

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Ratification of Free Trade Agreement

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Acting Premier, and I'll be interested to know who stands, and it is this, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the Minister of Trade answered a number of questions with respect to the free trade deal with the United States, and I refer the Acting Premier to this morning's edition of the *Globe and Mail*, which has a front page headline:

Premiers will get briefing today, but they have little say on the deal.

And the article quotes a Canadian trade official as saying that the provinces will have little voice in ratification of the trade deal.

And my question is this: does the Government of Saskatchewan have any sort of a veto over those aspects of the proposed agreement which would impact negatively on Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is quite right — at this very moment, as I understand it, the Premier along with other ministers are being fully briefed on the trade deal that was initialled.

Mr. Speaker, in so far as the consultation and the Premier's involvement in this process, all along the Prime Minister has kept all premiers fully involved and apprised of what the deal looked like and what options were being explored.

All along the way I think the consultation has been very full and, albeit at the end of the day, I suppose, the Prime Minister is the quarterback of the team, I think the team have been fully involved all along, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I didn't make my question clear. It did not deal with consultation, it dealt with the ratification procedure. And my question again is: does the province of Saskatchewan have any form of a veto over those aspects of the proposed trade agreement which might impact negatively on Saskatchewan?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Speaker, what the province of Saskatchewan is interested in, and was from the outset, was a good deal. I think the early indications are at least that Saskatchewan has got a good deal; indeed, Canada has got a good deal, Mr. Speaker. I suspect our Premier, if that proves to be true, will be ratifying this deal, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the minister for his answer indicating that there will be a ratification by the Premier on behalf of the Saskatchewan government.

My question to you, Mr. Minister, is this. Is there any formal ratification process by which a certain number of provinces must agree to the deal? Is there any structure built in? This has been talked about for a number of months. Can you tell us what the arrangements are?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any, and quite frankly I'd be a little worried if we were starting to rewrite the process at this point in time. I think the process, and how we would approach these trade negotiations, was established some long time ago, Mr. Speaker, at first ministers' meetings. It has been adhered to. There has been consultation and our Premier this very day is in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I understand from the Minister of Trade, yesterday, that his officials were receiving full briefings from their federal counterparts yesterday, and accordingly I want to direct some questions on clarification of the terms of the agreement which were set out in the American version of it in yesterday's *Globe and Mail*.

I refer the minister to the American summary which talked about free trade in services, and it referred to disciplines on public monopolies. And we raised that yesterday, Mr. Minister. Could you tell us what impact this agreement will have on the operation of such public monopolies in Saskatchewan at SaskTel and the Saskatchewan Liquor Board?

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Speaker, I would take notice of that question until our ministers and the Premier are back and we have a full understanding.

### Effects of Trade Agreement on Tourism

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Supplementary, Mr. Premier. I direct a question to the Minister of Tourism. The agreement provides, and he will perhaps recall there's a special reference in it to services, and special reference is made to architects and tourism, and my question deals with tourism: can you tell me what the agreement means with respect to "same nation treatment in services" as it relates to tourism? Could you enlighten the House on that?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Mr. Speaker, it only seems reasonable and logical to me that before any one suggests any implications . . . or interpretations of the agreement, that it would only be right that the premiers are being briefed on it, that we wait till the Premier returns to explain in full detail the implications to this House and to all of us. So in that regard my answer to you at this point in

time . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order. Order, please. The minister is attempting to answer the question.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — My answer, and thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for getting order in the House so I can complete my answer to the Leader of the Opposition.

And as I indicated to him, no, today I cannot expand upon that. But I think you realize, sir, that it's only reasonable to hear what the debriefing is, to hear what the Premier brings back from Ottawa, and at that point in time we'd be more than pleased to share that information with you.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### Continental Energy Agreement

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Acting Premier, whoever it may be, and I have a question that deals with the continental energy agreement which is proposed in this treaty. Under the treaty, Mr. Minister, the United States will have unlimited access to Canadian oil, gas, coal, hydroelectric power, and all other forms of Canadian energy. You called that, or the Minister of Trade yesterday called that, "access to the American market", but in reality it is a guaranteed access for Canadian energy . . . to Canadian energy for the Americans. Will you not admit, Mr. Minister, that even without this agreement, the Americans are such large importers of energy that Canada will always be able to sell our energy to the American market?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — We might as well try a female, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — In response to the hon. member's question, Mr. Speaker, what the Minister of Economic Development and Trade said yesterday is key for Saskatchewan, and that is access to those markets without artificial barriers being put up for the producers of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, if I think back a few years ago — and I use potash and uranium as an example, when there was a lot of taxpayers' dollars invested into it — and I would have to ask the hon. member: who did they think they were going to sell the product to? Potash for example — all of it to Canada? I mean, how much do we use? Very little, Mr. Speaker. Of course we weren't. We were going to sell it south of the border.

Mr. Speaker, the trade agreements in principle, removing barriers, artificial barriers, and giving us a say in the disputes that arise, is key for the future of this province in selling our products.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Supplementary question, to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Madam Minister, the Americans

are going to have access now to our energy — unlimited access, when they want it. When they don't want it they won't take it because this agreement does nothing about the countervailing tariffs and what the Americans can do with them. So in fact we got nothing in return for guaranteeing the Americans our energy at Canadian prices for all time. They will decide when they take it, and we can do nothing about it.

How can you possibly support that kind of a give-away of a valuable natural Canadian economic advantage for Canada and Saskatchewan while getting nothing in return?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, what this will allow — this trade agreement in principle will be for Americans in need of resources such as uranium, another product that has a lot of tax dollars invested into it. It's for sure, Mr. Speaker, that when the uranium mines were brought up by the NDP government back in the '70s, that there was not enough . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I will clarify it for the Leader of the Opposition.

**An Hon. Member:** — 600 million.

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — About \$600 million invested into it of the taxpayers' dollars, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Canada was not using all that nuclear power for that uranium, so it had to go south of the border.

In terms of the access that the Americans are going to have, what I will say to the member, they will have to negotiate for the resources that they want whether it be our oil, our heavy oil, our uranium, Mr. Speaker, or our gas, and that will have to be at a fair price and a return not only to the producers but the province of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### Effect of Free Trade on Energy Rebates

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — A new question to the minister, and at some point in time, Mr. Speaker, I would like her to tell us one single uranium mine that was ever bought up in Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Madam Minister, in these negotiations the result is that under the proposed free trade treaty which we're talking about, the Government of Saskatchewan will no longer have the option to offer Saskatchewan farmers and small businesses rebates or other breaks in the price of energy because we have to offer our oil and gas to the Americans for the same price. Will you confirm, Madam Minister, that that will be the result of this treaty?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, as the agreement applies to the energy sector, under the constitution, section 92(a), Mr. Speaker, we will retain the right to manage, develop and conserve our resources. And that,

Mr. Speaker, includes setting the primary rate of production on those resources that require that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me good business sense if you have a product, a resource that you can sell, Mr. Speaker, for a fair return, that creates jobs, opportunities for small communities, large communities in this province, resources for the future, for the institutions like education and the health institutions in this province, then that makes good economic sense to me. I don't understand why it doesn't make good economic sense to the member from Regina North East, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### Dispute-Settlement Mechanism

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Energy and Mines, and my question, Madam Minister, deals with the dispute-settling mechanism that is contained in the free treaty agreement that was just signed. Both the Prime Minister and the Premier of Saskatchewan said that that was the bottom line, a fundamental thing that they wanted in the agreement.

Madam Minister, do you realize that the tribunal that is proposed will not have the power to rule whether an American anti-dumping action or an American countervailing action against some Canadian product is unfair, but only if that action is in line with, or properly applied with, American law?

Now Madam Minister, since the current American laws are the problem that is confronting us, and not the application on it, why did the Prime Minister and the Premier of Saskatchewan cave in on this fundamental change that they said they were going to demand?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from Saskatoon South is missing one very key point in all this, and that is: nor will it rule on Canadian law that has been duly put into place by the legislators of this country, and perhaps even this province.

Mr. Speaker, the anti-dumping, the countervail duties, that is a legislation process put in by the legislators in the United States. I do not believe for a moment, for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that anyone at that negotiating table had the right to bargain away or remove legislation that has been put into place by elected people in this country, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand the agreement, we will, in fact, when it comes to the regulatory laws of Canada or the United States as it pertains to the energy sector, we will have an opportunity for greater consultation before those regulations in fact come into play. I also understand, Mr. Speaker, that there will be a phasing-in period of, say, five to seven years. And after that seven years, if we are not satisfied, then that will be expressed.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that the minister has admitted that they did not get an exemption to the American laws and that the American laws are still applying to the Saskatchewan potash industry and will continue to apply.

Madam Minister, I want to ask you again: is it not true that the tribunal that has been set up can only deal with the American laws as it applies to its . . . fairness . . . it can't deal with the American laws and getting exemptions for the Saskatchewan industry? Would you please indicate to me now: what does this do right now to the potash, the anti-dumping tariffs that have been put in effect right now on Saskatchewan industries? How does that affect it right now?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, I can inform the member that as it pertains to the uranium, which I'm sure he's been concerned about, that they have in fact agreed, Mr. Speaker, to remove the restrictions that have been put into place. And today that's good news for our uranium industry in this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, on the potash, this agreement comes into place January 1, 1989. It does not deal specifically today with the present anti-dumping duties, but, Mr. Speaker, after 1989 then in fact if that were to occur, it would go before the commission that will be put into place. And, Mr. Speaker, that is a big improvement over what we have been facing this year with our potash industry.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Madam Minister, you are admitting that this is a powerless tribunal — powerless tribunal that can only look at the laws in the United States and that will not deal with the problems that are before us right now. If the Department of Commerce makes the anti-dumping laws permanent, then the tribunal can have a look at that. Madam Minister, how can you say that you have not caved in to one of the fundamental conditions that you asked for under this agreement when you accept a tribunal which has a referee, and all the rules are established by the Americans and not by the Canadians. How can you say that that is fair and that will protect Canadian interests?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — What he just said is not right, Mr. Speaker. That commission will be made up of two from Canada's appointments and two from the Americans, and the fifth position to be decided upon within that group or the two countries. He is wrong, Mr. Speaker, wrong, wrong, wrong.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Madam Minister, you have agreed, or you have admitted in this House, that negotiations are going

on and those negotiations will carry on for at least five to seven years.

I ask you, Madam Minister, how does that deal with the current problems that we are facing with the anti-tariff or anti-countervailing duties that have been imposed by the United States? Are you telling this House today that we are going to have to wait another five to seven years before you come to grips with a problem that is affecting a very important industry in Saskatchewan today?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, let me say this to the member opposite. If there had've been a trade agreement between Canada and the United States in their term of government, we would not be in the fix we are in today with our anti-dumping on potash, Mr. Speaker. We would have that dispute mechanism to go forward with. Mr. Speaker, that will be in place beginning January 1 of 1989. That is a whole lot better than anything that ever happened in the '70s.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Goodale:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question to the same minister with respect to the trade arrangements with the United States. If I heard the minister correctly in one of her previous answers, I believe she indicated that the agreement that has been initialled deals specifically with an exemption for Saskatchewan uranium in terms of U.S. trade harassment practices against that uranium. Could the minister confirm that I heard her correctly on that point, and if I heard her correctly, could she, in fact, table specific documentation to support that point?

And secondly, Mr. Speaker, would the minister indicate why potash was not specifically exempted if uranium was. Why uranium and not potash too?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, yes, the member did hear me correctly. I have been informed. I do not have the documents, but I have been informed that there was an agreement to remove the further processing requirements that, in fact, put a restriction on the uranium producers in this province.

Mr. Speaker, the difference, the energy sector within this trade agreement has some restrictions on its own, and potash does not come under the energy sector. I would also remind the member what I just told this House in terms of legislation. Whether it's Canadian legislation or U.S. legislation, the negotiators at the table did not have the right to remove legislation that's been put in by duly elected people of either country.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Goodale:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could indicate to us specifically when the appropriate action is going to be taken to remove those U.S. actions with respect to uranium. When, specifically, will we see that particular spectre removed from our uranium industry in Saskatchewan?

And secondly, on the potash part of the question, in the

negotiating process did you try to get the U.S. action against Saskatchewan potash removed as a part of the negotiations, or was uranium the only thing that was discussed? Did you at least try to get that break for Saskatchewan potash as a part of the negotiations?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan put forth to the federal government our position on trade, free trade, as much as the members opposite don't like to hear the term, and it was related to access without barriers, and that includes all commodities. In terms of the specific date on the uranium, I do not have those details yet and, when those details are known, I'm sure that they will be forwarded.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### Effects of Trade Agreement on Saskatchewan Agriculture

**Mr. Upshall:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the next Acting Premier who may wish to stand up, and it deals with . . . The free trade treaty, as you will know, removes a number of restrictions on American investment. Does that aspect of the treaty also include American investment in farm land?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — I would take notice of that question, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Upshall:** — Mr. Speaker, you will also know that the Nielsen task force report of the past led us to believe that the — new question, Mr. Speaker — the Canadian Wheat Board may be done away with. Now some American groups are saying that the Wheat Board may also have it in their grasp. Mr. Minister, is there a possibility that the two-price system for wheat, as we know it, giving Canadian farmers about \$200 million extra in their pocket, is there a possibility the two-price system for wheat will be eliminated by this free trade agreement?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Speaker, along the way before these . . . before and during these trade negotiations and now, once we have some sense of the trade deal that's been struck, there was much talk made of those who opposed it that somehow we would go into this deal and the Canadian Wheat Board and other fundamental agriculture institutions would somehow be destroyed, Mr. Speaker. They were inaccurate then, and they are inaccurate now. The Canadian Wheat Board is alive and well, Mr. Speaker.

And I would say to you and to the people of this province and to the farmers of this province that either this is a deliberate attempt to be inaccurate or a deliberate attempt to scare people across this province and to scare the farmers. Because the reality is in this deal, Mr. Speaker, the reality is in this deal, it's a good deal for farmers. It's a good deal for hog farmers, and it's a good deal for hog processors. It's a good deal for beef farmers . . .

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

**Mr. Upshall:** — Mr. Speaker, it amazes me that the minister doesn't know what he's agreeing to in Ottawa. My question was about two-price wheat and extra income for Saskatchewan farmers. Where, in the language of this agreement, Mr. Minister, does it say that the two-price system for wheat will be protected?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Speaker, the reality is, when it comes to the whole question of wheat, this has been a constant straw man that the opposition have thrown up relative to this trade arrangement. Because where wheat becomes important, Mr. Speaker, where wheat becomes important is not so much . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. Order, please. Order, please. Would you please allow the minister to answer the question on the topic.

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Why I raised the point, Mr. Speaker, that the . . . trying to create fear and uncertainty relative to what this means to the Wheat Board or any other institution has been the straw man all along, and I'll tell you why, Mr. Speaker. Because the issue of trade and grains, particularly wheat, between the U.S. and Canada, the U.S. and Saskatchewan — not that there isn't some, and not that what there might be isn't important — but the reality is, trading wheat for Saskatchewan farmers is an issue not with the U.S. so much, but it's an issue with China and with Russia and with the Asia-Pacific countries, Mr. Speaker. And that's why that next important step, the multilateral trade negotiations, are all important for us in agriculture, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

### Natural Gas Deregulation (Phase 2)

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — In February of this year, Mr. Speaker, I had announced a program to deregulate Saskatchewan's natural gas markets . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Why is the member on his feet?

**Mr. Trew:** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask leave of the Assembly to introduce some guests before they leave your gallery.

Leave granted.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Trew:** — Thank you very much for the indulgence of hon. members on both sides of the House, and to you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to introduce today 19 students and four teachers and chaperons that are with them. They're native life-skills students seated in your gallery, Mr. Speaker. The teach and chaperons that are attending today are Barry McKay, Dan Danforth, RoseAnne Keller, and Gilbert Longclaws.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to meeting with this group at just after 3 o'clock this afternoon for drinks and a short visit. Please, all hon. members, join me in welcoming this group to our Assembly.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

### Natural Gas Deregulation (Phase 2)

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — As I had stated, Mr. Speaker, in February of this year we had announced a program to move through deregulation on the gas industry within this province. Mr. Speaker, phase 1 that was announced in February eliminated government regulation of prices and introduced a new price-sensitive royalty system. As a result of that phase 1, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan Power Corporation's gas costs dropped approximately \$30 million. That in turn allowed SPC to reduce rates and provide some savings to natural gas users.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the implementation of phase 2. Mr. Speaker, phase two will address three areas: direct sales, export policy, and security of supply.

Mr. Speaker, direct sales in the province of Saskatchewan of natural gas will be allowed. It will give Saskatchewan users the choice of buying gas from SPC or directly from Saskatchewan natural gas producers. As well, SPC's financial position, Mr. Speaker, will be protected by allowing it to be the sole transporter of gas destined for direct sales.

The practicality of these direct sales rests with large-volume users because of volume buying and economies of scale, and we recognize this. However, Mr. Speaker, it must be noted that direct buyers of gas will be responsible for their own security of supply.

Mr. Speaker, under the export policy, royalties will be based on transaction prices. Export prices will not be lower than prices paid by Saskatchewan consumers for similar types in terms of sales. Sales of gas outside the province will not be allowed where such sales would violate the sanctity of contract principles.

Producer exploration commitments will be lifted. However, Mr. Speaker, the annual volume limits on gas available for export will be set by a formula, which means gas will not be exported if Saskatchewan gas requirements cannot be met. Mr. Speaker, exports will be permitted only to the extent that they do not jeopardize Saskatchewan's security requirements.

In order to ensure fairness in the market-place, all existing removal permits will be amended to comply with the new terms and the conditions of the export policy, effective October 1, 1987.

Mr. Speaker, security of supply protection for Saskatchewan consumers will be provided through two mechanisms. Number one, SPC is directed to have available, through contract or direct ownership, sufficient

natural gas for at least 15 years of consumer requirements, and number two, Mr. Speaker, a formula calculation to determine the volumes for export.

Mr. Speaker, I'm confident that phase 2 initiatives will provide substantial benefits to Saskatchewan consumers, producers, and the Crown, and will assist the province in reaching its economic development and diversification goals. However, in moving from an over-regulated system to a deregulated system, we recognize there must be a transitional phase to accommodate SPC's contract obligations. In this transition any one buying directly from the producers, Mr. Speaker, will be required to take a minimum of 35 per cent of their daily requirements from SPC. Mr. Speaker, this does not apply to any new customers or new projects.

This is in essence, Mr. Speaker, phase 2 of natural gas deregulation. And what does it mean for those of us who are not within the industry or familiar with the technicalities of it? Well, Mr. Speaker, let me put it into this context. For the workers that work in the many industries and businesses and the plants around the province, those plants and businesses that they work in will be better able to compete with their out of province competitors. That in turn, Mr. Speaker, secures jobs for Saskatchewan people.

And for our businesses, Mr. Speaker, their competitive position will be improved. New investment will be easier to attract because of lower input costs and the long-term availability of gas for feedstock purposes, thereby promoting and enhancing the economic diversification. Mr. Speaker, that means further job opportunities in this province.

Mr. Speaker, for people like you and I, residential, the day to day gas supply and delivery arrangements with SPC will not likely change, and we will continue to pay our gas bills. However, Mr. Speaker, during the long winter months we know we will have a secure and reasonably priced source of heat. For the future, Mr. Speaker, for our consumers, competitive contracting by our utility, SPC, will continue to assure fair price gas.

Mr. Speaker, the natural gas industry has become increasingly more important to the economy of Saskatchewan. In 1981 we drilled 16 wells. And we compare that to an estimated 380 in 1987. And that was before the effects of deregulation, Mr. Speaker.

The jobs, Mr. Speaker, have increased from 40 — 40 in 1982 to over 200 this year.

Crown royalties from natural gas, Mr. Speaker, have increased from \$1 million in 1982 to an estimated 23 million in 1987. And the investment, Mr. Speaker — 1 million in 1982, and over \$63 million in 1986.

Mr. Speaker, our known reserves have increased from 1.2 trillion cubic feet in '82 to an estimated 2.5 trillion cubic feet today. As a result, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan gas rates to residential customers have been the second lowest in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, that has been the last five years of natural gas

policy in Saskatchewan. Phase 2 deals with the next five years, and we expect further significant benefits for the province — an additional 1,100 gas wells will be drilled, 600 new person-years of employment will be created, and revenues to the provincial treasury, Mr. Speaker, will increase by \$18 million.

And, Mr. Speaker, an additional \$200 million will be invested in this province by the gas industry.

Mr. Speaker, these new policy initiatives will ensure that the progress we have made over the past five years is continued in the future.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, the recently announced principles for a Canada-U.S. free trade agreement regarding secure access for Canadian energy producers to the U.S. market is timely indeed. It should only improve the prospects and the opportunities in this province for further job opportunities and revenues that will eventually occur to this province, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Before we proceed to the opposition critic, I would just like to bring this to the attention of ministers that ministerial statements are meant to be brief and factual. That particular one took almost eight minutes.

I'm only bringing this to the attention of the ministers now, that it doesn't establish a trend. I realize ministers do want to give as clear as possible an explanation of their statement, and therefore the explanation could become quite lengthy. So I'm just bringing this to your attention.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, just a few comments in the ministerial statement that has been made.

Madam Minister, I'm not certain what relevance your statement has with the agreement that was signed just a few days ago between Canada and the United States where you've set up a continental energy policy. The statements that you have made today may simply be of no significance whatsoever, because I am certain that if the agreement goes through that the free trade agreement will override what you have indicated today. As I understand the free trade agreement, you have no authority now to say to the United States people, we will not give you access to our energy on unlimited amounts. That is my understanding of the reading, and therefore what you have indicated today certainly you can't put it ahead 5, 10 or 15 years because you will have no control over that any longer. If I am wrong on that, Madam Minister, I will accept further explanation.

But, Madam Minister, what has been wrong with the way in which we have been transporting our natural energy and exporting our natural gas in the past? It seems to me that SPC has done a relatively good job in being the sole provider, or the exporter, of natural gas. And now it seems to me that you're putting an additional burden on SPC by putting in deregulation.

And I say to the Madam Minister that I also pay my natural gas bills. You say there has been a reduction in the price of natural gas. I have not experienced that on my bill that I have paid. All that I have experienced in the last five years, Madam Minister, is a substantial increase of the natural gas that I have.

**An Hon. Member:** — No, you haven't.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Oh yes, I have. The Madam Minister says I have not experienced that. I wish that she would . . . I'd rather pay my bills . . . I would say to the minister that I would rather pay my bills of five years ago than the bills that I am presently paying for natural gas. And I still live in the same house, and I have improved the energy factor of my house, and still I'm paying more for natural gas.

So I say to the Madam Minister that that is simply not correct.

Madam Minister, I also . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. Order. Order. Order! I'd ask all members to please allow the member to proceed without too many interruptions.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Madam Minister, I am willing to predict that under the announcement that you have made today, that for the residents of Saskatchewan, the residential users, the price is going to increase. But I'll also predict, Madam Minister, that the price for the large-volume users, the large corporations, and the large users of natural gas, that their price is going to go down.

So, Madam Minister, I don't see this as an advantage to the ordinary resident of Saskatchewan, but I certainly see it as an advantage to the large-volume user who will now be able to go to the natural producer and buy the natural gas directly whereas we will still have to buy ours from SaskPower. And it doesn't make sense for an individual resident to buy directly from a natural producer.

Madam Minister, what you again haven't told the people of Saskatchewan, what you are announcing today is deregulation, yes. It may be irrelevant under the continental energy policy, but what you are announcing today is a good deal for the large producers who will be able to buy directly from a natural producer, natural gas producer. And that is what I see in this announcement.

And, Madam Minister, I think you could have — and you would have without deregulation — have increased a number of workers and a number of wells that are going to be drilled. If that is not true, Madam Minister, surely you're not telling us that all the wells, the increase in wells were only done since February since you've announced the first phase of your deregulation. Obviously not. That has happened over the last five years. So deregulation has nothing to do with the increase of the drilling of wells.

What you are saying to us today, Madam Minister, is a break for the large users; again, increased costs for the ordinary citizen of Saskatchewan. That's what we're going to see today.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

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

## CORRECTION IN HANSARD MADE BY MEMBER

**Mr. Anguish:** — Mr. Speaker, before going to orders of the day, I have a correction that I'd like to make in *Hansard*. It goes back to what was national honours day in this legislature on September 30.

And on page 2976 of *Hansard* I introduced one of the honoured dignitaries that day, Mr. Allen Sapp. And the information, Mr. Speaker, that was given to me was that Mr. Sapp was a Member of the Order of Canada, and apparently the protocol office had been given that information they passed on to me. And it has come to our attention, since the introduction, that Mr. Sapp is not a Member of the Order of Canada. He, in fact, is at an upper level as an Officer of the Order of Canada. And I referred to Mr. Sapp twice during the introduction, starting on line 3 of my intervention that day, and on the final line, and I'd like *Hansard* to show that Mr. Sapp, in fact, is an Officer of the Order of Canada and not a Member. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### MOTION UNDER RULE 16

#### Job Creation and Employment Opportunities for Saskatchewan People

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, at the end of my remarks I propose to move:

That this Assembly regrets that Saskatchewan is the only province in Canada to have lost jobs over the past twelve months, and regrets the alarming out-migration of Saskatchewan workers, including many young Saskatchewan workers, to other provinces, and urges the Government of Saskatchewan to take immediate steps to provide jobs and job opportunities for Saskatchewan people, including the establishment of an effective winter works program.

(1445)

Mr. Speaker, I want to spend some time this afternoon just talking about the figures which establish the facts stated in that motion, and not only establishes the facts but in their own way paint a picture of a great deal of difficulty and tragedy for Saskatchewan people.

The government opposite has talked about diversification and job creation as the things which they put highest on their agenda. And they have been the two major disappointments in the government's six-year record, despite promising an all out effort and pulling out all the plugs, and the many phrases they used. In spite of all of the things they said they were going to do about job creation, this government has failed to provide any substantial job increases for Saskatchewan residents, and I want to take them one by one.

Job creation — in the past five years the performance has been disappointing. It's been just over 6,000 — about 6,400 jobs a year have been created under the PC government. During the period from 1971 to 1981 the figure was well over 9,000 a year. And you can pick any five-year period and it would be better than any five years under the Tories. We had a promise in 1982 that there was going to be a major thrust to create jobs, we should bring the children home, there would be jobs for them. That was a key promise, and it has not been lived up to. I want to repeat those figures again. During the 1971 to '81 period, or I could take '82 as well, the job creation was 9,100 jobs a year. Since that time, '82-86, it's been 6,400 jobs a year.

And as you might expect, Mr. Speaker, this has meant that the number of people without jobs, the unemployed, has gone up and up and up. It's gone up, Mr. Speaker, from 21,000 in 1981 to 38,000 last year in 1986 — almost double. This from a government which promised us a real thrust in job creation. So as you might imagine, Mr. Speaker, the unemployment rate has gone up — gone up from 4.1 per cent in 1981 to 7.7 per cent — almost double — in 1986.

The jobless rate climbed very, very slowly during the decade of the 1970s. It went up from 3.5 per cent in '71 to 3.9 per cent in '76 to 4.1 per cent in '81. Over 10 years it went up .6 per cent. In the five years since that period — in the five years that the PCs have been in office — it's gone up not .6 per cent, but 3.6 per cent. In no NDP year was unemployment over 5 per cent, and in no PC year has it been under 6 per cent. The NDPs worst was under 5, the PCs best was over 6.

And, Mr. Speaker, the story with respect to youth employment is tragically much worse. Youth employment has consistently been higher than the employment for other people — when we speak of youth, we speak of the people from ages 15 or 16 to 24 — and it's up to around 12 per cent. And the number of jobs provided for young people has gone down each year.

I won't review all of the record of the 1970s, but let's take the PC years themselves. In 1981, just before they came to office, there were 110,000 young people had jobs. By 1982 it was down to 107; then it went down to 103, and this year, 1986, it's 101. From 110,000 it's dropped to 101,000 — 9,000 fewer jobs for young people. And this from a government which said, bring the young people home, we will provide jobs for them. That's a sad, sad record.

Now perhaps the most alarming is that the employment trend in Saskatchewan is much, much worse than other provinces — much, much worse. This year, when I checked the figures for August of this year, the number of people who were working was 2,000 fewer than last August — a drop of 2,000 jobs in a year. Now that, Mr. Speaker, indicates that we in Saskatchewan are losing jobs, and we are the only province in Canada that is — the only province in Canada. Manitoba had 4,000 more jobs; Alberta has 12,000 more jobs; Saskatchewan 2,000 fewer jobs. And of course, as you might expect, Mr. Speaker, our unemployment rate has gone up faster in Saskatchewan than any other province in the last 12

months.

These are statistics which you and I here in this House argue with. But they're much more than statistics, they're the story of people's lives — people, particularly young people, who are looking for jobs, who can't find jobs, and who are therefore considering leaving this province, and in many cases are leaving this province. We have seen a massive out-migration of Saskatchewan people. This business about migration is what the statisticians talk about, but you take the number of people who move into a province, you take the number of people who've moved out a province, and you take the difference, and the net out-migration in Saskatchewan in 1985 was 6,000; in '86, 8,400, and percentage-wise, Mr. Speaker, that's the poorest record in Canada.

As a percentage of our population or our work-force, any way you slice it, more people on a net basis are moving out of Saskatchewan than any other province. And they're moving into B.C. to a small extent, Manitoba to a small extent, Ontario to a very large extent. And I have to emphasize that these are the young people who are moving out. That's the real problem. I look at the numbers, and the number between 20 and 24, there are 3,300 people moved out of that age bracket — 3,300 people. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is more than all of the people who moved out and who are over 40 — from 40 to 80 it was 2,600, from 20 to 24 it was 3,300.

There is overwhelmingly an out-migration, a moving out of young people. They're all set out in five-year blocks, and the biggest block is the 20 to 24, and the next one is the 25 to 29, and the next one is the 30 to 34, and the next one is five-years and under, or four-years and under. We can see what's happening. People between the ages of 20 and 35 are moving out en masse; sometimes they have children, and they're taking their children with them. Those are the people who are leaving our province, and we will pay in the future for that future drain, that brain drain which is happening to us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as you might expect there are serious drops in unemployment in many sectors. Manufacturing is one, and we've heard this government talk about diversifying and opening manufacturing plants. Well in 1981, 21,500 people were working in manufacturing and processing, and by 1985 that number, after five years of their efforts at building and diversifying, had dropped by 3,000. That is a record of failure.

Surely in this day and age we ought at least to be able to hold the manufacturing and processing jobs we have; but the answer is no, we have not. We have seen a huge drop in jobs in manufacturing and processing. And as I've said, these are not only numbers, but they represent a toll of human grief when people lose jobs and have to uproot their families, and move out of the province. Most people don't want to do that, particularly if they're settled here with a family. But that's happening to them.

And it's not good enough for people to say, oh well, the wheat economy is down. And that's our trouble, there's many, many troubles. That's one of them. Gross financial mismanagement is another. Who is going to stay in this province and face the inevitable increase in taxes



because of the financial mismanagement of this government over five years? If you've got a choice, you move out because the prospects in the next several years are not bright.

And unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, an increasing number of the people who are unemployed are falling into the long-term unemployment category. More and more people are out of work for one year or more, sometimes two or three years, and some of the young people have never had a real job. And I know, as a parent of teenagers and people in their 20s, I don't like to see young people not have a job. I like to see them get used to the idea of having a regular job and going there. I don't like to have them working a little bit here and a little there. Sure, if that's all they can do, fine. But I'd like to see them have the discipline of having a regular job.

I suppose I represent the views of parents of the older generation, but I think a lot of parents can understand how I feel. And it wasn't this way with my older children. They got jobs and they stuck with them, and they finished their education and away they went. The younger ones are having more difficulty getting that regular employment, and I'm sure that many, many families in Saskatchewan can repeat that story.

And members opposite should know that the number of people on unemployment insurance in their constituencies are going up and up. The member for Turtleford, he's got 100 more people in his riding who are getting unemployment insurance than there were a year ago. The member for Melville, he's got 90 more.

Yes, there are many, many more people who are having to seek that type of protection when they don't want to. It's easy enough to say that people don't want to work. All I can say is, Mr. Speaker, when there were jobs, they worked. When there were jobs, they worked. And if there were jobs again, they'd work.

Two thousand fewer people working this August, not because they don't want to work, but because there are no jobs for them to go to. They haven't got lazy since last year. Two thousand people haven't got lazy since last August; 2,000 people who worked last August aren't working this August because there are no jobs.

Now that's a failure, not of these people; they haven't failed. Their government has failed them, with the worst job creation record in Canada. We need some more action on the part of the government. We need action to create jobs, and particularly now we need a winter works program.

That is the proposition I am putting to the government opposite — that whatever may have been their failures in the past, they turn to the job of creating some employment, particularly for young people, and now with a winter works program.

And with this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Regina Rosemont:

That this Assembly regrets that Saskatchewan is the only province in Canada to have lost jobs over

the last 12 months, regrets the alarming out-migration of Saskatchewan workers, including many young Saskatchewan workers to other provinces, and urges the Government of Saskatchewan to take immediate steps to provide jobs and job opportunities for Saskatchewan people, including the establishment of an effective winter works program.

Mr. Speaker, I so move.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lyons:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm particularly pleased to rise today to take part in this debate and to second the motion put forward by my friend and colleague, the member for Regina Elphinstone, to deal with . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — The hon. member.

**Mr. Lyons:** — The hon. member from Regina Elphinstone . . . in order to deal with this question, one of the most important political question which faces us as politicians, regardless of what political stripe we may stand for, in terms of the question of job creation for people in Saskatchewan, in terms for the long-term growth and development of a viable life for all Saskatchewan citizens.

(1500)

Mr. Speaker, I won't take the time of the Assembly to go through all the facts and figures, all the facts and figures which prove that this government and this government's job creation strategy — or I should say lack of a job creation strategy — has left us in this kind of predicament where Saskatchewan has the worst job creation record in the country. Because I don't think it will serve any good to go and to hold up time and time again that in fact the government has failed, and has failed quite miserably, in providing that kind of job creation strategy for the people of this province.

My colleague from Regina Elphinstone has pointed out, has pointed out the trends and statistics which prove beyond any kind of reasonable doubt that job creation has just not been a major consideration and a major priority with this government. And I suspect, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to put forward the notion that the blind endorsement of the free trade agreement that we see from the members opposite are going to result in an even further loss of jobs for Saskatchewan citizens.

And I am sure as the weeks unfold, I'm sure as the weeks unfold and as sector by sector the results of what is really in that free trade agreement comes in, whether people are working in the poultry industry or whether they're working in the red meat industry or working in the grain handling industry or working in the petrochemical industry, or working in manufacture or the service sector of this province, that one by one, each of these sectors will see the results of that free trade agreement in terms of jobs.

And I suspect, Mr. Speaker, I suspect that if this

government is foolish enough, and if the federal government is even more foolish enough to endorse that free trade agreement, you will see, not as this government says, not as this government proclaims, prosperity and jobs; you will see the erosion and the even further erosion of jobs in this province — an erosion that we have yet to witness since the 1930s. That was the last time we will have witnessed that kind of an erosion in jobs and opportunities for young people.

We have seen, Mr. Speaker, we have seen five years of a lack of action in job creation, which is leading to a lost generation of Saskatchewan youth. It's a lost generation for those young people in Saskatchewan who decide to stay and tough it out under the Tory years. It's a lost generation because they have seen job opportunities which once were there, disappear before their very eyes. It's a lost generation in terms of hopes and in terms of dreams for young people in this province. It's five lost years. And the young people in this province are asking themselves, how much more must we endure?

There are those people who've said, well, I'm going to stay and tough it out under these Tory years, because maybe things will get better. And things will get better, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Things will get better when this government opposite is changed, when it's replaced by a government which says it's the government's duty to lead the way in job creation. Unlike this government which does not believe that the government should intervene in the market-place to create jobs for young people or for all working people, the members on this side of the House stand four-square for that.

We believe it's the government's job to create job opportunities and jobs for all people in this province, regardless of their political ideology, regardless of where they stand on the political scale. We say that government members were elected to do a job when it comes to jobs, and they have failed in that job. And the statistics speak volumes. The statistics speak for themselves.

As the member for Regina Elphinstone has pointed out that the job creation record of this present government is nothing to be boastful about, is nothing to be dealt with in any kind of proud moment.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to jobs it's as if the Premier had said, whoa, had said whoa in that proverbial mud hole. And not only had he said whoa in the mud hole, when it come to jobs for young people, he sunk out of sight, bubbles rising to the top, disappearing along with the hopes and aspirations of jobs for young people. The minister said whoa in that mud hole and the young people are suffering. When it came to jobs he forgot to say, give her snooze, or if he did he spit it away in the spittoon along with the jobs for young people in this province.

And the facts speak for themselves. Unemployment in 1981 in this province was 21,000; unemployment, 1986 — 38,000. Very stark facts and statistics. And as the member from Elphinstone said, those statistics, however, don't tell the whole story. They don't tell the kind of misery that the young people of this province who have decided to stay here and tough it out are facing.

But there are other statistics which do tell the story. We went through an estimate process last night, estimates in the Department of (public) Health, and we've seen a rising tide, and I'll quote the Premier: "We've seen a rising tide of drug and alcohol abuse among young people in this province." And in order to react to that rising tide the government was forced to initiate the Whitespruce home.

There's a correlation between the rising tide of drug and alcohol abuse and the rising tide of unemployment. There is a definite and a provable and tangible correlation between those two phenomena that are occurring. As everybody knows, Mr. Speaker, when there is no opportunities, when the future appears bleak, when there doesn't appear any way out, when you appear trapped in a situation, a great many people in this society turn to alcohol, to abuse alcohol. And that's what's happening, that's what's happening with young people in our province who see their doors being shut, the doors of opportunity being shut when it comes to jobs and job creation.

And as those doors are shutting, do we hear any response to that on the job front from the members opposite? Do we hear the enunciation of any job strategy and job creation strategy from the government opposite? And the answer to that is no. The answer to that is no, despite the former rhetoric of this government, Mr. Speaker, about pulling out all the stops, about making job creation the top priority. No longer do we hear of job creation as being a priority for this government. And I wonder why. And I have to ask myself, why is that? Is it because they've lost all political credibility when it comes to jobs and job creation? Is it they've said, this is not our issue, we can't make political capital on this, so we're not going to talk about jobs and job creation? I think so.

So here we have, Mr. Speaker, here we are faced with a situation with winter fast approaching us — winter fast approaching, skies turning dark, air getting cold, and no announcement of a winter works creation project. No winter works creation project announced by the government opposite. We have record unemployment, we have rising unemployment among young people and we have no winter works job creation program by the government opposite.

Now I don't know, Mr. Speaker, why that's so. Is it because they don't care about jobs? Is that the reason? Are they bereft of ideas? After all, for five and a half years they have been unable to come up with any kind of coherent job creation strategy. Maybe they've run out of ideas. Maybe they don't have any initiative. Maybe their imagination is deadened and dulled from the fact that they've spent five and a half years trying to struggle with an outworn ideology which has been unable to produce when it comes to jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I know the members on this side of the House have ideas when it comes to job creation, we have ideas when it comes to winter works programs. We have ideas that will begin to put Saskatchewan workers, whether young or old, back on the road to full employment. Because, Mr. Speaker, we've got a full

employment strategy for Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** — Order. The member's time has elapsed.

**Mr. Hopfner:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I guess I should be surprised, but I'm not, that we have such a motion ahead of us on the floor today. I'd like to say that I'd like to speak in this context not only as a member of the legislature but as a concerned parent.

In the spring of 1982 the voters of the province of Saskatchewan elected a Progressive Conservative government. And since 1982 Saskatchewan has maintained one of the lowest unemployment rates in all of Canada. And I'm proud of that fact. And I'm proud of the record of our Progressive Conservative government in job creation, economic diversification, building Saskatchewan, and bringing home Saskatchewan young people.

For 10 long years prior to 1982, and those were the NDP years, all of us remember the fact that thousands of Saskatchewan young people had to migrate to other provinces like Alberta and British Columbia to find jobs.

**An Hon. Member:** — Even in the good times.

**Mr. Hopfner:** — And yes, as one of my colleagues said, in the good times. Saskatchewan, during the NDP years, became the subject of a joke around the rest of Canada with the line that I will quote: will the last person out of Saskatchewan turn out the lights?

Outward migration of Saskatchewan young people during the NDP regime was not a job, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It was a very sad commentary on our province. The parents of thousands of those young folks punished the NDP in 1982 by throwing them out of office.

Today before this Assembly, the NDP opposition has decided to waste over \$30,000 of public money by introducing a motion that is steeped in socialist rhetoric, cloaked in sanctimonious language, and dressed in self-serving words.

The motion before the Assembly tries to ignore the past. It does not want Saskatchewan people to be reminded of who was responsible for a whole generation of Saskatchewan people to migrate to other parts of Canada. The NDP does not want the people to be reminded that Saskatchewan suffered a net decline in population during their term of office. No, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the NDP does not want to hear about the years of stagnation during the time they were at the helm. I am indeed amazed that they would even introduce a motion at this particular time that would draw attention to their record of failure in improving employment opportunities for the young during the years prior to 1982.

Yet we have a motion before us that I say is an example of their tactics of fear and destitution. Mr. Deputy Speaker, since 1982, since the election of the Progressive Conservative government, the population of Saskatchewan has increased. And I am proud of the fact that it has been during the PC government that

Saskatchewan's population passed the one million mark.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hopfner:** — Many of the people who moved to Saskatchewan from other parts of Canada since 1982 were people returning home. They were coming home because they had confidence in the economic policies of our Premier and this government. That confidence comes from the people because they have a government that has the courage and the leadership to create jobs, to build, and have pride in our province.

(1515)

Building Saskatchewan has meant such positive economic projects as the construction of Canada's first heavy oil upgrader here in Regina. That project is employing many young workers who have come home to Saskatchewan. Building Saskatchewan has meant the construction of a new paper mill in Prince Albert, and that too has seen young people return home to Saskatchewan. Building Saskatchewan means projects to provide jobs and opportunities for people.

Mr. Speaker, building Saskatchewan does not mean dwelling in negatives, in tearing down, in dealing in doom and gloom. It means promoting the greatness of this province and its people. We have sat in this Assembly all summer and going on to 100 days, and all we have heard from the NDP opposition are negatives. They are against building Saskatchewan. They are against economic diversification. They willingly held up passage of the potash resources Act to protect thousands of jobs in that industry.

They are against free trade with the United States, and they are against new job creations through helping companies expand. They attack Gainers and they attack Weyerhaeuser. They attack the Premier for going to Japan and the United States to promote trade. So how do they dare come here today and say they are concerned about employment, about the job creation, about bringing young people back to Saskatchewan.

The Saskatchewan . . . I'd like to go on, Mr. Deputy Speaker, just to indicate to you some of the other incentives we had here. The Saskatchewan home program has succeeded in generating the employment for many Saskatchewan workers. The home program is expected to stimulate approximately 850 million of new investment and create 19,000 new jobs, yet the NDP opposition criticizes.

Saskatoon has become a major high-tech centre attracting new high tech in business, yet the opposition seeds . . . seeded doubts and attacked business people. This Assembly has sat for nearly 100 days and not once have we heard the NDP opposition offer a constructive or positive policy suggestion.

Yes, we can talk about alarming out-migration, the alarming out-migration of the NDP years, the time when young men and women packed their bags and left Saskatchewan, not because they wanted to but because

they had to. Small towns got smaller. A whole generation was missing, and you could see it in every town, village, and hamlet in Saskatchewan. That was the lasting legacy of the 10 years of the NDP.

We can talk about job opportunities for young people because this Progressive Conservative government is proud of its record in creating employment opportunities for young people. We can talk about Saskatchewan Builds program and our commitment to build our province tourism industry.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are many, many, many things that we could talk about. And before I take leave and let other members comment, I would just like to suggest to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I'm more than proud to pass this amendment to the motion, and that I will read. It will be seconded by the member from Moosomin:

That the motion under Rule 16 introduced by the Leader of the Opposition be amended by deleting all words after the words "That this Assembly" and substituting them with the words:

recognizes that Saskatchewan, since 1982, has maintained on average one of the lowest unemployment rates in Canada, almost two percentage points below the national average and is pleased with the increase in Saskatchewan's population to the 1 million mark, especially since many of the people moving into the province are young people who left prior to 1982, and commends the Government of Saskatchewan for its policies of economic diversification and job creation which have resulted in the creation of new employment for the young people.

Mr. Deputy, I so move.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Toth:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise in this Assembly today to join in this debate of the motion put forth by the present Leader of the Opposition. The motion urges the Government of Saskatchewan to take immediate steps to provide jobs and job opportunities for Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker.

However, Mr. Speaker, I can't support the original motion, but I rise in support of the amendment. Why do I support the amendment? Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain why I support the amendment.

I am proud to inform the members opposite that this government has provided jobs and job opportunities and that this government will continue to build on our positive record.

We will continue, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to build because we are aware of the great things this province has in store for it with continued initiatives presented to our youth.

Through the most up-to-date education programs and institutions and programs available for those who wish to learn or upgrade their skills, these initiatives in education, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I raise in this debate for obvious reasons. The importance of education and skill development cannot be overstated, for the link between these and job opportunities, not to mention job security, goes hand in hand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Saskatchewan as a province can only benefit from having a work-force and a business climate that is able to meet the demands of a rapidly changing world. Only a party that remains stuck in neutral, occasionally they slip into reverse, but more often than not, the NDP present themselves as the party that does not change with the times. And that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, may be why the connection between initiatives and education and jobs and job opportunities was never raised when the member put forth this motion. That party doesn't seem to make the connection.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, another link with jobs and job opportunities that went over the heads of the NDP is the important role that small business plays in this province — a role that is very significant. And, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege the other day of being involved in the official opening of another small business, an expanded business in the community of Rocanville. The vast majority of new job creation is generated by small businesses in Saskatchewan and, Mr. Speaker, over 5,000 more businesses are operating in Saskatchewan than they were when this government first took place in 1982.

And with the Business Opportunities Saskatchewan show held in Saskatoon that this government was involved in, Saskatchewan will feel the benefits of business and job opportunities for years to come.

Those are the facts, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And let me share some other facts that may not be easy listening for members opposite, but I really wouldn't want them to forget. I wouldn't want them to forget that in June of 1981 when the NDP were on this side of the House, the population of this province according to SHSP (Saskatchewan hospital services plan) was 990,746 and, according to that same source Saskatchewan's population in June of this year was 1,045,440.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that there are more people living in the province under this government than during the NDP's last full year of governing this province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let's take a look at some facts in the labour force. Statistics Canada reports that the total labour force in June 1981, under the former government of Saskatchewan, was approximately 457,000. But what is it today? The total labour force, based on participants 15 years of age and up, was 742,000 in June of 1987 under the present Progressive Conservative government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's almost 300,000 more people in the total labour force in the province — almost twice the amount — almost 100 per cent more people in the labour force in this province under the Progressive Conservative government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government recognizes that jobs come through diversification. Let me give you a few examples of how this has proven beneficial to Saskatchewan. The Prince Albert pulp and paper mill is a prime example of government ownership versus private ownership. Which would you rather see, a mill that was losing approximately \$90,000 per day, a mill that was not able to keep employees working, a mill that was destined to pull its workers and their families down with it? Or, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would you rather see the sale of this mill to private enterprise that brings the facility up to date, that creates jobs and encourages the introduction of a chemical plant to yet further enhance the opportunities for Saskatchewan and its people?

Another example of how, through its policies, this Progressive Conservative government has encouraged a great deal of economic activity right here in Regina, Mr. Deputy Speaker: the heavy oil upgrader. We chose to stay away from the tactics of the former administration, tactics such as whining and snivelling because no big multinational company wants to come into Saskatchewan and build an upgrader. The results of their style was evident — no upgrader.

This government worked in co-operation with the co-op to have the upgrader project turned into a reality, and that reality, Mr. Deputy Speaker, standing right on the east side of Regina today. It is an upgrader that's created many jobs, and it is an important product, an important construction item in this province and for the oil patch industry of this province.

I am sure you can see, Mr. Speaker, that the single solution proposed by the members opposite, that famous massive government intervention, to use the words of the member from Regina Rosemont, that solution is not the solution for Saskatchewan families and the future of this province.

This province will experience continued growth and opportunities, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because it does have a government that understands how to create growth. It does have a government that understands what opportunity means. It does have a government with the courage and the foresight to pursue all avenues of development, from free trade and diversification to renewed education institutions and excellence in research. It is your government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Progressive Conservative government, that is doing those things. And we will continue to do those things, Mr. Speaker, for Saskatchewan's future.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will be voting against the main motion, and am voting in favour of the amendment. Thank you.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Upshall:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd just like to make a couple of comments on some of the things that members opposite have said. One member told us that we run "open for business: in Saskatchewan and all the young people came home. And I agree that a lot of them did come home. But do you know what they did? They looked

around and they went to Manitoba because they could see that there was nothing going on here. They came home in the spirit of optimism and left depressed with the economic conditions of this province created by that government.

Something else I would like to mention, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the last speaker said, told us all the great jobs that were created. I have no argument with the jobs that are created, but that's not the issue. The issue here is the jobs that aren't being created. And look at the numbers. The jobs that aren't being created in this province are going up and up and up. The young people, as we have heard, are going: unemployment rates are increasing.

(1530)

I would just like to tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the constituency of Estevan, for example, numbers of persons collecting regular benefits has gone up — gone up. Kinistino — number of persons collecting regular benefits has increased, 350 to 420. Rural people — Melville, increased from 300 to 390 — 25 per cent. These are the jobs that are not being created, Mr. Deputy. Souris-Cannington, 330- up to 360; Turtleford, number of persons collecting regular unemployment benefits increased from April '86 to April '87, 550 up to 650. And in my own constituency of Humboldt, benefits increased 25 per cent from 380 to 480 people collecting unemployment. In Athabasca, 580 to 690.

This is the issue that we're discussing here; the jobs that are not being created; the people who are not working in this province; the people who, if they were working, would be able to contribute to the economy but are being stymied and stifled by the government opposite.

I can tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, why this isn't happening. We've seen grants to villages, to towns, to rural municipalities reduced or cut. This money was used to provide jobs in the rural communities; it was used to provide capital work projects to employ local people. It's gone. That's one reason why this . . . numbers have gone up.

We see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a program like the Opportunities '87 drastically cut. Young people this summer went out of school expecting to work because of a program that should have been initiated by a government to its fullest degree. And what did we see? More hopes based and dashed by the Tory government — the dream brokers, the dream spoilers. We see this money cut from Opportunities '87 grant, fewer people employed, and that same money — where did it go — squandered to the pockets of Tory hacks; squandered by a Tory government incapable of managing this province.

I can look at my own constituency where we have the Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a fine — and I'll use the words of the member from Weyburn — state of the art facility. And what's happening to PAMI? This government is reducing their funding this year, and they're threatening to cut out the jobs of 25 people next year by totally eliminating the funding. And if that's not true, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I

would ask the member for Weyburn to stand up and tell me they're not going to cut PAMI out, and I'd ask the Premier the same thing.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, where are the winter work projects? Where are they? These people sit over here across the floor telling us about how great things are, and I hope they keep telling us how great things are because I know the reality out in rural Saskatchewan, and the people out there are telling me things aren't so great. So I would encourage the members opposite to live in their little dream world, live in their little dream world, because you're totally out of touch with reality.

We see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, unprecedented tax increases with . . . end result, fewer services and fewer jobs. Fewer services and fewer jobs, because the government doesn't care whether people work. They care about Weyerhaeuser. They care about Pocklington. I care about the people out there who are unemployed who want to work.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we see the minister of unemployment harassing those who aren't working. And what are they doing to let them work? Not creating jobs, and at the same time turning around and harassing them because they're not working. What kind of attitude is that bestowed by a government who is supposedly looking after the people of this province? Putting people out of work instead of putting people to work.

And just think, I mean, it's simple economics. The more people that are working, the more taxes that are paid, thus reducing the general tax load. It's a stimulation of the economy. Where's the sense in keeping people out of work and taxing heavily those that are remaining? It dries up the economy. Mr. Deputy Speaker, putting a great burden on those who remain.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would just like to say something now about what I hear across the floor of this House. We hear, New Democrats are the ones who are spreading pessimistic attitudes, doom and gloom, fear monger — that's what members opposite are accusing our side of the House of. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not propagate fear, but I know fear when I'm looking it in the face. And the people of this province are telling me by the looks on their faces that they are afraid of what is happening.

The farmers of this province are afraid of why their children aren't getting jobs and what they're going to do. You know, how is my daughter or son going to establish himself, have a family, and contribute to the society when the government is not creating an economic atmosphere in this province whereby he can do that?

And what about those people not being counted? Those sons and daughters of farm families and rural families who are back on the farm or in the small business. They can't find a job; they've given up; they're helping out on the farm. They're not even a statistic.

What about the daughter who's taken four years of nurses' training, four years of training, Mr. Speaker, at an approximate cost of \$16,000 a year times four, is \$64,000 to educate that nurse — \$64,000 of taxpayers' money to

educate that nurse and she cannot get a job. Now you may say, well maybe she can't get a job, there's other people working. But the reality, Mr. Speaker, is we have hospitals in this province whose beds are closed down because of lack of funds to keep them open. We have 11,000 people waiting to get into hospitals. And we pay \$64,000 to educate a young person who wants to be a nurse to contribute to the society, and this government says no. And so what does she do? She'll go to Alberta or British Columbia or somewhere else.

So we're manufacturing very good working people from this province, at taxpayers' expense, and shipping them out of the province, forcing them out of the province, because this government will not loosen up funds for hospitals so that they can be employed to help the people who are in need of medicare care. And what's happening? What's happening? We have the cost of the education, we have tax dollars being spent, and we have a poor management . . . we have poor management by this government. The result is again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a drying up of Saskatchewan's economy by this government. And let's just talk about . . .

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** — Order. The member's time has elapsed.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Petersen:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm very pleased to join in today's debate. I'd like to perhaps fill in some of the obvious gaps in the opposite members' memories, and there's some pretty large gaps in there, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We hear the NDP talk about employment and unemployment. We hear them condemn the government, talking about new opportunities. They haven't got any. We don't hear them talk about new opportunities — not at all.

They don't talk about the oil upgrader in Regina. They don't talk about all those people who are working on site right now. Why don't you take a little tour? Get out of your ivory tower here and wander down to that site and take a look at what real people doing real jobs are like. Take a good look. Maybe you'll learn something.

They try to create an impression that there's a mass exodus out of this province, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That's not true. Members opposite know it. The Leader of the Opposition quoted from figures, back and forth statistics. They point to us like drop in the work-force and they say, it's a disaster.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to remind them of a few facts. Let's compare records — their record to ours. They may not like to admit it, but from May of 1978 for example to May of '81, 7,000 more people left the province than came into it. And you can't deny those numbers, Mr. Speaker. The NDP can't deny those figures, Mr. Speaker. And according to their own rhetoric that we've just heard quite a bit of, that was during good economic times, Mr. Deputy Speaker — good economic times.

Now let's take a look at May, 1982, to May '86 under a PC government in what we've heard members of the opposition call tough times, Tory times, and yes, Mr.

Speaker, we have had some economic set-backs. Yes, we have. During that time 6,700 more people came into Saskatchewan than left, Mr. Speaker — came in. In their administration during good times, 7,000 left; under our administration during tough times, almost 7,000 came in.

What does that say, Mr. Deputy Speaker? It says, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that people have more confidence in a Conservative government in Saskatchewan than they have in the NDP's doom and gloom rhetoric that we've heard so much of today.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Petersen:** — They call for job creation programs. They call for job creation programs as if none exist. We heard the Leader of the Opposition talk about a winter works program, a winter works program. Well that was their answer to everything, I guess, if it's his answer to everything today. But they don't talk about the home program that we instituted. They liked it though. They liked it so well, they incorporated it as part of their platform during the last election. They called it 7-7-7, when you had to be seven years old, or 70, or seven months, or I'm not sure what exactly it was. But the long and short of it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was that they agreed that creating employment in the housing sector was a good thing. But we didn't hear the member opposite talk about that.

The home program is one of the most successful job-creation programs in the history of Saskatchewan. And it's not for a two-month period during one winter. It's not designed for people who are over 35 years old and going bald, for example. It's designed for everyone who wants to work — everyone who wants to work. Young people, Mr. Deputy Speaker, tradespeople, small business can benefit from it.

Fourteen thousand new jobs, Mr. Speaker, have been created by that program, and over \$600 million worth of economic activity have been generated. And the Leader of the Opposition neglected that. He kind of missed it. Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope he takes notice of it now.

The NDP have a fixed vision of what job creation should be. They can't allow small businesses to create jobs. They oppose programs like our home program. They oppose businesses. They don't want to see the heavy oil upgrader going. They didn't want to see the P.A. paper mill come into being. They don't want to see the Gainers bacon plant in North Battleford. They're against private enterprise. They're against small business. They're against people.

We talk about, what are our children going to do? Well, Mr. Speaker, some of us went through technical training programs and became mechanics, as I did, and had to leave the province to find a job back in the '70s. I couldn't get a job in Saskatchewan.

**An Hon. Member:** — How many of your class-mates did the same?

**Mr. Petersen:** — Most of my class-mates left. At the present time, some have come back again into

Saskatchewan, and I'm proud to say that my children are looking forward to completing their education in Saskatchewan.

But let's talk about the people who didn't want to, or maybe weren't given the opportunity to work in trades areas or perhaps in some of the professions — go to university, become a nurse, become a doctor, become a lawyer. What about people like that? And we've got lots of them in the province, Mr. Speaker.

In my home town, the town of Rose Valley, a lot of the people there, a lot of the farmer have some part-time jobs; a lot of the people make full-time employment out of working the diamond drills up North, working the oil patch, Mr. Speaker, in the South.

(1545)

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we had companies calling my office asking me if I knew of any young farmer who wanted to go to work who wasn't combining, because they desperately needed them because they're moving into the province to drill in the North and to drill in the oil patch.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Petersen:** — And I would suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that that's a direct result of many of our programs and many of our proposals that the NDP call no good. They don't want to see people working in the oil patch. They don't want to see people working in the diamond drills. They shut in the oil when they were in power, they chased investment out.

Let's take a look at the mentality of the NDP. Mind you, I might have to use a magnifying glass. It comes from *Hansard*, March 24, 1986, page 120. The former NDP member for Cumberland, who could hardly be deemed part of the party's left wing, said the following, and I quote, Mr. Speaker:

Mr. Speaker, capitalism is a system which does not work for northern Saskatchewan.

The blanket statement that capitalism does not work. Well what did they think would work? DNS, the department of northern Saskatchewan, and they imposed it on Northerners. That was their idea of job creation. Create a bureaucratic nightmare — a bureaucratic nightmare.

Take a look at the department when we took office. It was a department run amuck. It answered to no one. It just went wild. Millions and millions of dollars were wasted in that bureaucratic paper shuffle. Did it create meaningful employment? No. Did it create anything that produced a product that could be used? No.

Now a lot of the members talk about private enterprise is a bad thing but, Mr. Speaker, when you compare the record of a monster like DNS that created a bureaucratic nightmare of paper shuffling, compared to the jobs, the real jobs that people in Saskatchewan have today, I think the record speaks for itself.

In the North, private enterprise has developed wild rice farming, we have food processing, gold exploration development, uranium mining. And with the coming into being of a free trade pact, uranium will once again be very, very important for the people of the North and for the constituents from Athabasca and Cumberland to obtain employment.

The PC government in Saskatchewan has encouraged this type of activity; we've even helped it to expand and grow in Saskatchewan. We're not stuck into one narrow train of thought that the government can create all the jobs by itself, hire all the people. We believe in building and working with private enterprise. The NDP don't. They believe in the status quo — keep it as it is, let government do it all for you.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the past five years the people of the province of Saskatchewan have spoken twice and I think it's time the members opposite started to listen. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Goulet:** — Mr. Speaker, I'll be of course speaking in favour of the motion and against the amendment.

I would like to start my talk out with a comment on some of the statements made by the member from Moosomin, and the member from Cut Knife-Lloyd, and also the member from Kelvington-Wadena. And what I would like to show from those statements is to clearly show the empty rhetoric — the empty general rhetoric of the PC government. Also I would like to show, following that, what the actual facts are in the province of Saskatchewan, but also in the relation to the North, but also in relation to Indian and Métis people.

First of all, what I hear the PC government members saying is this. In the initial stage they had the rhetoric of more jobs through open for business; recently free trade and diversification are the saviours. Now they also state that we are dealing in the past.

But the other thing that they always mention in all of their talks in the past while is the question of fear. And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say yes to the Tories when they talk about fear. Of any government in the history of Saskatchewan, there has been none like the PCs that have created more fear in this province.

When they talk about fear, it tells me one thing. At least there is a tiny speck of guilt behind that rhetoric, because they know it is true that they have created fear in this province. So from a subconscious basis, they always come out and talk about this fear. So fear is the essence of the PC government policy and the PC government strategy.

When I look at the reply and the input of people, they say this is the most negative government that they have ever met. This is a government that has cut us back the most in the history of Saskatchewan. And as I travel around, that's the essence of their statements.

We come here to present a motion that looks at a specific

thing in the future, the real importance of jobs. Because it is not done in the oil patch, because it is not done to a very great extent in all other areas, we have to look forward to the cold winter months now and do something about a simple fact that has arisen in the last five years — the winter works programs have been steadily cut back. And the winter . . . Of course we come through a tough winter last year, and it will even be tougher this coming year.

Our proposal is a positive proposal, Mr. Speaker. It is one that looks at trying to get jobs for people through the winter — the jobs that the PC government has been unable to put into place because of their lack of planning and their simple give-away strategies to big business.

When I look at the reality, Mr. Speaker, I look at the facts from the period 1971, when the NDP came in power, to the period of course till 1981. And I look at the facts. In that period in time there was an increase in jobs — over 9,000 jobs per year.

When I look at the PC strategy in 1981 to '86, the record is 6,400 jobs; in other words, approximately 3,000 less jobs per year is the record for the PC government — 3,000 less jobs in the period in each year between '81 and '86, than between the period of 1971 to 1981. Those are the records; the facts speak for themselves.

When we look from 1981 to '86, the last time the NDP was in power, the unemployment rate has doubled. And when you look at a more closer record of the past year, we look at the fact that the Manitoba record is one where there's an increase of jobs of 4,000 over there, Mr. Speaker. And when I look at Alberta, it's an increase of 12,000. What do we get in Saskatchewan? A cut-back in number of jobs by 2,000. There's 2,000 less jobs and fewer jobs in this province, when on either side of these two provinces we have increases. That is the fact of the Saskatchewan record.

We also know that people are leaving this province. Our youth are leaving this province. Six thousand left in 1985; over 8,400 left in 1986; 1987, up to August, Mr. Speaker, we have about 6,000 have already gone. Our top people have been pushed out of this province. Our hard-working people are being squeezed out. Our youth are looking all over the place. All the people who have made a living here for many years are leaving our province.

When I look into the question of the North, one of the members, an opposite, talked about the North, and I must say that he kept talking about the rhetoric of PCs and the small business strategy. But what is the reality and what are the facts, Mr. Speaker? In general, I do know that there's a lot more small businesses that have gone down the drain in this province than at any time in the period in history.

That also the fact remains in northern Saskatchewan if you look at specific agreements, the very specific agreements, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the Key Lake contract which the NDP government put together where you had to have a monitoring committee to be able to favour small business and to make sure that small business was getting the contracts from the mining development, that was the record of the NDP. There was



more small business in northern Saskatchewan getting jobs through mining and forestry than what you will ever see with this PC government in the past five years.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Goulet:** — Not only was there more, Mr. Speaker, what you saw in the small business strategy was direct help and direct benefit to the businesses. The small business sector was provided with a 10 per cent clause. What that 10 per cent clause meant, Mr. Speaker, is that when they were bidding, the northern contractors, the northern small businesses were provided with a 10 per cent basis so that if they bid 9 per cent lower than the person, they would still be the ones that would be getting the jobs. And that was a specific directed strategy for small business by the NDP government during the period of the NDP administration. But when this government came in they took that away. They took it away.

When you also look at the jobs, we know that the jobs for Key Lake went down since the NDP administration because they did away with the monitoring committee also. The hiring of Northerners was an extremely important aspect of the NDP policy, and the practice was there where we had 60 per cent of the people hired.

When this government came in, now we look at the record. When I look at the record, the past two years, it even went down to 15 per cent. Yet this same government will talk about law and looking after the law, Mr. Speaker, and yet this same government won't even follow their own laws that are existing in terms of the employment of the people in this province and especially in northern Saskatchewan.

So when I look at the empty rhetoric, Mr. Speaker, they do not look at the facts. They do not look at the facts because what I see in the brand-new agreements, these brand-new policies, all they say is encourage.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Time has expired.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm just sorry, Mr. Speaker, that I haven't got half an hour to speak instead of two or three minutes. But it just bothered me today so much, Mr. Speaker, to hear the rhetoric coming from the other side of this House talking about this government not promoting jobs, and there have been less jobs in this province while we've been in government than when they were in government. That's absolutely ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, and they know so.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Muirhead:** — They stand up here with their cheap scare tactics is what they're doing. When I hear people stand up and talk about ... that's so mixed up — the member from Cumberland when he says 3,000 less jobs, then he says 2,000 less jobs, then he said 1,000 less jobs, he doesn't even believe what he's saying himself. He knows these things aren't true. It's just plain scare tactics, Mr. Speaker. And we have to sit and listen to it here day after day.

We've been sitting on this — it will soon be 90 days sitting

here, and we have to listen to it in question period, we have to listen to it in estimates, and we have to listen to it in debates — trying to scare the people of Saskatchewan.

Now that is not true, and who is the judge? The people of Saskatchewan have been the judge because they know, Mr. Speaker, when we had an election last fall that their scare tactics were not right, and that's why they re-elected the Progressive Conservatives for the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

We had to listen to the only — only elected farmer, who calls himself a farmer — the only elected one in the province of Saskatchewan, the member from Humboldt who stood up here and tried to tell us all these statistics. Well I think a *Hansard* should be taken back out to the constituents of Humboldt, and there's no way that that gentleman could ever be re-elected to this here legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a part of the Progressive Conservative government when I look back over the last five years and see the jobs that's been brought to the people of this province by this government.

(1600)

We hear the members opposite say there's been thousands of businesses go under under this government. That's absolutely false.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. I am afraid time has elapsed.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — Mr. Speaker, with leave of the Assembly, I move that we stand all the motions down to no. 21 and move on to adjourned debates.

Leave granted.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### ADJOURNED DEBATES

#### SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debates on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. McLeod that Bill No. 34 — **An Act to amend The Prescription Drug Act** be now read a second time.

**Mr. Koenker:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to start out by saying that I am 100 per cent opposed to this Bill. I think it's an abomination, I think it's wrong headed, I think it's cruel, I think it's opportunistic for these Progressive Conservative members opposite to introduce this kind of legislation to the people of Saskatchewan.

What we see with this drug prescription Bill, Mr. Speaker, is the beginning of the end of medicare. We see a poisoning of the medicare system with this legislation; we see a drugging of the people of Saskatchewan into accepting the demise of their medicare system.

This Bill wrecks the Saskatchewan prescription drug program, and it wrecks it because it shifts the burden of paying for medical care in terms of prescription drugs onto the backs of individual Saskatchewan people, onto the backs of individual Saskatchewan households. And this is what Saskatchewan people find so unacceptable.

For years they've come to expect that their provincial government recognizes its responsibility to provide medical services, to provide prescription drug services, and the plan that was introduced here in Saskatchewan was a model for drug prescription plans across Canada and indeed across the world.

What we realize, Mr. Speaker, and what everyone in Saskatchewan realizes fundamentally, is that illness or disease is no respecter of persons — is no respecter of individuals. And it's for that reason that the good people of Saskatchewan and the New Democratic government put into place a prescription drug plan that would protect Saskatchewan people from the unfortunate incidences of unforeseen illness or accident or disease.

Crucial drugs should not be predicated on the ability to pay, not if we want to have a universally accessible health care system. And what this Bill does, this prescription drug Bill does, is it shifts the ability to receive the drug onto the individual's ability to pay for it. And, Mr. Speaker, I have people in my Saskatoon Sutherland constituency who have already told me that they are doctoring themselves as a result of this Bill. They are doctoring themselves by either deciding that, well I don't really need to fill this prescription, perhaps I can do without it even though the doctor has ordered me to, and told me that I needed this prescription, since I can't afford the money up front, I'll hold back and I won't go to the drug store and buy it. That's one scenario that I've had a number of people in my constituency tell me; a decision that they have taken upon themselves because they don't have the ability to pay.

The other option, of course, which is very similar but slightly different, is simply to take the prescription and to cut it in half. Now they can do that. Some of them have told me that they've asked the druggists if he would only fill half the prescription. What is the cost, they ask? Sixty-four dollars they're told. Could you fill half the prescription? I can't afford quite that much money; I don't have it up front, could you do only half of it for \$32? Either that or they get the . . . if the druggist won't do that, they get the prescription filled for \$64 and then ration the drugs to themselves, again playing doctor.

Well for individual people to assume that medical responsibility after they've had medical authority suggest to them that they need drugs for certain illnesses and disease is playing fast and loose with the health care system of Saskatchewan. It requires that people . . . and this Bill requires that people put the money up front for their prescription drugs, an impossibility for many people on fixed incomes, elderly, single parents, and the like. This Bill does nothing to help those kinds of people.

In addition this, Mr. Speaker, another major problem with this Bill is that it eliminate from the formulary a whole class of prescription drugs — a whole class of

prescription drugs that are no longer available under the formulary that was part of the old prescription drug plan. And that means that people have to pay more for those drugs because they aren't included in the government's plan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about the cost of this plan. I haven't heard a whole lot about how much this is going to save the government. I think we can have estimates ranging up to \$30 million a year perhaps.

Be that as it may, what this Bill does is shift the cost of these drugs to the individual. As I've explained, it privatizes health care. It doesn't reduce the cost of prescription drugs for Saskatchewan people by 1 cent or by \$1. It simply shifts the burden for paying for those drugs onto the backs of Saskatchewan people.

And it's in this connection then, that I think we need to see this prescription drug plan, as set over against proposals by the federal government to change the generic . . . the prescription drug legislation for Canada and increase the waiting time for generic drugs to come on the market, because it's this kind of measure by the federal PC cousins in Ottawa that is in collusion or in partnership with the provincial PC plan to raise drug costs to Saskatchewan people, both provincially and on the federal level. And we have both level of governments partners to this — PC partners.

Mr. Speaker, in order to understand this issue and how this shift is taking place, we need to understand that it was back in 1969 that the patent Act respecting pharmaceutical drugs was introduced by the federal Consumer Affairs minister. And what this patent legislation did in 1969 was to allow manufacturers of generic drugs to produce less expensive equivalents of brand-name drugs, so the pharmacists and the consuming public could make a choice between whether they wanted a brand-name drug or a generic drug.

And anyone who goes to the supermarket nowadays knows that there certainly is to be a savings effected by buying a generic product as over against a name-brand product, and most of us in Saskatchewan realize that when it comes to prescription drugs. And when we look at something like aspirin, if we buy a brand-name aspirin, we pay proportionately more for it. Last time I did so, and bought the generic aspirin, I got the same amount for about half the price of the name brand. And I think most Saskatchewan people will recognize the savings effected by that sort of thing.

Now my point is, Mr. Speaker, that it was not without cause that the federal government in 1969 introduced this legislation, because it effected a savings for individual Canadians in their drug purchases. But more importantly, when the provincial governments, Saskatchewan leading the way, introduced their prescription drug programs, it meant that when they went to buy drugs for their populace, they could have the choice of buying generic drugs or name-brand drugs. And what this meant then, is that provincial governments, such as the Government of Saskatchewan itself — just as a consumer had the choice to buy generic drugs or brand-name drugs — could buy generic drugs and therein effect a considerable savings

given the scale in which the provincial plan was buying drugs.

So in 1969 then, Canada went from having among the most expensive drugs in the world to having the cheapest, as a result of this simple change in patent legislation. Now what we have with federal government's suggestion, the Mulroney government's suggestion, that we end this system introduced in 1979, is that the brand-name drug manufacturers would now have a 10-year monopoly on all marketing of newly patented drugs — a 10-year monopoly as opposed to the previous provisions. And this 10-year monopoly, it's estimated, will cost Canadian patients \$300 million a year in higher prescription drug costs.

We're told by a group of Saskatoon doctors within the last year — as they reviewed this legislation, this Mulroney legislation — we're told by these Saskatoon doctors that they estimate the extra cost to Saskatchewan people being in the neighbourhood of \$10 million a year if this patent drug legislation changes. Well that's the doctors in Saskatoon. The Canadian Drug Manufacturing Association, a group of generic drug companies lobbying against changes to this patent legislation, say it will cost consumers and the drug plan in Saskatchewan an extra \$26 million by 1995.

And so my point is, Mr. Speaker, that we have introduced here a Bill to change the Saskatchewan prescription drug program, and at the same time we have federal legislation introduced by the Mulroney government to change the patent drug legislation of Canada which grossly inflates the cost of drugs to this provincial government. So if they were really concerned, if the Minister of Health were really concerned about the cost of prescription drugs for Saskatchewan people, it would seem to me, at least, that he would address the situation of the patent drug legislation changes and tackle the federal government, the Mulroney government, on this issue, which is precisely what hasn't happened to date.

Indeed, we find exactly the opposite, that the present government, the present PC government of this province, supports the federal drug legislation, the patent legislation changes, even though the Bill could cost Saskatchewan consumers up to an extra \$26 million a year. Now who's going to be paying for that? Indirectly, the provincial government, but directly, the Saskatchewan taxpayer by additional taxes.

Take the lower figure offered by the Saskatchewan physicians when they talk about \$10 million. That's still a considerable savings. And yet this government, this PC government of Saskatchewan, has not uttered one protest concerning this federal legislation.

(1615)

And the only result, the only spin-off of this restrictive patent legislation is higher costs for new prescription drugs. Now why wouldn't this government tackle that issue? Why does it tackle individual Saskatchewan taxpayers and shift the burden of providing drugs onto their backs?

What we have, Mr. Speaker, is a privatization of pain, a privatization of the health care system, a shifting of the burden and of the responsibility that we share collectively to each other, back onto the individual families and onto individual persons.

And as I said earlier, disease or illness is no respecter of individuals. Any one of us could be struck by a debilitating sickness that requires prescription drugs. And the question is: what ability do we have to pay for that prescription drugs or to contend with these costs? In some instances the costs for new drugs, for experimental drugs, can be enormous.

And the fundamental question then is: should the individual be subject to the whims of fortune and outrageous fate when it comes to sickness and illness and disease, or does not the provincial government, do not the people collectively, have a responsibility to spread the burden of health care and associated costs?

And I think Saskatchewan people long ago — 25 years ago when they introduced medicare — said that we do have a collective responsibility to one another. We are our brother's or our sister's keeper in a fundamental sense. We do bear responsibility to protect and to cushion each other from the ravages of — not just physically, but fiscally — of illness and disease. But with the elimination of these generic drugs and not a murmur of dissent from this government to the federal government over these changes, we see an outstanding example of the hypocrisy and the failure of this government to protect the interests, the best interests of Saskatchewan taxpayers.

Jack Kay, a member of the Canadian (Generic) Drug Manufacturers Association, lobbying against the federal drug legislation says that "Saskatchewan consumers will pay \$26 million more for drugs by 1995 as a result of this legislation." And already now Saskatchewan taxpayers with this Bill 34 before the House to change the prescription drug legislation, already now Saskatchewan taxpayers are being asked to pay more when the federal legislation hasn't even been introduced. One wonders what we're headed for.

It's no wonder then, Mr. Speaker, that a considerable coalition of people have risen up in opposition to this legislation. And I think some of the same organizations here in Saskatchewan are opposing this very Bill, the prescription drug legislation we have before us in this House right now.

On the federal level we have the National Anti-Poverty Organization — it's no wonder that they would protest this legislation. The National Pensioners and Senior Citizens Federation — little wonder that they would oppose it. The Canadian Council on Social Development, the Canadian Labour Congress, the National Action Committee on the Status of Women, and representatives from countless senior citizens organizations and health care organizations across the country. Why would this be? Why would senior citizens, for example, protest this legislation? Because it's going to cost them dearly. And this same legislation in this House before us now, Bill 34, is going to cost senior citizens dearly and will be no respecter of persons or their abilities

to pay.

The former head of the . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Why don't you send the Bill?

**Mr. Koenker:** — Just a moment, Mr. Speaker, here. Nationally, it's estimated that Canadians collectively will spend an extra \$650 million by 1995 for prescription drugs. But what kind of sense does it make for us here in Saskatchewan to tackle one little corner of the prescription drug program and start chiselling away at individual consumers of drugs, then demanding that they pay up front by this legislation, and at the same time ignore a situation where, federally, Canadians collectively are going to be asked to pay an extra \$650 million in the next decade annually for prescription drugs?

Fundamentally, it seems to me, there's something wrong with the approach of the Minister of Health on this issue. Fundamentally we have a failure to protect the interests of Saskatchewan people.

There's no net benefit in this Bill for Canadians, says Mr. Kay, the head of the Canadian Generic Drug Manufacturers Association. There's no net benefit in this Bill for Canadians. It's a sell-out to pressure from the United States, said Mr. Kay, another sell-out, another give-away by this government to the Americans as part of the free trade negotiation, a direct result of the free trade negotiation that was initiated.

And this is very current, Mr. Speaker, because it was at the "shamrock summit" that Mr. Reagan came to Mr. Mulroney and said, if you want a free trade agreement, you change your patent drug legislation regardless of what it costs Canadian taxpayers — \$650 million.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. I'm not sure if free trade negotiations regarding drugs applies to The Prescription Drugs Act before the House.

**Mr. Koenker:** — I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I guess I'm not making my . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. Order, please. I know hon. members . . . some hon. members don't like these sorts of things brought to their attention, and certainly I'm not referring to the member from Saskatoon Sutherland because it isn't him at this moment, but many other members. However, from time to time it's my role to remind members that while some latitude is allowed in these speeches, they have to impose some rules.

**Mr. Koenker:** — I apologize, Mr. Speaker, in the sense that I don't think I've made myself clear. My point earlier, I think I have made clear, is that the patent legislation increases the costs of drugs; that this government is increasing the cost of drugs here in Saskatchewan to individual people. It's not tackling a corresponding increase in the cost of drugs federally, and I've simply mentioned the shamrock summit to detail the genesis of how this legislation was introduced. And that was the point that I wanted to make, that it was as a result of Mr. Reagan coming to Mr. Mulroney that we have that

situation and that now we have a government that is unwilling to challenge that legislation.

So I think the real issue then for us here in Saskatchewan is: how do we handle these changes that have been introduced? Now that we have a government that seems unwilling or incapable of addressing the larger changes, the fundamental structural changes in the prescription drug legislation federally, and simply keeps its mouth shut on the issue, what do we do now when we come to this particular Bill that deals with the provincial drug plan?

Well I think in the fundamental sense there is very little that we can do because the government has made up its mind to shift the burden of health care onto individuals, and as a result individual Saskatchewan taxpayers will be paying more for their drugs. This betrays Saskatchewan people. It betrays the heritage that we have here in Saskatchewan which is a heritage of collective responsibility. This was a tradition of Saskatchewan pioneers — that we care about one another, that we show compassion, and this is precisely the failing in this particular drug Bill.

It introduces into the Saskatchewan health care system the principle of user-pay. It doesn't matter whether you're sick or not, if you need drugs, you pay. And if you don't have the money, you pay. And if you still don't have the money, then heaven help you, but you will have to pay up front; you must have the funds to pay for that drug or you simply don't get it. That's a fundamental shift in Saskatchewan's prescription drug plan — the drug plan that we had before the Minister of Health introduced this Bill — a fundamental shift. And it's a shift that the people of Saskatchewan are not willing to accommodate because it gets so fundamental to our values system and to the tradition of this province.

This government is simply, with this legislation, betraying its incompetence. Why in the world would it shift the burden of provision of paying for prescription drugs onto the individuals? Because it's given away too much to the corporate sector. And that's why individual senior citizens will have to begin doctoring themselves and deciding to cut back on their prescriptions and to maybe even try to wean themselves off the drugs altogether at their own discretion and not the discretion of their doctor.

And this is no way to improve our health care system. It's a way to erode our health care system, and to compromise it, and to endanger individual lives, and so that's why I stand fundamentally opposed to this legislation. I can't envision individual Saskatchewan people doctoring themselves. I think we have concerns, all of us, that perhaps as a society we have too much dependence at many junctures on prescription drugs, but that isn't the issue here.

The issue is the ability to pay, and this is my concern. My concern is that by its mismanagement and by its incompetence that this government is changing the health care system that we have come to know and enjoy and appreciate here in Saskatchewan. This drug prescription legislation undermines our medicare system.

It's the wrecking of medicare; it's a poisoning of medicare; and it's a prime example of PC policy — PC policy federally which foists increased costs for drugs onto individual taxpayers and PC policy provincially which foists the cost of drugs onto individual taxpayers.

And there's going to be a revolt over this legislation, and there already has been a revolt over this legislation because even though the populous and the people of Saskatchewan have quieted down on this question of the prescription drug legislation, I think they've made already a fundamental decision with respect to it. And that decision is to say, any government that would change our prescription drug program in this fashion simply does not have our confidence. It has to go. And I think it's instructive for us then today that we don't hear wails and gales of protest over this legislation from the public.

And my suspicion, Mr. Speaker, is that the people of Saskatchewan have already written this government off, have digested this legislation personally in their own lives as they've gone — when was it? July 1? — before July 1 to the drug stores and bought drugs and store piles of drugs under the old plan. That's instructive I think, Mr. Speaker. That tells us that they have smelled a rat, that they know what is in store for them, and they now are only waiting for the change in the government.

They aren't going to attempt to change this policy overnight. And I don't think that this speech I'm giving now is going to change this policy at all. But fundamentally it will be changed.

(1630)

It will be changed when a New Democratic government comes into office and re-establishes a prescription drug program that is as good as Saskatchewan's own people, a prescription drug program that does not shift the burden of payment onto individual Saskatchewan people, that respects our collective responsibility to each other, and that is testimony to the competence and the caring and the compassion of a government that really does put human priorities first, and not just its political friends and patronage and the like, a government that is willing to stand up for its people and to tackle the federal government if it's out of line and compromising the best interests of Saskatchewan taxpayers.

And that's why, Mr. Speaker, I stand fundamentally opposed to this legislation. I wouldn't vote for this legislation if my life depended on it. And I thank you very much for your attention to my speech.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I understand the House Leader wants to move along very shortly, and I'll only take a brief while today to lay out some comments for the members, and perhaps will speak another time on this very important Bill.

Whenever we have important legislation such as this before the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, it's important that we examine it thoroughly, that we debate the issue back and forwards, and that we check the commitment of the

government to its programs. And one of its programs and one of its commitments was health care for the people of Saskatchewan.

They said, and I heard them say many, many times in the expensive advertising, that health care was number one with them. Matter of fact, I went back and got an ad that the Conservative Party had run in the *Star-Phoenix* or *Leader-Post* — I think they ran it in both of them — back in April 26, 1983, one year after they had been in power.

And in this particular ad, I think we can see that they clearly lay out what their commitment and policies were, and how strongly they adhere to those policies. And this ad was fairly self-congratulatory of the Conservative Party and the Premier. It starts out: . . . "because a promise is a promise." This is the Premier of our province one year after being in power, saying in an ad, "a promise is a promise." And in this ad they deal with a number of things.

In order to get the background of their commitment to health care, you have to examine their whole program, but essentially I shall hone in on health care. But they say, gasoline tax removed. This is back in '83. And they also say that the Government of Saskatchewan is proud to have played a major role enabling a Saskatchewan group to obtain an NHL hockey team. Well now that's not a big thing in Saskatchewan, but apparently the Premier had obtained an NHL hockey team in April 1983. A promise is a promise, he said.

They were saying that the Progressive Conservative government extended the Saskatchewan dental plan to include 16-year-olds. They extended the Saskatchewan dental plan to include 16-year-olds.

And they also said children's clothing is exempt from provincial sales tax. Well to that I say, so what, Mr. Speaker? Children's clothing was exempt from provincial sales tax in January of 1982; this government didn't come into power until May of 1982. But here they are in their ad, taking credit for it.

And in another sector, they say . . . Under the business sector, Mr. Speaker, very strong on business. Now the commitment of this party, who says a promise is a promise, displays broken commitment across the piece, Mr. Speaker. For business, they say. They're assisting business — with trade development, aid to trade programs, and encouraging new investment. And they go on and they say they're going to establish a Public Utilities Review Commission.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the sales tax has been put back on. We don't have an NHL hockey team. The dental program to 16-year-olds has been virtually demolished — changed from a school-based program serving hundreds of communities, down to a different type of program which has limited services, serving significantly less communities in Saskatchewan. And the business development programs are gone — taken away by this government in the last budget. And we all know that the Public Utilities Review Commission is being sacrificed as well by this government.

Now I don't know, in this ad where the Premier says, because a promise is a promise, means anything or not, or whether the Premier was telling an untruth in this ad. Now we realize that as we go through life there are certain untruths that are required. And I happened to come across an article, Mr. Speaker, dealing with this very issue. It says, and I quote:

Lying, a necessity, psychologist says. Lying is integral to a typical day of spared feelings, boosted egos, and social graces.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. Order. Order. First of all, I question whether that vein of the speech should be permitted. Secondly, I fail to see how the hon. member will relate it to the prescription drug plan. And if he directly relates it to the drugs Act, he knows the rules of the House.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I shall not stray from the topic which is before us, which is Bill 34, dealing with prescription drug legislation in the province of Saskatchewan. And I want to deal with this government's commitment to health care which they said was number one, including a prescription drug plan, not to mention dental care and hospitals and all those kinds of things, but prescription drug which is number one, and health care overall — number one.

And, Mr. Speaker, this psychologist says:

Lying is integral to the typical day of spared feelings, boosted egos, and social grace.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. I would like to ask the hon. member how he relates that statement to the drug Act under consideration.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I thought I made myself clear. I said that central to this whole government's program, which was advertised by the Premier in this ad in 1983 — a promise is a promise — was health care. And in health care one of the elements, one of the most important elements, was prescription drug service which Bill 34 seeks to amend.

Now I'm examining the basis which causes this government to change its mind about health care and about prescription drug service.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I would just like to make this comment. Many times in the past I have had to rise regarding unparliamentary remarks. I'm afraid that the member is speaking in a vein that will lead to just that. I don't want to force the hon. member or ask him to withdraw and apologize to that type of statement, so I'm bringing it to his attention now. But I think from now on we have to be very careful, and I talked about this the other day in the House, that we have to be very careful about unparliamentary remarks because it doesn't do the House any good.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I am quite aware of the rule with regard to unparliamentary remarks, and I welcome your suggestion that I should adhere to the rules of the House. And I shall adhere to the rules of the House.

I am quoting an article dated March 28, 1984, in the *Saskatoon Star-Phoenix*, and I read you the title, Mr. Speaker, and I read you one paragraph, and I'm reading you the concluding paragraph which tries to examine the basis on which I'm using to say that this government has changed its view. Now . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. If the hon. member from Saskatoon Westmount, through his quotes, is implying that the government was lying, that is clearly out of order.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I have said nothing of that nature. Now if someone wishes to accept that view, that has nothing to do with me. I have said nothing of that sort, and I deny having said that. I think an examination of the record will show that I did not say that.

Now this article which I am quoting, quoting directly:

We all lie to avoid unpleasant experiences, but I don't see it as a problem unless it becomes a predominant pattern in your life.

And I agree with that psychologist who said that. It's not a serious problem unless it becomes a predominant pattern. And Mr. Speaker, I can only refer to the number of promises that have been broken by this government, which are alluded to by the Premier's ad in 1983, health care being one of them.

It's necessary that we check the government's sincerity on the issue of health care. Are they telling the truth? What is their adherence to the to the principles of health care? Well we had another example of it not too long ago, Mr. Speaker, on June 30, and this shows in the *Votes and Proceedings* of the House where the Hon. Mr. Blakeney, the Leader of the Opposition, asked leave under rule 39 to move the following motion:

That this Assembly hereby commemorates the twenty-fifth anniversary of Medicare in Saskatchewan, and acknowledges the desire and . . . right of Saskatchewan people to have a high quality medicare system based on the principles of universality and accessibility.

Unanimous consent having been requested, it was not granted.

And I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, it was not granted by the Conservative Party of Saskatchewan who sits opposite to me.

What about the Minister of Health's commitment to health care in Saskatchewan? Well we saw some of his commitment on July 1 when he put into effect a prescription drug plan. But July 1 is another significant day in the history of Saskatchewan. July 1 is the day that medicare came in, and the Minister of Health was good enough to run an ad in the *Leader-Post*, and I suspect this appeared in the *Star-Phoenix* as well. And the ad says:

This week marks the 25th anniversary of the introduction of medicare in Saskatchewan, and we were pleased to proclaim July 2 as Medicare Day in our province.

It says, "we were pleased to proclaim July 2 as Medicare Day in our province." Now I fail to hear the Minister of Health on that, and the Minister of Health was a little slow getting his ad into the paper because July 2 was the day, Medicare Day, and he managed to get the ad into the paper on July 4, which shows to the people of Saskatchewan quite clearly that medicare week or Medicare Day in this province is an afterthought as far as the Minister of Health is concerned.

Now in the introduction of the prescription drug plan, the Minister of Health sent a letter to all and sundry in Saskatchewan. I expect everyone here got them, and everybody out in TV land got them as well. I got one and it was entitled, "Dear Saskatchewan Resident." And this particular letter was preceded before and after, and followed by volumes of advertising. And I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, you saw it. The colourful brochure on the Saskatchewan prescription drug plan was sent to all people in the province, and a letter. I'm sure that some of the Conservative Party's friends in . . . got fat and rich on this particular distribution of pamphlet all over Saskatchewan. There were ads — large ads in newspapers; there were ads on television, radio, very expensive plan to introduce to the people of . . . or advertising to introduce to the people of Saskatchewan a prescription drug plan.

And what is one of the elements of this prescription drug plan, Mr. Speaker? Well, one of them is the rebate program, the rebate part of the program. And the prescription drug plan has an interesting rebate system; first of all it has \$125 deductible, or \$75 if you are a senior citizen, and then it has a 20 per cent deterrent fee. This government is back into deterrent fees. Its predecessor, the Liberal government of Saskatchewan was into deterrent fees a number of years ago and the consequence of that, in the health care field, deterrent fees in the health care field, was that that Liberal government went the way that this government is due to go in a short period of time.

(1645)

Now what do they think of the rebate program? Well back in 1985 the minister of Finance, that was budget Bob, or pardon me, budget minister Bob . . . the member from Kindersley was speaking in the House and he said that all rebate programs: "dismissed as silly." This is an article that appeared in the *Star-Phoenix* or the *Leader-Post*, Mr. Speaker.

Well they have a rebate program in the drug plan, and the minister from Kindersley thinks that's silly. And they have a rebate program for the gasoline tax, and I suppose the minister from Kindersley also thinks that's silly, but the very thing that he says in 1985 is silly, he brings in — he and his government bring in in 1987 on a prescription drug plan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier in . . . a number of times has been concerned about us dealing with the subject of the prescription drug plan, so much so that he's taken to the headlines and one of them here is . . . I would quote his name, Mr. Speaker, but the rules prevent me.

The Premier slams NDP's drug plan rhetoric.

And he questions whether people are having any problems with the province's drug plan. And he suggests that the New Democratic Party is trying to score political points by continuously asking questions about the drug plan and this legislation, this drug legislation.

Well the Premier can call it scoring political points if he wishes, but when he comes out in an election and says he's going to make health care number one in Canada, it's central to his program, and one year after he's in power he starts to destroy the very basis on which he sought the confidence of the electors of Saskatchewan, I say to you that is rhetoric. And it has to be attacked by anybody and everybody in Saskatchewan who's concerned about it.

Here's another one:

The Premier questions the wisdom of free drugs.

Well, if the Premier in this particular article, which is August 1, 1987, in the *Star-Phoenix*, was out speaking at Leask, Saskatchewan, and he continuously referred to free drugs, free drugs, free drugs. I've heard him in this House repeat it. I'm against free drugs. There's no wisdom in free drugs. He's for free trade, but he's not for free drugs.

Well the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the patient does not write the prescription for the drug. The patient does not write the prescription for the drug, and it doesn't do the Premier's image much good to suggest the people are responsible for accepting free drugs when in fact the doctor write the prescription for free drugs . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If the good doctor from Weyburn wants to say a few words on this later, perhaps he can get into the debate and we'll hear what he has to say about prescription drugs . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . But maybe he's attending the Premier.

I'll tell you what, I'll tell you what, Mr. Member from Weyburn. You'd better watch out because when I saw you up in Saskatoon the other day those people up at the university are just waiting for the chance to get at you, just waiting for the chance to get at you.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the House Leader wanted to carry on some other business at this point and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. McLeod that Bill No. 48 — **An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act** be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. McLeod that Bill No. 50 — **An Act to amend The Hospital Standards Act** be now read a second time.

**Ms. Atkinson:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, this Bill 50 is a follow-up to Bill 48 and both Bills go hand in hand. Once again, we'd be prepared to move this Bill into third reading.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

#### **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

##### **Bill No. 49 — An Act to Amend The Change of Name Act**

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

#### **THIRD READINGS**

##### **Bill No. 49 — An Act to amend The Change of Name Act**

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that this Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a third time and passed under its title.

#### **COMMITTEE OF FINANCE**

The committee recessed until 7 p.m.