

From: [Christine Day](#)
To: [Committees LEG](#)
Subject: Fwd: Oppose privatization
Date: Saturday, June 04, 2016 12:54:56 PM

>

> And here are five good reasons to oppose privatization:

>

> 1. Our province stands to lose out on millions of dollars that could be used to support our public services – hospitals, road, schools, and much more.

>

> We have yet to see the government produce any evidence that the liquor system will not lose out on revenues., The Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives has calculated that privatization will cost Saskatchewan \$115 million in revenue in the first five years alone The government says that privatization will actually be revenue neutral -- but hasn't produced any evidence to back up its claim.

>

> 2. Privatization will cost communities decent, well-paying jobs.

>

> While there may be some new jobs at private stores, there will likely be a net loss of jobs with this move.

>

> In communities of less than 2,000 people (which is 27 of the 39 communities facing privatization), new private retailers will be allowed to sell liquor from an existing business – which can be done by the staff they already have.

>

> Jobs at private stores will almost certainly offer much lower wages and benefits than at publicly-owned stores. Instead of earning a living wage, liquor store workers will spend less in their communities, pay less income tax, and struggle to support their families.

>

> 3. If the government wanted to improve liquor retailing, it already has the authority to do so under the public system.

>

> The promised improvements of better hours, better selection, new locations, and more refrigerated product can all be done under a public liquor system – while keeping government revenues strong. But the government isn't actually interested in fixing the system, just selling it off.

>

> Government has also taken almost every penny in liquor store revenues as a dividend, leaving no money to renovate and expand existing stores, or open new ones.

>

> 4. Prices and selection are likely to worsen in smaller towns.

>

> Outside the big cities, communities would still only have one liquor store under privatization. It's unlikely that these stores, lacking any local competition, would start charging less than what they already know people will pay. Prices are likely to increase, in fact, rather than decrease.

>

> And if liquor retailing is absorbed into existing businesses, how much shelf space will be dedicated to liquor, compared to what a full-line public store offers?

>

> 5. Every single store slated for privatization is a profitable public asset.

>

> Each of the 40 stores facing privatization generates hundreds of thousands of dollars in public revenue each year. Six of the stores reliably bring in more than \$1 million each year.

>

> The private sector wouldn't be interested in buying up unprofitable businesses. This isn't about the government losing money in the liquor retailing system – it's a handover of profitable publicly-owned businesses to private buyers.

>

> This is just a start – there are many more reasons to oppose privatization!

>

> Sent from my iPad

>

> Chris

>