

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING, SELECT, AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Standing Committee on Municipal Law

Clerk Assistant: — Ms. Hamilton, from the Standing Committee on Municipal Law, presents the first report of the said committee which is as follows:

Your committee met for organization and elected Ms. Hamilton as chairperson and Mr. Serby as vice-chairperson.

The committee makes the following recommendations:

That the Standing Committee on Municipal Law be granted power to hold meetings away from the seat of government.

Ms. Hamilton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Moved by myself and seconded by Clay Serby, the member from Yorkton:

That the first report of the Standing Committee on Municipal Law be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Ms. Lorje: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you Todd Korol. He is sitting in the west gallery. Todd Korol is with First Light Associated Photographers and is from Saskatoon. He's well-known with the local media in Saskatoon and is an up and coming photographer with *National Geographic Magazine* and I welcome him here to the House today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Government Financial Procedure

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I have a question for the Minister of Finance. Mr. Minister, last evening the opposition submitted a proposal that would achieve the objectives of the government for money with some dispatch and the objectives of the opposition to maintain the constitutional order of this province.

Mr. Minister, I ask you: have you had an opportunity to consider those proposals and are you prepared to comment on them now?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I welcome the member's question and I want to say to him that's what most important of all here is what is the

objectives of the public of Saskatchewan. And the objectives of the people of this province is to put the past behind them, to begin to develop the future, for this government which is a new government to begin to develop the four-year plan to deal with the debt and the deficit. That's what this government is intending to do.

All we can do with the present situation is put in place the former government's budget because of the situation that was created by the special warrants and by non-passing of the budget. I still think that that is the most appropriate course to do. And I leave it to the legislature to decide when the resolution comes up for consideration at a later time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Minister, you are obviously not going to answer my question as to the appropriateness of the motion that we put forward, the amendment. Mr. Minister, it is apparent to the people of this province that there has been a mistaken report saying that the opposition is demanding that you come forth with a full-fledged budget. You have been using that argument and that statement as an excuse for saying that you have not had time to prepare such a document. And even our independent member in the House here, in her expert opinion, is suggesting that you do not have time to prepare such a document.

Mr. Minister, for the edification of the opposition, would you now explain how the document that you have tabled is anything other than budget estimates?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, it is clear and the members opposite know, because in 1982 when they were elected for the first time, it took them seven months to prepare a budget, from April until November. It's the magnitude of that kind of the time that is required in order to put together a budget. That's why what we have before the House today — introduced yesterday — is not a budget; it is a financial statement. It is a report on the special warrants and the interim supply Bills that have provided funding in the past, which was an option for this government to employ for the final three months. And we decided that we should not.

It also provides an opportunity for the legislature to vote supply for the final three months. And therefore because it is not possible to have a budget, all we can do is implement the former government's budget with all its flaws and its weaknesses and its huge deficit. We can only ask the legislature to do the correct thing and vote supply for the remaining last quarter of this fiscal year.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A new question to the minister. The minister has in fact presented a budget, and I hold it in my hand. You take a look at this document, Mr. Speaker, and you will find it being identical to any other documents and budgets that have been tabled in this House. But you have chosen to table it

under a different name and you call it a financial report.

Mr. Speaker, given the fact that it is a budget, Mr. Minister, do you not agree that the only thing that you are changing is the requirement for having individual ministers getting up and being responsible and accountable to this Assembly for their individual departments? Is that not your intent, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to be unkind but it takes more than the picture on the cover to make a budget a budget.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — I think the member needs to understand that a budget includes much more than a request for supply for three months of a year. A budget provides an outline of tax measures and revenues and many other things which . . . and borrowings, which is not included in the financial statement because that was done by the former government. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it would take a great deal more to put together a budget than what the member would like to suggest to the House it would.

Because the election was not held until October and because there was no budget presented . . . or was not passed in the spring of this year, the government and this legislature is faced with the difficult situation of not having time to prepare a budget, of the need to prepare a budget for 1992-1993 which is initiated and will take a considerable amount of time because of the circumstances we face. And that's why today we are faced with a financial statement and the request for a supply vote on the final three months.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, that is a bunch of nonsense and you know it. And so do the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, a new question and I will direct this question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, is it the position of your government that you are going to renege on the principle of ministerial accountability, where this opposition will have the opportunity in this House to question individual line by line of the departments so that the ministers are going to be responsible for their action?

Is it your intent now to renege on that because you are afraid of the group of 10, that the ministers are not going to be able to answer the questions? That is what I asked you, Mr. Premier. What is your real intent here in hiding the new ministers from public scrutiny?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, as I've answered many times before, both today and yesterday, that it is not a question of ministers responding to estimates because there are no estimates.

I, as the Minister of Finance, will take this financial statement and the Appropriation Bill to committee and be prepared to answer the members' questions that they may have, within the context of the information that's provided. There will be that kind of an opportunity, and there is no other choice because of the crisis that the former government and the former leader of the opposition, when he was the premier, put this province into by running from this legislature, by not passing a budget, and then delaying an election until October, leaving no time to prepare a budget, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. New question to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, what people in this province want is a government that follows the rules.

You have said, Mr. Minister, previously in opposition and again on the campaign trail, that this New Democratic government will be the one that follows the rules in the province of Saskatchewan. And yet you seem to be, sir, you seem to be willing to suspend the rules of this Assembly and suspend the constitution of this province to allow . . . so that you don't have to allow your ministers to answer for their spending plans.

My question is, Mr. Minister: considering that you have said that you do not think your ministers should have to answer for the previous government's budget, are you saying that from November 1 of this year until March 31 of '92, that your government has and will take no spending decisions that are inconsistent with the spending plans of the previous government? A simple yes or no, Mr. Minister, somewhere in your answer will be fine.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, the member is correct. What the people of this province want is a government that follows the rules.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — And I might add, Mr. Speaker, that because the people want a government which follows the rules, is precisely the reason why those 10 members are seated on that side of the House today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — All of the requests that the member makes opposite in his question is covered by the resolution and motion that is presented before the House today. That resolution asks the House, as should be the case, this legislature, to vote on a supply of money for the final quarter of this year so that the government can complete this fiscal year and implement the budget that was presented by the members opposite.

And in the mean time, get on with the future, get on with preparing the budget of 1992-1993, and get on with developing a strategy on how we will deal with the deficit and the debt over the next four years and beyond,

because that has got to be a major priority of this government and this legislature.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Supplementary to the same minister, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it was obvious by the member's answer that he did not wish to answer the question asked.

Mr. Minister, it has been obvious to everyone in this province that your government has been making spending decisions that were different than that considered by the previous government. And I say to you, sir, those are spending considerations tied to your political agenda. You've already committed \$10,000 a month for Donald Gass. That is a fact. You've committed \$300,000 to the Gass Commission. That's a fact. You have hired new people in SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation) to do your political work. Those are facts, sir. Those are spending facts.

Mr. Minister, if these are your spending plans, if these are your patronage activities, do you not believe that it is proper for the opposition to stand in this legislature and ask individual ministers about those plans on a line-by-line basis? Do you not agree, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, it is quite proper for the members opposite to ask any question they want. They've had an opportunity in question period to do that. Today is private members' day. The members opposite will have an opportunity to introduce debate on issues that are considered by the members of the opposition to be important.

The administration of government has to continue. The employment of people in the establishment of an open-the-books commission is something that is required. The people have demanded it, and they're going to have what they have asked this government to do.

Mr. Speaker, because there is no opportunity to present a budget, a situation created by the members opposite, all that this government can do in this short period of time is to ask this legislature to provide supply so that we can complete this fiscal year while the work is being done to prepare the budget for the next fiscal year and a strategy for the next four years.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — New question, Mr. Speaker, to the same minister. Mr. Minister, there are two points here that are very pertinent. First of all, you want to know that the motion that you brought before this Assembly does in fact suspend the rules of this Assembly as it has been the past practice. You have eliminated basically all the rules of this Assembly.

Secondly, sir, you have in all respects presented, if you will, a mini budget to this legislature, a mini budget which is consistent with that practice all through the British

parliamentary system.

Mr. Minister, can you cite in any precedent or any jurisdiction in Canada, other than Trudeau's invoking of the War Measures Act, where a similar circumstance has occurred? Mr. Minister, can you answer that?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I don't think I could cite another situation where a government of the day, as was the case in June of 1991, provided a budget, without even completing the passage of that budget, abandoned the House and then stayed out of the legislature for several months, governing by spending money by special warrant, leading to a situation where it's not possible to prepare a budget for this fiscal year. I don't know of any other precedent that ever happened like that before, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — And as a result of that irresponsible action, Mr. Speaker, we are faced with an extraordinary situation today. We face the situation where the legislature, this Assembly, will have to decide on a system by which this Legislative Assembly can vote a supply for the government for the final quarter of this fiscal year. That's why there is a resolution before the Assembly, so that this legislature can . . .

The Speaker: — Next question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the members of the media, that in this financial document, 1991-92 financial report, section 3, it's got fourth quarter expenditure requests. That is the new administration's expenditure requests, the money that they plan to spend. In here, Mr. Speaker, on pages 22, 27, 31, 36, 38, 43, and 45, they plan to spend almost \$3 million on advertising in the last quarter.

My question to the Minister of Agriculture is: if you can forecast that you're going to spend \$3 million in advertising in this last quarter, which is your responsibility, don't you think you can come up with the money to get dollars in the hands of farmers before Christmas?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I didn't hear any interruption when the Leader of the Opposition asked his question. I don't want any interruption when the Minister of Finance answers.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, any expenditures for the final quarter of this year that are being requested in a supply Bill are there

because of either commitments made by the previous government — therefore they cannot be changed — or they are there because the previous government underestimated the amount of money in order to make their deficit look better.

But I want to say to the Leader of the Opposition that in committee when this supply Bill is considered, he can get up and to the best of my ability I will provide him the answers that I can in the committee when the time comes to that point.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, and I say to the media and the public, I believe we've made our point. I want to raise one other example, and there will be several.

In this section 3, you forecast for the next quarter to spend \$1.7 million fighting forest fires in February. Now if you can afford to come up with the money to fight forest fires in the middle of the winter, don't you think that you could say to your Minister of Agriculture, or indeed to the Premier who promised more money for farmers before Christmas, if you can come up with \$4.7 million fighting forest fires and advertising in the next three or four months, don't you think you can come up with the money for farmers and put some hope in their hearts before Christmas, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, the problem with the budget that we are dealing with — the former government's budget — is that there was an underestimation of program uptake, an overestimation of revenue, and therefore some of those corrections have to be made in the final quarter because the government in some cases quite unconsciously — but in some cases deliberately — put errors into the budget, just like they did with the . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I know the minister knows that that is unparliamentary language, and I ask him to withdraw. "Deliberately putting errors into the budget" is unparliamentary, and I ask the minister to withdraw those words.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — I agree, Mr. Speaker. I withdraw that comment.

Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, again I go back to the minister. If he believes that there should be additions and deletions and errors and corrections and he's going to be spending money on whatever he chooses, it is the tradition of this Legislative Assembly and assemblies all across Canada in the British parliamentary system to put the ministers on their feet and explain what they're going to be doing with their agricultural budget, where they're going to be getting the money, and allowing us, Mr. Minister, to have access to those ministers and say why did you choose to do this or chose to do that.

Mr. Minister, you've been in government November and

you will be December, January, February, March — five months. You can't just dump it off on anybody else, Mr. Minister. Why don't you allow this Assembly to ask your ministers questions about these estimates in the last quarter of 1991-92?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, one hour from now, this evening . . . I'm prepared to stay here until midnight tonight to answer the members' questions if the member of the opposition has some questions. I was prepared to answer those questions yesterday, last night, while the members rang the bells and did whatever they were doing.

I'm prepared to do that, Mr. Speaker. I ask the members opposite to carry out the responsible desires of the people of Saskatchewan. Let's get on with the resolution. Let's get on with the consideration of the supply Bill and then the members can get on with asking their questions, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, new question to the minister. We've watched your ministers duck questions here today again and in question period because it looks like you're going to have six months of kindergarten and prep school for these new ministers because you won't let them address the questions. The members of the public are asking why can't the ministers stand on their feet and defend themselves.

You put forward these last quarter estimates which will tell us what you will plan to spend, and you have no idea where you're going to get the money. We want each minister to stand in his place to do this, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want the minister to tell this legislature again: why won't you put your ministers up and let them defend their departments, department by department? Why are you hiding your ministers?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, because under the circumstances, that is not the correct way for this process to take place. The member opposite should answer the question to the public of Saskatchewan: where was he and his ministers in June of this year when they would not allow their ministers to answer the questions?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — They should answer the question why one of their ministers, the House leader, the minister of the Environment, was so frustrated with what they were doing that he resigned in the spring of this year.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order. I hate to interrupt, but the Leader of the Opposition had his opportunity to ask his question, and I wish he'd allow the Minister of Finance to answer.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, as I said, the member from Melfort was so concerned about what that government was doing with democracy that he resigned from the cabinet and did not run again for this legislature.

What we have here is not a budget. That is not our responsibility. That is the responsibility of the members opposite. But it is our responsibility to have the legislature vote a supply of money for the final quarter, and that's what we're presenting here for consideration.

Scrutiny of Order in Council Appointments

Ms. Haverstock: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Premier. In a document published by the NDP (New Democratic Party) Party caucus in 1987, the NDP said the following with respect to public review and cabinet appointments, and I quote:

That a Standing Committee of the Legislature be empowered to review major Order-in-Council appointments . . . with public participation.

My question to the Premier is: when will this committee be formed?

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, the position of the government is, as we've indicated in the Speech from the Throne, that the package — the full range of democratic reform packages — will be dealt with some time early in the new year upon the completion . . . or whenever this session happens to be completed.

As part of the democratic reform package we are proceeding with the matters of the six-month by-election provision, maybe one or two others. The remainder will require consultation with the public and members of this House before we implement them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Haverstock: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It's common knowledge that governments make their major appointments shortly after taking office, Mr. Premier. Do you not think that your failure to form such a committee to date has compromised your party's commitment to allowing this Assembly and the public to review major appointments?

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The answer to that question, shortly put, is no, I do not think so. I think the committee, if and when it is established, will have the full freedom and option to review appointments. And comments and recommendations made at that time can be made at that time as they will be at any a time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Haverstock: — Supplementary. This is to the Premier. How do you propose to ensure that the public really believes that things are going to be any different under your administration, sir, with respect to appointments, if they're unable for six months to be able

to understand how you're going about doing these and why it is you're making these appointments?

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Well, Mr. Speaker, this of course will be for the public to judge. But as far as the government is concerned, what we have done by virtue of even calling this session and the way we've handled the matter of supply — the subject of some debate between some of the members of the official opposition and the Minister of Finance — for example, indicate this government's commitment to doing what we think is right, namely using this legislative body and its various emanations, the tabling of documents in a timely fashion, the answering of questions in an appropriate fashion. We'll be judged on this once the reform package is fully in place.

And I invite the hon. member to make her comments known to us as to how she likes or does not like some of the provisions. I think the actions will speak the loudest. And in this regard, I'm quite confident we'll do very well over the period.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Tabling of *Public Accounts*

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to make a brief comment on an important matter. I am pleased to rise in the House this afternoon and table the *Public Accounts* for 1990-1991. This is in keeping with the new openness and accountability that is being established by this government.

And I want to reinforce that by saying, Mr. Speaker, that this is the first time that the *Public Accounts* have been tabled in this legislature in the month of December since the last time that I was a Minister of Finance.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Pay-outs to Farmers

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to announce early pay-outs to farmers under the general revenue insurance program are almost complete. So far the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Corporation has issued almost 43,000 cheques totalling \$359 million in interim GRIP (gross revenue insurance program) payments.

Of this amount, 58 million has been applied to premiums and outstanding balances. We expect that by December 20 the remaining cheques will be mailed representing an additional \$20 million in payments. The early interim GRIP payment is the first of three payments under this program. The second payment is scheduled to be mailed prior to spring seeding in 1992. The third payment will be made after final grain prices are established for the 1991 crop year.

Western farmers are grateful to receive this money as they would be for any cash pay-out. But we want to stress this does not abrogate the federal government's responsibility

to come up with more money for our struggling farmers.

To date almost 68,000 in premiums have been paid. This leaves an estimated 245,000 in GRIP premiums yet to be collected.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Devine: — Just a brief comment, Mr. Speaker. The minister is talking about money going into the hands of farmers from the GRIP program. I would only say to the hon. member that while we're in the process of making some positive changes to GRIP, that the government, the new government, could stand in its place and allocate some of its advertising money towards putting dollars into the hands of farmers before Christmas.

I point out, Mr. Speaker, that advertising — \$3 million worth of advertising, the Premier wants to know where it is, Mr. Speaker, and I'll . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. The Leader of the Opposition is to direct his comments through the Chair and not . . . to simply ignore the comments of other members in the House.

Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure a lot of the farmers are going to ignore the Premier as a result of his inaction. I point out, Mr. Speaker, to the minister opposite that on page 22 of your new budget it has \$759,000 for advertising. And then you go on to page 27, communications, it's \$1.189 million in advertising. I go on to page 31, information services, \$153,000, and on and on.

And I just point out to the hon. member and to the Minister of Agriculture that in the last quarter if you can come up with this kind of money then, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the hon. members they could allocate some of that money in getting the 3 or \$400 million from Ottawa and put it into the hands of the farmers in Saskatchewan before Christmas, which I believe they would appreciate much more than a ministerial statement at Christmas time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 15 — An Act to amend The Municipal Board Act

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Mr. Speaker, I move that a Act to amend the . . . pardon me, to move first reading of a Bill to amend The Municipal Board Act.

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

Bill No. 16 — An Act to establish the Saskatchewan Telecommunications Holding Corporation

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Speaker, I move that an Act to establish the Saskatchewan Telecommunications Holding Corporation be now introduced and read the first

time.

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

Bill No. 17 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Act

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Speaker, I move that an Act to amend The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Act be now introduced and read the first time.

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

Bill No. 18 — An Act to Provide for the Public Disclosure of Crown Employment Contracts, to Prescribe Provisions in Crown Employment on Contracts governing Payments and Benefits on Termination or Expiration of those Contracts, to Void Provisions in those Contracts respecting those matters and to Extinguish any Right of Action and Right to Compensation for any Loss or Damage resulting from the Enactment or Application of this Act

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to Provide for the Public Disclosure of Crown Employment Contracts, to Prescribe Provisions in Crown Employment Contracts governing Payments and Benefits on Termination or Expiration of those Contracts, to Void Provisions in those Contracts respecting those matters and to Extinguish any Right of Action and Right to Compensation for any Loss or Damage resulting from the Enactment or Application of this Act.

Motion agreed to on division and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

BEFORE ORDERS OF THE DAY

Ms. Haverstock: — Before orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I would seek leave of the House to proceed to item 21 under motions, which if passed is going to allow me to participate more fully in the proceedings of this Assembly.

Leave not granted.

QUESTIONS PUT BY MEMBERS

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the question put by members, no. 24, be converted to motion for return (debatable).

The Speaker: — Motion for return (debatable).

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I would ask that a question put by members, no. 25, be converted to motion for return (debatable).

The Speaker: — Motion for return (debatable).

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I would table the answer for question no. 26.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that question put by members,

no. 27, be converted to motion for return (debatable).

The Speaker: — Motion for return (debatable).

MOTION UNDER RULE 16

Government Financial Accountability

Mr. Hagel: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to stand in this Assembly for the first time since the good folks of Moose Jaw Palliser decided to return me as their representative. And in doing so, Mr. Speaker, let me begin by offering my congratulations to you on your democratic election as Speaker of this House. Mr. Speaker, we all look forward to you serving this House by acting in defence of the principles and the procedures of democracy, and I'm sure that that will be your intent and your action.

It is in the spirit of the defence of the principles of democracy, Mr. Speaker, that I stand in this House today with this motion that I will introduce, Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks, and let me simply give it notice of the motion:

That this Assembly commend the new government for its commitment to financial accountability and its respect for the fundamental tradition that public funds must be appropriated by the legislature; and further that it condemn the unprecedented practices of the past nine years including the public spending by special warrant, government waste and financial mismanagement, and the accumulation of a massive provincial deficit.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I sat in this House today and yesterday and watched the goings-on in this House, in particular the conduct of the members of the official opposition, it was truly two days of amazing events, Mr. Speaker. And my amazement grew as I saw the PC (Progressive Conservative) response to a practical and a responsible motion by the Minister of Finance as they shouted from their seats: we want a budget, we want a budget — an incredible statement coming from that opposition on that matter at this time.

And, Mr. Speaker, reflecting on the events of yesterday and today and being somewhat inspired by the poetry of the season and in particular the poem *A Visit from St. Nicholas* by Clement Moore, which has become a bit of a family tradition in our house to be read by dad on Christmas Eve, I reflected on what I saw, Mr. Speaker, and would like to share with the Assembly these poetic words.

Mr. Speaker:

T'was the week before Christmas
and all through this House
Not a bell was ringing to awaken a mouse
When across the floor there arose such a clatter
I sprang from my seat to see what was the matter
When what to my wondering eyes should appear
But a miniature caucus whose mind is not here
With a frenzied old leader, the head of their band
We know him, the member, here from Estevan

More rapid than eagles (not the buses) did come
Heckles and catcalls from Tories so glum
“Now Budget! Now budget,”
went their raucous parlance
“On spending estimates and provincial finance!”
So up to their tiptoes those members they flew
To call for democracy as my amazement it grew.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I watched my amazement it grew, it grew. And when I listen to the members from the opposite benches, Mr. Speaker, express their so-called concern for fiscal responsibility, I can only conclude, Mr. Speaker, that what I was seeing was incredible — incredible in the sense of not credible. In fact someone suggested, Mr. Speaker — and I think accurately — that the phrase, PC fiscal responsibility, is an oxymoron. And I would agree. I would agree.

So let me review just briefly, Mr. Speaker, the PC record on provincial budgets from this band that we heard over the last 24 hours shouting we want a budget; we want a budget. Let us just simply review — let us review their record on provincial budgets and the use of special warrants that their Finance critic recommended to this Assembly yesterday.

(1445)

But first of all, Mr. Speaker, the issue of special warrants. What are special warrants? There is a fundamental principle of democracy, Mr. Speaker, that has been respected in this House for some time, that requires that a government must account for its use of public funds by submitting to the scrutiny of the Legislative Assembly. And special warrants for years have been provided for and given legal authority for spending money to pay for emergency expenditures or unanticipated expenditures.

For example, Mr. Speaker, a special warrant was used in 1896 to provide emergency roof repairs to the Parliament Buildings. That's where special warrants began. They're not used in this Assembly or elsewhere, Mr. Speaker, as a means to avoid the scrutiny of the Legislative Assembly but to deal with unanticipated expenditures. And in fact that has been the tradition here in Saskatchewan, where special warrants have been used at fiscal year end to provide for expenditures that were not foreseen and then approved in the subsequent budget of the spring sitting.

And so what's been the historical use of special warrants from this band of fiscally prudent people, we're supposed to believe? Mr. Speaker, here in Saskatchewan, special warrants were first used in 1906 prior to the first session of the first Legislative Assembly in order to provide spending and then again in 1908 to provide for late-year expenditures that were over budget. And then, Mr. Speaker, not until 1982 . . . 1906, 1908 and then 1982.

After a government, the NDP government, had introduced a budget, but then went to an election before the budget was carried, special warrants were required in order to meet government expenditures until the new PC government came to office and introduced its own budget seven months later.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we saw special warrants used by this

government again in 1987, again in the year following the election. The election of 1986, October 20, 1986 when this government was re-elected, when the PC government was re-elected, they went to the end of their fiscal year, and then from April 1 till June 17, eight months after their re-election as a government, they used special warrants, Mr. Speaker, until June 17 when we came into this Assembly, and as I recall the incident, Mr. Speaker, largely in response to the fact that the official opposition had said that they would take this government to court for operating on special warrants. That's what brought them here — the embarrassment of yet again what would have been the first of what became many visits to the courts.

Mr. Speaker, the government over the last five years since I've been in this House has spent more time in court than many promising and profitable lawyers in the province of Saskatchewan.

And so what happens here in 1991? Here we come to 1991 and the PC opposition is recommending that we should be using special warrants again, they say. Well the Minister of Finance outlined it briefly earlier this afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

And let me just remind the members of the Assembly the events of this summer. June 17, the House Leader of the PC government of the day stood in his place in this Assembly and resigned. He said that the government was on the verge of bankruptcy. He could no longer associate himself. He not only resigned his position in the government, he resigned from the PC Party.

On the next day, on June 18, 1991, the opposition, the New Democrat opposition, moved a motion which would have led to a vote in a non-confidence motion. That's what happened in this Assembly. The bells rang until the time elapsed without the government being able to muster up enough members to defeat what would have been a non-confidence motion by the New Democrats.

And then we broke for supper, Mr. Speaker, and I will never forget walking back into this Assembly at 7 o'clock that evening with the Lieutenant Governor coming through the doors of this Assembly. Because in response to their inability, to their inability to defeat a government non-confidence motion, without a single minute, without a single second of debate on the estimates of the budget introduced by the PC government of the day, this House was prorogued and the Premier said, it's time for all of us to cool down and go home and we don't need to operate with a budget and they prorogued the House.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we went home but we didn't cool down and the people of Saskatchewan didn't cool down and on October 21 they said, no more of this kind of government; that band is gone; it's time for a new form of government in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — And yet they promote that shameful display to spend the taxpayers' money by special warrant and the Finance critic for the PC opposition stands in his place yesterday to say that.

Mr. Speaker, that was clearly not the intention of special warrants and it was contradicted by an opinion put forth by Merrilee Rasmussen, former legislative counsel to the Legislative Assembly on July 5. I draw the attention of members to the conclusion of her legal opinion provided at that time, Mr. Speaker, and she said and I quote:

As a matter of law, the power to issue special warrants is only available when there is no Legislature in existence to consent to an appropriation or when an emergency arises in which delay would result in irreparable harm. Convention clearly authorizes the use of special warrants at the end of a fiscal year to top up appropriations when funds are exhausted. As a matter of convention and law, special warrants are NOT (in capital letters, NOT) authorized when the Legislature is available to provide its consent to government expenditures. Thus, special warrants are illegal when they are resorted to because it is more convenient for the executive to use them than to call the Legislature to give its approval . . .

And she goes on.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the PC opposition opposite says that we should continue with this illegal act — in the mind of the legislative counsel, previous legislative counsel to this Legislative Assembly. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that was shameful when this government . . . when the PC government chose to do it; it would be shameful to continue it, and it will not be done.

Well when we come to fiscal integrity, what is the record of the PC government who now sit in opposition? Mr. Speaker, there was nothing new, there was nothing new about the revelation of the true state of the finances as released by the Minister of Finance earlier this fall, Mr. Speaker.

Let me remind the members of this House, the previous record for forecasting deficits by PC ministers of Finance. Back in 1986 PC minister of Finance, Gary Lane at that time, stood in this Assembly in the spring of the election year 1986 and he said there would be a deficit of \$389 million. That's what he said.

And then, Mr. Speaker, then in January he said, well maybe it's going to be a little larger than that. And later that year, Mr. Speaker, in 1987 on March 5 he formally stated that the 1986-87 deficit would not be the \$389 million that the PC minister of Finance had previously forecast; he said it would be \$1.2 billion.

Whoops, he said. Whoops! We made a 250 per cent error in election year. And then how did he explain it? He said the explanation was very simple. He said, what do you expect? We're politicians, he said.

Well I say to you, Mr. Speaker, he made an error when he made that statement too. He should not have said: what do you expect, we're politicians. There is a new breed of politician in government today. He should have said, what do you expect? we're Tory politicians. And that would have been his honest statement, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Well now we come to 1991, and Lorne Hepworth is the minister of Finance. And he stands in his place this spring and he says, we're going to have a \$265 million deficit. That's what he says the Tory government's going to have. Well, Mr. Speaker, as we all know, as we all know, as was released by the Minister of Finance about a month ago, the honest statement of the deficit of this year, Mr. Speaker, not the \$265 million forecast by Lorne Hepworth. But once again, Mr. Speaker, if we are to believe a PC minister of Finance we have to begin the statement again with the big whoops, another 250 per cent error. Mr. Speaker, the forecast, the honest forecast would be some \$960 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I look at the track record of the PC government when it's been in power in Saskatchewan, it's interesting to note that since 1944, Mr. Speaker, in the province of Saskatchewan there have been only 12 deficit budgets. Since 1944, in the last 47 years, there have been only 12 deficit budgets. Mr. Speaker, 10 of those 12 deficit budgets in the last 47 years came in 1982 and 1983 and '84 and '85 and '86 and '87 and '88, '89, '90 and '91 — compliments of the PC government of Saskatchewan. That kind of fiscal responsibility is also part of the history of the province of Saskatchewan as decided by the people on October 21.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Speaker, I remind the members of the Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan that the approach of fiscal prudence and responsibility is nothing new to New Democrats, nothing new to New Democrats. New Democrats . . .

The Speaker: — Order. The member's time is up. Does the member . . . has he got a motion? All right, the member move his motion.

Mr. Hagel: — Well, Mr. Speaker, there will be others who will wish to address further this topic, Mr. Speaker, as per this motion. And I move, seconded by my friend and colleague, the member from Humboldt:

That this Assembly commend the new government for its commitment to financial accountability and its respect for the fundamental tradition that public funds must be appropriated by the legislature and further that it condemn the unprecedented practices of the past nine years including public spending by special warrant, government waste and financial mismanagement, and the accumulation of a massive provincial deficit.

Mr. Speaker, I move that, seconded by the member from Humboldt.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was going to start out my little talk here today by saying: and as I was saying before and was rudely interrupted in June . . . And I guess that's sort of the point of this whole

thing, this whole exercise we go through. We're talking about managing the province. We're talking about managing the province for the people, by the people, through the government, with no surprises.

This government, Mr. Speaker, had surprises. The people didn't want surprises. And as my colleague pointed out just a few minutes ago — and this will be repeated many times in this legislature I'm sure — that in 1986, the minister of Finance was out by 200 per cent in his budget. What a surprise. What a surprise!

This year, Mr. Speaker, the estimated deficit was 265 million, and now we find out it's going to be closer to 960 million — near a billion dollars. What a surprise, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, people in this province don't like those kinds of surprises. But I'll tell you, it was a surprise to the people, but I ask, was it a surprise to the government and the minister of Finance who concocted the figures? Mr. Deputy Speaker, I say it was no surprise. It was a planned surprise. A planned surprise to keep government and not think about the people of this province as they piled up the debt.

Mr. Speaker, our government will govern for the people. I'll give you an example. Previous to the change in government in this province, the minister of Agriculture who was the premier would go down to Ottawa saying, I'm going to get some more money for the farmers. He'd walk down there.

Well I'll tell you, every time he went down there, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he gave something away. And he'd come back and say, well I got a few more dollars for the farmers; aren't I a great guy. But every time he went down . . . I recall one time he was going to go to fix the interest rates. He jumped on his plane and took off to Ottawa. By the time he jumped on his plane and came back to Saskatchewan, farm credit interest rates had increased by one and a half per cent. He did a wonderful job.

I remember the free trade deal — took away \$250 million to grain farmers. But he was marching down to Ottawa. And every time he went down, Mr. Deputy Speaker, every time he went down, he gave something away and said, aren't I a good guy.

Well this is a different approach now. We have a Minister of Agriculture who is doing a couple of things right for a change in this province. Went down to Ottawa and didn't give the farm away; went down to Ottawa and talked to the people in Ottawa and took a delegation down, the Premier of this province and the Minister of Agriculture, and made a tremendous impact. And all you have to do is read the stories or talk to your MPs about the impact that was made in Ottawa.

Because they went down for a purpose, to try to help the people. And every time that ex-government went down, their purpose was to try to get the Tory government re-elected. And that's a change, that's a definite change, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And it's a change because the people of this province expect the government to govern for them, not to govern using them, and that's the

difference.

(1500)

The Tories governed for their friends and to govern for government. Five years and a day. Can you imagine, if there hadn't been a rule that we couldn't go longer than five years, how long they would have gone trying to fill the pockets of their friends?

And then we see them stand up and ask about the dismissals and what's going on. Well the people of the province, Mr. Deputy Speaker, dismissed the government. It just flows through that the attitude — and this is what we're talking about — the attitude put forward by the government will be maintained in the upper levels of government. It's not personnel we're dismissing or changing, it's attitude.

And that's why the people of Saskatchewan elected a New Democratic government, because they saw an attitude of honesty and integrity, an attitude that would bring forward in this province a change whereby people would not have to be on the welfare lines and people would not have to be running off their farms, or people would not have to be leaving this province to find work. A change in attitude — and that is why this government was elected and that government has been put out.

This attitude — I'll give you another example — \$250 million, we heard yesterday, that was supposed to be coming from CIC (Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan) to the government. The money wasn't there. And in other years, CIC paying dividends to the government and the Crown corporations digging down and borrowing more money, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in order to pay to keep their operation going. But who pays in the end? It's the people who pay in the end, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The Tories bailed out. They ran in June from the legislature; they didn't even pass the budget where they were telling the people mistruths about how much money was in CIC and where it was going. Now we see this great metamorphosis. All of a sudden we stand up in our places and we say, where's the budget? We want to ask individual ministers about the budget.

I ask you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, just consider somebody sitting at home, watching the question period of this House, when they know that that ex-premier of this province bailed out, didn't pass a budget when he had ample opportunity to, when it was his mandate to, and now all of a sudden he's saying, where is the budget?

An attitude, an attitude where he's trying to fool the people again. He got defeated on that attitude. This government will not maintain that attitude. We have a changed mandate and attitude in order that we can deliver programs. We bring forward a motion to deliver the program.

We bring forward a Minister of Finance who is ready to answer any questions on the budget — estimates that they had put forward. And actually this is real funny. I mean, they put us in the position where they could be asking and

they want to ask questions on their own budget. So what are they going to do — ask a question and then stand up and answer it?

This is the attitude — trying to fool the people, trying to say that the new government is the same as the old government. It's very different because it's a very different attitude. The people of this province saw a vision, a vision of a government with some competence, a vision of a government with an attitude that will put in place policies like democratic reform, that will put in place an instrument of the people which is called this legislature, that will bring forward Bills in a fashion that will provide laws in this country that help people maintain their lives and their dignity and their place in the province. That is what we're talking about.

The past government had no respect for this legislature, no respect for democracy, and therefore no respect for the people. And that was seen clearly on election day. The people came forward because they said, this government is incompetent. And I say, well yes it was incompetent for the masses of the majority, but I know a few people who thought this government and this past government was very competent because they filled their pockets of their friends and themselves. That has to change and it will change, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have people in this province who are in very dire straights — very dire straights. They work day and night, two and three jobs. If they're on the farms, they're working on the farm and off the farm, the majority of them; they are struggling to try to make a living and pay their taxes to the government in return for the government to provide services for them to live in this province.

Can you feature the desperation that some of these people are going through to try to find money and to pay their taxes and to work their jobs, whether it be any from a waitressing job to a lawyer or anything you'd want to talk about. But these people are working and the taxes keep going up and the services were going down.

We will change that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because we will not allow people in this province to be put through a wringer like they were put through in the last nine and a half years. The people know it's going to take a little bit of time to start the change. People know that this change is going to be a positive change because of the comments that are coming from the last few days of this House and this session. And they have patience.

Mr. Speaker, I tell you that this government is a government with compassion, a government with a new attitude, and a government that will allow the people of this province to partake in democracy as it was set out in the beginning. And we will carry it through as long as we will be government.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise in my chair to propose an amendment to the motion. At the end of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will be proposing a motion, and I move:

That all the words following “Assembly” be deleted and the following words be substituted:

Condemns the provincial government for attacking the basic principles of parliamentary democracy by (a) suspending all rules and procedures of the Assembly in an attempt to obtain supply without accountability; (b) refusing to place a budget before the Assembly, effectively suspending the province’s constitution; (c) refusing to table *Estimates* to avoid scrutinizing *en masse* firings and political hirings; and (d) using the Assembly to target individual citizens, thus placing the Assembly in direct personal conflict with individual human beings.

This is seconded by the member from Maple Creek, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment before this House is very important. For the members on the opposite side of the House to stand up and pat themselves on the back pretending to be open and honest, is totally unacceptable.

In only two short months we have seen everything but open and honest government; everything but accountability to the people. I think about what the NDP have done since being elected in October. They established a partisan committee to review the practices of the former government under the guise of a non-partisan group attempting to restore honest government to Saskatchewan.

Well we all know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this just isn’t the case. Firstly, the tribunal is only reviewing those transactions that have taken place since the NDP were ousted from power. Secondly, if the NDP truly wanted an objective, open and honest, non-partisan look at former governments, why not review the nationalization of the potash mines under the NDP government? Or the former Liberal government’s financial transactions? Maybe then the NDP story about open and honest government would gain an ounce of credibility; maybe even a gram of accountability.

And, Mr. Speaker, does any member here believe it possible to have a tribunal with three out of four members are long-time contributors to the same political party and still remain non-partisan?

I don’t think so, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It’s impossible. The NDP want the public to think it is a coincidence that the three Gass tribunal members donate to the NDP on a regular basis. Thank goodness, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the public is smarter than that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, an open and honest government would not promise to eliminate the provincial sales tax while all the time knowing they were not going to do it. An open and honest premier-to-be wouldn’t say to the

people of the province two weeks before an election that at midnight October 22, don’t pay the PST (provincial sales tax), then shortly afterwards remove the provincial sales tax only on a cup of coffee or a Christmas sweater. And, Mr. Speaker, an accountable government wouldn’t try to do this . . . what this government is trying to do their hardest today.

The NDP want to stand before this Assembly, hand over a document that vaguely explains where the province’s money will be going for the next while, without answering any questions about the document or the funds. How is this Assembly and the rest of Saskatchewan going to find out where the \$300,000 that funded Sask Works program went? How can we find the details on the firings of innocent people? How can we question the minister on why the NDP have allotted a few million dollars to fight forest fires in our province in the middle of the winter? And, Mr. Speaker, how can the people have a way of finding out what secret deals are being thrown together behind closed doors by the NDP?

Well, Mr. Speaker, it’s not a hard answer. We just can’t find out. They won’t tell us. The public will not be able to learn the details of important issues and concerns because the NDP government wants to suppress the constitution and suppress all accountability. And that happens to be the fact.

The NDP are using their swollen majority to railroad the opposition and the people they were elected to serve. This is an open and honest government? This is open the books? Well the NDP will try to say they’re doing what the people want and what the people need. Mr. Speaker, what the people want has absolutely nothing to do with what the NDP are giving them.

The members opposite claim to have the public’s interest at heart. If this is true, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the members opposite, what are their plans for the plebiscite results? The people have cast their ballots, they have made up their minds. I would like today to ask the NDP, what are you going to do about the abortion funding and how about a balanced budget?

Mr. Speaker, I could ask these questions many times, knowing all the time that I will not receive an answer. There are many other questions that need to be answered by the NDP, Mr. Speaker, but they are doing their very best to duck them. We see this in question period all the time.

The NDP want to be above reproach — not just to the members of this Assembly, but to every person in the province. And it’s wrong, Mr. Speaker, it’s terribly wrong. It is reprehensible, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I will not allow this to happen to Saskatchewan.

Principles of our constitution are built around freedom of speech and the rights of the individual. These principles also include accountability — accountability of those persons elected to serve the people. Long-standing traditions of grievance before supply must be observed if a government is to remain responsible.

These are very basic rules and they date back to the

Magna Carta and are a fundamental right, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And I was elected to preserve these rights, Mr. Speaker, and I will do so. And that is why I bring this amendment before the Assembly today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I so move, seconded by the member from Maple Creek.

(1515)

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm happy this afternoon to second this motion. After the actions taken by the Minister of Finance yesterday, I'm pleased to speak to this Assembly in favour of this amendment.

The NDP government has carried out unprecedented tactics that are a grave concern to this Assembly and to the people of Saskatchewan. The very principles of democracy are at stake here, Mr. Speaker, principles of our constitution dating back to the Magna Carta, principles like freedom of speech and long-standing traditions of grievance before supply. These are principles that must be observed if a government is to remain accountable to the people it serves.

What the NDP government have done, Mr. Speaker, is suspend those very rights. They have tried to eradicate accountability of the government, stifle the opposition's right to voice their opinions, and, Mr. Speaker, undermine the very essential liberties granted to us through democracy.

Principles set before us through the constitution include holding the government accountable for the spending of public funds. And, Mr. Speaker, in order to do this, accountability is necessary. The government must outline where the moneys are to be spent. The government must answer questions about where the funds are to be allotted and why. That's accountability. That's why we're here — to make you accountable for your actions and for what you plan to do to the people's money.

And, Mr. Speaker, every member in this House is allowed ample time to speak and to seek answers to their questions — to exercise one of our most precious, important freedoms — freedom of speech.

The NDP government has done away with questionable things, Mr. Speaker, and, Mr. Speaker, questionable actions without allowing questions. The NDP do not want to be held accountable for what they are doing as a government. They want to pass a motion that would strip this Assembly of some basic rights, that would place themselves above reproach.

Mr. Speaker, what the NDP have tried to do over the past two months is unacceptable. They have tried to take precedence over the rights of the people, over the rights of the members of this Assembly. They have fired hundreds, and I say hundreds of innocent people, appointed partisan committees to carry through their political vindictiveness, posed an inflated deficit before the public, and then refused to table the budget. And the list goes on and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, never before has a government in Canada attempted to strip the basic rights of democracy from the pages of the very constitution. And why? In order to erase any questions of why hundreds of innocent people have been fired by the NDP and, Mr. Speaker, in order to dismiss questions that would expose the NDP government for using totalitarian tactics to fulfil their socialist mandate.

The NDP government is trying to take money directly from the pockets of taxpayers and excuse themselves from telling the people where it is going. It's not good enough to point to the mistakes of the past government to justify your own mistakes. That just simply won't do. You've been elected now to be the government, and you have to show some leadership and to present to the people what they expected when they went to the polls. They expected you now to take over and do a job, not to simply point backwards and always say the other guys did it wrong, so it's okay for us to do whatever we please.

This sort of thing might be standard and it might be acceptable in countries like Cuba and China. But it is not acceptable in Saskatchewan because here we have a democracy and here we have people with long memories, and they will remember four years from now what you are doing here in this session.

And not after the NDP travelled around this province shouting promises like, open the books; honest and open government, they said. And here we've got . . . what we have as an example of what they think honest and open government is: dodging the issues, covering things up, not allowing anyone to see what's going on, secret commissions, tribunals, a handful of people running the whole province, unaccountable to anyone. This is what they call open the books. This is what they call open government.

I would like to ask the members opposite just who the government is open to. Open to yourselves maybe, back in the back lounge somewhere. It is not open to the members on this side of the House, that's for sure. And it's not open to the media. We've seen an example of that already. And, Mr. Speaker, it certainly is not open to the public because the public will be the last to find out anything that really goes on.

Mr. Speaker, it is open to no one but the troika who is running our province. This is open and honest government. This is what NDP and the NDP troika calls its open-the-books policy.

I challenge this government to hold true to its word. I challenge this government to truly open the books, to truly provide accountable government. And, Mr. Speaker, I challenge this government to start taking measures they promised to the people of Saskatchewan through the electoral process. That is why I stand in favour of this amendment today. And I want to thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to support the motion put by the member from Moose Jaw Palliser under rule 16. This government has

given our province a new beginning, and it is in sharp contrast to the ways of the previous government, the Conservatives, where their policies were of waste, mismanagement, secret deals, and misplaced priorities, Mr. Speaker.

The Tory record of accountability — disrespect for the legislature. The fact that the members opposite walked out of this legislature yesterday is indicative of their style of government. It was a government of secret deals and special warrants. And now to stand up and say, with three months left in this year, that we should bring in a new budget so that they can question the ministers and their departments, I think it's laughable, Mr. Speaker.

When we take a look at what happened in June when we were supposed to be going through the estimates and finishing the spending estimates for the government, what did they do? They just packed their bags and walked out and closed down this legislature.

What a sorry state that opposition must be in right now to come up with this type of an attitude, that they want to now force the government to bring in a budget. I say that this is wrong, and it's just not the way that you should be operating as an opposition in this House.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that there will be many more budgets to come, and you will have an opportunity to properly debate budgets as they are put forward in March. And you can debate them. You can debate all the ministers. And you will have lots of time to do that, the opposite member, Mr. Speaker, in the next four years to come.

And this is the way they went. They spent without legislative approval. They operated this government on special warrants. Then they ran from the legislature to avoid a non-confidence motion in June.

They ran from the legislature yesterday to avoid addressing the state of the province's financing — the confusing state of affairs that the Conservatives left this province in when they left government.

I say to the members opposite, just slow down. You'll have lots of time in opposition to question the government's spending because I suspect, as other people suspect, that you're going to be on that side of the House for many years to come.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — Mr. Speaker, our record will be one of accountability. We are following the traditions that the legislature has a right to approve of appropriation of the government prior to expenditure, NDP traditions to open and accessible government.

The new government has set a new direction for this legislature. It has moved in the direction of open, accountable, and accessible government. It has set new priorities, Mr. Speaker — priorities that put people first, not the large corporations and the rich friends of the Tories.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — I want to talk about the contrast of the priorities of a New Democratic government and what the priorities were of the Conservative government and their preferential treatment for Weyerhaeuser.

In 1985 the Weyerhaeuser corporation of Tacoma, Washington acquired assets in this province without any money down. That was in 1985. They acquired eight million acres of Saskatchewan's prime forest land — saw mill in Big River, pulp mill in Prince Albert, and a chemical plant in Saskatoon. But not one cent down.

And here we are in 1991, at the end of 1991, and they haven't paid one cent, not one cent on the principal of the \$236 million that they owe this government — that they owe the taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

What the Conservative government did opposite, they turned over control of the provincial forest industry to individuals or individual corporations like Weyerhaeuser and they came in and they took right over. The citizens of Saskatchewan had access to those forests; they no longer have that. Roads are blocked off; roads are closed for hunters and trappers and tourists who want to go up into the North.

They had other priorities also, Mr. Speaker — secret deals and no-cut contracts. George Hill, with his no-cut contract, and then they want to pay him \$1.2 million in a severance package. I say that's just not acceptable in this province.

The last Conservative member who just spoke in this House, he was talking about individuals getting fired. Well I just say, you should know about firing individuals in this province. Your government in one night, just after the 1986 election — and they didn't campaign on this platform — took it upon themselves to fire 423 dental nurses and dental therapists and dental assistants; 423 young women that your government just destroyed with one stroke of the pen. And you can stand up and defend that type of a policy. I say that that is a shame, Mr. Speaker.

And that's just the beginning. That's just the beginning. What about the Highways' workers — 237 Highways' workers all of a sudden one morning, all got fired. With the stroke of a pen that's what the Conservative government did. They destroyed the lives of those families.

That's the kind of a government that has no compassion, absolutely no compassion for the family, for the citizens of this province, and that's why you're sitting over there. And that's why I have said prior to this legislature sitting now in the House, that history would repeat itself. And I suggest that it will be more than 50 years before you'll ever see a Tory government in the province of Saskatchewan again.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — And what did their policies have for northern Saskatchewan? I say, Mr. Speaker, they had nothing for northern Saskatchewan. They took out the

fresh food subsidy to northern Saskatchewan. They just cut that right off. They brought in welfare reform programs, welfare reform programs. And what were they? They created jobs for 20 weeks so that the citizens in northern Saskatchewan could work for 20 weeks and then they would get laid off; then they would go to the UIC (Unemployment Insurance Commission) department so they could draw unemployment insurance.

Well I tell you, you didn't do that to George Hill, and you didn't do that to the president of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan who you paid \$740,000 a year. No, that's not the type of compassion that the Conservative government uses. And let me tell you that you are paying for it now and you're going to pay for it for many years to come.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1530)

Mr. Thompson: — Peter Pocklington, no problem giving him \$21 million. But when it comes to putting sewer and water systems in the communities that the NDP had not finished doing in 1982, like Stony Rapids and Patuanak and Poplar Point and La Loche, you had no money for that. St. George's Hill, Michel village, no money for that.

But you had money for Peter Pocklington; you had money for Millar Western; you had money for Weyerhaeuser. Let me tell you, you had money for your rich corporations and your rich Conservative friends, but nothing for northern Saskatchewan.

And when it comes down to your deals, one just has to go to Green Lake and look when you sold the Silver Lake farm to your friends in Prince Albert. The citizens of Green Lake wanted to buy that farm, and there was no reason why you could not have co-signed for the citizens of Green Lake. But you choose to do that for a group of your Tory friends from Prince Albert. You had no trouble with providing \$137 million for Millar Western in Alberta, but no money for the Green Lake citizens who wanted to purchase that farm.

I say that that is a shame. And that just goes to show you why you're sitting over there. Because your Conservative friends come first and your large corporations, and not the citizens of Saskatchewan.

I just want to touch on the financial situation as you took it over in 1982. You had \$139 million in the bank to the good — \$139 million to the good — and you took that now to close to \$6 billion in accumulated deficit in this province.

The Speaker: — Order. The member's time is up.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure today to rise in support of the motion put forth by my colleague, the member from Moose Jaw Palliser and seconded by the member for Humboldt — this motion that we commend the government for its commitment to

financial accountability and its respect for the fundamental tradition that public funds must be appropriated by the legislature. And of course the other half of the motion which I will address a little later, Mr. Speaker.

But first I want to state the joy I have in speaking to this motion. We have a Finance minister that has earlier this day tabled the *Public Accounts* for 1990-91. As he pointed out as he was tabling the *Public Accounts* books, that this is the first time this has happened in a good number of years, in fact, in just over a decade now.

I think it's a good move, Mr. Speaker, and I think it's one that truly points to the people of Saskatchewan and to those of us who are fortunate enough to serve the people of Saskatchewan. It shows the commitment of the now Minister of Finance to opening the process, to saying here's where we're at, now let's proceed from where we're at today so that in the future we can build upon our successes and hopefully put aside some of the failures behind us. It's also my pleasure to follow my colleague from Athabasca. And I noted he spoke about the Weyerhaeuser deal.

Mr. Speaker, the first time I rose in this Legislative Assembly in the late fall or early winter of 1986, right after that election, the Weyerhaeuser deal which had been made a couple of years earlier was tabled in this legislature.

In fact, it was the first time I was ever called to order because I was referring to something that was not on the topic at that particular moment. I'm pleased that it is part of this motion so I can refer to that very late tabling of the Weyerhaeuser deal.

But that late tabling of the deal by the former PC administration typified what that administration was all about. It was a secretive government that made big deals with its big-business friends, and it did not want to share those deals nor the terms of the deals with the people of Saskatchewan.

And I can well imagine why they didn't want to share what was in that. We know that there was \$236 million that is payable over 30 years — maybe. According to the deal, it's dependent upon Weyerhaeuser making a certain amount of profit, an amount of profit that they have not to date made. In other words, it has not resulted in them making payments on that money.

But in addition there was some rather strange things. The former administration promised, guaranteed to Weyerhaeuser, that they would build 32 kilometres of logging road every year at the taxpayer of Saskatchewan's expense — logging roads that formerly were built by the logging operation, by PAPCO (Prince Albert Pulp Company), and that now we build them for Weyerhaeuser at our taxpayers' expense.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, there was over a thousand kilometres of logging road that we had paid for through PAPCO, that the former administration again bought those roads and made a payment, a cash payment to Weyerhaeuser of Tacoma, Washington, for that more

than a thousand kilometres of logging road.

And it is astounding that such a deal could have been made, but it is not surprising that the former government wanted to keep that a secret.

Mr. Speaker, this motion is condemning the previous government for its unprecedented practices in the last nine years, including public spending by special warrants. And I'm reminded that in April 1982, the former administration, the former government, won office and it took until March 8, 1983 before the final Appropriation Act was passed covering that term.

Now I could forgive that perhaps as the beginnings of a new government, and they're just learning the ropes and getting their budget process in place. But then I look at what happened in 1987 when that former government was re-elected in October 20, 1986 and it took them until June 17. They had to operate under special warrants because they refused to table a budget in this legislature — hardly a commitment, Mr. Speaker, to an open, honest government.

And then in 1991, in the lead up to the recent provincial election, we saw a government that ran and hid literally. As long as they could, they ran and they hid from this legislature. They did not pass the budget. They fled the legislature because they feared losing a non-confidence motion and forcing an election in the summer. And instead they governed using special warrants in an unprecedented manner right up until after the election day.

And now we find ourselves in a situation where there's three months left in this budget year. We have a Minister of Finance that should have started his considerations some six weeks ago for the budget for next year, and we have the now opposition decrying that we haven't presented a budget.

The Minister of Finance is simply saying, look here is the expenditures that we've approved for the balance of this year. Stand up in the legislature. Ask us what questions you want. I will answer them to the best of my ability, but the real budget, the real process for an annual budget, that budget will be tabled in the spring of 1992.

And, Mr. Speaker, I can do nothing but support the current Minister of Finance.

The budget process is a serious process. It's not, as the Minister of Finance pointed out earlier today, it's not simply a matter of attaching the minister's picture on a piece of paper and the minister's signing it and saying, here's the budget.

We are taking this budget process seriously. I have every confidence that when the Minister of Finance tables his own budget, it will be an accurate budget that will stand the test of time, and that we will come back on an annual basis and review the budgets presented by whoever the Finance minister is in this government. But in this case, the member for Regina Dewdney is the Finance minister. We will be proud to say that we've met the targets in those budgets.

A budget process, Mr. Speaker, is a consultative process. And it's not so simple as to simply consult with members of the Legislative Assembly, although that's part of it. It is also to consult with the bureaucrats, to consult with the various department heads throughout the government, and some public consultative process as well. That's a process that is going on, Mr. Speaker.

You know, I'm astounded. Members opposite are saying they want the ministers to stand up and answer questions about the budget. Well, Mr. Speaker, it amazes me because what we're dealing with are estimates that were presented earlier in the year by the former administration. It's astounding to me that the now opposition would want our ministers to stand up and answer questions about an inadequate budget and put our spin on that. It would be absolutely astounding to have our ministers giving our spin on a former budget process.

And, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that the taxpayers of Saskatchewan would be well served by that process, and obviously nor does the now Minister of Finance believe that that would serve them well.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to support the motion:

That this Assembly commend the new government for its commitment to financial accountability and its respect for the fundamental tradition that public funds must be appropriated by the legislature; and further, that it condemn the unprecedented practices of the past nine years including: (1) public spending by special warrant; (2) government waste and financial mismanagement; and (3) the accumulation of a massive provincial debt.

Mr. Speaker, I support this motion and would urge all members to do so.

The Speaker: — Order. The member's time has run out.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. After the member from Regina Dewdney's motion yesterday, it is indeed a privilege to rise in the House and join in this debate.

Private members' day rules remain intact for now. Today we are debating a motion that deals with financial accountability. It is ironic that we should be dealing with financial accountability today when yesterday the NDP were attempting to scuttle the rules in place dealing with this very subject.

Yesterday the NDP proposed a motion to break the rules, to suspend the constitution and to eliminate estimates process. This would prevent the individual cabinet members from having to appear before the Assembly to answer any questions. Cabinet ministers will not appear before this Assembly and answer questions on their department's activities.

Mr. Speaker, if questions cannot be directed to the ministers, who will account for the money being spent in their areas? Where is the financial accountability, Mr. Speaker?

This new financial accountability allows them to ignore all our questions, to ignore them for an unlimited time. First the Gass Commission — to remove the right of the Assembly to hold the cabinet accountable. Now, Mr. Speaker, they are changing the rules so that we cannot even question them during budget debate — the only other avenue allowed us in opposition. They are doing away with estimates.

What do they have to hide? They haven't even been in power for two months. Why won't they answer our questions? What are they trying to hide? Are they hiding political NDP hirings? Political NDP firings? Wages they are paying their NDP cronies?

The member from Athabasca spoke of the previous government's deals with its friends. Yes, we made deals with our friends — the Co-op upgrader, the Wheat Pools at Biggar and Poundmaker, the Meadow Lake Tribal Council, and yes even jobs for union members.

The government opposite has an agenda — an agenda that is so secret that the NDP are not allowing it to go before this Assembly, an agenda so secret as their plan of action for the province of Saskatchewan. What can be so secret? What can the members opposite be hiding that this NDP government would deny us the estimates process?

The members opposite should be ashamed. Why is this House sitting? Why are we here, Mr. Speaker? We are being stripped of our rights. The Minister of Finance uses the excuse that he has not had time to prepare a budget. The Minister of Finance tells us that the people of Saskatchewan want him to do this.

He states that he is proceeding with the wishes of the public. They don't want him to rule by special warrants. They want him to dissolve all rules of the legislature and suspend the province's constitution. That is what the Minister of Finance is telling us. The NDP are conveniently picking, choosing, and implementing what they feel the public wants.

What about the plebiscites, Mr. Speaker? Do the public want publicly funded abortions? No, they do not. What have the NDP done about this? Nothing, Mr. Speaker. But the NDP are claiming the people of Saskatchewan want them to abolish the rules of this House. They claim the people of Saskatchewan do not want special warrants. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if the majority of people in Saskatchewan even know how a special warrant works.

(1545)

What they want, Mr. Speaker, is a government that follows the rules, not one that eliminates all the rules. Where is the NDP government's commitment to openness? Where is the open government? How can they claim to be open when they are closing the door on grievance before supply?

This government has no regard for the role of the opposition. They have no regard for the rules of this Assembly. They have no regard for the constitution. And, Mr. Speaker, they have no regard for the real wishes of the people.

What we are seeing here is an excuse in NDP wish fulfilment — fulfilling their wishes at the expense of this Assembly. The NDP are using their majority to exercise tyranny. They are deeming this opposition and back-bench NDP MLAs (Member of the Legislative Assembly) are useless.

This House needs only three seats: one for the Minister of Finance, one for the minister of everything, and one for the Premier. Those three, Mr. Speaker, are the only three left with any rights. After all, Mr. Speaker, they are making all the rules. They are rewriting the rules, much like children do when they are not happy with the way the game is going. The NDP are playing, I'm the king of the castle, when in reality we should have a democratic government in Saskatchewan. Shame on the members opposite.

Where is their regard for the democratic process? Why are they doing away with grievance before supply? Where is the money to go for the next four months? Why won't the NDP allow their ministers to field questions from this side of the House? Is it because the minister for everything would not be allowed to respond to community services' questions? Is it because the member from Regina Elphinstone doesn't trust the remainder of the cabinet? Are they not allowed to speak without direction? Is the minister of everything holding their hand? I think that may be it, Mr. Speaker. The troika wants to muzzle their own members for fear that they may reveal information that should remain hidden.

Mr. Speaker, this government is doing precisely what they said they would not. They are effectively closing their actions to public scrutiny. This is evident in the creation of the Gass tribunal and now again in disposing with the rules of the House.

The Gass tribunals are closed to scrutiny and now the spending of the NDP government is also closed to scrutiny. Closed to the opposition, closed to the media, closed to the public and the taxpayer. Is this the new form of government that the NDP brought to Saskatchewan? Is this financial accountability? A government that does not play by the rules. A government that disposes of rules when they so desire.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage the government to bring a budget down. I encourage them to grant this Assembly its historic rights. I encourage the government to put forward the estimates for the remainder of the fiscal year. I ask the members opposite to maintain the constitution and the rules and the procedures of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment to the motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I

was listening very carefully to what the members opposite had to say and it reminded me of a statement by Marshall McLuhan. Marshall McLuhan once said that all ignorance is motivated, Mr. Speaker. All ignorance is motivated.

Mr. Speaker, in listening to the remarks by the members opposite about the budget process, about the procedural motion that is on the books right now, Mr. Speaker, tells me that they know absolutely nothing about the process, the budgetary process, and it makes me wonder where they've been, those members that have been in this House, in the legislature for the last . . . since the previous election.

And it makes me wonder where the new members are getting their coaching from. I would advise the new members on the side opposite to watch who they take their lessons from. If they're going to take it from the people who are sitting in front of them, they ought to be careful because they just about all got cleaned out in the last election and they will get cleaned out even worse in the following election if they keep taking their advice from the people that are giving it to them right now, because they're completely out of base, completely off base.

Mr. Speaker, every one of those members, by this motion, will have the opportunity to stand for hour after hour after hour and ask any question that he or she may want to ask of the Minister of Finance. He may ask any question, no bars held. No bars held. And any statement that they might make to the contrary is completely false — is completely false. There is absolutely no limitation to the amount of debate that is being granted by this motion. And the members full well know that. They full well know that.

But for some reason they've got a motivation, a Marshall McLuhan type of motivation to mislead and to . . . which have a tendency to mislead anybody that may be listening. So I repeat that remark, Mr. Speaker, that Marshall McLuhan said — all ignorance is motivated.

So we ought to really find out what could be the motivation behind the members' remarks that they are saying. What could be the motivation that they are using to say that they don't want to go ahead with the supply debate? Why is it that they don't want to get up and ask those questions?

You know what kind of questions should be asked, what kind of questions should be asked of the Minister of Finance? I will tell. I will give them an example. I think that what should happen is you should be preparing so when this motion passes and the Minister of Finance stands in his place, you should be preparing to ask questions about four ministers — four ministers of the previous government that had in their hands a corporation called the Saskatchewan Diversification Corporation.

Did any of you even know what that corporation is about? I'll bet you don't. Well there are four ministers that lost their seats because of the secretness of that particular corporation. Your members, your former colleagues

voted them a total of \$4.1 million in secret. It was never made public till October 10 before the election, completely done in secret. It was completely done in secret. Your Conservative buddies voted them \$4.1 million in secret. For what purpose? — to give money away to 19 other small companies in the province.

Did anybody know about that? Did any of my colleagues here know about it? Did anybody in the press know about it? I'll bet you didn't even know about it. I'll bet you they even kept it secret from you.

It wasn't till there was an internal leak which came out and showed how fed up the public service was with your antics, with your Conservative antics, how fed up they were with your secretness that this thing came out.

And four ministers lost their seats. And the ministers included the minister who's name was Grant Schmidt, the member from Melville. He lost his seat. Why? Because of deals like this. The member from Meadow Lake lost his seat. His name was George McLeod. He was one of the ministers involved in SDC (Saskatchewan Diversification Corporation). Then there was the former Finance minister and the former Education minister, Lorne Hepworth from Estevan. Where is he now? Do you see him sitting in this legislature? No, because of secret deals.

And these are the kinds of questions you should be putting to the Minister of Finance to get the answers for your own edification, for your own edification so that you know how to run a proper opposition. Instead what you're doing is filibustering on a procedural motion.

And I repeat to you, you can ask any question on any subject that this legislature has a responsibility for and nobody, absolutely anybody, is barring you from it. And you're trying to make up a story as if you're being muzzled. Completely untrue, which is completely untrue. And I urge you to stand up and deny that statement. I would ask anybody to stand up and deny that statement about the truth of what this motion is about.

So, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am very, very proud to be standing here and supporting this particular motion which commends the Government of Saskatchewan, the existing Government of Saskatchewan for its commitment to financial accountability.

What we have done, Mr. Speaker, in the first step of doing this, Mr. Speaker, the first step was to put in a Financial Management Review Commission, an open-the-books commission. This commission will be charged with the responsibility of doing an audit from 1983, an audit as they see fit.

They are not being muzzled by anybody. They will set up their own frame of reference . . . No, that's not exactly true; they will set up their own guide-lines. They will set up their own guide-lines, Mr. Speaker, and they will be going through all of the books from 1983 on, to the existing budget which was presented to us but never passed, back in April of this year.

Mr. Speaker, there was a reason why people voted them

out of office. People wanted a change. They did not like the way the fiscal affairs of the province were being handled. They saw the members opposite who were in government at the time, as being fiscally irresponsible. They want to see fiscal accountability.

Hence we have put in these two steps: the open-the-books committee, and now we want to get a supply motion before the House, Mr. Speaker, a supply motion which will allow the members of this Assembly to ask questions about all supply. It's called grievance before supply.

The Speaker: — Order. Under rule 16 the time has elapsed.

(1600)

MOTIONS

Resolution No. 1 — Energy Options Agreement

Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I'm moving resolution no. 1 that says the following:

That this Assembly urge the Government of Saskatchewan to maintain the Energy Options Agreement with the purpose of researching all alternative sources of energy including the environmentally friendly use of coal, wind, solar, biomass, and nuclear, and that these studies will be released to educate the Saskatchewan public on the Energy Options Agreement findings.

I'm putting this forward, Mr. Speaker, because of the tremendous opportunities that are available to the people of Saskatchewan, to the Government of Saskatchewan, and to Canada if we explore all the options we have in energy in this province.

Under our administration, Mr. Speaker, the federal-provincial agreement on energy initiatives was signed, which allows for us to research all the possibilities. The Government of Canada and Saskatchewan joined forces in a long-term plan to assess a wide range of economic diversification opportunities for the energy sector.

The national Energy minister Mr. Jake Epp and myself at that time as premier signed a memorandum of understanding detailing the energy options so that we could co-operate in studying all of those options in the future.

This agreement was seen to be very important, particularly as a step to developing Saskatchewan's energy resources. And by the turn of the century, Mr. Speaker, as I'm sure you're aware, thousands and thousands and tens of thousands of jobs in the province of Saskatchewan are potentially there as a result of the agreement that we undertook.

My resolution today is to say to the members opposite and to the government, just please keep that energy agreement open so you can study all of your options. Don't close any of the doors. I believe that it's important that we review and assess the energy related

opportunities available all across Canada, and particularly here in Saskatchewan.

As some members know — and my seat mate was the minister of Energy when this was taking place — that Saskatchewan has tremendous potential for wealth. And a Government of Saskatchewan at any time is looking for the potential to generate revenue for health and education, balanced budgets and the like, particularly after plebiscites to say that we should have a balanced budget. We have tremendous potential for wealth generation in this province.

And, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you're aware that the mayor of Saskatoon, Mr. Henry Dayday; the mayor of Regina, Doug Archer, have led delegations and thinking about leading people and economic development committees across Canada and particularly down East to see if we could have major economic development here in the province as a result of our energy options.

Saskatchewan is blessed with an abundance of energy resources including crude oil, coal, natural gas, and yes, uranium. There are also untapped opportunities for alternative renewable energy. And certainly when my seat mate was the minister of Energy, he went through a number of them, and I just want to briefly touch on them today.

The memorandum of understanding calls for the Government of Canada and Saskatchewan to work together to do the following: evaluate the economic and environmental feasibility of clean coal technologies including the capture and economic use of carbon dioxide and constructing a demonstration power generating facility in the province.

Two, to study ways to promote the development and application of energy efficiency by assisting in the testing, commercialization, and initial marketing of new technologies intended to reduce agriculture imports to improve efficiency of electricity production and to use and to reduce energy consumption in buildings.

Number three, to evaluate the feasibility of establishing a nuclear research and technology program in the province which could include the design and the manufacture of CANDU 3 reactors, the construction of a nuclear power station, opportunities for development in the nuclear fuel cycle, and the enhancement of research programs in related fields.

And four, evaluate the feasibility of implementing a fossil fuel resource development program in the province of Saskatchewan. Such a program would encourage the development and application of new technologies to more effectively extract the province's abundant oil, coal, and natural gas resources, and to diversify the province's economy through processing of those resources.

The economic and environmental implications of all the projects being considered under the memorandum will be assessed, which, Mr. Speaker, as I'm sure that you are aware being from the city of Saskatoon, means literally tens of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in revenue, not only in energy itself and the production of

energy but in research and in several items, Mr. Speaker, like agriculture, like food irradiation, nuclear physics, and nuclear medicine.

Without restricting the generality of the agreement, the parties agreed to the following initiatives, Mr. Speaker, and I think the members of the legislature would be interested as well as the public to work together to assess the feasibility of implementing a program in Saskatchewan to advance commercial opportunities in clean coal combustion, and the recovery and the use of waste products including the construction of an integrated gasification combined-cycle electrical facility in Saskatchewan.

Such a facility would be a test centre for Canadian coals, acid gas, particulate, and carbon dioxide CO₂ recovery methods, and technologies requiring gasification as a base step, methanol production and fuel cells etc.

Number 2, the development and commercialization of technologies in the province to recover CO₂ from coal-fired power plants; these studies will focus on technologies which will enhance the recovery of CO₂ from integrated gasification combined cycles in electrical facilities or which will allow retrofitting of existing coal-fired plants.

Number 3, the development and commercialization of uses for the recovery of CO₂, and certainly there are significant opportunities for the use of large volumes of CO₂ in Canada as we use enhanced oil recovery and brines processing in Saskatchewan.

Another major part of the agreement, Mr. Speaker, was to work together on a feasibility study to plan and, as appropriate, to develop and promote an energy efficiency and the alternative uses of energy. These studies would consider the following: promoting the development and application of energy efficiency by assisting in the testing, commercialization, and initial marketing of new technologies including reducing agriculture energy inputs, improving efficiency of electrical production use, and reducing building energy consumption; and jointly assessing the feasibility of adopting alternative energy sources such as biomass for an example, to the conversion of agriculture and forest products, to transportation fuels; use of wood and peat for power generation in remote areas; and alternative transportation fuels such as natural gas; co-generation using fuels such as heavy oil emulsions; and the use of wind and solar energy, particularly in agricultural remote area applications.

And, Mr. Speaker, the agreement which we encourage the government to stay with works together to evaluate the feasibility of establishing nuclear research and technology programs in the province of Saskatchewan, including the following, Mr. Speaker: the design and manufacture of CANDU 3 nuclear reactors; the construction and operation of a CANDU 3 nuclear power station in Saskatchewan; applications for slowpoke energy systems; opportunities for the safe, long-term management of nuclear fuel and waste; nuclear fuel cycle developments; nuclear applications in medicine and agriculture; university research programs and the

enhancement of university programs in nuclear physics, medicine, and agriculture; related technology such as simulators, lasers, and irradiation processing; and, Mr. Speaker, the market of nuclear technology world-wide.

Another part of the agreement, Mr. Speaker, works together to find all the opportunities in implementing a joint fossil fuel resource development program in Saskatchewan; field scale upgrading; enhanced oil recovery; improved coal and oil transportation.

The parties acknowledged in this agreement put together by my seat mate when he was minister and the Government of Canada and myself, that in the course of implementing this memorandum of understanding and any subsequent agreements, consideration will be given to findings of public consultation processes, and such agreements will be subject to approved environmental reviews.

The whole memorandum of understanding, Mr. Speaker, is subject to public scrutiny, public review — consulting with the people and the environment in the cities of Saskatoon and northern Saskatchewan, southern Saskatchewan, and indeed across the province. Parties acknowledge that we will put together a steering committee. Any subsequent expenditures have to be agreed upon by both parties.

It means that we can work together with research. At a minimum, Mr. Speaker, it means there would be hundreds and hundreds of white-collar jobs in the city of Saskatoon and the city of Regina in research, looking at SaskPower, looking at the university, looking at medicine, agriculture, food irradiation, and the combinations of areas where we should lead, Mr. Speaker, on the environment as well as in agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make the point that about 20 per cent of all the uranium that is produced and marketed internationally is in the province of Saskatchewan. We have that tremendous potential to generate wealth. Uranium to this province is like oil to Alberta. We have the capacity plus the blessing of the resource and we have the educational capacity to deal with it, Mr. Speaker.

The world is waiting to invest, as they do now, in the province of Saskatchewan, whether it's the French that are investing here, the Japanese, Americans, Koreans, the Chinese. More and more people want nuclear reactors, let alone uranium.

We find countries like France that are now 70 per cent nuclear energy, with a socialist government. We find countries like Sweden have completely done an about-face and say that we want clean, environmentally safe electricity through the nuclear options. We find the same in the Pacific Rim.

World-wide the environmental problems are leading more and more people to the same conclusion that the mayor of Saskatoon has reached, the mayor of Regina has reached, many members of the House have reached, that we should look at all the options and particularly those we've been blessed with in the province of Saskatchewan: one, to make environmentally clean

sources of power; number 2, to generate the wealth that's there — literally billions of dollars; and number 3, to diversify our economy so that in fact we could have a high standard of living and the revenue to balance the budget, but of course pay for health, education, and several of our possible programs.

We were looking, Mr. Speaker, at the potential for 30,000 new jobs over the next 10 to 15 years in all of the energy options. Complete diversification — 30,000 new jobs — well into the 21st century that would put the province of Saskatchewan on the map in terms of energy options, diversification, and the potential to lead, not only Canada, but a good part of the world, in all of the nuclear capacity.

When we look at recycling, Mr. Speaker, there's a tremendous amount of money and demand for recycling. At a recent conference in the United States where I was joined by governors, many American governors were coming to Canadians or other people from around the world and said, are you prepared to do joint ventures on research on recycling? And what about the province of Saskatchewan because of its blessing in uranium? Are you going to be moving in that direction or is it going to be in New Brunswick or Ontario?

We look at the potential for nuclear medicine and research. And we also know, Mr. Speaker, that our own Lieutenant Governor, the Hon. Sylvia Fedoruk, has been an internationally well-known nuclear physicist. But the whole area of nuclear medicine and nuclear physics is something that we've been leaders in. And for us not to at least explore all those options would seem to be a terrible mistake, in my view, Mr. Speaker, because it's an agreement to spend money jointly, to do research in things that we're very good at, based on resources that we have here at our disposal. And we have people from all over the world investing now in uranium and in the energy options.

I could say from my own experience, Mr. Speaker, as well, that we market grain world-wide. And with the new technology of irradiation, you can irradiate wheat or food products so that their shelf life and their storage capacity is extended years and years and years. Now that's a multi-million dollar industry right in Saskatchewan. On a commercial basis, if we wanted to get into the shelf life and the storage capacity of grains, of food products, we have the potential to do this, Mr. Speaker.

And we have a new Department of Agriculture and Food who want to market internationally. We market the countries that don't have good storage facilities, like eastern Europe, China, the Pacific Rim. And by using food irradiation and grain irradiation on a commercial and technical basis, we can extend the shelf life for a long, long time which would help hungry people, which would help market our resources, take advantage of the kind of technology we have here. And, in fact, Mr. Speaker, we could be on the leading edge of that kind of technology.

I'll also point out that in terms of health care, we have never taken a back seat. And with the whole concern about cancer, Mr. Speaker, and nuclear medicine and the kinds of things that we can do to continue to lead, all of

that research is there for Saskatchewan people. We can lead in health care; we can lead in the environment; we can lead in energy; we can lead in agriculture; we can lead in international marketing; we can lead in recycling.

We can lead in all of these areas that we've had the capacity to in the past, but never really broken into the future to allow us to capture the 21st century like we know we can.

So, Mr. Speaker, the reputation of this province as being a leader and having the courage to go out in nuclear medicine, nuclear physics, food irradiation, marketing, health care, the environment, is one that I'm very proud of. And I sincerely ask the new Government of Saskatchewan to consider this motion, this resolution that's on the floor of the Assembly, so that in fact we can at least continue the research.

It's a joint-venture project that allows a lot of us to do work, many research scientists to be involved. It helps almost every part of our economy from the environment to agriculture to research to universities; diversification and economic activity plus, Mr. Speaker. And I'm sure any government would be interested in this — raises enormous revenue, enormous revenue. We're looking at literally billions and billions of dollars coming into the province of Saskatchewan in the 1990s and the 21st century if we don't just shut the door to this option, and all the options — whether they're biomass, whether they're ethanol, the combinations of wind, solar, and all of the other options — conservation. All of those are part and parcel of this research.

(1615)

So, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to raise this resolution because the people of Saskatchewan are very much in favour of all of these options. We had a panel review them all, and they recommended that we look at them one at a time.

I would think in the spirit of a new administration that is talking about co-operation, nothing could make more sense than co-operating with the national government in doing joint research, exploring all the options that we have in our jurisdiction for economic diversification and wealth creation that is environmentally sound. That just makes eminent sense, Mr. Speaker, because it's a joint venture. It is co-operating and it's in the spirit of how we're going to have to build this great nation in the face of the challenges in the 21st century.

So, Mr. Speaker, I move this resolution because I believe it's important to the province and indeed to the country and probably no doubt to the world because of its international, environmental, and economic resolution. So, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member from Souris-Cannington:

That this Assembly urge the Government of Saskatchewan to maintain the Energy Options Agreement with the purpose of researching all alternative sources of energy, including the environmentally friendly use of coal, wind, solar, biomass, and nuclear and that these studies will be released to educate the Saskatchewan public on

the EOA (Energy Options Agreement) findings.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am proud to be able to second the motion of the member from Estevan. The Energy Options Agreement is Saskatchewan's chance to grab the future. It is our chance to . . . Saskatchewan can grab the future with this agreement. This is our opportunity to gain the same sort of wealth potential that Saudi Arabia has.

Why hide from the future? Why live in the past? Very few of us, Mr. Speaker, want to go back to living in caves or even living in our grandfather's original homes. When we leave this building this evening we drive home with technology, with energy. When we walk into our homes and flip on the lights, that is energy. And we're all very pleased to have the heat turned on when we get there. This is all part of what this Energy Options Agreement is all about. Why should we not be trying to enhance that potential?

The members opposite are very concerned about the uranium industry. Some of them want to do away with it. Their federal counterparts in Ottawa wish to shut down the whole uranium industry. When I asked questions of the Minister of Energy and Mines concerning the mining industry, his reply was that we have to wait for the environmental study to be processed. Well that environmental study will not be finished until earliest, mid-1993, almost two years from now.

Mr. Speaker, the mining industry needs to know beforehand, providing it meets the environmental requirements, what is going to happen, what they're going to be allowed to do, will they be allowed to proceed with any plans? The mere fact that they cannot proceed at this present time does not mean they cannot be studying, planning for future developments.

Mines do not spring up overnight. They need long-term planning.

In 1988 under the auspices of the previous government, \$90 million was spent in exploration in the North in mining. How much will be spent in 1992? Fifteen million, 20 million maybe? A quarter of what was spent before. And, Mr. Speaker, I'm not talking about pre-development expenses. I'm talking about real exploration.

Chile, a land that has a lot of resources, is receiving \$500 million this coming year in exploration money. Ninety per cent of that, Mr. Speaker, comes from Canada. Why are Canadian companies investing in Chile rather than in Canada, rather than in Saskatchewan?

The Canadian mining industry, Mr. Speaker, uses the same guide-lines offshore from Canada as it uses in Canada for environmental concerns. And yet they know that in Chile if they develop a mine, that they will be allowed to continue to mine its products, to gain the benefits of their exploration. They have no such assurances in Saskatchewan.

Another part of the Energy Options Agreement concerns

the oil and gas industry, and the same concerns of uncertainty that affect the mining industry in Saskatchewan affect the oil and gas industry. When I look back at the changes that have happened in the oil and gas industry in this province over the last 20-some years, there have been quite a number of changes.

I started work, Mr. Speaker, out in Swift Current in 1970 in the oil. At that time, there was a project going called an INSITU project. Today that kind of a project could not proceed because of the uncertainty, because of the lack of direction from this government. These plans do not happen overnight. It takes a long time to develop. And you can't just state one day that, yes, you can go ahead and expect development to start taking place. The Energy Options Agreement would allow people to start developing plans and know where they're going.

Another type of new project that was started under the previous government in this province was the horizontal drilling. Under conventional wells you receive a small amount of pay zone from your efforts — you may get 5 feet, 10 feet. But under horizontal drilling you can get hundreds of metres of pay zone. This is the kind of development that the Energy Options Agreement would encourage, would help to build. And why are we trying to hide from it, Mr. Speaker? I don't understand.

We also have in this province, wind. Some people would say that there is a lot of wind generated in this building, but most of it comes from the West. I don't mean to disparage the members who come from the West with that comment but the wind generation concept is one that perhaps whose time has come. The Energy Options Agreement would give us the ability to do more research on that type of facility.

There are large wind generating farms in various other parts of this continent. California is a prime example, Mr. Speaker. You drive down the highways north of San Francisco and there are wind farms for 50 miles generating electricity. Efficiencies need to be gained in that industry to make it truly efficient and economical. The Energy Options Agreement would provide some of the money to do that research. In western Saskatchewan in the open areas, wind generation farms are a viable option. North Dakota is presently looking at those kind of facilities. They may well have some already started.

Solar power — some of our smaller farms, some of our communities are using solar energy to heat their swimming pools, heat some of their buildings. But their methods are inefficient at the present time. We need to have research to improve on those type of energy sources.

One thing that wind and solar provide is conservation methods. Mr. Speaker, SaskPower over the last number of years has provided a number of efforts to help conserve our energy. They provided blankets for the hot water heaters in people's homes. They provided a loan to allow people to insulate their windows better. Last spring they provided a rebate on fluorescent lights, the new small lamps that you would screw into an ordinary bulb socket. And now they are providing rebates to buy timers to put on your automobiles when you plug them in in the winter.

There may very well be other types of energy savings that could be researched and provided to the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan. All of these type of research provide a cost saving to all of us.

The member from Estevan mentioned biomass. The city of Regina is well aware of biomass, garbage. They're in the process of looking for — or perhaps they have decided now — where they are going to put their new garbage dump. If they had a biomass energy generator, they could dispose of a good portion of their garbage. These plants are already in operation. They need more work to become totally non-polluting. This agreement would provide that money to do that research. And why do we want to avoid it? We need that kind of research, Mr. Speaker.

The member from Estevan has a large amount of pull in his area and it borders on my constituency. Coal, when it's burned, is a pollutant. There are methods to scrub most of those pollutants out of the energy wastes that goes up the stacks but not all. More research can be done to improve that.

Coal gasification is a big effort across the line in North Dakota. Coal gasification is expensive, but it's also more environmentally sound. Coal gasification in the Estevan area at Coronach would improve our coal use, would make it more environmentally friendly, Mr. Speaker.

I've outlined some of the benefits that accrue directly to the mining, to the drilling of the oil wells, to the research in solar and wind. One thing I haven't mentioned is other sources of energy.

Uranium can be used in the CANDU reactors. Regina and Saskatoon and northern Saskatchewan are all interested in getting access to the CANDU technology and to utilizing it to generate power and heat in their cities. The CANDU reactor is probably the safest reactor in the world, Mr. Speaker. It's not like the one at Chernobyl. It's not like the one at Three Mile Island. And yet the members opposite seem to want to deny us even the opportunity to study that technology.

In all of the mining industry, in the research, there are jobs available. The research jobs, Mr. Speaker, are high technology jobs, good paying jobs, jobs suitable for our university graduates. The jobs created in the research industry are jobs that create spin-offs in our economy. We also have the jobs, Mr. Speaker, for all the people that are involved in the mining, the transportation of the product from that mine, the ore, the building of the transportation systems and all the infrastructures.

The member from Athabasca was saying that we did nothing while we were in government to aid the North. Mr. Speaker, we developed many new mines up there. And his members of the government want to shut those down now.

We have five proposed mines that are on hold right now in northern Saskatchewan. These mines, Mr. Speaker, if the government opposite would give the go-ahead and say, if you meet the environmental requirements you may proceed, they could go into planning and start to do their

pre-development work on these mines. But the members opposite will not give them that assurance that if they meet all the requirements they will be able to proceed.

The oil patch is in the same business. They need to know that they can proceed.

Mr. Speaker, I've outlined what I feel are the good points of this Energy Options Agreement, and I support and I would encourage all the members of this Assembly to support this motion. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1630)

Mr. Scott: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At the end of my remarks I will be moving an amendment to the resolution presented by the member opposite. The reason for the amendment is based on the fact that there is no such thing as an Energy Options Agreement. In his remarks the member opposite has now referred to the September 13, 1991, memorandum of understanding which is not an agreement on energy between the Government of Canada and Saskatchewan.

In this case the following issues are raised. First, the motion does not address the memorandum of understanding or its terms. Secondly, the motion is contrary to the contents of the memorandum of understanding.

The members opposite may be referring to the recent report of the *Saskatchewan Electrical Energy Options* panel, also known as a Billinton panel. If this is the case, the following observations are made: the panel has provided a report, has made recommendations, and has concluded its work.

The motion urges the government to research all alternative energy sources. This is not feasible or cost effective. The Billinton panel has identified that some alternative energy forms are not desirable or viable.

The motion has failed to name the preferred mechanisms identified by the panel for alternate energy generation including cogeneration, hydro, and natural gas. The motion also fails to mention the very important issue of energy conservation.

Mr. Speaker, we have sadly witnessed what happens when a government forges ahead at any cost on a pet energy development project which is flawed, piecemeal, and unsound on every account.

We can never again afford to have another Rafferty-Alameda Shand white elephant project in this province — a project which is riddled with controversy and court actions; a project that has not stood up to public scrutiny, but instead has become a shameful national example how a development should not occur in a nation looked upon as a leader in the world.

Mr. Speaker, all future energy developments in this province must meet four important criteria. Such developments must be technically feasible, socially

acceptable, economically viable, and environmentally sound.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Scott: — In the interest of the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, I therefore move an amendment to make the motion stating:

That all the words after “Assembly” be deleted and the following be substituted therefor:

encourage the Government of Saskatchewan to establish a sound energy framework in which co-ordinated energy development can occur which will maximize economic development potential, integrate energy related economic and environmental issues, promote energy efficiency to reduce energy costs, and will protect consumer and public interests.

I so move, seconded by the Member from Moose Jaw Wakamow.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the newly elected member from Saskatoon Greystone, I wish to speak to the motion from the member from Estevan. And as members will recall, when it came to a vote of confidence in the government in this Assembly last week, that I voted in favour of giving the Premier and the NDP government a chance to provide leadership and direction and integrity to the Government of Saskatchewan, for the benefit of people in our province. I voted to support the members opposite because I truly believe that they deserve a chance.

I have been on record, as my party has been on record, for supporting energy options and energy conservation. What I'd like to do today is to speak specifically to one aspect of this motion.

On September 6, I was at a luncheon sponsored by the Saskatoon Chamber of Commerce at the Travelodge motel in Saskatoon. Mr. Speaker, the guest speaker at that luncheon was the hon. member from Saskatoon Riversdale, the gentleman who is now Premier of the province of Saskatchewan. His address was one in a series, and the purpose of this series was to provide members of the Saskatchewan business community with a clear understanding of policies of the three political party leaders.

Each one of the leaders was requested to address three different topics, Mr. Speaker. One dealt with the deficit, the second with privatization, and the last issue with the idea of uranium mining and nuclear development. The chamber members wanted to know each party's position on these three very important topics.

Mr. Speaker, at that luncheon, in front of over 500 people, the member from Saskatoon Riversdale, the gentleman who was seeking their support to become Premier, said the following. He said that his party had an old, outdated anti-uranium mining policy — a policy which would

permit no new uranium mines to open and one which would close existing mines as new jobs were found for the displaced workers. The hon. member from Saskatoon Riversdale, the Leader of the New Democratic Party, was very clear and up-front when outlining this policy. But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member then told the group that this NDP policy was developed at the height of the Cold War, developed when tensions between East and West were high, and fears of nuclear war were very high.

Those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, the audience was told by the hon. member, had now changed. Peace had been achieved and the threat of nuclear war was no longer as great a concern. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from Saskatoon Riversdale, the Leader of the NDP, went on to say that other circumstances had also changed. That when the NDP policy was adopted, global warming and acid rain were not understood to be as great a threat as they are today. And he conceded that many people now feel that the scales have tipped away from fossil fuels and are favouring more use of nuclear power.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from Saskatoon Riversdale told the 500 members of the Saskatoon Chamber of Commerce that several important public review processes were at work and that his government would want to be guided by the recommendations of these bodies before making any decisions on uranium mining or nuclear power for Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the member from Saskatoon Riversdale listed those bodies. He outlined the panel; indeed he called it a blue ribbon panel, a panel of experts reviewing Saskatchewan's future energy options. And this panel was chaired by Professor Billinton of the University of Saskatchewan and four other members, individuals like Chief Roland Crowe of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians and other distinguished individuals.

Mr. Speaker, one of those individuals was even a member of the NDP executive, a former vice-president of the New Democratic Party. Well, Mr. Speaker, that particular panel has submitted its report to the Government of Saskatchewan. It has recommended that the Government of Saskatchewan provide leadership, provide the public with information and advice, and conduct a fair and reasonable assessment of the nuclear option.

Mr. Speaker, Professor Billinton and his panel struggled with the nuclear option but they recognized that it was just that, an option, an option on which government should provide leadership. Mr. Speaker, please note I said government, not SaskPower, not the New Democratic Party at its annual convention, but government — the function that the members opposite sought to obtain, and now that they have it, appear to be afraid or unable to exercise it.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from Saskatoon Riversdale led the people at that luncheon in Saskatoon to believe that he would be guided by new developments and by the recommendations of what he termed the blue ribbon panel, the Billinton panel.

Mr. Speaker, ask yourself: was the member choosing to mislead people in Saskatoon? Has he done what he said

he would do? No, he has not. And he has not said a word, not one single word, on what his government's policy position will be on nuclear development in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, in 1951 the CCF (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation) government of Tommy Douglas did a very irresponsible thing by the standards of some of the members opposite. Mr. Speaker, in 1951 the CCF government of Tommy Douglas began approving uranium mines in northern Saskatchewan — mines which produced uranium.

And do you know something, Mr. Speaker? Those mines did not produce uranium for nuclear power. No, Mr. Speaker, those mines produced uranium exclusively for the use in bombs. And, Mr. Speaker, the tradition of the NDP CCF goes a long way back. It goes back to an era when the CCF government of Saskatchewan approved 16 uranium mines in the Uranium City area, mines whose only function was to produce uranium for bombs — uranium which was exclusively exported to other countries for their bombs since Canada has never had, and I hope never will have, a nuclear arsenal.

Mr. Speaker, when nuclear power was successfully developed in Canada and the CANDU reactors were built and operated in Ontario and other countries, the Saskatchewan government was still there, still supplying uranium — uranium which was being refined elsewhere, refined in Ontario and exported around the world.

Mr. Speaker, the government of Woodrow Lloyd, the first NDP premier of Saskatchewan, had no problem with uranium mining. They had no policy to shut down the mines, no policy to ban the atom.

Mr. Speaker, some members will also remember that the Liberal Party of Saskatchewan formed the government from 1964 to 1971. And during that time we had drought, low wheat prices, a collapse of potash prices, and many of the same things indeed that the Conservatives have experienced during the 1980s.

But unlike the Conservative government just previous, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals did not leave Saskatchewan with a heritage of debt and corruption. No, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals left Saskatchewan with a pulp mill built and operating in Prince Albert and another one under construction in Beauval, Athabasca Pulp Ltd., a project later cancelled by the NDP because it didn't fit their model of development — a project cancelled because it had been started by another government, Mr. Speaker.

And the NDP really did not want to share any credit or success with anyone else. Even if it wasn't their project from the very beginning, it had to go as a result of that.

The NDP government in which the member from Saskatoon Riversdale served as deputy premier, Mr. Speaker, cancelled that deal. He cancelled it, Mr. Speaker.

And I wonder if the member from Athabasca would stand up and tell the members of the legislature today if that decision to kill that pulp mill project for north-western

Saskatchewan, that totally political decision, that decision based on the politics of fear, Mr. Speaker, would he tell us if that decision helped his constituency, helped the people of Beauval, helped the Indian and Metis people of north-western Saskatchewan?

No, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the member from Athabasca would not stand up and tell the House that that had been a good decision. He would not do that because he is a practical man and because he knows that it was the wrong decision for Beauval, wrong for northern Saskatchewan, and wrong for the province.

Mr. Speaker, where is the leadership in feeding and benefitting from the politics of fear? Where is the benefit? And where is the public service? I am sure that if we could turn the clock back to 1971, every member opposite would today vote to build that pulp mill in Beauval, would vote to help the people of the North, would vote for development and progress.

Mr. Speaker, the government of Saskatchewan faces a very similar set of circumstances today. All political parties recognize the need to diversify our economy. We all know that Saskatchewan is blessed with high grade and abundant uranium reserves. We all know that there are countries around the world, countries which have made decisions to develop nuclear power, and who would buy uranium fuel from Canada and from our province of Saskatchewan.

We know that in spite of current low uranium market prices that our uranium reserves are of sufficient grade and quality to ensure our mines are the most competitive on the planet. And we all know our uranium mines are closely regulated and controlled. We know that certain practices of the past are no longer permitted and that workers' safety and environmental regulations prevent any real danger or harm to people, communities and the environment.

But, Mr. Speaker, even though we do know these things, some members in the New Democratic Party and in government still seek to make political capital out of them; still seek to distort and twist facts to create fear and uncertainty; still feed the insecurity and the doubts of people.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservative government just defeated by the people of this province did accomplish some worthy projects. Nine years and \$9 billion can't help but result in some worthwhile projects. One such event was the Canada-Saskatchewan Energy Development Agreement, and this agreement provides a framework for the development of all of Saskatchewan's energy resources including, sir, our nuclear resources.

(1645)

Mr. Speaker, another agreement the Conservatives managed to develop during their term in office was the agreement between the Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. and SaskPower. This agreement, we are told, provided for a series of nuclear related developments; studies into nuclear applications in agriculture; nuclear research and applications in medicine; nuclear fuel storage

technologies; and for studies which, if they proved viable, could eventually lead to nuclear power as an energy option for Saskatchewan.

Keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, neither the Conservatives who signed the agreement nor the New Democratic Party who are now in government, have provided the people of Saskatchewan with any other details of this document itself. We are faced with addressing press reports and incomplete information on the content of this agreement.

Mr. Speaker, do you not think that it would be an attribute of a responsible government to table this agreement, to let Saskatchewan people see and understand for themselves just how good or how bad the agreements that the Conservatives signed really are? Mr. Speaker, wouldn't it be an action of an open government, a government which shows respect for media, which shows respect for openness and honesty and for the public?

In any case, Mr. Speaker, this agreement is described to me as a planning agreement. It provides for AECL (Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd.) to move 170 people to Saskatoon and to complete the design and engineering of the CANDU 3 project. It provides for jobs — high-paying and quality jobs. It provides, I am told, for the studies to see how well nuclear power would fit within SaskPower generating grid, what benefits would accrue, what sites might be suitable, what manufacturing spin-offs could be created and expanded for Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of some of the Saskatoon members of the legislature, we have a company in Saskatoon called Hitachi Ltd. and they're one of the largest industrial manufacturing firms in the entire world, Mr. Speaker. And they have built a turbine manufacturing plant in our province in Saskatoon. And I'm told that the Hitachi turbine could become standard equipment to the CANDU 3 design and that this would create a very strong sales package and that the market for these power reactors and small turbines would represent a tremendous stimulus to Saskatchewan industry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm also told that the agreement itself is conditional. That SaskPower and AECL both put up \$25 million to move these personnel to Saskatchewan, to conduct these studies, to complete the design of the CANDU, to do site selection, to fund a chair in science at the University of Saskatchewan, to assess food irradiation projects, to do further studies on nuclear fuel storage.

Mr. Speaker, if these studies were to show the projects were not viable, to show the projects were not in the interests of Saskatchewan, did not make sense, then, Mr. Speaker, then I am told that at SaskPower's option, they can advise AECL at any time up to 1995 and the funds so advanced by SaskPower will be converted into a loan and repaid to the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know all there is to know about these things. But I am amazed that the Conservative's struck this deal because it sounds far too practical and it actually sounds like a good deal for the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, this deal also sounds like it makes sense.

Yes, commit some money to our future, but on a careful step-by-step basis, study, evaluate, and do engineering. Provide for controlled decision points and allow for public discussion and debate. Get some benefits. And while you're doing this, get some jobs transferred to our province. Get some stable, well-paying, high tech jobs from a stable and established company, and provide Saskatchewan people with information and knowledge. And then when we really have the facts, have done all the homework, then we can proceed. If we decide not to continue with the project, we'll get our money back.

How, Mr. Speaker, can this be a bad deal for Saskatchewan and where is the risk? Where, Mr. Speaker, is the Premier on how a deal such as this can be bad for our province of Saskatchewan?

Well you may recall that I mentioned Mr. Tommy Douglas earlier and that he approved 16 uranium mines in northern Saskatchewan — mines used to produce bombs. And some of you may find it surprising to hear but you know that it's true. And I don't think anyone in this House would condemn premier Douglas for doing that because I think we all understood that he felt that it was necessary to do what needed to be done in the province of Saskatchewan for the people of Saskatchewan in his time. In any case, premier Douglas could and did make the decision. He could and did provide leadership.

And, Mr. Speaker, premier Douglas also helped build other weapons. He, together with some very distinguished Saskatchewan scientists, helped to build what we call the cobalt bomb — a weapon in use in the war against cancer, what is also called the cobalt radio-therapy unit at University Hospital in Saskatchewan. Tommy Douglas did understand the need for science and he supported this research. And what a return for Saskatchewan and for Canada and the planet, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make members of the legislature aware of a publication, a recent Saskatchewan publication. The publication to which I am referring is called the *Saskatchewan Nuclear Gazette*. Mr. Speaker, this gazette is produced in Saskatoon by aboriginal entrepreneurs who are in the communications business and who felt that nuclear issues in Saskatchewan had become so distorted, so unbalanced, that there was a niche in the market to produce a magazine that could put all of this in perspective.

And I would like to remind the members opposite that there have been several programs as of late, a series by people who used to feel similar to yourself, who upon obtaining knowledge have changed their minds. Mr. Speaker, I understand that some of the supporters of the party opposite could not even take this book on face value, but instead criticized the aboriginal owners as being pawns of the nuclear industry or being bought off.

Mr. Speaker, the ideological fanaticism of some opponents to nuclear science is so deep and so strong that they have no interest whatsoever in Saskatchewan or its circumstances. And they have only a singular interest in stamping out or discrediting anything or anyone who puts forward views or ideas different from their own. And I

urge the members opposite to disassociate themselves from such thinking.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to, as the member of Saskatoon Greystone, remind people that I come from a constituency that has very thoughtful people living there. I spent a great deal of time going door to door during this past year prior to the campaign, and I want to tell you about them, because they were very thoughtful on October 21. They wanted to send a message that they said that they were fed up with the previous government. They wanted to send a message that they believed in a better way of doing things in this legislature. And they wanted to send a message to the NDP that while their candidate was a good and honourable man, the majority of them did not think that the anti-nuclear approach that he took was good for Saskatchewan.

The constituents of Saskatoon Greystone wanted to send that message to you on behalf of thousands of people across Saskatchewan. And, Mr. Speaker, I am their messenger. So to the constituents of Saskatoon Greystone I say, please consider the message delivered.

There are people who have benefitted greatly from nuclear development. And I find it absolutely despicable, Mr. Speaker, that in this province where we discovered cobalt treatments for cancer, that we cannot even build a medical isotope.

What we need to do is to be informed, Mr. Speaker. And what we have to do is to look at the health benefits of nuclear medicine. Because it tells of a story of a Mossbank woman who was helped, a woman who was treated in this province in the 1950s and is still alive today.

Mr. Speaker, there are nuclear medicine departments in every major hospital in the world. Magnetic resonance imaging machines are nuclear medicine, Mr. Speaker, and the result of nuclear research.

And, Mr. Speaker, cobalt 60 is an isotope produced by CANDU reactors. Canada produces about 85 per cent of the cobalt that is used for radiation therapy around the world, and it comes from Canadian nuclear research — research that, in earlier years, was done in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.

We have credible and knowledgeable people right here in our province who have been part of this technology in helping mankind. And one such person is Her Excellency, the Lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan, a noted nuclear scientist and a member of the team who, along with Dr. Harold Johns, pioneered nuclear medicine at the University of Saskatchewan. And, Mr. Speaker, did you know that the first cancer patient treated with cobalt 60 in Saskatoon in the early 1950s is indeed alive today? That lady is still living and now resides in Victoria, B.C.

How much more evidence do we need to know that we require to understand that we should not become ideological prisoners of a small and misguided anti-development clique?

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to this motion presented by

the member from Estevan because I do believe very much in exploring energy options and energy conservation. But for anyone who has been interested in or partaken in research, we cannot leave out one variable or our research is faulty.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to be the seconder of the amendment from the member from Indian Head-Wolseley, Mr. Speaker. I had anticipated perhaps more time to address his amendment. I recognize we are coming very close to 5 o'clock, but let me say this, Mr. Speaker.

I've listened with care for the last 25 minutes to the independent member from Greystone who never once in her remarks came anywhere near the motion that is before this House. She clearly came into this House attempting to be the apologist for AECL in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier in his remarks, the member from Souris-Cannington, did a little better job of disguising what they were really attempting to do in this House today, and that is to be proponents for a CANDU 3 reactor. That has nothing to do with the motion that's on the order paper.

Mr. Speaker, members opposite had a golden opportunity to talk about the future for energy in this province as they might see it. Rather what we got was the sales pitch for nuclear reactors, Mr. Speaker. Totally inappropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I had anticipated the opportunity to speak about the energy options and to congratulate the member from Indian Head-Wolseley for his remarks and the direction he would point us, but time does not allow, Mr. Speaker, today. And so on that basis I would move that we adjourn debate on this motion.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:57 p.m.