



SECOND SESSION - TWENTY-SIXTH LEGISLATURE

of the

Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

(HANSARD)

Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Don Toth
Speaker



MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

Speaker — Hon. Don Toth
 Premier — Hon. Brad Wall
 Leader of the Opposition — Lorne Calvert

Name of Member	Political Affiliation	Constituency
Allchurch, Denis	SP	Rosthern-Shellbrook
Atkinson, Pat	NDP	Saskatoon Nutana
Belanger, Buckley	NDP	Athabasca
Bjornerud, Hon. Bob	SP	Melville-Saltcoats
Boyd, Hon. Bill	SP	Kindersley
Bradshaw, Fred	SP	Carrot River Valley
Brkich, Greg	SP	Arm River-Watrous
Brotten, Cam	NDP	Saskatoon Massey Place
Calvert, Lorne	NDP	Saskatoon Riversdale
Cheveldayoff, Hon. Ken	SP	Saskatoon Silver Springs
Chisholm, Michael	SP	Cut Knife-Turtleford
D'Autremont, Hon. Dan	SP	Cannington
Draude, Hon. June	SP	Kelvington-Wadena
Duncan, Dustin	SP	Weyburn-Big Muddy
Eagles, Doreen	SP	Estevan
Elhard, Hon. Wayne	SP	Cypress Hills
Forbes, David	NDP	Saskatoon Centre
Furber, Darcy	NDP	Prince Albert Northcote
Gantfoer, Hon. Rod	SP	Melfort
Harpauer, Hon. Donna	SP	Humboldt
Harper, Ron	NDP	Regina Northeast
Harrison, Jeremy	SP	Meadow Lake
Hart, Glen	SP	Last Mountain-Touchwood
Heppner, Hon. Nancy	SP	Martensville
Hickie, Hon. Darryl	SP	Prince Albert Carlton
Higgins, Deb	NDP	Moose Jaw Wakamow
Hutchinson, Hon. Bill	SP	Regina South
Huyghebaert, Yogi	SP	Wood River
Iwanchuk, Andy	NDP	Saskatoon Fairview
Junor, Judy	NDP	Saskatoon Eastview
Kirsch, Delbert	SP	Batoche
Krawetz, Hon. Ken	SP	Canora-Pelly
LeClerc, Serge	SP	Saskatoon Northwest
McCall, Warren	NDP	Regina Elphinstone-Centre
McMillan, Tim	SP	Lloydminster
McMorris, Hon. Don	SP	Indian Head-Milestone
Michelson, Warren	SP	Moose Jaw North
Morgan, Hon. Don	SP	Saskatoon Southeast
Morin, Sandra	NDP	Regina Walsh Acres
Nilson, John	NDP	Regina Lakeview
Norris, Hon. Rob	SP	Saskatoon Greystone
Ottenbreit, Greg	SP	Yorkton
Quennell, Frank	NDP	Saskatoon Meewasin
Reiter, Jim	SP	Rosetown-Elrose
Ross, Laura	SP	Regina Qu'Appelle Valley
Schriemer, Joceline	SP	Saskatoon Sutherland
Stewart, Hon. Lyle	SP	Thunder Creek
Taylor, Len	NDP	The Battlefords
Tell, Hon. Christine	SP	Regina Wascana Plains
Toth, Hon. Don	SP	Moosomin
Trew, Kim	NDP	Regina Coronation Park
Van Mulligen, Harry	NDP	Regina Douglas Park
Vermette, Doyle	NDP	Cumberland
Wall, Hon. Brad	SP	Swift Current
Weekes, Randy	SP	Biggar
Wilson, Nadine	SP	Saskatchewan Rivers
Wotherspoon, Trent	NDP	Regina Rosemont
Yates, Kevin	NDP	Regina Dewdney

[The Assembly met at 10:00.]

[Prayers]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Highways.

Hon. Mr. Elhard: — Mr. Speaker, with leave of the Assembly for an extended introduction.

The Speaker: — The Minister of Highways has asked for leave for an extended introduction. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Agreed. I recognize the Minister of Highways.

Hon. Mr. Elhard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, to you and through you, I'd like to introduce a large group of guests in our galleries today.

But first, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to preface this introduction by officially proclaiming the weeks of March 6 to 22 as Les Rendez-vous de la Francophonie 2009 in Saskatchewan. For these two weeks, Saskatchewan's francophones and French speakers will join those from across the country to celebrate francophone culture and heritage. This year's national theme is Celebrate Canada's Francophonie Today — Rich in its Diversity! Mr. Speaker, this theme speaks to Saskatchewan's own tradition of embracing the diversity of our multicultural heritage as illustrated by our provincial motto, "from many peoples, strength."

So, Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to all members of the legislature a group of young French-speaking students from École Monseigneur de Laval and from Campbell Collegiate and also representatives from the francophone community that are here today as part of the celebrations. Would our honoured guests please stand to be acknowledged today?

We welcome each one of you to your Legislative Assembly. Thank you for coming.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Elphinstone-Centre.

Mr. McCall: — Merci, Monsieur le président. Pour l'opposition officielle, je veux dire félicitations pour la proclamation des Rendez-vous de la Francophonie en Saskatchewan.

Aussi je veux dire une grande bienvenue et bonjour à tous les francsaskois qui sont ici aujourd'hui, spécialement les étudiants de l'École Monseigneur de Laval et Campbell. Merci pour toutes les choses que vous faites pour la province de la

Saskatchewan.

À tous les citoyens de la Saskatchewan et particulièrement les francsaskois, bon Rendez-vous en Saskatchewan. Merci.

[Translation: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of the official opposition, I would like to say congratulations on the proclamation of Rendez-vous de la Francophonie in Saskatchewan.

Also I would like to say a big welcome and hello to all the Francsaskois who are here today, especially the students from l'École Monseigneur de Laval and Campbell. Thank you for all the things that you do for the province of Saskatchewan.

To all Saskatchewan citizens, and particularly the Francsaskois, good Rendez-vous in Saskatchewan. Thank you.]

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Yorkton.

Mr. Ottenbreit: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today it is indeed an honour for myself to introduce to the members of the Legislative Assembly some very distinguished people and very recognizable people from our province, some that go without needing an introduction, but I'll do it anyway.

With us today in your gallery, Mr. Speaker, are Telemiracle Teddy . . .

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Ottenbreit: — And someone is here but not really seen, Mr. Speaker — Curtis Kimpton. He's the PR [public relations] chairman for Telemiracle, past president of the national Kinsmen Club, and Kinettes, and understand a dear friend of the member from Saskatoon Greystone. And as well I've been told he's also a new father. So congratulations to him.

As well today, we have Sheldon Bergstrom and Brad Johner, two of the national cast for Telemiracle, who again go without needing introduction — very recognizable figures; Lorne Steinke, Telemiracle 33 chairman; Mark Blatz, the Kinsmen governor of Saskatchewan; and members of the Kinsmen and Kinettes from Regina.

So I ask all members to welcome them to their Legislative Assembly, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Qu'Appelle Valley.

Ms. Ross: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As we recognize the outstanding work done by Telemiracle and the Kinsmen Foundation today, I would like to welcome a very special guest seated in your gallery. Ms. Candace Weimer of Regina joins us here today.

Candace's story is itself a miracle. Diagnosed with a form of

leukemia in 2005, Candace needed emergency bone marrow transplant in order to have a chance to survive. The procedure was done in Seattle, and it was the Kinsmen Foundation which helped with the travel and accommodations and the costs for Candace.

Mr. Speaker, while medical technology surrounding a bone marrow transplant has been with us for some time, this procedure is in no way routine. It takes a strong will, along with prayers and support of the family and friends for bone marrow recipients to have another chance at life. In Saskatchewan that support often includes funds which come from Telemiracle. Today we should all welcome Candace.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Saskatoon Northwest.

Mr. LeClerc: — Mr. Speaker, through you and to you, in your east gallery is 27 of the finest grade 8 students in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. I had the privilege of speaking to them not too long ago on Say No to Drugs, and I thoroughly threatened them and scared them. And they're accompanied by their teacher, Christine Rayner, Kristen Wieman, and their educational assistant, Diane Theissen.

I'd like the Assembly to welcome these fine young people to our Assembly.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Estevan.

Ms. Eagles: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, to you and through you, I too would like to recognize that Brad Johner is in the gallery today. Brad lived in my constituency for a long time prior to his move to Saskatoon, and his family still lives in my constituency. And in fact last week they were recognized as the Farm Family of the Year. So I'd like all members to join me in welcoming Brad.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Before we move on, I just would like to extend a welcome to all the guests that have joined us this morning, but also ask that the guests not participate in the debate from here on in this morning — thank you so much — in any form.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Dewdney.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I stand to read a petition that's in support of the government's policy on green vehicles, and the prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government ministers named in this petition to follow their own platform and government policies, and trade in

their Jeep Libertys for vehicles that are on SGI's 2008 list of recommended fuel efficient vehicles.

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Saskatoon Centre.

Mr. Forbes: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to present a petition on wage equity for CBO [community-based organization] workers. We know that on average CBO workers make about \$8 — \$10 less an hour than those who do similar work in government departments. I'll read the prayer, Mr. Speaker:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the development and implementation of a multi-year funding plan to ensure that CBO workers achieve wage equity with employees who perform work of equal value in government departments.

Mr. Speaker, some of these people are living in the towns of Hubbard, Kelliher, and Ituna. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from The Battlefords.

Mr. Taylor: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to present a petition in support of a new Saskatchewan Hospital in North Battleford, Mr. Speaker. The petitioners acknowledge that the existing nearly 100-year-old structure is in much need of replacement. Mr. Speaker, the petitioners pray:

. . . that the Legislative Assembly may be pleased to call upon the Government of Saskatchewan to immediately recommit funds and resources for the continued development and construction of a new Saskatchewan Hospital at North Battleford and provide the Prairie North Regional Health Authority with the authority necessary to complete this essential and much-needed project.

Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by residents of The Battlefords and the surrounding area. Thank you very much.

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Saskatoon Massey Place.

Mr. Broten: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand today to present a petition in support of fairness for students through the expansion of the graduate retention program. The prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to immediately expand the graduate retention program to include masters and Ph.D. graduates.

Mr. Speaker, the individuals that signed this petition are students from the University of Saskatchewan, students from the University of Regina, as well as a number of health care professionals who hold graduate degrees and work in the province. I so present.

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Rosemont.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to present petitions in support of a reduction in the education portion of property tax. This is needed by Saskatchewan families and business, increasingly more with the implications of reassessment here in 2009. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to stop withholding and to provide sustainable, long-term property tax relief to owners by 2009 through significantly increasing the provincial portion of education funding.

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

These petitions are signed by good folks and concerned citizens here in Regina, Mr. Speaker. I so present.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Yorkton.

33rd Kinsmen Telemiracle

Mr. Ottenbreit: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 2009 marks the 33rd Kinsmen Telemiracle, a true Saskatchewan institution, to be held in Saskatoon this weekend on March 7 and 8.

This week is declared Telemiracle Week through a private member's Bill in 2006 by Elwin Hermanson, the former member from Rosetown-Elrose, and celebrates the years of success and over \$77 million raised to date through the selfless dedication of Kinsmen and Kinette members — not to mention the countless other volunteers associated with this event. It truly reflects the volunteerism and caring of Saskatchewan people, and our call to help those in need.

Thoughts of Telemiracle and the Kinsmen Foundation often come to my mind when I recall my own family's struggle with a terminally ill child, and those offers of help if needed, and the many examples of families and individuals helped by the Kinsmen Foundation throughout our great province.

Telemiracle also helps to showcase national and international talent, this year expected to include Beverly Mahood, Brad Johner, Sheldon Bergstrom, Jim Witter, Bob McGrath, Donny Parenteau, Doc Walker, Jimmy Rankin, Jaydee Bixby, The Higgins, Andrea Menard, and Sue Foley, and local talent such as Saskatchewan Express and the Ukrainian dance by the Fetsch family of Yorkton. Even my own daughter, Rayanne, had the honour of performing last year, Mr. Speaker.

Congratulations to all the volunteers and Saskatchewan people that make Telemiracle such a huge success. And I know that this year we will ring those phones and pass the \$80 million mark.

Mr. Speaker, it makes me proud to be a Kinsmen from Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Saskatoon Fairview.

Annual Award to Trade Unionists

Mr. Iwanchuk: — Mr. Speaker, the Saskatoon and District Labour Council and the United Way of Saskatoon and area hold an annual event to recognize the achievements of a dedicated trade unionist who's active in both the community and their union. This award has come about because the labour council and our community's United Way saw the importance of celebrating labour's contribution to the health and well-being of our community.

This year I was privileged to see Robin East, a member of the Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada, receive this prestigious award. The list of Robin's achievements is endless, but I'll attempt to list a few.

Currently Robin is on the board of directors with the Council of Canadians with Disabilities, is national president of the Alliance for Equality of Blind Canadians, member of the Canadian Transportation Agency advisory committee, member of the city of Saskatoon accessible playground committee, member of the North Saskatchewan Living Centre, member of the Saskatoon Blind Skiers, a roaming advocate for persons with disabilities, and a member of numerous union committees.

Robin has a bachelor's degree in Social Work, a certificate in rehabilitation work, and has completed the assistive technology application certificate program through the Center on Disabilities at the California State University. He has worked as a teacher associate, a behavioural therapist, and finally an officer with the federal public service.

An advocate is like a catalyst that mixes with an ally and inspires empowerment — this is a favourite phrase of Robin's. Robin believes in working with allies to overcome barriers and address common issues. Robin has been involved in advocacy since the early '80s and continues to be a strong leader in whatever role he takes.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask all members to join me in congratulating Robin East and to thank him for inspiring all of us to participate in building a better community for all. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Saskatoon Northwest.

[10:15]

International Adult Learning Week

Mr. LeClerc: — Mr. Speaker, our government is proud to mark March 2 to 9 as International Adult Learning Week. Mr. Speaker, myself personally, at 38 years of age only had a grade 5 education. Through opportunity, today I have a university honours degree which has obviously radically changed my life in so many ways, and in fact has allowed me to have a life.

Mr. Speaker, adult literacy and lifelong learning is an important part of building the skilled workforce we need to meet our province's ongoing talent challenge, as well as building strong and vibrant families and communities.

We have built upon this commitment, Mr. Speaker, through ongoing investments in our province's post-secondary education institutions. Through these institutions, we offer our province's adult learners opportunities to continue and upgrade and even to begin their post-secondary education studies and training. We have also built upon this commitment through key investments in adult basic education. In 2008 and '09, these investments are providing opportunities for well over 6,000 Saskatchewan residents who have not completed high school to upgrade their academic credentials and develop essential skills for employment and for life.

And recognizing that the future growth and prosperity of our province is linked to the success of First Nation and Métis learners, we continue to create an adult basic education opportunities for that community living on reserves. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Saskatoon Centre.

Juniper Manor Opening

Mr. Forbes: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On January 15, Juniper Manor on the corner of Avenue F and 19th in Riversdale was officially opened. I was delighted to be present along with my colleagues, the MLA [Member of the Legislative Assembly] for Saskatoon Riversdale and the Minister Responsible for Sask Housing.

Abraham Yuel, president of the board says, Juniper Manor represents a success story of government, industry, and community working together in meeting the affordable housing needs of our seniors and new immigrants.

While Juniper Manor was conceived in late 2004 at a kitchen table meeting, its history has been described as a long journey to a place called home — spanning some 45 years. In the early 1960s, a local Chinese community identified a need for a community centre in the Riversdale neighbourhood. Plots of land were purchased by the Saskatoon Chinese Benevolent Society. And in the 1980s, the need for a cultural centre was revisited as the demand for language training was increasing and interest in Chinese culture grew. In fact, drawings were made but the costs were just too high.

Mr. Mak reflects that:

The opening of Juniper housing is a remarkable achievement . . . Although early pioneers such as Charlie [Mack], Tom [Gee], Hong [Wong] and Guy [Mak] have all passed away, their efforts along with many other volunteers have not been wasted.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all members to join me in congratulating Juniper Manor, its residents, and all those who helped to make

this dream a reality for a safe home for newcomers and seniors alike. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Qu'Appelle Valley.

International Women's Day

Ms. Ross: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, each year on March 8, Saskatchewan joins with communities around the world to honour women as part of International Women's Day.

This is a day of celebration that recognizes women for significant achievements and contributions to the economic, social, and cultural fabric of our communities. In our province, Mr. Speaker, we take this time to reaffirm our commitment to achieving equality for women. The goal is to build a stronger Saskatchewan and a better life for the people of this province.

Over the next few days, many events will take place across Saskatchewan as communities and organizations honour women and work to improve the status of women everywhere. This year again I will be attending the Canadian Federation of University Women event held right here in Regina.

This year Canada's theme is strong leadership plus strong women plus strong world equal equality. It is a reminder of the importance of supporting both women and men in leadership roles, helping all members of society to thrive and reach their full potential.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage everyone to take time to honour women in their lives. I want all people to benefit from living in Saskatchewan and to have equal opportunity to find security and prosperity here in our province. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Rosemont.

Donations to Heart of the City Piano Program

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, so often business make meaningful contributions to our community beyond the important role of providing jobs, products, or service.

I would like to specifically thank Mr. Tom Magnuson, owner of Grand Staff Music, for his donation of four pianos to students of the Heart of the City Piano program. I would also like to thank Curtis Jerome of Cary's Moving and Storage for the goodwill to transport these pianos to their new homes. Mr. Magnuson has committed his life to music, as a former teacher with Regina Public Schools and as a business owner. He knows the importance of music and the positive impact it can have on youth.

One of the appreciative recipients is a constituent of mine, Brandon Daley. His mother, Elissa Daley, states that she was

trying to purchase one herself for her son for Christmas, but that as a student herself, this was cost prohibitive. Her son was thrilled with the piano received from Mr. Magnuson, and I understand he has put it to great use.

Many businesses make contributions such as this that benefit the quality of life and opportunities for our young people. We are thankful. Mr. Speaker, I ask all members of this Assembly to join with me in extending our gratitude. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Weyburn.

Saskatchewan Takes Centre Stage

Mr. Duncan: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan under this government has finally taken its place on the world stage. Over the past 24 hours, the Saskatchewan story has been the top story on CNN [Cable News Network].com. It was both the number one viewed story and the number one emailed story on the media giant's website, and as of last night had received a million hits.

Mr. Speaker, on the Saskjobs.ca website, the CNN story resulted in a thousand per cent increase in US traffic, Mr. Speaker — visitors from all 50 states and the District of Columbia. In fact, Mr. Speaker, there was an 87 per cent . . . or, 87 per cent of hits were from new visitors. Mr. Speaker, the quote from a *Leader-Post* interview with the CNN reporter, she said, quote:

A lot of people are looking for hope right now, they're looking for places that have this glimmer of hope, and it seemed like this was really a [good] . . . opportunity to showcase a story where the government was doing as much as they could to put money into the economy, [Mr. Speaker].

In these uncertain economic times, millions of people around the world know about the positive Saskatchewan story. They know that there are jobs and opportunities here, Mr. Speaker. Because of the CNN story, media outlets from across Canada and in the US want to interview the Premier of Saskatchewan and find out about the opportunities here.

Mr. Speaker, while most of the world struggles under the weight of the global recession, Saskatchewan is the bright spot on the international stage. And it's more proof of our government's historic tax cuts, infrastructure investments, and measures to make life more affordable for Saskatchewan people. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTION PERIOD

The Speaker: — I recognize the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition.

Provision of SaskTel Services

Mr. Calvert: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday it became

clear, I think, to Saskatchewan people and the shareholders of SaskTel that this government is out to privatize another important service of SaskTel — to outsource its email services.

Yesterday in this House, we asked government to provide for the people of Saskatchewan a list of those companies who had been provided with an RFP [request for proposal]. The minister at that time didn't have the list, or refused to answer. So again, I ask the question: will you provide the list of those companies who have been invited to submit a proposal?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Deputy Premier.

Hon. Mr. Krawetz: — Mr. Speaker, yesterday the president of SaskTel was here in this very building, and outlined to the media exactly what has taken place at SaskTel. My understanding is that the RFP went to 17 companies all at the same time. This was by invitation, Mr. Speaker; this was for the purpose of providing email hosting — five in the province of Saskatchewan, six in the United States, and six in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I hear the member opposite from Saskatoon Nutana say, provide the names. She knows full well that SaskTel's business decisions require confidentiality. For that member who has sat in this House for far too long to not understand that she cannot receive those names is simply ridiculous, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Calvert: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if it is so ridiculous to provide the names of companies who have been invited to provide an RFP, why is it then, in the month of January, SaskPower provided just such a list publicly in a news release on their website?

Mr. Speaker, I ask again to the Deputy Premier, provide the list of companies because it's clear from today's press that some companies are being left out. The people of Saskatchewan — the taxpayers, the shareholders in SaskTel — deserve to know what this government is doing with their company. Mr. Speaker, I ask again for that government to produce the list today.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Deputy Premier.

Hon. Mr. Krawetz: — Mr. Speaker, let's take a little bit of a review and take a walk back to what the NDP used to do. Mr. Speaker, in 2004 — in 2004 — the NDP outsourced spam and virus company services to a company outside of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, in 2005 the NDP outsourced Web services to another US [United States]-owned company, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I find it rather interesting. The member opposite asks the questions about releasing the names. The president, Robert Watson, yesterday made it quite clear as to why SaskTel's position is exactly that. Mr. Speaker, this is a

procedure that is going to involve probably saving \$900,000, Mr. Speaker. The current cost estimate is about 1.5 million and the anticipated cost will be about 600,000.

Mr. Speaker, if that's something that that member does not support, providing better services at a cheaper rate, then he should stand in this Legislative Assembly and say so.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Calvert: — I'll tell you exactly what this member, what this caucus, and what the people of Saskatchewan support: they support publicly owned Crown utilities in this province; they support Crown utilities that are employing Saskatchewan people, that are contributing to the growth of our economy, Mr. Speaker. That's what we support, and that's what the people of Saskatchewan support, Mr. Speaker.

Again I ask the minister: why are they so hesitant to provide the list of companies who have been invited to make a proposal? Because we see in today's press, Mr. Speaker, that some companies are on the list apparently and some local companies are not. We hear that in terms of the list that has been mailed out, that some of these companies may in fact be in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, or perhaps beyond, Mr. Speaker.

The Power Corporation is upfront with the companies they are inviting for requests for proposals. We only ask the same from this government. Be upfront and tell the people of Saskatchewan who you want to do business with.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Deputy Premier.

Hon. Mr. Krawetz: — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite has raised two very specific issues. First of all, the Saskatchewan Party government has made it very clear about our stand on privatization of the Crowns. There will not be one, Mr. Speaker. We will not be privatizing the Crowns.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Krawetz: — Mr. Speaker, and the second point that the member opposite raises about is the NDP [New Democratic Party]. When the NDP was in government and outsourcing — and outsourcing, Mr. Speaker — they never provided one media advisory, Mr. Speaker, not one about outsourcing of services to companies outside of the province of Saskatchewan. Not once, Mr. Speaker. And I've already identified that this occurred in 2004 and it occurred in 2005.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the questions asked yesterday and today have been clarified by the president of SaskTel. And you know what, Mr. Speaker? The questions are not only ridiculous; they're very hypocritical.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Before I recognize the next questioner, there's been a fair bit of debate from both sides of the Assembly when

either the questioner or the minister's responding, so I'd ask members to be mindful of this when the next individual's recognized to ask the question.

I recognize the member from Regina Coronation Park.

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This government is all about secrecy and about stealth. Mr. Speaker, no one trusts them on the Crowns. We know they're about privatization.

This administration, this government, has just spent \$800,000 to invite 86 families to Saskatchewan, and we welcome that. But please to tell us how it is that by giving away six good jobs at SaskTel and exporting them out of province, how is this going to help the job situation in Saskatchewan? How is this going to help people in Saskatchewan that are currently employed at SaskTel and the Crowns? And how is it going to create a single new job?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Before I recognize the minister, I would ask government members to be mindful of what I just asked of members in the Chamber.

I recognize the Deputy Premier.

[10:30]

Hon. Mr. Krawetz: — Mr. Speaker, as I indicated yesterday, and the president of SaskTel, Mr. Robert Watson, indicated yesterday that in fact there are no job losses to SaskTel. There will be no job losses to SaskTel.

The member opposite has difficulty understanding that. I hope he doesn't have . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. It obviously appears that members would prefer just an open session. But I think we need to be mindful of the Chamber and people that are observing the proceedings. I recognize the Deputy Premier.

Hon. Mr. Krawetz: — Mr. Speaker, there will be no privatization of the Crowns. There will be no privatization of SaskTel. There may be some outsourcing, which is the procedure that the NDP followed in 2004-2005. We're going to try to ensure that the people of this province get better services for a greater economy, Mr. Speaker.

I can't make that any plainer other than to say again there will be no job losses at SaskTel.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Coronation Park.

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well the Deputy Premier says there's no job losses and we know full well that there's at least six positions that are being outsourced — at least six — and we think to out of province. We think Fort Lauderdale, Florida is perhaps one of the places.

My question to the Deputy Premier is: what other outsourcing is there? How many other jobs are you planning on bleeding from our Crown corporations?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Deputy Premier.

Hon. Mr. Krawetz: — As the president of SaskTel indicated yesterday, there are thousands of RFPs that are released on an annual basis. SaskTel's position has never been to publicly release those RFPs. I think the president also indicated yesterday that if the opposition wanted to see the RFPs, he would have absolutely no problem posting those RFPs on the website so that they can be seen online. That's the position taken by SaskTel.

Mr. Speaker, the member raises a very interesting question. Could he tell this Assembly how many jobs were moved out of this province in 2004 or 2005, out of SaskTel, when the NDP outsourced provision of services, Mr. Speaker?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order. I recognize the member from Regina Coronation Park.

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is all about secrecy and stealth. One of the companies being discussed is based in Fort Lauderdale and makes the following claim on its website. It claims, because our services, this is a quote: "Because our services are completely invisible to the end user, our partner's customers believe they are providing the data and infrastructure behind . . . [the site]." In other words, Mr. Speaker, customers would never know that the service was being received from somewhere other than SaskTel.

To the minister: what was the Sask Party's plan? Were they hoping that most Saskatchewan people would remain unaware of those very steps they're taking to gut SaskTel?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Deputy Premier.

Hon. Mr. Krawetz: — Mr. Speaker, I should have had the member opposite join me at a opening ceremony of LEADS [League of Educational Administrators, Directors and Superintendents] conference — LEADS standing for the directors and superintendents and administrators in this province — on Sunday night when a gentleman by the name of Ian Jukes, who's world renowned, off to speak to a conference in Dubai now about services, about Internet, about the continued expansion and how we do business, and how now business is being done worldwide.

We don't know, when we're doing online banking, whether or not we're being given the services from Calgary, Regina, or maybe some city in India, Mr. Speaker. We don't know that because it is a worldwide provision of services.

Mr. Speaker, we know that we have to get better. We know in this province that SaskTel is going to be around for a long time.

As I indicated yesterday, Mr. Speaker, we're providing an additional \$90 million to SaskTel to make sure that they're a company that will provide the services necessary for the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Coronation Park.

Mr. Trew: — Meanwhile, back in Saskatchewan. Hostopia, they brag and quote, "Because our services are completely invisible to the end user, our partner's customers believe they are providing the data and infrastructure behind . . . [the site]." Stealth and secrecy is clearly the modus operandi of the Sask Party government.

Why do you say you value openness? Why do you say that and then be so secretive about so many of your plans?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Deputy Premier.

Hon. Mr. Krawetz: — Well, Mr. Speaker, we're really secretive about the plans of wanting to improve Saskatchewan, to change Saskatchewan from a time when the NDP were in power and we lost 35,000 people. We really want to be secretive about the fact that Saskatchewan is a better place to live. We want to be secretive about the fact that there are job opportunities, that the Conference Board of Canada says that this is one of the bright spots in the country of Canada. Mr. Speaker, we're so secretive about this that in fact CNN is actually using this province as an example of how things are moving forward and the rest of the world should pay attention to Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure it would be appreciated if the minister would come somewhere close, somewhere close to the questions that he's being asked, in his answers.

Mr. Speaker, the outsourcing of the email service raises a particular concern for many subscribers, and I've heard the concern addressed to me already overnight. If in fact, if in fact this government wants to privatize and outsource the email services, and if that contract is awarded to an American company, there are significant concerns being raised about privacy issues, about the privacy of Saskatchewan consumers' emails.

A significant concern has been raised. It's been raised under the PATRIOT [Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism] Act. And so, Mr. Speaker, my question then to the Deputy Premier, who apparently now is responsible for the Crown corporations: can he assure, can he assure SaskTel subscribers of email services that there will not be a privacy threat as a result of this outsourcing?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Deputy Premier.

Hon. Mr. Krawetz: — Mr. Speaker, I have been assured by the president of SaskTel, Mr. Robert Watson, that there will not be any privacy concerns that the people of Saskatchewan should worry about.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, that is not the opinion of some other very significant folks in this industry. In January . . . Well the members opposite shout from their seats because they don't like these questions, Mr. Speaker. They shout from their seats . . . Well let me talk about who. In January 2008 of this year, the federal policy review panel, the federal policy review panel, a submission made to that group notes that CSIS [Canadian Security Intelligence Service], CSIS has reported that Canadian companies operating in the information technology sector, among others, have been targeted by foreign interests.

Given, Mr. Speaker, that CSIS cannot give assurance that this information can be guaranteed to be secure, what makes the Sask Party think anybody's going to trust their opinion on it?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Deputy Premier.

Hon. Mr. Krawetz: — Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding from information provided by Mr. Watson, that in the past when services were provided in the United States, and there was some concern about where it was located, that in fact in 2004, after the passing of what is referred to as the PATRIOT Act, when it was implemented, SaskTel has directed and moved all service into Canada.

Mr. Watson has indicated that there is no threat to privacy because whoever will be providing these services will be required to do it in Saskatchewan. That's his comment; that's his answer. So if the member opposite has the problem with Mr. Watson's direction and with SaskTel's board of direction, then I think he should be asking, by way of letter to SaskTel, whether or not that is . . . There's some fear that he has that suddenly Mr. Watson's answer must not be true. Is that the allegation that the member opposite is making, Mr. Speaker?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, this is an interesting debate because the position of the government seems to be changing on the fly in question period. Now I hear the Deputy Premier saying that if there is any outsourcing of the email service, that it must be outsourced to a location in Saskatchewan. Now is that what he's saying? That it is now a requirement of this outsourcing proposal that the successful company must relocate to Saskatchewan? Would he clarify that position please, Mr. Speaker?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Deputy Premier.

Hon. Mr. Krawetz: — Mr. Speaker, as I understand from the communications provided by Mr. Watson is that the control and the storage of information would be based out of Saskatchewan. That is my understanding as of yesterday. And if that is not in fact correct, Mr. Watson would clarify that, Mr. Speaker. But that is my understanding that in fact this would be a request.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the process hasn't even been completed. The process hasn't even been completed. The process hasn't even been completed and therefore the member opposite . . .

The Speaker: — I recognize the Deputy Premier.

Hon. Mr. Krawetz: — Mr. Speaker, SaskTel is actively involved in a request for proposal. They have not completed it. They have not even finished, in fact, doing the complete set of interviews.

My understanding is there are more than one companies that have been short listed, Mr. Speaker. So for the provision of those services, the questions will be answered by Mr. Watson.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Calvert: — Well, Mr. Speaker, some of us have seen a little commercial on television. It talks about clarity. We need a little clarity from this government on what they are doing, never mind just with email services in Tel but with all of our Crowns. But let's just focus on this email question.

Now the people of Saskatchewan, who I again repeat are the shareholders of SaskTel, deserve to have clarity in the answers. Will this outsourcing result in a circumstance that perhaps a foreign-based company will relocate to Saskatchewan to provide those services? The debate again would be simpler if we knew the list of companies being invited.

Now again in this question period, I believe I heard the Deputy Premier say that SaskTel would be more than willing to post on their website the list of those, of those companies who are being requested. Is that true? Will he repeat that? And will it happen today?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Deputy Premier.

Hon. Mr. Krawetz: — Mr. Speaker, I will repeat what I believe I said a few minutes ago, that, that . . . Well the member opposite seems to, seems to not want to hear, Mr. Speaker.

I said that the president of SaskTel says that there are thousands of RFPs that are required throughout the course of operation and that it has not been the practice of posting RFPs through the website online. Mr. Watson has indicated very clearly that if that's a desire of the Leader of the Opposition, he would be willing to post all RFPs online so that the member opposite can see every one of them. That's what I said, and that's what I've

repeated.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Calvert: — Then I take it now what the Deputy Premier is telling us, they will produce on the website the RFPs, but they will not disclose to whom these RFPs are being sent, who's on the invitation list. Is that clear?

Well then, Mr. Speaker, I go back to my earlier point. I go back to my earlier point. Mr. Speaker, how is it that we have one Crown corporation called SaskPower who is more than willing to produce for the public, for their shareholder of Saskatchewan, who they are inviting to do business with when another of our Crown corporations is not? Now maybe the Minister of CIC [Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan] should have a meeting with himself, figure this out, and get a consistent plan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Deputy Premier.

Hon. Mr. Krawetz: — Mr. Speaker, Crowns operate differently. We know that SaskTel is controlled by CRTC [Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission]. There are different rules that SaskTel must follow versus what SaskPower must follow.

The business practice of SaskTel, Mr. Speaker, the business practice of SaskTel, as determined by the board of directors of that company, is that they will not disclose names of companies with which they do business, Mr. Speaker, and which they try . . .

As I indicated before, the RFP proposal was an invitational proposal, Mr. Speaker. There were 17 companies that were sent an RFP. There were five of those companies that we know were from the province of Saskatchewan. None of the five companies that were asked, by way of an invite through an RFP proposal, they did not submit a proposal. All five that were contacted in the province of Saskatchewan did not submit a proposal.

So, Mr. Speaker, I make it again clear: the business policy of SaskTel is that names are not disclosed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

[10:45]

The Speaker: — I recognize the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, before the time of the question period runs out, I have another area and another question that I want to address to the Deputy Premier. Will the Deputy Premier confirm that this is not the first, this is not the first outsourcing of a service of SaskTel, a significant component of SaskTel by their government? Will he confirm to this House today that this government has in fact also outsourced conference calling? Will he confirm that? And will he identify to the people of Saskatchewan — the shareholder of Tel, the taxpayer — will he

identify to whom the conference calling function was outsourced to, the name of the company?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Deputy Premier.

Hon. Mr. Krawetz: — You know, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated at the very start of my response today, is that the questions are a bit ridiculous and obviously very hypocritical. When that government, as an NDP government in 2004, was outsourcing, they were outsourcing to companies outside of Saskatchewan in 2004. In 2005 the NDP . . .

The Speaker: — It's obvious there are many people who would like to answer the question, but there's only been one person's been recognized. I ask that you allow the Deputy Premier to respond to the question.

Hon. Mr. Krawetz: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as I . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Deputy Premier.

Hon. Mr. Krawetz: — As I said, Mr. Speaker, the NDP outsourced in 2004. They outsourced in 2005. And there is an RFP to look at provision of services for this, a current aspect facing SaskTel. The president of SaskTel indicated yesterday current costs about 1.5 million. It is desirable to try to move that cost maybe down to 600,000 — a tremendous amount of money for the province of Saskatchewan without any job losses.

Mr. Speaker, I think today's questions have become very . . . [inaudible] . . . It's no wonder, it's no wonder that the NDP are trying to outsource a new leader outside of the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Members will come to order.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Highways.

Government Investment in Transportation Projects

Hon. Mr. Elhard: — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to rise today to inform the House about this government's investment of over \$17 million in six transportation projects, along with another 98.5 million cash investment from the province for the Circle Drive South project in Saskatoon. Both of these investments will improve our province's transportation system and support the growth and expansion in several of our cities.

The advancement of these monies now allows for the timely completion of design work so that construction can begin on these important projects in the upcoming season. Of the 17 million which was announced as part of a \$500 million stimulus package last month, 10 million will go to the city of Regina to support development of the global transportation hub. This project is a partnership between our government, the Government of Canada, the city of Regina, CP [Canadian

Pacific] Rail, and the rural municipality of Sherwood.

The global transportation hub includes a new Canadian Pacific intermodal transportation facility, a related road infrastructure, and a new Loblaws distribution warehouse. The balance of the \$17 million will be distributed to the following projects. Six million dollars will go toward the Highways 1 and 4 interchange in the city of Swift Current. The city of Lloydminster will receive a contribution of \$750,000 through the urban highway connector program. Improvements will be made to the Highway 39 service road in the city of Weyburn with \$450,000 allocated for that particular project. The city of Melfort will receive \$300,000 for improvements to Highway 6, and the city of Humboldt will receive \$150,000 for improvements to the Highway 20 intersection.

Now improving these important urban roadway connections to the provincial highway system ensures corridor continuity to, from, and through urban centres. Nearly 70 per cent of our economy is driven by exports, and that is why projects of this nature are needed in Saskatchewan. Not only will they create jobs, but these investments will make Saskatchewan a more competitive and attractive place to do business. These investments will also enhance safety, alleviate congestion, and support the growth of cities.

The \$98.5 million cash injection from the province to the city of Saskatoon is to kick-start one of the largest transportation infrastructure projects in the province — the Circle Drive South project. This roadway will include the construction of a new bridge and roads to complete Circle Drive on the south side of Saskatoon, as well as interchanges at Lorne Avenue and Circle Drive South and at Idylwyld Freeway and Circle Drive South for a total cost of \$98.5 million.

The federal government has committed funding of 86.5 million toward the bridge, and the city of Saskatoon has committed \$92 million as its share toward the cost of the Circle Drive South project. The total cost is estimated to be \$297 million in today's funds.

These infrastructure initiatives are good news in our present circumstances and for our future aspirations. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Northeast.

Mr. Harper: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to start out by thanking the minister for providing me a copy of his announcement earlier this day, giving me ample time to go through it before the House convened.

I will agree with the minister that this is truly a good news announcement. I think any time that we can inject extra investments into our infrastructure certainly is good news. I think it's fair to say that if we want to have a strong economy and maintain a strong economy, we must maintain the infrastructure that provides the route of commerce. And this certainly will go a distance in providing that route.

It is truly a good news announcement, Mr. Speaker. There are some questions it does raise though. It does raise the questions of capacity within our industry. Does our industry have the capacity to take on the extra work that will result from this investment?

I would hope that it would not create a situation where we have a competition, perhaps an unfair competition, between the provincial work to be done and the continuous and continuum work of our RMs [rural municipality] of building their infrastructure, their grid road systems, and so on. I hope we don't find ourselves in a competitive situation where the RMs are competing against the province for the same contractors and for that same work. I hope the same would apply to the cities that have an ongoing need to maintain their infrastructure, that they don't find themselves in a competitive situation with contractors to be able to attract those contractors to do the work within our cities.

I would hope that this would not result, Mr. Speaker, in a situation where we have increased costs, not necessarily increased kilometres of road being built or projects completed, but simply the increase in costs of those projects simply because we have a pool of money that the contractors simply can't maximize within a reasonable time frame so that they simply drive up the costs of projects.

This is truly a good news announcement, Mr. Speaker, but it ignores a very vital part of our province, the northern part of our province in particular. We're seeing the northern highways have not been mentioned at all in this announcement, and nor do we see much mention of the northern highway situation even in the minister's five-year plan. It falls short. And I find that strange because if there's an area of our province that needs the stimulus, needs the extra work, needs the extra jobs, it would certainly be in northern Saskatchewan. But that has obviously been missed in this announcement.

Northern Saskatchewan is a unique situation when it comes to this highway system, unlike the rest of us in southern Saskatchewan who enjoy, as residents, pretty well enjoy more than one exit from wherever we happen to be. Whether it be in a small town in Saskatchewan or on a farm in our great province or even our cities, there's various ways that we can get in and out to, you know, other parts of the province.

That isn't the case in northern Saskatchewan. Communities in northern Saskatchewan have one road — one road that you travel in on and one road that you travel out on. That is their only artery and yet it has been ignored in this announcement. And certainly I find that strange because our greatest resource in this province, our greatest resource in this province is the people of Saskatchewan. The people in those northern communities are our greatest resource. And yet they're being ignored and not any futuristic hope of having improved arteries for them to travel in and out on for their own personal use or for the commerce and expansion of opportunities in the North.

We see that in particular in some recent . . . The previous government had announced some projects in northern Saskatchewan — I think one of them Pelican Narrows, for example — that has now been . . . the community's been informed by the government that that particular project's been

postponed. And there's several others, Mr. Speaker, but we'll have the opportunity to discuss these particular projects further in estimates when that opportunity arises. Thank you.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SEVENTY-FIVE MINUTE DEBATE

The Speaker: — I recognize the Leader of the Opposition.

Federal-Provincial Relations

Mr. Calvert: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At the close of my remarks, I will be moving the following motion:

That this Assembly condemn the federal government for their lack of attention to the needs of Saskatchewan in this year's federal budget, particularly the needs of cattle producers and forestry workers, and furthermore notes that the provincial government has failed miserably to obtain fair treatment for the people of Saskatchewan by Stephen Harper's government.

I'll move that motion, Mr. Speaker, at the end of my remarks.

As you can see there are two components to this motion, both related to the federal budget: one component of the motion directed very specifically to the Conservative government in Ottawa, and the second component of the motion directed more generally to the Sask Party conservative government in Saskatchewan.

On the first component of . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Oh the members opposite said that I can't say the Sask Party conservative Government of Saskatchewan. I think I just said it, and I think I'll say it again. This is a very conservative group of people we have over here, Mr. Speaker, a very conservative group of people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, on the first component of this whole motion . . .

The Speaker: — Order. I would ask members to come to order and allow the Leader . . .

Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, the members of the opposition seem to take some umbrage as being described as conservative people. They are very conservative people, and . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. I believe in the past, Speakers have given a rule that parties should be recognized by their specific designations, not what may be, what someone else may think they might be. And we currently have two parties in this Assembly, so I bring that to members attention. I recognize the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Calvert: — Well, see but I'd be proud of it if I were they, but never mind. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me . . . back to the motion. There is a component of this motion that addresses the federal government, the first component. And it's actually, Mr. Speaker, a component of the motion that I would expect every member of this House to be able to support. I would expect the first component of this motion, which identifies that the federal

government's budget, most recent, fails the needs of Saskatchewan. I can't imagine how any member in this House could stand in this debate and not support that statement, Mr. Speaker.

[11:00]

I can expect every member, I'm sure, to support it. Why? Because this motion, Mr. Speaker, is actually no different, no different in its content, this first component, than what the Premier said the day after the federal budget. The Premier, we'll all recall, the day after the federal budget, gave this federal budget the grade of D. He gave it a grade of D which is exactly what this motion seeks to do.

Why did the Premier give the budget a grade of D? Well he gave it a grade of D, as he described it that day, because this budget was disappointing. This was a disappointing budget for the people of Saskatchewan and particular — and the Premier identified it that day — particularly in its lack of response to our livestock sector in Saskatchewan. So the Premier condemned this budget, gave it a grade of D, said it was disappointing. Why did he say it was disappointing? Because it simply did not address the needs of this very significant component of our economy and our province, the livestock sector.

Now to be fair, since the federal budget, the province has acted. The province has acted to provide some support. They've acted after a significant call from the industry itself. They've reacted after pressure from the opposition. They have reacted, I assume, from pressure even from some of their own private members who represent many of our producers in this province. To be fair, this government has acted. That does not change the reality, does not change the reality that our national government has simply not reacted to the need of the livestock sector in Saskatchewan.

And so when the Premier of our province, the day after the federal budget in this rotunda with the journalists, said to the people of Saskatchewan, the people of Canada, this budget rates nothing more than a D, he had our support, and I'm sure he had the support of many, many, many Saskatchewan people. So our government has recognized the need to help the livestock sector. But even since the federal budget, has that federal government done so? No, it has not. No, it has not. The Minister of Agriculture knows it; he's said it. They have not responded even to date.

But even worse, Mr. Speaker, instead of responding to the needs of the sector as they should have done through the budget — as they could have done since the budget — no, what do we get from the federal government around this issue is sort of the back of the hand. They tell our government, just go home, just go home. You're making a mistake by supporting the industry.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Premier's assessment of the federal budget, the day after that budget was delivered, we believe was the right assessment. It is that same assessment that is reflected in the first component of the motion that's now before the House. And that is why I can't imagine why any member in this House would stand this morning and speak against this component of the motion.

And you know what is incredible here, Mr. Speaker, when you think about this, what is incredible is that we have a federal budget delivered, that by the Premier's description, is a D grade. It's disappointing because it does not address the needs of the livestock sector in our province.

What is incredible, Mr. Speaker, is that this budget was formed by 13 out of 14 seats held from this province by Conservative Party members in Ottawa, and even more incomprehensible when you think that our federal Minister of Agriculture is from Saskatchewan. It is almost incomprehensible to many of us that such a viable and important sector of our economy is so neglected by the federal budget.

And so for that reason alone, Mr. Speaker, for that reason alone, this motion, I think, is an appropriate opportunity for this legislature, unanimously, to send a very clear message to the nation's capital, to the Government of Canada, that this budget that they have recently delivered fails the needs of Saskatchewan people. And I've not even spoken to the issue of the forest.

On the basis of this lack of support for our livestock sector — which now the government has recognized needs to be there — on that alone this budget fails the people of Saskatchewan and this motion therefore deserves the support of every member in this House. If they do not, if members opposite don't stand and give support to this component at least, of the motion, then I would argue they're getting like their colleagues in Ottawa — getting too much like their colleagues in Ottawa, willing to take instruction from Ottawa as opposed to taking instruction from the people of Saskatchewan.

Now on the second component of this motion, Mr. Speaker, on the second component of this motion, I don't particularly expect that the member from Moose Jaw North is going to get up and support it. I don't realistically expect that — although I'd argue that any objective observer would find themselves completely in agreement with what the motion describes — but I don't realistically expect members to hop up and support the second component of this motion. Because, Mr. Speaker, as you can see, the second component of this motion notes that the provincial government — our provincial government, the Sask Party provincial government — has failed “miserably to obtain fair treatment for the people of Saskatchewan by Steven Harper's government.”

Now I don't expect the members opposite to get up and support that in their comments. I would believe that if there were a fair and objective observer over there, in fact they would support it. They would, but now I don't particularly expect that.

Now you'll recall, Mr. Speaker, as I do, that when the Sask Party sat in opposition in this House and when the Liberals were in government in Ottawa, that party, now government, was very quick to stand with us, shoulder to shoulder, in demanding fairness from the federal government. They stood should to shoulder with us; they said publicly that the equalization formula in Canada was not fair to Saskatchewan people. They made no bones about that. And we stood shoulder to shoulder. But something changed, Mr. Speaker. Something seems to have changed when their friends were elected to government in Ottawa.

When Mr. Harper and the Conservatives were elected to government in Ottawa, something changed in the Sask Party. And suddenly they were not quite as anxious to raise this question of fairness, Mr. Speaker. Somehow their position changed, and they gave up, Mr. Speaker. They gave up on battling for a fair return for Saskatchewan's non-renewable resources, which by the way, Mr. Speaker, by all conservative estimates, indicated a value of at least \$800 million a year owing to the people of Saskatchewan as a result of the unfairness of the equalization program in this country.

I think, Mr. Speaker, if time allows, a quick review of history here is important. It was Professor Tom Courchene who wrote what is widely acknowledged as the definitive piece of academic research on the specific question of the application of the equalization formula in Canada and how it has affected Saskatchewan. Widely recognized.

And Tom Courchene in that paper, he described the entire paper simply by the title that he gave to the paper. He called that paper “Confiscatory Equalization.” Confiscatory equalization, which in plain language means that for every dollar that we were earning from our non-renewable natural resources, we were being robbed of a dollar and a quarter by a succession of federal governments. And it went on for years.

We were losing, for every development dollar we were achieving for our non-renewables, we were losing 25 cents in terms of our fair share of federal resources. Tom Courchene published that paper. And then, in government, with the support of the opposition Sask Party at the time, we began to do battle to right that wrong.

We battled first the Liberal government of Paul Martin. And, Mr. Speaker, progress was earned. Progress was earned. We were able to negotiate a \$300 million payment from that Liberal government in Ottawa to compensate for some of the loss that we'd taken under this confiscatory equalization — a \$300 million contribution to the people of Saskatchewan and only to the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, it was about that time that that same federal Liberal government, same federal Liberal government signed what is now known as the Atlantic accord, when in fact they made right the circumstance around equalization and non-renewable resource revenues for the provinces of Nova Scotia, the province of Newfoundland and Labrador. They made it right through the Atlantic accord. That left Saskatchewan of course alone in Confederation, having not received the fair and similar treatment as every other province in Canada.

And so again we raised the battle. We raised the battle. I mean the minister of Finance in our government went to Ottawa. I attended to the House of Commons committee, the Senate committee. I went to see the Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker, then along came the Conservative Party candidates in Saskatchewan and their leader, Stephen Harper, and they made a promise. They made a promise to the people of Saskatchewan that if they were elected to the Government of Canada, they would make this right. That they would make it right by simply excluding non-renewable resource revenues

from the calculation to form equalization.

At that moment, Mr. Speaker, many of us rejoiced. Now I could never find myself voting Conservative, but that's about as close as I ever came. Because I thought at last we have a westerner who understands resource revenues, who understands how this equalization program has hurt Saskatchewan, and who has promised us, promised us that he would make it right.

Well we elected them. We elected them all right. We elected them on that promise, and what did they do? They broke the promise, Mr. Speaker. By everybody's agreement, they broke the promise. And you can read the journalists, Randy Burton, in *The StarPhoenix* — we may hear more about it later — how that's been described by journalists, by academics, by the citizens. It can't not be described but as a broken promise.

So we began the challenge again. We began the challenge again. Again I appeared in Ottawa. Again I met the Prime Minister. Now, Mr. Speaker, now, Mr. Speaker, we were again promised, I was promised as the Premier of the province, and so were my colleagues as premiers, in a letter from Stephen Harper saying, no, don't worry. We're going to review the equalization program and we're going to make it right. We're going to pull out non-renewable natural resources.

And again our hopes went up that we were going to get a fair deal — I remind you, worth \$800 million a year, 800 million for the people of Saskatchewan. Again our hopes were given up. And what did these Conservatives in Ottawa do? Oh they reformed equalization all right. And you know what they did? They actually pulled out non-renewable resource revenues from the calculation. And, Mr. Speaker, you know what they did then? They put a cap on it. They put a cap on it which only affects the people of Saskatchewan.

Now along comes the Sask Party government and we expect them to keep the same position they had in opposition. But no, no. They've seemed to have changed their position, and they no longer stand up for the rightness of this, Mr. Speaker. They've dropped the legal challenge. They've given up getting a fair return for the people of Saskatchewan. It's not, Mr. Speaker, that they've failed; they haven't even tried.

And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this Assembly should be unanimous in support of the following motion. I move:

That this Assembly condemns the federal government for their lack of attention to the needs of Saskatchewan in this year's federal budget, particularly the needs of cattle producers and forestry workers, and furthermore notes that the provincial government has failed miserably to obtain fair treatment for the people of Saskatchewan by Stephen Harper's government.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Will the members take the motion as read? The next speaker will be recognized. I recognize the member from Biggar.

Mr. Weekes: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm very grateful to be able to speak to this motion. This motion . . . I'll read just the first part of it, Mr. Speaker:

That this Assembly condemns the federal government for their lack of attention to the needs of Saskatchewan . . .

Mr. Speaker, the whole motion is hypocritical on the NDP side. It's obvious that the NDP opposition hasn't changed how they deal with other governments in the way they dealt with the federal government when they were in power, Mr. Speaker. The Saskatchewan Party government works with whoever is in power in Ottawa in a pragmatic, professional manner. We work premier to prime minister, minister to minister, government to government, and we don't go around insulting the federal government; we don't go around condemning them.

Do we have differences? Well we certainly do, and in my speech I'm going to go through some of the differences that we have with the federal government. It's only natural to have some differences as you never get everything that you want in life. And no, Saskatchewan doesn't get everything we want from the federal government.

But, Mr. Speaker, the NDP opposition is so hypocritical. Let's look at what they did in 16 years in government.

[11:15]

First of all, it was obvious they didn't work co-operatively with the federal government of any stripe, quite frankly. When you come to fully funding CFIP [Canadian farm income program] and then CAIS [Canadian agricultural income stabilization program] and AgriStability, what did the NDP do? Well they didn't fully fund the risk management programs that they had negotiated with the other provinces and territories and the federal government. They reneged on their agreement. At the end of the day, after much delay, they did put money in to a certain extent.

I believe one year in CFIP they never did put their share of the money in. And this is money that farmers were counting on to operate for the next season, and the farmers of Saskatchewan could not count on the NDP government to uphold their end of the bargain.

We go back to 1995 when the then NDP government cancelled GRIP [gross revenue insurance program]. That was something that really set agriculture back in this province and, you know, we've seen since then that there is thousands of farmers left the farm and left the industry totally.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen also, on an individual basis, the then Agriculture minister, Mr. Wartman, personally soured a deal for a packing plant to come to Saskatchewan and possibly come to the constituency of Biggar. It was incredible what we heard about what that minister did at that time. How he actually soured the deal when after BSE [bovine spongiform encephalopathy] and the whole situation that was going on there. And there was a move on to have more slaughtering capacity in Saskatchewan and that minister, well, ended up putting up roadblocks. And of course we never did see a packing plant come to Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about in comparison to what the NDP did in 16 years of government, I'd like to compare what Saskatchewan has done with working co-operatively with the federal government. I'm just going to list a few. Talking about the Prime Minister was in Saskatoon and made an announcement — \$62 million to complete the twinning of Highway 11 — then moved up the project from 2016 to 2012. I'd say that's working very co-operatively. I think things are, things are working quite well, Mr. Speaker.

The carbon capture file — \$240 million from the federal government to develop one of the world's first and largest commercial-scale carbon capture storage demonstration project. And the list goes on, Mr. Speaker.

Circle Drive South announcement, Saskatoon — \$86 million for the federal Gateways and Border Crossing Fund for the Saskatoon Circle Drive South project.

The global transportation hub — 27 million from the federal government for the development of Regina's global transportation hub.

Building Canada fund. The federal government and Saskatchewan government committed to \$31 million towards projects in the community of 100,000 people or less. I'd say again that's working very co-operatively with the federal government and getting results, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was going to say, but good things have happened working with the federal government. And there is some irritants. As everyone knows, as our Premier said, that we wouldn't ask the federal government to do something that we wouldn't do ourselves. So what did we do, Mr. Speaker? We committed \$71 million to producers from Saskatchewan hog and cattle support program, \$71 million. That's 40 per cent of what was being asked for by the livestock associations, and we do have a problem with the federal government's response. There's no doubt that we expect the federal government to come in with their 60 per cent of that program. As we know, these programs are almost always 60/40 between the federal government and the provinces.

We recognize, our Agriculture minister recognized that there was a need for support for our livestock industry, and our government came through. And there's one glaring example. We have an issue with the federal government and the federal Minister of Agriculture's reply. Just the other day though, the federal Minister of Agriculture, Ritz, was in Biggar actually and held meetings in the community to talk to livestock producers about the situation in the livestock economy and well, we're hopeful.

We're hopeful that he will and the federal government will see the light and come to the aid of the livestock producers as Saskatchewan government did, giving \$40 per head for all breeding cows and bred heifers and \$20 per market hog and also \$10 per head for iso-weanlings. It was a very welcomed announcement. And I just would like to quote Dave Marit, the president of SARM [Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities]:

SARM would like to thank the province for recognizing

the livestock crisis and for demonstrating its commitment to the industry through today's announcement.

Also quoting Sask Pork:

The Saskatchewan pork industry expresses its gratitude to the Government of Saskatchewan for recognizing the urgent need for producer support for the hog sector.

This is tangible results. This is tangible investment in the livestock industry, and we're certainly there as a provincial government to help the livestock sector.

But what else have we done, Mr. Speaker, for the agricultural sector in the province? Well we recently announced \$12.6 million to agriculture research projects in the province. We've also provided increased extension services throughout rural Saskatchewan for farmers and ranchers — opened up new offices in Watrous, Kindersley, Moose Jaw.

Now AgriStability, that's certainly, that is really the flagship of the risk management programs in this province. And we recognized that AgriStability being administered out of Winnipeg was not a good thing. There was the horror stories of many producers — I'm one of them — having files sit on a desk for four or five years when this money was so desperately needed, and so we . . . And the cost, quite frankly, of the administration that the province had to pay for AgriStability being administered, CAIS, its forerunner, being administered out of Winnipeg.

So what did we do? What did our Agriculture minister announce? Well we're going to move it to Saskatchewan, and that's going to happen. And we see a number of advantages out of that. First of all, we're going to have employees being paid, paying taxes, working in Saskatchewan and administer the program. And, Mr. Speaker, we also put the priority on having these files get dealt with on a very timely basis because having files that sit for four or five years is just totally unacceptable and especially when agricultural producers so desperately need funding from the risk management programs.

We can go on and on, Mr. Speaker. Farm and ranch water program, \$6 million was announced in the 2008-2009 budget. I just have a few seconds left, so I certainly will not be supporting this motion for the reasons I just laid out.

But it's interesting, if provincial NDP do not speak about their federal NDP counterparts. All we heard from them was, the federal NDP, Jack Layton, all he wanted to do was get a cabinet position and make a deal with the Bloc separatists so that, and with Stéphane Dion, in order to get a cabinet position. We never heard of any promises coming out of the federal NDP; what they were going to do for Saskatchewan. Did we hear anything from them? They had no plans to help Western Canada or Saskatchewan, and their leader certainly is hypocritical in that type of an arrangement with a separatist party. So, as I said before, Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting this . . .

The Speaker: — The member's time has elapsed. I recognize the member from Regina Lakeview.

Mr. Nilson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak in

support of this motion, and I know that all of us are very pleased when we can agree on that side of the House and this side of the House or previously when we were there and the members opposite were here that there was agreement on what was happening for our province and for our country.

And so about four years ago — March 2005 — one of our members said this, and I think it accurately reflected what was happening in Saskatchewan at that time. “I think all sides in this legislature can agree on one thing today. The federal equalization formula does not treat Saskatchewan fairly.” That was a comment made by the member from Swift Current.

Now the next year when the new government was elected in Ottawa and we ended up with a Conservative government in Ottawa, there was a very clear statement from the members of the Sask Party that the new equalization formula must exclude all provincial resource revenue. So that was 2006.

Then in 2007, there was a federal budget and there was a discussion of what should happen with that federal budget, and the members I think were once again unanimous in this legislature and once again one of our members was very clear. He says:

“I’m upset and I think the people of the province will be as well. Today the issue is did the Conservatives keep a promise that they made? A pretty clear promise without a cap. The answer is no.”

Once again a comment that reflected the feelings of all of us made by the member from Swift Current.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that what ends up happening is that last month we had a reflection by the Premier on the federal budget, and I think he summed it up for the people of the province that it was a D. And I don’t think there’s been anything that’s really happened since then to cause anybody to change that assessment.

Now what’s extremely unfortunate for those of us who live in Saskatchewan, that this seems to be a fairly consistent response to the people of Saskatchewan, whether the party opposite is in government or whether our party has been in government. And I think that’s one of the fundamental issues that was addressed by Mr. Courchene in his work, but also was an item that was addressed in many of the initiatives that we took when we were in government.

Now I think the frustration for the people of Saskatchewan is that there are many of these issues that now seem to be pushed under the rug or set aside. I think that it’s quite interesting. And I want to make a little bit of a quotation here; it’s not too long, but I think it’s an important one. This is one from the summer of 2007:

Prime Minister Stephen Harper’s caucus members in Saskatchewan have a problem that just won’t go away. There’s a big dead albatross hanging from their necks, and it’s stinking to high heaven. Yet whenever someone mentions the rotting carcass, they gaze wide-eyed around the room and say ‘Albatross? What albatross?’ This would be the infamous campaign promise guaranteed to

Saskatchewan that its non-renewable resources would be exempt from equalization calculations. The promise was made repeatedly in many different places by all Conservative candidates. It was promised to Premier Lorne Calvert in writing by Harper, who rode it to 12 Saskatchewan seats. Now that the promise has been broken by inclusion of a cap in the formula, Tory MPs are trying to deflect attention from that fact in any way they can.

This is a quotation from *The StarPhoenix*, written by Randy Burton. We now have 13 Conservatives in the federal parliament, and I think over the last 20 months or 18 months there hasn’t been any change in the perception of what’s happened.

Now what’s also going to be fairly interesting is that the person who wrote this very clear statement about the feelings of Saskatchewan people is now working, I think, very hard to make sure that the communications around the provincial budget on March 18 will have the same clarity. And we look forward to those particular words.

Mr. Speaker, when one works in this whole area of federal-provincial relationships, you end up having to develop relationships that are workable from both sides. And, Mr. Speaker, we know that, unfortunately for Saskatchewan, our place in Confederation has been replaced with one of fairly strong sense of our position vis-à-vis either the federal Liberals or the federal Conservatives by what appears more to be a position of compromise or allowing for the big brother to dominate the little brother. I know one of our Regina columnists described that as the big brother stealing the allowance from the little brother and basically telling him to forget it. And Saskatchewan then sits in this position of being treated like somebody with no power, with no influence in what goes on. And I think that that’s the part that frustrates many Saskatchewan people when they see the government in this situation that we’re in now.

[11:30]

And I think the motion today actually gets at the fact that when the government drops the lawsuit that was started — as many ways a last resort, having been part of the decision to go ahead with that — what they do is even further weaken a position of the Saskatchewan people. Now I thought it was quite curious, given all our reference to animals in Saskatchewan over the last number of days, that the Justice minister talked about that lawsuit as the elephant in the room and it was something that was always there. Well that was clearly the whole purpose of having the lawsuit, which was to remind the federal government that they had not treated Saskatchewan fairly.

It’s a sad case when we as a province, and especially the Government of Saskatchewan, have us as sort of the lapdog of Confederation. The federal government says something and we bark in unison or we do whatever is necessary to support the federal government.

And, Mr. Speaker, that ends up being a situation where you end up having to deal with some of the old traditional words of this legislature and of our predecessor legislatures, especially in

Great Britain where they talked about the Whigs and the Tories — or I think as some people have talked about, the Whigs and the Whags. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that we're sick and tired in Saskatchewan of being the Whags — the wagging tails of Confederation. And we want us to be in a position where we will stand up for Saskatchewan people, and unfortunately, the record of the government opposite has been such that they have not done that over the last while.

And, Mr. Speaker, we will continue to push this particular issue because we do not think that Saskatchewan people are being treated fairly. And we expect those people who temporarily have the responsibility of making our case, that they will do this in a forceful manner. So I speak in favour of the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Rosthern-Shellbrook.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Allchurch: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to stand in the Assembly today to speak to this motion. And I for one am not in favour of this motion.

As many members in this House know, I'm from the constituency of Rosthern-Shellbrook and in that constituency, it's basically agriculture. And there are a lot of cattle producers in that constituency. In fact in Rosthern-Shellbrook constituency, the biggest numbers of cattle are from that constituency. So I hear it every day as what's happening with the federal government and the provincial government in regarding the problems that the cattle producers are having, plus the hog producers are having, because in my constituency there are hog producers. Not many, but there's hog producers.

And, you know, when I look at this motion and it states that we should condemn the federal government, well this is typically, Mr. Speaker, what the NDP would do. This would be kind of a socialist attitude to condemn somebody. Instead of working with them, they want to condemn them. And that's why rural Saskatchewan, the farmers, the cattle producers in rural Saskatchewan, have got very little from the previous administration. For 16 years they've had to put up with the NDP administration that would sooner condemn than actually work with the federal government to bring out programs that would help and benefit them.

It's ironic with this motion that we have, the opposite side of the House, members of the NDP, who are all from urban Saskatchewan. And as the former premier, the Opposition Leader stated, it's been due to them that our government came forth with the \$40 per cow. Isn't that ironic? The urban farmers of Saskatchewan have come out now and stated they'll take credit for this. Well it wasn't them that did it. I can understand that the Ag critic probably got some phone calls; I got lots of them.

You know, Mr. Speaker, Kevin Hursh is an ag commentary person who knows ag really well. He was up in my

constituency in the town of Spiritwood, here just probably a month ago. And there were a lot of people there. In his talks there, he was talking about the problems in ag. And it's been going on for some years under the watchful eye — the watchful eye — of the NDP, who could care less about rural Saskatchewan. And one of the people that was there stood up and said, you know, after 16 years of NDP rule, we in Saskatchewan under the new government — the government I'm proud to represent with — we finally have an Ag minister that stands up for rural Saskatchewan, first and foremost because he's from rural Saskatchewan. He understands rural Saskatchewan. He grew up on the farm.

One of the things I told the member, I said . . . And that is true. After how many years of NDP rule, we get an Ag minister who understands rural Saskatchewan and livestock problems and ag problems. And I said the reason he is the best — the best — Ag minister we've had in a long, long time, is because when he speaks, he doesn't speak from a piece of paper handed in front of him. He speaks from the heart. And that's what an Agriculture minister should do, but you've got to know something about ag before you can get up there and stand. Our Ag minister does that, and that's why he's doing a wonderful job.

Yes, you can condemn the federal government for not coming forth with their share of the money, but there's an old saying — either lead, follow or get out of the road. Well I guarantee you, M. Speaker, our Ag minister and our government decided to lead. Instead of waiting for the federal government to come out with their share of the formula of 60/40 split, our Ag minister came forth and said, we're going to lead. Because this is what this government is about, leading this province into prosperity, not like our counterparts on the opposite side, the NDP, who all they seem to think about is being second-class province where we have to wait for help from the federal government. This Ag minister and our government is going to lead forward. And in ag that's why we've taken out and spent just over \$70 million to help the cattle producers.

And because I have lots of cattle producers in my constituency — in fact, in fact, Mr. Speaker, four of my brothers are also ag producers, as I am. And when I go home on the weekends I hear first-hand about the ag problems. But they'll be the first to say, we finally have a government that understands ag, and we finally have a Ag minister that understands ag. And we will do a heck of a lot better with this government in power, rather than what we had for the last 16 years under the socialist government of the NDP.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Allchurch: — Mr. Speaker, I just want to read a quote. I just want to read a quote from Kevin Hursh. And in the Regina paper . . . or Saskatoon paper, pardon me, Mr. Speaker, I want to quote from that. And it says:

Natural advantage for beef . . . [producers] squandered.

Western Canada in general and Saskatchewan in particular should be home to a vibrant cattle industry. Instead, cattle producers are under attack from all sides and the future appears bleak.

That is true. It also goes on to quote:

Unfortunately, the cattle herd is shrinking and will continue to do so as producers leave the industry . . . [This simply is economics.] Eventually people get tired of working for little or no return.

The Saskatchewan government's new support package for the livestock industry is the first positive news in a long [long] time.

This is from Kevin Hursh, the agriculture commentary:

To its credit, the province has decided to go ahead even though the feds have refused to cost-share.

The provincial payment of \$40 per cow or bred heifer will mean \$4,000 for a producer running 100 head. It would be considerably more useful if the feds would contribute \$60 per head in the traditional 60-40 funding split for farm . . . [support].

Mr. Speaker, if this motion has any relevance to what the feds are not doing, it's the feds have not come to the table with their \$60 per head. But it's based on \$100, but that's what the industry have asked for when they were coming to the Ag minister and saying, we would like \$100 per cow. That's what our provincial government has done. We have come to the table with \$40 because that's our share. But to have a motion on the floor from the NDP condemning the federal government on everything is not the way to do business. It is not.

If you want to work with the federal government, then you have to have meetings and stuff and bring out the issues. And that's what needs to be done. Not condemning them is going to go or do anything.

I'd also like to also talk about what the federal government has done since we took power a year ago. And the list is extensive. The federal funding brought in twinning of Highway 11. And it also, by funding the highway twinning from Saskatoon to Prince Albert, the funding will increase the production and have that highway done by 2012 rather than 2016. Something else the new provincial government has done.

The federal funding has also done in areas like carbon capture, Circle Drive South, the global transportation hub right here in Regina. That comes from the federal government. And how is that going to benefit Saskatchewan? It's going to benefit immensely.

But the reason these projects are coming forthwith is because we, this government, have sat down with the federal government and asked them. They've worked with them. We don't go out and condemn them and then come back with their hands out and say we need, we need, we need. That's something that the NDP would do. And the NDP have done that for 16 years and that's why we're in the same position we have been for many years.

To honour this new government, I can guarantee you we will go forward to make this province a better place. And I can guarantee you that rural Saskatchewan will foster more benefits

under this government with this Ag minister than ever before.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting this motion. I believe that this motion does nothing to help foster the relationship between the federal government and our government in transferring dollars and things that this province needs, especially in rural Saskatchewan. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from The Battlefords.

Mr. Taylor: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased today to speak in the debate on this motion, the motion that was put forward by the leader of the New Democratic Party a short while ago, Mr. Speaker.

And just for the record, for my constituents who are watching this right now and for those who may be reading the debate in *Hansard*, Mr. Speaker, I'll put on the record again the motion:

That this Assembly condemns the federal government for their lack of attention to the needs of Saskatchewan in this year's federal budget, particularly the needs of cattle producers and forestry workers, and furthermore notes that the provincial government has failed miserably to obtain fair treatment for the people of Saskatchewan by Stephen Harper's government.

Mr. Speaker, this motion comes forward today for a number of reasons, not the least of which, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the people of Saskatchewan are concerned about the lack of attention in the federal budget just released and comments made by Saskatchewan MPs, Mr. Speaker, with regards to what was not in that budget and what the province of Saskatchewan is doing, Mr. Speaker.

[11:45]

Our constituents are concerned, number one, about the lack of attention by the federal government because it affects them in their pocketbook, Mr. Speaker, and their ability to work within their communities to support their families. And, Mr. Speaker, they are concerned because not only are there 13 Conservative Party MPs in this province, Mr. Speaker, but there's a government in this province that says that they are the friends of those 13 MPs, Mr. Speaker, and that they have some influence over those MPs.

And, Mr. Speaker, just the other day we learned the Minister of Agriculture himself says he has so much influence over those MPs, Mr. Speaker, that they shake in their boots when we come — we, that means the government — comes to Ottawa to talk to them.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan know that the federal government is letting us down. The Premier of Saskatchewan has acknowledged the federal government has let us down. And, Mr. Speaker, therefore, those who are arguing closest to the ear of the federal government, Mr. Speaker, are failing to communicate our message.

It's a simple matter, Mr. Speaker, that anybody that's been in a

debate class in school, at high school or university, for anybody that's been involved in actually debates around the kitchen table at home or within their local organization, Mr. Speaker, when you make a good argument and you lose the good argument, you understand and you can explain, Mr. Speaker, not only to yourself but to others as to why you lost that argument. But, Mr. Speaker, you have to have made a good argument to begin with.

It's clear, Mr. Speaker, that the good argument has fallen on deaf ears in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker. And that's a failure of those who are communicating the message within the provincial government and, Mr. Speaker, within the debate that's brought forward by our own 13 Conservative Party MPs, Mr. Speaker.

In my part of the country now . . . I represent part of northwest Saskatchewan that I share with a number of members opposite, Mr. Speaker. In my part of the country, Mr. Speaker, people are starting to refer in coffee row to our members of parliament as our 13 useless MPs, Mr. Speaker.

And the worst part about this, Mr. Speaker, the very worst part about this is that our own Member of Parliament, Mr. Gerry Ritz, the Agriculture minister, has not only failed to understand the needs of his own constituency, Mr. Speaker, but he has also retaliated against actions taken by the province, as if the work that we do here in this Assembly — whether it's by government or opposition combined, Mr. Speaker — is not in tune with what he's hearing on the doorstep.

In fact while the Saskatchewan government has put 40 of \$100 needed in the livestock sector on the table, Mr. Speaker, and the expectation is that Mr. Ritz, who understands this problem as well, the fact that Mr. Ritz is called upon to put on \$60 of that \$100 need, Mr. Speaker . . . We've now got Mr. Ritz calling what the province has done a scheme. Just a scheme, Mr. Speaker. Well it's not a scheme; it recognizes some of the needs in the livestock sector. But there's so much more, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government has responsibility for.

And if the work of the provincial government were as closely tied as they say it is, Mr. Speaker, then of course the federal government would be there, as they are in the auto sector, Mr. Speaker, to top up the work that's going on here in the province. And Mr. Ritz, our MP — my MP, Mr. Speaker — and Saskatchewan's Agriculture minister should be working with his constituents and those who represent the stakeholders within his constituencies, Mr. Speaker.

Now I'm not the only one in this House that has the ability at election time, Mr. Speaker, to vote for our Agriculture minister. In fact, Mr. Speaker, that federal constituency of The Battlefords-Lloydminster touches on the MLA from Lloydminster. It touches on the MLA from Biggar. It touches on the MLA from Cut Knife-Turtleford. It touches on the MLA from Rosthern-Shellbrook who spoke in this debate. And, Mr. Speaker, it touches on the constituency of Meadow Lake. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I think that our Agriculture minister actually lives in the constituency of Meadow Lake and probably voted for the member from Meadow Lake.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with all of these people who have the ability to influence not only a Saskatchewan MP who's the Minister of

Agriculture, but in fact their own MP, Mr. Speaker, surely to goodness we should be able to understand that not only do they speak to him as a representative of the province of Saskatchewan, but they've actually phoned him and talked to him as their own MP, Mr. Speaker. And I'd be interested to know what the results of those conversations have been, Mr. Speaker.

The member from Biggar says Mr. Ritz was in Biggar just a week ago, Mr. Speaker. And did the member from Biggar attend that meeting with his constituents? Did the member from Biggar actually ask the MP for the area representing livestock producers to step up and put the 60 bucks on the table that his Minister of Agriculture, that he praises, has spoken so highly about . . . The need exists.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the livestock producers in this province and, Mr. Speaker, forestry workers in forest communities also in our northwest constituencies, Mr. Speaker, have also communicated that that need for those individuals and our people has not been recognized or represented. Our arguments from the province of Saskatchewan — and more importantly from those closest to the Conservative MPs, Mr. Speaker — that argument doesn't seem to be getting through. If Mr. Ritz and the other 12 MPs in Saskatchewan don't speak to their constituents and don't understand the needs here, then it's incumbent upon those others who are elected within our communities, including MLAs opposite, to speak to him, Mr. Speaker, to speak to them and ensure that they understand the needs of this province.

The essence of this motion, Mr. Speaker, is number one, on behalf of our constituents, to recognize that the federal government has failed us and there's no doubt about it. That's universal across the province. Even the Premier gave the budget, and the response to our needs, a D grade, Mr. Speaker.

And on top of that, Mr. Speaker, the motion from our constituencies, from our constituents, says to the Government of Saskatchewan, if you say you're close to these guys in Ottawa, that you can influence them with a good, quiet, peaceful argument, then by golly just go out and do it — do it — and show us by your actions and by the results of those actions, Mr. Speaker, that in fact you are able to carry the day with a good argument. And, Mr. Speaker, let's see a response, not only from our Minister of Agriculture who indeed has failed us but, Mr. Speaker, by all Saskatchewan Conservative Party MPs, Mr. Speaker, who rather would tell us what we need and what we think than actually respond to what we say is our need.

And, Mr. Speaker, I haven't had a chance to specifically talk about the equalization and the way our MPs talk to us about what we should want and what we should need and what we should get out of equalization. Mr. Speaker, we've communicated that message unanimously from this legislature. They in fact have responded to us by saying no, no, no, we might have promised it, but no, no, no, we're not going to address the needs of resource revenues in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, this is a motion I think that all members of this legislature can support, and I'm certainly supporting the motion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Carrot River Valley.

Mr. Bradshaw: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad to rise in the House today to speak against this motion. You know, we can be a little confrontational in our House, but this has gotten to the point of being too confrontational.

I have quite a few things . . . And we've had some good things. We've had some good things come from the federal government. And like, I mean let's face it. They can't do everything the same as what we can't do everything, even though we do a far better job than the members opposite.

I wanted to talk a little bit about the forestry end of it. As most of you people know, coming from the greatest constituency in Saskatchewan, the Carrot River Valley, we actually have the forest industry up there, in both Hudson Bay and Carrot River. And I was very happy to see the federal government step up to the plate with the Community Development Trust Fund, and especially me being from Carrot River. You know, that put in \$1.16 million into the Carrot River's economy, of which they plan on building a road for the peat moss, to continue to keep our peat moss industry going. Even though we have our forest industry down right now at the present time, our peat moss plant will continue to run. This initiative was handled by, also taken from the federal government and was given to our Enterprise and Innovation who worked very hard with the communities in our area to get this through.

Hudson Bay was another one that happens to be in the Carrot River Valley constituency. Hudson Bay is receiving \$3.26 million out of this fund. They're going to use that for an improved water supply for a proposed ethanol plant there. They're also going to use some of that money to rebuild a warehouse there that they desperately need. And this warehouse, this is looking for the future of the forestry industry. We know that the forestry industry is suffering at the present time. But it's a worldwide problem; it's not just a Saskatchewan problem.

And I would like to remind our members opposite that there were six mills closed down back when they were in power, and I don't think that they did a heck of a lot and didn't really get any money out of the federal government to help them at that time. The only thing they did do, mind you, on the forest end of it is just before the last election they came up and said that they were willing to give \$100 million to Domtar without even letting the mayor of Prince Albert know until it was just about to happen. I think he was down in the States somewhere. They didn't let Domtar know; they had to fly their person in. You know, that was just . . . All that was was political ploy. And it would have cost the province \$100 million — \$100 million that we wouldn't have been able to spend on the infrastructure, on the roads, the hospitals, the schools, that we are now doing and carrying forward, due to 16 years of neglect of infrastructure, I might say.

There are quite a few things on this, like . . . And here's the other thing. When you go out and you take that they had in . . . The government of the day just about fell due to a coalition, due

to a coalition. What did their great leader, what did their great leader, the NDP leader, Jack Layton, come up with? They were going to do, they were going to do a cap and trade; that was their whole idea. They were going to do a cap and trade. It was going to break this province. It was physically going to break this province. We would not be able to move forward, doing all the good things in this province that we are doing at the present time.

You know, they sit there and they condemn us. They condemn us for all these things and saying, well you know we won't vote for this, so we're back. They wouldn't even vote for our historically great income tax cuts. You know, give us a break. Give us a break here. We're working hard. We're working hard with the federal government. It's much easier to talk and be . . . Try and get along, try and get along with the federal government rather than sit there and criticize, criticize, criticize all the time.

Am I happy we're not getting as much as we want from the federal government? Absolutely not. Is this party happy we're not getting everything from the federal government that we want? Absolutely not. But I can tell you we're getting a heck of a lot more out of the federal government than that side ever did in 16 years. We are getting . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . You know, you just, okay, you just said name it. Let's go back.

We just had a historic announcement the other day on twinning of Highway 11 — \$62 million which is going to speed that up, which when we do get our forest industry back and rolling is going to help, is going to help because we're going to be able to have some of our transportation problems fixed up because of 16 years of neglect. Circle Drive South — \$86 million. These things are helping. These things are helping.

[12:00]

We have this . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . That's right. We have the Building Canada fund which is partnering with us; at least we're going to pick up our share of it. We're going to pick up \$31 million, along with the feds, on \$31 million on our Building Canada fund which is going to communities, going to communities of 100,000 or less. This is great.

Now think back, if you want to think back, to what was proposed by the other side here just a matter of a couple of years ago. They came out with a fund that basically none of the smaller communities could even apply for because you had to have a \$100,000 project just to be able to apply for any money from the government.

We and the federal governments have to try and work together. We have to try and work together and move forward. I just find it amazing . . . The other thing is we brought out our five-year rolling plan, our five-year rolling plan which is going in to our highway infrastructure. It's going to increase. It's going to increase our transportation 65 per cent more for a category 1 highway, I guess you would call it, which will help for the transportation within this province to move this province forward.

I do not think that the other side can sit there and say, well you have to condemn them. It doesn't fit. It just doesn't fit.

Crop insurance. Crop insurance, I think the federal government has been quite accommodating on our crop insurance. Remember that our Ag minister has said we actually, as a party, will now go and fund our share of the . . . [inaudible] . . . program — something that the other side went before and said they would fund it, and then when it got around to it, just flat out didn't do it.

We're going to be moving. We've made an agreement with the government to be able to move our ag stability back into Saskatchewan. So we have it back here which Saskatchewan farmers, could deal with Saskatchewan . . .

The Speaker: — Time has run out for debate on the motion before the Assembly. It's now, we now have time, a 10-minute question-answer period. I recognize the member from The Battlefords.

Mr. Taylor: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to ask a question in this debate. The member from Biggar made reference in his speech earlier this afternoon to a meeting that took place in the town of Biggar. Mr. Speaker, our federal Agriculture minister was in Biggar. The news media subsequently said that Mr. Ritz recognized that some people in the audience there in Biggar wanted a cheque in the mail, but others were concerned about the countervail.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the member from Biggar if he attended that meeting; if he is in agreement with some of his constituents that Mr. Ritz has indicated, believed, that the provincial program might be countervailable and certainly that a federal one would be. Does the member from Biggar agree with those statements? And finally, has the member from Biggar, Mr. Speaker, talked directly to the federal Agriculture minister with regards to this, and has he indicated that the people of Saskatchewan want — want, Mr. Speaker — \$60 a head from the federal government?

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Biggar.

Mr. Weekes: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad to rise and answer that question from the member opposite. Well the member opposite should realize that I was in the House that day so no, I did not attend the meeting in Biggar. But I am very glad that the federal Minister of Agriculture was in Biggar asking the agriculture producers of Saskatchewan their opinion on the livestock crisis that's in the province.

The obvious point of disagreement between the Saskatchewan government and the federal government — we believe the federal government should ante up their 60 per cent. We put in our 40 per cent on the livestock assistance program, and we are asking the federal government to do that.

I did not speak to the Minister of Agriculture directly. But I've certainly spoken to my MP, and I have relayed that information to her on a number of occasions. And I understand that the people from Biggar that attended the meeting asked the minister for the federal government to contribute their 60 per cent . . .

The Speaker: — Member's time has elapsed. Next question. I recognize the Minister of Agriculture.

Hon. Mr. Bjornerud: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, part of the motion that we're debating today talks about failing miserably to obtain fair treatment for the people of Saskatchewan, and that's something that the NDP in opposition should know very well because they had 16 years of failing miserably.

I just want to give a little bit of their track record in my question, Mr. Speaker. The NDP eliminated the GRIP program for farmers in this province. That was part of their record. They wouldn't fully fund the CAIS programs upfront. From 2001 to 2006, the crop insurance premiums, the premiums went up and the coverage went down. That's their track record. They also cut spot loss hail from crop insurance, closed 22 rural extension offices, closed 31 rural offices across the province, closed many hospitals, school closures, crumbling highways. Their saviour was going to be SPUDCO [Saskatchewan Potato Utility Development Company]. They invested \$30 million into SPUDCO. And guess what? Along with a bunch of other ventures and millions of dollars, lost that, and potato producers across the province.

Mr. Speaker, in my question to the member for The Battlefords: what makes producers in this province believe that the NDP government would have put \$90 million into a cattle and hog loan in the first year of being in . . .

The Speaker: — The member's time has elapsed. I recognize the member from The Battlefords.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I know that the member opposite had a question in there somewhere. He was trying to get to it, and I realize that, with the time expired. But, Mr. Speaker, with the little amount of time that I have, Mr. Speaker, number one, let's set the record straight. Every year in CAIS was fully funded by the New Democratic Party government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — Simple record, Mr. Speaker, you can go into Public Accounts and check it. Every year was fully funded. Mr. Speaker, but let's quote the *Leader-Post* from July 2008:

Simply put, [and it's a quote, Mr. Speaker] Wall and his government have allowed themselves to be bullied by Harper.

. . . And Wall's determination to keep big brother happy instead of looking out for Saskatchewan people's interests is deplorable on several counts.

Regina *Leader-Post*, July 2008.

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Saskatoon Centre.

Mr. Forbes: — . . . *Leader-Post* article from July 23, 2008, "11 MLAs linked to [the] Tories." The tight connection . . . And this is a quote: "The tight connection between the Saskatchewan Party and the federal Conservatives is illustrated by documents

filed with the legislative assembly.” He talks about five cabinet ministers who are card-carrying members who are Tories. They are six, and I’ll quote this statement: “Backbench MLAs who are Conservative Party members are Michael Chisholm, Greg Ottenbreit, Jim Reiter, Laura Ross, Randy Weekes and Jeremy Harrison.”

Mr. Speaker, I want to know if the member from Biggar will stand in solidarity with the Premier who condemned the federal budget by giving it a D. Will he today make a commitment to rip up his federal Conservative membership card? Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Biggar.

Mr. Weekes: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for the question. Well certainly, my decision to be a member of a federal political party is my personal decision and the Premier has made it clear that’s up to us as individuals. And I am proud to be a member of the federal Conservative Party. I certainly have no problem with that.

As far as the federal budget, the Premier was clear that he graded the federal budget as a D. But after consultation and discussion, our Premier and our cabinet has worked with the federal government to clarify a number of the things that were in the budget. And as we mentioned in our speeches here in the 75-minute debate, we have got a lot more flesh out of the budget and information and money coming to the province, and we’re becoming more and more happy with the budget.

But obviously we have one glaring problem with the federal Conservative government, is their lack of commitment to the . . .

The Speaker: — The member’s time has elapsed. Next question. I recognize the Minister of Agriculture.

Hon. Mr. Bjornerud: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, my question’s for the member for Regina Lakeview. And I just wonder. I would compare our record any day of the week in the one year that we’ve been in power, 15 months, compared to the 16 years.

The budget for Agriculture when they left office was \$300 million. In 2008 it’s up to 444 million and climbing, Mr. Speaker — \$71 million cattle and hog support program, improving crop insurance, AgriStability administration to Saskatchewan, expanding extension services, increasing education tax rebate.

Mr. Speaker, why would the member opposite believe that after 16 years of neglect for rural Saskatchewan and cattle and hog producers in the province, that they would come anywhere close from doing a \$90 million loan and then on top of that put in \$71 million for the cattle and hog industry and support for rural Saskatchewan and for rural producers?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Lakeview.

Mr. Nilson: — Mr. Speaker, some of us members around this House have been here a long time but we’ve also been a long time within the business community of Saskatchewan. And I think the member opposite would acknowledge that his whole, big plan that he announced for the cattle industry is basically a direct copy of the beef industry assistance plan put forward by Mr. Blakeney and the NDP government in 1977, because it was exactly the same kind of loans. You even look at the documents; I’m sure that’s where they are.

So, Mr. Speaker, the real question in this House is: what kind of support does this government provide to the people of Saskatchewan in making sure that we as Saskatchewan people get a fair deal?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from The Battlefords.

Mr. Taylor: — Thank you, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the member from Rosthern-Shellbrook, who spoke shortly a few minutes ago, Mr. Speaker. The member from Rosthern-Shellbrook said very clearly that when he goes home, he gets lots of phone calls. He says, and I quote, I’m the first to hear about the trouble in agriculture.

Well, Mr. Speaker, Kevin Hursh writing in the *Leader-Post* also says what’s been happening out there is “. . . not what cattle producers have been saying.” When the federal government says that the livestock producers can count on them for their support, they’re not getting it from Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, the farm groups have indicated they need \$100 per head. The province has put up \$40 per head, Mr. Speaker. What is the member from Rosthern-Shellbrook telling his constituents when they say, where’s the rest of the money coming from?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Rosthern-Shellbrook.

Mr. Allchurch: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, thanks for the question. I believe that I said, when I go home the people phone me. Well that’s what they’re supposed to do. I’m their MLA. I’m with the government. So my job is to take their concerns and I bring it to our government, which happened to be the Ag minister.

But in your comments regarding Kevin Hursh, this is what Kevin Hursh has to say in an agricultural commentary, and I quote:

Hooray for the Saskatchewan’s government’s support for the livestock industry. The province has decided to go ahead even though the feds have refused to cost share.

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Biggar.

Mr. Weekes: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Leader of the Opposition.

The Speaker: — Time has elapsed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

Motion No. 1 — Saskatchewan's Uranium Industry

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Harrison.]

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Wood River.

Mr. Huyghebaert: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm very pleased today to rise and continue with the debate on the motion put forward by my colleague.

On December 4, Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to present some opening remarks on this very topical subject, and I would like to today continue with my remarks. And in order to do that, I would like to refresh the memories of people by reading the motion into the record again. And the motion reads:

That the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan supports the consideration of further value-added development of Saskatchewan's uranium industry including nuclear power generation and recognizes the potential benefits to the growth and prosperity of the people of our province.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure everyone in this Assembly that I am very, very supportive of this motion. We do realize and our government supports adding value to our raw uranium resources here in Saskatchewan will support the long-term prosperity of our province and our people.

Mr. Speaker, the federal government in its last year's budget had reported . . . or there's language in it that signalled that there was a desire to pursue the next generation of Canadian reactor technology. And we, on this side of the House, believe that we should be at the forefront of that technology, leading the way. We have companies here in the province — uranium companies, such as AREVA and Cameco — who have by way of experience and hands-on involvement in the value chain in other jurisdictions where they operate. So why would we not go ahead and have the value added in this province also?

[12:15]

We have this natural advantage for us, and we should be leading in this regard. It's obviously our vision, as a government, that we would look at the value chain in refining and enrichment and potentially the power side of the nuclear industry. Since Canada is the world's largest producer of natural uranium and the world moves to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, many countries, including Canadians, are looking to nuclear power as a source of clean, reliable electricity. And our government wants to develop nuclear power to help grow the Saskatchewan economy and help with the GHGs or greenhouse gas emissions.

Also, and I will expand on this a little further, but nuclear power will generate billions of dollars in economic activity in this province, and I will go further on that. The development of

nuclear power would contribute to the economic competitiveness of our province. The new nuclear revival around the world will see increased employment in the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of nuclear reactors, as well as uranium mining, processing, reprocessing, and enrichment. The only way that Saskatchewan would be able to participate is if we became part of the nuclear industry.

Mr. Speaker, if we do not have a presence in the nuclear industry, we'll be left outside looking in. All we have to do is look at what happened in the past. We have countries now that are promoting nuclear enhancement — the US, Russia, China, France, India. Other countries are developing new technologies and new reactor technology. And once again, if we do not get to the forefront of this, Saskatchewan, like when the NDP were in power, will be left behind. We will not and cannot accept that.

While we're looking forward, we see people across the way that are stuck in the past and looking to the past. And I would just like to emphasize some of this with some quotes. And these are not my words. They actually come from members opposite. And I would like to put them to the record, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And here is one from March 22, 1990. And this is how far back the dialogue on the nuclear industry has gone — back into the '80s when members opposite actually marched against a plant being put forward in Saskatchewan for the processing of uranium.

And the march on the plant, the Leader of the Opposition was a member of that who was totally, totally opposed to any enrichment, enhancement of the uranium product in the province of Saskatchewan. In other words, what you have to look at is the mentality of the NDP socialist government that they say, we can mine it, but then we won't look at doing anything more. We can sell this product and get it out of our hair. We'll let somebody else reap the profits of processing, reap the proceeds of all of the other processing items. And also that chased our technology away from the province.

But I'd like to put some quotes on the record. And this is from Peter Prebble: "The Government of Saskatchewan should phase out uranium mining in the province . . ."

And I'd like to put that into context, and I will really get at some figures here, Mr. Deputy Speaker. But they wanted to phase out uranium mining in the province. Look at what this industry brings into this province, the billions of dollars it brings in, and the potential that it could have brought in had've we had a then government that was a little bit forward-looking and not ideologically bound against the nuclear industry.

Peter Prebble also stated, ". . . as long as I am in this legislature, I will continue to oppose that practice [of uranium mining] . . ." That must be fun sitting in that caucus with people that are just totally opposed to it. And I'll get further on this because there are one or two maybe that go along with the concept.

And Peter Prebble also said:

We don't need a nuclear reactor in the province . . .

. . . uranium mining in the province of Saskatchewan should be phased out until such time as there are proper

international safeguards in place to prevent uranium being diverted for military purposes.

The narrow-minded mentality of some of the people thinking that uranium mining was only for military purpose is such a small, small mind that it should be embarrassing for members opposite that one of their members would even stand up and say that.

Now we fast-forward a few years, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and this is very important because I have two quotes here from the now Leader of the Opposition, and they're two quotes. And if you listen very carefully and see that there's not even a subtle difference, there's a huge difference in these quotes. And I would like members to take note of the dates on these also. The first one is from the *Leader-Post* of November 2, 2005, November 2. And as reported:

Calvert said the province would consider any business case to establish a reactor or nuclear waste storage facility in the province . . .

[Further] . . . as a province that mines and benefits economically from uranium, it is our responsibility "as citizens of the globe" to share in the burden of dealing with all the byproducts of its use.

Now I would like that to be registered in individuals' minds because that was as of November 2. Now on November 3 the same year, 24 hours later, in the *Leader-Post*, and this is what the Leader of the Opposition said:

"Let me say today . . . [definitely], the answer is no. Under my leadership in this province there will not be in Saskatchewan a nuclear waste disposal facility" . . .

"They could come, I would consider it and I would say no" . . .

Now just to refresh your memory, we'll go back the previous 24 hours where the leader said ". . . any business case to establish a reactor or nuclear waste storage facility in the province . . ." he would consider. Does that remind anybody of things you wear on your feet called flip-flops? And I don't know how many members on the other side are on the fence on this issue. They'll flip on one side and they'll flop on the other. I don't know if they, even as a caucus, have any idea where they are going on this very, very important item.

Now we go a day later where I'll repeat what he said a day later: the answer is no, that he would not consider it. I don't know how one can shave in the morning after actually saying the opposite things day after day.

Now we have other members of the caucus at that time, and this is a quote from Eric Cline: "If you benefit from the mining of uranium or the use of uranium in your nuclear reactors — you can't then wash your hands of all the other issues." So in other words, one member of caucus was very much in favour of all of the cycle of uranium.

Now we fast-forward to October 2005 with one of the leadership hopefuls, Mr. Lingenfelter, and he said — members

should like this across the way — "If Tommy . . . were here, it would be exactly what he would be doing' . . ." I wonder how many over there agree that Tommy would be actually doing that.

He also stated:

"The opportunity is big. The only question is can we reach out and grab it?" . . . "It's got to do with what's best for the economy and the environment at this moment" . . .

So here we have, here we have what I would consider, on that side of the House, a House divided. We have one member of caucus saying, absolutely no, and another former member of caucus, a former deputy premier that's saying, we have to go this way. It's the only way that we can go in the province to help our economic situation.

Now I would like to continue with a few quotes because I think this is necessary to establish the flip-flop position of the members opposite. And this is from the Leader of the Opposition in 2003, and he quoted a little quote:

"The notion that you could build a reactor that's economic is a very, very questionable assumption. And this isn't a clean source of power. It's probably the dirtiest, given what comes out the tailpipe . . ."

Here we have the then premier, now the Leader of the Opposition, saying nuclear power is the dirtiest form of energy. The dirtiest form of energy. I wonder if his eyes are opened yet to reality. And I do have some reality checks that I would like to read in later.

This is a quote from 2005, and I quote, "In the '80s the NDP platform called for the phase out of uranium mining." Well I mentioned that, but that's an NDP platform to phase out uranium mining. How can we look at growing the province and expanding our natural resources base when we have people in government that want to phase out mining? That's almost as bad as them saying now that we should phase out oil because somebody in the United States is saying we've got dirty oil. I wonder if they should say we should phase out oil exploration.

And, Mr. Speaker, here's another quote from *The StarPhoenix*, and it says that "We all agree that the demand for uranium is increasing as fossil fuels run out and that there may be greater economic opportunities in the future' . . ." And this is from the Leader of the Opposition. Again I think, I think for individuals to understand where the NDP government is coming from — and this is their leader that's saying these things — he's all over the map. I don't believe we have a map big enough to record where he is on this issue. He's all over the place, from no to yes to maybe to we'll see. Or tomorrow I'll decide different. Or yesterday I said that. But although you understand what I said, what I said is not what I meant in the first place. Who knows where they're at.

There's one here that I'd really like to talk about also, and this is from 2004. And it's a quote from *The StarPhoenix*. And I'll quote:

Asked recently about the notion of building a nuclear

reactor in northern Saskatchewan to power Alberta's oil sands development, Premier Lorne Calvert called it a "horrendous" proposal.

Now that might go unnoticed to a few. But you have to really look up what horrendous means. And horrendous in the dictionary says it's horrifying. So here we have the then premier of the province saying that a nuclear reactor would be horrifying.

Does this remind members on our side a little bit about the fear? The fear that is perpetuated by the NDP. Whether it's an election or no matter what, they want to get their agenda forward or try to get their agenda forward, is through fear? Not through common sense. Not through practical means. It's through fear and fear alone. And here we have the then premier using the word horrendous which is horrifying. So it's a horrifying notion to want to build a nuclear reactor.

Now again you have to kind of follow me on this map that's all over the place, and I can't pinpoint where he is on the whole nuclear file. But I do know where he was around June 27, 2006, and I'll quote: "Premier Lorne Calvert is in France to promote greater Saskatchewan development of the uranium industry . . ."

Well this horrifying, this horrifying industry we're now trying to promote. So one day again, is it a little bit of a flip or a little bit of a flop? We're not sure. But one day, one day it's horrifying, and the next day he's in France trying to promote the development of the uranium industry in this province.

And this is from *The StarPhoenix*. And I should read it because I thought it was kind of cute. And I quote. It says:

Calvert should be lauded for his European vacation. After decades of destructive fence-sitting — allowing primary nuclear development but acting as if the product is morally tainted when it comes to milling, refining, using it to make energy and ultimately disposing of its waste back from where it came — the NDP government seems to finally be recognizing that Saskatchewan has a role to play in cleaning up energy production.

[12:30]

Now that is a quote from *The StarPhoenix*, but there's an awful lot of tidbits in there that relate back to, I wonder where the caucus sits on these issues. Because here you've got a look at a premier that's over in France trying to sell and promote greater Saskatchewan development in the uranium industry, but here is the party that is saying that it's morally tainted, morally tainted when it comes to the milling, refining, using it to make energy. So where do people actually sit on the issue? We do not know where the NDP caucus sits on that issue.

Now there's some of these that I think are very much worth repeating. One moment we have considering a nuclear waste facility, the next day not doing it, saying absolutely no. So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we even had the leader, the potential leader, the outsourced candidate for the NDP, that even congratulated one of our members for stepping up and making positive statements about the industry.

And the outsourced potential leader of the NDP is very strong, committed to the nuclear industry, and I would like to know where the other potential leadership hopefuls stand on the issue. We know where the current Leader of the Opposition stands — that's all over the map. There's no doubt about it. He's all over the map. We know where Mr. Lingenfelter is on this very, very important topic. He's very pro-nuclear enhancement industries in this province.

We don't know where two of the other members sit. But there is one, one of the leadership candidates from Saskatoon, and I'm going to come back with this one because this is very, very important, not only for the nuclear industry, but for other aspects of NDP policy within the province of Saskatchewan.

And this is from the website of the NDP leadership hopeful from Saskatoon. On his website, his policy principles say, "Policy has no sacred cows." I think that's something that we all should think about. Here's an NDP leadership hopeful that has no sacred cows. So to the nuclear industry, he's in favour of every aspect of the nuclear industry. You can read into it that he is fair with all of that. Although very, very leftist, he still thinks — obviously because there's no sacred cows — that this industry could go forward.

But here's the other one I'd really like to address, and I can do it at this moment. There are no sacred cows, Mr. Deputy Speaker, therefore he wants to privatize SaskTel. He wants to privatize SaskPower. He wants to privatize SaskEnergy. He wants to privatize STC [Saskatchewan Transportation Company]. So there are no sacred cows. So now we have a leader — potential — of the NDP that wants to privatize all the Crown corporations because he says right on his website that there are no sacred cows. So he is willing, he is willing to take his leadership hopeful to the membership of the socialist organization and say, I wish to privatize all of the Crowns.

I wonder if that'll fly in the face of some of the members opposite. I would suggest . . . no, maybe they'll be behind him. I'm not too sure, but maybe they'll be behind him.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have a number of more quotes here, but here's one I suppose I should put on record. It's another Lingenfelter quote and this is from 2005, and I quote and it says, "Former NDP deputy premier Dwain Lingenfelter not only champions building nuclear power plants in Saskatchewan, but also embraces locating a nuclear waste facility in the province — two ideas his former colleagues have refused to entertain [refused to entertain]."

Well that's depending if it was on November 2 or November 3. Well on the second, I think, some would have entertained it. On November 3, no way we'll entertain it, absolutely not. So I think one could determine from this that, on this issue, they could be considered a house divided. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to get into a few more reasons why an enhancement of the nuclear industry in this province is very, very important. And why there's reasons why the NDP are against it.

You know, it's kind of ironic. It's kind of ironic. We have . . . and there was discussion about a federal issue here in our debate earlier, but here we have an NDP caucus that is beholden

to their federal leader. And they are so beholden to him that they back him hook, line, and sinker. And here we have a debate on the nuclear industry in this province that is extremely, extremely important for this province. And we have, as I mentioned, a house divided over there. Well maybe yes; well maybe no; well I don't know; I'll sit on the fence — who knows where they sit.

But they weren't divided, they were not divided when they were willing to have open discussions with their leader in Ottawa, having open discussions to find ways to divide this country. All we have to do is go back to what happened last fall. They were supportive where we had the leader of the NDP and the leader of the separatists — the Jack and Gilles show — that was going to combine with the Liberals to form a coalition government. So here we have members opposite that they're supporting their federal leader that wanted to divide the country.

They wanted to break up the country. And they supported it. They supported it through their membership and ideology that, oh yes, we got to support Jack. And so they're in favour of splitting up the country, but they're not in favour of having an open debate on the nuclear industry in this province. Well they might have a debate. Some would be maybe yes; some would be maybe no; some would be I'll think about it. Some would sit on the fence until they see how one of their seatmates went, and then they'd fall in that direction possibly. Who knows.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to talk about a few reasons why we should develop nuclear power in Saskatchewan. And there are many. And I think people on this side of the House know why we should develop the nuclear cycle and have nuclear power in this province.

It's amazing, isn't it? We had out-migration in this province for years under a socialist government. People wanted to migrate away. And we'll get excuses from the other side of the House. We'll hear things like the economy.

Well, who created that atmosphere? And they'll blame somebody from the '80s or the '20s or back in the start of . . . Maybe it was Palliser that they wanted to blame because he is the one that said nobody should live here in the first place. They'll find . . . They're living in the past. They'll blame somebody from the past.

But we, but we want to look forward. We want to look forward. So now we can. We can look at . . . While they were chasing jobs away, today we're bringing people back because of what we believe in, and having a business-friendly province.

But how about if we have the nuclear industry up and running in this province like it should have been back when members opposite were campaigning solidly against any enhancement of the nuclear industry? What would have happened then if we would have had an expanded nuclear industry 20 or 15 or how many years ago?

It doesn't matter. Today, today we know that if we expand the nuclear industry, it can create thousands, thousands of new jobs and high paying jobs in this province. And I'm going to repeat, thousands of jobs.

Now you have to put it into context of what we lived with for 16 years. Chasing people out of the province; why would anybody want to do that? Why would anybody develop policies that people would actually leave our great province? Well you know that's a very, very interesting thought, is why they would do it.

Well they kept their base, and as mentioned by one of their members back then, the more people leave the province, the more is left for the rest of us here. And that was Eldon Lautermilch that said that, and I don't buy that. They can sit and they can . . . Maybe they believe that quote, but ladies and gentlemen, I do not believe that if people leave this province, there is more left for the rest of us that are here. That is absurd. That is totally absurd. And that fits right with the statement made by the then premier, now the Leader of the Opposition: we are a wee province. We will always be a wee province.

How do you attract business into this province? How do you expand a nuclear industry in this province with a mentality such as that? That we are a wee province; we will never be anything but a wee province; there's more left for the rest of us if everybody leaves. How do you attract businesses? Well there's another way that it was difficult to attract business also, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If you have a Bill on the legislative books that says the government of the day can take over any industry in this province à la what was used in the potash industry takeover back in the . . . What was that, what was the Premier's name in those days? Anyway it was a Premier back in . . . Not that many people care, I guess.

An Hon. Member: — Allan something.

Mr. Huyghebaert: — Allan, whatever it was, he brought this Bill in to take over the potash industry. And that was still on the books until we formed government. So if you're doing due diligence in your business, and you look at the Saskatchewan website and look at what the climate is in Saskatchewan, and you see that the government can take over any business due to this Bill, you'd probably have second thoughts of wanting to invest in this province. That probably fit right into the socialist ideology, but it sure doesn't fit in with our ideology whatsoever.

But then, then again if you had a business, whether it be in the nuclear business or not, that did a little bit further due diligence, and you called up the NDP website, and one of the first things on there was the *Regina Manifesto*, would you really, really want to come into this province and start a business when basically in the *Regina Manifesto* says that they're — to paraphrase — they're anti-business. They will not rest until free enterprise in this province is done with. And if you're doing due diligence and you see that, why on earth would any, any company — I don't care what company it is — want to come to this province? And yet they sit and say well, it was the economic times of the day. We lost people.

Well it was pretty obvious to me and those of us on this side of the House that if you have that kind of a policy, how are you going to attract business? And we know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that — what is it? — 60 to 70 per cent of all jobs are created by small business. But even if you had a small business, would you want to set up here with that kind of a mentality from the then

government? I would think not.

Now to the nuclear industry, just how the jobs can be created, it's estimated that to properly operate a reactor, it will create 150 highly trained nuclear engineers, scientists, and physicists. So these aren't just small jobs, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They're very, very high-paying jobs. They'd require a minimum of a university degree in the nuclear field, in some cases a post-graduate degree. And further there'd be requirements for 720 reactor operators, mechanical and electrical maintenance workers, chemists and chemical technicians, physics and radiation technicians, and other managers. Many of these positions require a couple or three years of specialized training, and so they would be very high-paying jobs also.

[12:45]

This, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would generate billions of dollars — billions of dollars in this province. That would definitely broaden our tax base which would allow us to do the things that we have already started to do in this province — allow us to keep our taxes low and pay for other initiatives that we have brought forward.

And I think it's probably appropriate right now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to talk of some of those initiatives. You have to again realize with all of this money that could be generated from the nuclear industry, what would we do with this money? Well I could suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we might reinstate the Saskatchewan mineral exploration tax credit to encourage ongoing sustainable development of Saskatchewan's mineral resources. Would we do that? Oh no.

By the way, we did that. In the 2008-2009 budget, we reinstated the 10 per cent Saskatchewan mineral exploration tax credit. So if we had the additional money from the nuclear industry, just it opens a myriad of ideas what we could do with the money.

But I'd like to go ahead with a few more. We would ensure that Saskatchewan is a member of North American international energy and economic organizations. We would ensure that. Oh sorry, we already did that. We kept that promise. That was a promise that we made, and that's a promise that we kept. We've joined The Energy Council, the Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission, and PNWER [Pacific NorthWest Economic Region]. Now if we have resources from something like the nuclear industry, allows us to do that. It allows us the extra dollars to do that.

Now I'd like to comment on the membership in The Energy Council just for a moment because again, we think forward; we're not stuck in the past. And I'd like to just comment on what was said prior.

The then minister, Eric Cline, talked about why would we want to join The Energy Council when we can attend for nothing. So, as has been eloquently stated by our leader, now the Premier, he said, here was the NDP wanted to go to The Energy Council and not pay their dues but stand at the back and swipe muffins during the coffee break. And also at The Energy Council, even if there was a representative from the then government at The Energy Council, at coffee break they would have somebody to talk to because Venezuela was a member. They could go talk

their socialist ideas over in the corner with the leader from Venezuela.

So that was a promise that we kept. But with money — and again thinking into the future — money generated from the nuclear industry, what more could we do and what more have we done? And I'd like to again talk about a couple of promises that we have made.

We made the promise that we'd double the green initiatives fund by providing an additional \$40 million over four years. That was a promise kept. The 2008-09 budget commits \$10 million increase for green initiatives. So the point that I'm getting at here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is if we expand our nuclear industry, it provides us with resources and we can go ahead and do a lot more for this province.

In this last year, we have kept over 80 promises that we made during the election campaign — over 80. We were able to do that in one year. Now with an expanded tax base, with an enhancement of the nuclear industry and the billions of dollars that it would create, just think where this province could go. It could be a leader in all aspects of, you name it. And we are very much on this side of the House in favour of that. Members opposite, some of them have their head in the sand yet. That's the old ostrich theory. If you put your head in the sand, you know not what goes around about you.

Now Bruce Power, their feasibility study, it's worth noting, and I'm going to quote you some numbers here in the next few minutes.

The construction and 60 year operation of a nuclear facility in Saskatchewan would have a significant and stabilizing impact on the province's economy for decades to come.

A 60-year operation.

Bruce Power has conducted an assessment to determine economic impacts . . . [in the province of] Saskatchewan of a two unit nuclear plant build assuming operation in 2018.

Now the construction impact.

During site preparation and construction the project would contribute about \$4 billion to the provincial economy including \$1.4 billion in labour income.

Now how could we even have members opposite think anything against this 1.4 billion in labour income? Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you have to ask yourself, would the member from Cumberland vote against this for enhancement of the nuclear industry? Look at the jobs that that can create in the North; the opportunities to be created in the North. Would the member from Cumberland vote against this? How about the member from Athabasca?

Look at the hundreds and maybe thousands of jobs that could be created in the North. You think the member from Athabasca could stand in his place and justify voting against enhancement of the nuclear industry in this province? The billions of dollars,

and yet you look around the caucus there, and how many of those people will vote against it? How can they possibly in their own conscience vote against it? And I would ask the member from Cumberland and the member from Athabasca who represent the North, can they in good conscience vote against something like this that would add thousands of jobs to the North? It would add millions and millions of dollars to the economy of the North.

And while I'm on that topic, I would just like to tell a little bit of insight when I was up at the nuclear mine and visiting the mine. After a tour of the mine we stopped and had coffee. And the person that was touring us around the mine, I'd made a comment about the goodies or the snacks that they had and he said, oh he said, this is a company that we have. And I said, really — and this should be very important for the member from Cumberland and from Athabasca — I said boy, it was very, very good snacks that they had put forward. And he said yes, it's a company.

He said, these two ladies were working for us and really doing good work. So he said, I approached the two ladies and I said, why do you not form a company and provide all the food service for us at this mine? And their immediate reaction was oh, we don't know that much about business; we don't think we could do that. And they said, well why don't you give it a try? We will give you some assistance.

Now these two ladies have a very, very profitable and prosperous company to provide food services in the North. Can the members opposite stand up and vote against something like that? Can they vote against young entrepreneurs that want to do some good in the North? How can these people even think about getting up and voting against something like that?

Now also, also, the construction impact. The project would generate a total of 20,000 direct and indirect jobs — 20,000 jobs. And I'm wondering, I'm wondering again if anybody on that side would vote against 20,000 jobs in this province.

“During the peak year of construction the project will directly and indirectly contribute approximately 2.2 per cent of provincial GDP and 48 per cent of the GDP in the host region.” Forty-eight per cent in the host region. Very, very attractive to the province of Saskatchewan and extremely attractive to the host region. This project alone could just boost the economy of Saskatchewan like no other project has.

Now I'd like to talk a little bit about the operating impacts, now 20,000 jobs during the period of construction. And the implementation project, about 1,000 full-time jobs and about 900 indirect jobs. So about 1,900 full-time and indirect jobs to the plan. This would contribute about \$240 million to the provincial economy. In fact the construction of a nuclear power station in Saskatchewan would be the largest single infrastructure project ever undertaken in our province.

Now we wonder what kind of revenue that would bring to Saskatchewan, and I've mentioned some of it. But throughout the construction phase of the project, total tax revenues generated would be about \$1.8 billion — 1.8 billion. During the 60 years of operation, the project would contribute over \$10 billion in government revenues — 10 billion.

And you know, what is quite ironic, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about greenhouse gases before my time runs out today. I'm just about finished my introductory remarks now. I'll get into my speech at the next session.

But greenhouse gases, now we've had a former premier say this is the dirtiest form of energy. Well I think even members opposite would disagree with him now. I'm sure that they would say, no, no, the greenhouse gas emissions, this is a clean energy source because greenhouse gas emissions are greatly reduced. Look at what that would do. It would help out our non-renewable resources, spread them out farther, albeit nuclear might be considered a non-renewable resource, but there's a long ways to go on that. And as we know, we only use about 10 per cent of the energy from the rods right now. With technology coming in the future, that could easily be expanded. It is now, but it's not economically viable to use more than the 10 per cent of the rods.

But the greenhouse gas emissions, and here on one hand we talk about we want to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but we close our eyes to nuclear. We close our eyes. They do, not us. And here if you looked at the one-point-some-million tonne per year of GHGs that would be reduced if we had a nuclear generating facility — 1.9 million tonne a year. And yet we will see . . . But how many people over there will vote against it? How many will stand up and vote against the reduction of GHGs because we have a nuclear facility?

As I've already mentioned, the mining. We create an industry in this province, and I have to state, Mr. Speaker, that it's not just us that's looking at expanding the nuclear industry. As I mentioned earlier, other countries are looking at expanding the technology base, but also the incorporation of nuclear reactors. You know, we have countries right now that are looking at nuclear reactors because of pollution. They realize that the nuclear reactor with its no greenhouse or limited greenhouse gas emissions is far better than coal until we get clean coal technology developed. So other counties are going to nuclear. Places like France, it's about 70 per cent of their power is generated nuclear.

So this all adds up that when we produce about 23 per cent or plus of uranium, that if there's more demand in the world, it's going to mean more demand for our resources in Saskatchewan, which is going to mean more jobs for people in the North. Again I look to our members from Cumberland and Athabasca. This is creating jobs in the North. This would create really good-paying jobs in the North for our citizens of the northern part of this province. How could anybody stand up and vote against an enhancement of jobs in the province, in the northern part of the province, Mr. Deputy Speaker? They deserve good jobs, they deserve high-paying jobs.

The Deputy Speaker: — Time of adjournment having been reached, this House now stands adjourned until 1:30 on Monday afternoon.

[The Assembly adjourned at 13:00.]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Elhard	2153
McCall	2153
Ottenbreit	2153
Ross	2153
LeClerc	2154
Eagles	2154

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Yates	2154
Forbes	2154
Taylor	2154
Brotten	2154
Wotherspoon	2155

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

33rd Kinsmen Telemiracle

Ottenbreit	2155
------------------	------

Annual Award to Trade Unionists

Iwanchuk	2155
----------------	------

International Adult Learning Week

LeClerc	2155
---------------	------

Juniper Manor Opening

Forbes	2156
--------------	------

International Women's Day

Ross	2156
------------	------

Donations to Heart of the City Piano Program

Wotherspoon	2156
-------------------	------

Saskatchewan Takes Centre Stage

Duncan	2157
--------------	------

QUESTION PERIOD

Provision of SaskTel Services

Calvert	2157
---------------	------

Krawetz	2157
---------------	------

Trew	2158
------------	------

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Government Investment in Transportation Projects

Elhard	2161
--------------	------

Harper	2162
--------------	------

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SEVENTY-FIVE MINUTE DEBATE

Federal-Provincial Relations

Calvert	2163
---------------	------

Weekes	2165, 2172
--------------	------------

Nilson	2166, 2173
--------------	------------

Allchurch	2168, 2173
-----------------	------------

Taylor	2169, 2172
--------------	------------

Bradshaw	2171
----------------	------

Bjornerud	2172
-----------------	------

Forbes	2172
--------------	------

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

Motion No. 1 — Saskatchewan's Uranium Industry

Huyghebaert	2174
-------------------	------

GOVERNMENT OF SASKATCHEWAN CABINET MINISTERS

Hon. Brad Wall
Premier

Hon. Bob Bjornerud
Minister of Agriculture
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan
Crop Insurance Corporation

Hon. Bill Boyd
Minister of Energy and Resources
Minister Responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs

Hon. Ken Cheveldayoff
Minister of Crown Corporations

Hon. Dan D'Autremont
Minister of Government Services
Minister Responsible for the Saskatchewan Liquor and
Gaming Authority
Minister Responsible for the Information
Technology Office

Hon. June Draude
Minister of First Nations and Métis Relations
Minister Responsible for Northern Affairs

Hon. Wayne Elhard
Minister of Highways and Infrastructure
Minister Responsible for the Public Service Commission
Provincial Secretary

Hon. Rod Gantfoer
Minister of Finance

Hon. Donna Harpauer
Minister of Social Services

Hon. Nancy Heppner
Minister of Environment

Hon. Darryl Hickie
Minister of Corrections, Public Safety and Policing

Hon. Bill Hutchinson
Minister of Municipal Affairs
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan
Gaming Corporation

Hon. Ken Krawetz
Deputy Premier
Minister of Education

Hon. Don McMorris
Minister of Health

Hon. Don Morgan
Minister of Justice
Attorney General

Hon. Rob Norris
Minister of Advanced Education, Employment and Labour
Minister Responsible for Immigration
Minister Responsible for the Workers'
Compensation Board

Hon. Lyle Stewart
Minister of Enterprise and Innovation

Hon. Christine Tell
Minister of Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sport
Minister Responsible for Capital City Commission