

The Assembly met at 1 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Wolfe: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly, some 25 students from the Wood Mountain 4-H Club and their visitors from Ontario. They're seated in the Speaker's gallery. Accompanying them are chaperons Elsie Karst, Dorothy Shier, Doreen Koester, Joan Hysiuck, and Loretta Smith. I ask all members of the Assembly to welcome these guests.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and to members of the House, Mark Hislop and his family, Brandi and Jude who are in your gallery here today. Mark is a former employee of the *Prince Albert Daily Herald*, and his interest in civic affairs led him to change jobs, and he'll be a research assistant for our Member of Parliament from Prince Albert-Churchill River, Ray Funk. Welcome to this Assembly.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Goods and Services Tax

Mr. Romanow: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the Premier and it has to do with the proposed national sales tax. Mr. Premier, I think it's safe to say that a growing number of Saskatchewan people, in fact I would say a majority of the people of the province of Saskatchewan, are now coming out firmly opposed to this additional new tax burden. Yet your position vacillates somewhere in between the position of considering whether or not to support the tax to strong public statements, in effect saying that you do support the public tax.

I note by today's *Leader-Post* on the front page in fact, the headline that says: "Devine backs GST." Now I'm therefore assuming that your government has in effect moved to adopt approval of the proposed national sales tax.

Mr. Premier, if I'm wrong, would you be kind enough to table the correspondence and any of the other relevant documentations that you and your officials in Finance, or in the Premier's office, have prepared by way of opposition to the national sales tax.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I think it's fair to say that all political parties and most Canadians would like to see us get rid of the thirteen and a half per cent manufacturers tax that there is now. It's an unfair tax. But the question is: what do you replace it with? And that's

what we're examining and discussing. Obviously, if we can replace something that's thirteen and a half with something that is nine, you can pick up four and a half per cent.

Mr. Speaker, if the opposition would just let me carry on, I mean, particularly given the fact that we have some guests here, it would be appropriate if I could just finish my comments.

The thirteen and a half per cent that is there today has been agreed on by all political parties as unfair the way it's applied. We would like to see that removed. We want to see it replaced with something that's more fair, and that's what we're in the process of doing.

We have discussed with our federal counterparts some of the pros and cons with respect to the proposal that's before us today. I have and I'm sure that the Minister of Finance has had correspondence with the federal ministers and others. I will take the hon. member's question with respect to the correspondence, and, if I believe that there's some that we can offer to the public here, I certainly will review that and provide them to the hon. member.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the Premier. I thank him for the suggestion that there might be some correspondence that the Minister of Finance has in this regard, and I would request, as a preface to my next question, that the correspondence be tabled as quickly as possible so that at least the opposition can take a look at it and ask any question yet during the duration of the balance of this session.

But, Mr. Premier, my new question to you is this: based on your last answer, it looks and sounds very much as though this government, your government is aiming toward, what I believe you're at in any event, a position of adoption of support of the new national sales tax. And its more complicated than simply a reduction of 13 per cent manufacturing to 9 per cent sales tax because the federal 9 per cent sales tax involves a whole new range of heretofore untaxable items which amount to simply one fact — tax increase, tax increase, tax increase. And it's an unfair tax and an unjustified tax.

Mr. Premier, I have in front of me here a copy of the federal paper, goods and services technical paper, which outlines the details of this new, unfair federal sales tax. Would you be kind enough to tell me whether or not you or your officials have analysed this paper — which I've now read on one occasion for sure, and we're having our researchers analyse it — have you had your people analyse this technical paper? And if so, will you be prepared to undertake the tabling of your analysis in order to justify what seems to be now clear, your support for this unfair tax?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, it's quite easy for the opposition to say they're against any form of taxation. I've

said at the outset, the thirteen and a half per cent tax that's there now on all manufactured goods in this country, and particularly in Saskatchewan, is very unfair, and we want to see that removed. Now I hope the opposition members agree with me that we want to see the thirteen and a half per cent manufacturers tax that's on now removed. For in a province like Saskatchewan, particularly where we're into processing and manufacturing and exporting, we would likely be able to not only remove the thirteen and a half, but not have the 9 per cent go on. So in effect we don't have any of that tax, Mr. Speaker.

Now if the hon. member knows how we might be able to do that, and he has suggestions where that may take place and how that could take place, I'm sure that the public would be very interested. I'm sure that the public would be very interested. I know that I would be in seeing that tax benefit, any kind of tax benefit come to the province of Saskatchewan.

Now we are examining the proposal, as the hon. member is, our officials are going through it. We're in conversation with other provinces in other jurisdictions, the business community, the farming community, consumers, all kinds of individuals, and certainly that examination is not finished. We're in the process of examining it along with everybody else. So the hon. member says, can we have our immediate analysis now? To be fair, as the hon. member is looking at it, we are. We've had many suggestions come from people; we're putting those together. As we examine them and, as we offer suggestions, we'll certainly be sharing them with the public.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the premier, and I must say to the premier that I am less chary or less acceptable of his suggestion that he needs more time because as the Premier knows that there are many organizations — I only have a partial list here — ranging all the way from the Canadian Federation of Independent Business to anti-poverty organizations, to the Consumers' Association of Canada, to farm organizations — as is also widely reported today in the newspapers — to your colleagues in government, the Premier of Ontario, the Premier of Alberta — these people have all taken a firm position. And I say to you, Mr. Premier, this is not the time for you to be sitting on the fence and waffling. It's a time for decisions.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — My question to you therefore is very simple. In light of the fact that the other organizations and premiers also have the same difficulties that you have; in the light of the fact that you have not tabled an analysis of the federal document showing why you would support the tax; not tabled the correspondence — although to be fair you say you're going to consider tabling those to us — in the absence of any evidence and in the face of the fact that there is growing opposition at home here in Saskatchewan by Saskatchewan business people and farming groups, that you should come out, as Mr. Getty has, in opposition to this tax. My question to you, sir, is simple: how about some leadership in saying that you've studied it enough and you're against this tax?

How about that?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, we have seen the province of Manitoba looking at the benefits to Manitoba of removing the thirteen and a half per cent manufacturing tax and replacing it with nine. We hear now from British Columbia that they're assessing it very carefully and reassessing it, as the result of the fact that they are an export-oriented province, and if you can remove the thirteen and a half, there are some significant benefits to provinces that are in the export business.

Now if we have big sectors in the province of Saskatchewan that could benefit as a result of us taking off the thirteen and a half per cent tax and not even receiving the 9 per cent because you're in the export business, I don't think that we should deny listening to the people and to those sectors that could have significant benefits. And maybe we can offset any additional costs with some other things that we could do with respect to the tax, say on farm machinery or some other things, that could be quite positive.

So, Mr. Minister, I just say to the hon. member, I don't think it's quite fair for him to stand in his place and say there's no benefit in reducing the tax from thirteen and a half because you're going to do it a different way. Every political party in this country has said, get rid of that thirteen and a half, and I hope he agrees with that. When do you get rid of it, there are some major benefits to the province of Saskatchewan, and if there are we want to make sure that we capture those, Mr. Speaker, and not bypass them.

So we're going to look at it very carefully, and I think he would expect us to go and consult with the public. And that's exactly what we're doing, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, what you say is, with the greatest of respect, only partially true. First of all your government has been privy to the thinking of the federal government for some several months if not a couple of years or more. This is not something which has struck your government or the people of Saskatchewan like a bolt of lightning out of the blue.

We know you know what's been on the table and what's being discussed. You know what your folks here at home want you to do as the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan. I can recite the list of the people involved. You know what the premiers are saying elsewhere.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a time for action and opposition to this unfair tax. And my question to you is this. In view of the fact that the House of Commons Finance Committee, the federal House of Commons Finance Committee, according to the documentation I have here in front of me, is now going to hear public representations on this tax in mid-September, will you undertake to this Legislative Assembly that your government will be there in written form making a presentation in opposition to this

unfair tax as the people in this province want you to do to on their behalf?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, obviously I will judge what the people of Saskatchewan believe that they want the government to do, and the members opposite may not agree with that. Often we agree to disagree about many things including the potash corporation and water projects and other stuff.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, every jurisdiction wants the thirteen and a half per cent tax that's there now, removed, and they want it replaced with something that's fair. I think that's reasonable. Consumers do, farmers do, and others do.

The member opposite just stands up because he has virtually no responsibility and says the tax is wrong. He won't examine the alternatives. He won't give alternatives; he has no suggestions to offer. And he says he has no responsibility to do that.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have some responsibility as the Premier of the province and the government of the province of Saskatchewan to look at it very carefully in terms of diversification, manufacturing, processing, and jobs, and all the things that might be beneficial as a result of a new tax system in this country as it applies to Saskatchewan.

So if I can make representation, and certainly we'll look at every form of representation. The hon. member says, will you be presenting a paper. We'll be looking at every avenue to make our point, Mr. Speaker. Personally, we will look at it in terms of writing, we'll look at it in terms of research, so that we make sure that the best case for Saskatchewan is put forward — not just what the NDP say, but what the people say that are making a living and looking forward to the processing, the manufacturing, and the exporting, and the fairness that could come from a better tax system, compared to the one we have today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Cash Advance for Farmers

Mr. Upshall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture, the Premier. Mr. Premier, you are aware no doubt that the federal government has not passed legislation enabling farmers to receive their cash advances. Now the earliest the cash advances will be coming out is possible November at the earliest, as I say.

Farmers need those cash advances now, not some time in the future, just like they needed the drought payment in January, not 10 months later. Mr. Minister, the federal government's incompetence has again bungled a program.

Will you today call on the federal government to reverse their program of removing the interest-free cash advance and maintain the old cash advance structure?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — A couple of observations, Mr. Speaker. I have been in contact with the federal minister, and I certainly talked to him about a week and a half ago when he was here with respect to the cash advance, and made the point that farmers want to receive their application forms as quickly as possible.

The second observation, and the hon. members knows if he's ever applied for it, that you can't apply and expect to receive money before you've got some harvesting in the bin because they'll ask you, do you have any inventory because they won't give a you a cash advance on nothing that's open . . . or nothing that's harvested. So the hon. member knows that when you fill in your application form, you're supposed to put in the amount of grain that you have in storage, and if you haven't started harvesting then you just can't do that.

I will say to the hon. member that I have made representation in several forms to the federal minister saying, we want the application forms as quickly as possible so that indeed people can fill them out as they harvest and certainly as they finish harvest to get their advance.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — New question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, you said you talked to Ottawa a week ago. Well that was after the House finished sitting and the legislation should have been passed before that. You're a little late in that respect. And another thing, within two or three weeks, the crop, if the weather continues, will be in the bin, and that's when farmers will need their cash advances.

You applaud everything the federal government does. You failed us on the drought payment. You failed us on the federal budget. You've failed us now supporting the new tax structure. And the problem that we have with you and the people in Saskatchewan have with you, Mr. Premier, is that you're a follower; you're not a leader. You follow everything that Brian Mulroney does.

One simple question, Mr. Premier: can you explain to the people of this province why you put your romance with Brian Mulroney ahead of the interests of the farmers of Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, between the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premier of Saskatchewan, we have led in providing in excess of \$2 billion in cash to the farmers of western Canada and particularly to the farmers of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — In this last crop year, we provided a combination of expenditures that would run in excess of half a billion dollars right here to the people of Saskatchewan and to the farmers here. And the hon. members ask about leadership. That cash, Mr. Speaker, goes to farmers. It does not have to be repaid. It's a direct

payment into their pockets because of drought, because of \$2 wheat, because of some problems internationally, and never in the history of Canada or Saskatchewan has there been leadership to put that kind of money in the pockets of farmers.

Now we will say, Mr. Speaker, that they would rather get their money from 5 to \$6 wheat and they certainly would rather see a nice production, a good crop as opposed to drought. But when there are difficult times, nobody can question the fact that the Prime Minister of Canada and, indeed, the Minister of Agriculture for the province of Saskatchewan today have provided as much leadership and as much cash as they've ever seen in the history of the country when it comes to agriculture support.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — New question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, farmers have come through the worst drought in many, many years. Their cash flow is at a minimum, if it exists at all. They have bills to pay. And you, because you're possessed with privatization, because you're only a part-time Minister of Agriculture, you missed the boat again on another issue.

The legislation should have been passed before the House adjourned in Ottawa. You were not there to make sure that didn't happen. Mr. Minister, can you tell me . . . can you explain to the people of this province why you are not on top of important agricultures like this issue and other issues?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to agriculture programs and policies initiated in the province of Saskatchewan, advice given to the federal government with respect to programs and policies in agriculture, I am sure that it would be fair to say that when all the ministers of agriculture come to this province for a national conference, they usually leave with a great deal of information about where the industry is going, new ideas about programs and policies for farmers and agriculture in the food business — ideas with respect to processing, manufacturing, diversification in agriculture and the food business. Certainly the federal ministers go back with a great deal of advice and ideas and suggestions with respect to farmers and farm families and how we can better protect them and how we can diversify the economy in rural areas.

So I could . . . I'm sure later today and tomorrow when we go through Agriculture estimates, I can list for the hon. member a large number of the various policies and programs that we've initiated as a result of us being very, very close to farmers in this province, because the food and agriculture industry in the province of Saskatchewan is our number one industry, and we're very proud of that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — Mr. Minister — new question, Mr. Speaker — Mr. Minister, your actions speak much louder than your words. You have missed the boat. Farmers are now unable to get cash advances. They're unable to get

advances, and many farmer and farm groups are saying that they might as well go to banking and lending institutions to get the money.

So here we have again, the Government of Saskatchewan supporting the Government of . . . federal government in Ottawa and the bankers, all in one cozy little nest again. The farmers are suffering. They can't pay their suppliers so the local business people are suffering.

Mr. Minister, I ask you again, will you make representation to Ottawa to abandon the change in the cash advance system to maintain the old structure, and will you table your representation in this House when you do it?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I'm sure we'll get into that when we get into my estimates. I will say that I have requested that the federal government send out the application forms as quickly as possible so that people can apply for the cash advance as they're harvesting, or as they have grain in the bins, so that they can record it down there to apply against their advances. And I will be glad to table representation that I have made, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Consultants on Future Directions of Health Care System

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. Mr. Minister, I have a copy of a news-letter here prepared by Gellman Hayward & Partners Ltd., a Canadian management consulting team which I understand from the news-letter has been hired by your department to develop strategy for bringing new information technology to the health care system in Saskatchewan. According to this news-letter, one of the top consultants of this vital project, in fact a partner in the firm, is Dr. Bob Fabian of Toronto. Can you confirm, Mr. Minister, that this is the same Dr. Bob Fabian who is advising you and your government on Guy Montpetit and GigaText?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of the principals of the company, but I will confirm, Mr. Speaker, that we are looking carefully at the application of technology and leading edge technology to the administrative side of health care. We've done that through our health card which is widely received, not only here in Saskatchewan, but across Canada and across the world. Without question that's true, and we've had a success story there with the health card, and there are other applications of that which are on the horizon, I would say. But I can't confirm who the principals are of the company that has been hired, but I can take notice of the question and come back and give the answer to the member.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, GigaText has proven to be a total failure for your government and a true reflection of your government's incompetence.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — And he is named in this literature as being part of this consulting team. Can you explain, Mr. Minister, why Dr. Bob Fabian, who was advising you on Guy Montpetit and GigaText, will not be intimately involved in a project that will determine future directions of the health care system in Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I said to the member that I wouldn't confirm, I wouldn't confirm because I'm not sure, I frankly don't know who the principals . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — As I say, I said to the member that I will not confirm because I frankly don't know who the principals are involved in the companies. But I do know this, Mr. Speaker, and this may well be an indication of that: co-operators Data Services of Regina, head office in Regina, but certainly a company which goes far beyond the borders of Saskatchewan now and beyond the borders of Canada very soon because of their involvement in this leading edge technology and health care technology, without question . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The members scoff at that. Members across here who all are carrying their health card which is known across the world now. They're carrying one in their pocket right now.

But, Mr. Speaker, that technology and the future applications of that technology, future applications of that technology are in fact a success story for Saskatchewan health administrators, are in fact a success story for this province and for CDSL (Co-operators Data Services Ltd.) and other high-tech companies here in Saskatchewan who've worked on that project.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, one would think that you would at least know who you were dealing with, but to make matters worse, Mr. Minister, another one of the consultants is Mr. Ron Gilmour. And in this very news-letter put out by the consulting firm of which Gilmour is also a partner, I understand, it points out that Mr. Gilmour, and I quote, ". . . did some work related to the privatization of Westbridge." Those are his credentials, Mr. Minister. Tell me, what does this project have to do with privatization?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, this project has everything to do with technology; this project has nothing to do with privatization. This question has everything to do with silly politics by that member because here's what it is . . . Mr. Speaker, the member says there is technology involved. Someone who's involved in technology had some involvement with WESTBRIDGE. Well what a surprise that is. Why would that be a surprise if someone in technology has something to do with WESTBRIDGE?

And, Mr. Speaker, the member says someone, whose

name she mentions and who I don't know, I don't know that principal, I don't know the person, but she says that person has some involvement with the technology related to the health card. That's a technology expert, Mr. Speaker. The health card is very much to do with technology, Mr. Speaker: very little to do, in fact, nothing to do with privatization. Privatization and the bogymen of privatization around every corner is what's on their minds, not on my mind. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order, order. Could we have order, please?

Absence of Minister

Mr. Anguish: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Premier. And as the Premier is well aware, the Premier of Alberta fired Connie Osterman, the minister responsible for the failure to ensure that First Investors and Principal investors were meeting the regulations. And I'm wondering if you've had the same thing in store for the minister responsible in this legislature, sir. If we look at the period of time the member for Maple Creek has not been in this house during question period since the day the Code inquiry was released — not in question period since the Code inquiry was released . . .

We need answers to those questions. My question to you is: have you fired the minister responsible, the member from Maple Creek? Or can you explain why she is no longer present in this legislature, Mr. Premier?

The Speaker: — I must bring to the hon. member's attention that the reference to members who are not present in the House is a breach of the rules of the House. Therefore the question is out of order. Order, order.

Before orders of the day, I wish to inform the Assembly that Her Honour is here for Royal Assent.

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS

At 1:32 p.m. Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor entered the Chamber, took her seat upon the throne, and gave Royal Assent to the following Bills:

- Bill No. 20 — An Act respecting the Reorganization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan
- Bill No. 93 — An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal year ending on March 31, 1990.

Her Honour retired from the Chamber at 1:34 p.m.

TABLING OF REPORT

The Speaker: — Before orders of the day, I should also take the opportunity to table the following report, the *Ombudsman of Saskatchewan Special Report to the Legislative Assembly on Bosco Homes*.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTION UNDER RULE 16

Attracting Investment and Building Saskatchewan

Mr. Martin: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At the end of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I'll be moving a motion pursuant to rule 16. The motion I bring to the Assembly today, Mr. Speaker, commends the government for setting a course that builds the province. It commends, Mr. Speaker, the policy that says we must have sound management of the economy, but we must execute that management in partnership with the people of the province.

Mr. Speaker, during question period we heard the Premier talk about how this government, specifically him had been helping the farmers during tough times. As the Premier said, the farmers would much have preferred to have 5 or \$6 wheat, but when wheat's only \$2, Mr. Speaker, they need some help. And it was this government's responsibility, led by our Premier, to supply the help that the farmers needed, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, before this government was elected in April of 1982, there was one and only one economic principle that guided the government of the day. That was government ownership. There was no co-operation with the people; there was no partnership with the groups in our province — just government ownership.

The members opposite say that the principle of development through partnership and co-operation means big business and foreign multinationals. But let us review some of the economic achievements of this government and let us see exactly who it is that the NDP are calling big business and foreign multinationals.

Mr. Speaker, Co-operative Refineries is a big enterprise. They are an important part of our province, owned by thousands of Saskatchewan people. And the government went into partnership with the co-op to build the NewGrade heavy oil upgrader right here in Regina, employing hundreds of workers and buying Saskatchewan products and building the upgrader — a tremendous boon to small and large businesses in this province.

And the NDP said it should not have been built. Not only that, Mr. Speaker; they said it would never be built. Indeed you recall the famous quote of members opposite that this government has only two kinds of projects: those that never would be built and those that never should be built. Well we did build the upgrader in partnership with the co-op, and a great many Saskatchewan people obtained jobs as a result. By participating with the public in this effort, we achieved real diversification.

And I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how the members of the co-op feel when they hear the NDP calling them a big business, that the government should not be working with them to build the province.

The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, Mr. Speaker, is another important Saskatchewan organization. It too is owned by thousands of Saskatchewan farmers. In participating with

the pool, we are diversifying Biggar malt. Working with the pool, we are attracting investment to Saskatchewan and providing increased opportunities for the people of Saskatchewan, and the NDP say this is a project that should not happen. The NDP say the pool is multinational that the government should not work with. How narrow they are, Mr. Speaker. How narrow to believe that everything must be or even can be done by government alone.

Mr. Speaker, I look to Par Industries. Not even the NDP can pretend to themselves that Par Industries is a multinational. As a matter of fact, Par Industries doesn't even qualify as a big business. But sound management of this province does involve working with all businesses, and by working with Par Industries, we have created real jobs for welfare recipients and given them new opportunities denied them in the past by the previous government.

Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat that because I think Par Industries illustrates another aspect of this government. I talked earlier about helping the farmers with an influx of money that they required. And I think this is a sensitive area of this government that too few people understand. And I think that this government working with businesses and by working with Par Industries specifically, has created real jobs for welfare recipients and given them new opportunities that were denied to them in the past.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, I remember asking the Minister of Social Services, actually his deputy minister, during Public Accounts one day — we were talking about this particular issue — and I said to the deputy minister, have you received any letters of complaint for people who have jobs. He said, no, of the hundreds and hundreds of people that we've employed in Par Industries, we haven't had one complaint from any of those people for anything at all.

But he said, we have received letters of thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the Department of Social Services, for giving these welfare recipients an opportunity to have a job that was previously denied them under the former government.

And the NDP says Par Industries is bad. Well I guess that means then that the NDP — if you follow that logically — I guess that then means that the NDP says that giving jobs to welfare recipients is bad, if that logic could be assumed. But we disagree with them, Mr. Speaker. Building the province is good. Building opportunities is good. Attracting investment from outside the province so that we do not have to borrow hundreds of millions, indeed billions of dollars from foreign banks — investment is good, Mr. Speaker.

But the word "investment" apparently frightens the NDP. Whether it is a Saskatchewan investment, Canadian investment, or indeed foreign investment, all they hear is the word "investment" and they say that is bad. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call them on that.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, when the government offered to go into partnership with the people to obtain investment in Saskoil, there was not one member of the

opposition that did not condemn the move. As a party they totally condemned the move of Saskoil. Investment in Saskoil is bad, they said.

And let's look at what they did instead of what they said. Let's look at what they did, the NDP did, instead of what the NDP said. And you recall, Mr. Speaker, I said that they said investment in Saskoil is bad. Well, Mr. Speaker, as the House already knows, the former NDP leader, Allan Blakeney, himself invested in Saskoil. And it's my understanding that the NDP member from Regina North invested in Saskoil. It is my understanding that the NDP member for The Battlefords invested in Saskoil, and that the wife of the member of Saskatoon South invested in Saskoil. A good investment, Mr. Speaker, an excellent investment. And I commend them for their acumen, for their foresight in buying into something that's very important. But how can they say that it's bad and then turn around and invest in it themselves? It's a hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker, that we see so often in this House.

So they say it is bad for Saskatchewan people to invest in Saskoil, but it's okay for NDP MLAs and their former leader to invest in Saskoil. Well, I guess if it's good enough for them, Mr. Speaker, it's good enough for everybody else in this province.

What do they think it is that makes them so special, so much better than the average Saskatchewan person? Why is it that the NDP think they are able to handle investing in Saskatchewan companies, but the average Saskatchewan person is not? Who made them so all-fired-holier-than-thou?

Let me give you another example, Mr. Speaker. Members of the NDP continually go on about how terrible the banks are. They say if you must work with the private sector, whatever you do don't work with the banks. No matter what the NDP say, don't work with those dirty banks.

And then we find the member from Saskatoon South owns shares in the banks. He not only works with the banks but has actually invested in the banks. Well it's a smart investment. If investing is good enough for the NDP MLAs, why is it the Saskatchewan . . . average Saskatchewan people . . . that makes Saskatchewan average people so awful that they can't do it?

When did God give the chapter, or the charter to the NDP that says only you can hold shares and invest, and the rest of us have to leave it up to the government? Mr. Speaker, we know God didn't do that, and we are just waiting for the NDP to realize it themselves. Perhaps a thunderbolt one of these days, Mr. Speaker, will clear their minds.

(1345)

Because what this debate is really all about is management, Mr. Speaker, management of the economy and management of the people's interest. I could pose the two opposing views of management for you very simply, Mr. Speaker. The NDP view of management and managing the economy was well represented in the recently concluded debate on public participation of potash. Before the NDP nationalized the industry, the

mines already existed. They cost the government nothing and they cost the taxpayers nothing. But the people obtained a return in the form of royalties and taxes. The jobs were already there, the mines were already there.

But the government of the member from Riversdale had some trouble with potash companies. The member from Riversdale couldn't come up with the management know-how to put a constitutional legal tax on the mines; he tried and he failed, and so he gave up. He said, we can't figure out how to do it so we'll go to New York, borrow a few buckets of money — lots of money — and nationalize the industry. The result of this action: were there any jobs created? No, they already existed. Did the mines suddenly dig themselves? No, that already existed.

So the NDP spent huge sums of taxpayers' dollars to buy something that already existed. That did not build the province one iota. And that is their view of good management of the people's interest.

We saw it very clearly, Mr. Speaker, in the debate. In the closing hours of this debate we saw the philosophy of the two government very clearly. The NDP believe strongly that if you're going to control and manage an industry or a resource, specifically a resource, you have to own it. The government has to own it. The cabinet has to call all the shots. This government doesn't believe that, Mr. Speaker. The government believes that letting the people participate, letting the people be involved in share offerings or bond offerings of resources. The government can control it through regulation and taxes.

That view is represented by the member for Estevan in this government, and it is one that says government must build and not buy. So take the example of Weyerhaeuser pulp and paper mill. There was a losing proposition for the people of Saskatchewan called PAPCO (Prince Albert Pulp Company), in fact losing \$91,000 a day, every day, all day long.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, I think it's important, having been in this House now for over a couple of years, that we keep reminding the members opposite of their strong and solid opposition to the Weyerhaeuser deal, the negative reactions that came out of . . . and specifically from the two members from the Prince Albert area, which was surprising to me, Mr. Speaker, because I would have thought that they would have realized the value of a company in Prince Albert that was going to increase the tax base of Prince Albert so much.

This government looked at the situation and saw an opportunity for the people of Prince Albert and the people of Saskatchewan. If we could get some outside investment, we knew that the thing could be turned around. So instead of being a drain on the province, it could be a job creator, a wealth creator, an opportunity maker for the people of Saskatchewan in generally.

So we did get that investment, Weyerhaeuser bought the pulp mill and one of the first things they did was build a \$250 million fine-paper mill. Then they built another operation that makes photocopier paper, fine quality bond paper, Mr. Speaker. And they built up a chemical

plant in Saskatoon. And they are marketing these products in the United States, bringing even more money into Saskatchewan.

And I think that was very clear, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier that I'm sure the two members from Prince Albert realize today that it's not in their best interest to go around that town and that city of prince Albert condemning and damning the Weyerhaeuser operation.

The Weyerhaeuser operation . . . I've sat in a restaurant, Mr. Speaker, while . . . Mr. Speaker, I can see the reaction from across the floor and I gather their opposition to Weyerhaeuser is going to continue, which I think could be a serious mistake.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I'd like to say that it's been a pleasure for me to be connected with a government that's done these building things in the province in the last couple of years. And I look forward to more in the future, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the member from Wilkie:

That this Assembly commend the Government of Saskatchewan for its policy of attracting investment to and from within the province, reversing the discredited policy of the previous administration of using taxpayers' dollars to buy existing industries; and further that this Assembly commend those who have joined with the Government to build Saskatchewan, including Federated Co-operative refinery, Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the Meadow Lake Tribal Council, the people of the Souris Basin, the employees of DirectWEST, the employees of Cameco, Marubeni-Hitachi, and Par Industries.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — On a point of privilege.

The Speaker: — There is a point of privilege.

Mr. Trew: — Point of order.

The Speaker: — Okay.

Mr. Trew: — In his speech the member for Regina Wascana referred to the member for Regina North, being me, as having shares in Saskoil. I have never had shares in Saskoil, don't intend to in the foreseeable future, and I think it portrays the balance of his speech . . . I'm wondering how much of the balance of the member's speech is as inaccurate as that is.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — You wish to speak to the point of order? I first of all wish to point out that the issue the member raised is a dispute between members, is in fact not a point of order — is in fact not a point or order. However the member wishes to speak.

Mr. Martin: — Mr. Speaker, I said in my remarks that I understand that the member from Regina North has shares in Saskoil. Now if that's . . .

An Hon. Member: — That's not what you said.

Mr. Martin: — That is what I said. If the member from Regina North does not have shares in Saskoil, then I apologize, if that's the case.

An Hon. Member: — You're wrong.

Mr. Martin: — Well I just said that if it's not true, then I apologize.

The Speaker: — The member has made his point and the member from Regina Wascana has responded. I believe the issue is now closed, the issue is now closed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At any time, Mr. Speaker, in this legislature, in respect to the impressive achievement of this government, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand up and make a few comments and enter into the debate.

The outstanding economic record of the PC government in this province is indeed a subject worthy of discussion in this Assembly. As a Progressive Conservative MLA I would like to state for the record that some of the impressive highlights that this government has done to build Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

The national unemployment rate is always a measure of the state of the economy, and I can point out with a degree of pride that the province of Saskatchewan, on average, had the lowest unemployment rate in Canada, and that has happened, Mr. Speaker, since this PC government came to power. And I should also point out, Mr. Speaker, that on average our level of unemployment has been well below the Canadian average.

And that has meant, Mr. Speaker, since 1982 when this government came into office, Saskatchewan has a high participation in the work-force. Job creation has and continues to be very important to this government in building the Saskatchewan economy. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the ongoing policy of this government has been one of attracting new investment, a policy of building and diversifying the economy. In our efforts to build Saskatchewan economy, this government can point with pride to an impressive array of new industries.

In the past, during the NDP regime, their policy was one of state ownership and using tax dollars to buy industries. It was the policy of the NDP to sink tax dollars into such things as cardboard box factory that went under. It was their policy to buy uranium mines, potash mines, pulp mills, at a cost of hundreds of million of dollars to the Saskatchewan taxpayer, Mr. Speaker.

And I could tell you a few other things that they bought that failed, Mr. Speaker, because I was around a long time ago when they bought the wool factory, the shoe factory, and they went into the fur marketing service, the timber

board, and all those great and wonderful things. I was there, Mr. Speaker, and I know how miserably they failed.

It was during the NDP years they promoted the family of Crown corporations. Instead of using those tax dollars to create jobs and meaningful jobs for the Saskatchewan family, Mr. Speaker, they had this wonderful family of Crown corporations. And there wasn't very many of them made any money. They had monopoly on many of them and couldn't make any money. And they sit over there and try to tell us they know how to spend my tax dollars. Give me your tax dollars, Mr. Speaker, and I'll spend them for you. I know better than you do. That's the way they talk over there, Mr. Speaker.

The result of the failed policy of the NDP was that in 1970, Saskatchewan fell behind the rest of Canada in terms of economic growth. We fell behind every other province because they said: you're not welcome in Saskatchewan; we don't want you here; all we want is farm economy so we can buy up the land, then we'll own the land and everybody else can stay out of the country.

Why are people leaving Saskatchewan today, Mr. Speaker? Because there is no other place to go. If there isn't jobs in the agricultural community, they have to leave. We know that. That's why we're building. We're building and diversifying the economy so if there's no jobs in the farm economy, our people then can get a job in the cities and towns throughout the country. That's the difference. That's the difference between us.

And their disastrous policies, Mr. Speaker, in the NDP years, meant that our province is running on 1960 economy in the 1980s. They just closed the shop, closed the door, let nobody in, built a wall. So, Mr. Speaker, when our Premier, this PC government, came into office, it faced a challenge. It faced a challenge of building a dynamic economy. So our province in the 1980s . . . and I can stand here with a high degree of pride and tell you, Mr. Speaker, the policies are working. The policies are working.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Britton: — Weyerhaeuser — they don't like to talk about Weyerhaeuser. They chuckle and they laugh with glee to hide their chagrin, Mr. Speaker, about the fact that Weyerhaeuser is a very successful company now.

An Hon. Member: — Well you gave them millions of acres.

Mr. Britton: — Oh, one of the members says we gave it. Well, Mr. Speaker, we offered an opportunity to them. We have since got 60 million back — 60 million. Just listen a minute now. We got 60 million back and they have since, they have spent of their own money, Mr. Speaker, \$250 million to build a first-class paper mill. They built that in the province of Saskatchewan. It's now in operation. They created 700 construction jobs and 169 permanent jobs for Saskatchewan men and women. Now is there something wrong with helping somebody get started?

Let's go on a little bit. They have also spent another \$20

million on an expansion to its paper manufacturing operation — another \$20 million that they spent, their money. We didn't have to go down to New York and borrow the money like the opposition used to do. The opposition in this Assembly opposed that, Mr. Speaker. They opposed Weyerhaeuser. They don't like it. That's about \$270 million extra money come into Saskatchewan. They don't like that because people become independent, Mr. Speaker. When they have jobs and are making good wages. They don't like that. They want them under their thumb. That's the way they want to work. They are on record in *Hansard*, Mr. Speaker, of opposing the kind of economic development that we have in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, since 1982 we have chalked up many impressive achievements, and I'll just list a few. And I can cite to you the saw mill at Meadow Lake. The Meadow Lake Sawmill was sold to its employees. They don't like that. Once the employees become part owners, Mr. Speaker, they're harder to handle and harder to control. They don't like that over there.

And 10 local Indian bands, Mr. Speaker, we're integrating the Indian people into the industrial fabric of Saskatchewan. What's wrong with that? Tell me, what's wrong with that? The Indian people like it. They're just like you and I — they have aspirations, hopes, and dreams for their children. Why shouldn't they be in it? I think it's a good thing.

And we have attracted \$236 million investment by Millar Western, a pulp mill in the same area, in the Meadow Lake area. Four hundred new jobs. Something wrong with 400 new jobs? I ask the member from Cumberland, don't you want your people to work? Of course you do. They have dreams just like we have.

An Hon. Member: — Are they working?

Mr. Britton: — They'll be working, they'll be working. You betcha, they're working.

I made a run up to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Okay, the member there opposite, they oppose the economic growth of Saskatchewan. They don't like that. So the private sector development, public participation development are foreign to the opposition, maybe because they adhere to a failed policy of the NDP, that of state ownership, government controlled.

Mr. Speaker, that's failed all over the world. A hundred countries, a hundred countries, Mr. Speaker. It failed in England, it failed in the nations of the U.S.S.R., it failed in China, it's failed in New Zealand, it failed in Australia, and it's failed in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there are members like the member from Rosemont and the member from Battlefords who choke, they actually choke when you mention the free enterprise system. They can't swallow that. And, Mr. Speaker, the radicals on the opposition benches would rather turn the clock back than keep Saskatchewan building for the future.

(1400)

Mr. Speaker, as it was mentioned by the Premier, they are marching steadfastly into the 1940s, Mr. Speaker, this government, our Premier, had the courage and the vision to look at all sectors of the economy and to create prosperity in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the formation of WESTBRIDGE Computer Corporation is an impressive success story, regardless. Nobody can deny it. The joining of the SaskCOMP utility corporation, the data terminal and mainframe business of SaskTel and two private companies has created the fourth largest computer service company right there in Saskatchewan — the fourth in the world, Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan. Never before, never before. Ninety-seven per cent of WESTBRIDGE employees participate in the ownership of the company. They like it. WESTBRIDGE today is Canada's largest fully integrated computer company, in Saskatchewan. That's in Saskatchewan where they build the wall around for 40 years . . .

The Speaker: — Time has elapsed.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, at the end of my remarks I intend to move an amendment to that motion and it reads as follows:

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

condemns the Government of Saskatchewan for its failure to promote a favourable business climate in Saskatchewan and for its hand-outs to a few large out-of-province businesses and investors, while Saskatchewan small businesses, working people, and farmers suffer through tough economic times.

And, Mr. Speaker, why I move this amendment is simple. It's simple because we've seen since 1982 what Tory governments do. Tory governments don't build, Tory governments sell, sell, sell and they tax, tax, tax.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — It's clear what's more, Mr. Speaker, the Tory governments borrow, borrow, borrow, so that they can give away all of the assets that the people of this province have built over the years of the history of this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, whether you look at the potash corporation privatization, whether you look at the sale of the PAPCO assets to Weyerhaeuser in Prince Albert, whether you look at the give-away of the WESTBRIDGE computer system, whether you look at the proposed give-away of SaskPower, the history is the same, the decisions are the same, and the results are the same, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — There's some questions that members on that side of the House refuse to answer.

Where do all of these assets come from that they're giving away? Who built them? Did they just come out of the air? No, sir, Mr. Speaker, to give something away, you have to have something tangible. And the assets of the people of this province are exactly what they're giving away.

Mr. Speaker, they've embarked upon a program of sell, give-away, borrow. That's what they've done. Taxes have increased in Saskatchewan, a rate that is unparalleled in the history of this province. And, Mr. Speaker, who benefits. Is it the people of this province who benefit?

When they introduced the potash privatization Bill, the minister who piloted it through this House indicates that he expects around 50,000 people in Saskatchewan to participate. Well, Mr. Speaker, we've got a million people in this province right now participating. How can you improve on that?

But again, where are they going? It's give-away, it's tax, and it's sell. It's a history that's unparalleled in this province, and I would suggest to you, will never be repeated by a Tory government in this province for another hundred years.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — And what, Mr. Speaker, have been the results of this give-away, of this tax, of this sell, sell, sell program of this government? Have we seen lower taxes? Of course we haven't. Have we seen a future for Saskatchewan's young people in Saskatchewan? Not likely.

If you look at the out-migration numbers ever since this government has taken power, you can tell that young people in Saskatchewan are fleeing and going to another place where they can build a future for themselves because they know clearly that sell, sell, sell, and tax, tax, tax isn't creating an environment that they want to be a part of.

This government has betrayed the people of this province, Mr. Speaker, and they don't deserve to govern this province any longer.

What have the results been? Has this province diversified its economic base? You look at the economic growth indicator since 1982. It's one of the worst records in our Canadian country of all the provinces, and those aren't my figures; they're their figures. And if this privatization philosophy worked, if this litany of sell, sell, sell and tax, tax, tax worked, why would people be coming to this province to be part of it?

Every move, every privatization move, Mr. Speaker, has meant the liquidation of Saskatchewan government assets — assets that are owned by the people of this province. They've almost given away, sold off every revenue-generating tool that we had. There's a couple of exceptions, and that is the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, which they just introduced a Bill to privatize; and what they're about to embark upon, if the people of this province don't get up in arms and have a total revolt, is the privatization of the power corporation.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this province aren't fooled by their phrases of build and diversify because they know what it's cost them; they know what it's going to cost them in the future; and they know who caused it. This government, Mr. Speaker, has betrayed a million men and women in this province. The liquidators, I call them. They remind me of a bank walking in and hiring somebody to sell off the assets of a company that's going bankrupt. And if you look at this province in economic terms of what our assets and our liabilities are, it's pretty clear they've just about delivered a bankrupt province.

And now they come, these liquidators, these merchants of sell and give-away and taxation, and they want to liquidate what's left of the assets of this province in order to pay for their mismanagement and their corruption and their waste. That's what they're doing.

Mr. Speaker, this government has no faith in the people of Saskatchewan, that the people of Saskatchewan can deliver the kinds of programs using the Crown corporations and using private enterprise and the co-operative sector. That's not their belief. This government has embarked upon an agenda that will totally admit public involvement in the Saskatchewan economy. They're selling off and they're taxing off every chance that we had to build a strong Saskatchewan.

And if you look through the different figures in terms of business growth in Saskatchewan since 1982 and what was there prior, it's pretty clear that this privatization mode isn't working. If you look at the number of corporate disappearances, businesses that just disappeared in Saskatchewan, last year in 1987 we lost 2,568 businesses. It's incredible, Mr. Speaker, it's unparalleled — not only business bankruptcies.

You look at the growth of our gross domestic product and compare Saskatchewan to the rest of Canada, and these builders, these purveyors of poverty — that's what they are, Mr. Speaker, they're not builders — every move that they've embarked upon, like I said, has cost the people of this province money. It's cost them their future and it's costing them their heritage.

Liquidators, Mr. Speaker, not governors, liquidators. They grab everything they can. And if it means introducing a Bill in this House, they'll do that. If it means that they gather their PC friends together and put public assets in their hands, at a very, very much undervalued price, they'll do that.

And then after they've done this, this privatization where they give to their friends they come to this House — a business, as in WESTBRIDGE Computer, that couldn't fail. Even these mismanagers, even these liquidators, couldn't make that business fail. It would be impossible for this Premier and this Executive Council to make WESTBRIDGE Computer show a loss. But they have the gall and the unmitigated audacity to walk into this House and stand up, speech after speech, and extol the virtues of WESTBRIDGE Computer, a company that absolutely can't lose money. Because, simply, most of the revenue comes from the people of this province through contacts with different government departments. That's what the litany of the privatization, that's what the litany

of WESTBRIDGE Computer is, Mr. Speaker.

But I tell you, these liquidators, these purveyors of poverty and out-migration aren't going to get away with it. And never mind how many times they'll stand in this House and extol the virtues of the mismanagement and the kind of government they've delivered, they want to know that the people of this province see through them. There's no smoke-screen that will cover this kind of waste and mismanagement. There's no smoke-screen that will cover the actions of these liquidators, of this Premier and his Executive Council. Mr. Speaker, people of Saskatchewan see through them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I said before that this government is treating the assets of Saskatchewan's people as if they were liquidating a business.

But interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, where these assets came from. They came from a government that has understood that there must be government involvement, private sector involvement, and the co-operative movement involvement in a buoyant economy for Saskatchewan. These assets didn't just come out of the air.

The Speaker: — Time has elapsed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Smart: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm very pleased to second this motion by my colleague, the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake. I've listened to the comments from the government members opposite, and I must say that the level of debate on this resolution from the government members has been about as low as I've heard in this legislature. It's not only mismanagement, and it's misinformation and at the level of condemnation of people that is really unacceptable and doesn't encourage intelligent debate on this very important issue, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read for you what the government opposite published in a brochure that they put out shortly after they formed government in 1982. It was a brochure that was sent out to businesses to encourage them to come to Saskatchewan. And in this brochure the government said this. The province's compound annual rate of real growth between 1972 and 1982, the years when the New Democrats formed government, was 4.2 per cent compared to 2.7 per cent for Canada as a whole.

We were doing better than Canada as a whole, under the New Democrat government. We were leaders in this province. The gross domestic product rose from 3.4 billion in real terms in 1972 to 5.2 billion in 1982 — a huge increase in the gross national product when the New Democrats were governing, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Smart: — Per capita incomes grew similarly, exceeding the national average, and the population jumped by almost 10 per cent in eight years to just under

one million in 1982. That's what happened under the New Democrat government, Mr. Speaker.

And what's happened under the Conservative government is not building the province, it's a demolition derby. They have torn the province apart, Mr. Speaker. They have not built it. They got a heritage from the people of Saskatchewan. They had programs in place when they formed government that people had built up over many, many years in this province, and they have destroyed them completely. They have sold them off.

What has been the result, Mr. Speaker, by this failure of this government, particularly to look at what happens when you get foreign investment and multinationals. Well one of the things that the government opposite says is that you can control them just as well even if you don't own the resources here. That's connected with the potash industry.

(1415)

And that's dream because when you look at the mineral taxes and royalties that they collected when they've been in government, and compare it with what the New Democrats collected when they were in government, was a lot more under the New Democrat government — a lot more royalty and mineral taxes being paid by corporations in Saskatchewan. Almost a hundred . . . \$986 million under the New Democrat government, 274 under the Conservatives — a big drop in revenue from royalty and taxes to the corporations.

Under the PC government in this latest budget, the Saskatchewan government has reduced their corporate taxes from 17 to 15 per cent. They've reduced the corporate taxes. At the same time they say they're going to do all this construction and building and building. And where is it and whose backs will it be done on, Mr. Speaker? It's not going to be done collecting taxes from the corporate sector; it's going to be done collecting taxes from the people of Saskatchewan.

And what does the member from Wilkie say will happen with this money? He asks the question, is there anything wrong with helping people get started — when he refers to Weyerhaeuser — is there anything wrong with helping people get started by putting tax money into the Weyerhaeuser plant?

And he would say the same thing about Cargill. Poor Cargill, just one of the biggest grain companies in the United States — \$31 billion in revenue and taxes. And we're going to help them with our taxpayers' money. This is money taken from the taxpayers of Saskatchewan; it's not money taken from corporate taxes. It's money taken from the people.

Taxes and taxes and taxes. We've seen, with the Conservatives, an increase in the sales tax. We've seen the gas tax come in. We've seen an increase in income tax. We've seen the flat tax. People are so burdened with taxes in Saskatchewan.

Now we've got the goods and services tax coming down on us from the federal government, and what does this government do? Nothing — says nothing about it. Quite prepared to let that tax come down on people's heads and let the consumers bear the cost of that, the taxpayers of this province. They're the ones that have to provide the infrastructure, since they won't get it anywhere else. They're squeezing it out of people more and more and more, and at the same time, they've sold off all our revenue-generating Crown corporations. The assets, the assets, that the member from Regina Wascana called a potash patch, a hole in the ground — that's how much he considered that of value.

They've devalued the potash corporation. They won't even tell us how much they're going to sell it for, but they guess around 800 million, which is far below what it's worth, far below. Selling off at fire-sale prices the income earning Crown corporations, selling them off for a song and taxing the people back — selling off and taxing back. And that's not acceptable to people of Saskatchewan, not acceptable at all. They knew they had a much better government under the New democrats. They strongly support us under this complaint about the privatization of the potash corporation.

An Hon. Member: — That's why you're 30 per cent in the polls.

Ms. Smart: — Thirty per cent they are in the polls. They're going down all the time. So the member from Wilkie says so nonchalantly, what's wrong with helping people get started? And he calls people Weyerhaeuser and Cargill, as I pointed out.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when they privatize those industries, we know that statistics show that only 14 per cent of the people in Saskatchewan are able to buy and invest in those resources that they're selling off, only 14 per cent. All the rest of the people are left not able to invest but carrying the burden of the taxes. This government is putting a load on the people of Saskatchewan that is really so totally unacceptable and so unnecessary and so unfair.

They don't buy and they don't build, that government opposite; they sell and they tax. That's their solution. And what we have are all the small businesses that are going bankrupt in Saskatchewan; in my constituency of Saskatoon Centre may empty stores, small businesses that have gone into receivership because of the liquidators opposite. Exactly.

They're selling. They're taxing back on people. They're taxing the small businesses. They're not listening to the independent businesses who are concerned about the goods and services tax. They not looking at the job loss and the terrific out-migrations from this province, people leaving, people voting with their feet to get out of the province, because they've destroyed it so completely.

They haven't built it. And they can't go around saying they've built the province. That's an insult particularly to the seniors in this province, seniors who are facing . . . seniors on low income who are facing higher income tax now than they had before. And those are the people who've built up this province and you're still trying to

squeeze more money out of them to pay for your mistakes.

Some thanks to the people of Saskatchewan. Some way to treat older people to take the heritage that you were left when you came to government and destroy it so completely. That's unacceptable to the people in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

The sell-off of the resources of this province is unacceptable to the people. The high taxation is unacceptable. It's unacceptable to put such a burden on people and to hurt them so badly. And I protest, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all my colleagues here, that this government would pride itself on managing the economy in any sense of the word in a method that would give return to the people of Saskatchewan.

They've given return to a few people. Many wealthy people have benefitted. But the majority of the people are becoming poorer, the majority of the people have higher taxes and lower incomes. They're out of work and they're leaving the province. That's what you've done to the majority of people.

You talk about public participation. It will only be for the few, the few that the government opposite wants to talk to, but not to the many people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, not to the many. The many are hurting under this government, and I'm sure that they're looking forward to the day when they can vote in a New Democratic government so that we can get this province back on its feet again as we did in the past. We did it very well, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Smart: — But I think the government members opposite should look very carefully at this government's failure to oppose the goods and services tax as the latest imposition of tax on the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, it's estimated that this new sales tax will impose over a thousand dollars in more taxes for a typical Canadian family — a thousand dollars, annually, more taxes on the people of Saskatchewan.

The Speaker: — Time has elapsed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hopfner: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to begin my remarks by suggestion to you that I've listened to both members, the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake and the member from Saskatoon Centre contradict each other.

I could not believe my ears when I heard the man from Prince Albert, the hon. member from Prince Albert say this government was responsible for tax, tax, tax and yet on the other hand, the member from Saskatoon Centre said, well there has never been more tax collected than under an NDP administration. She admitted it through her own words and it's in *Hansard*, Mr. Speaker. I could not believe this.

Now if I was a person out watching on TV land, I would suggest that I'd be awful confused as to what the members are trying to say across the way. But I want to indicate to you, sir, that the members opposite on one side of their mouth say that this government hasn't built. Well I want to talk about that, I want to talk about the fact of building in this province, and I want to suggest to the member opposite they should listen very well.

I would like to say that they wouldn't even have to leave the city of Regina. I want to take them on a little road tour. We're going to stay in the city of Regina leaving this building. We should go over to the NewGrade upgrader here right in the city of Regina, sir. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, when that particular project was announced I'll tell you there was opposition in this legislature in regard to that particular facility. And the opposition came from members opposite, the NDP opposition in this province. I want to say to you, sir, that the jobs that that NewGrade upgrader has created has been new jobs — new jobs.

And I want to indicate to you, sir, that if we just want to travel down the road and go over into the Prince Albert area, I would like to introduce them to the new Weyerhaeuser plant. It was better known as PAPCO years back under their administration that was costing this province \$91,000 a day and the taxpayer — \$91,000 a day. It is now turning a profit under Weyerhaeuser. It is under new expansion, it is creating hundreds of jobs, and I want to say it has been paying royalties to the province and also, sir, it's been paying back its debt to the province of Saskatchewan.

I want to indicate to you, sir, that we can just go over a little bit into my area and where Saskoil happened to have a little bit of a presence back under the NDP administration. But I want to suggest to you that as much as I take my hat off to the employees of Saskoil at that time, they were fairly well stymied. I want to say that within the oil industry, Saskoil was a kind of a joke, back under the NDP administration. They weren't a very successful company, buying out everybody's throw-aways. And this is particularly . . . well I invited the member from Regina Lakeview to visit my riding. I am in an oil riding of Cut Knife-Lloydminster. There's much oil there, and that's where Saskoil had its presence.

But I want to indicate to you, sir, that when they were running high deficits and coming back to the government's coffers for more and more money for buying up other oil company's throw-aways. I want to say to you, sir, that was what the particular joke was all about.

But today under our administration, we told Saskoil, no sir, you can no longer come back to the coffers. You either make it work or we're going to do something with it. Well, sir, we did and I want to say to you, sir, from a number 25 in the rating of oil companies, it's now sitting in number eight, number eight right across the country, and it's just been phenomenal. It's gone from a joke to a highly

respectable company.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hopfner: — And I want to say to you, sir, that is a particular success story in the province.

I want to say also that under the NDP, and I'll stay in my riding, we have an announcement, and it's under construction right now, sir, of another upgrader in the province of Saskatchewan, and it's a biprovincial upgrader with a deal struck between the Alberta and Saskatchewan governments along with the federal government and Husky Oil.

And I want to say, the members opposite were opposed to that deal. They had for 15 or 20 years under their administration have . . . or I shouldn't say 15 or 20 years, but 10 or 11 years under their administration, sir, they have been throwing out that little bit of a tease that there was going to be an upgrader built in our riding. Never once have they ever come down and got down to specifics and presented anything to the people out in my particular constituency, as they promised they would, or in Saskatchewan taxpayers, or indeed any of the Canadians in this country. They would come around election time and promise this and then they'd go away after the election and say, well it's just not feasible, and that's basically the way they left things, sir.

But I want to say to you that the members opposite have been opposed to that upgrader and here, when we're out negotiating, this is the kind of resolutions they pass at their conventions.

Be it resolved that the NDP Party, when it forms the next provincial government (if ever) adjust the royalty structure so as to make oil companies pay higher royalties than is now the case.

I want to say, sir, that if that is the mentality of the members opposite when the oil prices are at an all-time low and they're going to charge more royalties, sir, well we're right back to the 1982 crisis where all the oil riggers and service companies and oil companies pulled out of the province of Saskatchewan. There won't be any activity in the oil fields and they know it.

And they don't want that activity, sir, because they don't want free enterprise in this province, they don't want young people to have jobs in this province, because they know, sir, that the young people have their own vision. They have their own vision in this province and that vision is to move ahead. And that vision, sir, is by independent thinking. They know that it is no longer needed for the NDP to tell them how good or how bad it is. They figure that out for themselves, sir. They got that all figured out for themselves. They don't need anybody to tell them that.

And I want to say, sir, that's what the NDP fears is that youth. They know the youth has a vision, they know they have wants, they know they want this job and this expansion in our province. They're proud of Saskatchewan, they're proud to be Saskatchewanian. And yet the NDP try to stop every piece of legislation that

comes on the floor of this legislature to stop expansion and free enterprise and job creation.

(1430)

I want to say when we look at vision in this province, sir, in building, I want to say to you, sir, that members opposite are playing from a stuck record that I heard back in the '70s, early '70s and way down in to the '60s, sir. I want to say where that happened is not just reversed. It's a total reversal. They're not in power but they're singing from the same song sheet. I can't believe it.

You know, like they're trying to tell people now how tough it is, how bad it is in this province, sir. Well when we were in opposition, when they were government, we were trying to tell them that they should move ahead and allow this and that to happen, allow expansion and private diversification to take place in this province. And they told the people in this province how great it was, how they are building a Heritage Fund in this province for a rainy day and how they're going to protect, protect the people in this province.

Well I'll tell you, in 1981 interest rates started to sky-rocket, sir. They were driving business out of this province. There wasn't anybody to pay taxes to the coffers as there was in the '80s and in the economic boom period. They didn't save the money, sir. They were spending it like it was . . . there were trees, money was growing on trees.

High interest rates took place. People pleaded with them to help them out; they were losing their homes. And what did the NDP do, sir? They turned their back, they turned their back on the very people that elected them as government. And the people said never again, never again.

On April 26, 1982 the people elected a Progressive Conservative government and, sir, this province has never looked back. They've built nursing homes, hospitals. They done all sorts of building in this province — schools, education expansion, and . . .

The Speaker: — Time has elapsed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to rise to enter into this debate which is a debate about the business environment in the province of Saskatchewan, and I'm pleased to say, Mr. Speaker, that I rise to support the amendment proposed by the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake.

Mr. Speaker, the member from Cut Knife-Lloyd who just took his place in this Assembly has said that the PC government has a record of building. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if you ask Saskatchewan people if they believe that this government has built, Saskatchewan people will say, you bet they've built; yes they've built all right, but what they've built is the biggest debt in the history of the province of Saskatchewan, a debt which hangs like an albatross over the necks of Saskatchewan people and their children, and generations to come.

That's what they built when the people of Saskatchewan think about the PC Government of Saskatchewan today. That's their record of building.

And when I look at their record of building, Mr. Speaker, there are three phrases that come to mind that summarize the record of building and creating a building environment in the province of Saskatchewan. The phrases are these — sell, sell, sell. That's been a record — sell, sell, sell. But to their friends, it's give-away, give-away, give-away. And to the people, Mr. Speaker, to the people it's a different message. To the people the message is tax, tax, tax. That's the record of this government.

The PCs make the deals, and the people pay the tax. I say, Mr. Speaker, the PC deals are taxing, very taxing to the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — That's their record. That's their record in 1984. We saw this government sell off highways equipment, \$40 million worth of highways equipment go for fire sale prices of \$6 million. And what did the people get for that? What the people got for that, Mr. Speaker, was a flat tax. In return for that, the people get to now pay 2 per cent of their net income. That's what the people got. The PCs make the deals and the people pay the tax. PC deals are very taxing, very taxing.

Mr. Speaker, in 1986, we heard two of the members on the opposite side refer to the PAPCO give-away to Weyerhaeuser of Tacoma, Washington. And it was a give-away; it wasn't a sell — \$300 million worth of . . . PAPCO was assessed at least \$300 million. Claimed to be sold for \$248 million, but not having to be paid for unless there was 12 or 13 per cent profit each year. That's a give-away, Mr. Speaker.

And what did the people get from that? Well what the people get from that is gas tax. They get to pay, once gain, a gas tax, now 10 cents a litre and the highest in the history of the province, and once again, Mr. Speaker, the PCs make the deals and the people pay the tax. PC deals are very taxing.

We've seen, Mr. Speaker, the give-away to Peter Pocklington of \$20 million for his bacon plant in North Battleford. And what did the people get from that? What did the people get from that? They got an increase in their sales tax from 5 to 7 per cent despite the fact that these guys came into office claiming that they were going to eliminate the sales tax. And once again, Mr. Speaker, we see that the PCs make the deals and the people pay the tax. PC deals are very taxing.

In 1987, Mr. Speaker, we saw the privatization of the children's school-based dental program transferred to the private sector; just a devastating change, particularly for people in rural Saskatchewan. And now we've begun to see the sell-off and the give-away of the dental equipment.

And what do the people of Saskatchewan get out of that,

Mr. Speaker? People of Saskatchewan in return get a lottery tax which they claim will inject needed income into the health care budget. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, nobody believes that a single penny of the lottery tax would go to health care because as a matter of fact, not a single penny of the lottery tax will go to the health tax. And so once again, Mr. Speaker, we see the PCs make the deals and the people pay the tax. PC deals are very taxing.

But there's more of the same. It goes on, the list of sell-off mania and give-away mania to their friends. There is absolutely nothing sacred in this government, to this government, to this PC government which any other government has ever built up before. We've seen the sell-off of Saskoil, the privatization of Saskoil — 75 per cent of the shares now owned outside the province of Saskatchewan, 60 per cent Saskatchewan jobs gone.

The sell-off, Mr. Speaker, is taxing, very taxing. It's taxing to our employment picture in the province of Saskatchewan. The PC government inherited a circumstance where there were 28,000 people unemployed in the province of Saskatchewan, and after seven years of administration by the best business minds of the PC Party, we now have 37,000 in 1988 of people unemployed in the province of Saskatchewan. And again the PCs make the deals and the people pay the price. PC deals are very taxing.

We've seen the sell-off of Sask Minerals in the last couple of years, Mr. Speaker, when again the people continue to pay the price. We've seen, Mr. Minister, in Sask Minerals a little Crown corporation that for 40 years, in every year but one, paid dividends and averaged over a million dollars a year. What did this government give when it sold it off to their friends in Ontario and Quebec? Less than \$2 million net realized from that.

And the people of Saskatchewan, what do the people of Saskatchewan get? A growing debt — \$3.9 billion accumulated debt — every penny of that accumulated under the PC government elected in 1982. We've seen a combined debt, combining the Consolidated Fund or the operating fund with the Crown corporation, increase from \$3.5 billion accumulated over 77 years of Saskatchewan history, and then in seven short years of PC government, increase, increase, by \$7.7 billion under the PC government. That's what the people get is an increasing debt.

We've seen business bankruptcies increase. In 1982, 280 businesses in Saskatchewan bankrupt. In 1988 under the PC government, after seven years of management by the best business minds of the PC party, 461 bankruptcies. And again, the PCs make the deals and the people pay the price. PC deals are very taxing.

And now we see, now we see, Mr. Speaker, in this Legislative Assembly yesterday at 10 o'clock, the final decision made to sell off the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, not only to sell it off, but to sell it off for less than half its value. We've heard the Minister of Finance say it'll go for \$800 million. Anybody who's objective says it's worth at least 1.6 to 2.4 billion, an average of about \$2 billion.

But the people of Saskatchewan, what do they get, Mr. Speaker? They get the opportunity to flee their province, to vote with their feet, as the member from Saskatoon said earlier. That's what we get in return — dashed dreams, shattered hopes, and shattered futures, Mr. Speaker — 47,000 people net loss in the last four and a half years; 13,300 net loss in 1988 alone. More than twice as bad as any other province in all of Canada. This year, 14,600 already in the first seven months of this year, gone. And once again, we see, Mr. Speaker, the PCs make the deal and the people pay the price. PC deals are very taxing.

And so I say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, when we check the record, there is no denying, there is no denying the history of this PC government. The PCs make the deals and the people pay the price, no matter how you look at it. No matter how you look at it, the PC deals are taxing — taxing, taxing, taxing — to the people of Saskatchewan.

And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will stand in my place and support the amendment, the amendment that says:

That this Assembly condemns the Government of Saskatchewan for its failure to promote a favourable business climate in Saskatchewan, for its hand-outs to a few large out-of-province, businesses and investors while Saskatchewan small businesses, working people and farmers suffer through tough economic times.

Because the PCs make the deals and the people pay the taxes, Mr. Speaker.

Amendment negated on division.

Motion agreed to on division.

MOTIONS

Resolution No. 17 — Concern About Power Projects

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It gives me pleasure today to move this resolution no. 17, and for the information of the people in the galleries and who are watching on television, this resolution says:

That this Assembly condemns the Government of Saskatchewan for continuing to force its expensive Rafferty-Alameda and Shand projects without regard for widespread public concern about the environmental impacts of the projects.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say right from the very first, that this is a timely motion, it's very timely in the sense that the matter which required a court ruling at the highest levels in the country, that is of the federal Court of Appeals in Canada, ruled that the proper environmental process in licensing the Rafferty-Alameda dam projects had not been followed by the provincial government. My friend and colleague, the member from Regina North West will be dealing with that aspect of this matter a little bit later.

But I'd like to deal with what I think were some of the underlying faults which led this government to involve itself in a project which was flawed and which was

doomed from the beginning. And that is . . . it's not just the technical problems that this project has presented to the government, but the underlying political machinations and manoeuvres which were entered into by this government in order to sell a project which would not stand on its own merits.

(1445)

We know environmentally that there have been a whole range of objections starting from the lack of water and extending all the way out to the destruction it does to the fauna and flora in that particular are. But that is not, Mr. Speaker, that is not the main issue that I wish to address in this resolution, and that is that the Government of Saskatchewan has tried to force this Rafferty-Alameda project down the throats of the taxpayers of all Saskatchewan, regardless of the common sense, or the lack of common sense inherent within the project. And how did they do that, Mr. Speaker?

Well they entered into a game plan organized by the Deputy Premier and his henchmen, the president of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, Mr. George Hill, and worked with a civil servant named George Hood who works for the Souris Basin Development Authority, an authority set up to try to sell this project to the people of Saskatchewan and to try to provide the political propaganda for those in the south-central and south-eastern parts of the province, who they saw as a possibility of their natural allies in moving this project forward, despite the fact, despite the fact that they knew that this project was flawed in its very conception.

And the conception of that project, Mr. Speaker, was that it was going to be a multi-use water management system. That is what they say, although we all know differently, and everyone in Saskatchewan knows this not to be true. But the propaganda that the government put out, that this is going to be a multi-use project that involved everything from lighthouses and sailboats and a great big lake, supposedly stretching miles north of Estevan, to a vast reservoir of water which would be used for irrigation by agricultural producers throughout the entire south-east part of the province of Saskatchewan. That's the image, Mr. Speaker, that this government has tried to portray in dealing with Rafferty-Alameda.

And the facts of the matter are, as examination after examination by independent and qualified technical experts in the field have proven, have shown time after time, that this image painted by George Hill and George Hood and the political flacks at the SBDA (Souris Basin Development Authority), that the reality is a lot different. That far from having this grandiose multi-use project, another Lake Diefenbaker — the members opposite like to refer to this as another Lake Diefenbaker project — that the reality is just not there; that the reality of Rafferty-Alameda is much different. That, as the technical experts at Environment Canada have described in this document, the draft initial evaluation and other documents that deals with Rafferty-Alameda, that what we're going to have is a great reservoir of fluctuating green-blue algae that will go up and down, up and down, depending on the run-off from year to year.

And I see the Minister of Energy Mines scratching herself at this particular notion, and like her, I too would not want to go swimming in that particular blue-green algae-covered slough. Right?

Now we all in southern Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, have the opportunity to observe miniature Rafferty-Alamedas in action every summer. We here in Regina enjoy the beauties, particularly the spring and early summer of Wascana Lake, but then notice that it turns to a blue-green algae-covered slough, particularly the creek part at this time of year. And that happens as a normal process with bodies of water in this part of Saskatchewan. In the summer time, that's a normal occurrence. The same thing will happen to Rafferty-Alameda.

But the same thing will happen to Rafferty-Alameda in a manner which is more destructive to the south-east part of Saskatchewan than as if the water was going to be left lying there untouched, because remember, the government is trying to paint this as a multi-purpose project. And one of the purposes they say, that will be for irrigation and that all farmers in south-east Saskatchewan will have access to this water for irrigation purposes. Now, Mr. Speaker, that just ain't so. That is not anywhere near the reality.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, by the rules of the government's own Souris Basin Development Authority, all water uses will be curtailed, new water uses will be curtailed in south-east Saskatchewan because of the construction of Rafferty-Alameda. In fact there was a special piece of regulations drawn up which would limit access by people in south-east Saskatchewan to the Souris River and its tributaries until a certain even occurred. And that event of course is the filling of the Rafferty-Alameda dam.

So far from promoting the development of an irrigation project in south-east Saskatchewan, what we see is that irrigation has been curtailed and new irrigation projects will be curtailed until the Rafferty . . . and if, I should say, the Rafferty-Alameda dam happens to be filled. Now that of course is a big if. But that's one of the images; that's one of the political pictures that this government has tried to portray in regards to the Rafferty-Alameda project, that it's going to be multi-use and that all the farmers get to use the water for irrigation purposes.

In fact what happens, Mr. Speaker, what happens is very simply this. That when the Rafferty-Alameda project is filled, only about 3,000 hectares of land will be available for irrigation purposes — only about 3,000 hectares of land —downstream from the project in soils of a type suitable for irrigation. It just so happens that in the particular area of the province that there is a lack of soils suitable for irrigation, the class A, B, and C soils; you don't have it. Most of the soil types in that part of the province are, according to the agronomists, not suitable for irrigation anyway. But that doesn't seem to bother this government in pushing through this project, this politically motivated project.

The second image that the government tries to portray in regards to Rafferty-Alameda is that somehow this water will be available to other users of water in the agricultural field. That is that the water will be able to used for

watering livestock herds, or the water will be available for any other kind of agricultural operation, and again that is not true by way of the regulations which have been put in place limiting water users' rights in the Souris River basin area.

The fact of the matter is, is that given a normal fill-in period for the damn, if the dam had been built in 1912, it would not have been filled until 1953 — 41 years. That's with normal run-off experienced in wet years and dry years combined in the province of Saskatchewan, which means that for 41 years, the legal prohibition against new industrial uses for water arising from the Souris basin will not be allowed by way of special regulation.

So those farmers in south-eastern Saskatchewan and those stockgrowers in south-eastern Saskatchewan who think that they're going to have access to large quantities of water have fallen victim to the myth deliberately created by this government — a political myth, a myth, an untruth, a grand, grand untruth which has been spread out time after time after time in the government propaganda.

So that's another issue, which is a political issue, which forces us to deal with Rafferty-Alameda as it is — which is a political project.

The third issue, Mr. Speaker, is the manner in which the Government of Saskatchewan has deliberately — deliberately — set out to deceive, not only governments in other jurisdictions, but has set out to deceive its own citizens. The manner in which that deceit has been carried out is — I've just given several examples — is to paint a picture of the project, which is patently not true.

And I say paint in a very realistic and a very literal fashion. They drew up artist's rendering of a big lake with lots of cottages along the side, with a lighthouse, with a big lighthouse — can you imagine that? — a big lighthouse down in the Souris River, and sailboats sailing all over this great big lake — supposed big lake — that's going to be created.

Now I will . . . granted, after about a year of trying to peddle this artist conception of what may take place, the Souris Basin Development Authority no longer goes around and carries these kinds of picture to try to fool the people of the province of Saskatchewan, because they know, and everybody in this province knows that the fundamental issue of Rafferty revolves around the question of water management, because that's what this is all about, ultimately, the question of water management and what type of water management.

Now we disagree with the government, Mr. Speaker, on the conception of water management as embodied by the Rafferty-Alameda dam project. We disagree with that conception because it has now become clear and evident to water management experts throughout North America that, as the Minister of the Environment's own official heard in Edmonton last year by water resource management people at a national conference, that the worst way to manage water in Saskatchewan is to bring it to the surface, expose it to the sun and allow it to be

evaporated and spread by the winds.

That's what this whole thing boils down to in a nutshell. The government has involved itself in a political project using outmoded, outdated water management technology to the detriment, not to the benefit, but to the detriment of the people in south-east Saskatchewan. And I say to the detriment, Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity.

First of all, the only way in which the Rafferty-Alameda dam would ever be filled in normal operating regime, that is in normal climactic conditions — as we saw from history, it will take 41 years — but that the only way that it's going to be filled in reality is that the government intends to pump close to 300 cubic dams of water per year from the underground aquifer.

Now we had a little experiment with that last summer, Mr. Speaker, when the government was forced to pump water out of the same aquifer and put it into the Boundary dam, in order to maintain a minimum cooling level for the water at the Boundary power plant, forced to pump water from the aquifer. And in doing so, what happened is that farmers, particularly in the Hitchcock area, in the area north of Estevan, soon found themselves without a water supply. In some cases, the water supply in their wells had fallen 96, 97, and 100 feet.

And what was interesting as a side bar, if you like, Mr. Speaker, is that the government refused to accept or acknowledge responsibility for that particular drop in the water supply. I mean there's nobody else in Saskatchewan sees their wells drop 96 feet in a month, right. No one expects that kind of thing. There was a perfectly logical explanation which is the pumping of the aquifer to fill Boundary. The same thing is going to occur only on a much more massive scale — a much more massive scale — at Rafferty-Alameda, because that's the only way they can get water to cool that particular power generating station.

Now leaving some of the technological problems with that new station, particularly the air pollution technology which is completely untried, which is in operation only at one plant in Europe — only at one plant — which is looked upon by both the Europeans and by the American thermal generating utilities as an expensive, as probably the most expensive way to undertake pollution control — leave that aside, the fact of the matter is that the Rafferty-Alameda dam projects are probably the worse way of managing water in south-eastern Saskatchewan. It would be much better to leave the water in the aquifer and allow the farmers and the stockgrowers to pump the water out for irrigation, if that were to be the case, than it is to collect this water behind one dam and allow three-quarters of it in normal years — three-quarters of it — that's three out of every four gallons of water that flow into that reservoir, be evaporated and blow heaven knows where. That's the reality.

(1500)

If the water — and I say if — if there is the water need for the cooling of the power plan, and the power plant can be air-cooled, there's absolutely no reason . . . in fact SaskPower has models of an air-cooled Shand sitting out

there. And I suspect, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, that after the federal Minister of the Environment orders a review of Rafferty-Alameda, you will see then a very quick change-over to air cooling.

But be that as it may, what this government has tried to portray Rafferty-Alameda as this great water conservation project is in reality — is in reality — nothing more than a fabrication out of an artist's rendering of whole cloth. It just doesn't, pardon the expression, hold water. The whole project doesn't hold water because there's not going to be water there to hold. That's the long and the short. The minister, the Deputy Premier, the minister in charge of this project in fact stood in this House, stood in his place and said that if the drought continues in Saskatchewan, it's going to take 6,000 years to fill Rafferty-Alameda, which of course is perfectly true if the drought continues, i.e., if there is no water.

How can a government, Mr. Speaker, how can a government ever try to develop any kind of rational economic plans if they're hoping for rain . . . if their hope for rain is what's going to make power operate in this province? It just doesn't make any sense whatsoever. And you know something, the people of Saskatchewan understand that and they agree with that point. Because the people of Saskatchewan, from their year in and year out, day in and day out experience, first of all know that the Souris River is nothing more than an intermittent prairie stream, not fed by any glacier, not fed by any constant source of water, but totally dependent on spring run-off and spring rains, know very well that you don't plan building a dam when you don't have steady source of water.

Nobody plans building a dam when you have a steady source of building a water, which of course leads us to the next leap, which according to the Deputy Premier, that well since there may be a drought, since that we may not get the water from the Souris River, then what we're going to have to look at is pumping the aquifer. And he has admitted in this House, he has admitted in the committee on Crown corporations, and several times in this Legislative Assembly, he has stated yes, that is their back-up plan.

But do we find that back-up plan which was known to the Minister of the Environment as early as February of 1987? Do we find that back-up plan in any mention by the provincial government? No, we don't, not in any documents that came to public light. It took in fact going to court to force the Minister of the Environment, the minister in charge of the water corporation, to reveal that. It took a court case to get him to spring loose the documents that in fact showed that their real intention is to pump water out of the aquifer in south-eastern Saskatchewan, affecting hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of individual farms, affecting thousands of people in individual communities, affecting the whole water table and water balance system in south-east Saskatchewan.

The Minister of the Environment knew that in February of 1987 and did not . . . this was prior to the public face of the government trying to look like it was concerned about the environment. So the Minister of the Environment takes

this politically motivated project, hides the facts, and deliberately so, from the people of this province in order to get this project through. Because, Mr. Speaker, this is nothing than a political project. This is nothing more than a project which is concerned with buying votes and buying the loyalty of a small group of business people in south-eastern Saskatchewan. That's what it's about.

There is nothing more about Rafferty-Alameda than that bare bones, greedy, politically motivated project, because this project will not under any scrutiny, whether it's by amateur like myself or the most technical experts, will not stand on its own accord, will not stand of its own accord because the facts, the reality will not support the flimsy case built by this government.

And it's for that reason, ultimately, Mr. Speaker, it is for that very reason that we know that the people of Saskatchewan condemn this project and that our motion speaks for the great majority. In fact, the last poll released last week, I believe, had 74 per cent of the people of Saskatchewan are opposed to Rafferty-Alameda because they recognize it for what it is, which is nothing more than trying to bribe the people of south-east Saskatchewan with their own money.

And let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, when the next election comes along and the people of south-east Saskatchewan are faced with the kind of political mess, never mind the mud flats and the slough, the kind of political mess that has been created for south-east Saskatchewan by the activities of the Deputy Premier and the Premier, whose ridings are impacted by both these projects, let me tell you that they will have something to say about this project in a way which will not be pleasing to the Progressive Conservative government of this day.

Mr. Speaker, it is for that reason that I move:

That this Assembly condemn the Government of Saskatchewan for continuing to force its expensive Rafferty-Alameda and Shand projects without regard for widespread public concern about the environmental impacts of this project.

And it's seconded, as I say, by my friend and colleague, the member for Regina North East.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am pleased to rise in this debate to second the motion that has been moved by my colleague, the member from Regina Rosemont, who so well pointed out why this motion is so important and why it deserves the support of the members of this House, those members who are serious about what they are doing here and serious about what is good for the welfare and the future well-being of the province of Saskatchewan.

It's not a new debate. This debate has been going on for some time. It's been going on in fact for at least two or three years, and I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this debate is going to continue yet for some time. It is not going to go away. If it so happens that the federal

environmental impact study, if one is held, and I hope that one is held and one should be held, even if that study were to say that that project ought not to go ahead, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this debate will still go on.

I say that it's still going to go on because this debate is about more than just the Rafferty-Alameda project. This debate is about the very nature and the very personality of this government. It's about what this government is all about. So I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this debate will be around for some time, and it certainly will be around come the next provincial general election.

I want to begin by saying . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If the member from Weyburn will settle down and allow me to proceed. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, what this debate is all about. And I'm just going to itemize four things that this debate is all about. There are more, but four of the key ones.

First of all, this debate is about the lack of commitment by this government for protecting the environment. There couldn't possibly be — I guess maybe there could possibly be — but at the present time, I can't think of a more glaring and obvious example of the neglect of environmental concerns by this government that that which is displayed and exemplified by the Rafferty-Alameda project and the process which has let up to it, which I'm going to speak about at some length in a moment or two.

This debate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is about political pork-barrel and political patronage involving directly and very directly the Premier and the Deputy Premier. And that's why this debate is going to be around for a long time because it is only one example of many that involve this. This debate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is about this Conservative government's mismanagement, its incompetence, and its atrocious waste of resources and the taxpayers' money.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, the four points which I want to make here today is that this debate is about this Progressive Conservative government's dishonesty and lack of integrity.

So because of those reasons, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the motion states as my colleague has indicated:

That this Assembly condemn the Government of Saskatchewan for continuing to force its expensive Rafferty-Alameda and Shand projects without regard for widespread public concern about the environmental impacts of this project.

Now it's important to note, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there has been widespread concern and opposition. And I will talk in a few moments about the sources of that widespread concern.

Now here is a government that during question period and during debates on Bills and during debates on estimates, stands up and talks about all this process of consultation which, they suggest, is so important to them. Well here is an example where the feeling of the public of

Saskatchewan is undeniable. It has been expressed through public meetings. It has been expressed by citizens writing letters. It's been expressed by polls, as my colleague from Rosemont has indicated, this opposition by the public of Saskatchewan to the kind of mismanagement which has brought this all about. And in spite of that, the government went ahead and tried to force this project through.

The public is concerned and has been concerned from the very beginning. And so I want to begin my remarks here today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by talking about some of the history, talking about some of the sequence of events which have led us to where we are today, how the government followed some very specific strategies in order to try to force this project upon the people of Saskatchewan, a people which is not wanting to see it happen.

So I begin, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by commenting once again on one of the four points which I said I wanted to make, and that is that of mismanagement. This government, under this Premier from the constituency . . . the member from Estevan, had badly mismanaged the Rafferty dam project from the beginning, and now its mismanagement has resulted, as we all know, in a court decision that invalidates the federal government licence for this project.

Now the members opposite knew right from the very beginning that that licence was issued without all of the requirements being met. The members opposite knew, particularly the Premier and the Deputy Premier, but in spite of that, they went ahead. They knew that the law requirements of the environmental laws of this country had not been met, and in spite of that, they went ahead. Very irresponsible.

Now why did they do that? Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they did that because of the need for some political project in the constituency of the Premier and the Deputy Premier. They were prepared to ignore the environmental laws of Canada in order to try to meet some political needs of a couple of elected politicians on the government treasury benches.

(1515)

Now there was a triumvirate involved here, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It involved the Premier from the constituency of Estevan, who had a vested interest here. It involved the Deputy Premier from the constituency of Souris-Cannington in which the Alameda dam is actually located I understand; in fact it is. And it involved one other person. It involved one George Hill, the former president of the Conservative Party of the province here, who is also from Estevan, who was appointed as the chairman of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and also was very directly involved as the president of the Souris Basin Development Authority, the Crown corporation that this government created in order to run the whole project.

These three people conspired, through the process of the planning stages and the beginnings of this project, they conspired to try to get this project without having

to meet all of the requirements of the law. This is the team that brought about this disastrous project. This is the team, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this team of three that mismanaged this project to the tune of some almost \$40 million which is going to cost and in fact has cost, the citizens of Saskatchewan — taxpayers' dollars — all because of pork-barrel, all because of mismanagement, all because of incompetence, and all because of some selfish political need of two politicians, and a third one who was never an elected politician, but nevertheless a politician in the sense that he was very directly involved with both the Premier, the Deputy Premier, and the Conservative Party.

In a project of this magnitude, I think it is fair, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if one asks what the approval of such a project would mean for the entire province, both from an economic and an environmental point of view.

Let me deal first with the economics. So here let me deal with it by asking some questions which have not been fully answered in this legislature, and have not been fully answered in the public.

When did the Rafferty-Alameda project become such a high priority for SaskPower? I once sat on the treasury benches, up until April of 1982. I was very familiar with the priority rankings of the various projects within the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. There was a list of quite a number of them. During all my 10 years on the treasury benches of the Allan Blakeney government in this legislature and in this province, not once did the Rafferty-Alameda-Shand proposal ever come forward as a priority of Saskatchewan Power Corporation — not once. I thought I was fairly knowledgeable about what was happening in the government of the day during that time. And I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that that is why, that is clear evidence why this project has been a severe and a serious case of mismanagement.

The other question that has to be asked is what alternatives were studied, if any. Well throughout all of the environmental impact study which was provided by the proponents, which incidentally to a large extent were the same people who reviewed it, never was there any discussion of any alternatives that were considered. There were no alternatives. A political decision was made by the government opposite to do the project, and then it was determined that the environmental impact study and the statement that came out of it would be written in order to justify the project.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the time has come, and I will conclude my remarks by making a statement about how the time has come for a different process altogether than the one that exists in this province now when it comes to environmental impact studies; a process that takes it out of the realm of partisan politics which these people over there have put into the process, where the environment is of no consideration and of no consequence if it meets certain political objective of the Conservative government and of this Premier.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the members opposite will settle down and listen, I want to indicate the third question that I would like to ask, and people of

Saskatchewan have been asking. The question was, would it have been cheaper to go ahead with the long plan expansion of the power generation at Coronach? Well the answer to that is obvious — of course it would have been.

But all of the economic studies and all of the projections and all of the information that is available — was available, is available today — from the point of view of what is economically correct for the generation of more electricity, if that in fact is the way to go, would have been to do the expansion at Coronach.

Now the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, I wish he'd enter in this debate and speak about that, because I know that a lot of his constituents are very concerned about ignoring the expansion at Coronach, which was the legitimate and the correct place in which to be able to increase generation capacity, rather than the boondoggle which has been the title given to this project at Rafferty-Alameda.

An Hon. Member: — You guys have all the answers.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — These are some of . . . Well the member from Morse says that we have all the answers. Well I certainly want to say, Mr. Speaker, if he wants to know whether we have the answers, he should convince the Premier to call an election and we'll provide the answers when we're on the other side of the House as the government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — If he thinks he has all the answers and if he thinks that the people of Saskatchewan believe he has the answer, he shouldn't hide from the public of Saskatchewan; he shouldn't have supported the closure Bill, the closure motion which cut off debate on the potash corporation sell-out Bill by this government, who knows nothing about building, who knows nothing about development, who knows nothing about economic development, but only can think of selling and selling and selling and selling.

Take all of the assets that have been built by the people of Saskatchewan and previous governments who represented the people of Saskatchewan, those wealthy assets which are a guarantee for a promising future, and what did they do with them? They sell them. And if there was some benefit to come out of that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, one would have to say well, okay, but where are the benefits. Have the taxes stayed down? Of course not. They've not only sold and sold and sold, but they have taxed and taxed and taxed and taxed to the point where there's almost . . . You hear on street corners and in communities throughout Saskatchewan people talking about a tax revolt.

And if you look at what public opinion is on this government's new tax, the new and latest tax, the lottery tax, there is a tax revolt. People have stopped buying lottery tickets in protest . . . And so the member from Morse, who wants to know if we have any answers, I say to him one more time, call an

election and let's find out whose answers the people of Saskatchewan are interested in.

And so, as I was beginning to say before I was so rudely interrupted by the member from Morse and the member from Weyburn, that these are some of the key questions which have never been fully answered, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because the government has refused to release any studies which prove the economic viability of the Rafferty-Alameda project compared to the alternatives. Never has there been one study released.

Now why would they not? Knowing that they are in such big political trouble on this issue, if they had such a study, why would they not have released it? Because there are no such studies which can confirm the decision that the government has made. So in other words, the project was initiated and has been advanced without giving the legislature or the general public the opportunity to be convinced of the economic arguments for it.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, given these circumstances, the government should not be surprised about the continuous pressure that has been applied on them to reveal all of the studies respecting a project of this magnitude. It is not just loose change. It is not just a few thousand dollars. We are talking about in the area of \$1 billion all told when all of this is completed, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Surely the government shouldn't expect the opposition or the wildlife federation or the people of Saskatchewan to say, bless you, government, go ahead spend a billion dollars even though you're not prepared to tell us what the benefits are. I mean, that is atrocious. It's atrocious to even, on the part of the Premier, expect people to accept that approach. But that is the approach that they decided that they were going to take.

So now in the midst of the public debate which has been taking place over this Rafferty-Alameda, we see . . . even though they haven't been able to provide arguments, guess what? They say we got to have this project, we got to generate this increased energy, this increased electricity, it's the most economic way to go. And they made that decision. And then comes along a gentlemen by the name of Colin Hindle who wants to build a nuclear reactor, and the government applauds, they applaud.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the government has never addressed the economic viability of this project. The government has tried to ram the Rafferty-Alameda project through and saying that that was the answer to electrical generation. But after having said that, agree and support a proposal to build a nuclear reactor. So I have to ask: which is it? And it's not surprising the public is asking; which is it? Well they don't know which it is, because they have never sat down as a responsible government and figured out what their strategy is. They don't have a strategy, other than the simple narrow partisan political strategy in the interest of a few of them and their friends and not in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I say that these are fundamental questions which show the need for the government to lay out for the people of Saskatchewan — or they should have laid out — a complete and a rational and a

long-term game plan for power development in this province. That should have been laid out already; they have not done that. So what concerns many Saskatchewan people is that they don't feel the government has such a game plan at all, and I don't think they have such a game plan.

There are important environmental concerns as well as about the Rafferty-Alameda project. There are lots of groups, a number of them who have expressed concern about the environmental impact study carried out by the Souris Valley Development Authority. And to the last one of them, even the experts say that that was an inadequate study, it was a study that was flawed, it was a study that was done sloppily, and it could not possibly have passed the scrutiny of inspection by people who knew what they were looking at unless they wanted to go ahead in spite of everything.

It's not just partisan politics. It's not just the New Democratic Party who said this. My friend and colleague, the member from Rosemont, made it very clear what the issues were right from the beginning. But it wasn't just us. It was the Government of Manitoba who was concerned. It was the United States national wildlife association. It was the Canadian Wildlife Federation, the Friends of the Valley. It was SCRAP (Stop Construction of The Rafferty and Alameda Project).

All of these people, not involved in partisan politics in any way, said that there is something wrong here; this environmental impact study is inadequate; the government has not considered all of the questions and has not provided most of the answers. And in spite of that, they went ahead. Those groups questioned the effects of the dams and the quantity and the quality of downstream water.

And another serious concern expressed by them, Mr. Speaker, was that the changing water patterns of other jurisdictions who rely on the Souris Basin, that was never addressed by the environmental impact study, nor by the government opposite, nor by the Minister of the Environment, nor by the Premier. These people argued that these issues were not sufficiently addressed in that study that was carried out by the Souris Basin Development Authority, nor were they adequately addressed by the provincial and federal governments, and the federal court said so, Mr. Speaker — said so.

Provincial government officials informed the Minister of the Environment as early as 1986 that the province was shutting out federal officials and that there would be consequences. The government knew. The government was advised by its own officials in 1986 and it still went ahead. The Minister of Environment still issued the licence. He broke the law all along through this process.

Oh he says he's not. He would stand up and in great indignation and say he didn't break the law. Well there's many ways of breaking the law. Well there's many ways of breaking the law, Mr. Speaker. There is . . . you could go by the narrow technicalities and get away with it, but morally he broke the law, because knowing in fact that there was inadequacies here, morally he broke the law and so did the Premier and so did the Deputy

Premier by providing the licence even though all the requirements had not been met.

What were they hiding? What were they hiding? Well they were hiding the fact, Mr. Speaker, that there was a far, far bigger agenda, and if time permits I may get into that before I sit down, after making my remarks.

(1530)

But there is evidence to show that something was wrong. I mean, in November of last year there was a senior adviser in the federal government, adviser to the Minister of Environment, one Elizabeth May, who resigned because she could not in good conscience continue to work in a place where there was political trade-offs, where the environment was being traded off, the needs of the environment were being traded off for the political needs of a couple of senior cabinet ministers. And the evidence is undeniable. And the members of this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, also have warned the government since 1986 that it had to comply with all the federal and provincial environmental laws and regulations.

In today's world there is no other option, and nor should there be. If you look at today's world, with our forests being mowed down quicker than they can grow, where we see the soils of our farm land being eroded at such a rate that maybe there is danger that at some time in the future we will not be able to produce the food that we need to feed a hungry people; when you look at the fact that we have waters being polluted to such an extent that they're unusable and that is why in the United States they are begging for the water over here in Canada because they have not . . . they developed quicker than we did in some ways, and therefore did not know what they were doing, and if they did, they didn't care. It was all development, development, development without balancing it off with what is the environmental question so that there is a future to this development for younger generations and future generations.

There is no other option except to pay attention to the environmental laws and the regulations, and in fact, Mr. Speaker, the time is fast approaching, in fact it's here, when some of those laws and those regulations need to be tightened and need to be strengthened. We cannot continue to abuse our ecosystem and abuse our planet and expect to survive as a human race on it.

But in spite of all that, the project that we are talking about in this debate was being rushed, almost as though its continued construction would somehow overwhelm all of the people who expressed concern. And the government pushed it forward.

And so what was the result? The result was certainly court challenges, not by the New Democratic Party, not by any political party, not by politicians, but concerned and interested people. The Canadian and Saskatchewan Wildlife Federations challenged this whole process in the courts and the federal court of Canada . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The New Democratic Party doesn't appoint the judge; we don't appoint the judge or we don't write the judgement. It was the federal court of Canada, appointed by the federal government — in this case this is

a Conservative government we have in Ottawa took you know, Mr. Speaker.

That federal court said that the process had been circumvented, the process had broke the law and therefore the project has to be stopped. And so what's the price? The price now, I assume, because it was at 35 million or some, but because the Deputy Premier keeps saying it's costing so much every one, for the price, it's something like \$40 million.

Now what could we not have done in this province with \$40 million? What could we have not done for the hungry children who are walking some of our streets in this province, have to go to a food bank in order to be able to get a meal — \$40 million could have done wonders for them.

What could we have done for the thousands of people who are waiting to get into a hospital bed in Saskatoon and Regina for \$40 million, or even a small fraction of that \$40 million. What could we have done with that \$40 million, Mr. Speaker, to put nurses in our hospitals where our nurses are overworked and cannot keep up with the work-load that is being pushed upon them because the hospitals are understaffed?

Oh, the Minister of Finance he stood up and he gave a budget speech and he said we're going to increase the nursing contingent in our hospitals by 370. That was in March. The fiscal year began on April 1.

Yesterday during consideration of the interim supply Bill, the question was asked, have those nursing positions been approved? And the answer is no. All of that . . . this is five months later, five months later and it's still not there because the government is managing its atrocious and unbelievable deficit on the back of sick people, and the back of our hospital system.

Now had they not blown \$40 million on this disastrous boondoggle as my colleague, the member from Rosemont, has named it so adequately, I think that the government would not have had to feel so squeezed financially that they would have had to delay some of these projects that they have talked about.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I seem to be getting under the skin of the members opposite because they feel obligated to defend themselves from their seats. I want to assure them that my remarks will not continue very much longer and I'll give them time to stand up and speak in this House and . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Why is the member on his feet?

Mr. Hepworth: — Would the hon. member entertain a question?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite, if he has something to say, can get up when I sit down and he will have an opportunity to address this House in the same way as I am doing. When I get over there after the

next election, if he happens to be lucky enough to make it in this House, he can then ask me the questions, and I'll be only too happy to answer them at that time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, so the government, because of its process, has lost \$40 million, but that's not all. It created expectations among the people in south-east Saskatchewan. They created expectations falsely. And so all of those hopes that some of those communities had and some of the people who live there, that were falsely created, have been shattered — shattered not because of something that somebody did on the opposition or what the wildlife federation did, shattered because of the kind of politics and the kind of mismanagement and incompetence that takes place by that Premier and by that government opposite, Mr. Speaker.

And already, even though the project is stalled, we've already had some environmental damage done. There have been machines doing all kinds of things over there under a licence that was illegally given. So when this happens, does the government do the responsible thing? The federal court rules that the project has to stop until here is a further study. Does the government do the responsible thing and say to the federal government, go ahead, do an environmental impact assessment and do it quickly? That's what they should have done. No of course not.

The Deputy Premier goes and appeals, appeals the decision of the court. And the court treats that appeal as being such a frivolous appeal that it doesn't take more than 17 minutes to consider the appeal before they throw it out. Another several thousands of dollars being spent unnecessarily, money that could have been better spent providing services to the people of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all of the tings that I say, I do not say because I have dreamed them up. There are documents that have been made available because of a court order from the Saskatchewan Water Corporation which showed the conspiracy that took place here, which showed that all through the process, officials of the government and cabinet minister were deliberately withholding information that should have been made available. Information deliberately withheld from the federal authorities; information deliberately withheld from the Government of Manitoba; information that was withheld from the authorities in the United States.

For what reason? Well the reason was, Mr. Speaker, and it was stated in the letters that were written, the reason was that the project, they wanted it to go ahead as quickly as possible in order that people who may be concerned could not stop it when finally they were caught in their acts, Mr. Speaker.

I quote one letter here where it involved a Mr. George Hood and officials of the Souris Basin Development Authority where they were apparently trying to avoid the involvement of the federal government and the involvement of the Manitoba government, and they say, and I quote:

Our strategy has been and will continue to be to take the project as far as we possibly can on our

own and build as much momentum behind it before we open the process up to other governments.

That is absolutely irresponsible. That did not happen by accident. That was a deliberate strategy to circumvent the law. And is it any wonder that when all sort of came home to roost the federal Court of Canada ruled that the licence of the federal government, which these people knew happened, was given without all of the requirements being met.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the member from Rosemont, talked a great deal about the environmental considerations on water and surface water, as well as ground water, so I'm not going to get into that. But I just want to provide some evidence in this debate of the kinds of inadequacies and the kinds of things that were going on here.

We know that that report was poor, the environmental impact statement, it was inadequate. But let me just quote to you and for the record in the House and for the people who may be viewing these proceedings, the kinds of things that the government knew and yet ignored. Let me quote from a Souris Basin Development Authority memo which summarizes some minutes that took place at a meeting on April 2, 1986. I quote that to show that the environmental review process was flawed and inadequate right from the beginning. This is a memo from George Hood, the director of planning and operations, the man in charge:

To File: Regarding a Souris Basin Development authority operating committee May 2, 1986.

There were a lot of . . . present at this meeting, including representatives from the power corporation. And it talks about the environmental review process, and I quote what it says in the minute, and I'll give you the name. Wayne Nordquist provided the overview of the environmental review process. Nordquist noted that the EIA will be late, that the document will be submitted in another two weeks, but that:

. . . this should not be problematic because most people who will review this document are also those who are writing it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, surely when you have a situation where the people who are writing the document are also the people who are going to be reviewing it, you're not going to get the kind of honest assessment that a project of this magnitude with the kind of environmental implications that it could have, would have, you're not going to get the kind of honest review that is necessary here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, others want to speak, so I just want to conclude by making a few remarks on some of the four points that I raised earlier. This project's biggest motivation has been pork-barrel and patronage. It seems — in fact it's now known — that the Premier and the Deputy Premier decided that they needed it for political reasons in their constituencies. And they decided that whatever . . . to do whatever was necessary to get it built.

If it took some degree of dishonesty, that's fine, they would get it built. If it took the breaking of environmental laws, they decided it was going to get built. If it was going to waste millions of taxpayers' dollars, it was going to get built. And you know they got caught. But that shouldn't be surprising, Mr. Speaker, because patronage is a way of life for the members opposite. It's a way of life. It's the very way they operate as a government.

This isn't the first one. I could give you a list which I have here, and I won't go through them all, but it takes two and a half pages to list just the patronage appointments that this government has made since 1986 of its friends and defeated and retired politicians. And for the purposes of the argument in this debate, one of those patronage appointments was the president of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, and the president of the Souris Basin Development Authority, whose job it was to get this project built in spite of all the consequences.

How in Heaven's name, Mr. Speaker, can it possibly be justified to go ahead when in the federal initial environmental evaluation, it was clearly shown that the hydrological data that was being used was out of date and therefore not adequate, and that there did not need to be an updating of that hydrological data before some accurate assessments could be made.

(1545)

How could they possibly avoid earlier studies which showed that it may take up to 40 years to fill such a dam, if ever, depending on the circumstances that the climate brings for us. Because, Mr. Speaker, it went ahead because there was, in my view, some deeper motivation. Oh there was a political need for the Premier and the Deputy Premier, but there was another motivation, the one that has been unstated and I think which has not received enough debate.

The minister of privatization, the member from Indian Head-Wolseley let it out when he spoke about the need to go around the province and sell the idea of taking water from the Saskatchewan River system in northern Saskatchewan, so that it could fill up the Rafferty-Alameda dam and eventually, Mr. Speaker, move south of the border into the United States.

That's the deeper motivation here which has not received the kind of debate that I think it ought to have because that has some very major implications for not only this province but for Canada, especially in light of that free trade agreement which was signed between another Conservative, the Prime Minister of Canada, and the United States.

The question of water diversion, that's another big issue, Mr. Speaker. There is the untold plan of water diversion from Saskatchewan south of the border. I guess one shouldn't be surprised if he's watched this Premier with any amount of care, because this Premier is a captive of the United States. He is a captive of the United States.

He can't understand that we in this province have to steer our own course. Oh we have to recognize influences around us and the importance of the United States as a

market and the supplier of some of the goods we use; that's all important. But having recognized that we have to recognize that here we have to steer our own course, because if we don't, others will steer it for us and it will not be in our interests. The Premier believes what is good for the United States is therefore good for Canada and good for Saskatchewan, and I don't agree that that's the way we should be making our decisions here.

And so what do we have here? We have a bill of some \$40 million that the taxpayers have to pay. You know what the bill is for? This bill is for incompetence and mismanagement. It's not an isolated situation; we've had lots of them.

We've had a GigaText with \$5 million which has been blown away to some entrepreneur who walked in here from Quebec and sweet talked the Deputy Premier into giving him four and a half million dollars — no questions asked, no way to check up on how he was going to spend it — gave him a blank cheque and said go ahead, spend our money.

We have \$10 million . . . tens of millions of dollars that is spent annually on political advertising, not of any use to anybody but simply the politics of this government. When I talk of mismanagement, which is what this Rafferty-Alameda project is all about, I am reminded of the \$34,000 a day that the government spends one empty office space. That's mismanagement.

What about the \$9 million birthday party? We haven't heard too much about that lately. Oh the government has really become silent on that one. Wow, and it's no wonder because they're still insisting they're going ahead with it, even though almost everybody in Saskatchewan has said they don't want it. We've had teachers pass resolutions saying, we don't want it. We've had senior citizen organizations saying, what's this 85th birthday party for the province of Saskatchewan? Find a better place to spend the money. That's mismanagement. Rafferty-Alameda is mismanagement and it's incompetence.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, it results from a megaproject mentality — a megaproject mentality. It results from the members opposite ignoring the very reality that in this province, 70 per cent — more than 70 per cent of jobs that are created are created by small business; hard-working family operations in small businesses, who create new jobs and provide strength to our economy.

We could have diversification. They talk about diversification. If the government was not overwhelmed by this megaproject mentality, we could have diversification in Rosetown and Melfort and Yorkton, Melville, with three fertilizer plans which were proposed by Canada energy "88."

Instead the government became infatuated by one of the biggest multinational corporations in the world, Cargill Grain, and it abandoned this opportunity for diversification in favour of Cargill Grain to whom they're

going to let out some more of the taxpayers' money as if Cargill can't afford to do it on their own.

Mr. Speaker, if there was some benefit from all of this, if there was some benefit from all of this, I guess one would say that we don't have much of an argument to make. But I look around for the benefit and I can't find it.

Let's look at employment. In 1981, we had 21,000 unemployed, an unemployment rate of 4.7 per cent. By 1988, after several years of this PC privatization, we had 37,000 unemployed and an unemployment rate of 7.5 per cent. And you know what it is, Mr. Speaker? Today it's 43,000 unemployed, in spite of the fact, in spite of the fact that in this year alone over 14,000 people have left this province in net out-migration . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Now the member from Cut Knife-Lloyd speaks from the seat, which is not even his own seat. If he would be patient and listen, even he might be persuaded that the government has been wrong.

In 1982, Mr. Speaker, more people moved into Saskatchewan than moved out. By 1988 that net out-migration was 12,346, and you know what it's been for 1989 — 14,369.

Rafferty-Alameda, Mr. Speaker, has been an example of this government's lack of commitment to environmental questions. It's been an example of this government's mismanagement and incompetence. It's been an example of this government's dishonesty. It's been an example of this government's overwhelming obsession with the need to make all decisions based on partisan political decisions and not make any decision based on what is in the interest of all of the people of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think, if I can close by this, if nothing else comes out of this, the one thing I think that might come out of it, which would be very valuable, is the development of an environmental impact assessment process that is real, one that does the job, one that takes this kind of major decision making out of the politics and puts it in the basis of sustainable development, where the decision is made on the basis of what is good for development, which will provide jobs and will provide opportunity, but not just for today, but which will provide all of those jobs and that opportunity for tomorrow and the day after tomorrow and my children and their children and on. Unless we have a process that takes that into consideration, then we have no process at all.

And I said when we considered the Department of Environment and Public Safety's estimates some time ago, I said to the Minister of the Environment, isn't it time that we had an independent environment commission of some type which would provide guide-lines for environmental impact statements and studies, and which would in fact review the studies that are written up and provided by the proponents before it even went to the minister and made a recommendation which went to the minister, but not only to the minister, but which was made public so that finally we could make decisions which had the interests of the environment and the economic development interests seriously considered, and so that there was some balance, and so that we would know that

just as our forefathers thought about our future, that the future generations is being thought of by us as well?

Rafferty-Alameda is a lot of things, but I think most of all it's a betrayal by this government of the needs of environmental protection and environmental interests. I, for those reasons, and I've taken more time to talk about them than I had intended, but for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the motion which has been moved by the member from Rosemont, and I invite the members opposite, those who really care about the future of this province, to consider doing that as well and to allow this motion to get to a vote rather than just forgetting as, unfortunately, so many motions do in this legislature. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gleim: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to begin this afternoon by saying that I'm surprised to see this resolution on the order paper today. Surprised, Mr. Speaker, because it seems to me that anyone or any group with the kind of record that the NDP have on environment would want to keep a low profile when it came to this matter.

The NDP have anything but a clean record when it comes to environment, Mr. Speaker. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, this administration has made every effort to protect the environment in Saskatchewan. Careful consideration is given to the environment in all our endeavours.

We believe that protection of the environment in the fundamental is very important. Not only are we unwilling to pay the economic and social and human consequences that have resulted from inadequate protection of the environment, we are also unwilling to subject people to those consequences. It would be more political . . . I guess it would be more political suicide for us or any other administration to disregard environment in Saskatchewan. There is also the fact that inevitable environmental and human disaster can be prevented if the people act with responsibility — I mean responsibility in the environment of our people

Mr. Speaker, why on earth would we want to be subject . . . would want to subject ourselves, our children, or anyone else to such an incident? I wonder why. The only logical answer to this question is that we wouldn't want to, and in fact we have never, and we haven't.

The Rafferty-Alameda dams and Shand power stations were approached with the same high regard for environment. While the NDP know that environment was one of the major considerations in undertaking this project, they are still doing everything in their power to lead people to believe that environment was not given any consideration whatsoever. Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan are smarter than the NDP would give them credit for.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of what the NDP would like the people to think, the environment was given every consideration before we would allow the project to go ahead — every consideration, Mr. Speaker. It was given

every consideration before there was any type of work being done in that area. And I can assure you that this practice of ensuring environmental safety is not specific to the Shand-Rafferty-Alameda project. No matter what our initiative is, environmental protection is always given consideration.

With respect to the Shand-Rafferty-Alameda projects, there have been some improvements to the environment. Currently, Mr. Speaker, sewage from the city of Estevan is treated, then poured back into the Souris River. Well once the Shand power station goes into operation, it will use the treated sewage from Estevan as well as water from the Rafferty dam to cool the turbines.

Once the sewage has been used for this purpose, it is then stored in holding ponds on site, rather than being dumped back into the Souris River. These ponds, Mr. Speaker, are lined with impenetrable liners. Any liquid stored in them will not be able to seep into the underground water system or into the river system. Perhaps I should mention that it is not just the sewage that is used to cool these turbines that is stored in the holding ponds. Any liquids used at the site will be stored there, therefore eliminating any risk of environment.

(1600)

Mr. Speaker, the Shand power station will also use the latest technology to limit emissions of sulphur dioxide and other chemicals to the atmosphere. It will be the first coal-fired power station in Canada to use zero discharge system of water management — zero discharge, Mr. Speaker, and water management. What this means is that the smoke leaving the plant chimney stacks will meet or exceed the federal government's regulations for emissions.

Over the past few years, acid rain has become an issue of ever increasing concern, Mr. Speaker. People all over the world are concerned with acid rain, and this government, Mr. Speaker, and the people of this province, are no exception. Upon taking the time . . . acid rain was an issue that seemed far removed from Saskatchewan and even Canada. But, Mr. Speaker, that is no longer true.

Perhaps the first indication of effects of acid rain to hit close to home for most of us was the gradual dying of the maple forest in eastern Canada, brought about by acid rain. We now also hear about the crystal clear lakes in parts of Ontario. Mr. Speaker, a crystal clear lake, although it sounds beautiful, it is actually tragedy. It is a tragedy, Mr. Speaker, because the reason that those lakes are crystal clear is because they are dead. There are no fish, no plants, no algae, and all because of acid rain.

To take this grimy story a little further, many internationally renowned environmentalists are predicting that within the next decade if something isn't done, tropical rain forests will cease to exist. The implications of such occurrence is devastating beyond our imaginations, Mr. Speaker. Although the effects of acid rain have been minimal in Saskatchewan, at least in comparison to other parts of the world, it will only be a matter of time unless we take the initiatives ourselves to stop progression in its tracks, Mr. Speaker. The Shand

power station is a step in the right direction.

The Shand power station, it will use a lime injection system for removing the noxious fumes that have been associated with acid rain. The system works by covering the sulphur dioxide in a solid which is more easily and safely disposed of, rather than simply being carried away to the wind and further contributing to the environmental problems in Saskatchewan. The sulphur dioxide will be reduced by 85 per cent by installation of a finished system called LIFAX which used humidification process in addition to the lime injection.

Further, the plant will use a locally mined lignite coal to power its turbines. This coal, Mr. Speaker, mined in the Estevan area, has a lower sulphate content and a higher concentration of sodium, the result making it easier to turn the sulphide dioxide into solids. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the coal has a higher heating value so less is required to produce the same amount of heat. It only goes to follow that if you use less coal you will have less sulphur dioxide to handle.

As are all the initiatives of the government, the Rafferty-Alameda dams have only been undertaken after careful consideration to the environment. The Rafferty-Alameda dams are a water conservation program, Mr. Speaker, water conservation program. They will assist in water management, flood control and irrigation. Mr. Speaker, irrigation in itself is an environmental issue. Water is essential for life, both plant and animal. Lack of water is not only devastating to the environment, it is devastating to the economy too, Mr. Speaker.

Over the past few years Saskatchewan has been going through a massive drought, a drought that has been called more devastating than the one in the 1930s, Mr. Speaker. All of us in Saskatchewan have seen first hand the devastating effects of that drought and what drought can do to the province. Not only are farmers having a rough go of it, but the entire economy has been suffering in that effect.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan happens to be the land of the locked promise. Nowhere in the world is a lack of water more important than it is here, Mr. Speaker. The people of Saskatchewan, in particular the farm families, know the value of water. It is one of our most precious resources. Because water is of such vital importance to the agricultural economy and because the agricultural economy is of such vital importance to the rest of the province, we all suffer consequences when there is insufficient supply of water. As long as Saskatchewan gets rain, we do all right. But the past few years have been an excellent example of why we cannot depend on the weather. It is far too unpredictable, Mr. Speaker.

This fact combined with the fact that Saskatchewan has one of the shortest growing seasons of the agriculture economy in the world can paint a pretty grim picture at times. As a result, irrigation becomes a logical solution, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Rafferty-Alameda dams will indeed provide a means for irrigation as I have already

mentioned. I have already briefly touched on the unpredictable of the weather and the subsequent water in Saskatchewan. The Rafferty-Alameda dams will serve as a solution to this problem.

I heard the member across the way say and talk about the water. There's not going to be any water. It's going to take 40 years, maybe 40 years or longer. Just think how long it's going to take to fill it when there is no dam. That water's been running freely south for many, many years. And I guess it's about time that we start managing our own water. It's like the Premier of the province said that we lose 99.9 per cent of our water that nobody wants at that time of the year. And that is why it's so important that the Rafferty-Alameda dam is built.

In years when there is inadequate water supply, the water that has been stored can be drawn upon and used to irrigate the land. Mr. Speaker, the supply of water is also of vital importance to more than just rural communities. One of the major concerns with regard to the project has been the regard to wildlife that is indigenous to that area.

Mr. Speaker, before we undertook the project we made a commitment that there would be no net loss of wildlife habitat. In fact, this project will prove to be beneficial to the species that occur natural in the area. As I already mentioned, water is essential for life. Wildlife is no different. You don't see any wildlife where there's no water. I mean, they have to have water the same as people. And you build a dam and you just improve the wildlife that is going to move into that area. They need to live the same as the human beings do and they have to have water to survive, Mr. Speaker.

Without water the earth becomes unproductive and volatile. On the other hand, when there is an abundant supply of water, wildlife that is in the area will prosper and so will the farmers in that area.

This government cares about environment. We care about protecting the environment and our record is our best reference, Mr. Speaker. We are undertaking the Shand project, the Rafferty-Alameda projects, because they are good for the people of Saskatchewan. They are good for Saskatchewan and they pose no threats to the environment.

Mr. Speaker, if anyone is guilty of environmental negligence it is those people across the way. During the NDP administration . . . and I know you've all heard this story before, but I just want to repeat it once more just to remind you what your record is on environment. During the NDP administration there was a PCB (polychlorinated biphenyl) spill in the city of Regina, right in this here city, Mr. Speaker. I never heard about it at any time; none of my colleagues heard about it, and neither did anyone else. The reason that none of us heard about it is, Mr. Speaker, because the NDP administration hid it from the people of Saskatchewan. I can't think of anything more that posed a threat to the people of Saskatchewan than the PCB spill here in Regina.

Yet the members opposite decide to hide the truth from the people. They decided the people of Saskatchewan did not have the right to know about the incident that posed

real dangerous threats to their very well-being life here in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Minister, this behaviour . . . and if that's the idea of representing the people, then I am more proud to be a member on this side than I would be on that side, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gleim: — Mr. Speaker, it turns my stomach when I think about. I still think how terrible it is when they undertook the initiative and to try and say they protect the people of Saskatchewan. I'm not even going to try to understand that kind of logic, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: — You can't even understand any kind of logic.

Mr. Gleim: — The logic that member says I don't understand; I understand this one a lot better than what they did. They took and they covered up a PCB spill in this province, right here in Saskatchewan. You know how they covered it up? — 10 feet of concrete. The only thing they had going in those days, concrete is cheaper than it is today. And it's like one of the members on this side said, if they'd have still been in power, then probably the cement companies would have been doing better.

But what they didn't undertake was what it cost to dig that cement up, and I'd hate to see the day when that cement has to come up and we have to show the people of Saskatchewan what is underneath there.

Mr. Speaker, this kind of behaviour is not only unbecoming to the members of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, it is downright criminal. Not only did the people of Saskatchewan have the right to know, they also deserved the kind of protection that would have resulted had the NDP administration had some kind of integrity that they so easily accuse us of lacking, and clean up a spill properly.

Well, Mr. Speaker, at least I know I can go home at night and I can sleep. I don't have to be like the member from Regina North East. He was the member responsible for that. He never mentioned one little thing about that PCB spill, but he stood over there and he criticized these people across the way for the good job that we are doing in environment . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Right. I'm glad you understand.

An Hon. Member: — You keep on reading.

Mr. Gleim: — I will certainly do that. I don't have anything riding on my conscience about the way this government is handling its job, Mr. Speaker. This administration has been straightforward and honest with the people of Saskatchewan in the past, and we will continue to conduct our affairs of this province with that same integrity.

Mr. Speaker, we care about the people of Saskatchewan. We believe that they have the right to know. I would therefore like to move a motion, seconded by the member from Redberry . . . an amendment, I should say:

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

Commend the Government of Saskatchewan for initiating the Shand project and the Rafferty-Alameda dam projects, and for ensuring that all environmental concerns are addressed with regards to those projects and all others that they have undertaken and will undertake in the future.

I so move. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gerich: — Mr. Speaker, it's becoming increasingly obvious and more and more obvious to the people of the province that the members opposite are against everything that this government does. And they oppose any project that's initiated unless they themselves initiate or they are the initiators. Because the opposition is not the government, they don't have the opportunity to initiate programs, and the result, Mr. Speaker, is that they oppose every initiative that this government undertakes.

They even oppose initiatives that this government has undertaken that they condoned when they were in office. Public participation for one is an example that they denied, Mr. Speaker. They deny the fact that they would have embarked upon their own private . . . public participation initiative had they not lost the election in 1982. But then again, denial is nothing new to the members opposite.

(1615)

As I've already said, they oppose every initiative that this government has undertaken — every one, Mr. Speaker. And in doing so, they are denying the people of Saskatchewan, denying the people that they are paid to represent. Mr. Speaker, this resolution 17 is another example of the members opposite putting their own interests before the interest of the people that they represent. And if there were any doubt in their minds that the Shand-Rafferty-Alameda project would in anyway jeopardize the environment, I can assure you that we would not be proceeding with it, Mr. Speaker. If you compare our record on environment to that of the members in opposition when they were in power, it becomes very obvious which party has integrity and which one hasn't.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, compare our record to that of the NDP on any issue and you'll find the same results. Be it on the environment or health care, education or any other issue, our record is pretty well unbeaten, Mr. Speaker, and we are proud of that. The people of my constituency enjoy the benefits of this government and are also proud of the accomplishments that we have made.

The environment, Mr. Speaker, is of vital importance to this administration. We realize that environmental protection is not to be taken lightly. We are fully aware of the fact that environment is a very fragile entity. Upsetting

that delicate balance would result in irreversible damage. Man has already been the cause of many plants and animals becoming endangered species. In fact, some of these species have become extinct and lost for ever.

It's tragic, Mr. Speaker, tragic that man would let something happen like this. But, Mr. Speaker, we can't reverse the process. We can't bring back those of the lost species, but we can do . . . and what we can do is to prevent any further loss. And, Mr. Speaker, that's what this government is doing.

We can't bring anything back that has been lost, but we're aiding in the preservation of what we still have. The Rafferty-Alameda dams are no exception. Extensive research and investigation was done in regard to this project before we undertook it. We wanted to ensure the government would not be affected.

This government has no interest in being party to the destruction or damage to the environment. The Shand power station will use the latest technology to limit emissions of sulphur dioxide and other chemicals into the air.

Mr. Speaker, Shand will be the first coal-fired power station in Canada to use zero discharge system of water management. None of this water used at the plant will leave the site. The smoke leaving the stack will meet the federal regulations for emissions.

There's been some concern about acid rain and how Shand will affect it, and this is a genuine concern, Mr. Speaker. We too are concerned with this. The Shand power station will use a lime injection system for removing noxious fumes that have been associated with acid rain. The lime injection system works by changing sulphur dioxide into a solid, which can be buried rather than be carried away by the wind.

In addition to being environmentally responsible, this system will cost \$80,000 less than the traditional scrubber system at \$90,000. The lime injection system will save us approximately \$10,000.

In addition, a finished system called LIFAX, which uses the same lime injection method as well as additional humidification process, will reduce the sulphur dioxide by 85 per cent — 85 per cent and more.

The plant will use locally mined lignite coal to power its turbine. And what, you might ask, does the coal have to do with the environmental protection? The lignite coal, mined in the Estevan area, has a low sulphur content and a higher concentration of sodium. This lower concentration makes it easier to turn the sulphur dioxide into a solid. The coal also has a higher heating value, so less is required to produce the same amount of heat. Subsequently there is less sulphur dioxide to deal with.

Mr. Speaker, I have already mentioned that any water used in the process at Shand will be kept on site. The ponds that hold the water that will be used in the process are lined with impermeable lines, the result being that the water cannot leak into the underground water system or into a river system.

Water from the Rafferty dam, as well as the treated sewage from the city of Estevan, will be used to cool the turbine. The added advantage of this, Mr. Speaker, is that the sewage will go into the plant's holding ponds, rather than into the Souris River system.

The resolution also made reference to the Rafferty and Alameda dams, and as I mentioned before, this government is doing everything possible to be environmentally responsible for all our endeavours and the Rafferty and Alameda dams are no exception. These dams are a water conservation project. Conservation, Mr. Speaker, the very definition of this word generally refers to environmental issues, and it's usually viewed in a positive text. Environmentalists promote conservation and they aren't the experts when it comes to environment. If the experts encourage conservation, then why is it that the members opposite feel it necessary to condemn it? Why, Mr. Speaker? Well they think that they know more about environment and about related issues than the experts in that field do.

And, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that they know any more, and I hope that they don't think they know any more now. It's simply a case of members in the opposition once again opposing an initiative for their own personal and political gain.

These people, Mr. Speaker, that sit on the opposition side of the House from my colleagues and I, act with complete disregard for the people that they were elected to represent, and I would have thought that they would approach their duties with more dignity than that. After all, Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honour to be elected to represent one's neighbours in this Assembly. It's also flattering to know that those same people who elected you have the confidence in you enough to trust you to be their official representative. And it's sad that these people have had their trust violated by the NDP members of this Assembly.

But, Mr. Speaker, the next election will show just what the people think of someone, think of a party, either side, that violate the trust. I would suggest to the members in opposition that they watch their step closely. The people of this province know what's happening and what's going on here.

They hear the members of the opposition taking stabs at this government's policies, policies that are good for the people, policies that the people support. And they hear the members in opposition making personal attacks on members of this government, members that are of good upstanding character, members who set a good example for the rest of society — people from whom members of the opposition could stand a few lessons in integrity.

Mr. Speaker, the Rafferty and Alameda dams that I already have mentioned is a conservative project. It will assist in water management, irrigation, flood control. The province happens to be burdened with unpredictable weather and a short growing season, and we never know what to expect. How many times has the weatherman predicted a nice hot sunny day only to have it rain? And then how many times has he predicted it to rain and have

it hot and dry?

Saskatchewan is an agricultural province, and in order for us to succeed we need an abundant supply and access to water. We need to know that if we need water, we have access to it. And, Mr. Speaker, if you talk to the rural communities in Saskatchewan and ask them what their biggest concern is, it's water. Nowhere in the world is the value of water understood more and better than in this province.

Water is one of our most valuable resources, and the people of Saskatchewan know that. They know that because we don't have a consistent water supply and because we don't have any control over natural environmental conditions such as rainfall, we need a water management program. And the Rafferty and Alameda dams will provide just that. The dams will store water from the high-flow years in the Souris River and the Moose Mountain Creek for during our low-flow periods.

And, Mr. Speaker, this project does have an impact on the environment, but the impact and its results are positive. Without water, land becomes a dry barren wasteland, unsuitable for any habitation. And ensuring that there's an adequate water supply at all times also ensures that rural communities will prosper and that the wildlife that is indigenous to the area will be able to survive.

Mr. Speaker, currently there is very little irrigation that takes place in the Souris River Basin, but the Rafferty and Alameda dams will change that. When we undertook this project, we did so with the commitment that there would be no net loss to wildlife habitat. Mr. Speaker, to get the licence to go ahead with the project, protection of the environment was a provision that had to be made. The federal government made it impossible for us to go ahead with the project without due consideration for the safety of the environment.

This government does have the best interest of environment at heart. We know by ignoring the environmental concerns, we will only be hurting ourselves in the long run. If we do not take the responsibility today to protect the environment, what kind of world will our children have to look forward to? What kind of world will our grandchildren have to look forward to? Well I can't answer that question.

If the environmental issues are not addressed here today, who knows what kind of world will exist in the future. Perhaps it will spell the end of the world. I don't know that for a fact, but I am not and this government is not going to find out. Rather, we are committing ourselves to the preservation of the environment.

What little we do know about the potential dangers to environment and if they are not checked is very sobering. And as I say in the beginning of my remarks, because of man's lack of sensitivity toward the environment, we have already lost many things — things that our children and grandchildren will never have a chance to experience.

Mr. Speaker, this government is doing and will continue to do whatever is necessary to stop that trend. We will not

risk the environment for the sake of personal or political gain. And what we will do is to protect the environment. Our record is the best reference to our commitment to the environment. It shows our dedication, it shows our opposition to environmentally dangerous situations such as a PCB cover-up that occurred during the NDP administration.

And when it comes to the environment, the NDP opposite are the ones who should be condemned and not us. They attempted to hide the facts from the people of Saskatchewan by covering up a PCB spill with concrete. And the member from Regina North East was in cabinet and government at that time. I'd like to ask him how much concrete he used. Everybody says 10 feet but, you know, we'd like to know right first hand. Rather than doing the right thing and issuing a warning to the people of Saskatchewan and cleaning up the mess, they chose to deceive the people over the contamination and cover it up with cement.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they have to live with that kind of record and we don't. You can't rest assured, as long as we're government in power, the people will know that . . . and what we are doing to protect the environment. And they will know about the potential dangers to themselves. We will not hide the facts from them, Mr. Speaker.

And on that note I would like to second the motion by the member from Shaunavon.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, I stand in direct opposition to the amendment and support the original motion. The original motion had stated the following, and this was moved by the member from Rosemont and seconded by the member from Regina North East:

That this Assembly condemns the Government of Saskatchewan for continuing to force its expensive Rafferty-Alameda and Shand projects without regard for widespread public concern about the environmental impacts of the projects.

Then the member from Shaunavon moved an amendment which more or less commends the government for having proceeded with Rafferty-Alameda.

I must say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that only the PCs can have the audacity to stand in this House after a federal court ruling stating that they should not have proceeded with the Rafferty-Alameda project because it did not contain a sound environmental approach. Only the PCs can have the audacity to come back in the House and challenge a law of the federal courts in Canada.

(1630)

The member from Weyburn, of course, always yaps from his seat. He does not know that the recent polls have indicated that in the general province as a whole, there was 75 per cent opposition to the Rafferty-Alameda project.

An Hon. Member: — Have you gathered up any samples lately, Keith?

Mr. Goulet: — I think it's very important to recognize in regards to his sampling that he probably did that in somebody's home town basically because they are trying to protect their own political self-interests, and by that I mean the Premier and the Deputy Premier in selected parts of their own riding. And I would state that sure, if you did sampling, it's quite possible that the sampling might prove that it was beneficial to them.

I'm talking more about the provincial scene. I'm talking about the fact the Premier is supposed to stand up for the province, and also the Deputy Premier in regards to the environment as a whole. And I would state very clearly that the opposition, in regards to the breaking of the law by the PCs and their complete disregard to the laws of Canada, is what's at issue.

I might state very clearly that it was not the NDP . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . the member from Weyburn continues to talk from his seat. And I might state that it was the wildlife federation that have opposed you and also it was the federal court judge that made the decision and not the NDP. So when we stand here in opposition to the fact of your lack of environmental concern, it's based on what the record shows.

I would like to state that I heard members from the other side also talk quite a bit about the PCBs and cover-up. Well we've never seen a greater cover-up in many issues in this province than the PCs have. We've seen the cover-ups in regards to the auditor's report; we've seen cover-ups in regard to GigaText; and we've seen many other cover-ups in regards to many other issues that we have brought up into this legislature that the PCs have refused to answer.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make my presentation in the light of what's happening in the global scene but also what's happening in Saskatchewan and also in regards to the North. I would like to first of all start out on the global basis.

The PCs are always talking about global leadership and so on, but the fact remains very clearly that the global trend is one of the greater consideration for the environment. Many of the people have looked and have followed the example set by the international commission, the Brundtland Commission, you know, that was commissioned to the United Nations, and that in fact on the book written that was published in '87, *Our Common Futures*, states very clearly that the trend is towards sustainable economic development; that development was still very important but that it was to be based on a sustainable economic basis.

And the meaning behind that, Mr. Speaker, so that the members from the other side get to understand what the concept means, is that when you do economic development, not only the almighty dollar and the big corporations count, what it means is that you have to have economic development and economic consideration that takes into consideration the environmental balance at the same time. So that the short

basis, the short-sighted considerations of economic dollars for political self-interest so that the Premier might get re-elected, or the minister from Souris-Cannington might get elected. And I might say might, because as soon as people get more and more information about the project and its long-term impact on the environment, greater questions will be asked.

So I might say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that it goes against a trend in regards to a global considerations, that the PCs are behind the times when they consider only the almighty dollar as a judgement for development in the province of Saskatchewan. I would state also that in Saskatchewan here, and also more particularly in northern Saskatchewan from where I come from, many of the members do not know the impact of dams. As we look at the situation here in Canada, I might say the word, internationally, most places are now getting away from building larger dams. And many people are reconsidering and looking at smaller and smaller scale dams and other alternate sources of energy utilization.

It's becoming very clear that the moratorium, for example, in one of the northern European countries, the moratorium on dam building has come from basic knowledge about the practical devastating impacts of dams in itself of hydrodams. We know the impact in the media in the past year in regards to the dam building in South America, and not only the destruction of the land there, but the taking away from land of aboriginal people over there. And that has become an international issue.

But I think it's very important to recognize that even countries, who were always very, very in tune with bigness and large scale development, was the Soviet Union. But in the past couple of years, they have done away with building of dams in their own areas as well because their own environmentalists are saying that's not sound strategy, that development strictly for economic sense, for economic principles is not enough; that you have to have a sustainable development strategy as well; that you have to have consideration for the future.

The grandchildren and their children have to be considered in regards to long-term impacts. And this is precisely what we are talking about when we are debating this point and where the members have the audacity to commend the government for proceedings to breaking the law in regards to the Rafferty-Alameda project.

As I was mentioning, the issue is also one of dealing with the experience here we have in this province. I do not have the experience of dealing with the issue in regards to the impact of Diefenbaker Lake, but I know the impact that Cumberland House and the impact of E.B. Campbell dam, formerly called the Squaw Rapids dam. And also I know the impact as I travel through my constituency in regards to the Island Falls dam and its impact on the environment there, and also the dam at Whitesand at Reindeer River, at the mouth of Reindeer River on south end Reindeer Lake.

So I must say that I stand here, Mr. Speaker, in not only knowledge about the international situation in regards to developmental approaches, but also in regards to having

been born and raised in Cumberland House and having been experienced in dealing with the issues of the lack of compensation of the environmental damage by the Island Falls dam on the people in the environment of the people of Sandy Bay.

And also I might add, because a lot of the people were talking about PCBs and PCB spills, they must recognize that I raise the issue this past spring in regard to PCBs and the PCB spills in Island Falls this past year. And not only the health effects on the workers, that they never had anything positive to say about it. They kept trying to cover it up and they've been covering it up every since. So this whole debate brings out other issues that they themselves have not dealt with in this legislature. They simply want to hide the facts, and they simply want to cover up what has been happening in regards to environmental damage in this province.

So we are dealing here with environmental damage. A lot of the wildlife . . . and many of the people who deal with dams do not see the effects till after the fact. Well we have seen the effects. We have seen a lot of dead fish floating in shallow rivers because the sun beams down and the water is so shallow that a lot of the fish die. There is insufficient oxygen and so on, and because of the water levels get too hot, I've seen a lot of fish flow where the sea-gulls come down and plucking their eyes out because the water level is too shallow. And many of the people have not had that experience in the South, but we have seen it up North because that is what the impact is. We have seen sturgeon, their spawning areas get knocked off, many of the different . . . with the changes in condition because it's too shallow.

We see a lot of . . . They talked about acid rain and the coal fired plant that is going to be there. We know the acid rain from the Flin Flon mines in regards to our area where the trout were gone and they were completely annihilated from the mill lake, and I've raised that about two, three times in the legislature before. So the environmental impact which we have seen in northern Saskatchewan is something that should be considered in regards to the Rafferty-Alameda project. We know what happens.

We've seen . . . When I travel through my constituency now, I see many brown spots as I fly through my area, and those brown spots used to be the lakes. A lot of fish used to live there. A lot of the people who made their living from trapping used to make their livelihood from there, but no longer could they do it because of the tremendous environmental damage.

So the environmental damage, of course, causes long-term economic pain. So what we are talking about in this case is that the government is refusing to deal, not only with the international development and international development trends, but they're refusing to deal with the fact of what has been impacted on the dams in Saskatchewan.

I might say that all these things put together — the acid rain, the lack of water management which I will go into — is cause for great concern of many people in the province who are not necessarily environmentalist, you know, in

the usual sense of the world, but because they know people like to walk in areas, but also take a boat out in areas where there is sound environmental conditions. And this precisely the issue that we are dealing with here today.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, also I was listening to the other members and they were also talking about the nuclear . . . some of the members were talking about the nuclear reactor issue, and I notice that the Premier, at the same time that we were talking about the Rafferty-Alameda project, was talking positively about the nuclear reactor.

And a lot of the people in the North, when there was a one and a half hour debate on the radio, some people phoned in and said, if the Premier is so convinced about the nuclear reactor and the safety of the nuclear reactor, why doesn't he build it in his own riding and forget about the Rafferty-Alameda project. So the contradictions that were raised by the people were not fully satisfied by the opinion of the Premier.

So here we have a Premier that's talking great development about the North and how to put a nuclear reactor up there, and he wouldn't even dare put it in his own riding. And here he's talking about speeches about how dangerous acid rain is, and here he's putting an acid rain plant in his own riding. Of all the contradictions in regards to environmental trends, not only internationally, but locally in regards to what the Premier and the Deputy Premier are proceeding with in their own areas. And not only that, Mr. Speaker, and all for simple self-interest because they figure they can win an election out of that. Just pure political self-interest, and the usual patronage that goes along with it.

My own feeling there, Mr. Speaker, in regards to this, is that a lot of the large-scale corporations want to sell their turbines. They want to sell a lot of the equipment that goes on, and I'm pretty sure after the Nipawin dam was built, a lot of the Japanese turbine builders were interested in not only selling their turbines to Nipawin project but they wanted to sell it to the Premier, and the Premier must have said sure, I want to build a dam in my own riding. You can sell them to me over there, and I'll probably, with the Deputy Premier, we even have a plan to even probably have one in the Churchill River. We know that the Deputy Premier had looked at the Churchill in regards to that aspect.

So as I look at this overall issue, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's a real contradiction for the Premier who espouses environmental concern, a lot of the members from the other side. The proof has to lie in the fact that they are simply breaking the law for self-interest. They are trying to hide the fact of their own mismanagement and their own political corruption.

I might add, at the last point we talked quite a bit about diversion, and I remember the minister from Indian Head-Wolseley, who talked about diverting, you know, the northern waters into Last Mountain Lake and also possibly selling it to the United States. He's always talking about privatization and the economic diversification and gains for the Americans, but never for the province of Saskatchewan.

(1645)

But the key point here is that in most places internationally, diversion is a dirty word now. Nobody wants to talk about water diversion, and here we had the minister of privatization wanted to talk about diversion. And we were dealing with . . . At that point in time we were debating the benefits of the free trade deal, and they were talking about selling water to the United States of America. And there was no place in that free trade agreement that prevented that; that it was possible to sell it as a commodity, water as a commodity. And I am pretty sure that the member from Indian Head-Wolseley thought that he could channel money through Last Mountain Lake and over through his constituency somewhere and sell water to the United States. That is still going to be a debatable issue as time goes on, but that whole area of diversion is not of course a new idea.

We know diversion has been there for ages, for centuries, but it has come out to be an environmental issue more recently since the early days of dams in B.C. and also in Ontario and also, I might say, Europe and in Asia. Many, many of the people don't want to get into diversion. And it's true, many people say diversion is just not the way to go. But the member from Indian Head-Wolseley kept bringing that thing up during last year, and now he will probably try to deny it as time goes on. But that's the record of the PCs: they always try and cover up, hide the facts, deny, deny, deny, even though they have said things before. Whether it's to privatize SaskEnergy or whatever, they will deny the facts after they have done something.

So we are seeing here a whole issue of the environmental question in regards to diversion that hasn't been properly answered by the minister of the Environment and also by the Deputy Premier. We know that as time goes on, that will be a question, especially as the pressure comes in from the Americans and their larger-scale economic interests and their privatized power companies, they want to have a toe-hold in regards to our resources. They know that northern Saskatchewan supposedly they feel has a lot of water because a lot of them go there on tourism, and they see a lot of the water which they don't have in the United States. They've already had private interests in the United States completely wipe out their water supply down there. They know that the water table is so low in the mid-west that they're looking at our water, and that whole question of diversion is one question that they'll be pushing as time goes on. And with these guys, they're always into the American . . . they're more interested in American diversification than in Saskatchewan diversification.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — So these people are so obsessed and possessed with foreign control and American control and Japanese control, are now going to come out and say, hey, we commend the Saskatchewan government; we commend the Saskatchewan PC government for their great job in Rafferty-Alameda. And I must say, Mr. Minister, in closing, that only the PC government in the history of Saskatchewan can have the audacity to stand

up there and break environmental laws of Canada and come here and say, yes, we commend ourselves for doing that. And that's the most shameful thing I've heard in the legislature for some time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — So with that, Mr. Speaker, I would stand in direct opposition to their amendment, and I would like to say, not only to oppose it, but to adjourn the debate on this particular motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

Resolution No. 24 — Jeux Canada Games

Mr. Martin: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At the conclusion of my remarks I will be moving the resolution:

That this Assembly commends the thousands of volunteers who are responsible for the Jeux Canada Summer Games to be hosted by the beautiful city of Saskatoon, and further, that the Assembly extends a warm welcome to all participants in the games.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the city of Saskatoon and the province of Saskatchewan has the unique opportunity of hosting the Jeux Canada Games; they opened on Sunday. And, Mr. Speaker, what a wonderful show it was. Hundreds of Saskatoon youngsters and adults participating in the musical numbers and a great display of pageantry for all the folks; 13,000 people, Mr. Speaker, were there for the opening ceremonies. And I know the member from Saskatoon will be speaking on that matter in a moment as well.

Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker, is in an enviable position, one of which many cities across Canada . . . across Saskatchewan rather, and across this country would love to be in. The Jeux Canada Games will give the city of Saskatoon and the province an opportunity for the second time to show Canada and the world what it has to offer.

Mr. Speaker, there's a great deal I'd like to say about the Canada Games. I do however want to leave some time for the member from Saskatoon Mayfair, and I would however like to say, very briefly, Mr. Minister, that I had the opportunity to be involved in all of the Canada Games except the ones in Newfoundland.

I was at all the Canada Games beginning with 1967 in Quebec City for the first Canada winter games. I've taken part in the games in a variety of ways as an athlete and a coach, as well as a commentator and a part of the mission staff for the province of Saskatchewan. And it is without doubt one of the finest athletic programs anywhere in the world, Mr. Speaker.

And added to it to strengthen the Saskatchewan athletes, who over the years have progressively gotten better, Saskatchewan has introduced a program several years go, Saskatchewan First program, which we brought some of the finest coaches in Canada into this province, and

actually from outside of Canada as well, Mr. Speaker, to work with the athletes from . . . work with the Saskatchewan athletes.

Most of Saskatchewan athletes, Mr. Speaker, have been preparing for these games now for, I suppose, ever since the last games. Anyone up to 18 to 23 years of ages competes. So in all the sports that they are partaking in, we have fine coaches and an improvement in the athletic excellence.

And as a result of that, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has its first gold medal. Our first gold medal was earned by a young lady from Marsden, Shannon Kekula, who is a constituent of the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster, who can hardly contain his enthusiasm and is beaming, Mr. Speaker, with a grin from ear to ear about the shot-put gold medal by Shannon Kekula of Marsden.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martin: — I'd like to say also, I suppose report, Mr. Speaker, as I used to do, that all our athletes in rowing are doing extremely well. Seven of the eight events that Saskatchewan rowers are in, and this is a sport that was previously dominated by British Columbia and Nova Scotia, but seven of the eight teams in the various events in rowing have now advanced to the finals. I had the privilege of being in Calgary a couple of years ago for the Western Canada Games when we won our first gold medal in rowing, and they've been a steady improvement ever since.

Mr. Speaker, in softball, a sport that many of us on both sides of the House have competed in over the years, our men's softball team is doing extremely well. They beat Alberta 6 to 1 and Prince Edward Island 12 to 1 this morning. So our Saskatchewan team is doing very well.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martin: — So, Mr. Speaker, I want to leave the member from Saskatoon an opportunity to gloat a little bit about his town, about the city of Saskatoon. I do want to say though, Mr. Speaker, that you know we often . . . it's kind of annoying, Mr. Speaker, when someone says to you, Mr. Speaker, you should have been there yesterday or you should have been there last week. But I want to say that, Mr. Speaker, we all should have been at the opening of the game on Sunday morning through the afternoon in Saskatoon. My wife and I drove up and had the privilege of watching it, and it was a marvellous show.

One of the things too, if I just may finally say, that a major part of the Canada Games have become the festival and cultural events of the games. And all provinces in the country and the two territories will be putting on a display throughout the two-week period of the games, displaying the cultural heritage of their particular province.

And I want to remind the people of this province, on Sunday afternoon in Saskatoon, that our own Saskatchewan Express will be putting on their wonderful music show on Sunday afternoon at the Canada Games plaza in Saskatoon.

So having said those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I'll leave a few minutes for the member for Saskatoon, and I will move at this point:

That this Assembly commends the thousands of volunteers who are responsible for the Jeux Canada Games to be hosted by the beautiful city of Saskatoon; and further, that the Assembly extends a warm welcome to all participants in the games.

Moved by myself and seconded by the member from Saskatoon Mayfair. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise to second the motion made by my colleague from Regina Wascana. We are indeed pleased with the fact that the Jeux Canada Games are being held in Saskatoon over the course of the next two weeks, and we know that this is going to indeed showcase the city of Saskatoon and indeed the province of Saskatchewan.

I know that as the member for Saskatoon Mayfair that I'm very proud of the energy and the vision that the people of Saskatoon have had in making the commitment to host the Jeux Canada Games. We're very fortunate, Mr. Speaker, in Saskatoon that we have many, many people who are dedicated to putting on a first-class show during the course of these two weeks.

We've also been very fortunate, I think to show not only Saskatchewan but all of Canada in fact that the city of Saskatoon has got the ability and is very capable of hosting indeed, national events such as we've seen here or are going to see this week. Earlier this year we had the Memorial Cup play-offs. We also had the Brier, which attracted many thousands of people, not only from Canada but from other countries to the city of Saskatoon.

And it takes a very special group of people to provide all of the different services that are needed to host an event such as we're looking at during the course of the next two weeks.

And one individual that I wanted to single out as being very, very important is Mr. Tony Dagnone who is president of the Jeux Canada Games. Tony has worked long and hard with as many different organizers and thousands of volunteers, people that have given up a tremendous amount of time and effort to make these games possible. I think that it's an opportunity for us to show that we are capable of providing a program that is second to none, anywhere, not only in Canada, Mr. Speaker, but also probably to many other parts of the world.

We always have to think of what the games mean to a place like the city of Saskatoon. Obviously there are many economic spin-offs, because I think it's estimated that in the neighbourhood of 20 to 25 millions of dollars will be spent in the city of Saskatoon over the next two weeks. And that's good not only for the city but it's also good for the province.

But I think, going far beyond that, we have to consider the fact that we have young athletes — some 3,000 to 3,500 in number — from all across the country and from the Territories and the provinces that are going to be competing. But at the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, there will be many, many different friendships that will have developed through the two-week period of time, and those friendships are going to last for many, many years on into the future.

We also are very fortunate because millions of dollars have been spent on facilities in the city of Saskatoon and these facilities are going to be there for the citizens of the city and of the province for many, many years to come. These are first-class facilities, Mr. Speaker, some of the finest that you'll find not only any place in Canada, but any place in North America.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at the number of people that are involved, and some 6,000 volunteers are involved with the hosting of the Jeux Canada Games, we understand perfectly that we've got a group there that have committed themselves for, not only the last week or month, but these are people that have been involved, Mr. Speaker, for about four years in the planning for these games.

We're fortunate as well that Saskatoon has had the dubious honour of not only hosting these summer games, but also back in the year 1971 they hosted the Canada Winter Games. And I believe that they're the only centre in Canada, Mr. Speaker, that have had the honour of hosting both the winter and the summer games. So we're certainly very unique in that way. I think that having also enjoyed the opening ceremonies last Sunday, as the member from Regina Wascana indicated that he had.

We listened to our Prime Minister, the Hon. Brian Mulroney, speak about the importance of events such as the Jeux Canada Games. And it is one of the better examples that you'll find anywhere of where we go a long ways towards building that strong Canadian unity, where we bring youth athletes from all across the country together to perform and compete in many different activities. And culture and language and all of these other factors, Mr. Speaker, are totally forgotten when we come to an event like this, and it does a tremendous amount to build on that Canadian and national unity.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan team that's going to be competing over the course of the these two weeks is certainly going to be one, I think, of the best that we've ever put together in this province, and I think that they're going to do themselves proud and they're going to do Saskatchewan very proud. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I want to . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. It being 5 o'clock, the House stands recessed until 7 p.m.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.