

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ORAL QUESTIONS

Proposed Fertilizer Plant

Mr. Romanow: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed today to the minister in charge of Economic Development and Trade, and it has to do with an announcement in the *Leader-Post* this morning about the proposed fertilizer plant for Regina. Mr. Speaker, you will recall that back in April the Premier of this government, this province's government, made a big announcement, together with others, that there was to be a fertilizer plant, and in doing so said the following, quote:

It's a win-win situation. It's very good. It's a win-win situation,

referring to the fertilizer.

Today's *Leader-Post*, however, quotes one of the partners to the proposal, Mr. Leland of FCL (Federated Co-operatives Ltd.), as saying that:

Federated has decided it is "not interested in participating at this time."

My question to the Minister of Economic Trade: in the light of this great win situation, what happened? What's the status of this project as of this moment?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — The present status of the ammonia plant proposed in conjunction with the heavy oil upgrader in Regina is as follows. When the initial plan was announced, we were hoping for an integrated project which would tie on directly to the heavy oil upgrader. Over the period of time the Co-op has found that the project as large as a heavy oil upgrader, involving well over \$650 million, is a very large project and a project that they don't want to go too much further beyond. Now I think the hon. member should not read the headlines of the *Leader-Post* and come quickly to the decision that an ammonia plant or fertilizer plant will not, in fact, be built.

As we explored in the studies over the last six months or so, there is two and perhaps three ways that we can go, and each one of them involves a greater or lesser degree of integration. The most perfect situation would be to totally integrate the new ammonia plant right in with the upgrader. The problem, as I said, Co-op has some problems with that.

The second option would be to sell the hydrogen, the waste or excess hydrogen from the upgrader, to a consortium that would build the ammonia plant. In that type of situation the economics are still very good. The return on capital is still very good, and it's a project that is very much alive in the study going on today.

So I think the hon. member should be cautious not to simply interpret the headline of the *Leader-Post* as if

fertilizer will not in fact be produced in Saskatchewan. The mandate our department has received, and I have received from the Premier, is that he puts a very high priority on diversifying our economy, and particularly to diversify our economy to provide in puts to agriculture. That, we take very seriously. That, we are convinced will go forward in the next short while.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Is it not correct to say, Mr. Minister, that your Premier, in making this announcement in April of this year — I might add just a few months before what then was thought to be a provincial general election — and in using the words win, win, win, told the people of this province, and particularly the jobless people, the thousands of jobless people, that there would be 200 jobs — 200 jobs permanently; 1,200 in construction — and told the people of this province that this project was a go? That was the message given to us in April. Would you not admit that the Premier misled the people of Regina and Saskatchewan in making the announcement as he did at that time?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, the Premier of Saskatchewan did not mislead the people of Regina and Saskatchewan in April, he did not mislead them in October, and he doesn't mislead them at any time, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — The Premier of our province has made it a fundamental principle that we must diversify our economy to build projects that can help our farmers and at the same time create jobs and make Saskatchewan a stronger economic place.

That particular approach was endorsed by Vern Leland of the Co-op. That particular approach was endorsed by Ted Turner of the Wheat Pool. They are still very, very favourable to that project going ahead for the betterment of our province. We still believe that a project tied very closely to the Co-op upgrader will see the light of day, benefiting both the city of Regina, but more particularly, benefit the input costs of the farmers of this province.

Mr. Romanow: — Well, Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary, if I may, to the Minister of Economic Development. He just finished telling us in the second question that Mr. Leland and the other partners are still very much interested in having this project go ahead. He says so in the face of today's *Leader-Post* which quotes Mr. Leland as saying that:

Federated has decided it is "not interested in participating at this time."

And the minister also implies that there are some future interests, and I want to ask the minister this supplementary question to clarify the *Leader-Post* story. The *Leader-Post* story, asked about what future prospects of this project going ahead, said the following:

... declined to say when there will be an announcement about whether the project will proceed.

"Oh, I don't know, (the minister is quoted as saying) I never get tied into numbers and times and that type of thing."

I think we would know that from the minister's previous budgets. My question to the minister is therefore this: can you give this House some specific timetable as to when this project is going to get going, and more specifically, who are the partners that are involved? Because unless you can do that to this House today, we can say you have misled the people of Saskatchewan for purely political reasons if you can't do it otherwise.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member raises a question with regards to a quote, as interpreted by a reporter from the *Leader-Post* who posed the question to me, will you be announcing next week what this project is going to be?

I responded to him and I will respond to you in exactly the same way. We are committed to this particular project. We are moving forward with the studies and the research on this particular project, as I indicated in my initial answer, in three potential ways: one, the fully integrated system is not going to go for the primary reason is that the Co-op do not believe they can handle a project that would throw their project well over a billion dollars, and there's a lot of work involved and a lot of engineering, etc., tied into that. We are, and have been for some time, pursuing the whole approach of doing a stand-alone project, fed hydrogen from the Co-op upgrader. That is very, very much alive; that is still being pursued.

As to when the final decision of go or no go will be taken on that, I'm not going to stand here and say it's going to be tomorrow or three weeks from today or three months from today. You should know better than to ask a question that gives a finite time as to when that would be.

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the Minister of Economic Development and Trade obviously cannot or will not give an answer on this important question, I direct my question to the Minister of Co-operation and Co-op Development.

Originally there were four groups associated with this fertilizer project. There was the government, there was Federated Co-op, there was Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, and the French firm. My question to the hon. minister is ...

An Hon. Member: — Easy on the honourable.

Mr. Trew: — Easy on the honourable. My question is simply: who is involved at this stage? Who is still interested in seeing this important project go ahead, or is there anyone who is still interested?

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — I could answer the member by saying that Economic Development and Trade has been

the lead agency on the total project and I will refer the question to my hon. colleague.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, in response to the question which is very much like the question from the member from Riversdale, you correctly identified the two co-ops in Saskatchewan, the Wheat Pool and Federated Co-op as originally part of the group that studied whether the project could be built as an integrated project.

The other partner was CdF Chimie, a French company. That French company is still very, very interested in the project and to say that Federated Co-op, I think would be to put the words in the mouth of Federated Co-op that's not true that they're not still interested in this project — interested from the point of view of being able to have a project that they can sell excess hydrogen to, other than just venting it up into air. And that makes the upgrader a more economically viable project, and money is made both for the Co-op and for the people of Saskatchewan.

So they're involved in it from that point of view, and I think if you read further into the statements made by Mr. Empey, indicates that at this point in time they're not prepared to proceed on a 25 per cent share basis fully integrating that project. They're certainly interested in exploring. I think if you look at the — further read that article — the head of the Co-op refinery indicates that we are negotiating, or working towards, an agreement by which you could sell that particular hydrogen, that excess hydrogen, to this particular project.

And both the Pool and the co-op certainly would be involved, or be interested, at such time that this project was built as being part of — part of a marketing arm that would sell cheaper fertilizer to the farmers of Saskatchewan. And I would certainly hope that they would.

Mr. Trew: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, my question I guess I have to direct to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade: when will this paper project get ahead and finally occur?

The members opposite, the government, seems determined to have nothing but paper projects. I have here a statement that the studies must begin right away because of the decision on whether to proceed with the plant must be made by the end of May. And then, later on we have all of a sudden, May becomes October. My question is: is this project destined to always be a paper project as most of the other projects that the government has proposed, or will it, in fact, ever get past the study stage?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I make two comments. When you refer to paper projects — we're also doing paper projects in the city of Prince Albert. We're very proud of that paper project.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — And that paper project is going to be one of the best projects ever done in this province by

any government working in conjunction with the private sector.

The members opposite talk about paper projects. Members opposite talk about paper projects and upgraders. They had one in Lloydminster; they had one in Archydal. Remember that? You guys didn't want to deal with the Co-op; you wanted to deal with Gulf and Imperial Oil and some of those. That, Mr. Speaker, is what I call paper oil projects. The ones that we do are real projects, and at one point in the future of this province we're going to have a fertilizer plant, and we're going to have chemical plants because that's what the people want, and that's the type of diversification this province needs, and that's what they voted for on October 20th.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Implementation of Announced Projects

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A new question to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. Mr. Minister, it has become very clear that many of the announcements which have been made by the Premier and ministers of this government have been announcements which were not based on any facts whatsoever, like the hiring of staff at Narde Industries for several weeks so that the Premier could have an official opening, and then laying them off several days later; like the paper-mill, Mr. Minister, which appears not now going to be built according to the agreement which your colleague and your seat mate tabled the other day; and like the Husky oil upgrader which seems to have disappeared from the horizon in recent months.

Now, Mr. Minister, in light of that, and in light of the collapse of the Regina project which my colleague, the member from Riversdale asked about a few moments ago, another question I think needs to be asked and that is, Mr. Minister: how many more of the projects which you and your colleagues and the Premier announced are going to projects which are going to be nothing more than press release projects?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the member from Regina North East indicates to the House — I think it's wishful thinking on his part — that the paper project in Prince Albert is not going forward. I simply have this advice for the member from Regina North East: just hold your breath, my friend. That project is going forward, and that is going to be a good project.

Mr. Speaker, we believe importantly that major projects, that diversification of our economy, is the way that we must go. We have a project in Prince Albert going forward. We have two projects in North Battleford going forward. We have a plant in Saskatoon — which the hon. member from Riversdale might be interested in — where some Japanese are coming in to manufacture turbines for a new power project. That is going forward. We are building in this province, Mr. Speaker. We will continue to build in this province. If members opposite want to show doom and gloom then nothing will work. I can assure the members opposite these projects are going

forward and they're going to be for the betterment of this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Feasibility Study of Toll Highways

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, thank you. My question is to the Minister of Highways and it deals with the disclosure that your government has studied the feasibility of charging tolls on some Saskatchewan highways as a new source of provincial revenue. And I believe that the minister has already denied that this feasibility study was done by his officials, and I'm wondering if the minister will now give this Assembly his guarantee that no one in the Department of Highways was involved in this study whatsoever, and can he now tell us who actually authorized and paid for this report?

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had this matter brought to my attention just the other day by an investigative journalist, and he handed me a single piece of paper, page 42, from some project — some study that was done, and for the life of me I do not know who did the study. I did check with the senior departmental officials in the Department of Highways. We had a meeting just the other day. There was 35 of the top people in our department and I queried every one of them on it, and they totally had had no knowledge whatsoever of any study being done by the Department of Highways with respect to toll roads or toll bridges whatsoever, so I don't know.

We have an awful lot of documents that come before this government; we have an awful lot of people who do studies and different things, but I have to say, to the best of my knowledge, to the best of the knowledge of all the people in my department, this study was not done by the Department of Highways.

Mr. Anguish: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: — Would you believe it if we said we put a troll under the bridge?

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, one of the members opposite asked about the troll under the bridge. There have been several trolls under the bridge in the past four and a half years in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, the supplementary to the Minister of Highways. He's quoted in a news article that he knows nothing about this, but he also says that it would be only under very special circumstances. So it seems to me the minister has given some consideration at least to charging tolls on Saskatchewan's highway systems — to our motorists and the carriers that use that system.

Mr. Speaker, what we want to know is under what special circumstances, under what special conditions, would your government or your department, Mr. Minister, consider charging tolls to the people of Saskatchewan to use our road system?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Mr. Speaker, the whole subject of toll roads and toll bridges, I think, has perhaps come to the forefront in recent months, primarily because of wonderful, masterful piece of engineering out in the province of British Columbia, and that is called the Coquihalla Highways, I believe.

I have not had the pleasure of viewing the highway, but a lot of the people from Saskatchewan who attended Expo this summer did have the pleasure of going and viewing that, what I would term a magnificent piece of engineering.

I, Mr. Speaker, would say that that would be a very, very special purpose, a consideration, and I would ask the member, if he can come up with something that would be similar to the Coquihalla in nature, in the geography, in the topography of this province, well we may just consider it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that, as in the British Columbia situation, Mr. Minister, you'd be interested in charging people an \$8 toll to go across a section of Saskatchewan's highways. And maybe it's because in the Weyerhaeuser report that you're going to have to spend about 9 per cent of your Highway's budget to pay for roads for Weyerhaeuser corporation to reap Saskatchewan's resources out of the province. And what we want to know from you, Mr. Minister, is if you give us your assurance that you will never put in highway toll systems in the province of Saskatchewan. Will you give us your assurance on that?

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Mr. Speaker, I only became aware of this so-called study, and I'm not even sure that it was done by anybody within government, just a few days ago. I have not had enough time to really seriously consider this particular subject. I and my colleagues have spent a considerable amount of time in the last few weeks, and number of months prior to this, in looking at the overall future of our province; looking at the diversification of our economy; looking at the protection of individuals; looking at how we can provide jobs and opportunities for all those residents in this great province of ours.

I have not given this particular subject hardly a fleeting thought, so it would be very difficult . . . very difficult for me to make a . . . it would be extremely difficult for me to stand here today and give you my assurance, for as long as infinity is, that there will never be toll roads or toll bridges or anything else. I am frankly very, very surprised that given the special circumstances that we are under in this province of ours, that the NDP, all they can find to debate about, the most topical issue of debate, is some study that was done by some person, some place, and we have not given it consideration whatsoever.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Canada's Patent Drug Legislation

Ms. Atkinson: — My question is to the Minister of Health

and it has to do with the remarkable announcement a few days ago by the Premier of Saskatchewan that your government fully supports Ottawa's plans to amend patent legislation, amendments that will drive up the cost of prescription drugs for Saskatchewan people. The Premier says higher drug costs for consumers will be offset by new drug company investment in our province. For the Premier to say that means that he must be aware of the cost to consumers. Can the minister table, later today, all cost impact studies completed by his department or the federal government on how much the Patent Act changes will cost Saskatchewan people?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, the Premier's answer to the question . . . to a similar question earlier in this session was that yes, we do support the idea of more research and development in Canada. We do support the idea of more of that type of work being done in this country, and not only in this country, but for the potential for that kind of work to be done in our province as we attempt to diversify the economy here. And this type of very technical research, and so on, is just the kind of thing that we would like to see happen in our province.

So I want to emphasize one thing for the member opposite, is that the prices of drugs which are now in existence — the prices of drugs which are now in existence — the prices of drugs which are now in existence — are not going to rise, will not rise. And in the future, how can anyone determine just what the prices of drugs will be in the future? How can you determine what the prices will be?

What I have done in recent days for the member's edification and for all the members of the House, I've written a letter to minister of Consumer Affairs in Ottawa, with a copy to his colleague, the Minister of Health, and I have asked him to do three things as it relates to this, and I notice that some of those things are in place now.

The letter stresses the three main areas: the workings of the drug prices review board that is proposed. In controlling potential drug cost increases I want to be sure that those workings are . . . that the way in which that drug prices review board will work is in place and that it can be effective. And we know the history of price review boards in the past in this country, and we're not sure of just how well they can work. So that is one concern that I have expressed.

The allotment to this province and on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan, so the allotment to our province of the research and development initiatives, we are very concerned about that, and we are very, very . . . You can be sure, Mr. Speaker, and all members can be sure, that we will be fighting for every bit of that research and development to go on in our province that is possible to go on here.

And also the distribution of the \$100 million compensation funding arrangements going to the prices of future drugs, we have asked to have a very careful look at the distribution of the \$100 million compensation fund which is proposed.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have said we are concerned about these things on one side but, on the other hand, we are very much in support of the diversification of the economy of Canada, and certainly of our province in terms of research and development being done here in this country.

Ms. Atkinson: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. How can the minister opposite say that drugs will not increase in price when he refers to the \$100 million that the federal government is going to contribute to the provinces across the land in the next four years? How can you say that drugs will not increase in price and in the same breath talk about the \$100 million.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well I said very clearly, Mr. Speaker, that the cost of drugs which are now in existence, present day drugs, will not rise. I did not say that the cost of drugs which are to be developed in the future will not rise. I did not say that.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order. Hon. member know that when the Speaker is on his feet there should be no talking in the House.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS (Not Debatable)

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I would move that items numbers 1 through 158, inclusive, be converted to Motions for Returns (Debatable).

Mr. Speaker: — Converted to debatable.

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the address in reply which was moved by Mr. Martineau and the amendment thereto moved by the Hon. Mr. Blakeney.

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, yesterday I left off on the issue of housing. Today I would give a little bit of a clarification in regards to the language of presentation yesterday.

When I talked in Cree, I mentioned that I would be presenting the translation in English. So the presentation that I am making right now is the translation of yesterday's talk in Cree.

I guess in regards to housing, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned the tough time that people had in the North in regards to housing. As I come down to Regina, the situation is much the same. I only have to read the papers and the *Leader-Post* this past week in regards to housing in the city of Regina. In the paper there was an issue related to Gabriel Housing. Again, Mr. Speaker, here is an example of a situation where a Métis housing group who is trying hard to make good business decisions in the city of Regina can be put down in many different ways here in Regina.

People are trying hard to make a living, given the restrictions on limitations of the amount of dollars that we do have. When they use these dollars to the best of their ability, Mr. Speaker, they are put down. And when I saw a letter written by a business person in this city, it stated that it was only sound business management by Gabriel Housing, and that the type of restrictions that they are given is the same type of restrictions that I mentioned yesterday.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, today to start off on the possibilities of potential in this province, and I will raise the issue of tourism that has been talked about. As I attended the meeting last night over at the Saskatchewan Council of Cultural Organizations, some of the people that I talked to in there asked me about the potential in regards to the hospitality institute, and also the tourist dollars that are supposed to be released through this government. When they asked me in relation to the North, I had to say: nothing is specifically directed to the North. So when we talked a little more, we knew that there was basically three areas of tourism in this province: the North, the rural areas, and the urban areas. We are afraid by the lack of mention on northern development that, again, nothing will go to the North, and further questions will be raised in that regard.

Might I add that one of the key concepts in regards to sound business practice in the area of tourism is the inclusion of culture and social development along with that. When people come here from different places or when people from southern Saskatchewan visit the North, they want to know about the cultural traditions of the people as well. They want to know the knowledge the people have about the ways of life in northern Saskatchewan, and they want to be able to combine business with sound knowledge of the cultural background of the people as well. And I do not see any proposal here, but I hope that part of the dollars that are going to be generated through the provincial coffers will be provided for aboriginal economic development institutions.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — As I look at the issue of drugs and alcohol and the tremendous damage that it does to a lot of people . . . I looked at the policy of this government and I am, again, very amazed that in the North we continue to subsidize liquor. And it continues. But this government has taken the subsidy away in regards to food on the table for the women, children, and the older people of northern Saskatchewan. They would rather subsidize liquor, but not food on the table for the people.

In regards to another issue, Mr. Speaker. A lot of people in Cumberland House, Southend, and Sandy Bay have for many years raised the issue of compensation in regards to hydroelectric power development. Not only have they raised the issue of compensation, but also their experiences in regards to their input in the development of hydro. Before I would get into the compensation question, I would like to relate to the people in this Chamber some of the words of a person who had worked in the hydro development projects for over 40 years in regards to the relationships that we talk about amongst

people.

So I would like to read the words of the late Moise Bear of Sandy Bay in regards to the input in the area of work. This is what the late Moise Bear had to say in regards to the input on work, and this was in the early 1930s onward.

When we began working with the Euro-Canadian, some did not like the idea of working alongside us. They felt that we were ignorant about work and that we weren't good workers.

It's not that we were lazy, we were rather inexperienced on particular jobs. All the aboriginal workers that I worked with were extremely hard workers. The work was tough and strenuous; there was no room for people that were lazy.

I didn't let the expressed displeasure and disapproval of the Euro-Canadian bother me too much. I knew within myself that I was working hard and that is what I kept in mind. The Euro-Canadians, themselves, were also very hard workers.

Once I knew what was required of me on the job, I didn't like the idea of having someone tell me what to do. By then I knew what was expected of me and I also knew that I was a good worker. The Euro-Canadian isn't the only one who is a good worker. That's all.

And what the person was basically saying is that the people from the North and the indigenous people in the North have been builders in regards to the development of this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — One of the things that a lot of people told me in Sandy Bay is that although they were builders of this province, they were not able to benefit from the development of this province. For example, it took 30 years for the people of Sandy Bay to finally get hydro development inside their community from the Island Falls dam which was only two miles away. It took them 30 years before they finally got power, and they were the ones who built the dam.

When I mentioned the fact of compensation, there was a lot of feeling about compensation and the fact that nothing had still come out. So I would like to read a bit on what Angus Bear has to say in regards to the issue of the compensation question and what he feels about the government in that regard. Angus Bear states:

Maybe the government is afraid to pay because he is penny pinching. With all the money he makes in one year, the power house has paid itself a long time ago. I know this because it cost him 6 to 7 million. Today if he builds another damn, it will cost him over 100 million dollars.

He states that the government has a very good memory when it comes to providing benefits and profits for big

corporations, but when it came down to the people whose equipment was drowned in the water, the government seemed to forget. They did not seem to remember.

His own feeling overall in regards to the compensation issue is this, Mr. Speaker, and he can quote it, and it stuck with me. He said:

In my own thoughts, I have often wondered when the damaging effects of the damn would cease, if nothing was done. We have not been able to make a decent living since the devastation. A sturgeon was made extinct and the fishing never really regenerated at all. Trapping was also never really restored at previous levels. The damaging effects still confront us on a yearly basis. Nobody could be pleased with this. If only we could rectify it, but I just don't know.

And even in his last statement in regards to "I just don't know", the person has not given up hope. He still feels that something can be done, and I'm hoping that this government will be able to do something in regards to the compensation issue of the communities of northern Saskatchewan.

There are many other specific issues I would like to raise in regards to northern Saskatchewan. I would list, therefore — just make a summary statement and say that the economic development goals of the North have to be combined with social and cultural development, and that is what a lot of people have mentioned to me as I travelled along.

So combining social and cultural development with economic development is the way to go in the future.

In a summary statement in regards to the North, Mr. Speaker, I would like this to say. A lot of members across will talk about optimism, will talk about protection, will talk about freedom. But when I look at the record, Mr. Speaker, I see these being practised only in regards to the big corporations. When it comes down to the protection of freedom of the people in northern Saskatchewan, what they get in return other than this is more restrictions and more regulations on their lives.

Whether it's workers or small-business people or aboriginal or non-aboriginal people in northern Saskatchewan, the same is true. What people are saying in the North is very clearly this:

We want to be involved from the initial to the final stages of development. We want to be involved in the processes of change. We want to be involved because it is our children, it is our families, it is our communities that have to pay for the development costs of the government.

And this is the basic point that people are saying, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, as I arrived at the legislature I

found it a little bit ironic, I guess, when I walked into my office, and being a Cree-Métis, I was at my phone and I looked up the numbers on my phone and it said, 787-1885.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1445)

Mr. Goulet: — I certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, that what happened in 1885 does not take place again in 1986 and '87.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — The other thing, Mr. Speaker, as a critic for Indian and Métis issues, I would like to switch my talk now to the Indian and Métis issues.

So first I would like to relate back to the throne speech. As I read the throne speech, it said that the province's aboriginal people will be encouraged to become involved in main-line economic developments in business, manufacturing, and processing through an enhanced Indian economic development program.

My reaction to this statement, Mr. Speaker, is this. I first of all am a little bit worried about the word "enhanced." I look at the record of this government, Mr. Speaker, and in 1984-85 they spent 3.2 million on Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat for grants. Then I looked at 1986 and '87, where they were talking again about enhancement, and I noticed it was 1.2 million. It had dropped by 2 million.

When there are hundreds of millions of dollars talked about for the rest of the province, Mr. Speaker, and we are talking about enhancing \$1 million, I find that a little bit strange.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — It strikes me that they might have to start looking at developing new definitions for enhancement.

When I looked up another word that was used in this statement, Mr. Speaker, it said main line. And the word main line, or main lining, has a lot of connotations. Some may feel that we are questioning the reality of the situation, but when I looked up main lining, Mr. Speaker, in historical terms, I wonder if the same thing happened with the North four years ago. They wanted to mainstream us to the province; they wanted to mainstream us to main line departments down south.

The record shows in the mainstreaming process, in the main lining process, of the North four years ago, is that we have less jobs for the people of the North. We have less contracts for the people of the North.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the government has thought that they did such a good job to the North that they now want to do it to aboriginal people in this province. And that is what I am scared of, Mr. Speaker, when I see the word main line, because what it really states is this: that we will only support economic development that we consider as

defined under main line. The innovative ideas of aboriginal people in regards to economic development will be on the wayside.

The other thing that I read in regards to that same statement is this: it says, encourage. I see this same word in Weyerhaeuser, which I will talk about at a later date. But the same word is utilized — encourage. Well, Mr. Speaker, a lot of people do not need . . . aboriginal people do not need encouragement. They want finance capital like anybody else.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — And they also, Mr. Speaker, want to be able to work with this government in being able to carry out their plans. The central message that I hear from aboriginal people is this: we have made business plans which are new, in effect very effective and innovative, and we feel that they will contribute to the economic development of this province.

I guess, Mr. Speaker, the throne speech itself mentioned economic development on a very small scale. Some aboriginal people may feel that it is a ploy on the government's part to concentrate less on a most important issue of aboriginal people, which is aboriginal rights.

The throne speech does not mention anything about aboriginal rights although, Mr. Speaker, 1987 is the fifth year since the introduction of the aboriginal rights statements in the constitution of Canada for Indian, Métis, and Inuit; 1987 will be a very important year. It will set the stage as to how the governments, the Government of Canada and the provinces, are going to be able to deal with the aboriginal rights questions.

And it is very important, Mr. Speaker, for this government to be able to change from what they have shown last year and the year before in regards to the constitutional talks. In a straightforward summation of that experience, the Government of Saskatchewan when it come down to the constitutional talks last year, there was five provinces that were ready to go ahead with taking the second step in the process. There was two provinces — one was wavering — on the east side of Canada. There was one province that was key in making the second step go ahead. That was the province of Saskatchewan. The province of Saskatchewan played a key role in stopping the aboriginal process in taking an important second step last year.

And this, Mr. Speaker, is significant because Saskatchewan has the largest aboriginal population in the whole province. One-tenth, at least one-tenth of the province, Mr. Speaker are aboriginal people in this province. Yet we can stand and talk about individual rights and protection, yet we cannot even honour the treaty rights and the obligations and the land claims of aboriginal people in this province. We can only make promises and continue on a snail's pace in regards to aboriginal development.

When I look back as to what was the excuse in regards to why the province said no to aboriginal rights, they said it

was a matter of definition. They could not find a definition, they said. Then I looked around and I thought, well that's the first time I heard of that excuse. And as I checked around some more, and I come here in the legislature, you know for the first time on day two . . . the processes of negotiation on aboriginal people have taken over 100 years and so on, and are reaffirming those things.

And when I looked at the Weyerhaeuser agreement, Mr. Speaker, it's taken only a couple of years to come out with over 300 definitions. It's only taken two years to come out with over 300 definitions. When we deal with aboriginal people, we can't come out with even a general definition. And I find that hard to believe.

Mr. Speaker, in regards to the aboriginal rights issues, one band has proceeded with litigation . . . with the litigation process. But they don't really want to go through a costly litigation process. They want this government to deal with them fairly and justly. They want to see the settlement of the land entitlement and land claims issue as a central priority in the government's practice. I guess what aboriginal people are saying is this: we do not want people to feel sorry for us, we want people to deal with us fairly and justly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1500)

Mr. Goulet: — As an overall summation, Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that I hope that we give a different meaning to the words of openness, optimism, and protection. I hope that the meanings to these words are not only in direct practice with the big corporations of this province. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that these words will have meaning to the people of northern Saskatchewan and to aboriginal people in the province of Saskatchewan.

I would like also to add, Mr. Speaker, that we must combine openness, optimism, protection with constructive criticism and action. As I look to the future, we have a chance in the province of Saskatchewan to develop a system that has great compassion and respect for all nations and nationalities, including aboriginal people in this province.

We also have to give new meaning to the word "individual" and to sincerely state that it means all individuals in this province, and also individuals and especially the individuals in the North. The sign of a compassionate society is one that deals fairly with the people who are in the greatest need in that society. And we want to make sure that Saskatchewan takes a leadership role in that direction, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the government to take action on the issues I have presented. I look forward to the debates, questions, and the consensual processes of this 21st Legislature. Mr. Speaker, I am proud and honoured to represent the issues of aboriginal people and the people of Cumberland constituency. I stand to support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with other members of the Assembly in extending my congratulations to you on your appointment to the Chair of Mr. Speaker. And I look forward — I think as all members of the Assembly look forward — to dealing with you in a very forthright and forward-looking manner in the next four or five years.

If I can make the following observation is that the decorum in the House so far in this session, I think, is substantially improved from what I have experienced over the last eight years of which I have been a member in this Assembly. I think that's positive, and I hope that we continue making decorum in the House important to all of us. I look forward to you showing some leadership in that regard. The one thing that I have heard over the last four years, I think, is that very often when people come to the Assembly, and this is not to be critical of one side of the House or the other, when they come to the Assembly often they see members delivering or carrying on in a way that they, and perhaps they will admit in their naïve way, they did not expect to hear the robustness that we know has been a tradition in this House for very, very many years — they have a hard time believing that.

I think society also wants members to work together more than perhaps they do. They sometimes challenge maybe the adversarial role of politics that one side is always on one side of the fence, and the other side on the other side of the fence, and why can't sometimes the two cross over in particular areas and be able to collectively deal with things. And I think that is an issue that people are saying of all politicians, and I simply say I think that's something that we, as politicians, should perhaps give the people a little bit more credit and deal with . . . again not being critical to one side or the other.

I would also like to welcome the new members of the Assembly from both sides of the House. I think, as many members before me have indicated, that the ability, the honour of being able to take a seat in this Assembly is indeed an honour, and a honour that is bestowed on very few people in our society over a long period of time. We have seen over the last couple, three elections that the turnover of members in this House is, in fact, fairly high, and I think that is a case, not only here, but a case throughout much of our country where you see a fairly large turnover of members after each general election.

My advice of having been here for two terms is as follows: that if you want to make your mark here — nobody will make but a small mark when you look at it from a historical point of view — watch other people and learn some of their techniques, but always get your own technique, don't try to copy one or another. But do what you feel comfortable with and learn the process, and I say that as advice to both members on my side and members on the other side of the House. And listen to your riding; that sometimes can become a very difficult thing to do for all of us, and advice that's well taken by many.

I'd also like to acknowledge the support of the people of Kindersley to me in this election. We had a good vote from the people in Kindersley, even though the bulk of

that riding is either involved in the farming industry or in the oil patch, both of which are on fairly hard times and both, when they are on hard times, tend to get irate or irritated with the government. They did stick with me, and they did stick with the Premier, and for that I'm very grateful.

I would like to also extend my congratulations to the Premier. And I say that I think he ran a good campaign. I think the difficult nature of our economy made it a very difficult campaign to run.

I also would like to indicate that I've had the opportunity to attend with the Premier at many federal-provincial conferences, and I think a trend line is starting to develop at those particular conferences where you see two of the younger premiers of this country starting to get more and more to the forefront in federal-provincial relations and in leadership roles in our country. And those two people are the Premier of Ontario, David Peterson, and our Premier here.

And I think one of the reasons for that is they're not contented simply to go to a conference and rattle off the doctrine of their particular party, whether it's left, right, or centre, but are prepared to look at new ideas; to look at changes, how we might do things differently; to face up to some of the realities that we face, whether it's the native people or the farmers of our country or the business community or questions of international trade; to deal with questions of substance. Not to go there and spout the political line, or not to go there with their hand out, saying: give me more money; if only I had more money. And that's very often the case of many provinces at those conferences.

So I think from that point of view we are certainly, on this side of the House, very encouraged by the leadership of our Premier, both in the province and at the national stage. What makes us even more encouraged, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that our Premier is but 42 years of age, and he's just beginning. And so we look very forward to the leadership role that he will be playing over the period of time.

If I could, I'd like to speak just briefly on some of the areas that I have been asked to be responsible for in our government, and I will deal with them in a very brief way, not in a great deal of detail.

The throne speech, the primary focus of that throne speech was that we must diversify our economy, and how do we diversify our economy, and where we seek to diversify our economy; to go back and ask that question of ourselves: why do we need to diversify our economy? Over the years — that question is not new to our province — basically what we said is, well, in past years when farm prices were good and resource prices were good, we still must diversify our economy because that's the way you grow.

I think today when we say we must diversify our economy, we look at it for far different reasons. And we look at it for reasons that if we're not prepared to face up to the fact that the world is diversifying and we don't attempt to diversify, we're going to be left behind.

Now let me go back and try to deal with that in this way. Saskatchewan relies on the ability to trade our product, more than does any province in this country. And Canada requires international trade for its wealth, perhaps more than any nation in the world. We, in Saskatchewan, trade roughly half of what we trade in the world to the Americans, and the other half to the rest of the world. By and large the biggest part of our exports is related to our biggest industry, and that is agriculture. And the problem we face in agriculture today is really a trade question. And what that trade question is as follows: for a long time we felt that we could comfortably sit there because of our comparative advantage producing our grains, producing our cattle, and find a market for the world because we were more effective than were others. And that was true.

But what has happened in the short term, and developing over perhaps the last half decade, has been two fundamental things: one, and the one that we hear about so much, is the trade war between the United States and the EEC (European Economic Community). And that's real. That's damaging us as a province and as a country and certainly to the person out on the farms. It's damaging him a great deal. And one would hope that perhaps that trade war will pass through the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) negotiation. One would hope that would be sooner rather than later.

But that is not the only problem that is faced with agriculture on the trade front today. Because, while it is front and centre in the news, there is another fundamental thing happening, and that is a lot of the traditional markets of the world are also becoming smaller and more difficult for us to access. And you ask yourself why and what they are.

The great market we used to have was the People's Republic of China or India or much of south-east Asia. Now, that market is leaving us, for a reason. That is that those people today are not buying as much or any grain from us because they are producing much more of their own. They are producing much more of their own because (a) there has been a transfer of knowledge or a transfer of technology, and that's good. That's what we have been able to give to much of the world so they could feed their hungry people.

But another important thing that has happened is they have been able to apply research and knowledge to their industry. And what you see today in India, in post-Mao china, and much of south-east Asia is a country that can now produce virtually enough food to feed their own people and have some left over to export to the rest of the world.

(1515)

So we are not only competing against the Americans and the Europeans, but we are also competing against the very people that we used to have as customers, and so the market becomes finer and finer and finer to deliver.

Some have said, and we all read in the papers, that the great problem that faces agriculture and trade is subsidies. That is true for a goodly part of it. But equally as

much has been created by the growth of science and, of course, no society can stop the growth of science.

In India alone they have been able to produce and save more food by a simple process that they are able to put their grain in bins as opposing to leaving it outside. Twenty years ago in India the rats ate more of the food that they produced than did human beings. Today that is not the case.

And that's the reality of the trade dimensions that agriculture faces today and the diversification that is needed in order for them to address those type of questions. These type of problems will not easily go away. These type of problems will not easily be solved by a government program or a government hand-out. The reality that the farmer is facing more and more today is the reality that the economics of the world economy is far more dominant on us than is the macro-economics of the provincial economy or the nation's state. The international economy is having a big bearing on the way agriculture deals.

That is also having a bearing on our second largest source of our economy and that is the whole area of resource production. Obviously if you go to potash, potash is used, primarily, half in the United States and half in the rest of the world, of our market. Again that is tied very, very closely to agriculture. Of course as agriculture prices go down, so does the price of potash go down. So the problem that the potash producer faces is really no different than the problem that the farmer faces today and that commodity price again going down and down. Again, the solutions to that must come under the GATT type of system if we are going to get a grip and to solve that particular problem.

In the field of oil production, which is again a resource that can be a floating up and down, oil is under similar pressures to all other commodities but perhaps for different reasons, and I think will probably come back sooner. The reality in this country is we're running out of light oil. If we're going to be self-sufficient in oil as a national, which is a fundamental question that this nation must address and deal with, then we must develop our other sources than light conventional crude. And that means, do we develop in the Beaufort, do we develop in Hibernia, do we develop in the tar sands, or do we develop our heavy oil? And those decisions clearly have to be economic in nature in the sense that which is the best chance, which has the best economics. And the best economics of those four is heavy oil. And heavy oil, clearly, as a nation and as a province, is the way that we must proceed.

The other thing then is this, is that for the first time in a very, very long period of time we have the commodities of all the major resources — agriculture, oil, potash, uranium, and timber — moving downward at the same time. That's true here; it's true throughout the rest of the world. And it's a fact, and it's what's happened.

Today the only solid industry in this country is manufacturing and that, for the most part, is being done in central Canada where their economies are very robust and very strong, driven primarily by the automobile industry. So we sit and ask ourselves, as a province, how

do we diversify? Because, surely, I think, we must come to the conclusion that we have no other option but to try to diversify and to build other industries and other economies.

We start as our premise with the view that you must build upon your strengths. We are not going to manufacture television sets or build automobiles or manufacture and process textiles — that type of thing — in the province of Saskatchewan. We've flirted with it over the years. The reality is the economies don't work here.

What we must do is two things, it seems to me. One is to try to further refine upon the natural resources that we do. One is take heavy oil which we are now captive for the most part to the U.S. market. We export, and have exported for the last 15 years in this province, almost 70 per cent of our oil to the United States. And the main reason is because only the United States can process our heavy oil or medium oils that we produce in this province. So without upgrading capacity in our province, or certainly in eastern refineries, we will not be able to (a) develop the oil fields that exist in our province, or the potential for the oil fields that exist in our province.

If you look at the whole area of the forest industry, what we found was that the soft wood lumber clearly is under tremendous pressure and likely will be under some fairly heavy pressure for some period of time. With the project put together where we now can manufacture not only pulp but paper, and paper that the world wants, we have a potential to further refine upon the wood products that we produce. And we must move in those directions. So you can do some of those.

It's difficult to do a lot more processing with potash, although we are exploring some areas that we might deal with there.

You can do some manufacturing, and we've tried to do some of that — much of it because of perhaps the ability to source Saskatchewan, whether it's the Marubeni plant in Saskatoon that will manufacture or at least assemble much of the turbines that will be used in the new Shand power project or, because a family in North Battleford has a 50 to 60 per cent market share of the western Canadian recreation vehicles market, they can look at developing a recreation vehicle market in the city of North Battleford. But only for that reason, and that's a very isolated type of situation.

We can further develop in agriculture by, instead of growing wheat, to diversify our crops, but more importantly, to be able to convert into a stronger red meat industry, which certainly the Minister of Agriculture is doing, and the minister of Agriculture before him put a lot of effort into.

Each of those diversifies your economy. Each of those creates more jobs. Each of those takes you further down the road. The other industries you're left with then, and which most of the world is left with, is two types of industries.

One, our industries that require a fair degree of materials,

and the other that requires a fair degree of knowledge. The material-driven industries, whether it's automobiles or television sets or that type of thing, are experiencing the following problem: the amount of resources going into those factories is becoming less and less and less.

Those industries are having a difficult time to grow and to expand. And if you look at the industries that are expanding throughout much of the western world today, they are what are called the service industry or the knowledge industries. And those are the industries, whether it's pharmaceuticals, whether it's telecommunications, whether it's a variety of things, the computer world. Those are the areas that are growing, and those are the areas that I believe our province has a chance to cut an etch, not to control the market like we perhaps could with 50 per cent of the potash or 50 per cent of uranium, but could cut an etch in being able to do some things, whether it's in health care, whether it's in telecommunications, whatever it might be in. And that's where we must, I think, put some thought into how we proceed in the future down that road.

Those are difficult questions as to how we explore, how we move to develop our economy, to diversify our economy, and nobody has a monopoly on knowledge in this particular field. But I think some of the fundamental rules could be agreed upon. Now, we will commit what we can as a province to try to deal with some fundamental questions facing us in being able to preserve the export markets we have today.

As I indicated, 50 per cent of our product that we produce and export from this province goes to the United States. And we must explore with the Americans how we might be able to better provide a working arrangement by which we can ensure that we don't, on a monthly basis or a yearly basis, have the Americans moved by politics to provide a countervail, whether it's against our hogs, or a countervail, whether it's against our softwood lumber, or against next our potash, or maybe our uranium. But we must move in that direction and that's going to be difficult. But it's not something that we should walk away from.

The next dimension is that we must play our part as the key agriculture province in this country; play our part, both in providing the information and being part of the negotiations, to try to bring some order into a world that has lost its order in the area of the GATT round. Unless GATT can come to grips with agriculture, you're going to find the following happening, and I refer this to the member from Cumberland.

There are three types of producers of raw materials or food products in the world. There is the countries that have a large other industrial structure behind them, that's primarily the Americans and the Europeans. And they can be in a trade war for some time, and it's small change for the size of their economy to deal with that. Whether it's \$25 billion, it's still small change.

You then have a second layer of countries that are the Canadians, the Australians, the New Zealanders, and those people. They cannot compete with that kind of budget and they're going to have trouble with that. The third

group is the LDCs (lesser developed countries) or some of the Third World countries who rely on agriculture as their main source of income — Argentina, Philippines, Brazil, many of these countries — who, with their foreign debt and with their agriculture crisis that they face, are notable in the near future to be able to pay the debt that they owe to many of the banks of the world. And you could see a financial crisis coming upon us, driven by agriculture.

So the stakes in this one are very, very high, and it's something I believe that this Assembly should, for the most part, be able to come to agreement on in a general way.

Let me briefly, Mr. Speaker, deal with the other field that I am responsible for, and that's the field of justice. And while I suppose there's many areas that one can deal with here, it strikes me that there's two main areas that I think deserve attention, and areas that I believe we should work towards.

One is the sense that the legal system for the most part has and is seen by the people as something aloof from them or not accessible to them. There's a growing view that the only people that really have access to the legal process are the wealthy or the poor who are subsidized or supported by a legal aid or a legal support system. There's a grand group of people in the middle, that we so call the middle class, who quite frankly find certainly the civil court is not accessible to them any more because of the cost and this type of thing.

And I think you're starting to see some processes, whether it's here or whether it's across the country, dealing with the whole concept of more arbitration, more mediation, where people have access.

I have farmers in my area who have a complaint, let's say, against a chemical company, or something like that. They have a water rights question, and they find that they have to go to a lawyer; they have to dole out the money, and it takes two and three and four years for them to ultimately get a resolve of their dispute, and they find themselves frustrated by a court system. I think we must try to come to recognitions with that and try to see what we can do in that particular area.

The other area of law seems to me that is growing, and it's something that we should all be very cognizant of, is the whole question of law and order. And that law and order again is not an easy quest. But if you go to your constituents and talk to them, as I do, you will find people becoming more and more concerned that the break-and-enters are happening to their house, that people are breaking into people's houses on a more and more and more basis. And how do we deal with that question?

(1530)

You also see the situation, whether it's in Quebec or whether it's in Alberta, where you start to see store owners taking up guns and also getting into the vigilante whole area. And that is a serious problem that is going to be faced, and I think it's a trend that we, as legislators, should be cognizant as of to how we come to deal with

that. And there's no simple answer. Some will say on the one hand that if you just give them all money it would be all okay; some on the other hand say well if you just brought out the noose and I'll kick the box out from underneath and we'll solve it all that way.

But the reality is that the world, Mr. Speaker, faces more and more complex questions. The world is going to need people prepared to deal with those complex questions, and I believe the constituents of all of us expect us to deal with those in a rational way. I believe the constituents of this province and the people of this province expect this Assembly to sit here and to debate in substantive ways those particular questions, not as I said before to shout at each other, not to simply plod out the party line from one side or the other, but to deal with them in a substantive and meaningful way. And I dare say that on many of those issues there's some common ground, and perhaps we should explore that common ground within this Assembly, just as we should explore that common ground across this country.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we live in a fine province and we live in a fine country. I believe that people of this country expect their politicians to deliver to them, whether they're government or whether they're opposition, to be co-operative, to be consultative, to do the changes that they know have to happen, but to move forward. That's the commitment that this government gives; that's the commitment our Premier gives. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I will support this throne speech. I think it is the most imaginative, forward-looking throne speech that this province has seen in many, many years. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a point of order that I would like to raise, not in connection with anything that the past speaker said, but it has to do with an answer that the hon. House Leader of the government side gave during question period. And I'll make my point of order very briefly thus: as I understand the rules, albeit I'm the first to acknowledge that I'm rusty on them now, that when a member refers to a document in the course of an answer, and the Hon. Minister of Health referred to a letter which he said he had caused to be forwarded to the federal Minister of Health, that it is then obligatory upon that member to table that letter. And I cite 327 (1) of *Beauchesne's* at page 115, and would therefore ask the Hon. Minister of Health to table a copy of that letter that he referred to in giving his answer.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could speak to the point of order. And the point of order I would just point out to the point of order as follows: Number one, that in the rules it is impossible to table a document during question period, and the member knows that. Number two, I think it has been a long-standing tradition, and you will find rulings in the past in this House, where points of order relative to question period are raised before orders of the day and dealt with at that time — not before orders of the day, but at the earliest opportunity following question period.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, if I could just clarify the point, I think I could clear it up.

An Hon. Member: — Okay. Clear it up if you can.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, the rule to which the opposition House Leader refers, I believe he said 327, page 115 of *Beauchesne's*. If I can quote that it says, Mr. Speaker:

A Minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read or quote from a dispatch or other state paper not before the House, unless he be prepared to lay it upon the Table.

I believe that's what the member was referring to.

In my answer as I recall it, Mr. Speaker, I alluded to the fact that I had sent a letter to the minister in Ottawa. I said I had sent a letter. I did not say I was quoting from that letter. I was referring to some of the points that I made in that letter, but I was not quoting from the direct letter, nor did I have that letter before me today, nor do I have it here.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. I think I've gotten a pretty good view of the issue, but I will have to defer any judgement on this matter until I have an opportunity to peruse the official records and I will have an answer for you hopefully by tomorrow.

Mr. Upshall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate this opportunity to address this Assembly today in response to the speech of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor. I welcome all members, and especially new members on both sides of the House. I'm sure we'll be over a rough and rocky road the next four or five years, head to head — a learning process, a building process, hopefully with the intention of creating a better Saskatchewan in the foremost.

I would like to thank the people of Humboldt constituency. I am very proud to be your representative. This constituency is a very widely diversified area. We have large farms, small farms, hogs, poultry, beef, of all sizes — very diversified. And I am very pleased that these people chose to raise their concern of this government by electing me, a New Democrat.

A constituency with honest, hard-working people, many with proud ethnic backgrounds, they have seen tough times, worked hard, overcome them, and they won't stop now. The age groups, of course, like every place else go from seniors who have vast experience; their children who carried on these values in small towns from their parents; their grandchildren, many of them now making a living in the area, and even their great great grandchildren.

We must combine the knowledge, the experience, the values, the frustrations, and the aspirations to build a better province.

We have many walks of life — family farms, small business, families, working people — all these people have a sense of small-town Saskatchewan. They pull together, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to get the job done. They

know their neighbours, they help their neighbours, they share and they care.

These people rely on agriculture, potash, small business and so on, and they believe in the survival of the family farm, survival of small towns. They want to be self-sufficient in their business. They want to be self-sufficient in their towns, Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to represent these people because I, too, believe in that — family farms and small-town Saskatchewan. I believe in a strong bond between rural and urban people, and I'm very glad to see the references in the throne speech to the rural-urban bond.

However, in the light of this government's past activities I must look at these words with some scepticism. It was very evident in the recent past that there has been a thrust by this government, a publicized thrust, to be the saviour of the agricultural community while, at the same time, creating situations whereby people are being put in a very, very bad way. I find this a bit hypocritical.

A good example of this is the disaster at PCS, Lanigan. The government, it appears, is trying to use this strike as some sort of an example—a precedent, if you wish — to follow for further negotiations with other government-operated facilities. The result is that the government has victimized these workers at Lanigan, these people of Saskatchewan who have elected a government to run their public affairs in the interest of the whole province. Now it's even gone further. The people in Lanigan, Humboldt, Guernsey, Watrous, Burr — the whole area around the Lanigan mine — are crying out, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This dispute has pitted families against each other, families against families, friends against friends. The businesses of the communities are feeling a drastic effect from the reduction of cash flow.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, page 2 of the throne speech says in part, and I quote:

My government intends to implement its programme in a spirit of co-operation and participation.

I send a plea to this government opposite to wipe the slate clean. Summon your courage, your compassion, your common sense. Show the true spirit of co-operation and participation by taking immediate action to end this bitter dispute in a fair manner.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to turn to some other concerns in my constituency, and I would like to commend the government for finally getting the hospital project in Watrous under way. It was a long time coming and I can assure you that the people of Watrous were very, very happy to see the equipment arrive on the hospital grounds the morning of October 20th. The problem is that the facility does not meet all the needs of the area in health care.

The throne speech refers to the change in requirements. It sounds good, but the reality is the lack of dollars. The lack of funds in health care has placed the hospital in Watrous,

that is not a complete facility, with a complete level 4 joining. It's not a facility that fits the needs of that area. It is not big enough.

The whole health care system I just want to touch on briefly. It's in bad shape; we know that. We have to go for hands-on nursing care. We've created a false economy in health care. The government opposite can sit, stand up and quote all the figures — fine. I and many other have had personal experiences in hospitals, and I'm not afraid to say that if it wasn't for the people, the families and friends of people in hospitals, the care would be much, much worse than it is. The hands-on care is not adequate.

The people are running off their feet. We must de-centralize to reduce waiting lists; utilize small hospitals; have a renewed sensitivity for staff, and emergency units in small town hospitals should not just be stabilization and transfer units. Level 4 facilities are needed right across the province because small hospitals are being denied acute care because of the number of level 4 patients in those hospitals.

Other things specific to the Humboldt constituency, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that I ask the government opposite, Mr. Premier especially, for increased funding for the Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute (PAMI) in Humboldt. This is a very necessary operation. It tests machines for farmers and gives results of tests so that farmers can identify better what machine they need for their operation.

I would also hope that the committed projects of this government, like the 40 heavy-care beds for Humboldt and the seniors housing plan for Bruno, go ahead in all possible quickness, and I will be closely monitoring this.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm very pleased to see that in the last election our support in rural Saskatchewan rose substantially. It is a clear indication that despite the government opposite's attempt to sweeten the farmers of Saskatchewan with short-term ad hoc programs, a significant number — a significant number — said they would prefer long-term stability and proven programs of our party like crop insurance, stabilization boards and staunch support for the Canadian Wheat Board.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1545)

Mr. Upshall: — The citizens of Humboldt constituency were asking me, when the Nielsen task force report came out, where was the Premier? He was silent. His silence on these issues leads me to believe that he concurred with the report, and this report recommends an overhauling of the Canadian Wheat Board, whatever that means; paying the Crow benefit to the producers rather than the railroads; branch line abandonment; variable rates; shifting the majority of crop insurance costs to producers and cancelling the cash advance program, and it goes on and on.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, by their silence this government concurs with this program that basically knocks down the majority of our long-term stability in agriculture. The

Premier's acceptance of this report clearly shows this government's direction — forget about long term; concentrate on short-term ad hoc programs — and the end result is disaster for family farms in small-town Saskatchewan. And in the interim the Premier hopes to find cheap political gain.

There is another side to this and many other responses from the Premier on any issue which originates from Big Brother in Ottawa. Whether it be concerning the Nielsen report, free trade, deficiency payments, deregulation or whatever, it is clear that the Premier is unwilling or unable or both to stand up for the best interests of the people of this province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like now to turn to some of these issues. Free trade has been burning for the last year, and if accepted it would completely devastate the agricultural industry in Saskatchewan. The acceptance of free trade with the U.S. would force Saskatchewan into greater trade dependency with the Americans.

Saskatchewan producers cannot afford all their eggs in one basket. We must promote global trade. Free trade would wipe out virtually all the long-term stability that we have worked so hard to establish and that we need so badly. The Canadian Wheat Board and all the marketing boards would be put in jeopardy, to conform with a lesser system — and I think we can agree on that, members opposite — the deregulated system of the Americans.

It is obvious, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we must maintain trade with our American counterparts. But we must not do it at the expense of the family farms of this province. An interesting footnote I'd like to add right now regarding free trade. The adviser for negotiations on specific agricultural commodities for the United States is one Daniel Amstats. Mr. Amstats is the past president of Cargill Grain, Chicago. The Canadian adviser is Mr. David Gilmour, who is on loan right now for one year, I believe, or two, from none other than Cargill Grain, Winnipeg, negotiating agriculture in the best interests of the family farms of Saskatchewan. I ask you to draw your own conclusions on that one. And where does the government stand on this? I'll quote a news release — November 1985:

"Free trade is good for all the farmers," Saskatchewan Agricultural Minister, Lorne Hepworth, told North Dakota farmers today.

Another one — Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* of August 21:

The question of free trade with the United States is expected to dominate the premiers' conference for the next two days, with retiring Premier Peter Lougheed leading the charge, and Grant Devine, one of his strongest supporters.

It goes on.

I have a couple more I'd like to read, just to drive my point home. Again from the *Star-Phoenix*, September 30, 1985:

Devine, who with Alberta Premier Peter Lougheed is one of Canada's staunchest proponents of free

trade with the U.S., said American leaders must be made to realize Canada is a vital trading partner.

And again, talking about free trade, and I quote:

Devine also warned that the investors will decide not to invest in Canada if they see the province does not have access to the American market.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reality is that investors will be cautious in Canada, and Saskatchewan in particular, due to a sinking credit rating, the result of poor government in Saskatchewan since 1982.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the subject of deficiency payments is foremost in the minds of agriculture producers, as it should be. For months now Saskatchewan farmers and farm organizations have been calling for a grain price deficiency payment to bring the price up to roughly \$6 a bushel, which is equivalent to what the Americans are getting.

Saskatchewan farmers have become frustrated and angry — frustrated and angry at the government's slow reaction. Our Premier started out by saying he was going for \$5 billion. I applauded him. Then it slipped to 2 billion. Now it appears \$415 million is Saskatchewan's share — 48 cents a bushel, I believe, the number the Premier quoted yesterday, for wheat.

And I did some quick calculations on a Saskatchewan cultivated acreage basis. That amounts to somewhat under \$10 a bushel — \$10 a bushel . . . an acre, sorry. When my input costs for one chemical is \$18 and roughly 57 cents an acre, when input costs for stubbling-in stubble crop is \$22, roughly, per acre — \$40 an acre in two input costs; not to mention machinery, fuel, loans, on and on, all the other input costs, and we're getting under \$10 a bushel . . . or an acre.

The Premier was unable or unwilling to represent the best interests of Saskatchewan farmers. The buddy system doesn't work.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, while \$415 million is certainly welcome by all, but it's not going to fix the problem. We need a much larger deficiency payment. We need long-term security. Just yesterday the Premier said it was for the 1986 production; 1986 production, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is basically harvested in September, October of this last year. The farmers of this province were expecting a deficiency payment for the 1985-86 crop year, which was last year. There is really, technically, no deficiency until you sell your product. The deficiency was made last year. We're getting paid — what? — \$50 million for what is called a deficiency for this year, and they're saying, forget about last year. That's old business. A one-shot payment.

What about next year? I would urge the members opposite to encourage their federal counterparts to trigger long-term deficiency payments so that the farmers of this

province know what they are going . . . what they look forward to in the next three or four years.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, according to the economic review of 1985, net income from farming operations went from \$1.5 billion down to about \$274 million. One and a half billion to 274 million. The value of farm capital has showed steady declines from 1982, while farming operation costs have increased. Outstanding farm debt has sky-rocketed.

Simply put, Mr. Speaker, this government has not done the job. As of November 30, 1986, the Farm Land Security Board has received 840 notices of lenders' intentions to foreclose. Four hundred ninety-seven cases are completed, and in 279 of those cases there was reports prepared for court.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, The Farm land Security Act must be extended to not only cover land, but also to cover machinery, livestock, and any other asset that is necessary to maintain the viability of that farm, and I'll tell you why. The board that is set up to monitor this makes a report recommending a viable or non-viable operation. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I maintain it's very hard to have a board report a viable operation when a week previous another institution, or maybe the same one, has moved in and taken the machinery or the livestock.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — Input costs are steadily rising, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the price of grain has dropped. Chemicals and fertilizers are two input costs that this government said it's going to reduce the price of by encouraging their manufacture in Saskatchewan.

One question that comes to mind, especially in light of what's happened today: are they now going to go into competition with the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and the co-op system? The second question is: how is the government going to encourage production?

In the past we've seen this government encourage the production of bacon, much to the happiness and delight of Mr. Pocklington, and much to the chagrin of the people of this province. I ask, Mr. Deputy Speaker: where is the logic? This government assumes that the price of producing chemicals in Saskatchewan would automatically reduce the cost. Yes, a minute saving should be incurred as a result of less transportation costs.

But I must refer to the style of this government. Did selling Coronach give us cheaper power? Did selling the road equipment and encouraging private sectors give us better roads? While encouraging production of pork, or production of bacon, did we get cheaper bacon, or will we? With encouraging Weyerhaeuser to build a paper-mill, will we get cheaper paper?

An Hon. Member: — No.

Mr. Upshall: — I suggest not, too. If this government thinks that by simply encouraging the production of chemicals in Saskatchewan the price will automatically drop, they are in fantasy land. If they really want to reduce

the price of chemicals, and reduce it on a long-term basis, they will stand up to Mulroney in Ottawa and demand generic labelling of chemicals.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — This would reduce the price of chemicals 20 to 30 per cent. I would like to now give you an example. Roundup, common herbicide used, raw materials cost about 90 cents per pound to produce. The herbicide sells in Canada for \$31 a pound per active ingredient.

Another fact, Roundup sells in Australia for roughly half the cost of Canadian, of Canada. Even though Australia is 9,000 miles, 9,000 miles further, it sells for half the price. That's supply and demand? They still make a tidy profit on that.

And here's the clincher, Mr. Speaker, Monsanto corporation, by its own records, the maker of Roundup, estimates that the cost of developing the herbicide was roughly \$40 million for research and development. That \$40 million, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is returned to Monsanto every 24 days. This government is afraid to touch it.

There is a further step. I can talk about patents in a general sense now. We have the patents on drugs, which this government is not standing up to. We're concurring with them that the multinational drug companies should be making these exorbitant profits, taking more money out of the pockets of the people. They have failed us. They have failed us on generic chemicals, and they will fail us, I predict, on the whole area of plant breeders' rights, which is probably the next thing on patents which will be coming up in the near year.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — Taking the breeding of plants from the public sector to the private sector is not what we need. Mr. Speaker, the family farms of this province are under extreme pressure. The social well-being of rural areas is being ignored, and where will we be now when the Social Services is stacked up with portfolios as long as your arm?

We must monitor the quality of life in rural Saskatchewan. And if you don't think so, just ask some rural doctors. I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the stress on the family farm is at an all-time high, and it is especially hard, I say, on the women. The women are not only the bookkeeper and the psychiatrists and the referees, but they also drive the tractors, drive their kids to school, and do a million other things that have to be done. Farm women must be given more recognition and respect by this government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1600)

Mr. Upshall: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I suggest the government can make good by starting immediately and offering help to the Third National Farm Women's

Conference to be held in Saskatchewan in November of 1987.

They need substantial financial support, but they also need moral support, moral support from this government. They need clerical staff, they need research staff, all extension staff. They need this because they know what they want, but it's hard without the co-operation from the government to make a conference like this work — a national conference in Saskatchewan.

I challenge this government to meet their needs in order . . . so that Saskatchewan may stand up proud and say it had the best farm women's conference to date.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — The last point I would like to make, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that of the venture capital program with respect to livestock production.

Under the program an investor buys a share in a venture capital corporation for \$10,500 and receives about half of that back in the first 13 months in tax credits. The investor is then obligated to feed at least ten animals per year for the first five years. The feedlot owner manages the cattle, supplies the equipment, but does not own the cattle.

Because of the tax credit, the investor can lose money on every head and still come out ahead, whereas the family farmer, on a smaller scale, if he loses money on every head, he is eventually wiped out. I'm suggesting that this capital investment program is going to eventually wipe out the small beef farmer in Saskatchewan. He has an unnatural disadvantage.

And the other thing I would like to say about this is I am very, very, very adamant on the fact that any production coming off the farms of this province — any primary production including feedlots — every dollar made on that has to go to the farm family that is producing it and no one else.

This carries over into the land. If we get into the same business in a venture capital and assets in land, we are stepping into the wrong direction. That direction is that it's an opening for multinationals to come in and grab up much of the farm land. The time is right too, because so many people out there are suffering and they may not have any other option. I encourage this government to ensure that this does not happen.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — In the near future, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'll be meeting with and listening to farmers and farm organizations; I'll be listening and learning and hearing their ideas for the best way to get around this hardship we have right now.

We not only need short-term, well-planned relief, but we also need long-term agricultural programs, programs like those that were implemented between 1971 and 1982. I'd just like to mention some of those: The Natural Products Marketing Act; The Veterinary Services Act was amended to authorize increased grants to veterinary

service districts; The Milk Control Act was amended to authorize entry into the National Milk Marketing Board; farmstart; Agricultural Implements Board; crop insurance; provincial lands; the farm ownership Act was implemented, which stopped the drift of agricultural land to foreign hands; the Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission was set up, and the SHARP program began; the Saskatchewan Sheep and Wool Marketing Commission; the Saskatchewan Vegetable Marketing Commission; the beef stabilization plan, and on and on — long-term solutions that created tremendous stability in this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — And I'm sure the members opposite are sincere and are telling the truth when they say they know the problems of the farmers, and on this side we do too. But knowing the problem simply is not enough. We have to attack them in the proper manner.

I somehow get the feeling that the members opposite say the problem is coming from over there somewhere; it's not our fault. To some degree they're right. But they are, instead of alleviating the problem, in certain instances by give-aways to multinationals, by cutting back on services, they are adding to that problem. And I would say to you, on behalf of the people of this province, please turn around.

I would like to say one more thing, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I came into this Assembly as green as the grass — I still am — the only farmer on our side of the House. That was the catchword. And I must admit that while searching through my mind I was wondering what it would be like, and I'm very, very pleased and proud to tell this Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan that each and every member on this side of the House, my colleagues, know the problems of agriculture, are extremely concerned about the problems of agriculture, and if we can, at some point in the future, do something about it; and until then we will push this government because we know we are a unit here, concerned about not one sector but every sector. And I thank my colleagues for that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gleim: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, today is a real honour for me to rise in this House as a Progressive conservative MLA for the constituency of Shaunavon.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gleim: — First of all, congratulations, Mr. Speaker, which he's not here right now, on being elected to the Chair. It's an honour to be there and I know you will be fair to both sides. As well, congratulations to all the new members of this House.

A few weeks ago, October 20th, the people of Shaunavon constituency elected me as their MLA. The constituents of Shaunavon put their trust in me as their MLA, and I am grateful to them for their confidence in our Premier and government, of course myself too.

Mr. Speaker, there are many good reasons why the people of Saskatchewan decided to give this government a second term. The Speech from the Throne contains many excellent policies put forward to the people of Saskatchewan during the recent provincial election.

I would like to share with this legislature why I believe Saskatchewan elected this government for another four-year term. Mr. Speaker, the major reason the voters put their confidence in this government is because of leadership of this Premier.

An Hon. Member: — Right on.

Mr. Gleim: — We, in the province of Saskatchewan, are indeed fortunate to have a Premier who is a model of excellent leadership. He is a leader . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gleim: — Mr. Speaker, he is a leader you can have faith in. In four years the Premier of this province has always had an open door for people for all walks of life. He has a real close relationship with the people of Saskatchewan. His courage, his vision, his ideas, and his leadership make him by far the best Premier in Canada.

In my constituency, many people have told me that they trust the Premier and this PC government. Why do they trust this government? Because of his reputation, Mr. Speaker. It is a government that, when giving you a promise, it stays true to its word.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gleim: — Allow me to give this legislature some examples. When grasshoppers and drought and outside forces hit our farmers, the PC government said to the Saskatchewan farmers, we will help you; we will defend the family farm. And sure enough, Mr. Speaker, this government did everything possible over the past four years to protect the family farm. Farmers don't forget that support they received from this PC government.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier has said he will remain as our agricultural minister, and that ensures that agriculture will stay and remain the top priority in this provincial government.

Mr. Speaker, so far I have given this House two key reasons why on October 20th this government was given another mandate, and that is leadership and trust.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few things about my riding — what has been accomplished in the last four years. This government came to the people and asked: what should we be doing to help you when the drought hit our part of the province? They said they would listen and they brought in programs such as cash advance on livestock, freight assistance on feed, the production loan program. With all the other programs they put in over \$72 million into my constituency during the 1985-86 year, and that, Mr. Speaker, showed the agricultural people that this government listened and it delivered.

On that reason, may I congratulate the Premier again. He is the man responsible for getting Saskatchewan a \$415 million deficiency payment, and he is the man that sat at the same table with the Prime Minister and expressed how serious the farming problems are. I would say congratulations again.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention some other programs this government has brought into my constituency — the natural gas program to farms and towns, and along with individual telephone line service which shows us this government does care about rural Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few things about education in my constituency. In four years this government has spent over \$27 million in operating grants to schools alone, plus capital grants to build new schools. We just opened up a new six-room school in Climax this fall, which is a real big asset to that rural community, and that shows this government cares about education.

This government, Mr. Speaker, has spent \$12 million in operating grants for health care, along with a 12-bed nursing home in Nakota that will be opened in February and along with a six-bed, level 4 care in Eastend. We have proposals to build and renovate in other areas such as Shaunavon, Climax, and Kincaid, so that there is a place for our elderly people and that they can be close to their families.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to talk a little bit about building and diversifying. The Shaunavon riding is a big riding. It's 190 miles long, 60 miles wide. It consists of ranching, grain farming, small businesses, manufacturing, and irrigation, with a potential for expanding irrigation on the Frenchman River, Battle Creek, and Lodge Creek to help the needs in agriculture in the south-west.

Mr. Speaker, in the last four years we have people that have invested and built new feeding facilities and a brand-new \$2 million feed-mill, and with the poor quality of grain this fall, that feed-mill is running 24 hours a day since September.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1615)

Mr. Gleim: — That feed-mill alone employs 12 people and, Mr. Speaker, with that kind of building, it shows people have faith in this government.

Mr. Speaker, I want to mention the oil and gas industry in our area, which has probably developed more producing wells in the last four years, even though there was the odd dry one. It created a lot of employment for the people in my riding, Mr. Speaker. On a trucking firm alone in the town of Dollard employed 25 people, and 18 of those are young farmers. And that shows that the oil industry and agriculture can work hand in hand.

Mr. Speaker, in the last four years this government has spent over \$21 million on highway construction in my riding along with a graveling program that paid for 50 per cent of all gravel on farm access roads. And that, Mr.

Speaker, alone reduced the mill rate in the R. M. to about five to six mills, and that is a great saving to the people in my riding.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to talk about the home renovations program. This program created many new jobs in my riding, and it gives the people of my riding a chance to the things they couldn't do before in their home and outside their home.

Mr. Speaker, there is the whole matter of protection for the people in Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan's present government has an excellent record for protecting people against factors they cannot protect themselves from their own, such as home owners who cannot control mortgage rates. Saskatchewan is the only place in the world where a government had the courage to put a cap on mortgage rates.

The PC government said, look, we want Saskatchewan families to be protected from the possibilities of ever again being hit by double-digit interest rates. We want Saskatchewan home owners to be protected. And that is why in the Speech from the Throne there is an announcement that in this session there will be legislation to bring in 10-year and nine and three-quarter mortgage for home owners on their principal resident. That is the action of progressive and protecting government.

This government said to home owners and many people with no pension plan: we want to be protected in our retirement years. So this government did another first in North America. It introduced the Saskatchewan Pension Plan — the first. No other government in Canada or U.S. had the courage to do it.

The Saskatchewan Pension Plan recognizes the contribution of home-makers and acknowledges their rights to a pension plan of their own. It helps small businesses establish pension plans for their employees. It assists self-employed persons establish their own pension plan. And yes, Mr. Speaker, I am proud of this protection policy of this government.

When it comes to protection, this PC government has brought in programs to protect the elderly, the family, small business, the farm, health care, and many other social and economic institutions. To protect the economic future of Saskatchewan, the PC government has made job creation a priority. To protect the farm, we introduced The Farm (family) Land Security Act. And again, the first government in Canada with a vision to bring in such legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other programs that this government brought in to protect the family farm. We protected the small businesses through small business interest loans — that's 8 per cent money. And in this session, as announced in the Speech from the Throne, there will be more to protect the small business from high interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, to protect the individual, we have a government that removed extra-billing by Saskatchewan doctors. We removed taxes on clothing and gas and brought in mortgage protection. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the

people of Saskatchewan can expect this government to bring forward creative measures to protect the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I have cited leadership, trust, and protection as reasons why the PC government was returned to this office on October 20th. There is another reason — opportunities for people. Our Premier and this PC government believe that bringing unique and exciting opportunities to Saskatchewan citizens will bring continued prosperity to this province. The government has created a good investment climate in this province. We have created thousands of new employment opportunities for the people here. And, Mr. Speaker, we have and will continue to work at breaking welfare cycle by providing opportunities for those who in the past have survived on collecting government payments.

The employment development fund created many new opportunities and I am pleased to note in the Speech from the Throne the creation of a major government department aimed at creating opportunities of the people. I congratulate the government for having the vision to create these major new government departments aimed at better helping the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, when a government creates over 64,000 new jobs in four years, and when a government brings forward such an exciting program as Saskatchewan Builds to build our economy in future years, I say that is a government with leadership and vision of the future. The Speech from the Throne says there will be major initiatives in Saskatchewan business communities. A \$50 million, five-year plan to create over 6,000 new jobs — building our province with a future and providing opportunity. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, this building is the key reason the voters put their trust in a re-elected government. Building our province means attracting new industry, revitalizing existing industry, strengthening our agricultural sector, developing tourism; yes, building Saskatchewan to make it the strongest provincial economy in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to cite one more time all the reasons I have put before this House, why I believe our PC government is here for another four years. The first, leadership — the leadership of the Premier and the government. Trust — the trust the people have in this government. Protection — protecting the people of Saskatchewan. Opportunities — providing good opportunities for Saskatchewan people. Building — building Saskatchewan for the future. The Speech from the Throne contains programs that have all of those important points and I look forward to the next four years with optimism and pride.

Mr. Speaker, as an individual MLA, I am honoured to support the Speech from the Throne. I do so because of my belief in our Premier and his government. I do so because of my belief in the policies of the Progressive Conservative government. I do so because of my faith in the people of Saskatchewan. And I do so because of the trust of the people in my constituency that put me in as their MLA.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne is worthy of our support, and with a government MLA, the Shaunavon constituency can be sure that during the next four years there will be continued commitment to the riding by this government. As your MLA for Shaunavon, I shall work in close co-operation with the government to give my people effective representation in this legislature.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to put on record my appreciation to the people of my riding for electing me as their MLA, and I shall work with them in every way possible to represent my constituents to their best interests. I would like, Mr. Speaker, to thank all the people who voted for me and the rest of the voters in my riding, and I will work with you no matter what political belief you believe in. And, Mr. Speaker, I know in the next four years I shall have many other opportunities to speak before this legislature. But today I would like to express to this legislature my confidence in the PC government by asking every member in this House to support the Speech from the Throne.

Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koenker: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak on behalf of the people of Saskatoon Sutherland and to reflect some of their concerns this afternoon, in my response to the Speech from the Throne — both to commend the government on certain points of action and also to question it on certain points of action.

I would like to begin my remarks this afternoon by a commentary on some of the concluding words of the Speech from the Throne:

May Divine Providence continue to bless our province and guide this Legislature in all its deliberations.

Being a Lutheran clergyman I have some acquaintance — not a little acquaintance either — the workings of divine providence. And enough acquaintance, in fact, to know that divine providence does not bless this province or the legislature or the government of this province unless and until there is justice done. According to the great religious traditions of the world, and particularly the Judaeo-Christian tradition, divine providence does not in fact operate independently of justice. In a word, divine providence is justice in the public arena — in the private area, love; in the public arena, justice.

And so what I am doing then, in reviewing the government's agenda in the Speech from the Throne, is to ask myself: is divine providence going to bless our province? Is there justice on the agenda? And I ask this question because I know that's the question for the people of Saskatoon Sutherland. Not simply some vague blessing of divine providence. That's not what they're interested in. They are interested in justice — real justice in palpable terms.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koenker: — Mr. Speaker, I think for example of a

young single-parent mother whose home I visited about a year ago in the Sutherland constituency — in the College Park portion of the constituency which is rather affluent. It was in the summer and as I approached the front steps of the home there were two young boys out in the front yard dressed in — the one brother in a T-shirt, the other in cut-off shorts. And I asked them if their mother was at home. They disappeared into the house to call her.

And as I stood there on the front porch and looked into the interior of the home — the screen was ripped out of the screen door so it wasn't very difficult to see inside — there I saw a living-room devoid of any furniture, not an article of furniture. There was a picture on the wall and a few toys on the floor, but nothing else. And I said to myself, here is hard-core poverty.

It wasn't long before the mother came to the door and confirmed my observations about the situation. She told me about life as a single parent on welfare and how difficult it was to manage, or not to manage, on her welfare allowance; the impossibility of getting \$43 from Social Services to repair her washing machine, and the difficulty of therefore washing clothes in the bathtub for the last nine months.

That's not divine providence blessing our province in my estimation. It's not the workings of justice.

And so, Mr. Speaker, when I hear in the Speech from the Throne about the workings of divine providence, I think of this woman in the Sutherland constituency and her asking, where is justice? And accordingly, when I hear in the Speech from the Throne reference to the fact that during the life of this legislature:

... my Government will continue to review its social assistance and income support programmes to determine how they can most effectively combat poverty.

I applaud the government for this sort of initiative, provided it issues in assistance for those who are, in fact, impoverished and not a tax on the impoverished — the victims of poverty. But will this be the emphasis? Will justice be done, or will it merely be done in rhetorical terms? Will poverty be attacked, or will the victims of poverty be assaulted?

(1630)

Based on the record of the government opposite, I think we know the answer to this question. Their performance indicates their priorities. And so when I read again that special attention will be given to methods of delivery and ways of encouraging transition to the work place, I not only wonder, but I have to begin to suspect that injustice is in the offing.

Injustice offered in the name of welfare reform; injustice excused out of professed concern for those who are the very weakest, the very poorest, and the least privileged in our society. And yes, that's exactly what the people of Saskatoon Sutherland have experienced these last four years at the hands of the present government.

I think of a second single parent who was forced to jump through the hoops of the Minister of Social Services to receive her welfare payments last winter, traipsing down to the Sturdy-Stone Centre in Saskatoon to sign a slip — with a sick child, in the middle of winter, on the bus, giving up a half a days' wages. Some justice. Rough justice.

Or another single parent — still another single parent — mother in the Sutherland constituency who contacted me three weeks ago because she had been denied assistance that she was entitled to simply because the social workers in the system were not able to deal adequately with her problems in terms of assessment and the time that they gave her. Such a treadmill of running people in and out. And when I spoke to the supervisor, he admitted that in fact a mistake had been made simply by virtue of the pressure on the system. Some justice.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the people on welfare in Saskatoon Sutherland are hoping indeed that special attention is given to the methods of delivery of social services and that any changes will benefit and not penalize them. They need this government to provide special assistance to social services, but they don't need inconsiderate, insulting attention, assaults — the kinds of which they've been subject to the last four years. What they need is special attention to justice and its delivery.

And this leads me, Mr. Speaker, then to talk about jobs, because without the opportunity to work, those who are on welfare will never get off of it. Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne mentions the transition to the work place as an area of special concern to this government, and that is good. Good if there is, in fact, a plan to provide jobs to effect this transition to the work place.

But there does have to be work if a transition is to take place. And indeed, there is apparently in this very speech no plan, particularly with respect to the development of jobs in the technological sector. And I'd like to comment on this for a moment.

Certainly the Speech from the Throne speaks loquaciously and eloquently about the need for diversification of the economy, about the importance of research and development, the ability of science to provide us with a future and technology to solve some of our unemployment problems. And I and the people of Sutherland appreciate the role of science and technology, the role they have to play in creating jobs and diversifying the economy.

Indeed, Sutherland itself is bordered by the University of Saskatchewan campus, Innovation Place, the Kernen agricultural research station on another side of the constituency. Sutherland people are employed directly and indirectly by these research activities, and many of Sutherland's people are students at the university and at Kelsey Institute who are dealing with technology. And so they're concerned with the vital role that technology plays in terms of diversifying the economy and providing jobs. It's for precisely this reason, then, that people in Sutherland want to see what this government's plan is, in fact, for the development of jobs in the technological sector. They want to know what jobs will issue from the

technological hype that is purveyed in the speech.

In particular, many of the people in Sutherland involved in high tech want to know precisely what the government's plans are for the \$50 million that was announced during the election campaign as seed money for high-tech firms and now suddenly has shifted into money — \$50 million — for Saskatchewan small businesses to equip themselves with technology, with computers and such materials. A far cry from the Premier's election pledge of seed money for high-tech firms.

And so what we have here appears to be a major shift in priorities for the Department of Science and Technology, a major change in policy with respect to its program, a change which will see small businesses offered money to buy technology or computers from Japan but will see Saskatoon and Regina's provincial high-tech firms go starved for cash.

In this context I'd like to say that it's been just a day short of three years that the Department of Science and Technology has been in existence. During this time, the department and its programs have been aimed consistently, as I understand it, not at equipping small business with technology, but consistently — even exclusively — at helping Saskatchewan-based companies to produce and develop technology.

Until now the programs of this department were meant to provide assistance to Saskatchewan's high-tech firms, fundamentally to encourage research and development of projects, to support research programs and products in areas of mutual concern to government and the industry, to offset part of the costs in preparing proposals on high-tech projects outside the province, to help small companies conduct technical and feasibility studies, to provide capital equipment to the two universities and so forth. In a word, underlying this agenda of the department in the past has been that all programs would promote technological development through research and through marketing.

And so, Mr. Speaker, my concern with the technological agenda put out in the Speech from the Throne is that it appears not only to betray the original mandate of the department, but that it also appears to betray Saskatoon and Saskatchewan high-tech firms who are looking for government assistance in developing technology. And thirdly, that it also betrays the province's jobless who are looking for work in this sector and won't find it when small business firms are given money to purchase equipment from offshore or across the border.

I therefore hope that the announcement in the throne speech of the \$50 million a year over the next five years to equip Saskatchewan firms with technology does not indicate a movement away from the original mandate of the department — the mandate to do research and to do development work and to provide a firm foundation for future jobs in the province.

In addition, I would like to say that I look forward to announcements in the future from the department as to how the Department of Science and Technology will be

assisting in minimizing the impact of technological change in the Saskatchewan work place, how it will mitigate the displacement of Saskatchewan people affected by technological change. And finally, I look forward to working with the minister and the universities in the province, the research councils, and the industry itself, in the establishment of new research institutes as announced for Saskatchewan grain, biotechnology, and potash.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment finally on questions of security and protection. The previous speaker commented quite extensively on the measures the government has taken to protect Saskatchewan people.

In the pages of the Speech from the Throne we read:

(This) government is firmly committed to the protection of its citizens from forces beyond their control and intends to continue to back them in difficult economic circumstances.

That is, to my way of thinking, a good agenda for any government to lay before its people. And I particularly appreciate the measures take to establish a drug and alcohol centre in Yorkton for young people. They need that sort of protection.

But there is also other forms of protection that Saskatchewan young people need. And in this respect there is a glaring omission in the Speech from the Throne, namely in the provision for security for our population — for our young people in particular — to protect them from the threat of war.

Mr. Speaker, an usually large percentage of the people of Saskatoon Sutherland constituency are young people — university students who come from across the province from all constituencies. I've worked with these young people on the university campus for some five years, and I know that their concern is that we build a better world, one where there is real security and real peace that matches the sort of proclamation heralded some 2000 years ago this Christmas season. Peace that sees a world with individuals secure and nations secure. Peace, where we see an absence of preparation for war.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, nowhere in this speech do we hear a peep from this government about any commitment to peace or disarmament in the world community. Nor do we hear a whisper about the things that make for peace in the global village. Not a word about the commitment for increased funding to the Saskatchewan council for International Co-operation, to match the generosity of Saskatchewan people in contributing to the voluntary sector to help some of the very poorest of the poor. Not a word about a commitment by this government to deal with the questions and issues of disarmament. Not a word on Saskatchewan's complicity in cruise missile testing.

And on the contrary, low and behold, we find a commitment to the nuclear industry here in the province. We find a commitment to reduced taxation on the uranium industry and to establish a resource institute for the industry — the very industry that ships five out of

every six pounds of Saskatchewan uranium into the United States to wind up as part of the U.S. military stockpile.

All this from the Premier, who came to the University of Saskatchewan campus some two years ago to announce that Saskatchewan was open for business for companies wanting to do contracting for Star Wars research — some commitment to security; some commitment to the protection of Saskatchewan people. The same Premier who welcomes in Saskatoon the Pentagon war-lords when they came to market their death, and to seek contracts for instruments of death.

(1645)

And so, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I think I must say that this Speech from the Throne is, in fact, very appropriate for the season. It has all the promise and appearance of a gift to the people of Saskatchewan. It's wrapped in the paper of an attractive and important agenda for our province. It's tied with the rhetoric of past accomplishment. And in fact, it even has a beautiful bow attached to it in the form of the invocation of the blessing of divine providence. But it is a disappointment, a big disappointment.

The Speech from the Throne is a disappointment for the poor of the province who are looking for justice; it's a disappointment to the jobless who are looking for work; it's a disappointment to men and women looking for peace; it's a disappointment to myself. I believe it's a disappointment to the people I represent in Saskatoon Sutherland and I, therefore, will be voting in support of the amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me too, to speak today in response to the Speech from the Throne. But first I would like to congratulate you on your appointment, or election, as Speaker of the House. I know that you will give great thought, and fair thought, and impartial thought to the decisions you have to make from time to time, and I wish you the best in the coming session and the coming years.

Mr. Speaker, it's been an honour for me to be able to have represented the constituency of Maple Creek for the last eight years. The people of my riding are what I would consider people who are simply the salt of the earth. They are hard-working people, fair people, people who are very interested in what is going on not only in Saskatchewan and Canada, but indeed throughout the world.

These people have become very, very good friends of mien, and I often seek their guidance and their words. And I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I look forward with great anticipation to being able to represent them in this Assembly over the course of the next four or five years.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the people of Saskatchewan

are now embarking on a second phase of an important journey, a journey of building this province with a government that supports and protects the people and responds to our citizens' needs, rather than a government in which it, itself, becomes a dominant factor, dominating the people and doing the major activities by itself.

Last fall our government was pleased with the opportunity to present our record to the voters of Saskatchewan, and of course, Mr. Speaker, these people on this side of the House were very grateful that the people of Saskatchewan gave us a resounding vote of confidence and gave us another mandate.

Our first term in government was carried out through perhaps what could be described as some of the most difficult times this province has undergone since the 1930s. But despite those difficulties, Mr. Speaker, we were able to keep our promises and deliver to the people of Saskatchewan an improved quality of life.

Our programs succeeded in giving this province the lowest unemployment rate overall in Canada for the four years and, Mr. Speaker, we also had the best employment, job-creation rate in Canada. I believe that we did strengthen the province's health care system, and we provided a record increase in the financial benefits to our senior citizens.

In spite of what members opposite say, Mr. Speaker, our taxation policies gave us record tax reductions, and today Saskatchewan is known in the country as Canada's leader in tax reform, and we are known as a low-tax province.

Our actions recognize that Saskatchewan's strength begins in the farming and rural areas, and because of this, Mr. Speaker, we embarked upon a massive project of providing natural gas to a record number of farms, and as you know, this program will continue until rural Saskatchewan have the option of using natural gas.

And earlier this year we embarked upon another important amenity for our farming community, and that is bringing private lines to farms so that they may have access to the high technology that is available and really needed and used by our new generation of farmers.

We protected farmers against high interest rates. We saw record numbers of young farmers buying land as a result of the 8 per cent interest rate program brought in by this government, and this enables us to keep Saskatchewan's main industry, fresh and alive. All those young farmers bring new technologies and new ideas and just keep on improving the province.

The energy programs with the programs that we brought in in the last four years have led to record oil production in the province, record drilling, and they also led to record land sales, revenues and jobs.

Until the recent slump of world energy prices, Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that our energy industry was the main contributor to the province's treasury. These and other accomplishments from our first term in office reflect one overriding fact: when Premier Devine and our

government faced the difficulty of drought and declining commodity prices, we had the courage to move ahead decisively. And, Mr. Speaker, it is very obvious that our programs paid off. They moved this province ahead. But those first four and one half years, Mr. Speaker, are only a start, and the people of Saskatchewan recognized that in the recent October election, and they have given us a mandate to proceed with our program of building, of diversifying our province and to move our province ahead.

Let me say I'm particularly pleased to participate in this debate because the throne speech leaves no doubt — it leaves no doubt in the minds of the members on this side of the House and no doubt in the minds of the majority of our electorate — that our government is holding its course. And the people of Saskatchewan left no doubt also; they do want this province to build, and our Premier has the vision and the courage to respond. The Speech from the Throne is but a blueprint for a prosperous and fulfilling future for the people of our province.

In line with the reality of our province, the base of our program is agriculture and it is an economic diversification and there can be no doubt, Mr. Speaker, our program is generating solid economic growth within the boundaries of our province. Our intention to dramatically increase the production of farm chemicals in Saskatchewan and to encourage further development in our industrial base is exactly what the people, our citizens, want. We will use whatever mix of public and private investment that is necessary to accomplish this goal, and this one step, Mr. Speaker, will give us further control over our own destiny.

Our initiatives to encourage the establishment of community corporations so that people can identify diversification opportunities and convert those opportunities into reality will be welcomed across the province. It is in line with the PC way of supporting people to help themselves to build this province.

I particularly like our proposed five-year program to stimulate the tourism industry. It will be the most significant tourism initiative ever undertaken in Saskatchewan, aiming to increase employment in the tourism hospitality industry by 25 per cent or 7,500 jobs, Mr. Speaker, over the next five years.

And let me note that there can be no room for sceptics on this initiative. It is simply building on the spirit of Expo '86, where the young people from across the province worked at the Saskatchewan pavilion in British Columbia and demonstrated the tourism appeal of a good facility staffed by trained and confident people.

Again, we are rightly directing this tourism program to local communities because each community in Saskatchewan possesses a unique combination of cultural and recreational and natural qualities. And we will help those communities and cultural groups to develop their own strengths.

I would like now, Mr. Speaker, to turn to the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs. And I would like to say at the onset that it has been a pleasure for me to have

had this post for the last four years because this particular department has been able to play a very, very strong and important role in building Saskatchewan.

The activities of the department are designed to strengthen the confidence of the consumer in the market-place. As well all know, the alternative to a strong market-place is an ever-growing government bureaucracy with the resulting limitations of freedom on each and every one of us as consumers.

From the very first, I brought to this department a very strong conviction that, in the market-place, education is preferable to regulation, that the people of Saskatchewan will be far better served by a department committed to making the market-place work, rather than one committed to putting an army of government inspectors and regulators to work policing the people of Saskatchewan.

And I've implemented this program, Mr. Speaker, and the people of the department have resounded very enthusiastically. And we know, Mr. Speaker, from the comments that we get, that this particular program is succeeding very well in the minds of many of the consumers out there.

Of course we all recognize that there are times when enforcement is necessary — when a few people do try to take advantage of the market-place. And the department will certainly continue to keep a watchful eye. Where education won't do the job, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that we will have the proper regulation and enforcement in place. My department will be proceeding over the course of the next year or so with a number of initiatives which will improve the regulatory environment in several key sectors, raising the level of protection offered to consumers and providing businesses with a more flexible and responsible system of regulation.

Amendments to The Saskatchewan Insurance Act will be brought forward which will allow for greater protection for consumers in the event of company failures in the general insurance industry, and they will permit Saskatchewan's participation in a national consumer protection plan. Saskatchewan will also be supporting the creation of a similar plan for the life insurance industry and we will support the creation of a Canadian insurance exchange to foster the development of the insurance industry in Canada. This should contribute greatly to increased competition and service, particularly in the area of liability insurance, Mr. Speaker.

We will also proceed to develop a self-administration plan in the insurance industry — including the establishment of insurance councils — in the areas of life, general, and hail insurance. Similar developments will be promoted in the real estate industry, Mr. Speaker, and legislation will be put before this House to create a self-administered body for this industry. These initiatives have as their goals, greater government responsiveness and better protection for consumers, given the changing dynamics out in the industry.

The Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs will also be undertaking a number of initiatives designed

to increase the quality of the services that we offer to the public. Information services will be greatly enhanced by extending direct on-line access to public information data bases.

The Saskatchewan Gaming Commission will soon become fully operational and it will provide a central focus for the regulation of gaming activity throughout the province. Particular emphasis will also be given to aiding decision making for those wishing to take advantage of the government's home improvement program.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, efforts will be made to simplify departmental documents and to make them more understandable and accessible to the average citizen. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I'm particularly pleased with a few of my other new cabinet responsibilities. By bringing Saskatchewan Government Insurance Corporation and the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development together with Consumer and Commercial Affairs, the Premier has united under one minister most of the key provincial agencies involved in the financial sector in Saskatchewan. I believe that this is an eminently sensible move, Mr. Speaker, and I look forward to the challenge of seeing that these agencies serve the purposes of our people of our province.

Before getting into Saskatchewan Government Insurance, Mr. Speaker, and some of its accomplishments, and my other department, I will be up on my feet a bit longer, so at this time I would beg leave to adjourn debate.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.