

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The gist of the petition is . . . and titled:

To the Hon. Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan in legislature assembled:

The petition of the undersigned citizens of the province of Saskatchewan humbly sheweth:

that back pain and other highly prevalent neuro-musculo-skeletal disorders are extremely costly to the Canadian economy;

that scientific evidence clearly illustrates that chiropractic treatment is the most effective and efficient therapy for such disorders;

that in the face of an ever-increasing pressure to adopt expensive new forms of high technology treatment, chiropractic care has proven to be a low technology, low cost, conservative, and safe form of treatment, consistent with the true “wellness” model of health care;

that the government publicly asserts it remains committed to the basic principles of medicare, namely universality, comprehensiveness, accessibility, portability, and public administration;

that the government is acting to destroy these principles as they apply to chiropractic patients;

and that the government’s proposed restrictions on this therapy will clearly cost more both in dollars and in patient disability;

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to reverse its decision to eliminate full coverage and universal access to chiropractic treatment and that your Honourable Assembly withhold consent from any government proposal to discriminate against chiropractic patients by charging them fees not assessed for any other medical treatment.

And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too want to hand in a petition that deals with chiropractic care. I have petitioners from Regina, Lumsden, Windthorst, Strasbourg, and I want to place this petition before the House today.

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too wish to rise in the Assembly today to present petitions on behalf of Saskatchewan people who take issue with the government and the way they have implemented changes to the health care system.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I have people from the city of Regina and the community of Strasbourg who wish their names tabled in the Assembly.

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have, as well, a petition with regard to chiropractic care in the province of Saskatchewan. I’d like to place it before the House today. These names come from all of Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have a couple of pages of signatures here on a petition that I’d like to table today. Mr. Speaker, these are signed from people from Lake Lenore, Star City, Tisdale, Hudson Bay, Melfort, Carrot River, St. Brieux, Zenon Park, Saskatoon, Tisdale, Carragana — all across the province, Mr. Speaker. It’s my pleasure to lay this on the Table.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have petitions regarding the chiropractic problems that people are facing. I’ll just read the:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to reserve its decision to eliminate full coverage and universal access to chiropractic treatment and that your Honourable Assembly withhold consent from any government proposal to discriminate against chiropractic patients by charging them fees not assessed for any other medical treatments.

Of course I guess there are some others since this document was signed that have also been included, but they come from the east side of the province, Mr. Speaker, the Yorkton area basically — Stockholm, I see Esterhazy, and Saltcoats, and a few other towns and villages in that area.

Mr. D’Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a different petition to present to the legislature today:

To the Honourable Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan in Legislature Assembled;

The Petition of the undersigned citizens of the Province of Saskatchewan humbly sheweth:

That Saskatchewan producers are undergoing extremely trying financial times due to drought, grain prices and international trade wars and that they are being pressed further financially by the NDP government’s decision to eliminate the Farm Fuel Rebate program and it’s coloured fuel policy; and, that to implement the government’s coloured fuel policy will cost Co-ops and small independent fuel service

stations thousands of dollars, leading to the loss of jobs and businesses in rural Saskatchewan.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that you Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the Government to reverse its decision to eliminate the Farm Fuel Rebate Program and that they cancel the coloured fuel program.

And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

These petitions come Storthoaks, Redvers, Alida, Carlyle, Manor, areas of the south-east corner of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I just want to join with my colleagues in presenting some petitions with respect to the NDP (New Democratic Party) government's farm fuel rebate program. I won't reiterate what my colleague said, except to say that the enclosed would like to see the administration reverse its decisions because it's costing them thousands and thousands of dollars.

I will table these names, and they're from south-eastern Saskatchewan: Storthoaks; Alida; Sedley; various other . . . Redvers; and south-eastern communities around the Carlyle area.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Wednesday next ask the government the following question:

Regarding the Department of Natural Resources: (1) how many Crown range land leaseholders are there in the province of Saskatchewan; (2) how much additional monies were raised from increasing the cost of these leases in the last year; (3) what is the total amount of money raised from these leases; (4) what was the rationale for those increases; and (5) for what purpose were those monies used?

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Wednesday next ask the government the following question:

Regarding SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) in the fiscal year 1992: what percentage of SGI auto claims were related to damage involving wildlife; what is the total dollar cost of the auto fund of all wildlife-related claims; what percentage of SGI commercial claims are related to damage involving wildlife; what is the total cost of SGI's commercial of all wildlife-related claims; how many motor vehicle accidents involving wildlife and the proportion of total accidents does this constitute; and number six, how many of these accidents resulted in the loss of life or permanent injury to persons involved.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Ms. Murray: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to introduce to you and through you to members of this Assembly, seven Cubs from McLean. They are accompanied by their leader, Cliff Marshall. They have braved the lion-like weather of Saskatchewan today to come and join us. I'm looking forward to meeting with them after question period, so I ask all members to join me and welcome them here this afternoon.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

CP Customer Service Centre

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Economic Development. Last week I raised with you, sir, the issue of CP (Canadian Pacific) Rail and the possible location of its customer service centre to our province. Would you tell us, please, if you've met personally with CP officials recently and of the chance we have for obtaining the 300 new jobs and the \$10 million payroll that comes with this centre?

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to the member that we have met on a number of occasions with CP officials. My understanding is my deputy has been on the phone a great deal to Mr. Ed Dodge in Vancouver. It's my understanding as well that our Premier of the province has met with the CP officials as well.

And I think it's fair to say at the meetings they are encouraged with the proposals that are being put forward by Saskatchewan and that Saskatchewan is being looked at favourably at this point, although no decision has been made.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I'm sure then that you and the Premier are aware that the service centre is simply the beginning. Further centralizations are now being considered by CP Rail that would mean the creation of a calling bureau equalling some hundred jobs, as well as the centralizing of all of their accounting as well as their administration functions, which is going to mean another 250 jobs. The province that gets the service centre gets everything.

I'm asking you, sir, if your department and the Department of Finance has calculated the difference in revenue generated by an additional 600-plus jobs, quality jobs, for our province, versus reducing the locomotive fuel tax by a few cents in order to make us competitive.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want the member to know that when she talks about the sales tax — she will know that the sales tax on a litre of diesel fuel for the railways is 15 cents per litre — and most of that tax was put on over the last 10 years. I believe when we left office in 1982 it was 1.9 cents per litre. It was increased from 1.9 cents per litre to 15

cents per litre under the previous administration. I just want to make that point.

Having said that, you will know that the tax adds up to a great deal of money for the provincial coffers. And you talk about it in terms of a few cents per litre; you're talking about tens of millions of dollars. And obviously when we're cutting taxes for the CP — you're suggesting we cut tens of millions of dollars in taxes for the CPR — we have to balance that off against other economic development in the province. And we have put together a package that I think is very attractive.

But you shouldn't mitigate by saying a few cents per litre when in fact you're talking about tens of millions of dollars in tax cuts for the CPR. I'm not saying that we shouldn't do that or should do it, I'm just saying be accurate and honest with the public when you talk about what a few cents per litre means.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I understand, Mr. Minister, what you're saying then is that you and your department, as well as the Department of Finance, has done this comparison and that the \$10 million payroll that would come with the 300 new jobs, plus the millions of dollars of payroll that would come with the in excess of 350 other new jobs, plus the benefits and the spinoffs that would come with this, that that in fact is less than what you would get if you left the 15 cents per litre fuel tax in place.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Yes, we certainly have looked at the benefits that would accrue from having jobs coming to Saskatchewan and weighed that against the \$2 million per year that each cent of reduction would mean to railway fuel and these are the kinds of calculations that go on all the time. I'm sure Manitoba is doing the same thing right now.

And you will know that if you were to remove the sales tax of 15 cents per litre, you would be reducing the income of the government of Saskatchewan by \$30 million a year. And that's not for one year; that's ongoing over a term of office of four years. You're talking about \$120 million in reduced taxes.

And so obviously you do weigh these things out. And I just add again that you shouldn't simplify, taking a very simplistic approach to this, that it's a few cents a litre. You're talking about \$120 million over a term to remove the fuel tax on diesel fuel, that's for railways alone.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, I'm not talking about removing 15 cents per litre of fuel tax; I'm talking about a few cents. The next province, the province with the highest fuel tax next to our own, is at 13 cents a litre. The average in Canada of the provinces is 6.6 cents per litre. So we're not talking about removing all 15 cents per litre, Mr.

Minister.

Your job, sir, is to sell the merits of our province by convincing businesses — be it CP Rail or others — that our tax structure is fair and that it's competitive.

And I'd like to know what you're doing to ensure that Saskatchewan people already employed with CP Rail, those who are at risk of losing their jobs, and there are 61 of those people with a \$2 million payroll, as well as those people in our province who want high quality jobs — I'm sure there are more than 650 people in Saskatchewan looking for high-paying jobs — what are you doing, sir, to ensure that our tax system in this province is considered fair and considered competitive?

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the member opposite that we are working very diligently on this project, and we have had a great number of meetings going back all the way, for the member's information, to last fall. I believe our first contact was in October of 1992 or September of '92. We have had numerous meetings at official levels as well as ministerial level. And the Premier, as I mentioned, has met with CP to discuss this issue.

The real competition for this project of course, as you probably know, comes from Manitoba. There is a couple of cents difference per litre in the taxation, that's true, but Manitoba has a payroll tax, which makes it difficult for them to locate there as well.

So I'm saying to you that in working this out, you have to realize that the tax structure, while a small amount higher in Saskatchewan than Manitoba, CP is also looking at the fact that Manitoba has a payroll tax that they will have to be involved in if they were to go to Manitoba.

So the key here is, is to put together a package that is attractive, knowing that we have a \$15 billion debt and a tax on railway fuel that was jacked up from 1.9 cents per litre to 15 cents a litre under the previous administration.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, when you're faced with either reducing the highest locomotive fuel tax in Canada or creating hundreds of quality jobs, why would you choose to keep the Tories' unfair tax system?

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I say again to the member opposite that we're looking at all the options and I'm not ruling out any options at this point. And obviously, the Minister of Finance is quoted accurately that we're looking at ways and means of modifying taxes, making them equitable in order to attract business to Saskatchewan — as we did in last year's budget by reducing small business tax from 10 to 9 per cent.

And so over time, as we can afford it with the load of \$15 billion hanging over our head, try to balance out

where we are at in trying to solve the debt problem with trying to put a tax system in place that makes it easier for business to do business in Saskatchewan.

And I think you'll see that at every step that we're doing that. IPSCO is pleased with changes that were made. Hitachi is pleased with changes that were made. Sears is pleased. We're now working specifically with CP, and if our other record on Hitachi and IPSCO and Sears, if it works — and there's no guarantees in this — we will get the jobs. But to simply say all you have to do is remove the tax from CP and the jobs will come, I say is simplistic and isn't living in the real world.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I'm hearing what you're saying, Mr. Minister. I think that you're agreeing that Saskatchewan needs to be able to compete and that the current tax system in our province really can be considered by some to not create a level playing-field.

As many as 650 or more jobs and all their benefits and all their spin-offs are going to depend on whether or not this government recognizes that we don't have a level playing-field when it comes to taxation in our province. It is affecting investment; it's affecting our ability to be competitive. And many, many people other than myself are saying this. They don't consider it a simplistic view at all, sir.

Will you commit today — and I think I heard a glimmer of this — that you will level out the playing-field and in fact reduce the locomotive fuel tax in Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well obviously here again in doing technical negotiations with a company that's thinking about moving to the province, it would be less than responsible for you and I to do the bargaining on the floor of the Assembly. The injection of politics at this level to try to improve your standing, which after recent events are, to say the least, slipping; also at the federal level recent pollings would indicate that . . . But what I'm saying is to try to negotiate a complicated deal like this in a simplistic fashion on the floor of the Assembly isn't the way it works.

But what I can say is that in our tax policy, even with a \$15 billion debt, we were able to adjust the taxes to allow Hitachi to expand. We were able to adjust them slightly to allow Sears to move 900 jobs, most of them from out of province, to Saskatchewan. With the small changes, both IPSCO and Hitachi, as I mentioned, were able to come to Saskatchewan and to expand.

And I might add, Mr. Speaker, before I take my place, that if you look at the agriculture machinery manufacturing in the province at this point in 1993 compared to 1992, whether you look at Flexi-Coil in Saskatoon, where the employment has gone from 400 to 800, if you would look at Schulte manufacturing, if you look at the manufacturing based in Yorkton or Brandt here in Regina, you'll find that almost all of

the machinery manufacturing is up and up considerably under this administration. So I would, if I were you, I would quit preaching . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Next question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Haverstock: — Mr. Minister, the gentleman to your left is the one who has preached the most gloom and doom throughout the entire province of Saskatchewan, and everyone knows it. I think one of the things that we have to do is to offer some hope to the people of our province. And on Thursday next many, many people in this province have been led to believe that there are going to be tax increases, Mr. Minister — not some reasonable form of looking at taxation that can make people feel that they can be competitive and invest in this province and have jobs in this province.

I don't think it's simplistic in the least, and I think it rather flippant to talk in such a way when there are people worried — 61 individuals worried about losing their jobs and the \$2 million payroll that comes with that in this province. What we need in Saskatchewan are more people who can pay more taxes, not the kinds of people who are here who simply have to pay more and more and more and you can't get anything more out of them.

So we need 650 more jobs in this province. All that I'm asking from you today is some kind of assurance that you're doing your very, very best to ensure that we can have a level playing-field in this province and continue to have some commitment to stopping the kind of tax attack that you have on the people of Saskatchewan. Could you answer that please, sir?

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Clearly the member opposite is dealing with an issue that is a top priority of our government, and that is attracting jobs to Saskatchewan and creating jobs within the province by small- and medium-sized business.

But obviously I want to be clear that your idea . . . and you haven't been specific on how many cents you would suggest that it be reduced, or how many millions of dollars of taxpayers' money you would move from the CP (Canadian Pacific) onto the backs of other Saskatchewan residents. And I'd be interested in knowing where you would raise and replace that tax from in the initial stages.

But it's fair to say that in dealing with economic development, I think our record in attracting a number of successful businesses to the province and for allowing many businesses to expand, stands on its own.

Whether or not CP move to Saskatchewan in the end and move their centre to the province will depend of course on the kind of attitude the people of the province have as well as the taxation system. And I would just urge you to become more positive about Saskatchewan than the gloom and doom I've been

hearing from you over the last couple of months.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Haverstock: — Mr. Speaker, it's becoming quite humorous actually for most of us hearing all of this so-called gloom and doom from myself.

You're wondering from where I would move some of the taxes in Saskatchewan. I would like very much to have available to me so many of your staff, sir, whose job it is to find out exactly those kinds of things.

And, Mr. Minister, we know that you in fact have been at the employ of the taxpayers of Saskatchewan for some 13 years, the Premier some 26 years, the Deputy Premier for some 22 years. That adds up to 61 years of salaries and benefits paid for by the taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

I would suggest that perhaps you go back to your department and find out how much they are determining would be of benefit to the people of Saskatchewan. That if in fact we removed some of the locomotive fuel tax, what did they determine to be the most appropriate amount that we could reduce by and actually make some money by people being employed in our province?

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — I want to say to the member opposite that obviously putting together a package like this that will attract businesses to the province — in this case, CPR and their call centre — that putting together a package that maximizes the number of jobs but yet keeps as much of the revenue being generated as possible is key to economic development. And we're looking at that, and we're dealing with it, and our staff are working on it diligently.

As to the fact that I have been elected for a number of terms, I don't apologize for that any more than you would apologize for your salary coming through third-party government grants while you work at the university. And obviously you've lived off the taxpayers for many, many years and other of your family members as well. To get into that kind of a childish debate here, I don't think adds anything to the issue of CPR.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Highway Workers' Strike

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — The Minister of Highways will know that much of our province has been subjected to a severe winter storm. It started last night and has gone through the day. This has provided for some very dangerous driving conditions, Mr. Speaker. And it's odd, but the employees of the Department of Highways have decided that this is the right time to go on strike.

Mr. Minister, we on this side of the House feel that this is exactly the wrong time for your employees to go on strike because they have literally put the lives of thousands of motorists and their safety at great risk.

To the Premier, I'll ask the question, Mr. Speaker: what action has the government taken to get these employees back on to the job so that safe conditions for the motoring public can be returned.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Saskatchewan is of course a democracy and as in the case of any democracy, working people have the right to withdraw their services. And I know you support that idea and we on this side of the House support that idea as do all Canadians.

Now for today with this storm there are highway workers on strike, but the Highways department has people — out-of-scope people, management people, and others — on the roads, on the roads ensuring that the main arteries are open. And we expect that the situation is going to be manageable.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — Well, Mr. Speaker, thank you. To the Minister of Justice: it seems odd to me that the Minister of Justice would say that management can handle all the problems at the heaviest workload period that we would have for the Department of Highways. And it rises the question in my mind, Mr. Minister: why do we have the other workers at all then? Shouldn't maybe we just get rid of them all and we'll just let management carry on?

I know that the front benches of the government, Mr. Speaker, now in cabinet, they don't have to drive through this mess; they'll simply either sit here in Regina or fly over it in their airplane. They don't have to put up with what the ordinary people are putting up with, Mr. Speaker.

Why don't you recognize the plight, Mr. Minister, of the ordinary people in this province instead of the powerful unions? Or have you become so completely isolated to their needs that you can't see the needs of anyone else?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Good heavens, Mr. Speaker. I don't know how to characterize that question that would fall within the rules of this House.

I thought that the member had a clear understanding that in any democracy working people have a right to withdraw their services — that's fundamental. Collective bargaining is part of our way of life and part of collective bargaining is the right to strike. And you don't panic at the first sign of any difficulty and suddenly take away that right to strike.

We're watching the situation very carefully. We have

arranged for as many people as possible to be on the equipment today, as the day goes on, to ensure that the arteries are open. Now if the member knows of any particular situation where the road isn't open and the situation becomes dangerous, I expect that I would hear from him during the course of the day. But if the member is suggesting that working people in this province shouldn't have the right to withdraw their services, then I'd certainly be interested in knowing that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well the Minister of Justice can know it right now. I'm saying exactly what you've just said: in a crisis situation, people should not have the right to strike. When the other people's lives are put on the line and they're going to die because of your arrogance and lack of understanding of the needs out in the country, then it's time somebody got up and told you that there's a time that strikes have got to come to an end, and this is it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — I hope that you will recognize that priority today. And, Mr. Minister, your Minister of Highways should know exactly what the conditions are out on those highways better than I do, although I had to drive on them this morning. And I can tell you there are no highway trucks to be seen. And there are places where there are trucks upside down. There are accidents on the highway. How many accidents have there been, Mr. Minister, today? And how many people have been injured?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Well we're awfully glad, Mr. Minister, that the member from Maple Creek was able to make it in this morning, and we'll try and ensure that the road will be ploughed out in case he wants to go home tonight.

And is he suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that yesterday when the the weather was fine, then highway workers could strike but today they can't strike? And if tomorrow's a nice day, then they can strike? I mean you can't run a system like that. People either have the right to strike or they don't.

We would have hoped that the SGEU (Saskatchewan Government Employees' Union) would have ensured that there was a basic level of service for all of the areas where emergencies might arise. But we can't control that. We can't control that. We can't control that. This is kind of an upside down strike in that sense.

Usually a public sector strike, there's a strike across the service but some effort is made to provide emergency services. In this case it seems to be the vulnerable situations where the pressure is being put upon us. But we can take that. We want to be a responsible employer, and responsible employers have to take strikes when they come along. We're doing our best to settle it at the bargaining table,

which is where it has to be settled. And that's what we're trying to do even today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I think that the minister has failed to recognize that there is a more important right in every place in the democratic world. That's the right to live in safety and not to have your life jeopardized by people who go out on strike just at the time when they know that it will cost the most misery.

Now there is a solution, Mr. Minister; there is a precedence. And for very speedy action we could have back-to-work legislation. That's been done before and it could be done today. Would you consider bringing back back-to-work legislation and leave this . . . by leave this afternoon, with the opposition agreeing, to pass through all of the stages. We can't afford, Mr. Minister, to take a chance on losing any more lives in this province or having anybody else injured because the roads aren't cleared at the proper time when people expect them to be.

People out of our province don't know we've got a strike. They come sailing through and hit a snow drift, and they're dead. That's not fair and it's not right, And I'm asking you to cooperate with us. Will you act today?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — I want to say two things in response, Mr. Speaker. The first is that as I told the member in the answer to the first question that he asked, we do have management personnel in charge of the equipment and we believe that they will be able to manage this situation.

The second thing I'd like to say is that the forecast for this storm does not indicate that we've a storm of long . . . that's likely to endure for any significant period of time. So we're not up against a situation that's going to be a problem tomorrow. We expect that tomorrow will not be a problem at all.

Now I know the member is genuinely concerned. When he raises these questions I know that he is genuinely concerned and I'm telling the member that we think we're able to manage the situation. We think we have the resources and the people to do it. But even with all of the highway workers back at work when the snow is falling like it has today, it's pretty hard for anybody to keep the road clear, but we'll do the very best we can.

And as I say, this is not a storm that's likely to last long, so I don't think we have to resort to the drastic action that the member has suggested.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 32 — An Act to amend The Family

Maintenance Act

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the Bill to amend The Family Maintenance 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. 33 — An Act respecting Security Interests in Personal Property and making Consequential and Related Amendments to Certain Other Acts

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill respecting Security Interests in Personal Property and making Consequential and Related Amendments to Certain Other Acts 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. 34 — An Act to amend The SaskEnergy Act

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, I move a Bill to amend The SaskEnergy Act now be introduced and read for the first time.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, as it relates to question no. 4 put by the member from Saskatoon Greystone, I would request it be converted to a motion for return (debatable).

The Speaker: — Motions for returns (debatable), no. 84.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 25 — An Act to repeal The Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation Act

Hon. Mr. Penner: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to move second reading of An Act to repeal The Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation Act.

The Saskatchewan Mining and Development Corporation, better known as SMDC, was created by an order in council on June 4, 1974 and continued under The Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation Act, 1977. The initial emphasis for this Crown corporation in 1974 was in exploration, particularly for uranium in northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, in 1988 the previous administration privatized SMDC's operation by merging both SMDC and the federal Crown corporation, Eldorado Nuclear

Ltd., into the Cameco Corporation. Substantially all of SMDC's assets, contracts, and net working capital were transferred to this newly created company in return for sixty-one and a half per cent of Cameco's common shares.

Furthermore, with subsequent dispositions of shares, SMDC's holdings in Cameco have dropped to 38.9 per cent. As a result, SMDC evolved into simply a holding company for these shares. And now SMDC exists on paper for one reason only, and that is as a holding company for the province's interests in Cameco.

The Crown Investments Corporation currently administers all the operations of SMDC. Therefore our government believes our interests in Cameco should be transferred to the Crown Investments Corporation in order for it to directly handle this investment.

The repeal of this Act will save the taxpayers of this province the added expense of separate administrative costs to maintain the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 25, An Act to repeal The Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation Act.

Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the NDP administration for the recognition of the fact that SMDC is only a holding company.

I do hope that the . . . really the only reason that they're doing this is to save a little bit of money and not hide the transactions of this holding company in the Crown Investments Corporation.

I will assume that the minister will be able to report to the Legislative Assembly about the Crown Investments Corporation and the holdings that would be in SMDC and that we could have access to the kinds of information we've had before, but in this new kind of arrangement.

I would also point out that the general public has certainly benefited by the fact that Eldorado Nuclear and SMDC were able to come together to form a brand-new company.

As the hon. member knows, Cameco is doing really well. It is exporting and processing. In fact it is the largest mining and processing . . . uranium processing company in the world. We now have shareholders worldwide. People who have been from Germany, France, United States, Japan, and others can come into the province of Saskatchewan.

Cameco was publicly traded and as a result it is allowed for people in various parts of the globe to invest and to watch the people of Saskatchewan. It is quite open. And indeed it has been profitable.

Recently I can say, Mr. Speaker, that we now have seen firsthand the opportunity to export uranium into

the Pacific Rim and more particularly into Taiwan. And that will mean in the neighbourhood from 50 to \$100 million more sales into that country.

And as a result Cameco, because it is publicly traded and because people have confidence that it will stay publicly traded and this move today will ensure and help people believe that the NDP will not nationalize or try to nationalize that company, it bodes very well for the international recognition of a Saskatchewan-based trading company that is now traded publicly in the Toronto exchanges and recognized in Tokyo, New York, Toronto, London, various places throughout the globe.

I will also point out that the Cameco Corporation is building a reputation now of being a company that is looking at the newest technology. It certainly is marketing well on the international markets. And if we can have the support of the administration in encouraging more and more companies to do this, then in fact we will end up with some benefits that are a little bit difficult, perhaps, for the NDP administration to recognize but it can lead to things like AECL (Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd.) coming to the province of Saskatchewan.

So we not only have Eldorado Nuclear here with SMDC, now combined into a very large company; we not only now have large sales coming through because of changes encouraged by Cameco and encouraged by the federal government to sell internationally in the Pacific Rim, countries like Taiwan, but as well as Korea and Japan and Singapore and other major jurisdictions, but in fact, we can encourage more and more of the processing and energy-related, high-tech jobs and activities like AECL, coming to the province of Saskatchewan.

So indeed, Saskatchewan would not only be the largest mining, uranium mining jurisdiction in Canada and one of the largest in the world, it is now associated with a company that is the largest processing and marketing jurisdiction any place, and this company's headquartered here.

It is now tied to sales all over the world and it is linked now to even more and more energy development. Because in my recent trips for example, looking at the possibilities of sales in Taiwan, in China, in other jurisdictions, they asked about the attitude of Saskatchewan people towards nuclear development; uranium research; having AECL move to the province of Saskatchewan; CANDU 3's (Canadian deuterium uranium); the marketing arm; and I could say quite clearly that now the NDP administration support the mining of uranium. They support publicly traded shares because indeed they have now repealed the old SMDC Act.

(1445)

They support AECL coming to the province of Saskatchewan. They support the marketing of CANDUs internationally, and I'd like to point out, before I take my place, Mr. Speaker, that in fact it looks

like we could have CANDU sales and new CANDU sales in the Pacific Rim. And I was just a little disappointed to find out that the Premier of the province says, no CANDUs because we have no money.

Well I will point out to the hon. member, because we changed SMDC to put it into the real public sector, that is allow people to invest in it, there is money there. And because we market internationally, billions of dollars are now being paid for CANDU reactors internationally that can come into the province of Saskatchewan. In fact it is 1.5 billion per CANDU just in new investments. Now Saskatchewan hasn't got a lot of that money to date but we can begin to get that money.

So I would say that I'm very supportive of the arguments, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP will stand up now and say, well I guess we'll finish the privatization of SMDC. Looks like Cameco is doing well; looks like uranium mining is doing well; uranium processing is doing well; AECL is moving to the province of Saskatchewan. We like that very much.

We have new uranium sales in various countries like Taiwan and new ways to do it. And now we have the potential for CANDU sales even in the Pacific Rim that could generate billions and billions of investment, not from Saskatchewan people but from international sources, that would mean thousands and indeed tens of thousands of jobs for Saskatchewan people.

So I would recommend to the minister that he do and he does remind the Premier, who was very negative on CANDU here the other day because he said they had no money there, the CANDU money comes from offshore. International uranium purchases come from offshore. That money is not generated here.

We sell uranium and sell CANDUs and sell this technology all over the world. And as a result of this piece of legislation, now Saskatchewan people are into the 21st century with a new financial instrument, with an attitude and indeed frankly a reputation that even the NDP, even the socialist party in the province of Saskatchewan now, kicking and screaming, has had to endorse nuclear development, uranium, public share offerings, and the privatization of a once Crown corporation that the previous administration borrowed money to put together and they were going to nationalize this industry.

So from my vantage point, as long as they keep giving us full public information and don't hide it in CIC (Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan), I think this is a good move. I would certainly endorse people in Saskatchewan.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Devine: — And the hon. member says, hear, hear. Well right. To get the NDP to admit that nuclear development and uranium mining and publicly traded companies and the privatization of SMDC in

this legislature, for heaven's sake, Mr. Speaker, that's fairly historic. And for them to say: hear, hear, is double historic.

So I would just congratulate them for recognizing the facts of the contemporary world and I'd hope that they continue to look at opportunities like this, whether it's in SGI, whether it's in energy, whether it's in other corporations, because in fact you can start to have a reputation that you indeed are open for business, open for investment. And in fact money can come from across the world, not just from the taxpayers in the province of Saskatchewan.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Johnson: — Mr. Speaker, in supporting this Bill I'd like to say just a few words on it that, I believe, should be said in the Assembly; that in removing from the legislation SMDC we are in fact really cleaning up a mess that was left by the opposition when they left government. It's really a Bill of condemnation to the previous administration's ability to maintain a structure in the province of Saskatchewan.

If you take a look at some of the economic figures over a period of say the last 40 years, you'll see that in the '80s we started to slip from a province that had actually a net investment — government investment where you had reserves over and above the borrowing — into a situation where the opposite is the case. And this is just simply one of those pieces of legislation that indicate that.

In the vernacular in rural Saskatchewan there's a little saying that goes something like this: that the job isn't done until the paperwork is completed. And in that particular case, we're completing the paperwork for an administration that couldn't even finish a job that it started out to do.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too would like to take a moment and make a few comments on this Bill which repeals the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the member that this Bill effectively closes down the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation. In actuality, Mr. Speaker, SMDC was redundant; it was defunct since 1988. So this Bill, as the member said, is more or less doing the paperwork.

Mr. Speaker, in October of 1988 Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation and Eldorado Nuclear merged, and they formed a company called Cameco. The provincial Crown corporation and federal Crown corporation formed Cameco that some people now refer to as the uranium giant.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when it was formed it inherited a debt of \$650 million. That debt was cut in half by

1991. That was only three short years later, Mr. Speaker. And I would say, just imagine cutting a debt of \$650 million in half in three short years. I think, Mr. Speaker, says a lot for the forming of that company.

I would like to provide a few details to this Assembly on Cameco in its copy form by SMDC, which the Bill repeals. And I quote this, Mr. Speaker:

Cameco . . . is (now) one of the world's largest, low-cost integrated uranium producers. It operates and owns two-thirds of two of the world's largest, high-grade uranium mines in northern Saskatchewan and obtains a share of production from a third Saskatchewan mine. With its processing facilities in Ontario, Cameco is Canada's only supplier of nuclear fuel conversion services. Cameco reported net earnings in 1991 of \$47.9 million compared to \$91.6 million in 1990.

That's the end of the quote, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, that would seem to be a lot of bragging about Cameco — a whole lot of boasting and bragging, Mr. Speaker. And I would imagine that most of the NDP members would assume that I'm quoting from some Progressive Conservative document that brags up the fact that we were in power when Cameco was formed through the 1988 merger of SMDC and Eldorado.

But the truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, I am actually quoting excerpts from a Crown Investments Corporation 1991 annual report. The annual report of which the member from Regina Churchill Downs was responsible, or was at that time of the printing of the annual report.

How ironic that the NDP, the same party that condemned uranium mining, now brags up a uranium mining giant like Cameco. And this is relevant to this Bill, a Bill which repeals SMDC, a Crown corporation that formed Cameco back in 1988.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to now quote an STV (SaskWest Television) news report, dated March 8, 1990, and I quote: uranium mining is something that the New Democratic Party does not approve of. Its policy is to slowly phase out all three Saskatchewan mines and prevent new ones from getting started. It has also promised to provide alternate employment for mine workers.

That was the NDP policy on uranium mining back in 1990. Mr. Speaker, that's a far cry from the praise that CIC's annual report is heaping on Cameco right now. A company that would be shut down, just like SMDC, if the NDP shut down uranium mining in northern Saskatchewan.

Well thank goodness, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP have no problem in breaking their promises. A broken promise in this regard is a good one.

And I want to quote a few quotes, Mr. Speaker, on uranium mining and how things seem to change. I quote: The key question in environment control

concerns uranium mining. Unlike my colleague from Saskatoon, I have concluded the use of uranium as a source of energy is inevitable. I do not deny the problems associated with its use; I simply see no other alternative in the short term.

Ned Shillington, the budget of '81-82, and I'm quoting, Mr. Speaker.

I go on. Another quote: when he was told that the NDP phase-out policy on uranium mining had workers concerned about their jobs, Allan Blakeney replied: I suppose at some future time they may have a worry.

That was by Allan Blakeney, CFQC open line in Saskatoon, November 7, 1985.

Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to see how people's minds change when something turns out good.

Another quote: phasing out uranium mining would do more harm for Saskatchewan than good. Bob Mitchell, NDP candidate, *Star-Phoenix*, November 28, 1983.

Another quote: I do not believe that Saskatchewan can necessarily cease the production of uranium in Saskatchewan. Allan Blakeney, *Hansard*, March 17, 1980.

Another quote, Mr. Speaker: the Saskatchewan sale of the uranium overseas is an immoral act — an act over which the people of Saskatchewan may weep 20 years from now. Peter Prebble, *Hansard*, 1979.

Kind of all over the map. I don't know . . . Everyone has a different idea what's good for Saskatchewan, what's good for Canada, and what's good for people in the uranium industry. I go on to quote. This was in the *Briarpatch*: the NDP passed a very tough resolution on stopping uranium mining. It is conceivable at the time of the next election, and if you win, that mines at Cigar Lake and at the 5th, 6th, and 7th mines at Collins Bay will be in operation. Will you shut them down? This is a question.

Romanow: My position is simply that the party . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. Order. Just a clarification. Using member's names . . . If the member's name is contained in the quote, you can use the member's name; otherwise you must refer to their constituency. You can't say that so-and-so said this. Then you have to refer to the Premier said this or the member from Riversdale said this; otherwise you would be out of order. Just a clarification.

Mr. Britton: — Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was under the impression I could quote, and I thank you for the ruling.

I will go on: my position is simply that the party leader's job and the caucus job is to implement party policy. That is party policy. And so far as it can be implemented, when we are in office, it, like other

party policies, will be implemented. Interview with the now Leader of the NDP Party, the Premier.

Mr. Speaker, I will dispense from any more quotations . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member from Churchill Downs don't like it because we catch him with egg on his face so many times. And that's fair ball. I suggest maybe he should go and play with his toys, the toy minister . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That was your own definition, sir.

Mr. Speaker, I think I'll carry on a little bit here. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest a broken promise in this regard. We on this side of the House find that's a good promise to break because it was a bad promise to make. As the quotes I quoted to you indicate, Mr. Speaker, there's been a 180 degree turn-around. And we on this side of the House applaud them for making that.

(1500)

I would say rather than shut down the uranium mines up North which would devastate the economy of our northern communities by increasing unemployment, the NDP government should be, and I think they are, approving new mines. And I congratulate them for this flip-flop, Mr. Speaker. As I said, generally speaking, a flip-flop is not something that we would congratulate the government for, but in this case this is one of the promises that the NDP made that I don't mind being broken.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the Premier, this is a good time to break a promise. And I think that it should be quite easy because you're getting quite good at it and you have a lot of practice.

And I say it is also good because SMDC is no longer a Crown corporation — hasn't been for a long time. But this repeal will make it official.

The NDP government that was so against uranium mining has approved an underground exploration project at Cameco's McArthur River site. I understand that's been approved, Mr. Speaker. And again I say that is the right direction to go.

If there is an unexplored frontier in Canada, I suggest to you it is in the North. I also suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, if I was a young man looking for a future, I think I'd be looking into the North. I believe that's where the action is going to be. So we commend the government for at least having the foresight to change their mind and get on with the business of developing the North.

The news release that was put out by the NDP government states that there are several proposed sites. And once they are approved, there may be more uranium mines in northern Saskatchewan. This again is good news. This is good.

This is the kind of news, Mr. Speaker, that should be going out to the people of Saskatchewan, not the gloom and doom that we hear from the minister out in

Melville telling people that we're a basket case. This is the kind of news that I think should have been in the throne speech. This is the kind of news that brings people . . . brings their hopes up. So I say again, it's marvellous news because it's showing that the NDP do not now oppose uranium mining. That does two things. It brings up the hopes of the people looking for work, Mr. Speaker, and it gives the mining industry a feeling of security. No business can feel secure when they feel that they're bucking up against their own government.

Mr. Speaker, it gives the people of Saskatchewan some hope and it gives the people the hope that they will not do another flip-flop on the same development; that they will continue on developing the nuclear technology in this province. And I wanted to say that, Mr. Speaker, because I do believe this is the right move.

We saw, Mr. Speaker, an effective flip on uranium mining. There was a flip-flop on the AECL agreement. Well maybe we'll soon see the member from Regina Elphinstone announce the CANDU reactor is pending in the province. Maybe we'll see that. This would be a major development.

Imagine the boost to our economy, Mr. Speaker, the jobs that would be created. And without jobs, without people earning money, paying taxes, this province will not pull itself out of the crisis we're in. There is no way, there is no way the debt will be reduced by unemployed people. We know that. We have to employ them.

The previous government, Mr. Speaker, knew that too. We did spend some money trying to develop business for people, jobs for people. I would point out in one case, up at the Weyerhaeuser pulp mill that went from 600 people to 1,100 after they put the paper . . . 1,100 all good, unionized jobs, good paying jobs. That's the kind of thing that'll pay off the debt — not taxing people out of the province, not shutting down business — creating business. And I hope that they have finally opened their eyes, Mr. Speaker.

Speaking of open their eyes, it reminds me of the story of a little boy. He had five kittens and he was standing on the street corner and he was selling these kittens. His sales pitch was, NDP kittens for sale, \$5. He was saying this and the parish priest came along and he said, you know young fellow, he said, I appreciate your entrepreneurialship, but I'm wondering if you should be using that kind of an approach.

And he went on his way and about 10 days later the same parish priest came back past the same corner and the same young fellow was trying to sell these 10 kittens . . . 5 kittens. He said: Progressive Conservative kittens for sale — \$10 apiece. The same priest said to him, he said: you know, young fellow, I appreciate your entrepreneurialship but I still wonder if you should be using that approach. And why, 10 days ago you were \$5, today they're 10? He said: well, Father, these kittens have their eyes open.

That's what I'm saying to those opposite. I hope you have your eyes open now to what makes an industry run; what makes a province run. It is not driving people out; it is not shutting down business; it is creating business, creating jobs for people to work and to pay their taxes.

Mr. Speaker, this would be a major development. It would be welcome news to the people of Saskatchewan. But I digress again.

This Bill repeals the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation. Cameco has had its share of problems over the years — problems in court over environmental matters and problems with contract talks. One of the most recent problems deals with the end uses of uranium.

These are just growing pains, Mr. Speaker, that I'm pleased to think most businesses have to expect in a growing business.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to get into a debate on the end uses of uranium so maybe I should wrap up my remarks by moving . . . Mr. Speaker, I would like to move:

That this Assembly now move to consideration of Bill 10.

Seconded by the member from Souris-Cannington.

The Speaker: — Call in the members.

Order. Will the members please come to order?

Just for the information of the members, my understanding is that some of the bells are working, others are not working. However, I think those that are working, members will be able to hear those. And what I intend to do now is to put into effect a 10-minute recess and in 10 minutes time we will have the vote on the division. As of now.

The Assembly recessed for a period of time.

The division bells rang from 3:18 p.m. until 3:28 p.m.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 8

Swenson	Britton
Neudorf	D'Autremont
Martens	Goohsen
Boyd	Haverstock

Nays — 32

Van Mulligen	Johnson
Shillington	Trew
Anguish	Draper
Goulet	Sonntag
Kowalsky	Flavel
Carson	Roy
Mitchell	Cline
MacKinnon	Scott

Penner	McPherson
Upshall	Kujawa
Koenker	Crofford
Lyons	Stanger
Lautermilch	Kluz
Calvert	Renaud
Murray	Langford
Hamilton	Jess

I note, Mr. Speaker, looking at the “Monthly Statistical Review” from February on page 12, that the production of uranium in the province was up almost 100 per cent from the third quarter of 1991 to the third quarter of 1992. And that is a very positive signal to the families who depend on the uranium mines for employment, either directly or indirectly, as a result of the spin-off benefits of that very new industry and important industry.

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it’s certainly a pleasure to be able to speak on this Bill. This Bill marks the end of the process of privatizing the uranium industry in Saskatchewan. It also marks the first time the NDP Party has had to admit that uranium mining and development is good for the people of Saskatchewan, good for Saskatchewan taxpayers, and indeed good for the entire world, Mr. Speaker.

Congratulations — congratulations to the previous administration for their foresight in uranium development, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as you know, this process has not been an easy one — not easy at all. The NDP Party has fought nuclear development and uranium development, uranium mining, at every turn, Mr. Speaker.

This Bill, Mr. Speaker, marks the admission — the admission by the NDP government — that privatization of Saskatchewan’s uranium resource industry must be acknowledged as a reality, a fact of life, a good thing, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, for the NDP Party it must be an unpleasant task to have to admit that reality, Mr. Speaker. Regardless of what they say now, there are a number of occasions when members opposite have stated that if they had the financial room, they would re-nationalize uranium mines, Mr. Speaker.

NDP Party resolutions have always — always — until lately, been opposed to uranium development. The NDP desire was to shut down uranium development as soon as alternative jobs were found, were available. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, after all that has transpired, this government still dreams of one day buying up all the mines again.

Yet if we’d only look at the results of privatization, Mr. Speaker, they could see that great benefits are deriving from this privatization. Cameco is the company that succeeded the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation. And Cameco, Mr. Speaker, has been an impressive success story for the people of Saskatchewan.

Indeed there are three new uranium mines on the table for Saskatchewan; the possibility of an entire new and prosperous nuclear industry. These are the fruits of private sector investment, private sector involvement, Mr. Speaker. Although I must say, Mr. Speaker, that the privatization is not entirely complete and that is a matter that the people of Saskatchewan should be concerned about.

Mr. Speaker, the numbers are 1.5 million kilograms in the third quarter of 1991 to 2.9 million kilograms in 1992. Now that’s not quite doubling, but is very substantial. Very, very positive increase, Mr. Speaker.

And the increase happened, Mr. Speaker, after the creation of Cameco, which is a direct cause of the Bill before us now. Cameco is the largest uranium mining concern in the world, Mr. Speaker. It is the single largest player in the industry, and because of that it brings to this province an enormous amount of influence in the industry. Certainly an influence far greater than our population or size or economy alone would justify.

And along with that influence, Mr. Speaker, comes a great deal of responsibility. And I would be interested to hear from the member from Regina Rosemont as to what his thoughts are relative to this Bill on the end of the process of creating Cameco.

I would also be interested, Mr. Speaker, to hear from the Minister of Social Services in her capacity as a private member representing the people of Saskatchewan.

It would really encourage everyone in this legislature, Mr. Speaker, if they would get up and give their thoughts on the uranium industry to the people of Saskatchewan — and nuclear development. I think all of Saskatchewan taxpayers and all Saskatchewan people would be interested in their comments, those two members now, particularly as this Bill signals that the development will occur in the private sector.

You know, Mr. Speaker, regardless of how misguided Peter Prebble was, and is, the fact of the matter is he did not let this Assembly and the people . . . he did let the people of Saskatchewan know where he stood — in direct opposition to uranium development, in direct opposition to the government of today. He did not allow himself to be silenced by the member from Riversdale. And in fact on this issue of uranium mining, Peter Prebble stood and spoke at every opportunity presented to him in this House. If he were here today, Mr. Speaker, I would predict that Peter Prebble would again stand in his place and speak out against uranium development.

One would have to wonder, Mr. Speaker, where the member from Regina Rosemont is on this important question, Mr. Speaker.

But the NDP benches have fallen silent, Mr. Speaker, on this issue of uranium mining since Peter Prebble was defeated. Not a single member, Mr. Speaker, not

a single member, like the member from Regina Rosemont, has stood in his place and commented on uranium development in this House since it's reconvened or since the election, Mr. Speaker. Every single opportunity that has been presented to him to speak on this important issue, he has declined, Mr. Speaker.

And I think it's important that the people of Saskatchewan know where that member stands on this important question. Where will that member vote on this important question of the finalization of the privatization of Cameco?

The NDP members, Mr. Speaker, do not wish to avail themselves of this opportunity to be forthright with this Assembly and with the people of Saskatchewan with respect to uranium mining. And as misguided as Peter Prebble is on this issue, you have to render him respect for not hiding behind the government's majority, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the position of the opposition is well-known in this Assembly and in the province, and I'm proud to stand behind that policy — a policy, Mr. Speaker, which is well underlined by this Bill now before the Assembly. So, Mr. Speaker, on one hand I do commend the government for presenting this Bill as it does illustrate a belief on their part that the uses for a Crown corporation in the uranium mining industry are long dead, Mr. Speaker.

I do have one specific concern about this Bill, Mr. Speaker, in that the government still does own a significant interest in Cameco, and the passage of this Bill may have some accountability implications for the management of those shares.

I was a little concerned, Mr. Speaker, when I read one of the reasons given by the minister for the repeal of The Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation Act was that it would eliminate the need for a separate accounting of the government's shares in Cameco. There's something to be said for a separate annual report in that it provides a direct opportunity for the members of the Assembly to focus on the uranium mining industry — shares, and government accountability for the management of those shares, Mr. Speaker.

So this Bill is not a complete rose garden, Mr. Speaker, but it is certainly a big step forward, a big step forward for Saskatchewan and a giant leap forward for the NDP Party, Mr. Speaker. This Bill represents however, the principle that we have completed a major chapter in our history in shifting responsibility for our economy to the private sector from the government sector, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this Bill sets the stage for a tremendous economic growth in the uranium and nuclear industries. After passage of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, the only thing standing in our way will be the government wishing to pursue future opportunities for our people.

Mr. Speaker, let's just touch for a moment on the opportunities that come with this moment of transition. It was amusing, Mr. Speaker, to see the Premier of Saskatchewan saying in a paper that his province cannot avail itself to the nuclear opportunity because the economy is in poor condition. He did not say, Mr. Speaker, that he is opposed to a nuclear power plant. He said he couldn't proceed with a CANDU because the economy was in rough shape.

Now let's just think that through for a minute, Mr. Speaker. We have no jobs in the province, so we must not try to create any jobs. Is that what the Premier is saying? Our economic condition is poor so we must not try to improve the economy. It's truly a strange position for a government, Mr. Speaker, and especially strange for a Premier from the city of Saskatoon, a city which stands to benefit so greatly from nuclear development, Mr. Speaker.

Consider, Mr. Speaker, the absurdity of a premier saying his province is in desperate need of jobs but our one economic basis for job creation that no one disputes, the greatest hope, cannot be assessed because we have not enough jobs.

Mr. Speaker, it's not a matter of having insufficient funds. The fact is that the private sector in Saskatchewan has already expressed a clear enthusiasm to proceed with nuclear development without the financial participation of the Government of Saskatchewan. What's more, Mr. Speaker, is the huge volumes of dollars available from the federal government if the province were to pursue this exciting new development and opportunity.

I'm not certain what the numbers are now, Mr. Speaker, but at one point I was told that there was a billion dollars worth of federal money on the table if the province were to agree to a CANDU 3 nuclear reactor — a billion dollars of federal investment married to private investors in the province and possibly even to the participation of the power utility of the city of Saskatchewan.

With those kinds of dollars coming into the province, the Premier might expect to see some kind of job creation — job creation that we desperately need in this province; some kind of wealth generation; some kind of wealth creation the province of Saskatchewan desperately needs. But instead, instead of pursuing that tremendous opportunity, Mr. Speaker, we have a Premier unable to cope with the opposition within his own party. So he says we cannot proceed due to the very poor economic development problems we have, something he is unable to cure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we do commend the Premier for disowning his party when he decided to re-sign the AECL agreement. And we applaud him and his colleagues for setting aside, Mr. Speaker, setting aside their unfounded opposition to uranium development and setting aside their opposition to AECL coming into this province, something we heard a great deal about during the election campaign, Mr. Speaker.

At every opportunity that was available, the members of the NDP government spoke out against uranium development, and yet within months of taking office we commend them on changing their mind and looking forward and looking to the future of Saskatchewan. A giant flip-flop, but nevertheless a correct one, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier should use this opportunity presented by this Bill to go the next step and allow the development and construction of a CANDU nuclear three-generation plant in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP opponents to nuclear technology is based on the waste product that remains radioactive. And, Mr. Speaker, the extremists in their party have long held the contention that nuclear development would pose a great threat to all of humanity. And yet we see nuclear development all over the world, Mr. Speaker. And yet we see nuclear development all over the world and it hasn't been the downfall of humanity; it has indeed been the opportunity that humanity has been looking for in the 20th century.

(1545)

Mr. Speaker, the extremists in the NDP Party like to use the word radioactive. They use it to scare. They use it to scare, Mr. Speaker, the uneducated or the unsure about nuclear development. It is fairly easy to make the word scary since you are talking, Mr. Speaker, about something that cannot be seen, cannot be touched, or cannot be heard.

So by its nature the whole concept of radioactivity is easy to manipulate and easy to use in fear tactics. And that's something that the NDP Party has made a career of, an absolute career of scaring people, putting the fear of the problem into people — something they've been able to do through successive administrations ever since the province began, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the actual facts, it is not so scary and as frightening as the NDP would have you believe. Mr. Speaker, you may not realize, and members of the Assembly may not realize that you receive more radiation by wearing a see-in-the-dark watch than you do by standing in front of the door at a nuclear reactor.

What is more, Mr. Speaker, is that every human being generates radiations themselves internally, Mr. Speaker. It is not possible for a human being to be free of radiation. Even after death the human body continues to emit radiation. Because it is the most basic, Mr. Speaker. Radiation is in fact what all things are, all things in this universe. To be without radiation would be the same as being without any substance at all. And that, of course, is not possible in the physical world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not to say radiation is not dangerous. No one makes that admission, Mr. Speaker. At certain levels radiation is in fact dangerous, and exceedingly dangerous if handled

improperly or without due care. But, Mr. Speaker, almost all things are dangerous if not given the respect they deserve in their handling.

I invite the NDP members to examine the accident record of nuclear facilities, Mr. Speaker. Then compare that record to the accident record of almost any other human endeavour, Mr. Speaker. And even when such foolish and unnecessary tragedies as Chernobyl are included, Mr. Speaker, you find that the track record of uranium and nuclear industry are far better than the track record, for example, of accidents on our highways, Mr. Speaker.

The death toll on the highways of the world is truly enormous — staggering in fact when you compare it to the nuclear industry, Mr. Speaker. Yet I have not heard the NDP members calling for the elimination of automobiles and highways.

They say that . . . In spite of the fact, I'm reminded, Mr. Speaker, of the fact that they wanted to tear up highways in their last budget. They haven't called for the total elimination of them yet, just the ripping up of the pavement on the surface of them.

They say that accidents involved in automobiles are acceptable, given what society obtains from the existence of these machines and the infrastructure required to serve those machines.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, if the same NDP members choose to examine in detail the accident record of CANDU technology, they will find it has a better record than coalmining, a better record than the oil industry, a better record than the aircraft industry.

And there is a good comparison for this government, Mr. Speaker — the aircraft industry. This government went into enormous lengths to announce it had landed the Piper Aircraft deal. And of course, Mr. Speaker, that deal never landed but instead flew the coup. But the government did make that announcement.

All of us recall the glowing announcement that they made that the Piper deal was coming to Saskatchewan. And it didn't come and it never will come, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, did the government announce how many people are injured or killed in test piloting new aircraft? Did they announce the incidence of accidents in aircraft manufacturing plants? Do they do an industry analysis of workplace accidents and accidents involving the users of aircraft? No, Mr. Speaker, they did not do these things. And why not? Because they had no political forces pressuring them the way they do on uranium mining and nuclear development.

Mr. Speaker, in 1988 Cameco was formed through the merger between the provincial Crown, Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation, and the federal Crown, Eldorado Nuclear. In three years debt was greatly reduced by half, Mr. Speaker. Original debt

was around 600 million. In 1991 debt was about half that amount.

Cameco is one of the world's largest low-cost integrated uranium producers in the world. It operates and owns two-thirds of two of the world's largest high grade uranium mines in northern Saskatchewan.

In opposition and during election campaigning, NDP were bitterly opposed to those uranium mining developments, Mr. Speaker. Now that they are in power they are approving more, Mr. Speaker — they are approving more. Another NDP flip-flop, but this time a positive flip, Mr. Speaker.

It would seem logical that Cameco would prosper with the best uranium reserves in the world being in Saskatchewan. Also it seemed logical that AECL would develop technology here as well.

Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to note that the government now, when in opposition and during the election campaign they were so bitterly opposed to uranium development, and yet we see on February 5, 1993, Mr. Speaker, a news release coming out of the Department of the Environment. And I'd like to quote some passages from that:

Environment minister approves exploration project at McArthur River.

Environment and Public Safety Minister Berny Wiens has approved an underground exploration project at Cameco's McArthur River site.

They've given approval to it, Mr. Speaker. And we wholeheartedly agree with their approval, Mr. Speaker.

The approval of the exploration work was recommended Jan. 15 by the joint federal-provincial panel which is studying the future of several proposed uranium mines.

Not only one mine, Mr. Speaker, they're going to give approval to, but they're going to give approval, I predict, to a whole host of them in northern Saskatchewan before long.

"Based on this recommendation the project is being given the green light," Wiens said. "After studying the issue and holding public consultations the joint panel told us the project's environmental safeguards are fundamentally sound."

Those are the words of the Environment minister in this province today, Mr. Speaker.

The Environment minister and the Community Services Minister:

... will soon initiate consultation with northern residents and communities regarding:

a timetable and process for discussing northern policy issues related to uranium mining including revenue sharing and the standard provisions in surface leases; and

ways of dealing with panel recommendations on the specific surface lease for the McArthur . . . underground exploration program.

Mr. Speaker, and it goes on to say . . . the minister goes on to say:

... comprehensive discussions would address human resource development, environmental and worker protection, compensation for (those) directly affected resource users, as well as revenue sharing.

"The joint panel gave us more than just environmental guidance on (this) mine site," (the minister) said. "The report recognizes the role of local communities in dealing with the impact of mining."

What a direct turn-around, Mr. Speaker, from the words of members opposite when they were in opposition and campaigning in the election. At every opportunity they used words to scare the living daylights out of people, Mr. Speaker.

And now when you look at their press releases, they're trying to make everybody feel as comfortable as possible with uranium development in this province — something they should have been doing in opposition, something they should have been doing during the election campaign. But oh no, Mr. Speaker. They couldn't do it because they thought there might be some political mileage in it for them, Mr. Speaker.

The McArthur River exploration project will provide technical information on the ore body at the site but does not involve mining of the ore. Future mining at McArthur River, and at a number of other proposed locations in the north, is currently under separate study by the joint panel.

Mr. Speaker, I think we can all conclude from that that the mine indeed will be going ahead, and others as well. And, Mr. Speaker, while we're speaking about mining in northern Saskatchewan, I'd like to just give you a few short facts on the developments that are being currently proposed in the North.

The McArthur River project, the employment . . . When we look at employment, Mr. Speaker, if approval is granted to mine the McArthur River ore at the Key Lake mine, the current level of employment at Key Lake, 340 employees, will be maintained. The level of northern participation is targeted to be 50 per cent.

Investment. The investment that's going to be put into that is currently unknown. Cameco has not established an estimate for the cost of developing the McArthur River deposit. When such an estimate is

established, Cameco as a public company needs to provide the exchanges and shareholders with this information on a first-priority basis.

The royalty structure, Mr. Speaker, if the mine is able to sustain the Key Lake mill at full capacity for 15 years, minimum development of the royalties would be \$90 million — royalties to the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. The start-up date is planned for 1998.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at another project in northern Saskatchewan, the mid-west project as it has been called, will employ 242 employees, Mr. Speaker. A construction crew of 300 will be required for the predevelopment and building of the mill. Investment in that project, private investment in that project will be somewhere between 150 and \$200 million. Royalties to the province of Saskatchewan will be at a minimum of \$18 million.

Other economic spin-offs: annual payroll, estimated to be in the order \$10.5 million, Mr. Speaker; impact area for employment is identified as including Wollaston, Uranium City, Stony Rapids, Black Lake, Fond-du-Lac, and Prince Albert, Mr. Speaker — all areas that desperately need employment and investment dollars.

The start-up date for that project, Mr. Speaker, is planned for 1994. A truly important development for northern Saskatchewan.

Another development that's being proposed in the North, Mr. Speaker, is the McClean Lake development. Employment on-site will be 250 people, Mr. Speaker; office staff of 24. Total employment will be 274. Construction will begin in 1993 through to 1995, and 120 to 133 people will be directly employed in the construction. Future construction plans through 1998 to year 2000 will be an additional 33 to 88 people, Mr. Speaker.

Investment, at a minimum, will be 250 million. Again a substantial royalty of \$18 million as a minimum will be generated for the province of Saskatchewan. More spin-off benefits result from that development, Mr. Speaker. Payroll and employee benefits are estimated to total 200 million for the duration of this project, which will be about 14 or 15 years.

Minatco has engaged the services of NorSask Native Outreach, a native and Metis hiring service to assist in recruiting employees. Minatco is willing to hire 100 per cent native employees for both construction and production, if such were available, Mr. Speaker.

Bands and communities most likely to be affected by the McClean Lake development are: the Black Lake Band; Fond du Lac Band; Hatchet Lake Band; Stony Rapids; Wollaston; La Ronge. Mr. Speaker, important developments for the people of northern Saskatchewan; important job opportunities; important investment opportunities for the people of northern Saskatchewan. All of that project is planned to be started up in 1993, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: — Are you supporting this Bill or . . .

Mr. Boyd: — . . . absolutely supporting this Bill, Mr. Speaker. We will be supporting this Bill. And it's a pleasure to be able to stand in the Assembly today and say that, Mr. Speaker. I think it's important that the members opposite take the time — take the time to look over this Bill and comment on it.

It would be interesting, Mr. Speaker, it would be interesting and refreshing if all of the people of Saskatchewan could hear comments from each and every one of the NDP members in this House on these important developments. And we wholeheartedly endorse uranium development, Mr. Speaker. And we're glad to see, absolutely pleased to see the government bringing forward a Bill like this.

Mr. Speaker, it's just not government and opposition members of the House, of this Assembly, that are looking forward to development in the uranium industry. Mr. Speaker, it's people throughout Saskatchewan that are looking forward to this development.

And I want to quote a few things, Mr. Speaker, from an address entitled, "Three Major Challenges for the New Government: Deficit, Agriculture and Uranium." And this was put together by Mr. Roger Phillips, president of IPSCO Inc., and it was presented to the Melfort Junior Chamber of Commerce, and it was presented on January, 1992 in Melfort, Mr. Speaker.

(1600)

And I think it's important that we go through some of this, Mr. Speaker. And I won't quote it all through its entirety, but we want to point out some of the most important parts of this, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Phillips says:

We need systems which will encourage real cost increases in our grain collection and delivery systems. Every mistaken resistance to change merely saps our ability to be efficient (Mr. Speaker).

And I think this speaks to all kinds of industries.

The third major challenge will be one to take advantage of . . . the new distinctive natural advantage that Saskatchewan has over the rest of the world. We can't afford to pass this . . . (over). This is our uranium resource (Mr. Deputy Speaker).

Mr. Phillips goes on. He says:

I urge the government to ignore their recent party convention.

1. (And) Ratify a program of Saskatchewan-based nuclear research with Atomic Energy of . . . (Saskatchewan).

And, Mr. Speaker, the government has concluded that agreement and we wholeheartedly endorse that agreement. It was this party that set that agreement out in place to begin with, Mr. Speaker. It was this party that signed that agreement, it was this party campaigned for that during the election campaign, and it was those folks opposite, Mr. Speaker, that campaigned against it.

And yet now we see a major, absolutely major turn-around in this government and we wholeheartedly endorse it, and we hope the people of Saskatchewan do. And I'm sure they do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Phillips goes on to say the province should:

2. Seek to develop spent fuel resource facilities in the north to encourage uranium sales — please note that returning material of lower radioactivity than was originally mined shouldn't be a problem.

3. Seek to construct an initial Saskatchewan-based reactor as soon as possible — remember there's never been a major radioactive leak in any North American reactor. I note in parenthesis that the former NDP MLA told the CBC that a major reason for the party to reject the reactor was that the government couldn't afford it — obviously an argument for permitting a privately-owned nuclear reactor to sell electricity to SaskPower under long-term contract!

If you don't want the Government of Saskatchewan to invest in this development, Mr. Speaker, let private industry take over and invest for you. Let the private industry that want to proceed with this development, let them bring forward the investment dollars necessary to complete the construction of a CANDU 3 nuclear reactor.

Mr. Phillips goes on to say:

One of the largest countries under social democratic rule today is France, a strong proponent of nuclear power, with some three quarters of its electricity generated that way. And, environmentalists take note, tourists in Europe observe a marked difference between the blue skies of France and the grey ones of fossil fuel (generation) . . . in nearby Germany.

I cite France to suggest anti-nuclear is not a social democratic fundamental principle (Mr. Deputy Speaker).

The rest of the world is embracing nuclear development, Mr. Speaker, and it certainly is high time that the government moves forward with this kind of development in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Phillips goes on to say:

In a world where the green house effect and air pollution generally are severe problems, nuclear power, especially from smaller, less costly reactors, is an absolute necessity (Mr. Speaker).

It is always difficult politically for governments to cut back. In our black/white for/against adversarial system the opposition will always be against such initiatives (Mr. Speaker). When a centre to right government is in power the opposition can pillory . . . (against) being insensitive to social and human values. As a social democratic government with 52 percent of the popular vote the Romanow regime has the best chance of taking some . . . tough initiatives that must be taken if Saskatchewan is to remain a viable province.

I wish the government success in these endeavours.

Those are the words of Mr. Roger Phillips, president of IPSCO, with regard to nuclear development in this province, Mr. Speaker. I think those words are very, very important. I think the government should take and wholeheartedly endorse those words, Mr. Speaker. And it would be important if the members opposite, each and every one of them, would take the time to read his comments on nuclear development, take the time to get up in this legislature and tell the people of Saskatchewan exactly their thoughts on nuclear development.

I see the Minister of Energy and Mines giving the thumbs-up signal, Mr. Speaker, and I wholeheartedly agree with him. Thumbs up to the nuclear industry and uranium mining in this province.

We expect, Mr. Speaker, that the minister will be on his feet speaking to this very important question, and I'm sure the people of the NDP Party and his constituency would be interested in hearing his comments on this important resource development.

Mr. Speaker, uranium in Saskatchewan in 1990 . . . 20 per cent of the uranium produced in the world came from Saskatchewan. This province is a world leader in uranium development. The world needs Saskatchewan's uranium, and for Saskatchewan it means new jobs, new income, more diversification, new wealth, and a prosperous future, Mr. Speaker. Since the early '80s, capital expenditures alone have totalled more than \$1.2 billion with almost 500 million invested in exploration and pre-development in Saskatchewan's North.

Last year the uranium industry generated \$66 million in salaries, wages, and benefits for its 1,100 employees; invested 44 million in capital expenditures; paid close to \$30 million in taxes and royalty expenses and 2.7 million in industry fees; and donated \$350,000 to community and charitable organizations, plus another 38,000 to the education of the province's youth in the form of scholarships, Mr. Speaker.

Saskatoon receives the greatest benefit from all of this, Mr. Speaker. And it's important to note that the Premier's constituency of Saskatoon Riversdale has a number of people directly employed in the uranium mining industry in this province, and a lot of investment dollars come from that constituency into that important area of our economy.

All the head offices of the operating uranium companies are in Saskatoon in this province, Mr. Speaker. It is estimated that for every one person employed in the industry, there are two or three employed outside the industry that support Saskatoon in some way. From transportation of employees who must be flown in to the northern mines to equipment provision, engineering services, and catering services, there are a wide range of support employment generated in Saskatoon by the uranium industry, Mr. Speaker.

It is an industry that should be fully developed for the benefit of our urban and rural areas. The Saskatchewan government must encourage and facilitate the growth of the uranium industry, not shut it down.

And I think this marks, Mr. Speaker, this Bill marks an important step forward that the NDP Party have taken in Saskatchewan.

Premier Devine's government has already announced a comprehensive agreement, Mr. Deputy Speaker. When he was in office, he announced a comprehensive agreement with Ottawa, the AECL agreement to assess economic diversification opportunities for the energy sector in Saskatchewan.

SaskPower signed a memorandum of understanding with AECL under the previous administration that allowed for thousands of jobs to be located in Saskatchewan. The agreement will allow the two companies to assess the opportunities for a nuclear industry in Saskatchewan, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And we are very pleased to be able to support this kind of development in Saskatchewan.

Such an industry would, among other things, add value to the province's abundant uranium resources. These value added opportunities include the potential for a CANDU 3 power plant for generating electricity. And we believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this government should move ahead as quickly as possible in that area.

Additional manufacturing centred on uranium resources rather than just exporting it, Mr. Speaker, the production of isotopes for medical and industrial purposes — Saskatchewan is a leader, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in uranium development in Saskatchewan.

Related industries that Saskatchewan is currently pursuing include an accelerator manufacturing marketing capability for food irradiation and industrial applications, a nuclear simulator training facility, expanded scientific studies and research at

our universities, and recycling and waste disposal.

That seems to be one of the areas that is of great concern, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to opponents of nuclear development. It's that waste that is created from nuclear generating sites.

But yet, Mr. Speaker, the technology I believe is there, the technology the scientific community believes is there to deal with that problem, and they, I believe, could adequately deal with any problem that we might see in that area.

As well there is an opportunity to complete the CANDU 3 engineering in Saskatchewan. They would create numerous high-tech jobs in this province as well as spin-off opportunities for Saskatchewan manufacturing firms. By the turn of the century, thousands of new jobs could be created in Saskatchewan as a result of the Progressive Conservative plan to develop Saskatchewan's resources, particularly uranium. And that means new, high-income opportunities in Saskatoon, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And now, Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to see that the government is moving forward in this important industry.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should look back on some of the things . . . the NDP's position on uranium industry in Saskatchewan of the past. They were opposed, totally opposed, to uranium development, Mr. Speaker. The member for Riversdale said in the *Briarpatch* newspaper:

The NDP passed a very tough resolution on stopping uranium mining. It is conceivable at the time of the next election, and if you win, that mines in Cigar Lake and the fifth, sixth and seventh mines at Collins Bay will be in operation. Will you shut those down?

And the member from Riversdale said in answer to that question:

My position is simply that the party leader's job and the caucus's job is to implement party policy. That is party policy, . . . (as) far as it can be implemented when we're in office, it (is) likely party policies will be implemented.

Mr. Speaker, that interview took place with *Briarpatch* in December, 1987.

And we're glad, Mr. Speaker, to be able to read those comments back to the member from Riversdale because now he has totally changed his mind on uranium development.

Responding to questioners who expressed fears for the future of the uranium industry in Saskatchewan under the NDP government, . . . (the member from Riversdale) offered the official party position.

"Phasing out of existing uranium development in the north would only take place as

alternative jobs become available” . . .

Mr. Speaker, *Star-Phoenix*, March of 1990.

And, Mr. Speaker, we see that employment opportunities in northern Saskatchewan are extremely difficult to initiate, Mr. Speaker, and it's important now that the government takes it upon themselves to realize that, and they have done that and we commend them for that.

Prebble, a former NDP MLA, said:

The “Saskatchewan sale of uranium overseas is an immoral act, an act over which the people of Saskatchewan may weep 20 years from now.”

Hansard of 1979, Mr. Speaker.

We're very pleased to see that the good folks of Saskatchewan did not endorse that kind of attitude, Mr. Speaker. And we're very pleased to see that the people of Saskatchewan corrected the mistake of allowing Mr. Prebble to take his seat in this legislature.

He went on to say:

I mean I frankly don't think that we should be allowing mining of any kind offshore in a large commercial fishing resource like Wolliston Lake.

“STV News”, March 8, 1990.

One of the Regina MLAs (Member of the Legislative Assembly), the associate minister . . . or pardon me, the former minister of Finance, says the NDP is opposed to an expansion of the uranium industry. That is the position today.

Well we're very pleased to see, Mr. Speaker, that was the position of that day. And now, Mr. Speaker, the position of this government, the NDP government, is now that uranium mining should take place in Saskatchewan. Uranium mining is good for Saskatchewan, good for the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, good for Saskatchewan people, and indeed world development, Mr. Speaker.

Other members that have commented on uranium development in the past — the member from Regina Rosemont, Saskatoon Broadway, Regina Elphinstone, Regina North West. And here are their comments:

Although I have not been able to locate documentation for these, the office of the Minister of Energy and Mines is confident these folks are on the “opposed” side.

Mr. Speaker, these members were opposed to uranium development and we're very pleased to see that the members of the front bench of the NDP government were able to change their mind at the recent NDP convention, Mr. Speaker.

(1615)

Other members that spoke out about uranium development — the member from Churchill Downs. And here is what he said:

The key question is environmental control concerns uranium mining. Unlike my colleague from Saskatoon, I have concluded the use of uranium, as a source of energy, is inevitable. I do not deny the problems associated with its use. I simply see no other alternative in the short run.

That was the budget of 1981-82, page 703, Mr. Speaker.

And, Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to see that the member from Churchill Downs was able to use his persuasive powers in being able to change the minds of the people in his party. The persuasiveness of that man, Mr. Speaker, in his party must be immeasurable because he was able to change a party so opposed, so opposed to nuclear development, into a party now that is pro-development in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Possibly the next leader of the NDP, a colleague of mine says. I wouldn't go so far as saying that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, or Mr. Speaker, pardon me, other members have commented on uranium development in the past. The member from Saskatoon Fairview said, Mr. Speaker: “Phasing out uranium mining would do more harm for Saskatchewan than good.” *Star-Phoenix*, November 28, 1983. And, Mr. Speaker, we're very pleased to see that that member as well used his persuasive powers with his colleagues to be able to get them to change their mind on uranium development.

Other members, the member from Athabasca, Mr. Speaker, he also spoke on uranium development: “The fact that there has been an accident at a nuclear plant doesn't mean that nuclear plants should be banned . . . “ He went on to say that he personally supports uranium mining and the operation of nuclear power plants. *Leader-Post*, April 30, 1986, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, now we hear the member from Shaunavon speaking up and we hope that he would take the time in this legislature to give a little speech — and coming from him it would indeed be little — on uranium development and what his thoughts are on uranium development to the people of Saskatchewan. I'm sure the people of Shaunavon would be most interested in hearing what his comments are on uranium development, what he feels . . . if he feels how important this industry is in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, other members that have commented on uranium development are the member from Cumberland. And he said:

Although I do not have documentation . . . the

office of the Minister of Energy and Mines suggests he would be in favour of the industry given the related jobs and activity in his constituency.

And I think it's important, Mr. Speaker, that those members take the opportunity to stand in this legislature and reconfirm, reconfirm their commitment to uranium development in this province.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other members that have spoke on the uranium industry in this province, NDP members, Mr. Speaker, and we would like to give them, give them the opportunity to speak on uranium development, Mr. Speaker. Any one of them that would like to take the opportunity now to stand on their feet and speak on uranium development, I'd be happy to turn the floor over to them.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other comments about uranium development that I think are important. I think members on the opposite side as well as opposition members would like to take the opportunity to speak on this important development and important Bill and I will take my place now and let them have that opportunity. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that I would be remiss if I didn't take the opportunity as the former minister responsible for SMDC to rise and congratulate the member from Swift Current in his second reading speech here.

I notice that he has so much enthusiasm for the uranium industry that he wishes to re-enter the debate and talk about all the good things that this province has had in the past from uranium development and about the things that are possible in the future, as long as this government doesn't backslide on some of the new-found strength that appears to be there for the uranium industry.

It's also very pleasing, as the former minister responsible for SMDC and certainly working with Cameco Corporation on a daily basis through some of their endeavours, that this particular party and these people are realizing the benefits of the privatization of SMDC and Cameco. Because I remember distinctly, Mr. Speaker, being in this House and hearing a number of speeches from people as they talked about this particular move, and took great issue with the jobs and the employment and the dollars that would benefit the province of Saskatchewan — the royalties, the taxation, the aboriginal hiring practices. And they took issue with almost all of it.

And it was pleasing for me to listen to the member from Kindersley as he sort of did the roll-call and he went across this bunch and their comments. Because it's like every one of them almost goes out and takes a walk on the road to Damascus at various times in their political career. And depending on what they think is

popular at the time, that's when the sun shines down and we get these revelations.

And I would hope that the new Minister of Energy and Mines would tell us about some of the plans that he personally sees for this industry because he works with these people on a daily basis; he is involved in the regulatory mechanisms that govern the uranium industry; he's involved in the royalty structures that will affect this industry into the future. And I would think this Bill which clearly sets a new direction for the New Democratic Party government, would give that minister the opportunity.

And I think the minister who represents the Cumberland constituency also would take this opportunity to talk about some of the proposals being brought forward by the uranium industry as far as aboriginal employment. The potential on the eastern side of the province to expand things like the hydro grid, which hasn't been mentioned all that much, but the very fact that uranium has been an ongoing industry and development in northern Saskatchewan means that a lot of communities now have electrical power that isn't generated by fossil fuel.

The fact we've been able to tie together the hydro grid from southern Saskatchewan through all the way to Uranium City means that a lot of these mines have become more efficient, that the production of uranium, the production of gold, the production of potentially base metals in many of these communities now becomes more viable.

And it means that many of those northern communities that didn't have access before, now and in the future have the potential to increase the quality of life because they have access to the hydro grid. And I think it's a very important development for northern Saskatchewan in the years to come.

It's that old story about roads to resources. Well the roads are being developed, but you've got to have somebody there that can turn on the lights after you build the road. And an outgrowth of uranium development in this province has been the need to develop that, and it has been done.

Another very important aspect, Mr. Speaker, that's been touched on, but I think it's important that all members of the House realize that this industry has brought about, that for the very first time we have seen joint provincial-federal agreements and workings on major environmental impact studies.

Now we all know, Mr. Speaker, in this province that when the New Democratic Party were in opposition, that they constantly harped on the environmental issues, that they said that there wasn't enough coordination, that there wasn't the ability of provincial legislatures and federal legislatures to come to some reasonable agreement on environmental issues.

Well the process that has been put in place in northern Saskatchewan to do environmental impact studies on

five uranium mines, I think, Mr. Speaker, is a landmark process. It's one that will be used Canada-wide in determining issues of this magnitude where there is significant, potentially significant impact on peoples living in those areas.

We all, Mr. Speaker, as this province went through the Rafferty-Alameda process and the disagreements that arose between our own environmental impact studies and the EARP (environmental assessment and review process) process that the federal government put in place in 1989-90 means that there has been a tremendous cost attached to environmental impact to various industry groups and indeed to Saskatchewan taxpayers that might not necessarily have occurred had this process that we have developed in uranium been in place sooner.

And I think, clearly what it will point out to people in this province and people in communities most affected by uranium development, is that it is a sound principle, that a lot of the scare tactics which people like to come into our province and use — and indeed unfortunately some people within our own province, even people that were former members of this legislature who like to scaremonger on this issue — what this process will point out is that any Saskatchewan citizen, taxpayer, voter, has the ample opportunity to enter into the process, know that they got a fair hearing, and at the end of the day we aren't going to get whip-sawed. We aren't going to get whip-sawed by people primarily from outside of our own jurisdiction who have other motives involved in whether we, as Saskatchewan citizens, mine, refine, export, process uranium and its by-products.

Because there's all sorts of people around the piece, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately that have other agendas on this. And they want to always talk about nuclear bombs. And they want to talk about things that frankly no one in this province, I don't believe, when they look real deep has ever thought we were going to do here.

And I remember back some 10, 12 years ago to the debate that went around the potential uranium refinery at Warman, Saskatchewan. And I'm sure the member from Rosthern knows more about that than I. But I know, as the minister responsible to work with Cameco Corporation, that there is a significant number of jobs in this country that are tied to the processing of uranium. And unfortunately for us almost all of those jobs have resided in eastern Canada, that Ontario has been the prime benefactor of that development, and that attempts to bring that secondary processing, that value added processing, to this province over the years have been thwarted by people who are on these other agendas.

And unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, in the past, a lot of those people have hitched their wagon to the NDP Party for whatever reason. But that's where they hitched their wagon.

And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, it's very unfortunate that that happened. Because that meant that it got

involved in the political process with these people. And they were always looking for ways to politicize most everything that the former government did — and certainly the privatization of SMDC and Eldorado Nuclear and the resulting formation of Cameco Corporation wasn't lost in that process because that particular issue then got expanded by all these people who had hitched their wagon to the New Democratic Party.

And I think that's why we saw that nonsense arising out of their conventions about how we should shut all the mines down, and we should do away with all of the jobs, and we should sort of let northern Saskatchewan wilt on the vine. And I don't know where that silly thing came from but I suspect it was from these people attaching themselves to this political party and trying to make short-term political gains in some way.

And as we all know, Mr. Speaker, the result of a lot of that short-term thinking has now come home to roost on this political party because they're now charged with governing this province. And every taxpayer that is in this province, Mr. Speaker, is reaping the whirlwind of that result because we've just had no end of tax increases and everything attached to them, making those silly kinds of promises.

And we can only hope that some members of that party who are now in government and have the responsibility to make sure that uranium industry moves forward, will take this opportunity to digress a little bit from some of the rhetoric that we've heard in the past.

And along with this Bill, Bill 25, which finally finishes off the privatization process begun by the former Devine administration . . . by the former PC (Progressive Conservative) administration — I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, it just slipped out — that the former PC administration, that process that was begun I think set a very responsible and logically progressive mode in place to make sure that uranium mining continued on an even keel well into the future. That I think that it's important for some of these members to now stand up and tell us their thoughts about how this is going to occur over the next two years that remains to their mandate in this province.

(1630)

And I'd like to hear comments about how the board of directors for instance . . . and this government has the opportunity to appoint people to the board of directors of Cameco Corporation. I would like to hear from members of this government, from the treasury benches, what type of people, what type of people that they are appointing to that board so that the rest of us, the taxpayers of this province will have some feeling that there are reasonable folks being appointed there; that there are people that are in favour of expanding this industry to some of its logical conclusions.

That the agreement that finally was dragged out of this

government by the people of Saskatoon and the opposition and other people, that they will cooperate with AECL in developing some components of the uranium industry. That this agreement that was finally dragged out of them, kicking and screaming, by a significant portion of the taxpayers of this province, that that agreement will be adhered to, that it will be promoted, and that it will progress, that the government will back it.

And that means that the type of individual that this government appoints to the board of directors of Cameco is absolutely fundamental. That the policy of the former government to bring people in from outside of Saskatchewan, to indeed make it international in character, given that many of the people that buy uranium oxide from Cameco are people in the Pacific Rim, are people in Europe, are people in the United States of America, that that policy of being inclusive, of being worldly in outlook will be enhanced by people that this government appoints to the board of directors.

Because that was one of the things that the former administration, Mr. Speaker, felt very strongly about when this privatization took place, is that we as a Saskatchewan company, which Cameco is, headquartered in Saskatchewan, would derive its strength from expanding its horizons into all the areas of the world where we do business. And certainly by having people from Switzerland, having people from Asia, on that board of directors, I think gives us a view into other parts of the world that are beneficial to us, Mr. Speaker, in not only uranium but other areas of endeavour.

Because these are people that have their pulse on world affairs; that understand when the Soviet Union broke up, for instance, that there would be a lot of nuclear material come onto the market; that there would be weapons grade material that would have to be utilized in some way, would have to be reprocessed, would have to be moved into the market-place. And that they would be prepared to position Cameco in such a way as it doesn't have to go through a down time; that it can keep generating profits and royalties for Saskatchewan people that we in turn use in our social safety net, that we in turn use for education and health care and policing.

And that is very important. And I would hope that members of the treasury benches would give us some kind of an indication of who these people are, what their plans are in the future so that Saskatchewan people can be ensured that that view of the world won't be changed; that we aren't going to get someone who only looks inward and only looks at Saskatchewan, on the board of directors.

Because that's what the ministers are for. They're here to look after the Saskatchewan issues. And they aren't here to make Cameco Corporation into something that only looks inward.

It's very interesting, Mr. Speaker, when you travel around northern Saskatchewan. And I've had the

opportunity over the last few years, I think, to be in every uranium mine in this province, to be underground in any of the underground operations. I've even had the opportunity to be at Cigar Lake and go down into that very exciting potential new mine there.

And what it does for you, I guess, Mr. Speaker, is it gives you a perspective that most people in this province simply don't have. And I would encourage the government to continue on with the policy that SARM, the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, started a few years ago where their members have been going and visiting nuclear plants all across Canada.

And also the proactive manner in which Cameco and other uranium mining companies have done with Saskatchewan people to invite them to the mine sites, to take you actually into the processing mills, to go to the open pit mines, to go to the underground mines, and give people a true sense of what it's like.

I think so many times we expect people to come out of the ground sort of glowing in the dark. And that's certainly something that was perpetuated by people that were anti-uranium and anti-mining, that if you went anywhere near one of these places you somehow would glow in the dark and self-destruct in a few years time. And it's simply not true.

I mean as my colleague pointed out, for aboriginal employment in a lot of northern Saskatchewan, the uranium sector is the one that has the most opportunity. It's the one that has the dollars that it can dedicate to education that's absolutely necessary to have for people that are working in that sector, and it's an area that has always been very forthcoming, particularly since the formation of Cameco, in scholarships, in trying to do things interactively with various communities.

It means that, for instance, that the La Ronge band have been able to assemble a fairly large trucking fleet. It's not a well-known fact to many people in this province that the La Ronge band is involved with a trucking operation that probably has 50 semis on the road in any given week. Some of those are contract positions; some of them are driver-owned units.

But the very fact that they have been involved in the supply lifeline of the uranium business means that the La Ronge band is able to expand their economic horizons into other areas.

The last time I was up to La Ronge, I know that they had purchased the NAPA (National Automotive Parts Association) dealership because the NAPA dealership went hand in hand with the trucking business because of the parts that are needed to keep the trucks on the road. There's a service component that presently was all being done in Saskatoon which in turn . . . now some of that servicing component can be moved to La Ronge. That's much closer to some of the people that work in the business and it also, I think, makes them a more efficient deliverer of services.

That component can be expanded and strengthened to other bands in the province of Saskatchewan, bands that are looking now at the treaty land entitlement process which will give them more economic strength, more economic wherewithal to enter into various sectors, various economic sectors, various social sectors of our society. And uranium has been a very positive, positive benefactor in furthering that process. It has intermeshed very nicely with some of the economic development strategies and dreams of a lot of our Indian bands in northern Saskatchewan.

And I think it's important that once again as we look at the board structure of Cameco Corporation, that we look at the people that will influence on a day-by-day basis uranium mining in Saskatchewan, that that aboriginal component be strengthened as much as possible.

When we see predictions being made that by 1995 that fully 50 per cent of employment opportunities will be to aboriginal people, that commitments are being made to in fact push employment opportunities to 100 per cent in that area, I think that it's incumbent upon whatever government is in place in Saskatchewan today or in the future, that that aboriginal component be recognized and strengthened in every way possible.

And I know from my involvement with Indian bands in this province that they look to this as a very strong component of their future for many years to come.

And I think it was also important that we recognized that when moving into the joint assessment process with the federal government on the environment assessment side of uranium mining. Because when one visited with people from Wollaston Lake or visited with people from other communities up there, it was a sense of being shut out of the process in a meaningful way, I think, that caused some of the problems that seemed to crop up.

And once that they were assured that they would have a voice in a process that wasn't going to be ultimately flawed and dragged through the courts and subjected to all sorts of machinations by people on other agendas who didn't live in those communities, who in fact may have been from outside the province . . . I mean we had people from Greenpeace in Vancouver and we had people from various anti-nuclear factions from Europe coming over and telling Saskatchewan people things that simply weren't true; often for a person that hasn't had access to good educational opportunities, could be misled by people who are on these kinds of agendas.

And I think that by having the joint federal-provincial process with a lot of credibility attached to it, credible people, that we then were able to move down that road. And I only can say to government members, I hope that they're totally prepared to further that process and make sure that these good people are around.

An area that I also think we should talk about here is some of the value added sectors that are available to this province and the potential jobs. And my colleague from Kindersley did, I think, a good job in opening up some of those subjects, because when one studies the AECL agreements — and I say agreements because there are two of them, but they're virtually the same in scope and nature — and when you look at those particular agreements and you look at some of those applications, the potential applications, it just boggles your mind, Mr. Speaker.

When you talk to people who are on the leading edge — the leading edge — of technology in the nuclear business, it means that this province can leap ahead of anyone else, potentially, in the business today. And that means that the government is going to have to be dedicated. It means that the government is going to have to ignore some of those people who are around the edge of the New Democratic Party, ignore some of these people who would stop this process at almost any cost. Because I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, you're not going to get large-scale food processing interacting with the nuclear business unless there's a very clear strategy and game plan laid out. It's something that has to be handled in a way that marshalls the assets of government in many areas.

It means, for instance, the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Economic Development and the Minister of Energy are going to have to cooperate in a whole lot of areas.

You will not see irradiation of food on a boatload basis occur unless this government is prepared to sit down with the people in the industries involved, sit down with people from the federal government, and work in cooperation.

We are told, Mr. Speaker, that the first country that can irradiate, for instance wheat, on a large-scale commercial basis will have a definite commercial advantage over everyone else in the world who's in the wheat business.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that means that perhaps a unit train of grain of one specific grade would be marshalled in Saskatchewan, treated, put into hopper cars, and delivered directly to a ship in the port of Vancouver, offloaded in a port in China or somewhere else, and that the storage life of that particular boatload of grain would be double or triple what the storage life of grain delivered by some other country was.

That means, Mr. Speaker, that means that Saskatchewan then, as a producer of high-quality grain, for instance, gets a leg up, gets a leg up on people from Australia, or Argentina, the European Community, who don't have the same capability that we do.

(1645)

That means, Mr. Speaker, that in this province the nuclear business, the nuclear business has the ability to interact with nearly every significant sector of our

economy. It means things like lentils and peas to potentially be irradiated and shipped to markets all over the world and people there then can consume the product in the knowledge that it isn't going to spoil because of the climatic conditions or storage conditions, that bugs aren't going to get into it — that type of thing, Mr. Speaker.

And I know some of this stuff really bothers the members of the government, Mr. Speaker. And the reason that it bothers them so greatly is they know it's the truth.

But that political party fought, that political party fought against doing agreements with other governments, doing agreements with companies that could bring that about. It's because that political party didn't have the vision, Mr. Speaker, the vision or the fortitude to move ahead in some of these areas.

And I think that's why we would like to see members of the government besides the Associate Minister for Finance stand up and talk about this area. And I would suspect, if there is a reluctance, Mr. Speaker, to stand up and talk about it, is that they still haven't figured out what the vision is or what the plan is for them as a government to interact with people like Cameco and get on with the job.

They're still so busy gazing at their collective navel on this issue that they haven't got it sorted out yet; that they still go to meetings and they listen to the likes of Peter Prebble. Not only do they listen to him, they pay his salary and they pay his bills so that he can drag up all sorts of information that's totally bogus and present it at the inner sanctums of the New Democratic Party and get these people back off of what should be the agenda. And the agenda is moving forward, that when you've got the opening, you grab it, you run with it, and you bring home jobs to the province of Saskatchewan.

And I suspect if there is a reluctance, Mr. Speaker, to stand up and talk about this industry in here, that's why. We're still fumbling around in the dark. It might almost be beneficial, Mr. Speaker, that if you did blow a little bit, that we ship the whole kit and caboodle of them up there so that they could take on some light and some life on this issue, so they could get focused on what needs to be done, and that there be some prioritizing done. Not this yipping and yapping that we constantly hear from government members as they spread out around this province and say one thing out there at various meetings and then come into this legislature and all sit.

I mean it is absolutely time, Mr. Speaker, that the next time, for instance, that a uranium refinery, a uranium refinery is perhaps proposed for this province . . . And indeed this government has the ability to influence the decision of what will happen when the existing refinery in Ontario, run by Cameco Corporation, is closed down.

And there is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that there are significant environmental questions being asked in

Ontario right now that might indeed present an opportunity for Saskatchewan. And if that opportunity comes along in the near term, that means that this New Democratic Party government which is in power in this province probably until 1995, till the taxpayers of this province can have another shot at them, that if this opportunity in the near term arises, that we have a government that's prepared to move down that road; that we are prepared as a society to handle the environmental impact study that would revolve around a potential uranium refinery, as was proposed at Warman in another age; that we would be prepared to move into site selection; that we would be prepared to do the things necessary for that to happen; that hundreds of jobs that could be attached to it, and move on it. And that requires vision and a clear game plan.

And so far beyond this sort of "having to sign the AECL agreement even though we didn't want to" attitude that we've seen from these people, we've heard nothing. We've heard nothing from the Minister of Energy. We've heard nothing from the past minister of Energy. We've heard nothing from the . . . There's so many associate ministers over there, Mr. Speaker, that I can't keep them all straightened out. But I believe the member from Cumberland is an associate minister of some kind. It's like we're beginning to . . . We've got so many ministers of Finance over there right now, Mr. Speaker, that it's almost boggling.

But anyway, that's why it's incumbent upon some of these people that we hope would have . . . be part of a plan on a potential uranium refinery, would stand up and sort of give people an inkling of where they're coming down on some of these issues.

Because I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the names of things like Key Lake, Cigar Lake, and McArthur River, Collins Bay, Contact Lake — these are the kind of names that I think in the future are going to ring through Saskatchewan because of the potential tied to them. They are going . . . As I said before, they set in place processes that have never been done before — processes that make Saskatchewan the leader in environmental assessment.

And I would hope that every school child in this province, Mr. Speaker, every school child in this province would know those names and know the potential attached to them and know that their government did not pass up on the opportunities that are presented by those names, and many more that will be added in the years to come, to provide them with employment, to provide them with opportunities, to make sure that that education that they are working hard to garner, that that education and the benefits that can come from it can be exercised here in Saskatchewan.

The nuclear industry says to thousands of school children in this province that if I work hard and am diligent and I move into that area of endeavour that there will be a job waiting for me. That I can be here with my family, that I can be a productive member of my society, that I can be a contributor to building the

Saskatchewan economy because my government, my government took this exceptional opportunity that countries indeed around the world would give anything to have.

That my government took this opportunity — they didn't let ideology get in the way; they didn't let political rhetoric get in the way — that they planned well, that they grabbed hold of the issues and the initiatives, and they laid that plan out in such a way that I resulted in getting a job; that I resulted . . . That I became a taxpayer, and that I contributed to the building of my province because they mapped that out.

And I guess what we've been saying all through this particular debate, Mr. Speaker, is that we are not positive that these people have got that resolve clearly mapped out yet; that they've got to have that vision on nuclear issues well mapped out. And if that vision ultimately produces a nuclear reactor in this province, produces a nuclear reactor that will generate electricity but will also generate the export and sale of nuclear reactors all over the world, then I think once again people will say they planned well, they thought things out, they provided opportunities that would not have been there otherwise.

And then, Mr. Speaker, down the road 20 years from now, people that were in this legislature can say we collectively took some credit for that because we all spoke up, we all stood in our places and said yes, we want to be part of that plan. We want to be part of that vision; we want to be part of a society that would give that kind of opportunity to its children.

And that's why, Mr. Speaker, it has to be more than just the members of the opposition speaking today. It means that the roll-call on this issue has to include people who perhaps in the past, for some narrow political bias, were anti-nuclear; but realizing now that the responsibility of government is upon their shoulders, are now prepared to stand up like men and women of resolve and put their name to the issue, put their constituents' names to the issue, and be counted upon.

And it's simply not enough, Mr. Speaker, for the Associate Minister of Finance to sneak into this legislature and bring forward a Bill which finishes off the privatization of Cameco, the privatization of SMDC, and then hope that it'll simply die and go away. Because this issue is so large, involves so many people, and has so much potential that what we are talking about here is a turning-point perhaps for the province of Saskatchewan in how we handle our resources.

You know, Mr. Speaker, this province is blessed with all five natural energies, uranium being one of them. There's no other province in Canada that has all five. Most countries in the world don't have all five. We are blessed with so much and so much diversity in the energy sector that in the past we've been able to squander some of our opportunities. We had so much that it didn't matter how we generated our electricity,

that it was going to be cheap, it was going to be affordable, and that we could provide it on a constant basis to whoever wanted it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it's time now that Saskatchewan, as we go into the next century, starts to really analyse how we make best use of those. And certainly the nuclear option is one that many people in this province say has to be close to number one; that we have to be a little more conscious of how much coal we dig out of the ground, how much more fossil fuel we burn. How do we manage, how do we manage CO₂O emissions? How do we manage our contribution to solving the ozone problem? And nuclear, Mr. Speaker, demands that it be recognized in such a way that it is given that fair opportunity.

And that's why the people of Saskatoon by the tens of thousands said to this government, if you miss this opportunity with nuclear, you may be missing the opportunity of the century.

And that's why they had to back down. That's why the ideology had to get shoved off to the side. That's why some of the nonsense that used to come out of their conventions had to be handled. And as a result — and I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, for a minute that we would have seen this government bring in a Bill to finish the privatization of SMDC if that pressure hadn't been applied. It had to be applied in such a way that they start to wake up and smell the coffee — and as a result the minister has brought in the Bill and that process can continue on providing, Mr. Speaker, that many of the issues brought up by members of the opposition are dealt with in a proper manner.

In many of those issues, and the only way that Saskatchewan people, Saskatchewan taxpayers will have that assurance, is if members of the New Democratic Party government stand on their feet and give that assurance.

Like I said, Mr. Speaker, it's one thing to go out and skulk around the town halls of Saskatchewan and say these things. But to stand on your feet in here, in front of the television cameras, on record, in *Hansard*, and say to Saskatchewan people that I believe that I want to be part of the vision, that I'm not going to short-change the nuclear option, that I am prepared to put my electoral success and my seat on the line in support of it, means that Saskatchewan people then will have sufficient assurance, Mr. Speaker.

And it's funny, Mr. Speaker, how that scares members of the government. I mean all of a sudden we've had a polite exchange of ideas in here, and the minute that we talk about them putting their collective selves — and that's not the word I'd like to use, Mr. Speaker — their collective selves on the line electorally, that they can't backslide like they have on taxes, like they have on health care, like they have on education and some other areas, if they would stand and put themselves on the line as far . . .

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

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.