

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
March 8, 1995

The Assembly met at 1:30 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. McPherson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have another petition today from people of the Assiniboia-Scout Lake area. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to oppose changes to present legislation regarding firearm ownership, and instead urge the federal government to deal with the criminal use of firearms by imposing stiffer penalties on abusers.

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

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm happy today to present a petition on behalf of the people from the town and area of Gull Lake. I'll read the prayer:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to allocate adequate funding dedicated towards the double-laning of Highway No. 1; and further, that the Government of Saskatchewan direct any monies available from the federal infrastructure program towards double-laning Highway No. 1, rather than allocating these funds towards capital construction projections in the province.

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

And I'm happy to table these today, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have petitions to present today from the Carievale-Carnduff area of my constituency.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to unequivocally oppose changes to present legislation regarding firearm ownership, and instead urge the federal government to deal with the criminal use of firearms by imposing stiffer penalties on abusers, and urge the federal government to recognize that gun control and crime control are not synonymous.

And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray. I lay these on the Table now.

Mr. McPherson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also have a petition, some 26 pages, full pages, Mr. Speaker. The prayer is as follows:

Wherefore your petitioner humbly prays that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to retain the Val Marie highway depot.

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

Mr. Speaker, these are residents — in fact it is every voting resident — of Val Marie and surrounding RMs (rural municipality) that have signed this petition, Mr. Speaker, in opposing the closure of the highway depot.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Clerk: — According to order the following petitions have been reviewed, and pursuant to rule 11(7) they are hereby read and received.

Of citizens of the province petitioning the Assembly to allocate adequate funding dedicated toward the double-laning of Highway No. 1.

And of citizens of the province petitioning the Assembly to pull the agreement with the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations until such time as the exhibition associations of Saskatchewan and the Metis Nation of Saskatchewan can be involved in the decision making and the direction of gambling in the province of Saskatchewan.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Friday move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

With respect to Sears Call Centre: (1) table a copy of the deal struck between the province of Saskatchewan and Sears; details on all the discounts offered by SaskTel to Sears; details on total revenue forgone by SaskTel for each incentive offered to Sears; details on all tax discounts, rebates, or other incentives offered by the Department of Finance to Sears; details on total revenue forgone for each tax discount, rebate, or other incentive offered by Department of Finance to Sears; and details on provincial training package, including total cost and where the funds were delegated for this initiative.

And I also give notice that I shall on Friday move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

With respect to the CIBC Call Centre; table a copy of the deal struck between the Province of Saskatchewan and CIBC; details on all discounts offered by SaskTel to CIBC; details on all discounts, taxes, rebates, or other incentives offered by the Department of Finance to CIBC; and details on provincial training package, including total cost, where the funds will be delegated from for this initiative.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Thompson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to the rest of the Assembly today, a group of businessmen and elected officials from the constituency of Athabasca, sitting in the west gallery.

Included in that group are Leonard Larson, a businessman from Buffalo Narrows; Joe Daigneault who is the mayor of Beauval; Michael Durocher, executive director of the north-west mayors'

association; Louis Morin from Jans Bay, who is the mayor of Jans Bay; Edward Gardiner is from Cole Bay; Jim Daigneault is Green Lake councillor; George Raymond, Ile-a-la-Crosse businessman; Ron Bouvier is the mayor of Cole Bay; and Ernest Gardiner is the deputy mayor of Jans Bay.

The group is in, Mr. Speaker, today meeting with government officials and members of cabinet, and I would just like all members here today to welcome all the members from the constituency of Athabasca.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to join with the minister, the Associate Minister of Economic Development, in welcoming the visitors from the North, and apologize that I haven't had a chance to meet with you yet. I just returned from events related to International Women's Day, and I'm sure you can appreciate those commitments on this day also. But I hope to talk with you later. Thank you.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I also want to introduce a guest in the west gallery. In fact this guest has been my room-mate for the last couple of nights, and that's my father, Roy Atkinson, who is a farmer from Landis, Saskatchewan. I think this is the first occasion I've had to officially welcome my dad to the legislature, and I know that he has been around the legislature the last couple of weeks, paying close attention to what we're all doing. And I want to welcome him to the legislature.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Murray: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm very, very pleased today to introduce to you and through you to my colleagues in the Legislative Assembly, someone seated in your west gallery — a very, very dear friend and someone who is very important to organizing my life — my constituency assistant, Donna From. Would you please welcome her here today. Thank you.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Bradley: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's with pleasure that I want to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly, someone who is sitting in your gallery who is from my constituency. I'd like you to welcome Edward Strueby, an elevator agent from Ogema, that is visiting today for the first time to see the proceedings in the legislature.

I'd like all people here to give him a warm welcome on his visit here today. Thank you.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to members of the Legislative Assembly, three people seated in the west gallery. One of them is from Regina Albert North, Shayne Cristo, and with Shayne are his parents from Limerick. And I want to welcome Mr. and Mrs. Cristo and their son Shayne to the Legislative Assembly today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whitmore: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too would like to welcome today, in your west gallery, the Cristo's. Mr. Cristo is a director of Federated Co-op and I wish to extend, I think . . . on a very successful year of Federated Co-op and their annual meeting that they concluded last week.

Also too, to my constituent, Mr. Roy Atkinson, I would also like to extend a welcome to him today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the member from Athabasca and also the minister in charge of Indian and Metis Affairs to say a few words of welcome in our language from northern Saskatchewan.

(The hon. member spoke for a time in Cree.)

Please welcome them, Mr. Speaker, again.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add my words of welcome to Ed Strueby. He was elevator agent in Lintlaw and used to buy my grain. He bought some of the finest frozen wheat in the province. So, welcome.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

International Women's Day

Ms. Murray: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today is International Women's Day, formally proclaimed by the United Nations in 1975. A day set aside for women around the world, and men, to commemorate our struggle and celebrate our achievements. A day also, Mr. Speaker, to consider what remains to be done. As we approach the end of this century, and this millennium, I think we should remind ourselves that nearly all of the advances women have made in the workplace, and in the law, have been made in the 20th century. Progress in one out of twenty is not a great average.

I mention this to remind us that the status of women in society, though greatly improved, is recent and fragile. As a reading of Margaret Atwood's novel *The Handmaid's Tale* tells us, what has been gained can be taken away if we become too comfortable; if we let those voices which say women now want too much drown out the obvious fact that our wishes are, in fact, quite modest.

This day then is a call for attention. In Saskatchewan though, Mr. Speaker, we have much to be proud of. With the encouragement of all Saskatchewan people for instance, we have passed progressive legislation which improves the rights of part-time workers, too many of whom are women. We have brought into law and practice The Victims of Domestic Violence Act, and we have led by example by placing several women in positions traditionally reserved for men, positions such as cabinet ministers.

Mr. Speaker, 65 years ago in Canada, women were legally declared persons. I think on this day, we can celebrate quite a remarkable

feat of evolution in those six decades. I predict even more extraordinary progress in the years to come. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Saskatchewan Women's Agricultural Network

Mrs. Teichrob: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On International Women's Day, I would like to inform the Assembly about a group of women, about 50 strong, who have made a significant contribution to the lives around them in Saskatchewan.

This group, Mr. Speaker, is the Saskatchewan Women's Agricultural Network which is celebrating its 10th year of existence this year. The goals of SWAN (Saskatchewan Women's Agricultural Network) are as follows: to enable women to become knowledgeable participants in farming operations; to provide women a forum for the exchanging of ideas and information; to encourage research on problems common to women in rural Saskatchewan; to support and network among individuals and groups of women within rural Saskatchewan; to work with other groups with similar interests; and to use education and research to promote the improvement of the status of rural women.

Mr. Speaker, although this group may be overshadowed by larger and more elaborate organizations, the work they do contributes to and enhances the lives of rural women and their families.

SWAN and its members inform and enlighten the public, government agencies, and other farm women about concerns facing farm women; issues such as women's equality, child care, training needs, health and safety, and community building.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues in the legislature, I would like to congratulate SWAN on its 10th anniversary and wish it continued success in the future.

Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

YWCA Centenary

Ms. Hamilton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, as we contemplate the meaning of International Women's Day in our own life circumstance, I would like us to remember the many millions of women who live daily with the threat of violence.

Locally I would like to recognize the many organizations that shelter women courageous enough to leave an abusive relationship.

One such organization is known worldwide and is celebrating its 100th anniversary. The world YWCA has grown considerably over the years from 23 countries in 1945 to 91 countries in 1994. It's now the oldest and largest women's ecumenical movement in the world, representing 25 million women.

At a ceremony in Westminster Abbey to launch the centenary, the president of the world YWCA, Razia Sultan Ismail, praised the legacy of women who are remembered as pathfinders in so many countries for their work at home, in their neighbourhoods, in refugee camps, or prison cells.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the women who participate in this movement for their hard work and dedication around the world. The centenary of the world YWCA provides an opportunity to recognize the women who have made a significant contribution in the quality of life for women and their families.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Laparoscopic Surgery

Ms. Lorje: — Mr. Speaker, on International Women's Day I want to comment on how health reforms are helping the strength, courage and dedication of women.

As an example, I want to mention the experience of one woman in particular, namely the Minister of Municipal Government. Last week, my colleague from Melfort underwent laparoscopic surgery for removal of her gall-bladder. The next afternoon she was back at work, and just 36 hours later she returned to the House and delivered five second reading speeches.

This is truly a testimony to her resolve and dedication. More importantly, it is a testimony to the modern advances in medical technology that are allowing us to reform health care delivery under the wellness model.

The surgery procedure of laparoscopic removal of gall-bladders was pioneered at City Hospital in Saskatoon. Laparoscopic surgery involves four to five small incisions and the use of a microcamera for organ removal or internal repair. This is a tremendous improvement over the former method which meant long and painful incisions and long and lonely hospital stays for patients. With this type of surgery the patient is released from hospital on the same or next day and back at work within the week, or quicker, as demonstrated by the hon. minister.

Laparoscopic surgery, whether it involves gall-bladder removal, ovarian surgery, or tubal ligations, allows women to quickly resume their active and busy lives. This innovation, along with other programs such as early releases from maternity wards, and improved screening for breast cancer, is yet another example of how health reforms serve to improve the quality of life for women everywhere. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Lloydminster Woman on United Nations Committee

Ms. Stanger: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On International Women's Day I want to comment on a remarkable woman in Lloydminster. I know, Mr. Speaker, that you want me to say, another remarkable woman in Cut Knife-Lloydminster, but I'm too modest.

This is a case, Mr. Speaker, where an individual is not just making a difference in her local community but is involved in changing attitudes and conditions worldwide.

Zuhy Sayeed is the president of the Lloydminster Association for Community Living. She and her husband have worked for years to remove barriers for persons with disabilities. Now her commitment and knowledge is being called upon as part of a new United Nations panel involved in introducing international standard rules

for opportunities for persons with disabilities.

This panel is to be made up of six representatives of international non-government organizations and is charged with the responsibility of monitoring the implementation and effectiveness of these standardized rules. And Zuhy Sayeed has been asked to become one of these six people.

This is a great honour for Zuhy and a deserved one. What she will be doing is simply extending her knowledge and experience gained on the local level and into the international. She will be promoting the same worthwhile goals, just on a broader stage.

And, Mr. Speaker, promoting standardized rules for these persons is ultimately a human rights act, not simply a matter of access. It takes a person with dedication, ability, knowledge, and energy to take this responsibility, and the UN (United Nations) I believe has chosen the right person. And I am very proud of Zuhy.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

International Women's Day

Mrs. Bergman: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, International Women's Day is an opportunity to celebrate the many achievements of women, and face with renewed energy the task of creating equality between the sexes. Equality for women does not mean special rights, it means equal rights.

In our country, women continue to make progress toward that kind of equality but that goal is by no means complete. Only when we achieve full equality among men and women will we as a nation be able to say that we have full social and economic justice in this country.

There are hundreds of thousands of women in this country who have worked publicly and privately to make this country and this province a better place. To all of them we owe a debt of gratitude for the changes they have helped bring about, so this very Chamber is now made up of 19 per cent of women when only 24 years ago there were none.

Today, as we acknowledge International Women's Day, let us renew our pledge to one another, to the people of Saskatchewan, and to the women of today and the children of tomorrow to advance, promote, and protect the rights of all women throughout the world. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Gambling Addictions Treatment

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my questions this afternoon are for the Minister of Health.

Mr. Minister, on November 7 of last year you announced funding for six community agencies to set up gambling addiction programs. What you haven't announced is that that funding has now been discontinued. It runs out on March 31. And that responsibility is

being transferred to the health districts who already have more responsibilities than they can possibly afford.

Mr. Minister, why did you establish these programs only to cancel them four months later? And why haven't you had the courage to announce these cancellations?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, let me say to the member, I think it's been very clear that community-based services, including addictions treatment which in this case includes the addiction treatment for the gaming addiction, has been moved to the districts; that's been a policy intention that's been widely known and long time announced.

In the current year, before that transfer of responsibility took place, we knew that some of these services needed to be available at the community level. We made that community grant process therefore available and had these programs available. It was clear at the time of the program announcement that these were a one-year program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the transfer of funding to the districts will continue to enable this kind of treatment to happen on a community basis.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the minister of Gaming recently said that the churches were the driving force behind gambling expansion in this province. This is an outrageous statement, Mr. Speaker. In fact churches have been the driving force behind trying to straighten out the gambling mess in this province created by the NDP (New Democratic Party).

I have here a letter from Rev. John Fryters of the Prince Albert Family Church. He recently cancelled a meeting with the Health department in protest of your decision to cancel the community addiction programs.

Mr. Minister, instead of blaming the churches for gambling addictions, why don't you work with the churches and people like Rev. Fryters to address the problem of gaming addictions?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have had my first experience as a minister of being taken totally out of context.

In Crown Corporations Committee, your hon. representative there asked a question which I answered, and I emphasized that historically there was a role of some churches — not the United Church — some churches and also charities in the early provision of gaming activity in the province. And it was your government that removed it from being a charitable and church activity into the commercialization of the bingo halls with the large prize boards and what not.

So if he had gone on, he would have also heard me say that I think that charitable and religious purposes are good uses of gaming dollars because they belong in public pockets, not private pockets.

And I would hope that both the media and the opposition bother to go to the next sentence when they're quoting.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Madam Minister, what you indeed said was this: I would say that religious and charitable organizations have been, in part, the driving force behind the expansion of the gaming industry in Saskatchewan.

That's what you said, Madam Minister. No matter what you say now it's a little hard to get out of that kind of comment.

Madam Minister, Rev. Fryters tells us that when these programs end on March 31, there'll be nothing in place to replace those programs. He says apparently negotiations need to be started for the continuation of these programs with the individual health districts.

Madam Minister, given bed closures, reductions in emergency care, and the financial crisis facing many health districts, I really doubt gaming addiction is going to be a priority item for them.

Madam Minister, how can you establish community addiction programs only to cut them off a few months later with nothing to take their place?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, as is regularly the case, the Leader of the Opposition of course has it totally wrong and then brings his confusion to the House and therefore to the public.

Mr. Speaker, in this year's budget we have tripled the expenditures on prevention and addiction treatment for problem gaming. Mr. Speaker, that will provide, across our province, 44 councillors to provide services. It will continue the operation of the 1-800 24-hour mobile crisis access to help. It will provide what is unique in Saskatchewan, which is a program of prevention among young people; only in Saskatchewan — nowhere else. We have a community development program and we continue to work with partners, the Canadian Mental Health Association. Mr. Speaker, we have the most comprehensive program of treatment and prevention in all of Canada.

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, Rev. Fryters disagrees with you. He says that NGOs (non-governmental organizations) like the Metis Addiction Council in North Battleford have just begun to develop a significant case-load. They're just starting to make progress with many gambling addicts in this problem. And the end of the problem is near and it's very, very unfair, and it's dangerous.

Rev. Fryters says, and I quote: I am seriously concerned about this decision. It jeopardizes not only the health, but potentially the lives of quite a number of Saskatchewan residents. End quote.

Mr. Minister, when are you going to realize that your helter-skelter approach to gambling addictions in this province is hurting real people all across Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, let me repeat. We have in the province of Saskatchewan the most comprehensive program of prevention and treatment of any jurisdiction in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, if the member wants to judge the program on a per capita expenditure basis, Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan we are spending more per capita than in any other province in Canada by far, by far — about three times as much, Mr. Speaker, as his counterparts in the Government of Alberta are spending, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Government Relations with Large Corporations

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the transformation from rabid socialist to captain of industry has certainly been a short trip for the current NDP Premier in this province.

In an editorial in today's *Star-Phoenix* Dan Zakreski wrote, and I quote:

Back in 1991 during the provincial election, premier-in-waiting . . . (the hon. member from Riversdale) toured the boonies pilloring . . . (the member from Estevan) and the Tories for their joint venture with Cargill.

The NDP rhetoric painted a picture of hard-hearted Cargill executives rolling across the American border on Harley Davidsons wearing chains and black leather.

And that was just a few years ago, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, Cargill is the Premier's best friend, now that he's in power. The M-word, megaproject, with multinational corporation is now okay, Mr. Speaker.

My question to the Premier: Mr. Premier, where has all the inflamed rhetoric gone? Which is it? Were you wrong then, or are you wrong now, Mr. Premier?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to say to the hon. member from Morse that I was correct then, and I'm correct now.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — I was correct then because the arrangement that your seat-mate, the former premier, made with Cargill was a once-in-a-lifetime special arrangement, the funding and the nature of which is still on the table, and everybody knows the circumstances of it.

The consequence of the announcement that was made outside of Saskatoon for Blucher on Monday morning in Saskatoon is part of a policy which is designed to promote manufacturing and processing — note those words — manufacturing and processing right across the piece, not only for the Cargills of the world, but for the Wheat Pools and in manufacturing and processing in other areas.

We said that once we got out of the financial mess that you left us in, we would have sufficient funds to have targeted tax reductions designed to embellish and enhance jobs, jobs for Saskatchewan people in selected areas and industries. This is a uniform tax concession applicable right across the piece, fairly, to everybody.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Premier, you should talk to your seat-mate there, the Economic Development minister, because I don't recollect you changing that deal with Saferco at all. In fact your minister there says, and I would quote: in the fall of 1992 Economic Development minister Dwain Lingenfelter praised Saskferco as an exciting project that employs 130 people and contributed 90 million annually to the provincial economy.

The same member who incidentally slammed the project a year earlier as a sweetheart deal, Mr. Premier, a sweetheart deal, one year later, Mr. Premier — as Mr. Zakreski said, "Ain't love grand."

Well, Mr. Premier, you've come a long way since executives of Cargill visited this very Assembly. And I remember the childish insults the members of your caucus threw at those Cargill executives that day in this House. So, Mr. Premier, is economic development and job creation a good thing for Saskatchewan no matter who does it, or only when you do it, sir?

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is it's a good thing obviously that we all achieve, but not the way you and your administration did it. Definitely not. Because the way you and your administration did it was to drive us 14 to \$15 billion in the hole. You gave money away to all the large, multinational corporations, and in the consequence the starvation that took place in social and other economic programs were obvious for everybody to see.

You get up and you quote that Mr. Zakreski — I'm assuming that's Mr. Dan Zakreski from the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* — as a source. That is where the PC caucus research is all about — the *Star-Phoenix* and the *Leader-Post*; they're the Liberal/PC calling card in the province of Saskatchewan; the CBC (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation) which takes one sentence

out of line and somehow says, this is how the facts of economic development are.

They aren't the facts. The facts are that our policy is designed on a *Partnership for Renewal* paper. It identifies our strengths; it identifies our weaknesses; it is designed to give tax breaks, those limited ones that we have — and we still are in some difficulty in getting out of your mess though the sky is now brighter and the sun is beginning to shine in Saskatchewan — selected tax increases along a purposeful job creation strategy based on Saskatchewan strengths aiding Saskatchewan people. There's a world of difference between your way and the people's way, our way.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Premier, now that you've changed your mind about the M-word, let's go on to the P-word — privatization. Mr. Paul Martin has a nice quote from the *Star-Phoenix* here talking about the Potash Corporation.

Just a few years after privatization, the Potash Corporation has gone from losing \$100 million a year to posting profits exceeding 125 million. It has paid off its debt, and it's strengthened its balance sheet, and was able to finance a hundred per cent of Texasgulf. It's abundantly evident that none of this, none of this, Mr. Speaker, would have been possible if PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan Inc.) were still in government hands, in your hands, Mr. Premier.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Now I would be very curious to hear, Mr. Premier, what convoluted and politically charged response you have to this success story. Is less government through privatization good for the economy of Saskatchewan? Or is it not in the cards for the captains of NDP industry?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order. Before I hear from the Premier, there's just too many people want to answer the question for the Premier. And I wish that people would please not interrupt. And when the Premier is answering, there's just too much interruption from this side. Please stop the interruptions.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Those who are seeking to help me to answer of course are from the opposition. But I would say, Mr. Speaker, that those in the opposition who asked this question are like the Bourbons — they learn nothing and they remember nothing. What they want to do is to fight the election of 1991 all over again. And I want to tell you that if they want to meet us in this forthcoming election on the same grounds and terms and conditions, we welcome that 100 per cent of the way.

Because when the member talks about the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, and again refers to that Liberal and PC calling

card named the *Star-Phoenix* and the *Leader-Post* as the evidence for this, what he refuses to mention is that in the privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan you gave away in taxpayers' money something in the order of over \$400 million in the privatization — 400, in fact I think it goes between 400 and \$600 million — that's what you gave the private shareholders of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, from which now they build.

Of course we welcome that they build. There's nothing we can do about the fact that you gave away 400 to \$600 million of taxpayers' bucks which we could have used for hospitals and for roads and for small businesses.

That was the election of 1991; whether or not the ordinary taxpayers and farmers would support your big-business friends and your privatization mania, your attempt to sell off SaskPower and SaskEnergy — your privatization mania — and Cargill on those special deals. I'll be more than pleased to meet you and your colleagues on the election trail on that methodology of economic development, and the *Star-Phoenix* and the *Leader-Post*, any day, any day.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Health District Deficits

Mrs. Bergman: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The deficit problem for the province's health boards continues to grow, Mr. Speaker. First we heard about the Regina District projected deficits. Then yesterday we tabled two more health district financial statements in the legislature, showing two more deficits.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I table a further four financial statements from the Twin Rivers, Prince Albert, Saskatoon, and Prairie West health districts — all showing overall deficits for the last fiscal year. This is a very disturbing trend, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Health. Since the minister must now have most of the financial statements of the district boards for last year in his possession, will he commit to tabling them so that the people of Saskatchewan can see the full extent of the problem?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, the member, whether she doesn't understand or doesn't want to bring this information to the attention of the House, she brings to the House now figures based on '93-94. That's the figures she's bringing to the House today. And I know this because I've had phone calls to my office telling me that she or some member of her staff have been phoning around the province this morning.

Now they bring in data for '93-94. I would remind the member that the district health boards, for the most part, only were formed for a very short portion of that fiscal year. And deficits may have been run up by institutions in that year, and they will show in that fiscal year.

I want to report to the member today that the fiscal year for '94-95 will end at the end of this month. Three months from that date, all of the district health boards are required by legislation to provide audited statements of their financial affairs to the department, to myself. When those audited statements are available, Mr. Speaker, I will make them available to the member and to all members.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mrs. Bergman: — Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Health minister told us that he didn't know how many districts had deficits this year or last year, or what the total health care deficits are. The ones we now know about, Mr. Speaker, amount to more than \$22 million, and apparently over 15 million in operating deficits alone. And it is the opposition who has had to uncover this information, Mr. Speaker.

Despite the minister's assurances yesterday that this information is public, and I quote:

... with each of our district boards we work very ... closely. And we'll work with the Regina board in terms of their budget and their plans, as we do with every board in the province.

My question is to the Minister of Health again: since you have been working so closely with these boards, how do you explain not just one, not just the three we tabled yesterday, but at least seven deficits for last year alone, totalling \$22 million and probably much more?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, it becomes more clear on a daily basis what happened a year or two ago when that caucus and that party voted against the formation of the district boards, voted against the health legislation; now they make it clear they are opposed to the concept of local control and local decision making over health care. What they are saying now, that we don't trust the local communities to make the best decisions.

I repeat — I repeat, Mr. Speaker — that when the fiscal year ends, by law, the districts are required to provide to the department, to the minister, and through the minister to the legislature, their audited financial statements. At that time, Mr. Speaker, we can have a reasonable debate based on the real audited numbers and not some imaginings that may come from the parties opposite.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mrs. Bergman: — Mr. Speaker, I tabled financial statements today that indicate these deficits. This government went to great lengths to tell people that closing 52 hospitals would save \$20 million.

This was a key part of the government's health care reform plan. Some plan, Mr. Speaker. Only a short year later, it seems that the plan has not worked or that the actual plan has been to offload the province's deficit onto the health boards.

My concern, Mr. Speaker, is that these deficits will mean more lay-offs, more hospital closures, and longer waiting-lists. The \$22 million in the health deficit that we now know about is equivalent to over 800 more licensed practical nurses being laid off.

My question to the minister: given that the minister says that he has been working closely with the boards, can he tell us what he intends to do about these deficits? Do people in Saskatchewan once again have to brace themselves for more lay-offs, more hospital closures, and further deterioration of patient care?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, I repeat to the member, I repeat to all members, that yes, the department and myself and the government continues to work closely with the district health boards, both in the terms of the formation of their budgets and approval of those budgets and in the reporting and the accountability of the district health boards.

Now she talks about potential lay-offs or potential difficulties in health care funding. I want to ask that member, I want to ask her caucus, where were you when the federal government were planning their budget? Where have you been? Where have you been since your federal government has announced billions of dollars in reductions to health, education, and social spending across Canada? Where have you been?

And let me ask this final question. Where are you today on the question of block funding? Do you support the Liberal position, federal, of block funding to the provinces? Do you support that? Please stand up and tell us where the Liberal Party of Saskatchewan stands on this crucial question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

SGI Broker Convention

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the minister responsible for SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance). Mr. Minister, why is SGI holding a free, I repeat free, George Fox concert for its brokers on March 18 in Regina? Why should Saskatchewan taxpayers have to fork out for your Crown corporation to have a party for its brokers?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to respond to the member's question because it gives me an opportunity to correct some of the misinformation he provides here.

SGI has had a convention and a workshop session for its brokers for 40 years, every year in a row. There is an important reason for having that, Mr. Speaker. It provides training sessions and it's important for the maintenance of accreditation of the brokers out there who make sure that SGI's insurance business is well marketed by these very same people

So, Mr. Speaker, the expenditure of money in order to provide this training and this accreditation and show these brokers that the taxpayers who are the shareholders of SGI appreciate the work that they do for them, is an important function for which I think neither members of this House nor members of that House should apologize for.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well I'm glad to see we have a new SGI minister, because I certainly wasn't impressed with the performance of the last one.

Mr. Minister, Saskatchewan taxpayers don't even get to go to this concert even though they get to pay for it. I guess you think that's okay, Mr. Speaker, because Saskatchewan taxpayers get to pay for a lot of things they don't get any benefits out of; like \$9 million pensions for the Premier and his gang of seven.

Mr. Minister, you have forced Saskatchewan families to make sacrifice after sacrifice. Taxes are up, utilities are up, and SGI insurance rates are up. You have closed hospitals, cancelled gambling addiction programs, and taken millions of dollars from farm families. And now you have enough money to put on a free concert just for SGI.

Mr. Minister, why on top of all these things should Saskatchewan taxpayers be forced to pay for a free concert they can't even attend?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the member should be reminded that the brokers who come to this convention which assists them in marketing the products of SGI and therefore, Mr. Speaker, assist the policyholders who buy policies from SGI because these people are then more qualified to advise them, I want the member opposite to know that brokers who come here actually contribute to the cost with their registration fees to the tune of \$64,000.

So they contribute to their training as well as SGI because everybody benefits. The brokers benefit, SGI benefits, and the policyholders benefit because the brokers are more prepared to provide them the services that they require when they come to their office to purchase the policies from SGI.

There is nothing wrong, Mr. Speaker, in also saying to these brokers, who make SGI a successful company, thank you for what you do for us, thank you for what you do for the brokers, and thank you for what you do for the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Resignation of Judge Robert Smith

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today

to advise the Assembly that in accordance with the requirements of section 17 of The Provincial Court Act, I am tabling a report of the committee of inquiry that was established by the Judicial Council to determine whether Judge Robert Smith of the Provincial Court of Saskatchewan should be removed from office.

The Judicial Council, as it is empowered to do pursuant to The Provincial Court Act, established the committee as a result of a number of complaints it received respecting Judge Robert Smith. That committee, chaired by Mr. Justice William Matheson of the Court of Queen's Bench for Saskatchewan, has now submitted a report to the Judicial Council, a copy of which was provided to the Attorney General.

In its report the committee recommended that Judge Robert Smith be removed from office. The Judicial Council, after receiving and considering the committee's report, also recommended that Judge Robert Smith be removed from office.

I understand that Judge Robert Smith and his legal counsel received copies of the committee's report and the recommendation of the Judicial Council. I was advised yesterday afternoon by the chief judge of the Provincial Court of Saskatchewan that Judge Robert Smith resigned from the office of judge of the Provincial Court of Saskatchewan effective March 7, 1995.

In accordance with the requirements of section 17 of The Provincial Court Act, I am now tabling the report of the committee of inquiry.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 36 — An Act to amend The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill to amend The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act, 1995 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. 37 — An Act respecting Medical Laboratory Technologists

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill respecting Medical Laboratory Technologists.

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

Bill No. 38 — An Act to amend Certain Health Statutes

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend Certain Health Statutes.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time

at the next sitting.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly and in consultation with the members of the opposition, I would move that we would revert to private members' Bills, second readings, Bill No. 03, An Act to provide for the incorporation of The Manitoba-Saskatchewan Conference of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

Leave granted.

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 03 — An Act to provide for the incorporation of The Manitoba-Saskatchewan Conference of the Seventh-day Adventist Church

Ms. Lorje: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure to speak to second reading of Bill No. 03, An Act to provide for the incorporation of The Manitoba-Saskatchewan Conference of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

The purpose of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is to streamline accounting within the Manitoba and Saskatchewan Conference. They will, as a result of the passage of this Bill, if it should pass, they will then have one overall umbrella which will make for simpler and more efficient operation. It will replace three corporations and roll them into one, and it will include all current tax exemptions.

I wish to speak briefly to this Bill because it seems to me that many people do not fully understand just exactly what the purposes and missions of the Seventh-day Adventists are, and I would like to quote from a document I've received regarding their mission:

Seventh-day Adventists are committed to using all their resources and energy, including their churches, educational institutions, and health facilities, to carry out their mission of leading people to salvation in Jesus; to teaching people the biblical faith and the Christian lifestyle, thus equipping them to serve, through their God-given abilities, in their church and communities, and preparing them to meet their soon coming Lord.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Seventh-day Adventists exist to promote Christianity as they understand it. They have several unique beliefs, very deeply held beliefs, including celebration of the Sabbath on what most of us would consider to be Saturday. And they also believe in the physical second coming of Christ, not just the spiritual second coming of Christ.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, often people think that Seventh-day Adventists are a cult. They are not, though they are sometimes misunderstood perhaps because they have very

clear customs such as tithing, adult baptism by immersion, and observing the Sabbath on a Saturday. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, they have often been prosecuted under old Sunday labour laws because of their strong, biblical, and intense belief in the fourth commandment.

Seventh-day Adventists have been on the Prairies, Mr. Speaker, since the 1880s. The first church that they established in this province was at Waldheim, Saskatchewan. The Manitoba-Saskatchewan Conference was formed in 1932 to meet the economic problems of the Depression. They now serve their flock, their congregation, in over 180 countries around the world, and they have three main purposes. In no particular order, their three main purposes are, first of all, medical; secondly, educational; and thirdly, religious.

In the medical field, they have over 300 medical clinics and 162 hospitals with 20,000 beds that they operate worldwide. Members of this House would perhaps be most aware of their amazing successes at the Loma Linda medical facility in the United States. Because of the unique Canadian medical system, they do not operate hospitals — the unique and wonderful Canadian medical system — they do not operate hospitals in Canada, but they do operate nursing homes, and the Sunnyside Nursing Home in Mr. Speaker's constituency is a good example of the long-term care facilities that they operate.

Their second purpose is educational. They are the second largest religious-based educational system in the world, second only to the Roman Catholic Church in terms of the number of schools owned. They have over 5,000 elementary and secondary schools, 92 colleges and universities.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the paramount purpose of the Seventh-day Adventist Church is to advance their religion and their observances of Christianity as they understand it. Worldwide, they have 8.2 million members. They believe in adult baptism and immersion in water, and each week in this world over 11,000 people are baptized into the Seventh-day Adventist Church. In Manitoba and Saskatchewan the Seventh-day Adventist Conference operates 35 churches, has 3,000 members, operates five schools, and three extended-care homes. They have over 400 employees promoting education, health, and the Christian lifestyle.

They provide for services for their members and also for the general population. Many members of this House may be aware of some of these services. For instance, they do an excellent program in stop-smoking seminars. They conduct nutrition classes and stress-control workshops. I've already mentioned the extended-care homes they operate. They also have community service centres which provide short-term and emergency help with food and clothing to indigent people. And finally, Mr. Speaker, they also have in this past year initiated a ministry for northern first nations people. All these things go a long way to promoting wellness in this province and in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 03 will allow this church to carry on their

very good purposes and missions. The purpose of this incorporation is to enable the Seventh-day Adventist Church to consolidate its operations in Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

And consequently I move that Bill No. 03, An Act to provide for the incorporation of The Manitoba-Saskatchewan Conference of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills.

The Speaker: — I assumed when we asked for leave before to return to this Bill, that immediately after we would return to government business. Is that correct?

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as well I would ask, with the spirit of cooperation, I ask leave to move to private members' Bills, second reading of Bill No. 33 — An Act respecting the Donation of Food.

Leave granted.

(1430)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 33 — An Act respecting the Donation of Food

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's with great pleasure that I give second reading to a Bill respecting the Donation of Food.

Mr. Speaker, in recent years demand at food banks has continued to climb, and unfortunately donations have not kept pace. A story in last Friday's *Star-Phoenix* said that the Saskatoon food bank is down to one day's supply of food. And I understand that the Regina food bank is in a similar situation.

Recently I heard about an idea to help address this problem, an idea that would result in more food being donated without costing Saskatchewan taxpayers one dime.

Every day in Saskatchewan hotels, restaurants, grocery distributors, and others in the food industry throw out hundreds of pounds of good, nutritious food. They are not doing this to be wasteful. In fact most would prefer to donate left-over food, surplus food, to the food bank, but they are unable to do so because of the liabilities they could face in the unlikely event that the donated food causes illness.

In recent years the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, and Manitoba have enacted what is called good Samaritan legislation. Legislation that exempts donors from any legal responsibility for the food unless the consumer of the food becomes sick as a result of an intentional act or the

donor acted with a reckless disregard for public safety. The Bill also gave the same protection to food bank workers.

The response, Mr. Speaker, has been tremendous. We received copies of letters from various food banks in Ontario which have noticed a significant increase in the food donation since the legislation was introduced last June. I understand in fact, Mr. Speaker, there is something in the magnitude of a 70 per cent increase in the donations of food to food banks in Ontario.

We have also received copies of letters from grocery distributors and manufacturers who are more than pleased to donate excess food now that the legislation is in place.

I am pleased to introduce a similar piece of good Samaritan legislation to the people of Saskatchewan. Yesterday I took the unusual step of providing an advance copy of the Bill to the Premier, the Government House Leader, the Liberal House Leader, and the ministers of Social Services, Health, and Justice for their review.

The reason I did this is that we would like to see this legislation passed as soon as possible. It's a relatively simple piece of legislation — it's just one page long — and we could pass this legislation right away if members of the House would co-operate, Mr. Speaker.

I believe there is a sense of urgency. As I mentioned earlier, the Saskatoon food bank is almost out of food; Regina is facing a similar situation. This is a common sense solution to a problem that we could implement right away. And again it doesn't cost the taxpayers of Saskatchewan one dime.

I should also mention that this Bill has received the support of many provincial hunger organizations, including the Regina and Saskatoon food banks, Chili for Children, the Infant Hunger Action Group, Hunger in Moose Jaw Inc., Saskatchewan child hunger and education, and the Regina Education and Action on Child Hunger, commonly known as REACH.

We have also been in contact with some Regina hotels like the Hotel Saskatchewan and the Ramada Renaissance. They are supportive of this Bill and excited about the possibilities. And, Mr. Speaker, we have also received a letter of support from the Canadian Federation of Independent Business.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good idea. It's supported by people on all sides of the issue. I'm hopeful that members on all sides of the House will see fit to support this Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move second reading of a Bill respecting the Donation of Food.

Hon. Mr. Pringle: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I yesterday, you recall, had agreed to take a look at this Bill and to consult with other provinces, which we're

beginning to do today, with other provinces where this legislation has been brought in, and also with the food banks.

And that's certainly not meant as any indication that what the Leader of the Opposition says isn't accurate; it's just that I think it's also incumbent on us to make sure that we believe that the various groups, as quoted by the minister, support this kind of approach.

And I say this because I spent an hour and a half last Thursday with the executive director of the Regina food bank and the board. And we looked at the issues facing the Regina food bank and the other kinds of services that are located there and potentially to be located there in terms of an integrated, holistic service, and this was not raised with me. However, that's not to say that they don't support it.

I guess I would suggest that . . . In fact I'm advised by my staff that the incredible success that the hon. leader quotes in other jurisdictions may or may not be accurate. But we wouldn't . . . but there is some public support for this notion.

We want to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that we deal with the immediate needs of food banks, and of course, as you know, we're directing — just this year alone, and last year and the year before — over a million dollars on child development and nutrition programs to deal with child hunger.

I might add that I find it somewhat surprising in the face of this Bill that the opposition members chose to oppose that million dollars on hunger programs. And I would hope that they will see fit in the current budget — in the current budget — they will see fit to support the child development nutrition program this year, which directs a million dollars towards hunger programs and I think some 45 or 50 hunger programs that we're supporting around the province, many in schools. And in fact some of those programs are located in food banks — for example, in Saskatoon.

So I think that we need to make sure as well that we're consistent on the approach around child poverty strategy. Mr. Speaker, the issue of family poverty is a serious challenge. I think we would all agree with that.

And the key of course to dealing with family poverty is addressing the issue of strengthening the economy; providing long-term, meaningful job opportunities to Saskatchewan families; to stabilizing and enhancing our agricultural strategy, which we believe we've done through the *Agriculture 2000* paper and the *Partnership for Renewal* job strategy which is beginning to pay, we think, big dividends.

That's the approach to take to providing the training, education, and skill development opportunities through enhanced programs like New Careers, Future Skills and the JobStart program, the new money directed towards the forestry and young people, and also directed towards some of the other initiatives. And of course, providing tax breaks to small-business people, which we did in this budget. Those are the

ways in which we create jobs, Mr. Speaker, to create meaningful salaries and benefits to working people.

I might also add, Mr. Speaker, that again I find it a little bit inconsistent that the Leader of the Opposition who promotes this Bill — which I don't oppose — but that he would also introduce private members' Bills to try and take away potential benefits from part-time employees who also live in poverty, Mr. Speaker.

And so, without putting too fine a point on it, there are a lot of inconsistencies by that particular member. Having said that, I certainly want to mention that if this Bill is as positive as it appears to be on the surface, we'll ensure that it has speedy passage.

I think there are some other good signs, Mr. Speaker. The social assistance case-loads are down. I know the majority of users of the food bank are on social assistance. And the majority, 45 per cent of all the recipients of the food bank services, are children.

And so we certainly support the fact that young people off assistance and providing jobs for people to get into the labour market are key elements, because we also have to address the causes of poverty. Mr. Speaker, we have to address the causes of poverty.

Now we know that poverty developed and grew in incredible ways during the 1980s, and we're trying to play catch-up now, but that's fine. We have to work together on this, Mr. Speaker.

So the long-term strategy . . . I want to see some commitment to the long-term strategy too. The long-term strategy is to improve the economy, to provide good supports to training, education, and skills development, enhanced day care, Mr. Speaker, which is an important part of this. Because again 45 per cent . . . pardon me, 29 per cent of all of the recipients on social assistance are single-parent women who certainly require day care as a way to sort of bridge that support to independence.

And so I'm committing ourselves . . . we're committing ourselves to looking seriously at the Bill. And I would plead with the Leader of the Opposition to also take seriously that there is a longer, broader-term strategy, and to look at some of the areas in which they actually have voted in a way which would enhance the numbers of children going into food banks and requiring the service.

All I'm asking is that they give some thought, on reflecting on this Bill, that they need to be giving other messages too that are important in supporting low income people.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I believe that, as I said, we will give the Bill serious consideration and make it speedy, once we do our own research. And I'd like to move adjournment on debate at this point.

Debate adjourned.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS (Not Debatable)

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — As it relates to return no. 46, I move that it be converted to motion for return (debatable).

The Speaker: — Motion for return (debate) for no. 46.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 34 — An Act to repeal The Economic Development and Tourism Act

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, this is a very minor amendment. And, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Economic Development has requested that this Bill be repealed effective April 1, 1995.

The sections of this Act that are still in force exist to support the northern Saskatchewan economic development revolving fund which my department intends to dissolve. And with the announcement of my colleague, the Associate Minister of Economic Development, this all becomes obvious as it moves to another venue.

All assets and liabilities will be transferred to the General Revenue Fund. And under the powers of The Department of Economic Development Act, 1994, my department will continue to administer outstanding loans that were made under the revolving fund.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of the Act.

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

Bill No. 35 — An Act to amend The Department of Economic Development Act, 1993

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned a few moments ago, the repeal of the previous Act is complemented and supplemented with the implementation of this amendment, and I'm pleased to present to the Assembly for second reading, the amendments to The Department of Economic Development Act, 1993.

Mr. Speaker, it's a simple housekeeping Bill required because my department intends to initiate a loans program as part of the northern development fund. The purpose is to amend section 12, so that the Minister of Economic Development may, first, set interest rates on loans; secondly, dispose of assets realized when security is seized.

And, Mr. Speaker, although the minister currently has these powers under section 9(1) of The Economic Development and Tourism Act as you are probably aware, it is intended that the Act be repealed, which we are in the process of doing at the present time.

(1445)

Although this is a simple change, Mr. Speaker, I should however emphasize the importance of the northern development fund, or NDF. You may recall that the initiative was announced on February 8 by my colleague, the associate Economic Development minister, and his presentation along with the Associate Minister of Education in northern Saskatchewan.

The NDF will enable government, in partnership with Northerners, to pursue opportunities through a loan program up to \$2 million annually. The fund will provide core funding of \$315,000 annually and an advisory support for community-based regional economic development organizations.

These organizations are similar to the REDAs (regional economic development authority) in the southern part of the province, and in principle, but specifically adapted to the unique situation and needs of northern Saskatchewan.

This year's budget provides \$250,000 funding for support in professional assistance to complement existing federal and provincial programs and increase Northerners' access to markets, promotion, research, and development of expertise and resources.

Mr. Speaker, in this fiscal year, a northern advisory board will help improve the coordination of provincial government and community-based regional economic development policy and programing, and to participate in an advisory role in the administration of the NDF. The fund will also be used to increase the professional and technical business advice the government provides Northerners, and to develop a training and skills enhancement package.

In partnership with community-minded companies that are creating resource opportunities in northern Saskatchewan, the northern development fund will support Northerners in exciting new business creation and expansion efforts that will benefit the entire Saskatchewan economy.

Mr. Speaker, a good example of this is Contact Lake gold-mine, officially opened recently, which has put millions of dollars into northern economy through intensive and extensive use of northern contractors, and by creating jobs for northern residents.

It is with tremendous opportunities like this in mind, Mr. Speaker, that I am pleased to present amendments to The Department of Economic Development Act, 1993, for second reading.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading of this amendment.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we believe that this Act, An Act to amend The Department of Economic Development Act, as the minister has indicated, is not as simple

as the minister has brought forward. I believe that when we start talking about loans and readdressing how loans are made available and an expenditure of funds, it's important that as an opposition we do take a little more time to review the Bill to see exactly what the Bill is addressing and where it is going.

And for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I believe it's appropriate that we would move adjournment of debate at this time.

Debate adjourned.

The Speaker: — Why is the member on his feet?

Mr. Martens: — Could I have leave to introduce some guests?

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Seated in your gallery is a neighbour of mine, Mr. Stewart Wells, who has come to discuss with the Committee on Private Members' Bills some of the implications of the Act respecting the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. And I heard from committee members that this gentleman, Stewart, has conveyed his impressions of what should be done and what shouldn't be done in a very convenient and a forthright manner. And I want to welcome him to the Assembly here today, and thank him for coming to see the business of the House today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

General Revenue Fund Women's Secretariat Vote 41

Item 1

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have no officials here today. We've agreed to use the vehicle of estimates to comment on some of the policy initiatives on Women's Day today, on International Women's Day, and I thank the opposition and the third party for making this possible.

One of the things that women are looking at always on International Women's Day is to measure what we've achieved in the past while. It's kind of a taking stock day. And in the political sphere people have asked themselves the questions, are we progressing? And we think that the achievements of women in the last two decades have been significant, especially in the political sphere, and of course I feel that way being that I'm able to be here making these comments.

Too often we think of the political spheres involving only women in traditional political party work, but the political sphere involves everyone who takes a role in changing what's

going on in their community, in their union, and their workplace, and their business, and so one of the great achievements of the women's movement has been to redefine what's political, and it's made many issues that were previously seen as personal and put a political view on them.

For example, issues like violence against women and abuse. These are issues that several years ago wouldn't have been on the public agenda and certainly wouldn't have been on the political agenda. But because women have worked on raising the awareness of these issues because of the very personal impacts they've had on their lives, it's moved these issues onto the political agenda. And because of that we now have networks of transition houses, crisis centres, and advocacy groups that are working on preventing and eliminating violence as part of public policy.

The Victims of Domestic Violence Act was a ground-breaking piece of legislation in Saskatchewan, and it provides for an abuser to be removed from the home. And certainly women have been very forthcoming and saying if we're going to deliver services in these ways, then we have to have more outreach types of services so that while women are in their homes they can still receive the kind of services they might have received previously in a transition house.

But more importantly, this kind of an Act sends a message that we're no longer prepared as a society to tolerate domestic violence and that we're prepared to protect people who are victims. And I think it's those kind of messages that are also very important to women who are trying to create change.

The women's movement has also advocated for changes in the paid labour force, and we've seen changes to labour standards where employer-sponsored benefits must now be given to part-time employees on a prorated basis in workplaces of more than 10 employees, and also statutory holiday pay being prorated for part-time workers.

Improvements to both maternity and paternity leave helps families because it gives them more flexibility in their family responsibilities.

Domestic workers was an area of particular concern and now domestic workers are entitled to minimum wage, hours of work, holiday pay, and overtime pay — and this would include women who live in their employer's home, also who come in on a regular basis.

And I know this is very important. A young woman who I spoke to last year, who was working as a domestic worker, was very concerned that there was no standards regulating her place of work. So we consider this a particularly progressive part of this legislation.

Sexual harassment has always been a difficulty — if a person wants to keep their job, they often are put in a position where they have to put up with a number of things which are not necessarily conducive to a happy workplace. And we've

recently added sexual harassment to the provisions under The Occupational Health and Safety Act. And one of the really good things about this, is it's created a proactive way to deal with problems before they get all out of proportion and before they become a major disturbance in the workplace. And I think it's much better, if there's problems due to people's differing views of what constitutes appropriate sexual behaviour in the workplace, this gives people a way to deal with it that's not as confrontive as the mechanisms of the past.

As far as balancing work and family, I was mentioning to some women I spoke to the other day — sometimes you feel like that little Duracell bunny that's on TV and you just sort of keep going until your battery runs out, and someday women will just collectively all fall over when their batteries run out.

But we have had a condition of women, when they entered the workplace, not only doing the workplace jobs, but also continuing to carry the responsibilities of home and family. So many women's groups, many employers and many unions, are looking at how to create more family-friendly workplaces, and looking for more flexible arrangements that recognize the realities of people's daily work lives without having to sacrifice productivity or accomplishments in the workplace.

As far as child care goes, there's been some changing views in how child care is handled. At one point there was a lot of support for a more institutional approach and now people are moving a little more to wanting child care closer to home in their neighbourhood where the children don't have to leave the area that they live in and that they go to school in. So we have a range of approaches now to child care, but our goal is to still increase support as we're able to in those areas.

In health care, there's been more recognition of specific women's disease, women's illness that affects women more than it does other people. And in recognition of this the women's health centre has been opened at the Regina General Hospital and it offers a range of reproductive health services including counselling, diagnosis, and treatment. One of the health services in Regina has recently added a menopause clinic, and just in the nick of time, I might add.

There are many other areas in which women's movement has made gains. And many people who are watching today are activists and know how much has been achieved and how much more needs to be done. The important point though is that women have achieved a greater political voice and have made some room for these kinds of important issues on the public political agenda.

Today 13 women sit as MLAs (Member of the Legislative Assembly) in the Saskatchewan legislature. There are four women in cabinet. And since the spring of 1992, 44 per cent of all appointments of boards, agencies, and commissions in Saskatchewan have been women. On health boards 49 per cent of those appointed are women. So these will all bring those additional voices and broader perspectives to the discussions that take place.

It's become apparent to myself that there's more work to be done in terms of rural and agricultural women, northern women, people who have less access to services and exist in more isolated situations. Certainly disabled women and disabled parents experience many problems that many of us aren't familiar with. And there's new opportunities for women in business.

And these are all areas that I think in the coming year, as we move towards another year of action in this area, we'll be looking more closely at these areas. But today is a day to take stock and to celebrate. And I thank the legislature for giving us the time to do this today. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1500)

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to stand in my place today in recognition of this very important day.

It has been a long, hard fight for the women. Mr. Chairman, it goes back over 100 years. I would like to mention the name of Elizabeth Cady Stanton who was born in Jamestown, New York in 1815. She isn't too well known in our time, Mr. Chairman, but few women have made a greater influence on women's issues than Elizabeth Cady Stanton.

She was one of the early feminist leaders and the author of the historic *Declaration of Sentiments* at the first women's rights convention in 1848, and also spearheaded the successful efforts to give women in the New York state joint guardianship of their children and the right to own property and also the right to sue in court. Just listing the rights that she did so much to win is an indication of how bad things were for women before she came along.

She did not live long enough to see women win the right to vote, but on days such as International Women's Day, she deserves to be saluted and remembered for the way she fought for equality and justice for women. Several years later in 1869, the territory of Wyoming became the first government, virtually anywhere, to adopt women's suffrage and give women the right to vote. And it's interesting to know at that time, Mr. Chairman, Wyoming was considered a way out west, where men were men, yet they were a half a century ahead of the rest of the world in rights for women.

That was well over a hundred years ago, Mr. Chairman, and although women have made great strides over the past century there is still much to be done. Problems such as equal work for equal pay have yet to be completely realized, even in Canada in the 1990s. There is still widespread physical abuse of women and children. And although people are becoming more and more aware of this abuse, unfortunately it is still considered acceptable in some countries and is ignored in others. As well, United Nations delegates at the world's poverty summit presently being held in Copenhagen state that women constitute

up to 70 per cent of the world's 1.2 billion poor and two-thirds of the world's illiterate.

Mr. Chairman, it's obvious that statistics like that are alarming and are proof that there is much to be done to deal with the many of the challenges facing all people today and especially the women.

Dealing with these problems takes the effort of everyone, Mr. Chairman, not just the women who are affected. It is imperative that we all work together to strive for equality for all individuals. Yet today, in recognition of International Women's Day, I would like to congratulate all of the men and women who have worked diligently over many years to address the needs of women, starting over 100 years ago, to strive for equality and fairness, and in the end, make the world a better place for all of us to live in.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to make a few remarks on this day, this day marking International Women's Day. And I do so mainly just to assist with the raising of the awareness of the importance of keeping vigilant, both politically and at home, about the need for continued change as affects the relationship between men and women.

And also, I suppose, the first thing to do on a day like this is also to celebrate the accomplishments that have already happened in the past. And it's not difficult to just think of what these accomplishments are. When I think myself of four generations of women, starting with my grandmother's generation and then my aunt's and mother's generation, my wife's and my sister's generation, right down to my daughters' generation, and how the roles of women have changed both in work and in family, and the corresponding change in order for some of these roles to change, how the changes had to take place also at the same time with their husbands and the men that were influential in those four generations as well.

And when I think of the work that my grandmother did, it was all centred around the family and very hard work at the farm and very hard labour. And she managed with that as well to develop very high ethical standards for her family. But how the nature of the work has changed over the time in my aunt's and mother's generation; they tended to have a higher education and some people involved in entering the professions. My wife's and my sister's generation, which became professionals in many cases, but they were in the traditional areas which differs a lot from my daughters entering into their world of work and where they became professionals in working mainly outside of the family and outside of the home situation. So we've come a long way in terms of changing the workload and the roles that women are playing in society, and we're all to the better of it.

We're not finished. And I suppose there's nothing better than to bring to one's attention in the testimony of a single person who

is affected by some things that still need to be worked on within our society. And I heard the testimony recently of a middle-aged woman who came from a middle-class — what is known as a well-established middle-class home — who had lived over 20 years in a successful marriage, and during that time never, ever had the inkling that there would ever come a time when she would be the victim of abuse. However, due to an illness on her husband's part, has suffered in the last few years all four — mental, psychological, and physical, and sexual abuse.

And the woman was left without any place to go. This happened quite suddenly and she realized she had to leave the situation. She ended up having to go to a hotel, spend the weekend there hiding from her husband, who had lost touch with reality, and really all was able to do was to get \$20 from Social Services or a friend to eat hot dogs over the weekend until she was finally able to find a place to live.

And we have now in some of our towns in Saskatchewan an increasing demand for shelters for women just like this one, who also had a child to take care of, I ought to mention. They are increasingly being organized and cared for by volunteers, with some community help, with some government help. They need a place where they can go and heal. And I think the rest of us who are around, who have not had to suffer that kind of fate, need to be sympathetic and to be aware that these things still do exist.

We are getting to a situation where I think we are considering physical abuse, even though it comes from a partner, to be more and more regarded as a criminal act. It is pretty well any place in the street. We still tend to condone some of this physical abuse in many sporting events, particularly on TV, and those that are televised think the day is going to have to come when we're going to have to consider physical abuse in sporting events just as criminal as physical abuse at home or on the street.

The role models that we have, fighting in the hockey rink, really are a throw-back to an old age. And I think we have to move away from that, and see and encourage the people that are working in those fields to consider changing the rules so we can get away from it. Because I think the role models that are set there as just not desirable for society and not desirable for our children.

The old model was that you never . . . that too often in a marriage, wives are considered property rather than partners. We're moving away from that. Husbands are acting more in terms of thinking about consequences of a lifestyle where a wife is abused.

These agencies that are working towards that and that are helping the women who are in these difficulties, have a big job ahead of them because really you have to rebuild people's lives. They have to help them recover from the state of abuse that they've been in.

Their aim, of course, is to help the women regain self-esteem

and self-reliance. And I want to wish those institutions such as in my home town, the women's aboriginal council; the YWCA, all their staff and volunteers, and particularly in this case, to the director of the YWCA in Prince Albert who I know has worked very hard in these situations, and I wish Mrs. Kowalsky the best in her work in the future. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Murray: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, today is International Women's Day, a day to pay tribute to all women; some internationally recognized; some legendary; many — most — totally unknown, save by those who they influenced or inspired.

On a day like this the lives of many women come to mind — Mother Teresa, Eleanor Roosevelt, Elizabeth I, Florence Nightingale; many whose lives are known to us and have been a powerful influence for good. This includes women who have entered public life in Canada. One of the most treasured documents I possess, my certificate of Canadian citizenship, was signed by Canada's first woman cabinet minister — Ellen Fairclough. And two of the women who are my colleagues in this Assembly each have their own remarkable story to tell.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the story of one woman, no heroine, no legend, but no less interesting and instructive for that. No heroine, I say, but she was very brave.

She was born in the early years of this century in Europe into a lower middle-class family. She had an alcoholic father, but a strong mother. Life was not easy, but the family was a happy one and they managed. She loved school and fought to go, even worked to go, since she had to earn a penny every day to ride the ferry which crossed the river that flowed between home and school.

She graduated and went to work in an office in a large city. This in itself was unusual for a young woman from her neighbourhood. She met a man, fell in love, and they married. A child was born, but by now these were the dark days of the Second World War and her country was soon invaded.

Feeding a family was almost impossible, and she often cycled miles into the country for one precious egg. Imagine her terror one morning when her husband went to work but did not return. No word, no idea if he were alive or dead. The country was occupied and no one could help her. There was a curfew. People who ventured out after dark were shot and often left on the street for days as a reminder to others who would disobey.

(1515)

But she fought back. She continued to try and find her husband and she joined the resistance movement, distributing information leaflets from the false bottom of her child's baby carriage — an extraordinarily courageous act.

Well 50 years ago her country was once again free, liberated by

the Canadians. Her husband returned from two years in a labour camp and her love affair with Canada began. She was the driving force to emigrate but the waiting-list was years long, even then. She persevered. She learned the language, studied the history and geography, and read *Winnie-the-Pooh* to her children at bedtime, in English.

Then one day a visitor came to her door. There had been a cancellation on a ship sailing to Halifax. If they could be ready in a week, they could go. A week — a week to say goodbye to the only life she and her family had ever known, one week to get packed, tie up all your loose ends, one week to say goodbye to her and her husband's family. But she did it.

And two weeks later she stood with her family, two large trunks and 100 Canadian dollars, on a dock in Halifax. She was 40 years old. They boarded a train in those halcyon days when the CPR (Canadian Pacific Railway) still had passenger service right across Canada, and went to Vancouver, and later by CPR ferry to Victoria.

She found a place to live virtually in the wilderness, but it was Canada and she loved it. And she worked. She worked alongside her husband and she also worked outside the home, amid much criticism from neighbours. But she persisted because she wanted her own house for her family. And build it they did, side by side, with her husband and children, bit by bit as they could afford the building supplies. It took three years.

And during those years, Mr. Speaker, she still had time to work with her community and her church, volunteer at the nursing home, the library, and local park. She also painted, and had a marvellous garden.

Mr. Speaker, this woman is now in her 80's. She lives in her own home, still drives, walks her dog every day, and has a beautiful garden. She visits people regularly and delivers books to those who can't get out. She hosts teas and volunteers at the local seniors' centre.

Mr. Speaker, an interesting life, but no more so than many, many others. She represents the courage, the strength, and determination of women throughout the ages — the pilgrim, the pioneer, the immigrant, the builder, and the community activist.

On International Women's Day, I'm proud to celebrate this woman's life because she is my mother. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Lorje: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would like to say a few words too on International Women's Day. I was very pleased that a member of the opposition got up and made such glowing comments about women. But I also want to emphasize that while we can make glowing comments about women on one day of the year, quite frankly, real equality has to come about through us continuously pushing for 365 days of the year. We must be ever vigilant and we must be very, very careful not to allow the forces of darkness to turn the clock back.

It has already been noted that most of the advances that women have made have occurred in this century, indeed in the last couple of decades. I'm pleased about that. I'm very pleased that women are now in the paid labour force at a rate that is almost equivalent to the participation rate of men. I'm very pleased that women can now access most medical services very easily. I'm very pleased that we have a fair degree of comfort and security in our country, and that women do not need to be overly concerned about random acts of violence.

At the same time I have to say that while we've made some progress, we have not made enough progress. It is unfortunate that we even have to have a Victims of Domestic Violence Act. It is unfortunate that in order to avoid riling the forces of reactionism, we have to comment that this Act applies equally to men and women, when all of us know that underneath it all we really are talking about the fact that women are generally the victims of domestic violence.

It is unfortunate that we have to continue working for the same kinds of wages as men have. It is unfortunate that in this province women only get paid, on average, 75 cents for each dollar that men earn. Now that's a distinct improvement over what you will see in other jurisdictions, and it's a distinct advance from the time when women were told that they had to leave their jobs after the Second World War because all they did was work for pin money, and now that the boys were home from overseas they wanted their jobs back.

But still, we haven't made enough advances. We do have a new Labour Standards Act that gives some degree of comfort and security and benefits for part-time workers, that gives us some fairly major advances in terms of lay-off notices and the ability to be treated with dignity and respect in the workplace. We have an Occupational Health and Safety Act that will deal with the whole issue of sexual harassment.

But all those things, as wonderful as they are, are still not enough, because quite frankly, all the legislation in the world cannot substitute for that most basic of things, and that is an attitude that says that all people in this world, regardless of their sex, have the right to be treated with dignity and have the right to be employed with dignity. So we need to keep working for these kinds of things. That's why this one day is important. It gives us an opportunity to focus particular attention on the issues that are as yet unresolved for women. But one day in the year is not enough. It has to be 365 days of the year. And the reason for that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is because we are now seeing the forces of right-wing extremism start to gain the ascendancy in many parts of this continent and indeed this world.

I would point out to you that it is in the last few years that we are seeing the abortion debate, which has been framed either as a moral issue or an issue of choice and control of the woman's own body. It has moved from that kind of debate and the political action and the struggle on both sides, the pro-life and pro-choice sides, it has moved beyond that into a very ugly, very pernicious, active violence that we now see occurring all

too frequently at abortion clinics in the United States and even in our own province of British Columbia.

Those kinds of extreme reactions are the same kinds of fearmongering reactions that for too many centuries kept women silent about their needs and concerns.

We also have the example of Marc Lepine at L'Ecole Polytechnique, a university, going in and gunning down 14 innocent women who were there doing what we would assume most people would want to see happen. They were studying to advance themselves to be able to become engineers, to take over in a previously male-dominated field. And instead, Mr. Chair, what happens? Marc Lepine comes in, having decided that because they are feminists, they should be exterminated.

These kinds of extreme reactions have the general effect of making women, rather than the beneficiaries of all our wonderful social advances, instead they start to become more and more frightened about taking advantage of these advances.

And finally, Mr. Chair, we see in the United States the American exemplars of conservatism, the Newt Gingrichs of the world, the Republicans deciding that they will capture America, take it by storm, and put a moral contract out on that country. They're moving to make sure that men can assume men's roles, which of course by logical extension means that women must therefore get out of those inappropriate places where they have been and go back once more to their traditional women's roles.

Newt Gingrich says he's going to set things right. I don't know how he's going to free single women and their children who are on welfare with his so-called welfare reforms. And I don't see how he's going to set things right by continuing this whole notion of blaming the victim.

We are, Mr. Chair, almost . . . well we're within five years of the end of the century. I would hope for all of us who are fortunate enough to survive through to the year 2000 that we will be able to hold our heads up highly, that we will be able to be proud and say we have achieved solid gains for women, not just on one day of the year, but for 365 days of the year.

I would hope that we will recognize the value of the unpaid work that women do in the homes and that The Income Tax Act will be changed to reflect that. I would hope that we will be able to make major advances in terms of minimum wages so that women primarily who work for minimum wages will be able to achieve a greater degree of economic security for themselves and for their children. I would hope that we would continue fighting violence in all its ugly forms and that we would continue making those solid kinds of changes that are needed to make a difference in women's lives.

But most importantly, I ask that all of us, men and women both, take a look in our own hearts and look to see what we can do individually and collectively to make a difference for women, not just on March 8, but throughout the whole of the year.

Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Hamilton: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. On the occasion of International Women's Day, I felt it was important to be able to rise in my place and share with colleagues an experience of coming together last fall of over a thousand women at an international conference titled, Women, Power and Politics, exploring the issue of a hundred years of women's voting rights in some parts of the world, such as South Australia and New Zealand, and with that knowledge, how far have women come in the hundred years in using their voice and their vote to establish internationally the issues that most affect women.

It was a powerful experience and, I think, one that broadens the perspective that we have when we leave our homes and our communities to explore what is the place of women in other countries and other communities around the world. And being a far ways away from home, understanding that no matter where we are, women have a common spirit, a common strength and determination to improve the quality of life, not only for themselves, but for their communities, for their families, and to be able to pass on a legacy of furthering the rights of women to the next generation.

As a mother of a young teen daughter, at times I need to reflect on how far women before me have come in their struggle and fight to provide me a level of comfort in seeking a position in a government in Saskatchewan and understanding how much we can do as women within the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan to continue the fight, but to also provide a level of comfort to the next generation that some of the issues will be addressed, will be important to them, will provide the equality that they're seeking in their time and place as well.

And I want to explore four areas, the first one being women in education and the challenge to the women of the future to become involved in the computer generation. Women in technologies, women in science, are among small numbers, as women who were in the past small numbers in the area of medicine and law and some of the professions that we now see gains in the numbers of women who are represented in those areas of our communities.

But what we see is women lagging behind in entering the science and technologies. And I challenge the young women of the future to get involved and not become ghettoized in the cyber space of the future.

(1530)

The women at the conference looked at the access to education in those areas, and certainly the subtle differences in which young women and young men are treated when they are being streamed into the areas of jobs of the future.

And when we're looking at the advances we've made, certainly in information technologies, the Internet systems, the

information highway, we don't want to be along the side of that highway in the future. We want to be participants in the democracy of cyber space — on the road, and moving forward into the future.

Women and the economy was an interesting day with 900 women exploring right-wing economies, left-wing economies, and which economies best suit the needs of women and advance women.

And I think one of the messages there . . . and the challenges to women in the future to be ever vigilant in guarding the idea that women cannot be involved in and understand the economies of the world. And certainly our Minister of Finance is proving locally that we can control the finances of a province or a nation and do it with a prudence and justice and wisdom that in many years past would not have been recognized, and certainly can provide incentive to women in the future to become involved in the economics in our communities and to understand that they have a vital and valid role and knowledge base to bring to those situations. Becoming involved in . . . and I'll come to, in another part of my address, that: women in government and the involvement of women in government.

I certainly want to leave the understanding that women in the economy . . . if you're looking at on the local scene, more women than ever have an entrepreneurial spirit and are becoming involved in small businesses in our communities, the areas that we're looking at providing support and some encouragement and nurturing of small business in Saskatchewan.

You'll find that what's being said about women in entrepreneurial roles and in business situations is that they do their homework. Very often their businesses are having success rates that far surpass men in the community because they are more cautious and tend to do the networking and webbing that needs to be done to understand what niche they can provide in the market-place. And it certainly is a challenge to the community to do the same kinds of diligence that's necessary to be entrepreneurial and to succeed in the business world.

At a chamber of commerce luncheon, I was so impressed with a woman who is vice-president of a major corporation in Canada and said that there are many more women who are now serving on boards and commissions and serving in the upper management levels of organizations because women bring many strengths to those organizations that haven't been there before — certainly an echoing of the women being able to web in their networks, being able to go out to the communities and hear what's necessary for a large corporation to be able to address the needs of the community, but also to be involved in the quality of life of that community and return some of the benefit to the community they serve.

And most recently at an announcement of the CIBC (Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce) call centre here, I was very impressed with the woman who was vice-president of the CIBC, who handled the media with skill, who spoke for her

organization, who talked to the issue of being customer-orientated to meeting the needs of women in their organization. But also being able to relate to women that they are in charge of their own economics and in control of the economy will provide much benefit for the women of the future in our society. So there are many areas that we need to look at that we can strengthen and support women in the economy.

Next, as my colleagues mentioned, women in government. When we have an address from the Minister responsible for Women's Secretariat and noting the numbers of women in cabinet, there are still not the equal numbers of men and women in cabinet or in many of the areas of upper management within government as well. And we need to be ever vigilant on saying what is the role that we can play to advance women in leadership roles in government.

We're very fortunate to have a society that . . . perhaps a party system that can look at what are the hindrances to women being involved in government and women in politics. And I know there have been many conferences — one I attended for the Canadian Parliamentary Association — that addressed this issue. What forms of government can put forward greater numbers of women involved in government and in speaking and representing women in the leadership in their community, and certainly exploring how we as women can network and strengthen and support each other.

But the men who are colleagues in our caucuses and in our parties can look to the areas where they can provide a role. I know the men in our caucus do provide the support, the understanding, and certainly the background and knowledge base of information where we'd come in partnership to address the issues . . . and appreciate the support from the colleagues that we gain in those areas.

So we have come a long way. We've been galloping along. We need to do more and to be able to look to the time where, in Australia, the Prime Minister mentioned that they were going to work toward 35 per cent women in government by the year 2000 and have aggressive strategies to address that target and goal. The challenge was that it's unfortunate that in our time and place we need to set the quotas and targets because, realistically in our history, we need to come to a point where there are numbers of women that represent the numbers of women in our communities. But for now we're going to be looking at setting targets and strategies that we can attain those goals of having at least 50 per cent women in leadership roles and in government.

Another day at the international conference brought to mind that we are very fortunate, as not only women in this community but women in leadership roles and women in our own homes and society — that we can look to a certain degree of comfort and support. We today have recognized those women in our society that live in violent situations and that are fleeing violence in their homes and their communities.

But when you look to the international scene, women were

speaking out about issues that were very important to them, and they are issues that certainly were gut wrenching and need all of our attention and support to be able to highlight those issues and to be able to address them on an international basis.

When we talk about the abortion issue, we also talk about, in some countries, fetal determinations. We talk about genital mutilation, talk about bride burnings . . . once a person has secured the dowry, the woman is no longer necessary to that person's life. And there are many areas where women are living daily under excessive abuse, not only physically but mentally. And the whole issue of human rights becomes certainly a women's issue and one that we need to broaden our scope and pay attention to on an international level.

So with the experience of coming together with a thousand women from many, many countries around the globe, there is much that has been done. There's much more that needs to be done. And on International Women's Day, we also need to turn our attention to the many women around the world who need our prayers and our support as they address on a daily basis the life circumstance that has them facing the situations of violence, of undermining of their role in their communities, and forever leaving them in a place where they are not a person in their own right or an individual, but someone's property to be abused or praised depending on the situation.

Mr. Chairman, I felt that on this day we need to really look at ourselves and our place in the international world, as our world becomes smaller, and applaud the women who face these issues with courage and the women that will continue with education, with understanding, and support to elevate the role and the goal of women in society — an equality situation, not only here at home but around the world. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to just make a few comments regarding International Women's Day and bring out the fact that there are many women who speak to me who feel that they have almost been put in a position of feeling inferior for a choice they made in their lives.

And while I think it's important we recognize the efforts and endeavours of individuals who look at and choose leadership and look at leadership roles in establishing businesses or aiming for positions of directorship in major corporations, I think it's very fundamentally important that we also recognize the many women who have chosen to remain at home to become homemakers and mothers.

And as I indicated, Mr. Chairman, many of these women sometimes feel like they're being left out, like they're all of a sudden second class citizens because they didn't choose to further their education, or they may have had that furthering of education and started a career and then chose to marry and then start a family and establish a very good, healthy home relationship. And I think, Mr. Chairman, it's important that we recognize the role that mothers and that homemakers and

housewives play in our society as well.

And on that basis, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to take that moment to bring that perspective to this debate, recognizing that role and acknowledging that all women in our society, regardless of the choices they make. Whether they choose to become corporate leaders, whether they choose to fill positions as teachers and nurses or in different jobs and different roles, we also must recognize the women who have chosen to make homemaking and motherhood part of their livelihoods.

And I just wanted to raise that point and bring it into this debate and acknowledge the many women who have chosen that lifestyle and give them credit for having made that choice and acknowledge the fact that it's because of their leadership in the home, many times, even as many of us as members in this Assembly will indicate, we're only able to be here because we have supportive wives who have taken leadership of the home, have become the mothers, and sometimes the disciplinarians.

They may not appreciate that role as much, but they have chosen that and given that role, and I can certainly say that in my case, not only a supportive wife but a wife who has been more than willing to accept the responsibility and give me that support at home as well as on the road. And so I thank you for your indulgence, Mr. Chairman.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1545)

**General Revenue Fund
Energy and Mines
Vote 23**

The Chairperson: — I would ask the minister at this time to introduce the officials who have joined us here today.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would like to introduce, to my right, Ray Clayton, deputy minister of Saskatchewan Energy and Mines; to my left, Trevor Dark, who is the director of Energy economics. Immediately behind me is George Patterson, who is the executive director of geology and mines; beside him is Bruce Wilson, executive director of petroleum and natural gas. In the back, I have Lynn Jacobson, who is director of personnel and administration, and Doug Koepke, manager of accounts.

As well, from the Saskatchewan Energy Conservation and Development Authority, I have the president, John Mitchell, and his finance person, Crystal Smudy. Thank you.

Item 1

Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I realize that this is a new portfolio for you, and you probably had quite bit of research to do in the last little while to get caught up. But I'm sure your officials will have some of the information.

I'd like a summary of the general state of the industry, briefly, the oil and the gas industry and the mining industry and how you see it today and where you see it going, briefly, in terms of general profitability and returns to the province, and the nature of how healthy or unhealthy it is and how likely it is to be sustained in the present condition.

Similarly I'd like you to generally comment on utilities. You're responsible for SaskPower and SaskEnergy, gas and oil and power, electricity, and maybe you could comment on how you see the utilities doing, the general health of the utilities.

And third, perhaps you could just briefly comment on some of the future projects that you might see taking place in utilities, whether it's power projects, TransGas projects, or energy projects. And you might touch on co-generation. That might just get you warmed up to start off with.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you. And I guess, to the member from Estevan, that may get me even more than warmed up; that's a long list of issues certainly that you raised.

I guess I'd like to begin by saying that as minister in charge of Energy and Mines and being new to the portfolio, I really do find it quite an exciting time and an exciting area of our economy.

The general health of the department with respect to its administration in what I can see in the short time that I've been here would tell me that we're dealing with a group of professionals, people who are serving, I believe, our province very well in terms of their interaction with people in the oil and gas and the mining industry and with other arms of government. And I find in my travels, although quite limited, that people in the oil and gas industry find Saskatchewan a good place to do business and find the Department of Energy and Mines a good branch of government, a good arm of government.

And I guess one of the comments that I get from them when I'm speaking with them is because of the professionalism of the department and the people who work there, and the advice and the recommendations that they have made to government, that the environment for their businesses in our province is a very healthy place in terms of which to do business.

And I think that's evidenced by the fact that last year we experienced record land sales, over \$200 million in this province, which certainly assisted us in putting together our balanced budgets. And so I say that this arm of our government certainly deserves, in no small way, a lot of credit for the kind of initiatives that they've assisted the government in moving toward.

With respect to the mining industry, as you will know, there are some new initiatives that are coming on stream in northern Saskatchewan that will create employment opportunities in the uranium industry, both in construction and in operations. And I think that's an exciting operation.

We just recently attended, the Premier and myself and the Associate Minister of Economic Development, attended the opening of the Contact Lake gold-mine just north of La Ronge, which is creating employment opportunities for aboriginal people and non-aboriginal people in northern Saskatchewan. So that too is really exciting.

I think the bottom line, and as it's relayed to me by people in industry, is that they find this very much a business-friendly province, a good place to do work. They're comfortable with the royalty structures that we've put in place with respect to oil and gas. And although, as you will know, coming from the southern part of the province, we have a depressed price for natural gas, but still there's optimism even on that side of the exploration and development industry as it pertains to gas.

With respect to the utilities, as you will know, this is the estimates for Saskatchewan Energy and Mines. And the Crown corporations, both SaskPower and SaskEnergy, are dealt with in the form that you and I are both familiar with in that we've scrutinized the expenditures and the direction of Crown corporations over the years as we've been in this place and as we've worked in this legislature together.

And the Crown corporations really . . . the Crown Corporations Committee is the format and is the place where we do an analysis of how those corporations are operating. And I frankly look forward to the discussions that we'll have there when we have the officials from both SaskEnergy and SaskPower, because they really are times of change for them with deregulation and with trade barriers being removed across North America. The way they're doing business is changing, and quite certainly we'll have some interesting discussions in that regard.

I think in terms of future initiatives and initiatives of the Department of Energy and Mines, one of the areas that I personally do have some concern with is how industry operates and how we tie environment and how we tie development together with industry and how we allow industry to still operate and satisfy the needs of their shareholders, but at the same time that we be cognizant and be well aware of environmental concerns that surround some of those initiatives simply by virtue of the kinds of activities that happen in order to remove oil and gas from the deposits where they are.

So I think one of the future initiatives that Energy and Mines has in the past spent and will be continuing to spend their energies on, will be how we deal with environmental concerns. And it's certainly not an issue that's only pertinent, I guess, here in Saskatchewan — it's something that we, worldwide, have to be concerned with.

We're becoming more aware of the impact on global warming and the greenhouse effect and how that might impact on other industries in terms of climate change. And so those are the kinds of initiatives that I think we need to be aware of.

On one hand, we want to create a healthy climate where

industry can satisfy the needs of their shareholders. Quite clearly, the people of Saskatchewan who are shareholders and who own the resources in our province, want a fair and a reasonable return for their resources. And on the other hand, we have to be very cognizant of the fact that our children and their children are going to be living in an environment that has been very much changed since the industrial revolution and even much more in the last 30, 40 years; and that we need to satisfy their needs and their dreams and their desires, and we have to maintain Saskatchewan as a positive place to live. And we have to be aware of the fact that our world is a fragile place.

And so I think these are some of the challenges that we as a regulatory body and a licensing body face. The Department of Energy and Mines and the people who work in it are well aware of that, and I know they're working with other arms of government to ensure that we do have a good future and that we do have an economic and an environmental future in our province.

There are a number of other initiatives, and I'm sure over the course of the discussions that we'll have here today and perhaps tomorrow and in future days in this session, that we'll have the opportunity to discuss in detail more of the initiatives that we're embarked upon.

But I think I've given you a reasonable overview of my perception, firstly, of the department; secondly, of the work that they've been doing; and thirdly, the approach that the government and government policy has taken with industry; and fourthly, our concerns for the future viability and development of our province and the resources that we will be developing over the years.

Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I just wanted to clear up something. I think that you mentioned that you could not talk about . . . or were reluctant to talk about utilities, SaskPower, for example, and SaskEnergy, during these estimates. I've always asked, and have had ministers respond to questions about SaskPower, for example, in Energy estimates, Energy and Mines, and they usually . . . your predecessor certainly did.

On page 136 of the *Estimates* we have to deal with advances to SaskEnergy and advances to SaskPower. And they have to pass this Legislative Assembly; they can't go to a Crown corporation. So we've got to ask why the utility needs the money and what it does with it and so forth.

So I think it's fair, you're the minister, and actually to get a complete picture you need to know something about the combination of money being dealt with in Energy and Mines. And certainly power is energy and gas is energy, and that's why normally the portfolios would go together.

So not to be difficult, I would think that you could sustain the practice here in the House to generally discuss — and you may not have all the details with respect to Power — but sort of the philosophy of how Energy works together in utilities and in the

departments, would be fair.

I just make that point and maybe we can get back at it at a later date.

What I was interested in finding out is that if you're optimistic about royalties and land sales in the province of Saskatchewan, could you or your officials summarize the amount of money coming into the province of Saskatchewan from oil and gas royalties — you could perhaps break it down, gas and light oil and heavy oil — the last couple years and then now; and what you expect to see in the immediate future, in the next year or so. Could you do that, so we could pursue that a bit?

(1600)

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — To the member from Estevan, with respect to the latest forecast for '94-95 in terms of royalties and taxation, our forecast is \$259.6 million. We're estimating for '95-96, \$278.3 million. This is inclusive in terms of oil. We don't have a breakdown but we can get it for you in terms of light, medium, and heavy. And we'll certainly . . . we'll forward that to you.

With respect to the bonus bids of land sales, as you will know, last year a record year, \$201.3 million last year. The most expansive land sale that this province has ever seen, which certainly does indicate some faith in our economy and faith in the structure that we put in place. And we're forecasting in terms of '95-96, \$70 million.

And as you will know, after a record investment that oil and gas people have made in the '94-95 fiscal year, it's to be expected that certainly that level wouldn't be maintained, especially in light of the wild fluctuations that we've had with respect to natural gas.

The gas royalties, we're predicting that it will be, '95-96, about the same as '94-95. We did \$67 million in '94-95 and we're projecting \$68.1 million in '95-96. So that's basically what we're expecting to generate.

So I've given you the land sales; I've given you the oil royalties; what we're expecting in terms of gas royalty and taxation. And as I said, we're certainly expecting a lot of the land that has been purchased in the last fiscal year will hopefully generate a lot of employment in our province with respect to exploration and drilling. So I think we can look for a good year although we're certainly not expecting the large amount of bonus bids and land sales that we had in the last fiscal year.

Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I wanted just to confirm the number on the land sales for '94-95. And I apologize, I didn't get that number for the land sale.

But I would appreciate the breakdown in oil royalties — the 259 million or the 278 million into light, medium, and crude. So if you can get that for another time, that would be very helpful.

You did say that the gas royalties broke out for 67 million last year and forecast to be 60 million this upcoming year. And I think you said the land sales would be about 70 million dollars in '95-96 but I didn't get the number for 1994-95. Was it a couple hundred million, or was I wrong?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — I'll give you those two figures again: '94-95 in our latest forecast is that they'll come in at 201.3 million. And with respect to gas royalties estimated for '95-96 — I think that's what you were asking for — we're forecasting \$68.1 million. The latest forecast — I'll just give this to you in case you didn't get that — for '94-95 was \$67 million.

Mr. Devine: — But the land sales was 201 million? Is that correct for '94-95? And the estimated land sale for '95-96 was 70 million. Is that correct? So it's dropped a significant drop.

Mr. Minister, we're looking at I guess in the neighbourhood of heavy oil would be . . . or the oil category, 260 million plus land sales as 200 million. That's what? — 460 million plus gas is another 60-some million. You're looking at \$520 million in '94-95 in gas and oil and land sales revenues. Would that be accurate?

Could the minister give me an idea, and this is partly what I'm after and we might have to get it later, but in terms of the production of oil and gas, could the minister give me an idea of what kind of heavy oil production we had in 1994-95? You must have a ballpark figure. And production of light, if he has. I mean I'll take medium too, but certainly if you've got light and heavy, I would be most interested.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Yes, I'm told by the officials that the aggregate amount is about 106 million barrels. And it breaks down roughly — and we don't have the exact numbers — but it breaks down roughly a third light, a third medium, and a third heavy.

Mr. Devine: — All right. So we're looking at something like 30 million barrels of each. Could the minister also then tell us or give some indication of where the oil goes on the light, medium, and crude . . . light, medium, and heavy after it's pumped out of the ground?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you. The officials indicate that about 63 per cent of Saskatchewan's production is exported to the U.S. (United States) while the remaining is sold in Alberta and eastern Canada. That the NewGrade upgrader is a market for about 50,000 barrels a day and that's a mixture: Swift Current, medium; Kindersley, heavy; and Lloydminster, heavy. So it's a mixture that is used at NewGrade.

And at Bi-Provincial, I'm told 50 per cent of the heavy oil feed stock for this one, and that's around 20 to 25,000 barrels a day, comes from Saskatchewan.

Mr. Devine: — So we're looking at, if I take your figures, on that heavy and medium side, we'd be looking at over 75,000

barrels per day going into the upgraders — about 50,000 for NewGrade and about half of that, because it's split with Alberta, in the Husky upgrader. And so we'd be looking at maybe 25 million barrels a year being processed. If I take 75 to 80,000 barrels a day times 365 days, assuming they work all the time, I'm going to get a pretty healthy sum of that medium and heavy crude being processed. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — I think the combination of NewGrade and Bi-Provincial, quite clearly, and if you look at the blend, the mixture of light and medium and heavy and what is being processed as well through the Bi-Provincial, it works out to about 75,000 barrels a day. So over a course of a year it does add up and there's quite a bit processed through those two facilities.

Mr. Devine: — I'm sure the officials have this. I can probably dig up the figures, but obviously taking up 75,000 barrels a day out of the heavy and medium oil market in processing has at least two advantages. And I wonder if you have any estimates of what that might be worth to us.

In other words, if we were taking the heavy crude and selling it export — as you said, 63 per cent is exported and a third is kept here and processed — if we were exporting it versus processing it into synthetic crude and then moving it, is there some significant or reasonable advantage to the province of Saskatchewan and to Alberta?

And secondly, what might be the benefits of the increase in economic activity generally associated with pumping another 75,000 barrels a day, or — what would it be? — 25 million barrels a year in heavy and medium crude out of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Chairman, I think the member and I will both agree, and there will be no dispute that the added processing in the province with respect to NewGrade and Bi-Provincial quite clearly creates economic activity; and without those two facilities, that would not be here. And I mean we both will agree to that.

In terms of . . . and as you referred to this, and I think this is what you were saying, was that because of those two facilities the total amount that goes and is processed through those facilities is incremental oil that is brought on stream that otherwise wouldn't have been. I'm not sure that . . . although you can make the argument that that is the case, there's no way certainly to document that incremental oil is to that tune, to the 75,000 barrels a day, is in fact coming on stream.

And I say that certainly the people who are working in those two facilities are appreciative of where they generate their pay cheques, and quite clearly that is certainly a positive issue for them.

I think and I would want to say . . . and I think it would not . . . I would want to indicate that there is an economic advantage, and we recognize that. But on the other hand, there certainly have been costs associated with the financing and the provincial

involvement in both Bi-Provincial and in NewGrade.

So in closing, I guess I would just want to point out that if you're indicating you believe that there is an incremental exploration activity and that is drawn out in terms of the 75,000 barrels a day, I'm not sure that you could make a very strong case for that argument, although an argument can be made.

Mr. Devine: — Well it's not an argument. It's just a consensus. Certainly NDP administrations and Conservative administrations for several years were trying to build upgraders because it makes some economic sense and to give you some market power to process your heavy and medium oil here rather than just be subject to coke industries or somebody else in the U.S. who takes it and refines it. And so we all have tried to put together upgraders to enhance our market power.

Now what I want from you is, now that it's up and running, both of them are up and running and we're looking at at least 75,000 barrels a day, 25 million barrels a year, with some market power behind it . . . because we can either sell it off to the United States as crude, heavy, or we can process it in synthetic crude and we can refine it. It has some advantages and I just want to help get some of the documentation on what it's worth because we both want upgraders, no question about it.

(1615)

And we can get into further the financing of how those are done, but clearly, and I think you would agree, there's a significant advantage of processing 75,000 barrels a day of Saskatchewan heavy and medium crude because it gives us market power, it gives us more royalties, it sucks up more oil, it opens up the market. And obviously it creates a lot of spin-offs in terms of economic activity, drilling for that oil, servicing it, finding it, and seismic and so forth.

So if it's 33 per cent of what we've got it must be generating a fair amount of money. If it's 33 per cent of the, if you will, the oil royalties and probably a higher royalty or a higher benefit because we're processing it, then you're looking at a net benefit of 75 to \$100 million a year to the province of Saskatchewan. Would that be a fair ballpark?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Well I want to say to the member from Estevan, if you look at the total amount that's processed through both Bi-Provincial and through NewGrade and if you look at the amount that is processed over a period of year and the differential between light and heavy crude, I think it's fair to assume — and my officials tell me that \$5 a barrel would be a reasonable amount to look at in that regard — that you'd be looking at perhaps \$100 million that may not have been there.

But I want to say that . . . and I guess I want to go back to your initial comments in terms of Saskatchewan people looking at secondary manufacturing and value added processing in the province. Those have been initiatives — and I will agree — that have been embarked upon by all governments, whether it be your administration when you were the premier in the 1980s or

whether it would be in the 1970s, the era of the former premier of Saskatchewan, Mr. Blakeney, or whether it would be this administration; we're certainly always looking for opportunities.

But I guess I'd want to say that you can attract development and you can bring people in to develop new expertise or even old expertise. I mean you can build upgraders, you can build all of these facilities — any administration can do that; but I think what you have to gauge is, on one hand, the benefits — and I think this is what you're trying to get at — but on the other hand, what you have to gauge is at what cost these facilities were developed.

And as I've indicated we clearly and readily admit that there is incremental revenue just by virtue of the fact that the two upgraders are operating here in our province; but on the other hand, financed in no small way by the provincial government with public funds to the point, if you include those with some of the other initiatives that have happened since 1982, between '82 and '91,— and now some that we're still investing as a result of some of the decisions that were made then — we're sitting on a provincial debt of in the neighbourhood of \$15 billion.

Our third biggest expenditure is \$870 million that we're forecasting in interest payments in this fiscal year, '95-96, the one that we're looking at, the one that's coming on us. So quite clearly there are some benefits on the one side, and we admit that. And we have no reason to deny that because quite clearly we're using those to help pay down some of the province's debt.

But on the other hand, the third biggest expenditure, because of some of the decisions that were made — and I don't say this with malice; I only say it because it's true — that our third biggest expenditure right now is interest, \$870 million.

Now if we had even half of the \$870 million we might be able to look at perhaps even a richer incentive program for the oil and gas industry. But we don't, because that's money now that heads out of the province and is in the hands of bond dealers in New York and Zürich and wherever else money was borrowed.

So I say that these developments, although we welcome them and we're doing whatever we can to make them run efficiently and effectively . . . As you will know, we're now partners with Husky on a 50/50 basis at Bi-Provincial. We've restructured the deal, the NewGrade upgrader here in Regina, to make it an economically viable upgrader. We're trying to put these plants in a position where they can generate revenue over the long haul and pay back the shareholders, our partners, and as well the people of Saskatchewan who have invested hundreds of millions of dollars in these particular initiatives.

We understand there are some positives, but I want to make you aware of the fact that this government, this administration, is dealing with some of the effects that were created by the investment and by the decisions that were made in the 1980s in terms of the development of these upgraders.

Mr. Devine: — Well that's fair enough. I just want to put it on

record that through no . . . I was going to say fault of your own or no major initiative on your part, it looks like we're picking up about \$520 million in cash '94-95 in oil and gas and land sales.

And the royalty holidays haven't reverted back to the 1970s. They're much more contemporary and I congratulate you on that. And we're picking up net \$100 million from two upgraders, in your estimate. And that probably doesn't include all the spin-offs associated with economic activity. But that's just the net coming in here as the value of 75,000 barrels a day, 25 million barrels a year, being processed in the province of Saskatchewan that gives us some market power.

So I would just make the point, half a billion dollars in revenue coming in from the oil patch based on a structure that hasn't, to be fair, changed an awful lot in terms of royalty holidays and land sales. And a hundred million more than would have been there if we hadn't had the upgraders.

Now in financing and putting together upgraders, I will admit it isn't easy. And I think the NDP administration of the past tried a long time to build them but were never successful. But there are two here now.

When you look at them today, two things are quite obvious about the upgraders. And I think those at NewGrade will tell you this and Husky will tell you this. The interesting part of the Lloydminster upgrader is that, to a very large extent, it was financed by Alberta and the federal government. I think Saskatchewan had 15 to 17 per cent of that action. But it's interesting that the upgrader ended up on Saskatchewan side.

So for a modest percentage, we got the upgrader on our side of the border, which means the financing, which was done by Husky, done by the federal government, and done by the Alberta government, which now was granted to us. I think that in terms of your refinancing, you said that the Alberta government just said, fine, you take it. We'll throw in a billion and the feds will throw in a large amount. So it's now 50/50 in Saskatchewan — with Husky in Saskatchewan and with the Saskatchewan government.

Now I think quite conceivably, with that considerable amount of federal money and Alberta money, that Saskatchewan government and Saskatchewan taxpayers, plus Husky in our province, is going to do all right.

Secondly, when you look at the NewGrade upgrader, one of the most significant advantages of building an upgrader is to tie it to a refinery. In other words, you save about 700 million to a billion dollars if you don't have to build a refinery next to the upgrader.

And so we have here in the province of Saskatchewan, in the city of Regina, a very good upgrader tied to a refinery that is helping generate in the neighbourhood of \$50 million a year net to the province of Saskatchewan. And the refinery is making lots of money, and you and the feds and the co-op, Federated,

have restructured so that refinery and that upgrader are looking better all the time.

So I just want to make the point that the upgraders are helpful, the upgraders will be profitable — and I think you will agree with that — and the structuring of those diversification and value added opportunities is also generating beyond the upgraders themselves, in your best guess, at least \$100 million a year.

Now that's one of the interesting arguments that I saw in previous research done by the NDP administration in the '70s, saying if we can build these, the economic spin-offs are encouraging for royalties and for economic activity, for exploration, for seismic, and for jobs.

And I just have to say I agree and I'm happy that there's now \$500 million coming in annually. At least 100 million of that is associated with the upgraders . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well you can correct me, that's fine, these are your numbers.

And the Husky upgrader, the Lloydminster upgrader, is going to be profitable because the feds and Alberta sort of threw in the money and we never were at risk for a lot because we were at 17 per cent, I believe was the right number. And here in Regina the big benefit of course is the fact that we have a refinery tied to an upgrader and the refinery is doing very well.

And a fourth benefit, and I think one that the engineers and people in the oil patch and at universities will tell you — these two upgraders provide an excellent opportunity to learn about upgrading technology. There will be nobody in Canada, in fact very few in North America, that will have the opportunity to learn more about upgrading and upgrading technology than in the two large "educational institutions" we have here in upgrading in Saskatchewan because we will be on top of it. And if you look at the NewGrade facility they have and will continue, to learn and provide tremendous expertise to that whole area of knowledge here in the province of Saskatchewan. And I'm sure the province and Husky will find the same with the Lloydminster upgrader.

So I just wanted to confirm — and if you want to modify any of the numbers — that the upgraders have made and will continue to make a significant contribution to royalties and to money and to jobs and to education in the province of Saskatchewan. And I'm happy to see that . . . well we both agree that they're a positive contribution to the province and to western Canada.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Well I guess I would just want to say that certainly we agree with much of what you're saying. And I say to the member from Estevan that we recognize that certainly there's an educational component that the people of Saskatchewan will enjoy by virtue of the fact that we've built them here. Many of our people are working in them to learn the operations and development techniques to make them more efficient, and I think certainly that that's expertise that will serve us well in future years.

There are a number of things that I would want to correct the member on. First of all with respect to the royalty structure that has generated much of the activity, that was an initiative of this administration. That royalty structure was put in place in January of 1994.

And I want to correct you in one other aspect of this. You're referring to the hundred million dollars that I spoke of, as incremental revenue. What we're talking is value added, and not revenue generated from the upgraders. And it's also important to know that the provincial government takes no royalties or taxes off of that value added product.

I want to say as well that quite clearly the restructuring of Bi-Provincial was an initiative embarked upon by this administration. It was an agreement reached with Husky Oil, and it was necessary to do simply because of the debt load of that particular facility and the cost overruns that occurred when it was being put together.

And the fact is that this government was prudent enough to buy the assets from the Government of Canada and the Government of Alberta for 7 cents on the dollar. The initial investment, the investment that you made when you were premier, was in the neighbourhood of \$275 million. And I believe as you're right, you're correct, that gave the people of Saskatchewan a 17 per cent share in the upgrader.

Well we were able to pick up the balance to the point where we got 50 cents on the dollar and we now own 50 per cent of that particular facility. And we bought it; we invested \$43 million. And I guess, if my figures are correct, that would give us 33 per cent of the upgrader for \$43 million or 7 cents on the dollars, which I think speaks very well for the kind of business that the Premier and the Executive Council and the caucus members . . . and the kind of business that we do.

(1630)

It's not a matter of investing money for investment's sake. It's got to make some economic sense and some financial sense. And I think after having met with John Lau — and you will know Mr. Lau, the CEO (chief executive officer) of Husky Oil in Calgary — a week or so ago, he's really quite pleased with the business arrangement that we've been able to make.

I think he and I will both admit that the investment has, I guess, less of a payback than what we would want to see in terms of return. But I think over the long haul, with the restructuring and the cost effectiveness that we're going to be able to put into the operations, we will over the long haul be able to get a return on investment for the people of Saskatchewan.

But I think really, to the member from Estevan, what this government has done, even more than restructuring some of the business deals that we were less than in favour of, I guess would be fair to say, and trying to make better of what we felt were maybe not the best deal that could have been reached, one of the most positive initiatives that we've done in terms of

attracting business is — people who want to invest in this province — is that we've done something really quite simple.

We've restructured the way this government spends its money and the way we generate our revenue. What we've done is we balanced the books, and that's something that hadn't happened in this province since 1982. And I think the confidence that the business people, not only in the oil and gas sector, but in other sectors have shown by the fact that they're investing over \$200 million in land sales last year, speaks well of what this government has done.

And I want to say that the people of Saskatchewan have very much to be proud of, the fact that they shared and helped us in terms of putting a balanced budget together, like I said, for the first time since 1982. They went through some hardship and some difficult times, and they made some sacrifices. And they're in no small way responsible for the attitude that the business community take towards investment in our province.

And I think that's one of the things that we will look back on, and certainly I will look back on, as a politician when I'm finished my career either at the will of the people or a decision made by my family . . .

An Hon. Member: — By your wife.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — One of my colleagues says, by my wife . . . is that I'll be able to sit back and say that we were part of an administration that took on a major responsibility, that of putting our fiscal house in order.

And I find it really quite interesting, the comments from the business community and from the oil and gas industry. And what they say is that this is an environment that they want to do business in and where they want to invest. Because they know what the rules are. We're not moving the goalposts, in their words. And they have got now a stable economy in a province where they want to invest. And they've got stable regulations, and they know that this government is here to work with them to ensure that their shareholders, the people who invest in their corporations, will want them to be investing money in this province.

And I think that's going to continue. Because I believe what they found is they've got a fair government, they've got a fiscally responsible government, and they've got a government that listens to them.

And I guess one of the comments, and I would have to commend my predecessors and the Department of Energy and Mines as well, one of the comments that I heard and have been hearing over the last month is that they're very pleased with the fact that they can have access to the minister's office, that they can have access to the department and the department officials, and that they don't have to wait for a long, long period of time for these things to happen.

So all in all, what we're trying to do is create an environment

where people want to do business in. And I think if you look at the retail sales growth in this province you'll see that consumers have got confidence — 9.9 per cent increase last year over the year before. You look at the manufacturing and processing sector where you've got a 17 per cent increase in terms of our exports.

And I think all of this bodes well and all of this speaks to what this government has been able to achieve since October 1991.

And I would want to say that it's a road that we are going to continue on. It's, I think, a responsible approach to governing in the 1990s. And although you and I may disagree politically, I think one thing you have to agree, that the facts speak for themselves. And the facts say that business is investing, consumers are buying, our manufacturing sector is growing, we're creating more and more jobs in Saskatchewan. I think, all in all, you can sum it up by saying it's a good place to do business and it's a good place to live.

Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Minister, if you can talk about balancing the budget, I guess I can ask some questions about your philosophy on balancing the budget at least.

My point is going to be, as you said, you picked up about half a billion dollars a year in oil royalties and land sales, which had virtually nothing to do with your administration. You said you've redone the oil royalty structure. Well if you look at so-called modifications to the oil royalty structure compared to what we introduced, I mean they're quite modest, to say the least.

The big structural change was when we said to people, you can come into the province and have oil royalty holidays and carry on, and that attracted the attention. And what you've realized — and I give you credit for it — is that is an intelligent thing to do because it generates revenue and it generates jobs. And the land sales and the oil royalties, which are \$500 million a year, are based on a philosophy that says, open up.

Now clearly — you and I won't argue about this — your political record is one of, you know, not too cozy with the oil patch. And we've heard it, and the NDPs have heard it for years. And now what I want to do is congratulate you for recognizing that you can make \$500 million a year by inviting them in to participate. And on top of that you can make a considerable amount of money through the diversification of a couple of upgraders, which you now say will . . . at least one will be breaking even or making money because of the restructuring and another one is getting better, certainly here.

Now the second point I want to make . . . and it's interesting that you would comment on it in terms of you're proud of balancing the budget. If you take \$500 million in oil royalties alone and land sales and you take the utilities that you're responsible for, I think annually now you're looking at — what? — 6, 7, \$800 million you're taking in from your portfolios? I don't know what the profits would be, and you can tell me if . . . Generally, if we want to get into it, the net profits in utilities are

pretty high. SaskEnergy and TransGas and SaskPower — those three are pretty healthy.

Now, a couple of points. Number one, you didn't like it when we opened up the oil policy to the industry and said, come into the province; here's an oil royalty structure that will encourage you. You said you didn't like that. Well, it turned out to work.

Secondly, you said — and you criticized previous administrations — you didn't like raising utility rates, said that's not good. But obviously you've raised them a lot. But those two policies which you've kind of flipped on have generated in the neighbourhood of 700 to \$800 million annually. And you said, well it's sort of magical that we have balanced the budget. We got that.

Well I'll tell you, in most years, if you look at the deficit during the 1980s, with one or two exceptions, you'll look at from 250 to \$350 million was the annual deficit — 250 to \$350 million — and I've got the list of every one of them. 1986 was over a billion dollars; the rest of those, the majority of them were 350 to around \$300 million. Now you've just picked up \$500 million in oil royalties and land sales, and you haven't done anything.

And you've also picked up enough just in public utilities to make a significant contribution. And again, all you've done is change your policy where you said during the election you wouldn't raise taxes or utilities, and now obviously you're picking up . . . I think the number, Mr. Minister, is 400 million in utilities.

So oil royalties and land sales, plus utilities, are getting you close to a billion dollars a year in new-found money — one, because you adopted the Conservative policy in oil royalties and gas; and number two, because you changed your mind and decided to tax the people in utilities, which you're responsible for because you're the Minister of Power and the Minister of Energy and Minister of TransGas.

So it's interesting. If the oil patch is coming back and say they really like the environment, I'm sure they're doing so to keep you in line, Mr. Minister, and saying, don't go back to the 1970s with your oil royalty structure. Don't pick on us. We can do good. We can find oil. We can find gas. And it'll pay. And I think you have to admit today that the oil royalty structure that we put in place and that you have tinkered with pays very well. The upgraders have generated a lot of economic activity and pay very well. You are changing tune in terms of utilities. They certainly paid you well, but it's cost the Saskatchewan taxpayers a great deal.

Mr. Minister, I wonder if you could comment about the amount of natural gas that is consumed by a project the size of Saskferco and what impact that might have on the economy in the province of Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Well let me begin by saying that we don't have that figure. That would be a question that would

be probably more appropriately addressed to SaskEnergy when we're doing Crown corporation estimates. We just don't have the figures from SaskEnergy here. We're dealing with the estimates of Energy and Mines.

I just want to comment on your analysis of what we've been discussing here. You talk about this portfolio in total generating perhaps \$700 million in revenue. But what you're forgetting is, and what you're not understanding, is that this is not incremental revenue. There was a revenue base before this royalty structure was put in. There was a revenue base from the oil and the gas sector before the upgraders were put in.

And I think what you also need to understand in this year's budget, from Crown Investments Corporation there's something like \$50 million towards, on the revenue side, estimated for '95-'96, which is all of the Crowns, the whole Crown corporation and the whole branch of Crown corporations.

And I don't want to be argumentative, but I want to say that certainly there are some similarities between the oil structure that we've put in place and the one that you had in the 1980s.

And I would not be so foolish as to stand here and indicate to you that I felt all of the initiatives that you did when you were the premier of the province were negative initiatives. I don't feel that way because I really do believe you tried to govern this province in the best way you could when you were the premier. There could be lots of arguments made as to why your administration was a success or was a failure. And I certainly wouldn't stand in my place today and say that I thought everything that you did was a failure because I don't believe that.

But what I also don't want is for you, with a similar royalty structure to ours, to stand in this House today and take credit for balanced budget initiatives that this government started in October 1991 and was able to succeed. And I hope that's not what you were doing because with the same royalty structure in every budget that you delivered, you were never once able to deliver a balanced budget.

And I'll give you the argument, and I know the argument that you will use: you had drought, and you had grasshoppers, and we had difficult times in agriculture. And I understand all of that, and I don't want to go back to the 1980s and discuss with you . . . although we can, but I don't think that it's going to be any benefit to us or the people of Saskatchewan. And we can discuss what Allan Blakeney did in the 1970s, but I don't know that that's going to be a benefit to us either. What I would rather do is sit here and discuss with you how this department, how the regulations and how the licensing branch and how our interaction with the industry can benefit the people of Saskatchewan in terms of job opportunities in the 1990s, and what we do into the next century after the year 2000.

And so I say in closing that these certainly are interesting times, exciting times. They're exciting times for Saskatchewan. They're exciting times for our young people to see youth

employment opportunities that hadn't been there in the past. Young people able to get jobs. And we see our population growing. And I think those are all positive things. We see the number of jobs in Saskatchewan growing.

(1645)

But I want to say that part of it is, whether it's a Conservative administration or whether it's a New Democrat administration or even if it may — and I don't think this will happen, certainly not in this decade — a Liberal administration, but I think what's important is that governments deliver fairness. They deliver stability, and they take leadership in terms of sound fiscal management because that's what brings business here. It's more than just the royalty structure, and it's certainly more than just the tax levels in the province, although those are all part of the decision-making process.

But I think the main thing that the business community want, and the business community that I talk to . . . and I'm part of the business community and have been for 25 years in this province . . . want stability, want to know what the ground rules are, and they want fairness. And that's what this administration and that's what this department is trying to create for investors in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Minister, I would agree with a lot of what you said. What we want to do, sorting partisan stuff aside, is cause economic activity and not rewrite history any way other than it actually took place. And just rewrite it with truthfulness and with fairness.

And what we're saying here is if we look at the . . . I used to call it the tax elasticity of demand in the oil business. If you relax a little bit, you make an awful lot more money. And that philosophy has generated a great deal of wealth in the province of Saskatchewan, and I'm happy you picked up on it. That's a very good thing to do.

So if you could drop that price and increase your revenue, then it's just like the business you're in. You know at some point in time no matter what your business is in and you raise your price too high, you're not going to sell any. And if you lower your price, you might even do better because it's an elastic demand. Well it's the same with respect to taxes.

And what you finally found out here is that the revenue coming into the province of Saskatchewan — \$500 million a year — is in large part linked to the fact that administrations, ours and yours, finally recognized, if you treat this industry with the right kind of royalty and tax structure, you're going to make money, and they're going to make money. And I just want to put that on the record.

And if you diversify and look at some of those things that can add some value and give us market power, what it does is increase the elasticity on our side. It becomes more inelastic if we get to control synthetic crude versus crude oil that is sitting there unprocessed. And if we can have that option of selling

synthetic crude in the United States, the elasticity of demand is much more in our favour.

And that makes us money. And that's why you tried to build upgraders, and that's why we did build them. And you can have the advantage of saying, well I restructured it; fair enough. But we built them, and they're both in Saskatchewan, and they're on the Saskatchewan side of borders, and they generate a great deal of income, plus oil royalties.

What I wanted to pursue and to carry it on with you, is if we want to have more economic activity in the province of Saskatchewan then the pursuit of attracting industry here is helpful — more industry, less government. And if you can attract them here with your royalty policy or your taxation policy, you're going to make money.

Let's look at Saskferco for an example. I believe it's fair to say Saskferco is providing to the province of Saskatchewan from 80 to \$100 million a year. Now the Government of Saskatchewan are partners with Cargill on that fertilizer project — they're partners. Do you have any idea, Mr. Minister, what your share of that project might be? Or do I have to wait and ask the Minister of Finance or somebody else? Or if you don't have that, would you have any impact on what the value to the natural gas business is as a result of that project?

Or philosophically, I guess I could ask you this. Do you think it's a reasonable idea to encourage private sector people to come in, and how would you evaluate the Saskatchewan government's equity position in that fertilizer project with its partner, Cargill?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Well first of all let me make a couple of comments. One of the theories that you propose this afternoon is that less government will bring more industry. And I think it's safe to say that this government has done an awful lot in terms of cutting the operational costs of government.

We've cut from 1991, when we took power on the operational side, to this point, if you exclude the amount that we're paying for incremental interest and the amount we're paying on the \$15 billion the province owes, we've cut the operational cost of government by around \$300 million. And so, given those figures and given that as being fact, I guess you could say that in that respect, we agree.

What we want to do is create the most cost-effective government that we can and that's why we've restructured government departments. We've amalgamated Environment and Natural Resources. We've done away with Rural Development and moved it into Municipal Government. And I think it's working well. So I guess what I'm saying is there are many initiatives that we've taken to try and streamline the operational costs.

And I think you'll agree with me on this as well, that everything that government does as it relates to interaction with industry and with business, there has to be a balance. And there has to

be a reasonable balance and it can't be slanted to one side where it's all for business, nothing for the shareholders, the people of Saskatchewan. There has to be a balance. You can find a balance. You sit down and work at it. There's always a situation where you can create fairness for both partners.

And I guess that's how we view our interaction with the business community — as a partnership. And in any partnership, whether it's a business arrangement or whether it's a marriage, there has to be fairness on both sides. And I think by virtue of the investment . . . You indicate \$500 million, and that's a fairly rough figure in terms of just the oil and gas industry, but we're generating revenue on that side. Quite clearly that indicates that we have reached, to a degree, some fairness, some balance — a scenario where business wants to perform and do what they do in our province.

With respect to your questions on Saskferco, I can't comment. We don't have any of those figures here. Those would probably be best handled by either Crown Investments Corporation estimates or perhaps Executive Council estimates or the Committee of Finance. I don't have any officials who would have any of the information that you have requested. But I'm sure that the minister of Crown Investments Corporation . . . well the short-time minister for Crown Investments Corporation, if he was still the minister, would be more than willing to bring all of the details to you. And the Deputy Premier, the minister of Crown Investments Corporation, would be more than willing to discuss in a detailed fashion when they have the officials who are there to assist with the details of that particular operation.

Mr. Devine: — Mr. Minister, I mean you don't have the . . . I'm surprised your deputy wouldn't have the amount of gas that that company would use and the royalties we make off of using that much gas. I mean it's a fairly large user of natural gas. You're the Minister of Energy for gas and oil and energy. You must have some idea of what it's generating in terms of consumption of natural gas and what that might be worth to us.

And secondly, I just wanted your general comment on how you thought the company was doing and how the province of Saskatchewan was doing in a joint venture where you're an equity partner, and how you felt about that.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Well to the member from Estevan, I can give you the global numbers in terms of direct sales of gas. I can give you those from 1991 through to . . . or 1990 through to '93 with an estimate of 1994. But I can't give you a breakdown because I don't have a breakdown of all of the direct sales and how much their volumes were.

That information would be available at SaskEnergy. And certainly our officials of SaskEnergy will be able to bring those kind of detailed breakdowns. I guess it's . . . what would it be here? In 1994, the global estimate that we have is 32,000 bcf (billion cubic feet), but that includes all of the direct sales.

So in order to get that kind of detail, certainly we would have to

March 8, 1995

have the officials from SaskEnergy, and those would be available at Crown corporations estimates. And if you're available to ask those questions, we'd be more than willing to give you a breakdown.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:56 p.m.