

The Assembly met at 13:30.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. Kwiatkowski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to present a petition on behalf of residents of Saskatchewan concerned about the negative consequences the signing of the Kyoto Protocol would have on the people and the economy of Saskatchewan. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to take the necessary actions to protect our province's economy by working to halt the federal government's intent to sign on to the Kyoto accord in its current form.

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

This petition is signed by residents of Codette and Carrot River.

I so present, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. Julé: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I too stand today to present a petition from citizens throughout the province who resist signing on to the Kyoto accord. And the prayer reads as follows, Mr. Speaker:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to take the necessary actions to protect our province's economy by working to halt the federal government's intent to sign on to the Kyoto accord in its current form.

And the signatures on this petition, Mr. Speaker, are from Weyburn, Tribune, and McTaggart.

I so present.

Ms. Draude: — Mr. Speaker, I too have a petition to present today from citizens who are concerned about the Kyoto accord.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to immediately take all necessary action to protect our province's economy and work to halt the federal government's intent to sign on to the Kyoto accord in its current form.

The people that have signed this petition are from Wadena, Kelvington, and Rose Valley.

Mr. Bjornerud: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to ensure the responsible use of natural resources by all citizens. And the prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon.

Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to work with the federal government, First Nations representatives, and with other provincial governments to bring about a resolution in the Lake of the Prairies situation and to ensure that our natural resources as a whole are used in a responsible manner by all people in the future.

The signators, Mr. Speaker, are from the communities of Esterhazy, Langenburg, Stockholm, Bredenbury, and Yarbo.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As well to present a petition. Reading the prayer:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to immediately take all necessary action to protect our province's economy and work to halt the federal government's intent to sign on to the Kyoto accord in its current form.

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

Mr. Speaker, the petition I present is signed by people from the communities of Pleasantdale, Naicam, and Spalding.

I so present.

Mr. Stewart: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise with a petition signed by citizens concerned with the economic impact the Kyoto Protocol may have on Saskatchewan. And the prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to take the necessary actions to protect our province's economy by working to halt the federal government's intent to sign on to the Kyoto accord in its current form.

Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by individuals from the communities of Drinkwater, Marquis, Spring Valley, Cairn, Saskatoon, and Moose Jaw.

I so present.

Mr. Elhard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the imposition of the Kyoto accord on the people of Saskatchewan is of considerable concern to the residents of Cypress Hills. And they have signed, in large numbers, petitions to that effect. And I'd like to read the prayer if I may, Mr. Speaker:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to take the necessary actions to protect our province's economy by working to halt the federal government's intent to sign on to the Kyoto accord in its current form.

Mr. Speaker, these petitions are signed by residents of the community of Gull Lake, primarily, and I have many more to present in days ahead.

Thank you.

The Speaker: — Order. Just before I recognize the next petition, I'd ask members to just keep their voices down a bit so we could hear these petitions properly.

Ms. Eagles: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I too rise today to present a petition on behalf of the people in my area that have grave concerns with the Kyoto accord in its present state. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to take the necessary actions to protect our province's economy by working to halt the federal government's intent to sign on to the Kyoto accord in its current form.

And this is signed by people in my constituency, namely Estevan, and a place where the natural gas plant is situated, Steelman.

Ms. Bakken: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to present numerous petitions that have been signed by residents of the constituency of Weyburn as well as throughout the province of Saskatchewan, who are very concerned about the devastating effects that Kyoto will have on our economy. And the prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to take the necessary actions to protect our province's economy by working to halt the federal government's intent to sign on to the Kyoto accord in its current form.

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

And the petitions are signed by residents of Weyburn, Osage, Stoughton, Kisbey, Oungre. More from Weyburn, from Kipling, Corning, Bengough. More from Bengough, Regina. More from Weyburn, McTaggart, Moose Jaw, Bienfait, Asquith, Brooks, Alberta, Calgary, Alberta, North Battleford, and again Regina.

I so present.

Mr. Wall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too rise on behalf of residents very concerned about the Kyoto accord and its effect on the province and specifically in this case its impact on my region of Saskatchewan, the southwest corner of the province. Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition reads as follows, that:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to take the necessary actions to protect our province's economy by working to halt the federal government's intent to sign on to the Kyoto accord in its current form.

And the petitioners today are from Wymark and the city of Swift Current.

I so present.

Mr. Huyghebaert: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I again rise with a petition from citizens from my constituency that are very concerned about the economic impact that the Kyoto accord is going to have on our province. And the petition reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to take the necessary actions to protect our province's economy by working to halt the federal government's intent to sign on to the Kyoto accord in its current form.

And, Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by the good citizens of Mankota.

I so present.

Mr. Brkich: — Mr. Speaker, I also rise with a petition on Kyoto with many signatures. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to take the necessary actions to protect our province's economy by working to halt the federal government's intent to sign on to the Kyoto accord in its current form.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Signed by citizens from Saskatoon, Davidson, Bladworth, Girvin, Regina, Calgary, Lethbridge, Rosetown, North Battleford.

I so present.

Mr. Weekes: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise today to present a petition from citizens concerned about the economic impact of the Kyoto accord. The prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to take the necessary actions to protect our province's economy by working to halt the federal government's intent to sign on to the Kyoto accord in its current form.

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

Signed by the good citizens of Biggar.

I so present.

Ms. Harpauer: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I too have a petition of citizens concerned about the proposed Kyoto accord. And the prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to take the necessary action to protect our province's economy by working to halt the federal

government's intent to sign on to the Kyoto accord in its current form.

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

The petitioners, Mr. Speaker, are from the communities of Davidson, Smiley, and the city of Regina.

I so present.

Mr. Allchurch: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in the Assembly today to bring forth a petition signed on behalf of citizens from my constituency that are concerned with the signing of the Kyoto accord. And the prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to take the necessary actions to protect our province's economy by working to halt the federal government's intent to sign on to the Kyoto accord in its current form.

And the signatures on this petition, Mr. Speaker, are from Spiritwood, Shell Lake, and Leoville.

I so present.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Clerk: — According to order the following petition for a private Bill has been reviewed, and pursuant to rule 12(7) it is hereby read and received:

Of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool in the province of Saskatchewan praying for An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool Act, 1995.

Deputy Clerk: — According to order the following petitions have been reviewed, and pursuant to rule 12 are hereby read and received:

Petition concerning the Kyoto accord;

Petition concerning grasshopper spray penalties assessed to farmers by Saskatchewan Crop Insurance; and

Addendums to previously tabled petitions being sessional papers nos. 11, 18, and no. 169.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

Mr. Brkich: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on day no. 85 ask the government the following question:

To the minister responsible for Sask Water: how many new people has the Sask Water authority hired since its inception?

Mr. Kwiatkowski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on day no. 85 ask the government the following question:

To the Minister of Industry and Resources: (1) what are the

names of all separately identified and/or separately named funds administered directly or indirectly by your department; how many of these funds had surplus and/or retained earnings at the conclusion of their most recent completed fiscal year; which of these funds had some or a portion of their surpluses taken away through government action and how much money was affected in each case; in each case where the government took some or all of the surplus of one of these funds, what is the money being used for; what programs previously paid out of departmental budgets are now being paid with the surpluses from these funds; which positions in the public service that were being funded through the departmental budgets are now being funded through one of these funds or with the proceeds from these funds?

And I have similar questions, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Labour, the Minister of Learning, and all other departments.

Thank you.

Mr. Elhard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on day no. 85 ask the government the following question:

To the minister responsible for Learning: in the year 2002 how many government-owned or leased vehicles have been made available to the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology for the use of its employees; how many of these vehicles have been painted with special effects and/or logos for the purpose of advertising the institution; does the minister sanction the practice of purchasing personalized licence plates for these government-owned vehicles; and what has been the cost of this project in dollars and in-kind services?

Mr. Speaker, I have this question for the year 2001-2002, and a similar question will apply to the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Regina.

Thank you.

Ms. Draude: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on day no. 85 ask the government the following question:

In the year 2001-2002 fiscal year, did any First Nations that are not members of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations receive any money from the First Nations Fund?

And I have a similar question for the year to date for 2002-2003.

Ms. Bakken: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I rise to give notice that I shall on day no. 85 ask the government the following question:

To the minister responsible for Liquor and Gaming: for the fiscal year 2001-2002 and referencing the 1.5 million in travel expenses as outlined in your supplementary financial report, what was the identity and the departmental rank of all those who travelled; what were the specific costs incurred by each individual; what was the destination of each individual; and what was the purpose for each

individual's trip?

Mr. Allchurch: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on day no. 85 ask the government the following question:

To the minister responsible for Crown Investments Corporation: what is the current status of CIC's plan to purchase property for the forestry centre in Prince Albert that was announced this past summer?

Mr. Wall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on day no. 85 ask the government the following question:

To the minister responsible for CIC: has CIC President Frank Hart solicited and/or accepted any gifts, tokens, or gestures from EDS since the year 2000, including tickets to PGA events such as the Masters in Augusta, Georgia, transportation and/or accommodation?

(13:45)

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Axworthy: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and through you, representatives of the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission who are here with us today on the occasion of the human rights . . . of Human Rights Day in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, seated in your gallery are Christine Lwanga of Saskatoon, Marjorie Hutchinson of Fort Qu'Appelle, who are commissioners of the Human Rights Commission; and Rebecca McLellan, who's the manager of operations.

And I'd ask you to join me in welcoming them to the Assembly, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Axworthy: — Mr. Speaker, I'm also pleased to introduce three students who are articling with the Department of Justice — Erin Hobday, Joanne Khan, and Carla Nokusis. They're observing today's proceedings — I hope that Mr. Speaker doesn't deter them from their career in law — from the Speaker's gallery. They're joined by Elizabeth Smith, who is executive assistant to the deputy minister of Justice.

Mr. Speaker, the three — Erin, Joanne, and Carla — are graduates of the University of Saskatchewan College of Law and they began articling with the department in 2002 . . . in June of 2002. Mr. Speaker, we're very pleased that we have students of such high calibre articling with the Government of Saskatchewan — I guess we shouldn't really call them students quite any more — articling with the Department of Justice and the government. I hope that they will find their time with us interesting, satisfying, and enhancing in their practical knowledge of the justice system and how it works.

Mr. Speaker, I'd ask you to join us . . . ask members to join with me in welcoming Erin, Joanne, Carla, and Elizabeth to the House today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Heppner: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of the opposition, I would also like to welcome to the Assembly the representatives from the Human Rights Commission this afternoon. I hope they enjoy our procedures and we really appreciate their attendance here this afternoon.

Thank you.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Julé: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Saskatchewan Party opposition, I too would like to join the minister in welcoming the articling students from the Department of Justice. We do hope you enjoy your stay.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Serby: — In your gallery is seated Mrs. Isabelle Muzichuk. She's a constituent of the Canora constituency and spends a fair bit of time in my office talking about the environmental issues around the province. And I appreciate the fact that she chooses my office to do that in and to say that Ms. Muzichuk is clearly someone who understands the environmental issues of the province and spent a lot of time as a professional, teaching students in our province for many years before she retired, nursing students.

And I want to commend her on the work that they do, keeping governments and opposition honest about the kinds of work that needs to be done to sustain good environmental standards across the province.

Welcome to the Assembly and enjoy your time here.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Krawetz: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to join with the member from Yorkton as well in welcoming Mrs. Muzichuk to the Assembly. I've done so on numerous occasions. And I'd like to also inform the legislature that Mrs. Muzichuk spends a lot of time on the phone with me, as well as visiting my office. And I'd like to also ask members to welcome her here this afternoon.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Melfort's Coming Home Campaign

Mr. Gantfoer: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and members of the legislature, I recently had the pleasure of attending the kickoff of a fundraising campaign in Melfort. The goal of the Coming Home Campaign is to raise \$1 million to equip and furnish Parkland Place, our new 105-bed, long-term care facility.

The campaign board placed their trust in the generosity and commitment of the people of the district to respond to the needs of the community.

Mr. Speaker, the results were remarkable. Before the project was even official, Mary Stasiuk contributed \$45,000. A further

anonymous donation of \$275,000, 100,000 donation from Edythe Campbell, \$100,000 donation from Tom and Laura Smith, and other generous donations fast-tracked the project.

I'm delighted to tell you that the campaign Chair announced at the kickoff ceremony that 700,000 of the \$1 million had already been raised.

Please join me as I thank the many extraordinary generous people for the enormous amount of time, energy, and money that they've invested in quality, long-term care for our community. I would also like to extend best wishes for the continued success of the Coming Home Campaign.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Record Set For Natural Gas Wells Drilled

Mr. Addley: — Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has set another record for the number of natural gas wells drilled in the province. So far, 1,725 natural gas wells have been drilled, exceeding last year's record of 1,409. This is the fourth consecutive year of natural gas drilling records set in the province.

Increased drilling levels benefit the provincial economy by attracting investment, creating jobs, and generating revenue for the province. Favourable gas prices and a recent gas development in the Shackleton area of southwestern Saskatchewan have contributed to this new achievement.

Mr. Speaker, the oil and gas industry is one of the largest contributors to the Saskatchewan economy. Of the 1,725 gas wells drilled to date, 1,515 were in the Swift Current area, 127 in the Kindersley area, 81 in the Lloydminster area, and 2 in the Estevan area.

In 2001, oil and natural gas companies invested 1.4 billion in exploration and development, accounting for 22,000 direct and indirect jobs and generating \$684 million in revenues for the province. These revenues help fund health, education, and other valuable social programs.

Mr. Speaker, recent royalty and tax changes by this government for oil and natural gas will further encourage exploration and development of Saskatchewan resources.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure all members will agree that our future is wide open and this is more good news for Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Developments in Gaming Industry

Mr. Hillson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to make members aware of developments in the gambling industry in Nova Scotia. That province has introduced new VLTs (video lottery terminal) called responsible machines.

The new Nova Scotia VLTs are equipped with four features to encourage responsible gaming. They include: (1) a permanent clock showing the time of day; (2) a display of betting activity in cash rather than credits; (3) pop-up reminders of the time

spent playing after 60, 90, and 120 minutes; (4) a five-minute cash out warning at 145 minutes of continuous play and a mandatory cash out at 150 minutes.

Forty per cent of VLT users in Nova Scotia have said that the new machines help them to keep track and to gamble responsibly. Showing credits as opposed to cash was initially introduced to mask from gamblers the full extent of their losses.

Gaming is going to be part of our society but we must do everything possible to minimize the negative effects. If the government is serious about discouraging uncontrolled gaming and not just wanting to rake in money from the vulnerable, it will adopt these measures. If the government isn't totally addicted to gambling revenues, it will adopt the new Nova Scotia machines.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Tourism in Cumberland Constituency

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, here is good news for tourism in our province.

Mr. Speaker, tourism has become an important part of our economy. Employment in the tourism industry has grown by 23 per cent from 1997 to 2002. There are also over 3,400 tourism-related events, attractions, and organizations in Saskatchewan. In addition there are hundreds of businesses which depend on the tourism industry. Mr. Speaker, there is a grand total of 1.3 billion spent each year in tourism. This is a spending increase of 22 per cent from '97.

I am particularly proud of the contribution made by my constituency of Cumberland in particular and the North in general, in attracting tourism dollars. Five hundred and sixty-nine residents of Cumberland constituency were employed this year in tourism-related industries. This is an increase of 26 per cent over the 452 employed in 2001.

There are 227 tourism businesses, attractions, and events in the Cumberland constituency. Travellers spent an estimated 44 million directly in the Cumberland constituency in 2001, an increase of 9 per cent.

Congratulations, Mr. Speaker, to the tourist outfitters, guides, their industry, and everyone involved in this vital Saskatchewan story. Yes, Saskatchewan is wide open for tourism.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Gordon McRae Awarded Air Cadet League Certificate of Honour

Mr. Brkich: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in the House today to talk about a great honour received by one of my constituents from Davidson. On October 26, Mr. Gordon McRae was awarded the Canadian Air Cadet League Certificate of Honour for over 18 years of highly dedicated service.

The award, presented by Lieutenant Governor Lynda Haverstock, recognized Mr. McRae's remarkable contribution to the Air Cadet League as an honorary director. And indeed

this award is only the seventh time in the last 61 years that such a high honour has been bestowed for duty in the Canadian Air Cadet League. This certainly attests to the character of this gentleman who believes in the duty on ongoing community service.

In addition to helping the air cadets, Mr. McRae has served for several years on the National Aviation Committee of the Department of National Defence. On the local level, Gordon McRae has been actively involved with the Davidson branch of the Royal Canadian Legion and has served as chairman of Davidson-Craik community consultative group that works with the area RCMP (Royal Canadian Mounted Police) detachment.

Clearly this man has demonstrated his dedicated service to the community as well as Saskatchewan and Canada. Mr. McRae adds that his wife, Eileen, has been helping him with all these tasks over the years and is very deserving of this award as well.

These folks have provided a great role model of volunteerism and community spirit for other Canadians to follow. I would ask that all members join me in congratulating Mr. and Mrs. Gordon McRae for their outstanding service to their fellow citizens. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Cornwall Alternative School Wins Donner Foundation Award

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Mr. Speaker, it is not only Saskatchewan people who are announcing our unique qualities to Canada and beyond. Others are also recognizing the high level of achievement in our province.

A case in point, Mr. Speaker, exists right here in Regina. On November 1 of this year, the Donner Canadian Foundation Awards for Excellence in the Delivery of Social Services were presented at a reception in Toronto. These awards were established in 1998 to recognize and reward excellence and innovation among non-profit agencies at the community level.

The recipients were chosen from 282 applicants from 103 locations across Canada. The prestigious Overall — overall, Mr. Speaker — Award for Excellence was presented to the Cornwall Alternative School of Regina.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Van Mulligen: — This school was established in 1972 as a community response to the need for alternative learning for students not attending traditional schools. It began as a drop-in centre which quickly evolved into an educational facility, now working with over 180 students a year — students, I should add, who might be lost without the environment provided by Cornwall Alternative School.

We have much to be both proud of and grateful for, Mr. Speaker, and I congratulate the Cornwall Alternative School, its staff, and its principal, Eunice Cameron.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

St. Louis Rebels Hockey Marathon

Ms. Julé: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Humboldt constituency are very innovative. And that is certainly true for the people of St. Louis.

The St. Louis arena was in need of repairs, so the old-timers hockey team, the St. Louis Rebels, sponsored a hockey marathon to raise funds and possibly break the record in the Guinness world book of records.

The marathon began the evening of Friday, November 29 and finished the following night. There were approximately 40 players between the ages of 14 and 40 that participated in that marathon. Players came from Domremy, Bellevue, St. Louis, and Hoey, bringing pledges as well as donations of cash and food.

A pancake breakfast was held Saturday morning as well as a supper Saturday evening for the players and the general public.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the marathon ended there were some fairly tired people but a new record was set. They played 26 hours, 30 minutes, and 47 seconds, lasting 54 periods with the Reds defeating the Whites 273 to 263. They beat the old record by 28 minutes.

(14:00)

The St. Louis arena is a busy place. The artificial ice is ready each year by October 1. There's a hockey school held in October and as well, there are six minor hockey teams, one rec team, and a figure skating club.

Congratulations to the St. Louis Rebels and to all the skaters and volunteers who helped with this marathon, placing St. Louis in the Guinness world book of records. And they raised \$3,200 for their arena.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Plans for Population Growth

Mr. Hermanson: — Mr. Speaker, there are different ways to measure the performance of a government but one of the best ways is to ask the question: are more people moving in or moving out? Sadly, under the NDP (New Democratic Party) a lot more people are moving out.

New census figures released today show that over 67,000 people moved out of Saskatchewan between 1996 and 2001, while only 42,000 people moved in. That is a net loss of 25,000 people in five years. That is the second worst emigration record in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, that's the NDP record and it's a disaster. Mr. Speaker, why is the NDP government driving so many people

out of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, the opposition leader and I share a common point of view here. This is not a satisfactory situation, that we see people leaving our province, particularly our young people, looking for opportunities elsewhere.

And, Mr. Speaker, I tell you what this government is doing about that. We are building a new Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — We have engaged the largest personal income tax cut in the history of this province. We have, this fall, this fall, renovated our mining exploration tax regime to encourage opportunities in this province for our young people. We have changed the regulations in oil and gas, our regulation there, to encourage young people to have opportunities in this province. We're building an ethanol industry. We've built a sound stage. We're building a synchrotron, Mr. Speaker. We are building a new Saskatchewan.

What do they have, Mr. Speaker? They've got a slogan; that's what they've got. What do we have? A plan that's working.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hermanson: — Well thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, all of those innovations were suggested by someone else, many of them from the Saskatchewan Party. They haven't come up with one new idea.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hermanson: — Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Party has a plan and it's an exciting and positive plan to grow Saskatchewan by 100,000 people in 10 years. Now that is a far cry from the last 10 years of our history under the NDP — a decade when Saskatchewan lost nearly 45,000 people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are not just numbers. These are real people; people with families. And the NDP is driving them out of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, these are our sons and our daughters and they have left — 45,000 of them have left in the last decade under the watch of the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, the future of Saskatchewan is diminished because of the NDP government and its policies. Why, I ask again, is the NDP content to drive so many people out of this province?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — I want to tell the Leader of the Opposition and his party about the future of this province. The future of this province is wide open . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — . . . wide open to those people who will dream big, who will plan well and work hard. The Leader of the Opposition in his place, not moments ago, suggested that things

we're doing are his suggestion. Then why, I ask the Leader of the Opposition and his party, why do you criticize everything that happens in this province?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — You criticize the development of ethanol. You criticize the sound stage. You criticize from your bench . . .

The Speaker: — Order. I'd just remind the Premier to continue to direct his remarks through the Chair.

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the reminder.

Why does the Leader of the Opposition stand in his place, and his critics, criticizing the investment we're doing in education this budget year? If they're interested in building a future for the young people of Saskatchewan, why do they criticize the economic development issues; why do they criticize our investments in education?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hermanson: — Mr. Speaker, we criticize that government because even when we give them a good idea they aren't able to deliver on it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hermanson: — Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the NDP had a chance to improve their sagging image. Some young people raised concerns about the NDP's high taxes and so the Minister of Culture and Youth told them, come back when you're older and start paying taxes.

Mr. Speaker, when the people of Saskatoon decided they wanted to host the World University Games, the minister said, oh no, we can't do that; Saskatoon is too small. What kind of a wide open future is that?

Mr. Speaker, how does the NDP expect young people to believe in Saskatchewan when they don't even believe in Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hermanson: — Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan is a first-rate province with a third-rate government. It's time to start losing people and to start growing this province. Why does the NDP have no plan to grow Saskatchewan? They can spend \$2 million just blowing smoke; they're not doing a thing.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition now seems to be taking the point of view of his member from Cannington. He says this province blows smoke. His member from Cannington says it's all snake oil. He says we've got nothing to sell as a province.

That kind of attitude is rejected — rejected — by this

government, Mr. Speaker. We have a plan in place. The plan is working. We have working today in Saskatchewan more people in the month of November than this province has ever seen, Mr. Speaker. Today we meet in the city with the lowest unemployment rate in Canada.

Young people are finding opportunities in this province and, Mr. Speaker, we are reaching out to our young people, to young people across the country, telling them that the future of this province is wide open.

Mr. Speaker, this government has a plan and the plan is working. That opposition has a slogan that's full of hot air.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Proclamation of Farm Security Legislation

Ms. Harpauer: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. Last week when he was announcing his response to the ACRE (Action Committee on the Rural Economy) Committee's final report, the minister said that the issue of the farm land security was one of the ACRE recommendation that's been dealt with by this government.

He said, and I quote:

We can check that one off.

Well not so fast, Mr. Speaker. It's been five months since the farm land security legislation was passed in this very House, yet the Act is still not proclaimed. What is the holdup?

Mr. Speaker, will the minister explain to Saskatchewan farm land owners and interested buyers why this legislation is taking so long? Why has it not been made into law?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Axworthy: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to advise the member and all members that the preparation of the regulations for this legislation are complete. Forms have been revised in order to accommodate those changes to our regulations. And this legislation which attempts and which will grow the Saskatchewan economy in a responsible, careful manner, responsive to the wishes of those across the province, will be introduced in the very near future, certainly no later than the beginning of the year.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Harpauer: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is typical of the NDP government and how they handle issues that are so critical to our province. The former, former Agriculture minister said he'd look into this issue — Mr. Eric Upshall. And the former Agriculture minister, he promised to address the issue. He even hired people to study the issue.

And now this minister assured me that he was finally serious about making the changes that people have been asking for in order to grow this province. And the committee met and we did all that for the minister and we finalized the legislation by this

spring.

Mr. Speaker, they say the future is wide open, except the Saskatchewan borders are still slammed shut. Will the minister explain exactly when this legislation is going to be proclaimed? When is it going to be law, and when can these business owners start to look at Saskatchewan indeed being open?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Axworthy: — Mr. Speaker, the member will be aware that the committee, the committee raised an issue about whether or not the changes would be NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement) proof. We've had the legal opinion, Mr. Speaker, that confirms that it is. Mr. Speaker, we've had the opinion that confirms that it is, and I can tell the member that this Bill will be proclaimed as soon as possible, certainly by the new year.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Kyoto Protocol

Mr. Stewart: — Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier. The federal Liberal government will vote to support ratification of the Kyoto Protocol. The federal Liberals plan to force Kyoto on Saskatchewan even though it will kill thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in economic activity in our province.

So just where does the government stand? Mr. Speaker, the NDP Premier said he can't oppose Kyoto. The NDP MLAs (Member of the Legislative Assembly) for Saskatchewan, Saskatoon Nutana and Saskatoon Greystone, say Saskatchewan must strongly support Kyoto. And the NDP's Industry minister says he's opposed to Kyoto.

Mr. Speaker, it's time for the Premier to make a clear statement today on the Kyoto Protocol. Will he stand in the legislature and clearly state that the NDP government is opposed to ratification of the Kyoto Protocol because it will devastate Saskatchewan's economy while doing almost nothing to protect our environment?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — In a matter of moments, Mr. Speaker, a resolution will be introduced into this House which will clearly voice the position of this government, and I anticipate and I'm optimistic that members of the opposition will support a unanimous motion from this legislature.

Let's be real clear about this, Mr. Speaker. Point number one, do not take anything any member over there says about the position of government as the position of government. We'll speak for the position of government.

Point number two, from day one . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Point number two. Point number two, Mr. Speaker, unlike members opposite, this government recognizes it has a responsibility to the future generations, to

the future of this nation, to the future of this world. From day one, Mr. Speaker, this government has made it clear we do not — we do not — oppose the principles and objectives of the Kyoto Protocol, do not object to taking on the challenge of greenhouse gas emissions.

Our fight is not with the principle of Kyoto. Our fight is with the federal Liberal government who has refused from day one to participate with Canadians in building a sane implementation plan that will protect the interests of the environment and the interests of the economy.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stewart: — Mr. Speaker, our position is clear. The Saskatchewan Party supports the goal of reducing man-made emissions of greenhouse gases. But we're strongly opposed to ratification of the Kyoto Protocol because it will devastate Saskatchewan's economy, kill thousands of jobs in our most important industries while doing little to protect our environment.

The Saskatchewan Party supports a made-in-Canada, made-in-Saskatchewan approach to reduction of greenhouse gas emissions that balances the goal of protecting the environment with an equally critical need to get Saskatchewan's economy growing again.

Mr. Speaker, will the NDP government's resolution clearly oppose ratification of the Kyoto Protocol in favour of a made-in-Canada, made-in-Saskatchewan plan that protects the environment and grows Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — The member opposite stands today in this House and says that he and his party support the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. This is an interesting revelation because I have not heard from he or any member over there, including the leader, one substantive plan, one substantive idea that would in fact lower the amount of greenhouse gas emissions.

Compare that with this government, Mr. Speaker. Compare that with this government. Wind generation, ethanol, greenhouse gas research — on and on it goes. Mr. Speaker, we will have opportunity well throughout this debate to flesh out the position of the Saskatchewan Party. I'm inviting them today to join with this government, to join with every provincial government in Canada, in giving unanimous support from this legislature to the resolution that's being brought in by the government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(14:15)

Mr. Stewart: — Mr. Speaker, for months the NDP government has sent mixed messages. Will the Premier simply stand today and clearly state that his NDP government opposes ratification of the Kyoto Protocol because it will devastate Saskatchewan's economy without protecting our environment?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Here we go again. They're great on slogans. They're great on sloganeering, but pretty thin, absent on real plan. Great on slogan, pretty thin on plan.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, I repeat, this government from day one has accepted its responsibility to share in building a sane and clean environment for the future. We take that responsibility very seriously.

Our battle is not with the principle of Kyoto. Our battle is with a federal Liberal government who has refused from day one to participate with the provinces of Canada, with industry of Canada, with the people of Canada in building a strong implementation plan.

We have an opportunity, we have an opportunity in this legislature to pass a resolution that will set before the national government the 12 principles agreed to by all the provinces — by the way, Mr. Speaker, 12 principles that were built on principles developed by this minister and this government. That's where they came from.

We'll have an opportunity to be as one voice from Saskatchewan, to demand of our federal government the responsibility of that federal government in looking at those 12 principles and putting them into action.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Government Participation in Potato Industry

Mr. Wall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in 1997, according to NDP cabinet documents, the NDP government decided to risk millions of dollars in the potato business, even though the briefing and the information they received from the minister at the time, the current Minister of Industry, was later proved to be incorrect.

Mr. Speaker, in 1998, the NDP knew, found out about this. They found out they had acted with improper information. But did they put a stop to the investment of dollars? No. They invested, they wasted 14 million more dollars, Mr. Speaker, even though they knew the truth. And by 1999, the NDP's entire potato investment collapsed and virtually bankrupted Sask Water.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Party has obtained a cabinet memo from the deputy minister to the premier, Greg Marchildon to Premier Roy Romanow, dated July 16, 1999. It says Sask Water had lost so much money on potatoes that it was virtually insolvent. The question to the Premier is this: how could the NDP let their runaway wreck of an adventure in potatoes almost bankrupt Sask Water?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Sonntag: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Well either the member opposite understands the court process, or he does not understand the court process. I think he probably does understand the court process. He knows very well, Mr. Speaker, that I'm very limited in what I can say here in this Assembly or outside of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker.

But I will say what I said yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that there was infrastructure in that area, Mr. Speaker, some \$140 million — a lot of it invested when they were government, Mr. Speaker, back in the 1980s — 140 million by way of irrigation infrastructure that needed to have products that we could add value to, Mr. Speaker. So we worked with the growers in that area to build an industry, I would argue, an industry that has gone from 200 acres to 10,000 acres, Mr. Speaker — something we should all be proud of in this Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wall: — Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Party has been talking to people in the potato industry in that part of the province. Those people are represented by Saskatchewan Party members and they tell us that far from helping, this NDP debacle has set this industry back. This debacle has almost ruined the potato industry in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP knew its potato business was in big trouble, but they covered it up. They told Saskatchewan people it was a partnership, but it wasn't. They told them it was making money, but it was losing millions of dollars. And then in July 1999, on the eve of an election call, the premier was advised that Sask Water was broke, and he covered it up, Mr. Speaker. The current Premier was working in the premier's office; he knew that Sask Water was broke and he covered it up, Mr. Speaker, on the eve of an election.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier: why — why did the NDP cover up the loss of millions of taxpayers' dollars and the ruination of Sask Water by this government's policies?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Sonntag: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well again let me say, Mr. Speaker, to be clear — even if those members opposite don't want to listen, I want to explain to the public of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

The reason I can't respond to the questions that are in the court, Mr. Speaker, is because . . . And they laugh, Mr. Speaker, and they laugh. Mr. Speaker, the reason is, it's not just for the protection of government, Mr. Speaker, it's also for the claimants in the case, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's for the protection of the claimants, the people who are taking Sask Water to court. That's a . . .

The Speaker: — Order, please. Order, please. Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Sonntag: — Mr. Speaker, that member would have me circumvent and this government circumvent the court process so there isn't even a fair trial for those people who are claimants in this case, Mr. Speaker.

Let me say that — and it is public information about the facilities there, Mr. Speaker — we said that we would turn them back and sell them back to the growers, Mr. Speaker. We're doing that in an orderly fashion, Mr. Speaker, and there is a viable, vital potato industry in Saskatchewan now, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wall: — Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, what the Enron and the WorldCom scandals were all about in the United States is the leadership of those corporations misleading their shareholders . . .

The Speaker: — Order, please.

Mr. Wall: — What the scandals were all about, Mr. Speaker, is the leadership of those corporations misleading their shareholders. In this case, the shareholders are every single taxpayer in the province of Saskatchewan, and all the documentation shows that those people were misled, Mr. Speaker.

And another Enron accounting tactic is at play here — the draining of other bank accounts to cover up losses. Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Party has obtained a CIC (Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan) information item that went to cabinet on November 1999. It says, and I quote:

At the end of 1999, Sask Water has 3.9 (million) . . . of in trust liabilities, either associated with Rafferty . . . completion or owed to Ducks Unlimited, which cannot be funded as the cash associated with these has been used to finance SPUDCO storage capital and losses.

Mr. Speaker, the question to the minister is this, the question to the Premier is this: will he stand up today and apologize to the people involved in the Rafferty partnership and to Ducks Unlimited for using their money for his SPUDCO (Saskatchewan Potato Utility Development Company) debacle?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Sonntag: — Mr. Speaker, I would . . . I still to this day receive phone calls and letters, Mr. Speaker, from individuals who would disagree with that member's position that this is a debacle, Mr. Speaker.

They are appreciative — they are appreciative — of the fact that in their constituencies that they represent, Mr. Speaker, there is now an industry that has gone from 200 acres to 10,000 acres, Mr. Speaker, an industry that grows some of the best seed potatoes in all the world, Mr. Speaker, in all the world.

Mr. Speaker, we have a strong and vital potato industry and again, Mr. Speaker, we are engaged in an orderly disposition of the storage facilities in that area, Mr. Speaker. And there is a full accounting of that, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wall: — Mr. Speaker, last week . . . The minister didn't answer the question. I'm sure he's still hiding behind the courts. But he should know that last week . . . But he should know that last week officials of Sask Water were more than willing to talk about these two trust accounts. Officials of this government were prepared to answer the question.

The Speaker: — Order, please. Order, please. Order. I would ask members to allow the question to be put.

Mr. Wall: — Mr. Speaker, the Chair of the Crown Corps

Committee sits right behind the minister. He should have whispered to him and told him that his officials were more than happy to talk about the draining of these trust accounts last week. So we'll give him another chance.

The CIC item clearly indicates that Sask Water has a \$3.9 million in-trust liability associated with Rafferty completion or owed to Ducks Unlimited because these funds have been used to finance SPUDCO storage capital and losses. His officials commented on it yesterday. Will he stand in the House today and apologize to those people involved in those trusts for using their money for the SPUDCO debacle?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Sonntag: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well the way the member opposite, Mr. Speaker, is ranting, the Chair of Crown Corps would have to do a lot more than whisper for me to even begin to hear him, Mr. Speaker.

Let me say again, Mr. Speaker, if that member is now suggesting that we — we this government, myself as minister — should now start to circumvent a court process . . . Pay attention, people of Saskatchewan, pay attention to what that group of individuals would do if they were ever government. They would have total disregard, Mr. Speaker, for any court processes that exist. I say pay attention, because that's the way they would run government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Axworthy: — Mr. Speaker, I ask leave . . .

The Speaker: — Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Axworthy: — Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, to make a statement in regards to Human Rights Day.

Leave granted.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Human Rights Day

Hon. Mr. Axworthy: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as all of us know, today is Human Rights Day in Saskatchewan. Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which incidentally, Mr. Speaker, was written by a Canadian, states:

All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.

For 54 years these words have resonated in the hearts and minds of Canadians and of people around the world. They're the cornerstone of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the UN (United Nations) General Assembly on December 10, 1948.

After World War II the world was stunned at the atrocities that had taken place. People struggled to understand how such

abuses could have happened and how future generations could be spared the devastation they had witnessed.

More than 50 years have passed since the Universal Declaration was adopted, and human rights principles have increased in importance worldwide.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, Saskatchewan has a very special place in the history of the promotion of human rights in Canada. In 1947, 18 months before the passage of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the government of Premier Douglas passed The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights Act. Premier Douglas said of Saskatchewan's original Bill of Rights:

Freedom, like peace, is indivisible. I must protect my neighbour's rights in order to safeguard my own.

Mr. Speaker, The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights Act was Canada's first comprehensive human rights legislation and its passage was a very important act of leadership. All of Canada was profoundly affected by it and, following Saskatchewan's lead, other jurisdictions in Canada began passing legislation to address the serious issue of discrimination.

Saskatchewan's human rights legislation evolved and progressed steadily through the years with the consolidation of anti-discrimination laws under the Saskatchewan Human Rights Code in 1979. And the most recent changes to the Code were made in May 2000.

It's interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that there was unanimous support for the Human Rights Code when it was passed into law in this Assembly. The Code was clearly grounded in a philosophy that rose above partisan politics.

Mr. Speaker, as we approach the new year, we also approach the 30th anniversary of the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission. It opened its first office in Saskatoon in 1973 and in the same year held its first formal inquiry. In 1980 the commission gave approval to the first employment equity program in Saskatchewan. In 1986 the commission initiated a program for kindergarten to grade 12 designed to encourage Aboriginal children to participate fully in the school system and to complete grade 12.

In 2001 the Saskatchewan Human Rights Tribunal, a seven-person permanent panel of adjudicators, replaced the former system of boards of inquiry appointed on a case-by-case basis. Over the years the commission has also been involved in cases that refined human rights law and forwarded human rights principles in Saskatchewan, including a 1984 decision by a board of inquiry that affirmed for the first time that sexual harassment was discrimination on the basis of sex, in 1985 a case at the Court of Appeal that established a duty to accommodate, and a 1994 case also at the Court of Appeal that said displaying or selling racist stickers was a violation of the Code.

(14:30)

Mr. Speaker, I ask all members of the Legislative Assembly to join me in congratulating the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission on 30 years of service to the citizens of this

province and also to join me in celebrating Human Rights Day in Saskatchewan. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Heppner: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it is often said that a society is judged on how it deals with those people who are less fortunate in that society. And I think as the minister has already done this afternoon outlined some of the progression that has taken place, the evolution that has taken place within this province.

The dates that he mentioned where this all began essentially in the late '40s and early '50s, and I think we can underline how far we have come. Have we come far enough? No. And as I said, this is an evolution. But in that same House at that time, Mr. Speaker, there were individuals who were sitting here who had some years earlier written documents talking about individuals who had some disabilities as being subnormal.

So we've come a long way, Mr. Speaker, and I think it's important that on this particular day we look at the 30th anniversary of the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission. And the minister again very ably outlined some of the historic events that have taken place along the way, the rulings that have taken place. And I think as people of this province we can take pride that we have taken a leadership role, Mr. Speaker, not only in this province but in this country and across the world as well in maintaining and declaring that individuals have rights and have abilities and have respect in this particular province.

And so we join them and join the minister this afternoon in recognizing the 30th anniversary of the Human Rights Commission on this particular day. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To ask leave to move motions regarding membership on standing committees of the legislature.

The Speaker: — I would ask the member from Cannington to just wait for one item. Are there any further ministerial statements? Now I would ask whether the Assembly is prepared to give leave to the member for Cannington to introduce a motion. Is leave granted?

Leave granted.

MOTIONS

Substitution of Members on Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move:

That the name of Donna Harpauer be substituted for that of Daryl Wiberg on the Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills.

Seconded by the member from Indian Head-Milestone.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member from Indian Head-Milestone:

That the name of Jason Dearborn be substituted for that of Arlene Julé on the Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills.

Motion agreed to.

Substitution of Member on Standing Committee on Non-controversial Bills

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the member from Indian Head-Milestone:

That the name of Jason Dearborn be substituted for that of Rudi Peters on the Standing Committee on Non-controversial Bills.

Motion agreed to.

Substitution of Member on Standing Committee on the Environment

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member from Indian Head-Milestone:

That the name of Denis Allchurch be substituted for that of Wayne Elhard on the Standing Committee on Environment.

Motion agreed to.

Substitution of Member on Standing Committee on Education

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the member from Indian Head-Milestone:

That the name of Wayne Elhard be substituted for that of Rudi Peters on the Standing Committee on Education.

Motion agreed to.

Substitution of Member on Standing Committee on Constitutional Affairs

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the member from Indian Head-Milestone:

That the name of Jason Dearborn be substituted for that of Brenda Bakken on the standing committee on the constitution.

Motion agreed to.

Substitution of Member on Continuing Select Committee

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move,

seconded by the member from Indian Head-Milestone:

That the name of Yogi Huyghebaert be substituted for that of Bill Boyd on the standing . . . Continuing Select Committee.

Motion agreed to.

**Substitution of Member on
Special Committee on Regulations**

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the member from Indian Head-Milestone:

That the name of Ben Heppner be substituted for that of Brenda Bakken on the Special Committee on Regulations.

Motion agreed to.

**Substitution of Member on
Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections**

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the member from Indian Head-Milestone:

That the name of Doreen Eagles be substituted for that of Milt Wakefield on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

And that's the last one.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I would ask for leave to move a motion pursuant to rule 46.

Leave granted.

MOTION UNDER RULE 46

Kyoto Protocol

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, I want to say how very pleased I am to be able to make a few remarks today as it relates to the Kyoto Protocol.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — This has been, Mr. Speaker, an issue of a lot of discussion, a lot of debate, not only in our province but around our country, around the world. And I want to say as well that it's with mixed emotions that I stand here.

This debate should come to no surprise as anybody . . . or as no surprise to anybody in the House. As I said, it's been dominating the conversation across our nation — newscasts, university classes, coffee row. And I know my colleagues share with me the conviction that we need to preserve our natural environment for generations to come.

The quality of our natural environment defines our quality of life in Saskatchewan; a quality of life that the Premier, myself, and folks across this great province are proud to celebrate. And

our vision is of a Saskatchewan with clean air, land, and water, where pristine forests, rolling hills, and living skies provide wildlife habitat, support a growing population, and nourish the human spirit.

But over the course of the last number of months it has become very clear to us that the Kyoto Protocol in its current form will not do that; that this protocol could have grave consequences for our provincial economy, for the jobs and lives of our citizens and their children, and that the federal Liberal government in Ottawa is not committed to public consultation, to regional fairness, or economic development outside certain centres — in short, that the government of Ottawa is not committed to Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that we, on this side of the House, are and will be committed to the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — We will stand up for Saskatchewan so that our province can continue to enjoy the economic and job growth that we've heard so much about lately and that's why it's my pleasure to stand before you and move the following motion.

Mr. Speaker, I will read just part of it and describe part of it. I'll read the actual motion in when I conclude my remarks. But basically what we're talking about here are the 12 principles that were agreed to by all of the provinces and territories — that's very much a part of this motion — and that we support the 12 principles as a basis for a negotiated climate change plan with the government to address the Kyoto Protocol target of reducing national greenhouse gases below . . . to 6 per cent below the 1990 levels by 2012.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to the 12 principles adopted by the provinces and territories. And so while I want to say that there are members of this House that will snipe from those benches, this government's been acting. And I want to say, to simply oppose everything without giving any reasoned thought to our environment and to our economy is not what members on this side of the House are about. There are some members who are content not to put forward any real solutions, any real plan, or any new ideas. But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that that's not the position taken by this government.

This government is signing on to the principles that will address climate change, and we signed on to the principles that we believe will work for Saskatchewan. And we want a plan that works for Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

I don't think it's any secret that the people of Saskatchewan have misgivings about the Kyoto Protocol. As recently as yesterday, the *Leader-Post* reported that 62.2 per cent of Saskatchewan residents believe implementation of the Kyoto accord will be bad for Saskatchewan and that more than 70 per cent would like to see a made-in-Canada alternative to Kyoto. And, Mr. Speaker, that's what this motion is about.

It's made in Canada, tailored to Saskatchewan principles that garnered the unanimous support, I must say, of Canada's

provinces — principles that the federal government chose to ignore in a rush to meet an artificial, an unrealistic ratification deadline. And now, Mr. Speaker, we have the federal plan before us. A plan, much like the rhetoric I'm hearing from across the floor, is better described as a goal, a wish, a dream, a hope that would be nothing but bad news for the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the federal climate change plan is not a real plan. It contains no details, no specific information, and no realistic cost estimates. Sounds kind of familiar, Mr. Speaker, but I don't think that's what we need here in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I want to spend a few minutes discussing the federal plan. Unlike my opposition colleagues, I can recognize the good work of others, Mr. Speaker, and the federal government's plan does have some good ideas. Ideally these would be the starting point for discussions with the provinces, industry, and Canadians. We in Saskatchewan have strong interest in some aspects of the plan: ethanol, new technologies, and agriculture and forestry soil sinks.

And our province was pleased that the federal government has recognized the need to establish a partnership fund to foster initiatives. But we simply need more detail before we can sign on. We can't accept the plan that we know will be at least 30 to 50 per cent higher than claimed by the federal government and that may cost twice what's expected.

(14:45)

So what is the federal non-plan, Mr. Speaker? Let me address it for just a couple of moments. The federal government — the federal Liberal government — claims that its climate change plan will help Canada to meet its obligation to reduce projected 2010 emissions of greenhouses by 240 megatonnes. Existing measures already underway are expected to provide 80 megatonnes. This includes 20 megatonnes from forest sinks and 10 megatonnes from ag sinks, but we will find it difficult to believe that these existing measures will really mean an 80-megatonne reduction. And reliable indicators tell us that this is a reduction and a reduction of this size through existing measures will cost much more than the \$1.6 billion budgeted over seven years.

New actions included in the federal plan are expected to provide 100 megatonnes, 55 of which are to come from large industrial emitters. This section of the federal document has no budget estimates, something that given recent news about federal Liberal budgeting practices should give us all some reason for pause.

Moreover, Saskatchewan industries would be expected to spend between 40 and \$200 million a year to meet their Kyoto targets. Our industries would be forced to buy large purchases of international emissions — or hot air — from Russia. Taking investment out of Saskatchewan and depositing this investment in what is one of our major competitors in the international potash markets, Mr. Speaker, doesn't make any sense.

Uncertainty over this plan is already affecting Western Canadian industry. Mr. Speaker, in November Husky announced a hold on a planned upgrader expansion, and IPSCO

here in Regina says that Kyoto could be disastrous, especially given the fact that the US (United States) is not signing on. Saskatchewan can ill afford to lose this investment, especially for an arbitrary plan that won't even meet our Kyoto targets and that will have no clear effect on climate change, a plan that would take our agricultural soil sinks — a potential of 300 million annual benefits for our farmers — and credit them to the federal government, if you can imagine, Mr. Speaker.

The third part of the federal plan relates to current and potential actions by provinces and individual Canadians — actions the feds expect to provide the remaining 60 megatonnes. As part of this, the feds are encouraging individual Canadians, all 31 million of us, to reduce our emissions by 1 tonne each.

Now I think we could all do a lot to be more environmentally efficient. I think that's fair and there's evidence of that. And there's no doubt in my mind that the Office of Energy Conservation will continue to work toward improving the efficiency of our province. But to expect every single Canadian to reduce their emissions by 20 per cent? Might happen.

My colleagues across the floor might realize the importance of our natural environment. Every little girl in Saskatchewan might get a pony for Christmas. My point, Mr. Speaker, is that we simply don't know.

I want to move to the 12 points. This motion before us today calls this Assembly to support the 12 principles adopted by all of the provinces and territories. And these 12 principles should be the basis for negotiating a national climate change plan with the Government of Canada.

While the federal government claims to have consulted with Canadians, these 12 points are the direct results of the meetings of all Canadian regions — all provinces and territories. And I believe they're the basis for a truly national plan, a plan that can be based on federal, provincial, and territorial partnerships.

In fact the first principle calls for the full and informed input of all Canadians to the development of the plan.

The second principle is, in my opinion, key. This principle would ensure fairness for all Canada's regions and industries and clarity on targets and costs.

The Prime Minister promised fair regional . . . regional fairness back in 1997. But you know what they've put forward as a document shows that 3 per cent of the Canadian population and 3 per cent of Canada's GDP (gross domestic product) . . . Saskatchewan industry would be expected to make 8 per cent of the emission reductions from the Canadian industrial sector. And we say that's not fair and that's not what the Prime Minister talked about.

The plan that the federal government unveiled has no commitment to clarity and would mean that the federal government doesn't have to compensate regions that are disproportionately affected. And that's not right. And that's why we can't support what they've put forward.

The sixth principle, explicitly rejected by the federal government, would protect our province from unilateral federal

actions which would damage our economy. And that, Mr. Speaker, is not the partnership of which we speak.

So the federal government can sign on to whatever they want and they can leave the provinces and territories to pay the bills. And, Mr. Speaker, that's not where this province wants this discussion to go and that's not where this province wants this debate to go.

Simple fairness, Mr. Speaker. Is that too much to ask? Federal government would also see the benefits from agriculture and forest sinks would accrue to the federal government. What right do they have to assume that, Mr. Speaker? What right do they have?

Ag sinks, as I said before, could mean as much as \$300 million to our farmers. And here you have a national government that won't support in trades war . . . trade wars, and on top of that intend to remove possible benefits from an agreement that could be reached for the province of our . . . for our farmers.

And, Mr. Speaker, in 2001 if the drought wasn't enough, now the federal government wants to credit itself for the assets of the farming community in this province. And I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, we have been standing up for our farmers and the seven principles show that other provinces are doing the same — the seventh principle. These principles would ensure that Saskatchewan realizes the benefits for its competitive advantages and the successes it has already achieved. And that means work, sir, that we've already done — that we need to be . . . needs to be recognized.

Our significant wind power potential . . . Canada third . . . we're now Canada's third larger producer and we're growing. Our agricultural forest sinks, the new technologies that we have and are developing such as the international CO₂ test centre, the enhanced oil recovery CO₂ monitoring project in Weyburn, clean coal. Saskatchewan can and should benefit from the progress that we've made in this area and we need help. The federal government should step up and provide real, tangible support for greenhouse gas emission reductions.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I don't think it's a secret to anyone here that we need to take action on the environment. Climate change is serious business and it's our responsibility to address it. But the Kyoto Protocol will not stop the climate change. Stopping climate change will mean going beyond Kyoto, working together in partnership over the long haul to ensure that sustainable solutions are put in place.

We as provinces have asked the federal government to work with us in developing a partnership to address the environment. We've developed these 12 principles in the hope that the federal government would take our offer to heart and work with us to address the needs of the environment that we all cherish. It's our hope that motions like this — the one I spoke to today — will convince the federal Liberals to stop this foolishness before it's too late, to work with us to develop a made-in-Canada solution that works for Saskatchewan. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, it's for these reasons and more that I ask all members to join with me in supporting the motion.

Mr. Speaker, I've just received a note that this afternoon the

federal government did ratify the Kyoto Protocol by a vote of 195 for and 77 against. So I think, Mr. Speaker, it's very clear that we in this Chamber now need to join together in putting forth a motion that will give direction; to put together, working with the provinces and territories, a plan that will work for Saskatchewan, that will work for Saskatchewan people in terms of protecting their jobs, that will work for Saskatchewan people in terms of protecting their environment.

Mr. Speaker, that's the work that's been going on in this side of the House. And it's not been slogans, and it's not been political gamesmanship. We've been working hard at this. And the men and women within these government departments that had been part of these discussions for years are very serious about what they attempt to achieve and what they want to achieve.

So in closing, before I read the motion, seconded by the member from Athabasca, into the record, I would ask all members of this Assembly to support the 12 principles put forward in this motion so that we can move forward in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan, for the common . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — So I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the member from Athabasca:

That this Assembly recognizes that climate change is a critical issue facing Saskatchewan, Canada, and the world; and

That this Assembly supports the 12 principles adopted by the provinces and territories as a basis for negotiating a national climate change plan with the Government of Canada to address the Kyoto Protocol target of reducing national greenhouse gas emissions to 6 per cent below 1990 levels by 2012, specifically:

- (1) All Canadians must have an opportunity for full and informed input into the development of the plan;
- (2) The plan must ensure that no region or jurisdiction shall be asked to bear an unreasonable share of the burden and no industry, sector, or region shall be treated unfairly. The costs and impacts on individuals, businesses, and industries must be clear, reasonable, achievable, and economically sustainable. The plan must incorporate appropriate federally funded mitigation of the adverse impacts of climate change initiatives;
- (3) The plan must respect provincial and territorial jurisdiction;
- (4) The plan must include recognition of real emission reductions that have been achieved since 1990 or will be achieved thereafter;
- (5) The plan must provide for bilateral or multilateral agreements between provinces and territories . . . with the federal government;
- (6) The plan must ensure that no province or territory bears the financial risk of federal climate change commitments;
- (7) The plan must recognize that benefits from assets such as forest and agricultural sinks must accrue to the province or territory which owns the assets;
- (8) The plan must support innovation and new technology;
- (9) The plan must maintain the economic competitiveness

of Canadian business and industry;

(10) Canada must continue to demand recognition of clean energy exports;

(11) The plan must include initiatives for all citizens, communities, businesses and jurisdictions to make the shift to an economy based on renewable and other clean energy, lower emissions and sustainable practices across sectors;

And finally:

(12) The implementation of any climate change plan must include an incentive and allocation system that supports lower carbon emission sources of energy such as hydroelectricity, wind power generation, ethanol, and renewable and other clean sources of energy.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Belanger: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I stand today as a seconder to the motion in recognizing some of the great and significant challenges we have ahead of us and to recognize that climate change for Saskatchewan and for the Government of Saskatchewan is a very serious issue.

Saskatchewan will face serious environmental, economic, and social impacts from the effects of climate change. More severe drought and storms, escalating forest fires, a decline in river and lake levels, and a reduction in our agricultural productivity are predicted as a result of climate change. Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan government supports the spirit of the Kyoto Protocol to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions that are contributing to climate change.

Mr. Speaker, what is Saskatchewan doing? Saskatchewan is not standing still on this issue. We are moving aggressively forward to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to develop innovative solutions to capture and store CO₂, and to develop strategies for adapting to climatic changes.

(15:00)

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan, after several years, is now the third largest developer of wind power projects in Canada. And planning is underway, Mr. Speaker, for a new development that would see us become the leader in this area.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation has undertaken extensive energy conservation work on 70 government buildings that will result in energy savings and financial savings to the taxpayers.

We are participating, Mr. Speaker, in the Canadian Clean Power Coalition study of new, clean-coal technologies. Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan farmers have the highest adoption rate of conservation tillage systems in the world, transforming agricultural soils from an emission source for atmospheric carbon dioxide to a carbon sink, Mr. Speaker.

An innovative agreement between SaskPower and Saskatchewan Environment to plant trees and to create a forest carbon reserve recently received national endorsement by the

greenhouse emissions reduction trading pilot project which is a scientific panel established to review carbon sequestration and trading projects, Mr. Speaker.

Since 1996 Saskatchewan has supported the Prairie Adaptation Network at the Saskatchewan Research Council, to examine the probable effects of climate change on the Prairies and to develop effective adaptation strategies that allow us to take advantage of the expected changes.

These are just a few of the innovative developments that Saskatchewan is participating in to deal with the issue of climate change now, Mr. Speaker.

Saskatchewan people want and Saskatchewan people demand and Saskatchewan people deserve to have a Saskatchewan solution to this challenge. Mr. Speaker, we are willing to do our part and we have already taken many important actions to reduce the amount of emissions that our province releases into the atmosphere.

Mr. Speaker, the Kyoto Protocol is an international treaty negotiated in 1997 through the UN to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The Protocol is the result of a consensus amongst members of the UN stating that climate change caused by human activity is a concern and concrete action must be taken.

The Kyoto commitments applied to only 38 developed nations, and countries in transition in central and in eastern Europe. As an example, Mr. Speaker, Russia and the Ukraine, etc.

The overall reduction in greenhouse gases from 1990 levels is 5.2 per cent. Canada's target will be to reduce its output of greenhouse gases between 2008 and 2012 to a level that is 6 per cent below our 1990 emissions.

This fall the Prime Minister, as we all know, announced his intention to ratify the Kyoto Protocol before the end of this year and we have heard that has been done today; however, Mr. Speaker, without a plan in place that is acceptable to the provinces and territories, and that is the severe weakness, Mr. Speaker. Saskatchewan is concerned that ratifying the Protocol without a clear plan will harm our economy without having any real benefit to the environment.

Mr. Speaker, while Saskatchewan people are people who care about their environment and who are more than willing, more than willing to do their share in contributing to global interests in reducing greenhouse gas emissions, we are also an economy that currently relies heavily on fossil fuels. Climate change and greenhouse gas reduction is a global and national issue, and a small economy such as Saskatchewan's should not be disproportionately burdened with the national family.

The Saskatchewan government responded by releasing a discussion document in October called, *Making it Work: A Saskatchewan Perspective on Climate Change Policy*. The document listed 19 benchmarks that the province would use to evaluate Ottawa's plan. The federal government released what they called the climate change plan for Canada, more accurately described as a framework.

Mr. Speaker, the provinces are concerned that the federal

framework does not adequately address the 12 principles agreed on by the provinces and by the territories in their October 28 statement on climate change policy. Saskatchewan stands alongside all provinces in calling for a climate change plan that is clear, that is effective, and that is economically sustainable. We cannot support the federal government's plan to ratify Kyoto without a clear implementation plan in place.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that Canadians need to know the cost and the impact of climate change policy on business, industries, and the consumers. The federal climate change plan is not a real plan. It contains no details, no specific information, and no accurate cost estimates. It contains no information as to how provincial economies reliant on fossil fuels will be assisted to ensure that they do not face unreasonable burden in adjusting to the Kyoto targets.

The federal plan claims that cost impacts are modest, but the financial analysis that is provided is based on different assumptions than are included in the plan since Canada's request for clean energy exports was not approved, Mr. Speaker. The costs of ratification will be at least 30 to 50 per cent higher than claimed by the federal government, and these costs may double.

The most recent federal government analysis predicts that Kyoto will cost Saskatchewan 6,000 permanent jobs by 2010. The cost of government programs to reduce emissions will reduce after-tax household income by 1,300 to 1,500 a year in 2010.

The plan glosses over a number of serious unresolved issues, Mr. Speaker. For example, the federal government assumes it can claim the emissions credit related to carbon that has accumulated in sinks in forests and agricultural soils. Saskatchewan feels very strongly that the federal government has no right to claim these credits, Mr. Speaker. Most of these things belong to farmers, to landowners, and to provincial governments and the federal government must either offer fair compensation for these sinks or allow the owners to sell their related emissions credits to industry.

Of particular concern, Mr. Speaker, is the plan's expectations that our industry will purchase greenhouse gas credits and simply transfer money that could be invested here to countries such as Russia, with no reduction in greenhouse gas emissions — and again I stress, Mr. Speaker, with no reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.

With so little detail it is impossible for any province to assess the impacts this plan will have on the residents and industry of our current provinces. Portions of this plan such as building codes are beyond the federal government's jurisdiction and need provincial co-operation to be implemented.

Ratifying Kyoto over the objections of provinces may affect future federal-provincial co-operation to implement such measures. Saskatchewan disagrees, Mr. Speaker, with the plan's claim that the federal government has held extensive consultation. Canadian citizens and businesses do not understand how they will be affected, nor do they understand the costs that they will incur.

The plan acknowledges that Canada needs to make, quote:

Large adjustment . . . (to) many small pragmatic steps.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan agrees that achieving Kyoto targets will require a large adjustment. This is why we feel strongly that the federal government should take the time to undertake extensive consultation and prepare a well-thought-out plan, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Belanger: — The plan contains some desirable measures and would be a good starting point for discussions with the provinces, with industry, and with Canadians. Unfortunately the federal government has introduced a motion into parliament that will commit this country to a Kyoto target before those discussions and these discussions can occur.

The federal government must permit adequate time for consultation on proposed initiatives, establishment of fair targets for industry, Mr. Speaker, and also verifications of their federal government's estimates of costs and impacts. Saskatchewan has a strong interest in some of the measures outlined in the plan — ethanol and new technology, agricultural soil sinks. But we need to know more details, more details about what the federal government intends to do in each of those areas. Those details, Mr. Speaker, are not forthcoming.

Saskatchewan is pleased that the federal government has recognized the need to establish a partnership fund to cost-share initiative. However there's no indication on how large the fund will be, and no indication whether it'll be used in a manner that alleviates unfair burden on particular economies such as Saskatchewan. The federal government needs to ensure that targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions are shared equally across Canada.

We seek a long-term financial commitment to help meet those targets. We believe assistance is necessary for any transition that might affect communities, industries, workers, or consumers.

Mr. Speaker, we ask the question: where to now? The provinces are asking the federal government to work with them on a made-in-Canada solution that reduces emissions while minimizing the impacts on provincial economies and jobs. Saskatchewan continues to urge the federal government not to ratify Kyoto without first developing a plan that all provinces can agree to. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that message was not heard.

A plan that meets the 12 principles agreed to by the provinces and by the territories will provide Canada with the best mechanism to meet the reduced targets or the reduction targets when it ratifies the Kyoto accord.

We also, Mr. Speaker, call on all members of the provincial legislature to support a motion, and that motion clearly states:

That this Assembly recognizes that climate change is a critical issue facing Saskatchewan, Canada, and the world; and

That this Assembly supports the 12 principles adopted by the provinces . . . for negotiating a national climate change plan with the Government of Canada to address the Kyoto Protocol target of reducing national greenhouse gas emissions to 6 per cent below 1990 levels by the year 2012, specifically (Mr. Speaker):

- (1) All Canadians must have an opportunity for full and informed input into the development of the plan;
- (2) The plan must ensure that no region or jurisdiction shall be asked to bear an unreasonable share of the burden and no industry, sector, or region shall be treated unfairly. The costs and impact on individuals, (on) businesses . . . (on) industries must be clear, reasonable, achievable, and economically sustainable. The plan must incorporate appropriate federally funded mitigation of the adverse impacts of (the) climate change initiatives;
- (3) The plan must respect provincial and territorial jurisdiction;
- (4) The plan must include recognition of real emission reductions that have been achieved since 1990 or will be achieved thereafter;
- (5) The plan must provide for bilateral . . . (and) multilateral agreements between provinces and territories, and with the federal government;
- (6) The plan must ensure that no province or territory bears the financial risk of federal climate change commitments;
- (7) The plan must recognize that benefits from assets such as forest and agricultural sinks must accrue to the province or (to the) territory which owns . . . (these) assets;
- (8) The plan must support innovation and new technology;
- (9) The plan must maintain economic competitiveness of Canadian businesses and industry;
- (10) Canada must continue to demand recognition of clean energy exports;
- (11) The plan must include incentives for all citizens, communities, businesses and jurisdictions to make the shift to an economy based on renewable and other clean energy, lower emissions, and sustainable practices across sectors;

And finally, Mr. Speaker:

- (12) The implementation of any climate change plan must include an incentive and allocation system that supports lower carbon emission sources of energy such as hydroelectricity, wind power generation, ethanol, and renewable and other clean sources of energy (Mr. Speaker).

As Saskatchewan, we demand that, Mr. Speaker. As Saskatchewan, we need that and I stand in full support of the motion tabled here today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stewart: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to enter into the debate over ratification of the Kyoto accord.

Mr. Speaker, the Kyoto Protocol was negotiated in 1997. Under Kyoto, Canada is required to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 94 per cent of 1990 levels by 2012.

Greenhouse gases are invisible. They are not smog or other types of visible air pollution caused by particulates in the

atmosphere. The most common greenhouse gases are carbon dioxide and methane. Both are naturally occurring in our atmosphere. Carbon dioxide is necessary for plant life on earth.

The issue is the concentrations of these gases beyond natural levels may cause global warming, not that the scientific community can even agree as to whether or not any global warming is occurring outside of normal cyclic temperature swings or, if so, if it is man made or caused by natural events.

(15:15)

Mr. Speaker, what of the impact on Saskatchewan? The provincial Department of Industry and Resources estimates Kyoto could cost as much as \$2.6 billion in economic output by the year 2020. SaskPower estimates Kyoto could cost the provincial power utility as much as \$250 million per year.

IPSCO, one of Saskatchewan's largest industrial companies, has indicated that ratification of the Kyoto Protocol could force the company to move to the United States. The Canadian Taxpayers Federation estimates ratification of the Kyoto Protocol will cost every family in Canada approximately \$2,700 per year, and more if they live in Saskatchewan or Alberta.

Saskatchewan's most important trading partner, the United States, is not ratifying Kyoto and therefore will not incur the same new costs as Saskatchewan companies. Kyoto will cause significant economic damage and kill thousands of jobs in Saskatchewan's most important industries — agriculture, mining, forestry, and oil and gas.

And the impact of Kyoto on Canada, Mr. Speaker. The Canadian exporters and manufacturers association estimates Kyoto could kill 450,000 jobs in the country. The Canadian Chamber of Commerce estimates Kyoto could cost \$30 billion in economic output annually. The province of Alberta and the Fraser Institute agree that the cost could reach \$40 billion in economic output annually.

The system of proposed carbon debits, carbon debits and credits will effectively cause millions of dollars to be paid by Canadian companies to less energy efficient countries in Europe and Asia.

The devastating impact of the Kyoto Protocol on Alberta, Saskatchewan, and the Atlantic provinces will further exacerbate the existing regional tensions and alienation that has plagued Canada for decades.

Canada is the only country in the G-8 that must meet GHG (greenhouse gas) emission reduction targets under the Kyoto Protocol. The United States, Canada's most important trading partner, has decided not to sign Kyoto.

Why will Kyoto have such a devastating impact on the economies of Canada and Saskatchewan? Jobs will be lost because Canada would not be competitive with the United States, our largest trading partner and a non-participant in the Kyoto Protocol. Every Canadian will suffer from a weak economy and higher prices for energy-related products, with resulting increased prices on many products. Industries that cannot meet emission targets will have to purchase credits from countries who have room to spare in their greenhouse gas

allotment. If 50 per cent of emissions are reduced by efficiencies and technological changes, then credits for the other 50 per cent will have to be purchased.

The estimates are that as much as 2 to \$6 billion per year might have to be purchased from countries in the developing category. This money would leave Canada. Costs for the purchase for these credits will be passed on to consumers through higher product costs. Oil, gas, electricity, agricultural products, etc., would become more expensive and non-competitive in global markets. Canada does not set prices for oil and gas, electricity, and most agricultural products.

Some industries, such as agriculture, will be severely affected because of the high consumption of energy products whose prices would increase under Kyoto: diesel fuel, natural gas, fertilizer, etc.

Industry and investment would tend to locate in countries that do not have the extra costs, perhaps in the US or in developing countries that do not have a target and thus no extra costs. Why would an industry locate in Canada when it could be located across the border and not have to worry about the extra emission control costs?

Mr. Speaker, the federal government has been misleading the people of Canada and snoring provincial governments like this one opposite by maintaining that the impact on Canadian gross domestic product will be less than point five per cent and will not be felt in the average household.

Mr. Speaker, I beg your indulgence to read from an article published in the *National Post* and *The Ottawa Citizen* on November 21, 2002. And that article reads:

The federal government is underestimating the cost of implementing the Kyoto Protocol by as much as 30 per cent in some sectors an Industry Canada study says.

The new study predicts Canada's energy industry in particular will see tremendous losses in investment, employment and output by 2010, two years before the treaty is supposed to be fully implemented.

The article goes on:

The final Kyoto plan which is to be made public today but was obtained (this is November 21 — made public today but was obtained) by the *Ottawa Citizen* yesterday, also will not guarantee financial compensation to the provinces for possible economic losses under Kyoto.

It will instead set up a fund to help provinces pay for projects to reduce greenhouse gases. No amount has yet been specified for that fund.

The Industry Canada study blamed the federal underestimation of the costs on the type of economic modelling used by the planners.

Although completed early in the summer, sources said the study has been kept under wraps because it contradicts the rosy economic picture painted by (the) . . . federal

government economic forecasts of the costs of implementing Kyoto.

The report, entitled *Economic Impact of Carbon Abatement Policies and Market Structure*, forecasts the coal industry will suffer with investment declining by 48% and employment dropping by as much as 21%.

In the crude petroleum and natural gas sectors, investment is forecast to decline 33% and employment by 14%.

In the refined petroleum sector, investment in the sector could decline by 55% and employment by 27%.

Jean Chrétien wants to have Parliament ratify the treaty possibly as early as next week (this was written on November 21). Major energy-producing and -consuming provinces including Alberta and Ontario (of course Saskatchewan's left out because nobody knew what our position was) want to delay ratification until an implementation plan and its costs are better understood by the provinces and the public.

The Industry Canada study is based on simulations of the impact on 13 sectors and takes into account the full implementation of the Kyoto Protocol. The international treaty requires Canada to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions to 6% below 1990 levels.

The federal Kyoto plan aims to involve every citizen in reducing one tonne of greenhouse gases from their cars and homes. It will also commit the federal government to negotiating greenhouse-gas reduction targets with individual industrial sectors . . .

I hope the members opposite are listening to this.

The new plan refuses to concede to three of the 12 provincial demands: (one), that Ottawa pay for any economic losses attributed to climate change initiatives; (two), that it bear all the financial risk for its climate change measures; (three), and that the carbon credits from forest and agricultural land, which absorb carbon dioxide, belong to the provinces.

That is the federal government refuses to concede those things.

The government's latest estimates reveal Kyoto would cost at least 200,000 jobs and a (gross domestic product) . . . reduction of 1.5% over the next decade. Estimates from other sources, such as the Canadian Manufacturers and Exporters (association) . . . peg the (full) cost of . . . implementation at 450,000 jobs in manufacturing alone, and a 3% decline in GDP.

However, the government's estimates were based on reducing greenhouse gases by 170 megatonnes after claiming credit for clean energy exports — which it has been denied — a figure (of) 70 megatonnes less than the target set out in the Kyoto treaty.

The model used in the new study is thought to be a more sophisticated attempt to measure the costs of the treaty and

its impact on investment decisions . . .

“To our knowledge, this is the first forward-looking, dynamic equilibrium model that incorporates an imperfectly competitive market structure in the analysis of the Kyoto Protocol, not only for Canada but also for any other country.”

The price of carbon as a commodity in the study is . . . 29.20 per tonne in 2010 . . . This is contradictory to earlier estimates by David Anderson, the Environment Minister, that carbon credits covering a tonne of emissions will cost \$10. The government study also indicated that at the high-end, the carbon credits could cost as much as \$50 a tonne . . .

“Energy sectors are the most affected . . . these sectors undergo large contractions,” said the study, claiming the largest decline in output will be in the coal industry with a (30) . . . per cent fall, followed by decreases of 28% and 21% in . . . natural gas and refined petroleum sectors . . .

The paper cautions . . . it will be necessary to compare whether the economic costs of compliance with the Kyoto Protocol will outweigh the benefits of having a lower level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere.

Mr. Speaker, if we could have had some leadership from this government and this Premier some time ago, perhaps in conjunction with other provinces, this thing may have been stopped. Instead we in this province are victims of the inaction of a government paralyzed by internal conflict and dissent. Under the leadership of this Premier, who sold out the interests of Saskatchewan in this debate in order to appease the left-wing, lunatic fringe of the NDP party . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stewart: — . . . that will not be appeased until the economy of Saskatchewan is completely devastated and private enterprise driven from the province.

Mr. Speaker, Canada produces 2 per cent of the world's greenhouse gas emissions. And countries either not signing on or signing on without targets represent 65 per cent.

Canada will be the only country in the western hemisphere to sign on with any targets of greenhouse gas emissions. Mr. Speaker, it is in the best interests of Saskatchewan and Canada to put our . . . Is it in the best interests of Saskatchewan and Canada to put our economies at risk maybe to make a slight reduction in 2 per cent of the world's greenhouse gas emissions? I think not, and the Saskatchewan Party has a better solution.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stewart: — Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I propose the following amendment to the motion, that this Assembly opposes ratification of the Kyoto Protocol and that this Assembly support the 12 principles adopted by the provinces and territories as the basis for negotiating a made-in-Canada, made-in-Saskatchewan plan to reduce greenhouse gas

emissions that balances the important goal of protecting the environment with the equally critical need to get Saskatchewan's economy growing again, specifically:

- (1) All Canadians must have an opportunity for full and informed input into the development of the plan;
- (2) The plan must ensure that no region or jurisdiction shall be asked to bear an unreasonable share of the burden, and no industry, sector, or region shall be treated unfairly. The costs and impacts on individuals, businesses and industries must be clear, responsible, achievable, and economically sustainable. The plan must incorporate appropriate federally funded mitigation of the adverse impacts of climate change initiatives;
- (3) The plan must respect provincial and territorial jurisdiction;
- (4) The plan must include recognition of real emission reductions that have been achieved since 1990 or will be achieved thereafter;
- (5) The plan must provide for bilateral or multilateral agreements between provinces and territories, and with the federal government;
- (6) The plan must ensure that no province or territory bears the financial risk of federal climate change commitments;
- (7) The plan must recognize that benefits from assets such as forest and agricultural sinks must accrue to the province and territory which owns the assets;
- (8) The plan must support innovation and new technology;
- (9) The plan must maintain the economic competitiveness of Canadian business and industry;
- (10) Canada must continue to demand recognition of clean energy exports;
- (11) The plan must include incentives for all citizens, communities, businesses, and jurisdictions to make the shift to an economy based on renewable and other clean energy, lower emissions, and sustainable practices across sectors; (and finally)
- (12) The implementation of any climate change plan must include an incentive and allocation system that supports lower carbon emission sources of energy such as hydroelectricity, wind power generation (and) ethanol, and renewable and other clean sources of energy.

And, Mr. Speaker, the actual motion moved by myself, to be seconded by the member from Carrot River Valley, reads as follows:

That all words before “specifically” be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

That this Assembly opposes ratification of the Kyoto Protocol, and that this Assembly support the 12 principles adopted by the provinces and territories as a basis for negotiating a made-in-Canada, made-in-Saskatchewan plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions that balances the important goal of protecting the environment with the equally critical need to get Saskatchewan's economy growing again.

I so move.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(15:30)

Mr. Kwiatkowski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to enter into the debate on the Kyoto accord and to second the motion, or the amendment to the motion as proposed by the member from Thunder Creek.

Mr. Speaker, in order to understand the Kyoto accord I think it's important that we understand a little bit of the history behind it. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the IPCC, was jointly established in 1988 by the World Meteorological Organization and the United Nations Environment Programme to assess scientific, technical, and socio-economic information on the climate system, climate change impacts, and response options.

The IPCC second assessment report released in 1996 concluded that climate change had indeed taken place and some of this change might be attributed to human activity. Governments around the world adopted a goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and this led to more than 160 nations gathering in Kyoto, Japan, December 1997.

The purpose was to negotiate the Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations framework treaty on climate change. This international agreement under the United Nations was created to reduce greenhouse gases in the developed countries around the world.

As a result of the meeting in Kyoto, 38 developed nations agreed to reductions. The goal of the Kyoto accord is to reduce overall greenhouse gas emissions by 5.2 per cent below 1990 levels in the commitment period from 2008 to 2012. The United States agreed to 5 per cent, and Canada decided to go one step further and agreed to 6 per cent.

In 2001 the IPCC published its third assessment report. This report reiterated the need for Kyoto and for further action. It outlined increasing understanding of climate change risks. The most abundant greenhouse gases, Mr. Speaker, are carbon dioxide and methane. Both of these gases are naturally occurring components of our atmosphere. We actually require greenhouse gases to survive. However the concern for some is that these gases are being emitted in a concentration that is above a natural level, resulting in global warming.

However many scientists feel that warming and cooling cycles are normal and that in the past thousand years there were much warmer and cooler periods than there are today. There is no consensus, Mr. Speaker, on the theory that humanity is causing significant climate change, as there is not even consensus that the atmosphere is warming.

Kyoto primarily targets the production of carbon dioxide from the burning of fossil fuels. The approximate breakdown is as follows: 25 per cent from transportation, 18 per cent from oil and gas, 17 per cent from the mining and manufacturing industry, 16 per cent from power generation, 10 per cent from agriculture, 10 per cent from buildings, and 4 per cent from landfill gases. Kyoto does not address the problem of air pollution as many Canadians believe, and as the federal government has led Canadians to believe.

Ninety per cent of all global carbon dioxide production is from

natural sources, with only 10 per cent produced by humans. Kyoto targets require that Canada reduce emissions by 240 megatonnes by 2012. This is 30 per cent below current levels.

A special report on land use, land use change, and forestry, which was negotiated subsequent to the signing of the original treaty, authorized the use of sink credits. Canada, Japan, Russia, and other countries will be allowed to claim certain credits due to the fact that forest and plant growth within their countries draw carbon dioxide from the air. Canada's original target was reduced by 10 per cent, meaning that Canada can claim 24 megatonnes worth of sink credits as an outcome of these negotiations.

However the federal government has penalized the provinces by claiming these credits. They have told the provinces that they will not be allowed to benefit from the credits. They are using the provinces' forests to reduce Canada's overall burden but not allowing the provinces themselves to use these, even, Mr. Speaker, when forestry and agriculture are under provincial jurisdiction.

Canada has also sought 60 megatonnes of clean air energy exports. Under this proposal, if another country reduced its emissions by switching from coal or oil to natural gas bought from Canada, Canada wanted to be able to claim the reduction in the other country's emissions for itself. Twice, other members of the Protocol have declined Canada's request for these credits.

However these credits are taken into account by the federal government when they calculate the estimated cost that Kyoto will have on Canadians, even though they have been told that Kyoto will not be amended. The November 2002 New Delhi convention did not even allow this issue to be put on the agenda, Mr. Speaker. It is becoming obvious that this will never occur. Canada will now have to hope to negotiate these credits in the next stage of the Kyoto process which begins in 2013.

As a result of its inability to claim these credits, the government is short and have said that they may be forced to look at even further reductions from industry, provinces, and municipalities. And the natural gas companies, Mr. Speaker, who thought they may be in a somewhat better position than others, were dealt a severe blow with this news.

Another issue that has become very evident from New Delhi is the refusal of developing countries to commit in the future to any greenhouse gas reductions. Kyoto requires compliance on average from 2008 to 2012. By 2005, members must submit evidence of having made substantial progress toward meeting their goals.

Mr. Speaker, what are the penalties for failure to reach these targets set out in Kyoto? For the Kyoto Protocol, according to the Marrakesh accord, nations that ratify Kyoto who do not meet their targets in round one are penalized another 30 per cent in emission reductions and will not be allowed to sell carbon credits in round two, and that any shortfall will have to be made up for within 100 days.

The European Union has also threatened that they will introduce World Trade Organization penalties against nations

which fail to meet their targets, thus affecting trade — something very important to Canada and very important to this province, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Just 25 per cent of the world's greenhouse gas emissions are produced by the 18 developed countries who have ratified the accord. Canada is one of 25 countries classified as a developed country. Only developed countries are required to reduce emissions. Other countries termed developing countries are not only exempt from the reductions, they are actually allowed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to increase emissions under the accord.

Under this accord, developing countries are able to sell credits for the unused part of their emission reductions. These credits can be sold to developed countries that cannot meet their emission targets. In Canada the effect of purchasing these credits would cost approximately \$6 billion annually by the year 2008. This is money that would leave our country and do absolutely nothing to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

As it stands, it appears that only Russia and the Ukraine expect to be in a position to have any significant credits to sell. Therefore these countries, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would have a competitive edge over Canada which will find itself in an extremely difficult position as Canada has a growing population, a resource based economy, and a cold climate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is also no mechanism in place for auditing the validity of these credits and, since the breakdown of the Soviet Union, there are no legal institutions to provide reimbursement if the credits turn out to be fictitious. Would it not make more sense, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to spend this \$6 billion within Canada on the research and development of looking at areas around alternative methods to reducing greenhouse gases.

The costs of Kyoto implementation depends greatly on whether the emission credit program comes into being. And since the government is still very unclear on how to address the risk involved with this, this issue makes it only one of the serious potential consequences not addressed by the federal government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Australia and the United States have refused to ratify the Protocol. None of the OPEC (Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries) countries are considering reductions under the agreement. Russia has said it will, but even though it has the most to gain it has not been quick to act. Europe has agreed, but their target is only about one-third the size of Canada's.

Developing countries such as China, India, and Indonesia, who are viewed as emerging industrial leaders, produce 7 to 10 times as much greenhouse gas per dollar of GDP as developed nations, who originally signed the accord but were not restricted by the constraints Canada would realize under Kyoto. In New Delhi recently, China and India said they will not be ratifying Kyoto as they fear it will shut down their economies.

Of the more than 160 parties to the Protocol, only 38 agreed to emission limits. Countries representing 5 billion of the world's 6 billion people, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are exempt from the accord.

Japan, who have the same reduction targets as Canada, have signalled their acceptance of Kyoto reductions. However they have stopped short of full ratification, meaning these targets will not be legally binding. Japan's government will not impose emission limitations on companies or consumers. It will instead be promoting household conservation.

Countries such as Russia, Bulgaria, Poland, and Romania, and most of the other original signatories to Kyoto have been termed by the United Nations as economies in transition, which permits them extraordinary flexibility in meeting their targets, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Germany and the United Kingdom have indeed reduced their greenhouse gas emissions over the last decade. However in both these countries their economic survival depended upon moving more towards more modern technology. It at the time had very little to do with environmental concern, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Germany's closure of many of their financially draining, coal-intensive firms and the conversion from coal to natural gas in the UK (United Kingdom) has caused the drop in that country's emissions. As the European target is continent wide, the emission reductions recognized in the UK and Germany will assist other EU (European Union) countries.

(15:45)

So Canada negotiates a higher reduction, therefore has to pay an enormous amount in credits to countries who have made no real effort to reduce emissions. In fact, they are saving themselves economically through the closure of inefficient and financially unviable operations. And with so few countries participating, the environmental benefits of the implementation are virtually nonexistent.

If Canada proceeds with the ratification of Kyoto, it would be the only country in the western hemisphere to do so and at a great cost to Canadians. And as we heard earlier, Mr. Speaker, I think we were all very unhappy to hear that the federal government in fact pushed the vote through in favour of the accord this afternoon in the House of Commons without the country being able to be heard, without them being able to get the benefit of the debate from this legislature.

Mr. Speaker, Canada will have to make significant changes in order to reduce its carbon dioxide emissions. Today, we are 30 per cent over 1990 levels. In order to reduce emissions to the targeted amounts, it's going to require major changes in Canadian households and in Canadian industries. The government is telling us that each Canadian emits 5.4 tonnes of carbon per year and that we will be required to lower this emission by 1 tonne, about 20 per cent, through energy conservation and other approaches.

As Canadians we can expect the implementation of Kyoto to be very costly. The government says they will initiate advertising to focus on household energy efficiency measures and estimate that these efforts would result in approximately a 0.4 megatonne reduction. This carries very little weight, as our target for reductions, Mr. Speaker, is 240 megatonnes.

In order to reach these targets, there will be substantial changes

in consumption resulting from large energy increases through taxes, tradable permits, or cost pass-throughs from new regulations on industry and households. Canadians will see a higher cost of living and at the same time have lower real income. For Canadians to reduce fuel consumption by a substantial amount, fuel prices will need to increase permanently and significantly.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how about the \$1.7 billion the federal government has already spent on Kyoto? What do we have to show for this? They have been advertising and they have been doing polling. And, Mr. Speaker, last month alone the federal government spent approximately \$10 million on attempting to promote the accord.

Mr. Speaker, there was a recent Industry Canada report saying that the federal government is underestimating the cost of the implementation of the Kyoto accord by as much as 30 per cent. Taking into account that there are still so many questions to be answered, Mr. Speaker, how at this point can we understand how much Canadians are really going to spend on the Kyoto accord.

The study that I refer to, Mr. Deputy Speaker, predicts that Canada's energy industry will see grave losses in investment, employment, and output by 2010. At the same time the federal government is maintaining that the average household will not be affected. However a study by the Canadian Taxpayers Federation says that natural gas prices may see up to a 90 per cent increase, and the price of gasoline could rise by about 50 per cent.

Price increases in combination with necessary wage reductions that will occur are expected to reduce the annual after-tax income by approximately \$2,700 by 2010, or more if you are a resident of this province, Mr. Deputy Speaker. There will likely be tax increases in order to expand public transit systems. Money will be required to fund incentive and recycling programs. Government programs and services like health and education will no doubt be affected by the drop in government revenue.

And it's difficult to understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how these kinds of effects were not taken into account when the federal government determined that they were going to proceed blindly with the ratification of this accord. We've even had the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Manley, admit that uncertainty about Canada's Kyoto plans are already discouraging investment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, over 50 per cent of the energy produced in Canada comes from coal. However, coal is one of the largest producers of carbon dioxide. We will suggest . . . Will we suggest that all the coal plants be shut down? Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think there are some realistic things that we need to address and there are some things that, with respect to this accord, are just completely unrealistic.

Kyoto is not the answer for Canada. It's not the answer for Saskatchewan. It is not going to be what is best for our children and grandchildren. We do need to address the environmental issues and the associated costs. We need a time for this, Mr. Speaker, time that unfortunately Mr. Chrétien was not willing to give us and to give Canadians. That is why I am pleased to

second the amendment as proposed by the member from Thunder Creek.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm extremely pleased this afternoon to enter into this debate on the issue of Kyoto.

Mr. Speaker, I want to examine for a few minutes what the actual motion made by the government was.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the members opposite have made an amendment, but I think it's time to examine the content of the original motion, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the original motion said very clearly that this Assembly recognize that climate change is a critical issue facing Saskatchewan, Canada, and the world. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think to deny that is sticking your head in the sand, to not looking at what's happening in the world around us, to not critically examine the scientific evidence being brought forward that in fact the climate is changing in the world.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we need to recognize in fact the climate is changing. And Mr. Deputy Speaker, the start of this motion simply says that we recognize in fact the climate in Canada, Saskatchewan, in fact the world, is changing. We're seeing it with increased drought. We're seeing it with greater fluctuations of climate in various parts of the world, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And we need to deal with that.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, all it says is that we recognize that it is a critical issue facing both our province, our country, and in fact the world. Can anyone disagree with that, Mr. Deputy Speaker? I think to disagree with that is in fact ignoring what is going on around you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the second part of this motion simply says that this Assembly supports the 12 principles adopted by all of the provinces and territories as a basis for negotiating a national climate change plan with the Government of Canada. Mr. Deputy Speaker, who can have difficulty with that?

We've heard the members opposite, in their own motion, recite the exact same 12 points that the government brought forward. The same 12 points were brought forward by the opposition, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that the members opposite have difficulty in facing an issue head-on. They're having difficulty realizing that in fact, that there are issues facing Canadians that we must deal with.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's really, really difficult to understand that the members opposite would stand today, they would stand here today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, after the federal government has already ratified Kyoto and say, let's oppose something that's already happened. They want to change what's already occurred, Mr. Deputy Speaker, rather than focus on the path this government is focusing on — the future.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it's very, very important that we examine, that we examine the 12 principles that the motion

speaks to, the government motion speaks to and look at what they mean.

Let's talk about point no. 1, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It says:

All Canadians must have an opportunity for full and informed input into the development of the plan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's simply democracy.

We're asking that all Canadians have input into the development of a plan that's going to affect all Canadians. That Canadians in British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Nova Scotia, all have input into a plan that's going to affect them. A very elementary concept, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Why would they want to be opposed to it?

But of course they weren't. They enjoy supporting that principle but they don't want to recognize that what they're supporting is actually occurring because they don't want to recognize that climate change is occurring. But they will support that principle in discussing that issue, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's hard to follow the opposition, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Now of course, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I disagree with the federal plan as well that the federal government's put forward to implement the Kyoto plan because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they didn't put forward a plan. They simply said they wanted to accomplish a goal in principle and we can agree with that principle, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but they didn't put forward a fundamental plan that I could agree with.

But does that mean that I disagree with the principle of reducing greenhouse gas emissions? No. It means that I agree that we need to negotiate a fundamental plan that we, as Saskatchewan citizens, can agree with, that puts our province in the best possible position.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, point no. 2 says that:

The plan must ensure that no region or jurisdiction shall be asked to bear an unreasonable share of the burden and no industry, sector, or region shall be treated unfairly. The costs and impacts on individuals, businesses, and industries must be clear, reasonable, achievable, and economically sustainable. The plan must incorporate appropriate federally funded mitigation of the adverse impacts of climate change initiatives.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what we're saying is that nobody in this country, whether it be in British Columbia, Nova Scotia, or Saskatchewan, Mr. Deputy Speaker, should pay an unfair price. And we want to see that the industry . . . no particular industry pays an unfair price, no particular sector of the economy pays an unfair price. And we want to have those discussions in an open way so that all Canadians can participate, and it'll be fair.

And why, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would they oppose that? In fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it surprises me.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, point no. 3:

The plan must respect provincial and territorial jurisdiction.

Well what's surprising about that, Mr. Deputy Speaker? The Kyoto accord itself represents the . . . reflects the autonomy of each individual nation, and the fact that nations have the opportunity to either ratify or not ratify the accord. They had an opportunity to discuss how ratification would impact their individual countries, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

We're asking for the same principle that Kyoto put in place to deal with nations, be put in place for the provinces to deal with Canada. That's all we're asking, Mr. Deputy Speaker — an open and consultative process that respects the jurisdictions of each province, a very admirable quality.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, point no. 4:

The plan must include recognition of real emission reductions that have been achieved since 1990 or will be achieved thereafter (Mr. Deputy Speaker).

We want that plan to recognize initiatives we've already taken in Saskatchewan, and there's a number of initiatives we've already taken in Saskatchewan, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I just talked about a few of them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we in Saskatchewan have the . . . Saskatchewan farmers and the people of Saskatchewan have the highest adoption rates of conservation tillage systems in the world, transforming agricultural soils from an emission source for atmospheric carbon dioxide into carbon sinks, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

SaskPower is participating in two wind turbine projects. Together, these two Saskatchewan wind power projects represent the third largest wind power development in all of Canada, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We want recognition for what we're doing and what we're going to continue to do, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Saskatchewan has been working with EnCana Corporation and various other interested parties to initiate an IEA Weyburn carbon dioxide monitoring project. The project uses carbon dioxide enhanced oil recovery techniques to permanently store carbon dioxide underground and simultaneously increase oil production. Very good for the economy, but also very good for the environment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation is undertaking extensive energy conservation in more than 70 provincial government buildings. The work is being financed through energy savings which ultimately translate into savings to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, but also reducing our energy consumption.

Saskatchewan assisted in establishing of an international test centre for carbon dioxide capture at the University of Regina. This \$8.5 million facility will develop technologies to reduce carbon dioxide emissions, especially those produced by the energy sector, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

(16:00)

That's only a few of the initiatives we've undertaken to this point, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And we continue to undertake new initiatives to reduce our energy usage and to conserve energy and by doing so, Mr. Deputy Speaker, reducing our greenhouse gas emissions.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Yates: — We want to see recognition for that, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Point no. 5, Mr. Deputy Speaker, deals with . . .

The plan must provide for bilateral or multilateral agreements between provinces and territories, and with the federal government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker. So it allows us to work either bilaterally or multilaterally to solve some of the problems that the Kyoto accord or Kyoto agreement will . . . are . . . bring forward for Canadians, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

All it says that we're going to work together, that we form agreements that allow us to work together.

Point no. 6:

The plan must ensure that no province or territory bears the financial risk of federal climate change commitments.

So simply that the federal government, if it makes commitments, will bear the financial cost of those commitments, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That's a great bargaining position to put forward. Why would the opposition want to oppose that?

Point no. 7, Mr. Deputy Speaker:

The plan must recognize (the) . . . benefits from assets such as forests and agricultural sinks must accrue to the province or territory which owns those assets.

Right now the federal government wants to take those credits, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We're saying that those credits produced in this province are for the benefit of this province, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Of course the members opposite would have to agree with that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, point no. 8.

The plan must support innovation and new technology.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's through innovation and new technology that we will be able to continue to reduce the amount of greenhouse gas emissions that are produced by Canadians and in fact produced around the world, Mr. Deputy Speaker. So of course that plan must support that innovation and new technology.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker:

The plan must maintain the economic competitiveness of Canadian business and industry.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the government is as concerned about the economy of business as all Canadians are. It's atrocious to hear the opposition, Mr. Deputy Speaker, say that we're not concerned about the economy, about business in our province, because that's our number one priority.

Our province is our priority and we're as concerned about the economic well-being of our province as we are about the environmental well-being. But what we're saying is we can balance those two things, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, point no. 10 says that:

Canada must continue to demand recognition of clean energy exports.

That is a key issue for Saskatchewan. We are large producers of natural gas. We are going to be large producers of ethanol, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We can be huge producers of wind generated electrical power, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And we want credit for that energy production. We want credit for selling those resources and exporting those resources to other countries, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Point no. 11, Mr. Deputy Speaker, says:

The plan must include incentives for all citizens, communities, businesses, and jurisdictions to make the shift to an economy based on renewable and other clean energy, lower emissions, and sustainable practices across sectors.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are going to be one of the largest, if not the largest, producers of ethanol in the country and we need to have that recognized in this plan, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We need to see the Government of Canada recognize the initiatives that the Government of Saskatchewan is putting forward by being leaders in the ethanol industry, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We need it recognized.

And last but not least, Mr. Deputy Speaker:

The implementation of any climate change plan must include an incentive . . . (an) allocation system that supports lower carbon emission sources of energy such as hydroelectricity, wind power generation, ethanol, and renewable and other clean sources of energy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we want to see those clean energy sources recognized for the people of Saskatchewan and reducing our obligation in any plan that's put forward.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to talk for a few minutes about what the Kyoto accord and what some of the other countries are saying, and how they're going about dealing with the issue of greenhouse gas emissions. Australia and the United States have announced that they aren't going to ratify Kyoto. But both those nations are doing a significant number of things to help reduce their own greenhouse gas emissions.

The United States has large wind farms throughout the United States. They're introducing . . . they refine and produce ethanol like we do in Canada, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They are doing significant energy conservation issues in many states in the

United States. They're moving forward with their own plan.

All we're saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in our 12-point plan or 12-point principles, is that we want to negotiate a plan that's good for Saskatchewan within the Canadian framework. That's all we're talking about, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there's one other point about the Kyoto accord that creates a great deal of difficulty for me and I think for Canadians in general. That's the idea of buying credits from Third World countries where there's no guarantee that that money will actually be used to reduce greenhouse gas emissions at all. It simply may be used by those countries for other purposes. There are no guarantees. There's no accountability. There's no check mechanism to ensure that if you bought credits from Third World countries that in fact it would be used to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we note today that the Government of Canada has ratified the Kyoto accord, that they have ratified moving ahead with it. Now it is upon us as legislators in Saskatchewan to move forward and negotiate a plan that looks after the interests of Saskatchewan people, business, the environment, that leaves our province in its best possible position as this issue moves forward, because we as legislators are both the stewards of the economy and the stewards of the environment. So it's up to us to balance those interests, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

And we as a government have put forward a motion saying that we want to use the same 12 principles that all Canadian provinces and territories have adopted as a basis for which to negotiate that plan. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that all members of the Assembly should work together to move forward and negotiate the plan on behalf of the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in concluding I would like to say that I will be supporting the original motion and opposing the, opposing the amendment put forward by the members of the opposition, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Julé: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the Kyoto Protocol over the past few months and though it has been more than five years since Canada agreed with most countries, including the United States and Australia, to set targets to reduce greenhouse gases, very little has been discussed publicly, especially here in Saskatchewan and in particular within this Assembly.

And what has been finally said by the NDP government a week or so ago has been bewildering and confusing. The Premier of Saskatchewan had given up the fight. He was no longer interested in stopping the ratification of the Kyoto accord. But his own Minister of Industry and Resources, the Hon. — I can't say his name in here — disagreed with his leader and is staunchly opposed to Ottawa's bullheaded, misguided, and mishandled position.

Why everyone though, Mr. Speaker, why everyone in this government would not opposed a convoluted plan that could

devastate Saskatchewan's shaky economy is mystifying. And why it would wave a white flag as other provinces are stepping up their opposition was bewildering.

Each public opinion poll showed that a majority of Canadians supported the Kyoto accord initially — initially. Yet those same polls reveal that most people did not understand what the treaty attempted to address, much less understand its frightening ramifications. And just as shockingly, those that support Kyoto the most are the people who understand it the least.

But as of late, Mr. Speaker, a more recent poll on the subject indicated that 63 per cent of Saskatchewan's residents polled opposed Kyoto.

The past president of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, whose company EnCana operates one of the world's largest carbon dioxide oil recovery operations at Weyburn, warns that the border states of Montana, North Dakota, and others must be rubbing their hands with glee. They soon will be luring businesses to move down and set up shop in the United States, a country that soundly rejects the Kyoto accord.

The oil producing provinces, Saskatchewan, Alberta, BC, Newfoundland, and Nova Scotia are nervous that they will be hard hit while Manitoba and Quebec believe they are in an advantage with their hydroelectricity.

Mr. Speaker, here is what Gwyn Morgan, president and CEO (chief executive officer) of EnCana Corporation, said at the recent annual meeting of the Canadian Chamber Commerce:

If the federal government remains on course to sign this most damaging of international agreements, if we continue to adopt our good Boy Scout image, Canadians will face major problems, serious divisive problems. We will face Kyoto discord.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Party supports the goal of reducing man-made emissions of greenhouse gases but it has to be a made-in-Canada, made-in-Saskatchewan plan. Saskatchewan can ill afford to play this high-stakes game in the false and naive hope that we need to be the good Boy Scout to look good.

As the Minister of Finance so clearly pointed out recently, the province has lost a staggering \$521 million so far this fiscal year and this number will surely rise before the year ends. What definitely has risen, Mr. Speaker, is the overall debt which has increased over \$700 million in the past two years to 11.9 billion during the NDP's regime.

We do not have the money for health care, education, highways, social services, and all the other essential services. Now this government is thinking, under this Premier, to further erode our economic base by supporting this ill-thought-out Kyoto treaty.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Party is not opposed to reducing pollution and working towards a healthier environment. But in our little corner of the world with its big skies and wide open spaces, the least populated province, incidentally, west of the Maritimes, what we contribute to pollution on a global scale is negligible. What it will cost us will be huge.

And now that Kyoto has lost so many key players such as the United States and Australia and with India, China, and Russia refusing to sign on, over one-half of the top greenhouse gas emitters, the accord will not only be unsuccessful in reducing the earth's emissions but could serve to increase them.

And at the same time it would do grievous economic harm to all regions of Canada by slowing down our economy at a time when more money is needed to fund health care and the military, just to name but a few.

Saskatchewan's cost to join the federal Liberal government's ill-thought-out scheme — a federal government, incidentally, that has done little for our province — would be devastating. Saskatchewan's financial affairs have gotten worse; in fact they're disastrous.

In a province where we have more natural resources than our booming neighbour Alberta, we have fewer taxpayers than the city of Calgary. To help improve our faltering economy the Premier flies off to Calgary begging transplanted teachers, engineers, and yes, even lawyers to return home to prop up the NDP's socialist fortunes in what one columnist refers to as the cradle of saskatchewanistan. But I digress, Mr. Speaker.

As I said, Saskatchewan could be economically devastated if Kyoto is ratified by the federal government and now we recognize that that is so. There is considerable evidence that is not worth putting our citizens at risk. For example, the president of SaskPower estimates that Kyoto will cost SaskPower up to 250 million a year and will burden customers up to 25 per cent more than their already large bills.

In addition, our public utility may have to spend a staggering \$3 billion just to replace its coal-fired generators. IPSCO, one of Saskatchewan's most important industrial companies, says that the ratification of Kyoto Protocol could force the company to move out of the province.

The Minister of Industry and Resources' department estimates that Kyoto could cost as much as 2.6 billion in economic output over the next few years.

The Canadian Taxpayers Federation estimates that ratification of Kyoto will cost every family in Canada \$2,700 a year and more — much more if they live in Saskatchewan because of the loss of precious jobs and businesses.

Many farmers have second jobs in the oil patch, incomes which are vital to the survival of their farms. Many jobs are generated in the oil industry from Lloydminster to Kerrobert, Kindersley, Swift Current, Gull Lake, Weyburn, Milestone, Carlyle, Arcola, Estevan, and even here in Regina.

The Kyoto accord could have the same negative effect as did the ruinous national energy program that we all recall with nightmarish agony, shutting down half of the production and throwing thousands of people out of work.

With the loss of jobs, Mr. Speaker, there will be increases in taxes — taxes our dwindling number of overburdened taxpayers can ill afford.

(16:15)

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has seen for too long how misguided socialist doctrine benefits a few, plundering our province while the rest of Canada flourishes. Supporting a misguided treaty that will devastate Saskatchewan is sheer folly. It is not unlike the 1999-2000 Y2K computer scare that turned out to be the biggest fraud in the history of mankind. This misguided Kyoto accord could easily outdo that sham.

The Saskatchewan Party supports the goal of reducing man-made emissions. We should be reducing the energy required to heat a house, decrease emissions to produce a barrel of oil, and encourage ways to reduce automobile energy costs. But with only 30 per cent of worldwide emissions covered by Kyoto, and Canada's contribution less than 2 per cent and Saskatchewan's far less, we strongly oppose the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol. It will devastate Saskatchewan's economy, kill thousands of jobs, attack our most important industries, and achieve little in the goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that over 95 per cent of the carbon dioxide in the atmosphere — the target of the Kyoto accord — comes from nature, not from man. If the Kyoto Protocol were fully implemented, man-made carbon dioxide levels would increase by 25 per cent instead of 35 per cent if Kyoto were not implemented. In short, the effect of implementing Kyoto would be miniscule.

So what are the culprits, Mr. Speaker? It is not carbon dioxide as we earlier feared. The same NASA (National Aeronautics and Space Administration) scientist who identified carbon dioxide as the problem now says it is methane, nitrous oxide, and soot, which are not even covered by Kyoto.

So what then is the Kyoto Protocol? Well, Mr. Speaker, it's not about science. It is crass, old-fashioned politics — socialist politics — intent on redistributing income led by overzealous Environment department bureaucrats.

Mr. Speaker, this is the season to be jolly, but there can be no merriment in Saskatchewan. No responsible government in Saskatchewan, no political leader in this province interested in building Saskatchewan, could endorse the Kyoto accord.

I ask all members to support the Saskatchewan Party's amendment to oppose Ottawa's ill-advised ratification plan that will cripple our economy without achieving any significant environmental benefit. I ask all members of this Assembly to oppose ratification of the Kyoto Protocol. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Thomson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's my pleasure to enter into this debate this afternoon to talk about some of the objectives that we have had in this province as we've moved through the discussions with the feds and other provinces about implementation of Kyoto, to have an opportunity to speak on behalf of my constituents, and to correct some of the very glaring misconceptions that have been put out by the opposition.

When I was minister of Energy and Mines, I had the opportunity to be the lead on . . . for Saskatchewan on the

climate change file. And I want to say that it was an eye-opening experience for me to listen to what other provinces had to say and to listen to the different views coming out of the federal government, both from the Minister of Environment, Mr. Anderson, and the Minister of Natural Resources, who initially was Mr. Goodale, and of course now is Mr. Dhaliwal.

I want to say that the federal government's approach to this is wrong headed. It is not an approach based on co-operation. I had an opportunity to listen to Mr. Anderson talk on the radio on *As It Happens* the other night, suggesting to Canadians that we had need not worry about the impact of climate change if we change our ways. Fair enough. What was his suggestion in terms of dealing with it? His suggestion was we should turn down the thermostat, put on a sweater, and stop driving the SUVs (sport utility vehicle). He suggested that we should move out of the suburbs back into the inner cities.

This is a fine idea if we were building a Utopian society. But for those of us who are starting from a sense of reality, I think that we need to take into account a more realistic set of solutions.

And that's what the Minister of Industry in this province and the Minister of Environment have gone forward with other provinces to negotiate. That is what the 12-point plan that the provinces, all the provinces, agree on.

What I think is unfortunate is the approach that the opposition is taking to say under no circumstances should we pay any attention whatsoever to Kyoto; under no circumstances should we recognize that climate change is a problem in this province; under no circumstances should we work to correct that. And that is all they're interested in doing is contributing more hot air to a problem that's already caused by that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the approach the opposition's put forward in terms of their amendment to this resolution is wrong, it's inaccurate, it's inflammatory, and it must be defeated in the interest of a more rational approach which has been proposed by the Minister of Industry.

Let me take for a moment just a very quick look at what the member for Thunder Creek and the member for Carrot River Valley proposed. They say that what we need to do is that we need to reject Kyoto and that we need to get Saskatchewan's economy growing again. Well I've got news for the opposition. Saskatchewan's economy never stopped growing. Saskatchewan's economy has continued to grow in every single year that we've had an NDP government here. That's what's happened and it will continue to do so long after the next election, under this particular Premier.

Let's understand what this growth has been fuelled on. It has been fuelled on a sensible approach to making sure that we make good use of our resources. And you take a look at the approach that we've taken over the very last few months. I had the pleasure of working with my colleague from Regina Qu'Appelle Valley, with my colleague from Saskatoon Greystone, on an ethanol plan. We've brought in a proposal to make Saskatchewan a leader in terms of ethanol production, over the objections, over the objections of the Saskatchewan Party — and you can hear them today. Over the objections of

them we brought that in.

But we said that there was more than we could do. We moved forward to change the regulations around the mining industry in order to increase more exploration. We've changed the regulations to increase oil and gas production despite the fact that under this term, under this government, since the Romanow government came in, in 1991, that we have doubled the amount of oil and gas production in this province — doubled it. That's what we've done.

The economy has continued to grow, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The amendment to this resolution is wrong. And I think that their approach is wrong. When I listen to the member for Thunder Creek stand up in this Assembly and suggest that it's the lunatic left, he says — it's the lunatic left that says we need to deal with climate change.

Well let me tell you who's the lunatic left. The member for Thunder Creek puts into that group by saying the only ones concerned about climate change, the council of Catholic bishops. The Catholic bishops are who these people are attacking because they say we have to deal with climate change. They're attacking the working men and women through CEP (Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union of Canada) who support the need to move forward on climate change. They attack the steelworkers who support moving forward on climate change. That's who these people characterize as the lunatic left.

And I guess if you're that extreme right wing, if you're on that extreme, the right wing which that ideologically biased right wing ... (inaudible) ... party is, then there is clearly an understanding why the Catholic bishops, the unions, and the NDP would be considered the lunatic left. Well that's not a position, that is not a position supported by the mainstream of Saskatchewan people.

Saskatchewan people know that we need to move forward on climate change. They know that we need to do something on the Kyoto accord. The question here is not the ratification of Kyoto. The question here is how we deal with the implications within Canada. And this is the part that frustrates me about our federal government. Our federal government has set up a divide and conquer approach. They have divided off the provinces that are in a good position on climate change, namely Manitoba and Quebec, who have resources at their disposal to be able to move forward. And they have divided them off from those of us in the West.

This is a wrong-headed approach that the federal Liberals have taken. I can see why people in other provinces have suggested, in industry have suggested that this is akin to the old national energy program because it has ignored the approach that we have suggested here in Saskatchewan — that we have banded together with Alberta, with British Columbia, with Ontario, with the Maritimes in saying it's not the right approach to move forward with. That we want to see co-operation. That we want to see a plan.

That's what we have asked for. We have pushed for that for years. The federal government is now in a position that they are going to have to start to make some decisions.

I want to congratulate my colleague, the Minister of Industry and Resources, for accomplishing something that I wasn't able to do while I was the Minister of Energy. And that is to get a national consensus on the approach to move forward.

Manitoba has the potential to be a significant winner under the Kyoto proposal. Quebec has a significant opportunity because of their hydro resources. We're coal dependent. That makes it a lot tougher for us. But even Manitoba and Quebec understand that we need to have some kind of a sharing arrangement to make sure that no province is adversely affected and that no one's economy suffers, that we all share in the wealth as we do in Canada and we all share in the potential problems that result from these changes.

That's been Saskatchewan's position. That has been what we've advocated all along. And what I see now today is an opposition standing up, attempting to grandstand on this particular issue to try and drive a division which is not supported by very many people. I challenge them to say who in the oil industry today says not to proceed with a sensible plan in terms of reducing greenhouse gases.

We have partners in the oil and gas industry. The member for Weyburn-Big Muddy may want to go back home — not her home, but to her home constituency. That member may want to travel down the road. If she needs, I can get the Minister of Highways to draw her a map. And she may want to go and tour the carbon sequestration plant which is in her own constituency. That's where we've been co-operating with industry because industry, oil industry, understands that they need to be part of the solution.

If the member can't make it that far, she may just want to go down the street and take a look at what's happening at the University of Regina in terms of the International Test Centre for greenhouse gases. She may want to take a look at what we're doing with the PTRC (Petroleum Technology Research Centre). She may want to sit and talk to the scientists that are working at the Prairie Adaptive Research Collaborative. All of these things that we've funded jointly with industry, with academics, and with our partners in the federal government because we're interested in making real and substantive change and progress on this file.

It's got to be about more than rhetoric. It's got to be about more than trying to cozy up to the big companies that they want donations from. It's got to be about more than just more hot air.

These members have it wrong on that side. It's not about opposing Kyoto. It's not about taking an economic side versus an environmental side. This is about us moving forward in a way that we can find balance. And that's what we have advocated on this side, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

There are different views, there are different views on this side in terms of how we strike that balance. But let me say this, this party has always accepted a many, many different views and we have always found a balanced approach. We don't need to worry about just slavishly adhering to our right-wing ideology like the members over there do, who will characterize anybody in opposition to them as being part of a lunatic left including the Catholic bishops. That's what those members say — that's what

those members say.

And that is, I think, a shameful approach and part of the problem that we have as I've listened to the debate over the last several days in the House of Commons, as I've watched the approach being taken by other provinces, as we've gone through this debate, and it is part of the problem that we have today, and I suspect we'll hear into the night and tomorrow as the members of the opposition stand up.

I say what we need to do is go back to finding the middle ground, finding the common ground that allows us to deal with climate change. Let's identify those issues and how we move forward. Let's present a common front to the federal government. Let us present an approach which benefits all of Saskatchewan, that recognizes that not only are we potentially one of the most adversely affected in terms of the economic input . . . impact, but we are potentially one of the most affected in terms of the environmental impact.

We need to do something on climate change. This government has done a great deal to date: we've done ethanol; we've moved forward in terms of wind power generation; we've moved forward on the research; we've talked about carbon sequestering both in terms of the bio fields and in terms of the gas fields; we have moved forward in a number of different areas. But what we need is we need the federal government and, I dare say, we need the members of the opposition to come on side in terms of moving this forward.

If you take a look at the opportunities that we have, I will tell you I am no friend of the federal government on this file because I think they've handled it wrong. I for one find it to be a problem that they never recognized the potential benefit that our uranium mines have in terms of reducing global greenhouse gases in France. I think that's a shame that they don't recognize that. They should recognize those clean energy inputs. They should . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I hear a new voice, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I hear a new voice in this Assembly and I welcome it.

The member from Kindersley pipes up and talks about how we need to move forward with nuclear reactors. Well he's definitely cut from the same cloth as the former premier, Grant Devine, isn't he?

(16:30)

This is not about nuclear reactors. This is about recognizing the benefit and the strength of the industry here, a mining industry here in Saskatchewan, which is helping keep clean air throughout the world. That's what this is about, sir. That's what this is about. And it's time that this member sit back and take a few notes, and we'll have a chance to debate this soon enough.

But this government has moved forward in terms of a very balanced approach. We have moved forward in terms of our approach in terms of asking for clean energy credit recognition. We've moved forward in terms of the stuff we've done on ethanol, which his party opposed. We've moved forward in terms of the approach on oil and gas production, which the members opposite never recognized. By the way, oil and gas production which benefits the Kindersley constituency, but we

never hear anything out of the members to ever recognize that. That's what this government's been about.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I won't spend a great deal of time because of course by the rules, we've agreed to, to limit our comments. But let me say there are a lot of areas that we can work together on and that we are working with industry, oil and gas industry.

I had the pleasure as minister of Energy and Mines of announcing that we were looking at partnering with them to use flare gas off the wells to generate electricity — a very positive step forward. But we had a number of different initiatives we worked with them on. I talked to you about the International Test Centre for Carbon Dioxide Capture. I talked to you about the benefits that we have with Prairie Adaptive Research. We've joined together with other partners across the country to work on clean coal. This is another area that we've been able to move forward on.

But what we need to do today is come together as a legislature to find common ground around the 12 principles that all of the provinces have agreed to — all of them, including hydro-rich Quebec, including hydro-rich Manitoba, including oil-rich Alberta, and ourselves. All the provinces agree on this.

Now I say it's time that this opposition set aside its right wing rhetoric and join with us to talk about what the next steps are, recognizing that the federal government has the unilateral right, if it so chooses, to ratify the Kyoto Protocol. What we need to do is we need to work out within the national context, within the sense of co-operation, how those targets will be set — across industry, across the provinces — and who will share in terms of making sure the impact is mitigated. That's what we need to now do.

It is wrong to say that Saskatchewan's target will be 1990, less 6 per cent. We have no indication from Ottawa that that's what the case will be. We have no understanding at this point from Ottawa how they're going to set this, whether it's going to be regionally. Is the West going to be counted as a region? Is the province? How are they going to work it out between the industries? How are they going to deal with the domestic emissions trading?

These are issues that are yet to be resolved, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That's why the approach put forward by our ministers of Industry and Resources, and Environment is a sensible one. It's a moderate one. It's a pragmatic one. And it's one that I think all members should be able to support.

I'm disappointed to read the amendment put forward by the member for Thunder Creek that talks about the . . . that drives a wedge into Saskatchewan's position and is full of right wing rhetoric and Sask Party politics.

The fact is, is that this amendment is not about talking to what's in the best interests of Saskatchewan people. All this amendment speaks to is what is in the best interests of the Saskatchewan Party. And I think that it is time that these people on that side be exposed for this sham of an amendment. It's very unfortunate. But there's an opportunity for these members to rise above this.

I suspect that we will defeat this amendment. And I would encourage us to defeat this amendment and return to the 12 principles — the principles that will help the oil industry move forward, the principles that will help us in terms of dividing the targets among provinces to protect our industry, protect our jobs, and to protect our environment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will not go on too much longer. I will simply conclude by saying that our initiatives over the last several years have moved us forward to a much better position in dealing with climate change. We operate from a position of intellectual honesty and integrity on this side, which I think gives us credit across this country. And I ask the members, in fact I would offer to the members opposite that they can share in that credibility by joining with us in terms of supporting the original amendment and defeating this partisan, right wing, extreme position that they have suggested in the amendment.

Let's defeat that amendment. Let's take a pragmatic, rational position, and let's support the 12 principles that have been negotiated and agreed to by all of the provinces across this country. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brkich: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a privilege to enter into the debate. It's kind of curious to note that the member from Regina South when he talks about the few people that support this motion . . . I think the poll was getting close to 70 per cent of people that do not support Kyoto, and it's growing all the time as people find out the possible implications of Kyoto.

As I travel around my constituency it's almost 100 per cent of the people that are against Kyoto, basically because they don't know what's going on. They don't know how it's going to affect them. And the federal government and the European countries aren't telling them that it's going to be there.

There's no overwhelming consensus about this international agreement on climate change. It would cost Saskatchewan far more than it would gain. And the people I talk to basically are in no mood to sign on to an agreement that has the potential to cost our province billions of dollars in an economy that was already battered and in trouble.

The people I talk to are already saying the NDP are doing a very good job of losing money and jobs without taking on the impact of Kyoto. It'd be fairly safe to say the large majority of Saskatchewan residents believe that it would be better to commit to made-in-Saskatchewan, made-in-Canada approach to protect the environment. That makes the most common sense.

The big problem about this document that Ottawa would like to sign is that the Canadian taxpayer simply does not have enough information to make an informed decision. Certainly both sides of the argument can quote endless statistics on why it should be signed, why it shouldn't be signed. But I would like to take a moment though to talk about a few of the major arguments against Kyoto, which is so convincing they need little explanation.

This document has been called an international agreement and I

suppose it possibly could be called international because all the countries have looked at it. But many, many countries aren't going to sign it and many, many countries will never sign it. Considering that the biggest traders are part of . . . The United States isn't signing it and huge countries like China, India, Mexico aren't signing it. I believe right now that we trade . . . about 80 per cent of our export trade is south of the border.

Simply put, if Kyoto was such a good deal for all the world's countries, why doesn't the United States government sign it? Because they realize the disadvantage that it will put North America on the trading block, and that's why they don't sign it.

Then there's the question of whether or not all countries are treated equally in this document. The question is a very clear, no. Countries are basically divided into two categories, developed countries and developing countries. The remarkable thing here is that only developed countries are required to reduce emissions by 2002.

This agreement kind of reminds me of the agreement that was supposed to end grain subsidies. Canada applied to the rules, did what they were supposed to do. Did the other countries do? No. So right now we're at a big disadvantage. That's another reason that this agreement shouldn't be signed till all the rules are placed on the table or that you know that the other countries are going to follow the rules — where everybody is set on the same level playing field, which we're not right now.

Some of the main reasons that developed countries will not sign — basically it is not a fair document at all. And then I would ask the members opposite: who may support Kyoto; why would anyone sign an agreement so imbalanced as this one? It certainly can't be seen in any light as a good business deal. Any Canadian businessman would not last very long by signing a document that would give clear favouritist competition.

We already know that the province and the British provinces . . . and British Columbia, Alberta, and Ontario have stated clearly that they're opposed to this accord. It is very important to note that Canadians as a whole are not opposed to having a solution put forth to do our part towards controlling greenhouse gases. I believe that Canadians more than any other people in the world are very concerned about the effects of global warming and the long-term impact.

Our cropland, our forests, and our lakes, and our oceans are what make Canada such a great and beautiful country. Certainly here in Saskatchewan where agriculture base and forest management are most important, people will readily agree to the challenges ahead of us. But they are insisting that any agreement be viable and effective and fair to all involved. Anything else will endanger our economy and the security of our future.

This agreement does not allow us to use our vast amount of cropland or forest as credits towards carbon sinks or absorbing any of the emissions that are out there. The fact is that our soil and our forests absorb a large amount of CO₂ emissions. I believe that's a proven fact. And yet Saskatchewan ironically will be forced to buy credits from a developing country in order to continue to operate our most important industries. I find it ironic that the year 1990 is the year that we set the benchmark

for reducing greenhouse gases 94 per cent — to that level 2002. Who decided this and why?

Would it be that that was when the Cold War was ending and European countries — their factories were being shut down so that they were at the very possible lowest emissions? Was that the reason that 1990 was picked? I don't know.

I believe that it was addressed and I'm afraid that this is just a plan to move some wealth from developing countries, developed countries to developing countries. And I don't think this was the right way of doing that.

But with Kyoto anything before 1990 is not considered at all. Only that Russia and other countries have ignored and even destroyed some of their environmental, environment are deemed to be positioned to sell credits to wealthier countries for cash on the barrel.

Do any of us have any illusions that this money will actually go towards cleaning up their environmental or their environment? I doubt it.

I think our money can be better spent on our own solutions here — in Saskatchewan, in Canada. With Canada only contributing 2 per cent of the total fossil fuel based emissions into the atmosphere, it would be a clearly, to be more cost efficient for a made-in-Canada solution. It would be better for our companies, our corporations to use that money here in Saskatchewan rather than to be buying credits in other countries where that money . . . who knows what it will be used for in them countries.

Respected institutions such as the Canadian exporters and manufacturers association estimate that Kyoto could kill up to 450,000 jobs in Canada. The Canadian Chamber of Commerce estimates that this accord could cost 30 billion in economic output annually. Alberta estimates that the costs could be more than 10 billion, could be more than 10 billion above that estimate. Indeed Canada is the only G-8 country that must meet the emission reduction targets under Kyoto.

In Saskatchewan the president of SaskPower himself has estimated Kyoto could cost the utility as much as \$250 million on an annual basis. This government's own Department of Industry and Resources have estimated that Kyoto has the potential to reduce our province economic output by as high as 4 per cent per year.

The question remains then, why does this government continue to lean towards supporting .ratification of Kyoto? It's such an obvious bad deal for Saskatchewan and a bad deal for Canada. But why does this government and Ottawa refuse to give people more detailed information on what the potential costs be and the potential impact?

In fact in a recent message from the Government of Alberta, Premier Klein clearly outlined his position on the Kyoto accord, and even went on record as saying, and I quote, and it's a good quote:

It's like signing a mortgage for a property you've never seen and for a price you've never discussed. At the very least the federal government must first evaluate cost, create

a realistic implementation plan, and then consult with the provinces, including a meeting of the ministers . . . of first ministers.

Certainly our Premier should be at least asking the Prime Minister exactly what he has in mind by signing the accord later this month and exactly what the cost will be in the future for this province and for the people here working.

There's also the question of nuclear energy, how it could be factored into climate control. I don't think the Kyoto accord really addresses that. And I think the member from Regina South had made some points on that, that it is a clean burning fuel but yet there will be no credits, I believe, given for that at all. And that will hurt our province again. Everything seems to be stacked against the North American side, especially with only one signing.

And our uranium industry is a very important part of our . . . of this province and it has a great future. The president of Cameco Corporation indicated that since 1990 the uranium industry has invested more than \$3 billion in Saskatchewan to build and operate the most technology advanced mining and processing facilities in the world. In 2001 alone the economic impact to Saskatchewan resulted in over \$100 million in direct wages, \$168 million in purchases, and about \$44 million in provincial tax and royalties.

Mr. Grandey went on to say that in Saskatchewan 70 per cent of the public support . . . 70 per cent of the public support uranium mining industry today, which is approval rating about the same as the people that don't support signing the Kyoto accord. Even the United States with uranium is up to 65 per cent approval rating this year.

(16:45)

It is also sobering to consider that more than 2 billion people around the world, about 35 per cent of the world's population, have no access to electricity at all. Further development in these places would almost certainly have to be done in a more environmentally friendly way than burning fossil fuels, and one of them is looking at nuclear energy. Nuclear energy basically could be the key in that.

In Canada alone nuclear energy accounts for one-sixth of our total energy generation. It also provides 16 per cent of the world's electricity, and without it two and a half billion tonnes of greenhouse gas would be flushed into the atmosphere each year, if it wasn't for nuclear energy. So there is a strong case for the uranium industry to be recognized in the Kyoto accord.

I believe that as part of a made-in-Canada solution to climate control, Saskatchewan can be a leader in development of wood power generators and high powered . . . high tech solar power. We would all agree that here in Saskatchewan we get plenty of wind and plenty of sun — unfortunately maybe just a little bit too much out our way this year.

The other factor that Kyoto does not recognize here in Canada and Saskatchewan is that we have a large source of clean burning natural gas. In fact our usage and export is on the rise, and yet the Kyoto accord will not give Saskatchewan any

carbon credits for this obviously more environmentally friendly source of energy.

Another irony which affects this agreement is the fact that the accord strictly deals, strictly deals with global warming. We all have visions of big cities like Vancouver and Toronto, Los Angeles, New York, Mexico City — all cities which have a serious smog problem which is obvious to anyone who lives there. But Kyoto does not deal with this obvious chronic air pollution problem that affects the health of its residents.

And when it comes to the scientific community about it, the global warming itself, basically the scientific community is split 50-50 on whether there is . . . if this will even address the problem with that. They're split right down the centre on that. And you know that it won't affect smog into the cities, and that's about the only place . . . and maybe Montreal and Toronto is why there's a little bit of support in it, because they feel that it will affect their smog problem. But the Kyoto accord is not made to address that problem.

And as more information comes out about greenhouse effect, even more of the scientific community is learning that, that it isn't caused . . . it's caused by many other things. So this Kyoto accord isn't going to address it at all. What it's going to do is put our province and Canada at a major disadvantage as being a trading partner in the world.

Basically the bottom line is that we need more time and more commitment towards coming up with a solution that will appeal to all the world's countries. That puts everybody at a level playing field. For in the end, we cannot effect real climate change without the total help of all these countries. Piecemeal efforts like the Kyoto accord will do little to solve the greenhouse gas issue.

As far as the costs for Kyoto, the sky's the limit. With a track record on outrageous federal spending such as the gun registry, you can understand that . . . the concern that's out here especially in rural Saskatchewan of the costs, potential costs, that could come from here when the federal government says, basically, trust us. And you've looked at their past record on anything else they've ever said on cost estimates. So it can be very scary when . . . I get very nervous when the federal government says, trust me. I get very nervous when this provincial government says, trust me.

And like one of our members said, like most of the people in this province also get very nervous about this government.

What remains of this debate falls down to the question, remember. . . What remains of this debate falls down to the question whether the members opposite have the courage to stand up against Ottawa on the Kyoto issue and whether or not they really do have the faith in their citizens to see major bold incentives come to reality.

It's time for this government to stand up for its people and their future and not — and not — support Kyoto in any way. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Wartman: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker,

I'm very happy to enter into this debate to have an opportunity to talk about the plans that this government has been engaged in, and the kind of commitments that we have made.

This whole issue of climate change and global warming is not new to our understandings or our way of approaching the world around us. What is having an impact and what we've been working with is a federal government that has determined to pass the Kyoto accord without having negotiated very clearly what that will mean for the provinces. And we have lobbied and we have pushed hard to have an opportunity to say what that will mean.

But, Mr. Speaker, this government has been working for years with a vision for where we need to go in the future. And the reason why our economy has been growing so consistently over this past decade is because we do have a vision for the future. We're not just tied into today and we're certainly not locked into yesterday like some of the members opposite seem to be.

We've got a vision for how this province can develop and use the best of its resources in order to have a future where we are being responsible for the environment, Mr. Speaker.

I think of some of the work that we have done in these past few years. I think of the farmers that I know out around the Indian Head area who have worked very hard on soil conservation issues and they have been developing, working with others to develop both equipment and methods for zero till farming. Some of those developments have led to real gains in terms of the province's manufacturing and it's that kind of vision that is so far out in the future that has been enabling our economy to keep growing as it has.

So we've developed new technologies. Those technologies are in the forefront of agricultural developments in the world. Our industry has been growing and our exports have been growing as people throughout the world are realizing the value of some of these technologies which have been developed here.

It seems to me that it is forward thinking that we need. It is the kind of visioning of where this province and this nation can be down the future that is what we need. It's not being tied into the ways of the past.

Now we have been given this Kyoto decision by the federal government. That's a done deal. The next question is, what are we going to do with it? And the 12 principles that were agreed to by all the provincial ministers and the territorial ministers, Mr. Speaker, really help us get a sense of where we need to go in dealing with the federal government. We need to make sure that we get credit for the developments that we have in this province. There is no way that the federal government should be able to claim the kind of carbon sequestering technologies and developments that have been put together here for their own. These are a part of who Saskatchewan is and the developments that we have made.

I want to take a look as well at some of the other technologies not only that we have developed, but that we are developing, that are going to make a significant difference in terms of global warming. One of those which has been referred to several times is the whole development of renewable fuels. In this case we

have been working diligently for years now on the development of an ethanol industry. Using ethanol even at a 10 per cent blend with gasoline reduces greenhouse emissions by about 30 per cent.

And some of the work that's being done around the country also will help us to address, as some of the members opposite don't seem to understand, address the issues of smog and air pollution as well. The work that's being done in Manitoba and Winnipeg where Husky Oil is partnering with the city and the provincial government on ethanol experiments with bio-diesel, they're blending 7.5 per cent ethanol with the diesel and using it in the buses in the cities. It's not only reducing the greenhouse gases but it's reducing the particulates significantly. And we see the great potential for that in terms of not only reducing greenhouse emissions but pollution and smog in some of our larger cities.

Along with that, we have seen some good inroads in the whole area of bio-diesels. We have been major producers of oilseeds for years. We plan to continue in producing those and we will be able to use those oilseeds for bio-fuels. Those bio-fuels will also reduce greenhouse emissions and the particulate emissions and smog. So we're taking steps that need to be taken to address these issues. And we are accelerating the pace of these.

I think that there are also a number of things that we have done in this province that will really help us to be leaders in the development of technology. And I think of the work that we've done with SaskPower in terms of the wind turbines. It's been tremendous development. We already are third in the country in terms of energy by wind turbines and we will be leading in short order as far as I see our planning into the future.

I think that there are other elements that we have taken on that have been very, very progressive. We have got programs — loan programs, low-interest loan programs — so that homeowners can retrofit their homes. Very important in this whole process, because even in our individual homes we can help to clean up the greenhouse gas emissions and we can help reduce those and make for a much cleaner environment.

I think of the work that's been done on carbon sequestration — the carbon dioxide monitoring project that's been done with EnCana down in Weyburn, looking at ways to permanently store carbon dioxide underground and to simultaneously increase oil production.

I think of SaskPower and its project to plant trees because trees help take the carbon out of the air — \$6 million to plant approximately 5 million trees and to establish a forest carbon reserve.

Mr. Speaker, these are steps that we need to take as a province, and we are taking those steps. And it's these steps that have made our economy grow so rapidly over the years in this last decade, even leading the nation at times.

We look at the work that's been done by our Property Management Corporation, retrofitting 70 of our provincial buildings so that they will be more energy efficient. And when we do this, we produce jobs, Mr. Speaker. And when we produce jobs, we need people to fill those jobs. And that's why our unemployment rate is low, because we have people working

in this province.

We have had successful programs that really provide a model for the rest of the world that enable people to move off welfare without penalizing them to take these jobs. And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, it's this kind of progressive future thinking that is making a difference for this province, that is enabling our economy to grow and that is enabling us to deal with these issues of greenhouse gases and emissions.

I think of the work that's being done with SaskEnergy and some of the oil companies to look at ways of using flare gas for energy, capturing those.

And I think at this point, Mr. Speaker, we're ready to ask for a recess. It's just about 5 o'clock and so we'll ask to recess until 7 o'clock where I will continue debate.

The Speaker: — It now being very near the hour of 5 o'clock, this House stands recessed until 7 p.m.

The Assembly recessed until 19:00.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Kwiatkowski	2853
Julé	2853
Draude	2853
Bjornerud	2853
Toth	2853
Stewart	2853
Elhard	2853
Eagles	2854
Bakken	2854
Wall	2854
Huyghebaert	2854
Brkich	2854
Weekes	2854
Harpauer	2854
Allchurch	2855

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Clerk	2855
Deputy Clerk	2855

NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

Brkich	2855
Kwiatkowski	2855
Elhard	2855
Draude	2855
Bakken	2855
Allchurch	2856
Wall	2856

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Axworthy	2856
Heppner	2856
Ms. Julé	2856
Serby	2856
Krawetz	2856

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Melfort's Coming Home Campaign	
Gantfoer	2856
Record Set For Natural Gas Wells Drilled	
Addley	2857
Developments in Gaming Industry	
Hillson	2857
Tourism in Cumberland Constituency	
Goulet	2857
Gordon McRae Awarded Air Cadet League Certificate of Honour	
Brkich	2857
Cornwall Alternative School Wins Donner Foundation Award	
Van Mulligen	2858
St. Louis Rebels Hockey Marathon	
Julé	2858

ORAL QUESTIONS

Plans for Population Growth	
Hermanson	2858
Calvert	2859
Proclamation of Farm Security Legislation	
Harpauer	2860
Axworthy	2860
Kyoto Protocol	
Stewart	2860
Calvert	2860
Government Participation in Potato Industry	
Wall	2861
Sonntag	2861

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Human Rights Day

Axworthy2863
Heppner2864

MOTIONS

Substitution of Members on Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills

D'Autremont2864

Substitution of Member on Standing Committee on Non-controversial Bills

D'Autremont2864

Substitution of Member on Standing Committee on the Environment

D'Autremont2864

Substitution of Member on Standing Committee on Education

D'Autremont2864

Substitution of Member on Standing Committee on Constitutional Affairs

D'Autremont2864

Substitution of Member on Continuing Select Committee

D'Autremont2864

Substitution of Member on Special Committee on Regulations

D'Autremont2865

Substitution of Member on Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections

D'Autremont2865

MOTION UNDER RULE 46

Kyoto Protocol

Lautermilch2865

Belanger2868

Stewart2870

Kwiatkowski2873

Yates2875

Julé2878

Thomson2879

Brkich2882

Wartman2884