore, you have our government building jobs in resources. Oil — we have promoted the production of oil. The members opposite have whined. We have promoted lumber production in the pulp mills. The members opposite have whined. We have promoted jobs in small business. They don't like business. They don't like any kind of business, so they have whined that we have created jobs in small business.

We have created jobs in co-operatives, something that they tried to take over as a political movement. The co-operatives in this province are the purest form of capitalism. They are the little guys' corporation. This government is co-operating with the co-operative to build upgraders, to build oil refineries, to build fertilizer plants.

And what do they do over there? Are they happy about the jobs? No. It is a continuous whine, a continuous whining, day in and day out. You have the NDP wine that has turned to vinegar, and it tastes terrible, and the people are sick and tired of listening and tasting this wine from the members opposite.

And therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have created jobs in agriculture and agriculture processing. And what do we hear from them? Whining. And we have created jobs in North Battleford in the bacon plant. And we hear from the members opposite whining that it's a gift to someone. There is no gift. The opportunity for the member from Shaunavon to dig oil wells and drill them and find salt is equal to everyone else. And he whines.

Their policy of creating jobs was to pay for dry holes or salt-water wells. Our policy is that if you find oil, you get an incentive. And this has created jobs.

And the former premier, Leader of the Opposition, has a comment about Alberta. I would think that this province could stand an attitude such as the one in Alberta. There is really a change in attitude when you cross the border. Let me tell you about my own brother. When he was in Saskatchewan, he was a bit of whiner himself, and he believe in the socialist policies. And as soon as he moved to Alberta and crossed that border he had a change of attitude. And I can tell you right now he is a Progressive Conservative. He should have the attitude that the people in Alberta have. It's whenever you listen to the members opposite and their attitude of how you create jobs — you create jobs about whining, about

progress; you create jobs according to them — whining about building industries and plants.

I tell you, the people of this province are totally sick of this kind of whining. They want a positive attitude, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They came here to build this province. Our ancestors came here and lived in sod shacks; then they lived in log houses; then they lived in brick houses and in frame houses. And now they are living in very comfortable circumstances in this province, all because they built it. They build this province with a positive attitude. They built jobs — the spin-off from people working. People whining have never created a job in the entire history of this province.

And I encourage the members opposite to adopt our policies of positive building in this province — create jobs for the people of this province. And so therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm in favour of this motion, this resolution.

This province has consistently maintained the lowest average unemployment rate. This province has maintained a priority for jobs. The members opposite, their priority is for a few people making a lot of money. Our priority is jobs for everyone. And once we have jobs, then we will work on the working conditions and improve the jobs and improve the working conditions of these people. But the very poorest working condition that I can think of in this province is to not have a job. That is the worst working condition I can think of.

And they stand there and they talk about jobs. And the member for Canora wants to tell me about jobs. I tell you, the member for Canora had better apply for a job right now, and it better not be in this province because he is well-known. And I doubt very much if anyone is going to give him a job, so he had better start running in British Columbia, I tell you — that's where his home is. So if the member from Canora wants to give us a lesson in jobs, he should get off of his chair, and I will give him the floor and he can tell us about jobs, and how many jobs he would create with the Western Canada Concept Party, who has no concept of a deficit, no concept of taxation, and don't even talk about jobs. And the Western Canada Concept Party . . . It's amazing that we now mention this group in the House. I mean, they never speak. They never talk about jobs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I invited that member from the Western Canada Concept Party to get up and explain how his party would create jobs. But what I'm telling you is that it's the members opposite in the NDP who are the true danger to this province. I will ignore the Western Canada Concept Party because they are a blip in the history of this province — a hiccup in the history of Saskatchewan, and we will not concern ourselves with.

The true danger to this province and the jobs of our people is the New Democratic Party. And I invite the people to make a comparison between the New Democratic Party and this government. The New Democrats: well they have no new ideas to create jobs, none whatsoever that we have ever that we have ever seen. And it's submitted here that this province would be better off staying with the government they've got, the government

that is building jobs — and I haven't even got to the entire list — building jobs in industry. A Phillips Cable plant in Moose Jaw, they whined about that. There isn't anything positive that this government can do that the members opposite don't complain about. And they have the same attitude as the . . .

Recently I received a brief from someone who's to represent workers, the president of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour. It was a 27-page brief on how jobs could be created in this province, or what should be done with respect to jobs. And 27 pages of that document were negative. And I said to Ms. Hunt: isn't there anything in the 27 pages of this brief, is there anything in the 27 pages — can't you think of one good thing that our government has done? And she said, no, really, I can't. That is a negative attitude.

The members opposite, and some people in this province who are not in favour of workers but are in favour of their own political purposes, try to use jobs as an example of how they would help the people. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the best example of what are good policies, the best of what a good government is doing, is to have people working. And there are 17,000 more people working right now this very day than there were a year ago. And there are thousands and thousands more than there were in 1982.

And there is a statistic that said the unemployment rate is up slightly, but the employment rate is up to a larger figure than it ever has been.

**An Hon. Member:** — Phenomenally.

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Phenomenally, I had it pointed out to me.

Now the members opposite have indicated their idea of jobs is militant labour. And militant labour doesn't go on strike any more. They go on job actions. And I submit to the members opposite, to the people of this province, and to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that my idea of a job action is people working. That is what I call a job action. And we have 17,000 more job actions today than we had a year ago, and I like that kind of job action, and I do not believe that militancy and a whining attitude by the members opposite is going to do anything for employment in this province.

And therefore I am very pleased to commend this government on the action it has taken. Thank you very much.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm very pleased to have the opportunity to enter the debate.

The government . . . If you can believe it, the member is congratulating the Government of Saskatchewan for creating jobs and opportunities for the people of Saskatchewan. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that in light of the fact, what hypocrisy!

If we take a look at what is going on in Saskatchewan, if

we take a look what's going on across Canada under a federal Tory government, if we look at what is happening to the young people of this country and in Saskatchewan, it's a national disgrace. There are 16 to 17 per cent unemployed among young people of Canada and of Saskatchewan. And do you realize that they stand up, one of their departments, and they come forward with a document, and do you know what they say? Pretty soon it will be socially acceptable that we have high unemployment among our youth. And they stand up here and they have the audacity to come forward to congratulate themselves on the creation of jobs and opportunity to young people.

And if we take a look at the . . . in Saskatchewan, if you go to Saskatoon, the city in which the member that moved this resolution comes from, you find that the unemployment is over 12 per cent in the city of Saskatoon. And affected most are the young people of Saskatoon, and indeed, the whole entire province.

I say, if you take a look at the unemployment here in Saskatchewan, just as has been indicated in the conference on unemployment across Canada by a Father McGrath from Newfoundland, who said that it was a national disgrace that so many people do not have full-time jobs, and if you look in Saskatchewan here, you find over 100,000 of the employed people of Saskatchewan — over 100,000 — are working from one to 30 hours a week. They disguise that there's full employment and that there's opportunities for people in this province.

And I say to you that if you look here in Saskatchewan, you find that there has been a 90 per cent increase in the number of unemployed over the past four years. From an average unemployment in 1981 of 21,000, to an average number of unemployed in 1985 of over 40,000, that's a 90 per cent increase, Mr. Speaker. And they stand in this legislature and they congratulate the effort of making unemployment the highest in the history of this province, at over 40,000. And the most recent statistics that came forward, last month unemployment in this province has now risen to over 47,000 — 47,000 people unemployed.

And if we take a look at, in addition to that, how they have provided opportunities to people of Saskatchewan, you find that in the welfare not only has unemployment risen, but welfare has risen massively. And do you realize, Mr. Speaker, that over 65,000 people are dependent on welfare in this province that they say there is so much opportunity? Do you realize that the opportunity that they have given to thousands of people in this province, in 1982 there was about 4,500 unemployed employables on welfare. You know what it is today? Almost 15,000 people, unemployed employables, that should be working, Mr. Speaker. This is the Tory opportunity that they're giving to the young people of this province.

And I want to say that if we take a look at the record of job creations, how well is the province of Saskatchewan doing in creating new jobs? Well, statistics came out in respect to that also, and if you look at where they are in creating jobs, there are only two provinces in Canada doing worse than Saskatchewan: Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland. Every other province in Canada is

creating more jobs and giving more opportunities than Saskatchewan.

And they talked and they bragged about how the population of the province is increasing. And you take a look at the statistics in respect to whether population is coming here or leaving Saskatchewan, in light of all this opportunity that they talk about. And you know what the statistics indicate? That in 1985, 6,040 people left this province.

(1630)

Now I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that if there's economic buoyancy in this province, you'd have people coming and not people leaving. And if you analyse what people are leaving, you find that it is young people, aged 20 to 29, leaving the province. In the first two months of this year, there were 1,700 a month that left this province; about 57 people a day leaving the province. No jobs, no opportunities, no future, no hope provided by the economic policies of this group — this bankrupt group — across the way.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, it's understandable that the circumstances for our young people instead of getting better, is going to be worse, because the birds across the way, they put all of their eggs in one basket, and that was in the oil company, in the multinationals, in their oil policy. That was supposed to give economic development in the province.

And you find, Mr. Speaker, that there has been a bust in the oil company, and people are being laid off. And you find in the steel company people are being laid off. You find even in the brewery companies they're laying them off — not getting jobs, no new opportunities.

And I ask anyone, and I ask the people of Saskatchewan, go into rural Saskatchewan and ask. Can you find one small manufacturing business created in the last four years? I'll tell you, you can't find very many. You can find some that have had to close their doors, like in Humboldt. The manufacturing of farm equipment had to close their doors.

But I'll tell you, during the period of a New Democratic government there was opportunities. And I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, If you go around my constituency — is a demonstration of working with small business to create jobs and opportunities in centre after centre in Saskatchewan.

Not today. I look at Englefeld and the Schulte Industries. I look at Annaheim, and we have the Doecker brothers. I look at St. Gregor and Western Industries, Michel's Tarps. You go into Wynyard and you have the Plains Poultry. You look in Lanigan, and you have potash and you have other industries — every community. And I'll tell you, every community that we have those manufacturing and small business set up, it was during the period of the New Democratic tie and during good economic times.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — But what we are finding across

Saskatchewan today in rural Saskatchewan: business after business closing their door. And I say, times are tough under Tories. There are not great opportunities.

I want to tell you of a very, very moving situation that I have had experience with. And it's not a single, isolated situation.

And I had a mother approach me and say, could you do something to help my son get a job? He graduated from high school. I sent him off to Saskatoon to the tech. I supported him during this period of time to finish off his grade 12. He has tried to get a job and he is unable to get a job since he has graduated despite the fact that he has gone to school.

These are the situations that are happening across Saskatchewan. And I'll tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you cannot fool the people of this province into believing that you're offering opportunities to the young people. Ask young people today, or parents of young people, whether they have better opportunities today or whether they had better opportunities under the New Democratic Party. And I'll tell you, they will overwhelmingly say young people had an opportunity to do, work.

I remember there was a lot of young people who in fact used to go out and work on the Department of Highways during the summer, earn a decent wage, go back and pay their tuition fees and go on to education.

**An Hon. Member:** — Can't do it any more.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Can't do it. No highways. They don't build them. They get outsiders. They bring them in from Alberta or Manitoba. They don't give them to . . . the opportunities to the young people of Saskatchewan. I think you really have a lot of nerve to come before the legislature here and to indicate that you're offering opportunities to young people.

And I'll tell you this, Mr. Deputy Premier, that what the people of this province want is not your rhetoric and not your jobs that you're pretending you're going to create by press releases. What they want is indeed solid jobs. They say this government is bankrupt. And what the people of Saskatchewan want is an opportunity to turf you out of office. The only thing that is preventing them from doing that is that you haven't got the nerve to go to the people of Saskatchewan. And you should be ashamed of yourselves because four years is up. The people of Saskatchewan are phoning our office saying, get rid of this outfit.

You know, if you look at some of the key industries here in the province and you ask: how can they stand here and say that they are creating jobs? Retail sales are down; housing — 5,200 housing during the past year; investment is down — public and private investment; business closures, bankruptcies, and on and on it goes.

And, in fact, if you want to look at the businesses closed since these members opposite came in, you've got Dad's Cookies, closed out. You've got Ipsco, closed out. Friggstad, closed. Dominion stores, closed. Robinson Stores, closed; MacLeods, closed. Pioneer Trust — well

Pioneer Trust, their friend — closed, gone. They filled their suitcase, mind you and took off and went south. Eaton's, Moose Jaw, closed down. Co-op Implements in the South, closed. And on and on the list goes.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is another way. There is the New Democratic way, providing jobs and opportunities for Saskatchewan people; doing it here and building ourselves, not depending on multinational corporations or for anyone from outside of Saskatchewan — but rather, I say, doing it ourselves.

And we have put together several policies which I think will in fact bring about job opportunities to our young people. Can you feature that one of the industries that has the best job producing record in the province is housing? And they say that thousands of people are coming into this province. Oh, they're just coming in, in hordes. They haven't hardly built a house in four years. I wonder where these people are heading out.

But I'll tell you there is an alternative, and I'll say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we have a housing program that is going to provide young people with an opportunity to own a home, and it's going to give an opportunity to our business community, the plumbers, the carpenters, the electricians, give them an opportunity to work again.

I'll tell you, come to my community in my constituency and see whether or not the plumbers and the electricians and the carpenters have the same amount of work as when we were in office, and you say you give the opportunity. I'll tell you that they'll turf you guys out if you ever get the nerve to call the election. There is absolutely no doubt. People of Saskatchewan know that. You tested the waters. They say you're finished; call the election.

And I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, this is what the people of Saskatchewan are looking for. They're looking for positive programs to build and to give people an opportunity to work. And we have a housing program here, and I want to say, I offered it to the members opposite, and I would recommend that they put it into effect.

What we've proposed to do here is to provide direct financial assistance of \$7,000 to first-time buyers of new homes. That gives an opportunity, a stimulus — provide security for families through 7 per cent home mortgages for the first \$70,000 on all new and existing homes for seven years; increase construction of affordable, decent housing for low-income families and seniors.

I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, there have been some winners and there have been some losers under the administration of the members opposite. There's no doubt about that. But I tell you, the winners have not been the young people of this province. Sixteen to 17 per cent unemployed and you're saying you're giving opportunities to young people? Young people taking education and unable to find career opportunities. This is the opportunities that the members opposite give. But there have been some winners on that side.

**An Hon. Member:** — Few. Very few.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Yes. They have a method of allocating the jobs. They have a method of allocating jobs to some particular people.

**An Hon. Member:** — How does that work?

**Mr. Koskie:** — I'll tell you how it works. They send in names and they get names of young people that are looking for jobs and they have them checked through and they send it in to the Public Service Commission with a little blue star. And if it's a little blue star, you can go ahead and hire him because he's likely to be a Tory. Those are the opportunities they give.

I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, the people of this province are sick and tired of listening to the Premier go around this province, community after community, with a press release, with no substance whatsoever of offering opportunities to these young people.

The most recent is the one that he announced here in Regina that he was going to set up a fertilizer plant. Well when you go through the press release in depth, you find that it's just a memorandum of agreement to take a look into the possible feasibility of it.

As I was saying, there are some winners though, Mr. Speaker. But I'll tell you, it hasn't been the young people of this province that were the winners. The winners were the oil companies that they handed out \$300 million annually. The winners are the oil companies who the Premier treks down to Ottawa to get some financial assistance for it. That's what he's doing.

But I'll tell you, the Premier hasn't stood in this legislature and asked us to join in a constructive way of building in Saskatchewan for our young people who have no opportunity. I'll tell you, Mr. Deputy Premier, you may sit there and groan away, but if you had the courage, you would in fact call an election and let us get on with the business of the province.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we have seen that by the indication that there have been some winners and there have been some losers. And most of all, even though the unemployment rate is extremely high — it affects our young people the most — the other reality that we have is that, even if this government wanted to have a meaningful program for Saskatchewan people, they are no longer able to do it. Because they have driven this province into debt — \$2 billion, maybe more, just on the consolidated account.

(1645)

And they say they are giving people an opportunity? I'll tell you, every young people is being burdened with debt. They are. Their future is being jeopardized by the extravagance and mismanagement of this province by the members opposite.

And so I say, Mr. Speaker, it's time that the people opposite . . . You'll notice that in their caucus many of them no longer will be running. Thirteen of the original

caucus, originally in their caucus, have decided to jump ship, not to go forward with them, because of the magnitude of the mess that has been created here in Saskatchewan.

And so what I want to do here, Mr. Speaker, is in fact to move an amendment to this here resolution:

That all the words after "Assembly" be deleted and the following substituted:

Condemns the Government of Saskatchewan for allowing unemployment in Saskatchewan to rise to record levels, and for the introduction of programs which create only a few short-term jobs in order to create the illusion of reducing the numbers on welfare while doing nothing meaningful to assist the 100,000 Saskatchewan people who are unemployed and on welfare.

I move this motion, Mr. Speaker, seconded by my colleague, the member from Regina Centre.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I recognize the Minister of Social Services.

**Hon. Mr. Dirks:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. State your point of order.

**Mr. Shillington:** — It has always been my understanding that a person that seconded the motion had a priority in following the speaker, Mr. Speaker. I believe I have priority as a seconder of the motion in this matter.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Not as a rule on an amendment, unless you were up first.

**Hon. Mr. Dirks:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**An Hon. Member:** — Point of order.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, while the debate was going on — and I don't want to put the Table in a bad position — but I checked with them to ask whether or not priority would be given to the seconder. They informed me that they would get priority. And I wonder where the rule is that you are using that is different from the people who advise you? Because I want to say clearly that in this House it has been the, if not written, at least the tradition, that the seconder get to speak. And I'm asking that question very clearly of you, sir on your ruling, whether or not you have documents or precedents to back that.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. If the member has a point of order and he would like to state the rule that he's applying it to, I will be glad to look at it. But I don't believe that the member will find a rule that states that.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Dirks:** — Mr. Speaker, the issue at stake here in this motion is whether or not . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. The members are shouting at the Chair as though the Chair has no right to make a decision. The first member on his feet was recognized, and I give the member the right to speak.

**Hon. Mr. Dirks:** — Mr. Speaker, the issue at stake in this motion is a very simple one, and it's whether or not the policies of an NDP party, or whether or not the policies of Progressive Conservative government, are going to be able to create more jobs. And, Mr. Speaker, I note the members opposite, the members of the New Democratic Party opposition . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — State your point of order.

**Mr. Shillington:** — You asked for some authority. I refer you to . . . and it's been the practice for . . . I've been here . . . this is my 11th year, and it's been the practice in the full 11 years. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to rule 304:

The member who makes a motion may give the name of his seconder who will, if necessary, indicate his consent, and the seconder will then be allowed to speak on the question.

I say, Mr. Speaker, if you want authority it's rule 304 of *Beauchesne's*.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. You're dealing with a motion here, and at this point in time we are dealing with amendments. However, I can't wait in the Chair until somebody gets up to speak in the seconding position. The first member on his feet was on this side of the House this time, and he was the person recognized.

Order. Order, please. The first person recognized was the person who was on his feet and the member has the right to speak. Proceed.

**Hon. Mr. Dirks:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for providing me with the right to speak. It's clear that the NDP opposition would want to use procedural wrangling in an attempt to keep the people of Saskatchewan from hearing the real story that they need to hear — the real story that they need to hear in the next few minutes, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. Order, please.

**Hon. Mr. Dirks:** — And I want to tell the people of Saskatchewan the story that they haven't heard. Here's the story they haven't heard, right here, Mr. Speaker.

The New Democratic Party, when you were in power the last three years of your government, how many permanent jobs were created? How many permanent jobs were created? Four thousand permanent jobs in the last three years that you were in government? Well I want to compare that, Mr. Speaker, to the number of permanent jobs created under the Progressive Conservative government. How many: 4,000, 10,000, 15,000 . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. Order, please. The House cannot operate with that amount of yelling, and I'm going to ask for order.

**Hon. Mr. Dirks:** — Mr. Speaker, I will not be shouted down by the members opposite, the members of the opposition. They don't want to hear. They don't want to hear the truth. The truth is that under their administration there were only 4,000 permanent jobs created in the last three years that they were in power. Under a Progressive Conservative government, 21,000 full-time permanent jobs created in a commensurate three-year period of time — 21,000 — almost five times as many as were created under a New Democratic Party administration.

Mr. Speaker, that clearly indicates that the policies of the Progressive Conservative Party and the policies of a Progressive Conservative government under Premier Grant Devine create far more opportunity, create far more permanent jobs, create a brighter future for the people of this province, than would ever be available under a New Democratic Party.

I want to explain, Mr. Speaker, the kinds of things that are being done now and in the future in this province to provide that kind of opportunity. I don't have much time, but I do want to list these projects because I'm sure the people of Saskatchewan would like to hear what is being done today, what will be done tomorrow, what will be done in the next three months, and six months, and after the next election.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, we have the new paper mill project in Prince Albert, a project that the members opposite in the NDP opposition have indicated they oppose. Then we have the new Regina oil upgrader, Mr. Speaker — thousands of jobs created out in the oil patch. And then we have the announcement recently of an ammonia plant which is going to be attached to that particular project. That is going to create jobs and opportunity for many people.

But I would bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite would like to close down the oil patch and in so doing they would put at risk . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please.

**Hon. Mr. Dirks:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. They would put at risk, by closing down the oil patch, this massive oil upgrader for the city of Regina, for the residents of this city, for the residents of this province.

In addition to the oil upgrader we have the new Rafferty and Alameda dams and the Shand power project in Estevan. And what have the members opposite said about this project which will create literally hundreds and hundreds of jobs over the long term for the people of our province? Are they in favour of this project? No, they would close that one down, as well.

We have the new fertilizing manufacture plant in Regina; we have the new technical school in Prince Albert, recently completed; we have the new agriculture college complex in Saskatoon that was recently announced by the Premier. That construction project will create literally hundreds of jobs, many opportunities for working people here in the province of Saskatchewan. We have the new irrigation projects which have been . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please.

**Hon. Mr. Dirks:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The members opposite would like to delude the public into thinking that somehow the oil upgrader project is not going to go ahead. Well, I note from the newspaper today: “Another co-op upgrader contract awarded” — another co-op upgrader contract awarded, a firm indication that in fact the oil upgrader is going ahead, just as the P.A. pulp project will go ahead, just as the Alameda and Rafferty dams will go ahead, just as the bacon project in North Battleford will go ahead, Mr. Speaker. Because we believe in creating long-term, permanent jobs for the people of Saskatchewan.

**An Hon. Member:** — Where’s your evidence?

**Hon. Mr. Dirks:** — Well, the member opposite seems to suggest that perhaps the statistics that I quoted may not be reliable. I want to indicate to the member opposite the following: the last 44 months under an NDP administration, October ’78 to May ’82, created 19,000 jobs. Let’s compare that to the first 44 months under the Progressive Conservative administration. Thirty-five thousand jobs created in comparison to 19 under the NDP.

In the last 12 months, Mr. Speaker, the last 12 months, January ’85 to January ’86, 17,000 more people working in the province of Saskatchewan, an increase of 15,000 people in the labour force, an increase of 13,000 women in the labour force — most of those new jobs going to women.

What about the last 12 months under an NDP administration, May ’81 to May ’82? How many permanent jobs were created, Mr. Speaker — 5,000, 3,000? Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that under that administration, the last 12 months that they were in power, there was a loss of 1,000 jobs under the New Democrats — a loss of 1,000 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I carry on. We have the new Mackenzie Art Gallery announced recently as a construction project here in Regina; the new individual line service for rural Saskatchewan which will create hundreds of construction jobs. We have the expansion of the rural gas distribution system in the province of Saskatchewan. We have the recently announced power lines in northern Saskatchewan. We have the burying of power lines in rural Saskatchewan. We have the new cable companies in Moose Jaw and Weyburn. We have new health facilities across the province — 1,500 new nursing homes being constructed, and then, of course, we have the new rehabilitation hospital being constructed here in the city of Regina. There are many, many more projects, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I don’t have time to enumerate them all. I would beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned 4:58 p.m.