

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**April 12, 1983**

**Evening Session**

**MOTIONS**

**Resolution No. 16 – Saskatchewan Crown Corporations (continued)**

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry, I did not see you enter the Chamber when you did.

I want to address a few comments on the motion moved by the member from Quill Lakes. I was in the process of suggesting to the members opposite that you are letting your philosophical biases and your philosophical hatred of public expenditures come between you and a proper administration of the affairs of this province.

I pointed out to . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . All right, to the member from Rosemont who is apparently having some difficulty hearing, you may be able to get a hearing aid available. What I was suggesting is that your philosophical bias against expenditures in the public sector are coming between you and the proper administration of the affairs of this province. I point out that the prosperity which this province experienced during the '70s which was unprecedented under any administration was largely fuelled, was largely fuelled because of the development of this province's resources and the development of an economic infrastructure, and the basis of that were the crown corporations. The crown corporations played a key role in the development of the resources and the development of the economic infrastructure of this province.

You people have a different approach. You people have the open for business approach. You've been in office one year and you haven't got a single significant success for all that ballyhoo — not a single, significant success. Oh sure, sure, sure . . . tell us about the bakery, the bakery in Watson. . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . the bakery in Watson . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . There isn't a business with more than five employees who has relocated in this province because of the ballyhoo you people subjected this province to in the open for business . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . There is . . . If you believe that, you have my utmost pity because I thought you to be a more intelligent man than that. You absolute believe that, then my heart goes out to you. Because I do not believe . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . I do not distrust the public servants, I do distrust these figures in the hands of members opposite. Because I . . . Given the desperately poor track record you have, you have little option but to jiggle the figures to try and make a better story out of it.

Just . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Just look across the treasury benches, at what you people have done with crown corporations. With the exception of the liquor board, whom the member from Saskatoon Mayfair is promoting with all . . . It's not Saskatoon Mayfair, actually; it's Saskatoon Fairview — he's promoting. The Minister of Consumer Affairs — how does that sound? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Saskatoon Centre.

If I may say, if I were the member from Saskatoon Centre and I had a seat as unstable as that one in the hands of a Conservative, I think I'd be lot more careful about how I go around this province pumping booze and . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think that the hon. member is straying a long ways from the text of the motion, and I would ask him to stay on the subject.

**Mr. Shillington:** — I think I may have been provoked into straying just a tad off the subject. That possibility exists, and I apologize to the House for that.

The liquor board, the one crown corporation which you people have been promoting, and are promoting with vigour. The others are just a trail of disasters. Just a trail of disasters.

Let's just start with the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan — the largest, the largest. It was a crown corporation which you people showed your abhorrence for when it was passed. The member for Moosomin and the member from Rosthern and a handful of others will remember how long it took to get that legislation passed which set up that crown corporation. It was several weeks, as you stalled the bill in the House with one frivolous argument after another about how the establishment of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, as a major player in the potash industry, was going to bring this province to its knees — to its absolute ruin. The member from Kelvington would not believe the nonsense which colleagues, who are part of the party with the same name as he's . . . (inaudible) . . . They were part of the Conservative Party. You would not believe the nonsense to which we listened for several weeks. That bill was introduced in late November; it was passed in late January. Nearly three months elapsed while you people stalled that bill, did everything you could to kill it. And what happened thereafter? Did the dire predictions of the members on the left side of the official opposition, as it then was, did the dire predictions of members opposite come true? No, it did not. What happened was the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan made money from the beginning and in the latter years it made a lot of money, made a lot of money. The last year under our administration it made over \$100 million.

What happened when you people take over? The first thing you do is to join Canpotex, a move that anyone would have suggested to you was ill-advised. It is a marketing cartel. Let's call it what it is. It's a marketing cartel for the private industry. It is run by the private industry, for the benefit of private industry. And if it doesn't come as a great surprise to you people that they hate the ground upon which the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan stands then you are indeed a very blind lot because they do. And what happened was absolutely predictable. And I recall members of this opposition predicting the fate of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan when you joined Canpotex. What happened is your share of the market fell, you share of the market fell. And what happened is the credit which accrued to the Minister of Finance also fell. And that's a significant part of the reason why you people are so penniless, as penniless as any government since the Great Depression. \$120 million, \$120 million was what that corporation contributed to the public finances of this province in the last full year of our administration. You people got a hold of it and what happens? It plummets. And a large part of the reason why it fell as rapidly as it did was because you gave a way a big piece of the market, because you don't believe, you people simply don't believe in public enterprise. I note your admirers are just everywhere . . . (inaudible) . . . Let me read from you an article . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Let me read to you an article.

In a province that traditionally has cuddled itself cosily in crown corporations, the potash corporation was nevertheless something special. Though one of the youngest of the provincial children, it was a powerful tot, darling of its political parents, and the symbol of a misunderstood province mightily on the move, the one-time have-not getting rich.

That's exactly what they were saying about Saskatchewan during the '70s, as the crown corporations led this province through a period of unprecedented prosperity. It was, after all, the biggest potash producer in western world. If you people are there for very long, it's going to lose that fast.

Created out of five once-private potash mines, bought by the government for \$520 million, and enlarged to a value of twice that, its 1980 income is the 17th in Canada's top 500 corporations.

I ask the members opposite to remember that we paid 525 million over your dire objections. You did everything but fall on your swords in the middle of the Assembly to stop that bill.

In its last year of operation, it made \$120 million, but it doesn't take you people long to find a way to scuttle it. The members opposite, if they only had the courage of their convictions, would have sold it, or privatized it. But you don't have the courage of your convictions.

I can see the knowing smile of the member for Cannington . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If you had the courage of your convictions, you'd have sold the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, but you ain't got the guts! That's the only thing that stood between this government . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I may have been unfair to the member for Rosthern. The only thing that stood between the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and its sale was your lack of courage of your convictions. But you're accomplishing the same thing, you're accomplishing the same thing.

**And Hon. Member:** — What is this, a filibuster?

**Mr. Shillington:** — No, it is not a filibuster. . I've started a scant 10 minutes ago. The members of the government . . . I hope I'll be allowed just a bit of liberty to respond briefly to that. The members of the government benches may not take private member's day seriously. I want to tell you that we do, because this Assembly is more than just simply dealing with the business of the government. It should also be debating the issues of the day, and one of the significant issues of the day is the fate of crown corporations in this province.

The prosperity of this province was, during the '70s, built on it; you're dismantling it, and you are dismantling it without any workable alternative. All you have to replace it with is the open for business philosophy. You don't have to have been around this province very long to have seen that in its many disguises. It wasn't particularly well disguised in the Thatcher regime. It was called the open for business philosophy, and it was a dismal failure, it was a dismal failure. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I do not recall a single significant success to Thatcher's either. There were the three pulp mills that the member from Prince Albert should remember. One of the few successes of the open for business philosophy of Ross Thatcher was the pulp mills.

The potash mines, I say to the member, were almost all begun long before Ross Thatcher's wrecking crew got anywhere near the province. The vast majority of those were well in the planning stage before that government was defeated in 1964. It would . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Who brought them here? The CCF government of the day, that's who brought them here . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . You people's memory of history is a little short . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

The argument is lost. Times change; governments change, and the once-powerful Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is being . . . (inaudible) . . .

Not convinced that crown corporations in the resource field are intrinsically good and noble, a government whose motto is Open for Business. PCS will not triple its size by 1990, as it would have under the former administration, or possibly ever. It will not enlarge its mines, as it would have under the former administration. Its international sales arms has been cut off at the shoulder. Its plans to leave Canpotex, the marketing agency for all Saskatchewan potash producers, which PCS once felt did not serve it well, have cancelled. Sales went by the board, so the government decided that PCS International's efforts to create a pricing war would have destroyed the entire Saskatchewan potash industry.

You people are in the process of down scaling the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan through its participation in Canpotex and by depriving the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan of the markets it needs to thrive and survive. That would be alarming enough because of the sheer size of what you people are giving away. I remind you that your deficit was \$317 million. Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and its profit of \$120 million might have made a significant portion of that deficit and might have been a lot less embarrassing for the members opposite if you didn't try to skewer corporations like the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

But let's move on to some of your other successes. No doubt members want to move on to some of your other successes. So let's deal with the Saskatchewan Government Insurance office. Now there is a corporation which is truly fried under your warm tutelage. That corporation has experienced nothing but disaster since the present minister took over at the helm.

I want to relate an incident which I experienced about a month ago shortly after you people introduced the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, there were problems . . . Since the member from Moose Jaw, and I'm sure this is the first time I've heard from you — your first speech and I want to congratulate you. It's a great deal better than the absolute silence which we've had from you today. I want to say to the member from Moose . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I don't know how many times I have to caution the member, but I would ask him to stay on the subject. Otherwise we're going to have to call for another speaker.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well, I was, Mr. Speaker, dealing with the attitude of the government towards the SGI, because the members opposite insist on blaming SGI for every conceivable twist of the market. And I suggest that the reinsurance there may have been a problem, but it was corrected under our administration and not yours. It was corrected under our administration, not yours. Instead, you people treat SGI as some sort of a leper, and you have consistently treated it as a leper in the crown corporations of Saskatchewan. The SGI was not the only crown corporation that experienced problems with reinsurance. Lots of insurance companies did. SGI corrected theirs under our administration and not yours, and I'd ask you to keep that in mind.

But what you have done since then with the SGI, which at one point in time was the

flagship of the Saskatchewan crown corporation? What did you do? What did you do with SGI? You have raised the rates to the point that that company is scarcely competitive. I recall being in the office of an insurance agency, and I won't tell you the name, but in Canada, but I recall being in the office of an insurance agency. I was shown a comparison of Royal Insurance companies rates, and SGI rates and the Royal Insurance rates were less. I don't know how you people can expect to sell insurance if your product isn't competitive. It is not competitive, and I say to members opposite, that is intentional on the part of this political team because you don't want SGI dominating the market as it did.

I say to members opposite, that when the former administration took office in 1971, SGI had a little over 60 per cent of the general insurance market in this province. When we left office, they had well over 80 per cent of the general insurance market. Does anyone want to make any predictions about what percentage of the market SGI is going to have when you people leave office? I think the people at SGI would be delighted to think that when this wrecking crew finally leaves office, they might still have 60 per cent left — what they had when we came into office . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

I really would appreciate it if members opposite would engage in the debate from their feet and not from their chair. It would be so much more useful if members opposite thought they might get into the debate.

But the Tory wrecking crew . . . Well, SGI didn't stop with that. You proceeded to raise the deductibles in a fashion which I suggest was designed to bring not only SGI, but the public utilities review commission, into disrepute. You should have known what was predictable, and . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Well, I wish your shame would show up sufficiently to mend your ways.

You have fired a large number of employees in that corporation. You have terminated . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . The braying of the member from Regina North West makes it almost impossible to speak. I don't mind some other members, but the foghorn . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. Some heckling across the floor is acceptable, but I think it's gone beyond the acceptable level, and I would ask members to control themselves.

**Mr. Shillington:** — You have released a lot of employees of SGI. You are privatizing part of its function. You are sending out to the private sector some of the functions that that company performed, and I suggest you performed more economically in-house than out-of-house. I'll give you an example: that's the legal services; that's the one I'm familiar with. I say to the member opposite that SGI cannot perform the legal services as cheaply by hiring members of the legal profession as they can by employing their own. That is simply not the way that the private law firms work. I say to you, when you disbanded the best portion of the legal office and sent that out, what you did was make it even more difficult for the SGI to compete with the private market. It's another way which you people have found to make SGI less competitive.

I might go on to one of the few success stories that you have got. Saskatchewan Mining and Development Corporation. . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I heard members opposite take no credit for it, as well they should not. The first bit of honesty we've seen from this government in some time. But the Saskatchewan Mining and Development Corporation did make money, certainly through no fault of yours. It is money which I

would have thought this government could have used. We will later get on to some of the estimates, but there are some deep, deep cuts in these estimates. Profits of the crown corporations could have assisted you in avoiding some of the worst of it.

What happens? The Saskatchewan Mining and Development Corporation, which made money last year and made a good dollar the year before — is it expanded? Not on your life. It's put in an iron corset and it will remain there until you people are finally driven from office in two or three years hence, whenever you have the courage to call an election. That is an example of a crown corporation which is doing well, which is making good money, and which you people insist on restricting. I ask members opposite: why on earth would you want to restrict a crown corporation that's making money?

There is only one answer, and it was enunciated by the former minister of mineral resources: because you find the whole concept of public investment abhorrent. And whether it is in your best interests or not — I see the member from Prince Albert nodding — whether it is in your best interest or not, you will restrict the role of crown corporations, you will down-size them. You will do everything you can, whether its gone through some difficult years as admittedly SGI did, or whether it's a gravy train such as the Saskatchewan Mining and Development Corporation — you people are going to restrict it.

I can tell you as well, that another company which has done well over the years, has done well over the years and made good money considering the small amount that was invested in it, is Saskoil. I will well admit that Saskoil may have fallen on hard times very recently as all oil companies have. But if you people approach the role of crown corporations with any balance, you would be taking this opportunity to expand Saskoil, taking this opportunity to buy oil-producing tracts when they are cheap, and if you did, Saskoil would expand its operations and expand its profit. But is this government looking for opportunities? Not on your life. Not on your life. Saskoil is in the same iron corset as all the other crown corporations notwithstanding the very considerable opportunity which awaits you.

Let's get onto Sedco, (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation), another corporation which has had difficult times. Let's get on to Sedco which you people just found an opportunity to try and discredit. You just found an opportunity to discredit. I predict that every time we get an annual report from a crown corporation from now on, we're going to find disparaging comments in the annual reports about the crown corporations. The minister in charge of SGI took the opportunity to publicly discredit it here in the House. He did the same thing in Sedco — he did the same thing in Sedco.

Admittedly, Sedco has had a difficult time, and it is to be expected that a company whose function . . . Set up, I may add, not by the NDP; Sedco was not a creation of this dream team of socialists that you people are so angry with. Sedco (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation) was a creation of the Thatcher regime. And it worked well. We weren't always complimentary about it, but basically it worked very well. It acted as a lender of last resort. It lent money to companies and to ideas and funded ideas which couldn't be funded anywhere else. And it had a good track record. I know you people will never admit it but Sedco had a good track record.

I'd be interested in hearing from some of the members from public accounts on this,

because they can tell you that when Sedco was before the public accounts committee, what we learned was that their loss ratio compared very favourable with the chartered banks, compared very favourably with the chartered banks. It was my understanding that it was, that their loss ratio, which was around 3 per cent, is about what a chartered bank expects to sustain. And they did that loaning to ideas and to opportunities and to people whom the banks wouldn't touch because they weren't secure enough.

Sedco is one of the successful Saskatchewan stories, one of the successful Saskatchewan stories. Does that stop members opposite from doing everything they can to discredit it? It sure doesn't. Just got the annual report and there's some sort of a suggestion in the annual report that there should have been a fund set aside for losses, notwithstanding the fact that that is not, that is not the custom of any other lending institution. Sedco operates their affairs as does a chartered bank or any credit union. They operate no differently except that they accept loans which no one else will. They've done so with a very good track record, a very good track record, which is as good as any chartered bank.

Do you people come to the defence of it? The very least that the crown corporations have the right to expect is that this government will come to their defence when a defence is merited. But do you take that opportunity? No. You use the annual report, which is a document put out by the crown corporation themselves, to try and discredit them. And you do so in a manner which is just simply not fair. I suggest the members opposite are going to have an opportunity to explain what they're doing when that annual report comes before the crown corporations committee. Because that annual report is neither fair nor balanced, just as the annual report from Sedco is neither fair nor balanced.

You people just lose no opportunity to discredit the crown corporations. Even the private utilities, even the utilities, SPC and Sask Tel, you people have done what you can. I say you have done what you can to restrict their proper role. I will begin with Sask Tel. Sask Tel had a monopoly on providing telephone equipment. You people have destroyed that monopoly. I just suggest in doing so you disregard the history of this province and the manner in which this province was developed.

Sask Tel has always operated by the principle that you use those profitable endeavours to subsidize those which are not. If you make a good dollar providing telephone equipment in the city of Regina, that subsidizes providing telephone service in Morse. Nobody can make money on it at the rates Sask Tel is charging. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member from Morse is quite mistaken. The member from Morse is quite mistaken. Sask Tel used its profitable lines to subsidize its non-profitable lines and that meant that rural people in Saskatchewan got service at a cost which could never, never have been met if you people had been in charge of Sask Tel when it was set up and implemented this user-pay system.

I know that you people will not admit it but what you're doing with respect to the utilities is a kind of a user-pay system, and in doing so you are destroying the cross-subsidization which Sask Tel has long done, has long done. You have taken away from Sask Tel some of its profitable lines of providing equipment. And I admit much of the add-on equipment which they provide and which you can now buy at Radio Shack, they made good money on, but they used that not to line the pockets of some shareholders; by and large, they used that to subsidize services provided in the likes of constituencies such as Morse where, if you'd had to pay the full cost of providing a service in Morse, it would have cost you a lot more. So you are doing the same thing to the utilities which

you are doing to the other crown corporations. You are restricting their role. You are trying to turn them into private utilities. You are suggesting that they should operate as a private utility does. By doing so, you are restricting the natural role of the utilities.

So, it matters not whether one is talking about the utilities which operate in what has traditionally been thought of as the private sphere — that is the crown corporations, Sask Mining, Saskoil; that is not . . . (inaudible) . . . we're talking about those — or whether we are talking about the utilities, you people don't understand the role of crown corporations. I was aghast to hear from the Wolfgang commission a suggestion that the utilities ought to operate . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — The Wolff pack.

**Mr. Shillington:** — The Wolff pack. A suggestion that the utilities ought to operate in a fashion more along the line of private companies. That destroys the whole reason for being of a publicly owned utility. That destroys the whole reason for being when you do that. You people don't understand crown corporations. You are in the process of restricting their operations. You have put the crown corporations of this province into an iron corset. And in doing so, what you have violated is not just simply the philosophical beliefs of the opposition. Far more fundamentally, you have given away a good deal of money which you very badly need.

Your financial problems are not solely caused by your utter mismanagement. It is partially caused by your philosophical obstinacy in refusing to use the crown corporations for what they are: a useful instrument to develop the province, which they were so successfully during the '70s, and a useful instrument for enhancing the revenue position of the province.

This province pays the third-lowest taxes, and did under the former administration, pays the third-lowest taxes in the dominion. Only Nova Scotia and Ontario had a lower rate of taxation than this province. And that was the truth; and that wasn't because this province had fewer services provided through the public area. This government provided a lot more services. It was able to do that, not because of any magic, but because a far larger percentage of its revenue came from resources than any other province. A far larger percentage of our resources, except Alberta, came from resources, than any other province. And we achieved that because we had the crown corporations, because we got the profit from a part of the industry, and because those crown corporations were a part of the industry. We knew what the companies could afford to pay and were able to extract a fair rate of taxation. And that is an important role for the crown corporations to pay, and one they did — one they did. They gave us a window on the industry, and there was just simply no substitute for that.

I recall the take-over of the potash industry on behalf of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. I recall those companies saying they couldn't possibly pay those taxes. They did, because after the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan was set up, we knew full well that those rate of taxes could be paid, and they were paid. The potash companies which refused — absolutely refused — to pay their taxes before the potash corporation was set up, paid them after the potash corporation was set up, and paid taxes on that same level for several years before the tax regime was changed. And that was a role that the crown corporations paid.

We were not simply spectators. We had a window into the industry. We knew what the industry could afford to pay, and they did pay it. And the rate of taxation in this province



during the '70s was considerably higher than it was at any other province. That was why Saskatchewan enjoyed a rate of taxation which was considerably lower than it was in any other province.

So I ask members . . . I'm going to give you the opportunity, because I'm going to take my chair in just a moment. And I'm going to give you an opportunity to speak. I hope all the members who have tried to shout me down . . . I hope at least some of those members will take the opportunity to enter this debate and defend the wrecking job which you have done on the crown corporations of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Petersen:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I feel it behooves me to stand up and reply to some of this drivel that I've been subjected to for the last couple of hours.

The member for the Quill Lakes made a statement in some of his comments and that was that crown corporations are an integral part of our province. Well I don't think that's quite true. I think crown corporations are an integral part of a socialist government. You recall their family of crown corporations, their family of crown corporations, Mr. Speaker. They went out to enhance the big brother attitude. They wanted to have individual initiative destroyed. They wanted to make people dependent, dependent on government, dependent on big crown corporations. They wanted to do away with private enterprise, Mr. Speaker.

We believe otherwise, Mr. Speaker, and so do the people of Saskatchewan. They proved that on April 26th and they reaffirmed that on February 21st when they elected the member for P.A.-Duck Lake.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Petersen:** — Now the member for Quill Lakes went on and he spoke about the election and he said it was as if someone had flipped a light switch. Well, we flipped a switch all right, Mr. Speaker, we flipped a switch. We switched off those crown corporation ads. You recall those: 'Your family of crown corporation loves you. This crown corporation is wonderful. Our family of crown corporations — aren't they wonderful?'; Those ads cost the taxpayers of this province millions of dollars, Mr. Speaker, millions of dollars.

We flipped the light switch, Mr. Speaker, all right. We switched on the light of optimism in this province. We switched on the belief once again in individual initiative.

Now I believe it was the member for Regina Centre who made the statement in his remarks that the prosperity of the '70s was based on the crown corporations. Well, Mr. Speaker, if those crown corporations were so good and if there was so much prosperity, where's the heritage fund? If the prosperity of the '70s was based on crown corporations, Mr. Speaker, what does that say for the private individual in the province of Saskatchewan? What does that say about the faith in the little guy, the faith in the individual? Not very much. But that's in keeping with socialist doctrine, with socialist attitudes. The individual is not important; the state is.

We have faith, Mr. Speaker, we have faith in individual enterprise and individual initiative.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that the crown corporations of which he

spoke of would declare a profit, pay a dividend to the government, and then turn around and borrow huge sums of money to expand even further, like a cancer, just growing and growing and growing, encroaching even further in the world of private enterprise, encroaching even further into the lives of the little people, the individuals of the province. In so doing, Mr. Speaker, they placed a huge debt load on the people of Saskatchewan. A huge debt load that had to be paid for through taxation, and they paid for it through some of the most despicable forms of indirect taxation I've ever seen.

Now a private company, Mr. Speaker, wouldn't have been able to do that. A private company would have used its profits to pay for expansion and would not have placed a tax burden on the taxpayers of this province. And individual company, a private company, Mr. Speaker, is bound, it is bound by the laws of economics to have sound managerial decisions made. But not so with the crown corporations. There's always the big government behind you, big brother to bail you out if you get in trouble. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move a motion. Pardon me, I would like to move an amendment to the motion: that the motion no. 23 be amended by striking out all the words after the word 'Assembly,' and by — pardon me, 16 — and substituting therefore the following:

That this Assembly supports the Devine government's steps to assess the operators of the crown corporations through the report of the crown investments review commission and its determination to put the Saskatchewan crown corporations on a firm managerial and financial footing.

And it's seconded by the member for Saskatoon University.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — I find the amendment in order and the debate continues concurrent.

**Mr. Yew:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise to enter into debate regarding bill no. 16. Mr. Speaker, I have noted several comments made by members of this government and I took particular interest to the areas pertaining to our resolution. No doubt, Mr. Speaker, that initiatives and policy decisions made by the government of the day will evolve with a loss of jobs, a loss of revenue to the province, a lack of investment to this province, a lack of investment for the potential of this province in terms of our crown corporations. And there will no doubt be a loss of public participation in the development of this province. There is a tremendous huge human potential in those crown corporations. I want to remind the members in government that there are crown corporations that serve the interests of the people of this province. I have been non-political for many years, but it has only taken me a mere few months or years to realize the benefit, the serious benefit that those crown corporations have made to the people of this province. There have been benefits to the people of this province.

You take the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Okay, you want an example? The member from Rosemont wants an example. I'll give the member from Rosemont an example. You take the . . . (inaudible) . . . Saskatchewan fur marketing corporation. There's a good example. The Saskatchewan fur marketing corporation was intended to provide public input by the people that were involved in that industry. There is a good example. That crown corporation was never, was never in the red. It provided a service. It provided an input whereby the people that were involved in that one industry were able to go to that one crown corporation and have some input into the way that their product

would be marketed. There is, Mr. Speaker, some faith in the initiatives that were taken by the former administration. There were people who relied in that one crown corporation.

And going into the other crown corporations that are, in terms of debate tonight, there were many another crown corporation that was and still is of benefit to the general public at large.

In terms of our amendment, I may remind, Mr. Speaker, the members in government, I may remind the members in government that our resolution reads, and I'll read it word for word for the members in government:

Resolution No. 16 — That this Assembly regrets the Devine government's undermining and mismanaging Saskatchewan's crown corporations, and the resulting loss of earnings and jobs for Saskatchewan people.

That is a clear message. That is a clear message, Mr. Speaker: that this Assembly regrets the Devine government's undermining and mismanaging of crown corporations. These crown corporations, Mr. Speaker, have served a useful purpose. And they have certainly, maybe not all, but they have certainly served a useful purpose and have created a benefit for the people of this province. That is why I get up to enter into this debate, and to raise and express my support for the crown corporations that are under debate.

The member before me, I can't recall his constituency, but the member before me talks about faith in individual initiative, faith in individual enterprise. But, I remind the members in government, what kind of faith, what kind of opportunity have you people ever given the native people of this province? What kind of opportunity have you ever provided for the native people, for the minority groups of this province? I want to ask you . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please! Order, please! The member's having a great deal of difficulty being heard. He is recognized and has the floor, and I would ask the members to give him an opportunity to speak.

**Mr. Yew:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much. Though I certainly don't want to lengthen this debate, Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to point out my reason for entering into the debate. My reason for entering into the debate, Mr. Speaker, is to try to protect what investment, what the efforts of this province have given to our crown corporations. They have given a tremendous amount of effort, long hours trying to decide the policy and procedures of those crown corporations . . .

**And Hon. Member:** — In the best interests of the province.

**Mr. Yew:** — . . . to the best interests of the province. Thank you, fellow colleague.

To try to preserve the crown corporations at this point in time, Mr. Speaker, is something that I feel strongly about. I feel that we should all together try to preserve and strengthen our crown corporations. I don't think we should try to undermine and to try to weaken those crown corporations. I think they have served a useful purpose. I believe that they have and they will continue to perform a very useful purpose for the general public of this province. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank you and the legislators of this Assembly for having heard me out. I would also like to state to the

Assembly that I support the resolution. Thank you.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Morin:** — I would like to take a moment to participate in the debate here today regarding resolution no. 16, particularly as amended by the gentleman across the floor. Mr. Speaker, throughout the term that we've been sitting here in this House, the people of the province have heard the opposition trying to paint us as some radical right-wingers that are out to carve up the province. The people on the street know better than that, Mr. Speaker, and they put no credence in those sort of arguments.

What we face in the world and Saskatchewan today is a mixed economy — an economy that has the private sector involved with it, and an economy that has government involved in natural monopoly areas, and a mixture in areas where it's reasonable and practical that the government and private sector should co-operate and co-ordinate their efforts. And more and more we're seeing that. We're seeing that in megaprojects around the world. It's the way of the world and the people that are on the street are in touch with that feeling. They know that that's the way it's going and they know that this government is in touch with them and with that reality that we face.

We hear over and over again the members in opposition bring up the number of wells that were drilled in this province by the oil industry in 1980. Well, I think it would be fair to put to them in this type of a debate: how many of those wells were drilled by that crown corporation that they so glowingly refer to?

I've dealt in this House before with the reason why there was a record year in 1980, not only a record year in Saskatchewan, but also a record year of oil and natural gas drilling in Alberta, in British Columbia, in Manitoba, and in the Maritime provinces and, in fact, in Ontario. In every province where there is even a hope or a prayer of finding gas or oil, there was a record year in drilling, and that was because, Mr. Speaker, the prospects for the market were just phenomenal and private companies and public companies looked to that optimistic future and sunk holes with the attitude that they would be able to bring future production on-stream at a higher price, particularly relative to where they could drill those wells at that time.

The comment was made that Saskoil was profitable. I'd like the member to show me what year. Every time the accountant from Saskoil was faced with a little bit of red ink, they changed their accounting principles. They changed them so darn often that they made the guy dizzy and he had to be replaced by somebody else that hadn't got number fatigue. Finally, last year, even after all smoke and mirrors on their numbers, they showed a loss, and for the capital that the people of this province have employed in Saskoil, the hundreds and millions of dollars that we've spent on Saskoil, if the government were inclined to take that crown corporation and go out into the market-place and say, 'We'll offer this to you for sale,' nobody would buy it. It's been a disaster. Now there's an opportunity there and I don't want to downplay Saskoil; there is an opportunity there in the province. With management not being in touch with the way an oil company runs — those are the things that can be overcome, and those are the things that the Wolfgang Wolff report addresses.

The dividend from Sask Mining Corporation which was announced yesterday is an indication of the way this government is going, and we were looking at crown corporations. They have to be accountable. The people of this province have to get

some money back on their investment. They've taken hard-earned tax dollars, pumped them into these sectors and never got a nickel back for them. You can't continue in that way. The people aren't in a position where they are able to continue digging into their pocket and pulling out more and more money to feed the ravenous appetite of the crowns, so they have to be accountable.

You know when they talked about SGI, and I won't even deal with reinsurance because I know that that topic has been brought up here before, but, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about management and efficiency, SGI during most of my lifetime was called SGIO. And the former government commissioned a study to spend \$100,000 to take the O off of SGIO. The only thing I can think of to say in response to that type of a mentality, Mr. Speaker, is to thank goodness it wasn't called SGIOOO, because it would have probably cost a billion dollars to take the O's off.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Morin:** — You know, Mr. Speaker, they've dealt with the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, and the dealings through Canpotex. Mr. Speaker, we saw what happened in the provincial treasury with Canpotex. We've seen what's happened now that we've gone back into Canpotex, and we've sold almost as much potash, so far this year, as PCS sold last year, entirely. So, how are we wrong to be back in Canpotex? Any reasonable, thinking person out on any street, in any town in Saskatchewan, is going to say that had to be a good move; you got results; it worked. And it did. So, it had to be the right thing to do. And yet, we hear the chirping from down the line here, that it was a terrible mistake; it was a terrible thing. Well, how can it be? If they support the wheat board, why don't they support Canpotex?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the comment was made that we need these crown corporations to have a window on the industry. And I agree that if you're going to be a government in isolation, a government sitting way out in the boonies somewhere, then you have to have a way of monitoring what's really going on with the people that are paying the taxes to you, particularly the larger and larger corporations. And I subscribe to that 'window on the industry' argument, Mr. Speaker. That's a good argument, and it makes a lot of good sense, but it's underlined by a couple of very, very key issues. And the major issue that underlies it is the assumption that you will have your crown corporation playing by the same rules as you have the private corporation. So theoretically, if they're playing by the same rules, the reactions and outcomes in your crown corporation will be the very same as those in private sector.

But, within the private sector, they have a little thing called profit, which has been a dirty word in this House for 11 years. And that profit motive keeps them alive and viable. It helps them to pay their bills, and it helps them to employ their employees around this province, and around the country. If they don't make a profit they go broke; and it's a measure of efficiency. Well, where is that measure of efficiency if you're a crown corporation? If you can continually run back to the provincial treasury; if you can go back to every taxpayer in the province, and say, 'Dig a little deeper, because we made a few mistakes'; they never go broke, they never re-evaluate themselves. Then where are we as a government, and as a country?

And what the Wolfgang Wolff report says (and I don't know if the member down the line read it or not, but it doesn't sound like it) . . . The Wolfgang Wolff report says that, one, the management of the crown corporations have no clear direction as to why they should be there. The crown corporations are set up, and we have no idea why they're

there. Seems to me to be reasonable to have some accountability in that regard. And that's the key argument within the whole report. So, I think that it's fair and reasonable to say that the Wolff report is a good and realistic document.

Finally, I'd like to say that this 'bigger is better' attitude that gets us into so many of these crown corporations is a myth, and thank goodness it's going by the way. Small is beautiful, and I think we're seeing more and more of that. The innovations and technology . . . I see the member from Kelvington-Wadena laughing. Well, you're not small, but certainly you're . . . Well, I don't know if you're beautiful . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

The innovations, Mr. Speaker, that are coming forth that are going to help us through these tough and turbulent times that we face in the economy, are coming from small corporations. Sixty-six per cent of the jobs created in the economy are created by businesses which employ less than 20 employees. Now, goodness, surely we can get together and say: yes, there are natural monopolies, there are areas in which you would like to have crown corporations. But do you want them in the auto body business? Do you want them selling life insurance? Do you want them pumping gas on the corner? I think not, Mr. Speaker, and because I think that way, I'll be supporting the amendment to this resolution, and I'll be opposing the main motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Folk:** — Mr. Speaker, it also gives me great pleasure to come and enter this debate on motion no. 16, the ill-conceived and poorly thought out motion by the member from the Quill Lakes. And also on the amendment put forth by the member for Kelvington-Wadena, a realistic amendment that really truly shows what is actually going on in Saskatchewan here in 1983.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Folk:** — On April 26, 1982, the people of Saskatchewan made a historical change of government. One of the main concerns was the NDP's gross mismanagement of the crown corporations and their insatiable thirst for public funds.

I've listened to numerous comments being made by the opposition members, and I would like to comment on a few made by the member for Regina Centre. He mentioned in public accounts the fact that Sedco (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation) was there. And he also went on at great lengths about SGI, but he did not mention that they were also in public accounts. And there were a few things brought out in those meetings that are of great interest, such as the millions and millions of dollars lost by SGI through management shortcomings, and also the rate changes that went on from about 1978 to 1982. For example, Mr. Speaker, in 1978 there was an actual rate reduction, to my knowledge. But soon after that — and to my knowledge, 1978 was an election year, Mr. Speaker — soon after that the people of Saskatchewan faced a rate increase of approximately 28 per cent.

Then, if you'll notice on the amendment put forth by the member from Kelvington-Wadena, the last part of it says:

and its determination to put the Saskatchewan crown corporations on a firm managerial and financial footing.

That is indeed what the Devine government is intending to do with all the crown corporations here in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I have more remarks to make on this motion and this amendment in the future, and with that in mind, I would like to beg leave to adjourn debate. Thank you.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

**YEAS — 0**

**NAYS — 4**

Lingenfelter  
Lusney

Shillington

Yew

**Mr. Folk:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to once again rise and resume the debate on motion no. 16.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Folk:** — Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier in my comments, the people of the province of Saskatchewan made a momentous change on April 26th last. And now, the mandate given to this new government is to take what had transpired for the 11 previous years under the NDP, take their crown corporations, take a good look at them and try and make do with the best possible outcome.

With this in mind, the Premier of Saskatchewan, and indeed this new government, has gone forth with the task of taking a good hard look at the crown corporations in this province to see how they can best be suited to serve the needs of Saskatchewan, and within the structure, how they can best be run and put on the firmest possible financial footing.

Mr. Speaker, numerous comments are being made by the members opposite. They talked about 'Blakeney's Vision' and that resulted in the \$5 million profit for SMDC this year. I might ask: what about SGI and PCS? Is that part of 'Blakeney's Vision' years ago, that indeed, reinsurance would be at the point it is right now costing the people of Saskatchewan, through SGI, millions and millions of dollars this year? And what about the rate increases that occurred over the last four or five years? Zero rate increase in 1978, the election year, but soon after that a 28 per cent increase is hit. Is that what he called good management? 'Blakeney's Vision' — firm financial management. That's not what I call it and I commend the new Government of Saskatchewan for taking a good hard look at the crown corporations as they exist today.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there are others who would like to join the debate and I think it goes without saying that I will oppose the motion put forth by the member from Quill Lakes and support the amendment from the member of Kelvington-Wadena. Thank you very much.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I enjoy the opportunity of getting into this debate, Mr. Speaker. Listening to the members opposite, I find it very interesting in some of the comments that they have been making, specifically in the comments that they have been making regarding the crown corporations and how they were going to or are going to somehow make these good, financially sound corporations, Mr. Speaker.

But when you look at what's been happening in the past with some of these corporations, and when you look at the record of the corporations in the past, the service that they have been providing to Saskatchewan people . . . And you can take any one of the corporations and go down the list — be it Sask Tel which has provided a service to this province for many, many years, a service at reasonable cost and continually expanded that service throughout the province — but you take that one corporation and look at what has happened to it in the past year since this government has taken office, you will see that a corporation that has been doing reasonably well up to 1982 . . . You will look at what has happened to it since this government took office and you see that when it had a profit of some 24 million in 1981, and when you look at '82's estimate — the one that they haven't tabled as yet — but the proposed profit for 1982 is something under \$8 million, Mr. Speaker.

When you see that kind of reduction in profit, it makes one wonder how their expert financial advisers are making this a sound, financially sound corporation. And that applies to just about every corporation . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

When you look at all the corporations, and somebody mentions SGI. Well, we can look at what happened to SGI. SGI was providing insurance to Saskatchewan drivers for many years, providing an insurance on their vehicles at a reasonable rate, the lowest rate in Canada. Mr. Speaker, what has to it since? What has happened to that corporation since, Mr. Speaker? You see SGI, that had a profit last year of some \$12 million in '81, and you look at 1982, and they're talking about some \$28 million deficits now.

That, Mr. Speaker, is more of that expert management — the expert management that this government was going to bring into every crown corporation. They said that the corporations, previous to their taking power in this province, were operating under government control and were losing money because they had politicians running them, and not these expert managerial advisers of theirs. Now we see the experts in there, and in every corporation that these private enterprise experts have taken over, you see continuous losses in the year of 1982, Mr. Speaker.

And they said themselves that they require a large increase now in '83, if they are not going to continue to lose money. And what has happened to these experts that they have? Where are those experts? Why would SGI today require a 28 per cent increase, or 25 per cent, or any increase above 10 per cent? Why would it require that high of an increase if they have all these experts in there operating this crown corporation, Mr. Speaker? The only reason I can see for that happening, Mr. Speaker, is that the experts that they hired could not run those corporations. The government could not run the corporation. It is the mismanagement of this government, and the people that they have put into position in those corporations, that is causing the huge deficits that you see within all the crown corporations.

You can look at Sask Tel, Mr. Speaker . . . or pardon me, Sask Transportation. Sask



Transportation last year had a deficit in '81 of some 292,000. After one year of the Conservatives being in office, Mr. Speaker, we're looking at a \$2 million deficit. Every crown corporation, for some reason or other, is running up huge deficits — huge deficits under a government that said that if they came into power, they would show the people how to run these corporations. They would show the people how to run these corporations. They would show them how they could make money and how they could save money for the people of Saskatchewan. And to this day there isn't one corporation that has saved any money for the people of Saskatchewan. The mismanagement of this government has not saved money. What they have done is cost the people a lot more money than it was costing the people a year ago. That, Mr. Speaker, is what has been happening with the crown corporations since the Tories took power.

The member from Kelvington-Wadena mentioned that somehow their concern was to put these corporations on a firm financial footing. Well, Mr. Speaker, we see what the firm financial footing that these corporations are on right now is like — the kind of firm financial footing that if it continues, we are going to see no corporations and not corporations on a firm financial footing.

The member for The Battlefords says that when the NDP was in power somehow when the profits showed up there that all they were doing is changing their accounting principles. Well, Mr. Speaker, if anybody is changing any accounting principles, it is happening with this government that's in power now and it hasn't been happening in the past. What was happening in the past was that there was some good management and a direction for the crown corporations to be of service to the people, and at the same time to provide them the cheapest rates possible. That is what has been happening in the past but that is no longer the case, Mr. Speaker.

They mention the potash corporation, and I think that was one of the most accepted corporations in the province of Saskatchewan. The people of Saskatchewan accepted that corporation. They accepted and appreciated what was being done for them via that corporation. The money the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan was bringing in to general revenues, to the people of Saskatchewan, through taxation and royalties, was beneficial to all people of Saskatchewan.

But what do we see happening now? In the past year we've seen lay-offs in potash. We've seen lay-offs in potash and we see a government that's complaining about the fact that the potash sales aren't there, and just recently they're bragging about the huge sales that Canpotex has made for the potash industry of Saskatchewan. And that's true, Mr. Speaker, Canpotex has been making some sales for the potash industry but the majority of those sales were going to the private sector.

When PCS International was in place, they were making sales for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and that sale was benefiting the people of Saskatchewan and it was not to the benefit of private enterprise or to private corporate mines in Saskatchewan of which the money was going not to the people of Saskatchewan, but the majority of that was going across the line to the head offices of the parent company.

That, Mr. Speaker, is what is happening with potash now, and that was not the case before. And this government is bragging about how they're going to make these corporations strong and put them on a firm financial footing. They are somehow going to improve them. And all the improvements that we have been seeing, Mr. Speaker, are not improvements for the crown corporations; they are benefits for their private

enterprise friends to the detriment of all the people of Saskatchewan. That, Mr. Speaker, is what has been happening in the province of Saskatchewan since April of 1982.

Mr. Speaker, if we go down the list of every crown corporation that we have, and you can start with the smallest and go up to the largest.

Sask Forest Products: a corporation that they criticized, I think, for all the years that they were in opposition. That corporation in 1981 made close to \$1.5 million. But what do we see happening in 1982, Mr. Speaker? In 1982 that corporation has \$9 million deficit. That, Mr. Speaker, is what happened in one years time.

Sask Fur Marketing: one of the smallest corporations in this province, I believe. It had a small profit in the past, but it was a profit and it was providing a service to the trappers of Saskatchewan. It had a \$5,000 profit in 1981. But what has happened in 1982, Mr. Speaker? We see over \$140,000 in deficits. Another corporation, instead of making a few dollars, has gone down into a deficit position.

So it doesn't matter if it's Sask Forest Product, Sask Fur Marketing, Sask Transportation, Sask Tel, SGI, Sedco (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation), potash corporation — everyone under the control of this present government and under their direction and their expert management people, has been losing money in 1982.

Mr. Speaker, I can only say that I think that is a dismal record for this government. I think it should be an embarrassing record for this government, especially a government that has been bragging over the years of how they could make these crown corporations more efficient and provide a better service to the people of Saskatchewan at less cost.

And that, Mr. Speaker, I think is a key, when we should say what they were promising is more efficient corporations with a better service at less cost. And none of that has materialized, Mr. Speaker, and I would venture to guess that it will not materialize over the duration of this government. And I would hope that it won't be all that long, because I don't think that the people of Saskatchewan can afford to keep this government in power for all that long if this type of record is going to continue. Thank you.

**Mr. Birkbeck:** — I see the possible next leader of the NDP in opposition was a little slow to his feet wanting to get into the debate. He should realize there are a few other members who would like to debate this very important motion that's before the House.

It seems rather ironic, Mr. Speaker, that we're sitting here getting a lecture from the NDP on how to run crown corporations. I mean, that has got to be really the joke of the day, if not possibly extended into the joke of the month, or the joke of the year for the NDP in opposition — and in opposition because, Mr. Speaker, they mismanaged the crown corporations. And everyone knows they mismanaged crown corporations; everyone in the province of Saskatchewan knows they mismanaged crown corporations. We have the record, and unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we have all of the mismanagement and that total mess that they left in crown corporations to now clean up as the new government.

And I think that's a dastardly thing for any government to leave a new government coming into power, a dastardly thing to do. And then, if that wasn't enough, Mr.

Speaker, they're dastardly again to stand there in opposition, and rant and rave over the government of the day, saying. 'You're mismanaging the crown corporations; you're screwing them up.' Well, how could we screw up the crown corporations when we've only been here for a few months? How could we do that? What we are trying to do is clean up the crown corporations — clean up the mess that you left. And if you don't think we haven't been on the right track for a long time, just hand on 'cause I'm going to just point it out to you. All right?

We can just go back . . . And if the member for Cumberland wants to maybe lay down the newspaper and pay attention too, take off your shades, brighten up, here comes a lesson. All right?

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we have is a debate that took place back in 1976: Bills 1 and 2 that were moved by the government of the day, the NDP government — bills to expropriate and set up a potash corporation of Saskatchewan. That's what that was all about, Mr. Speaker, keeping in mind that was not in their campaign at all in 1975. There was not a sneaky little work, Mr. Speaker, that they were going to take over the potash industry. Not a word, no sire, Mr. Speaker, not a word that they were going to take capital that was invested here in our country, in our province, by the Americans, no, take that capital and jam it right back into the South.

Mr. Speaker, here we are today in 1983, and we know they still hate the Yanks. They're burning their flags now — took over their potash mines in '75-76; burning their flags in '83. Well, what are they going to be doing in another five years? Heaven only knows. They'll have snipers out for any Americans that are coming across the border just to visit, just friendly tourists. You know, I don't know what they're going to be planning next.

All we have here is a resolution, Mr. Speaker, before the House. A very simple resolution it would have to be; it's from the member for Quill Lakes:

That this Assembly regrets the Devine government's undermining and mismanaging Saskatchewan's crown corporations in the resulting loss of earnings and jobs for Saskatchewan people.

Undermining crown corporations; in all of their debates, Mr. Speaker, they haven't pointed out where we've undermined crown corporations, not one instance of where we've undermined crown corporations. Not one instance of where we've undermined any crown corporations. A lot of talk about crown corporations but not isolating any particular example that will prove their very argument that's in the resolution.

**An Hon. Member:** — We're still working on it.

**Mr. Birkbeck:** — Now the member for Pelly is saying, 'Well, we're still working on it.' Well you know, Mr. Speaker, I didn't know he could talk even until about 1979, because he never said a word in the legislature. He sat on the far side over here when they were government. He never uttered a word. In fact I used to call him Stone Face because he couldn't even smile. And now he sits in opposition chirping away like a little canary. Well I'll tell you, Mr. Member, you'd have done well to have spoken when you had your chance over here. You'd have done well, because there's a bunch of members on this side of the House and they take their opportunity to speak. Every opportunity they get, they're on their feet. And you should have been doing that when you were over here, because you're talking over there and it's . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! I believe that the hon. member is straying completely from the subject. I would ask that you read the motion so that you realize what the subject is and then stay with the subject.

**Mr. Birkbeck:** — All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for that ruling. I was reading the resolution and it was talking about undermining and mismanaging Saskatchewan's crown corporations. And I point out, and I point out again right now that those members never took the opportunity when they were government to speak about the very bill that they moved on the crown corporations. They never spoke on it then. Now they are speaking on it, saying that we're undermining it and not making a point whatsoever — not making any point at all. The loss of earnings and lost jobs for Saskatchewan people. You tell me: how many jobs did buying potash mines create for the people of Saskatchewan? Not one new job. The same numbers of holes in the ground and not one new job.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, what was the opposition of the day saying? What was the opposition of the day saying in 1975-76 on that debate, an opposition that took the opportunity to speak? Now then, I just want to . . . I've taken the time, Mr. Speaker, I've taken the time to mark a few quotes out of my own speech in the legislature. January the 12th, 1976. Well what did I say at that time? Keeping in mind, Mr. Speaker, this is January the 12th, 1976, and I quote:

We believe that there are things worth conserving and things worth changing. We do not believe that everything should be conserved or that everything should be changed. That politics is not the most important activity of man and that the ends . . . spiritual and intellectual ends. That our goals at all times consider human happiness. That there is not necessarily a political solution for every social problem. Social progress is based on the needs of people, not to form political theories and then change the people to fit those theories. We take the position that the best way to conserve that which is best and change that which needs changing is by reasonable political policies based on the social facts of life. We stand for a more general political view and not a specific and rigid political creed. We take the position which will permit individuals to achieve their full capability and the final goal of human happiness. We stand on the ground that government should not become involved in everything and that there are areas of concern that legitimately belong to other social institutions, such as the family, the church and the voluntary associations. We stand for a strong government, but with government being the servant of the people, and not the people being the servant of the government. We take the position that the vital functions the government ought to perform are:

The maintenance of order; the stability of social life;

The general betterment of the people in the area where private initiative is insufficient;

The fair and efficient administration of justice; (and)

The improvement of public conduct by the example of government behaviour.

(And) we stand on the ground that reasonable political policy must be based on the social facts of life and a reasonable desire of all men to enjoy the wide variety of benefits that civilized social life can provide.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, those were comments made back in 1976, as it relates to a crown corporation and the formation of a crown corporation; and whether or not, as it relates to this resolution, we in government now are going to maintain crown corporations, or undermine crown corporations, as the opposition is trying to make a case on. And it's a very weak case. As I've said, they haven't given me one example of where we're undermining crown corporations.

Furthermore, I stated, Mr. Speaker, in that speech, that the act will have serious consequences in so far as future investments in Saskatchewan are concerned. I would suggest the name might be more fittingly be called 'the resource anti-investment act.' And the way that the crown corporations were handled, the way the government of the day — the NDP government of the day — proceeded with crown corporations, was to throw a fear into the people of Saskatchewan that there was only going to be one way of life in this province, and that was the government — the government, vis-à-vis crown corporations. And you built your massive towers; you did that. Sure, you did that. You built great big crown corporation buildings all over this province. You took the resource wealth of this province, and you put it into government.

And as the government grew richer, the people grew poorer. And that's your idea of social progress. That is not our idea of social progress. We believe in a balanced approach, in so much as we look at the economic and socio-economic progress of Saskatchewan people — balance between crown and private sector. Now whether you like it or not, that is the policy of this government — a balanced, reasonable approach, vis-à-vis crown corporations and the private sector.

If you think for one minute that any of us on this side of the House believe that you have any support whatsoever for the private sector, then you've surely got to have another thought coming. Because you don't. And there are resolutions to no end — I could go through them, but I'm not going to. I could be here until midnight. You talk about a adjourning debate, because he may well have had some other thoughts that he want to put to this House, and get his notes together. You know what that's like; you've been around long enough. You may not be around much longer, but you have been around long enough to know that . You didn't do that.

If you want to know about debate, this side of the House could debate with you people on any issue for any length of time. So I'm not going to go through all of your resolutions. But I would just suggest to the member for Cumberland that he take a look at the NDP resolutions, because it's contrary to what he's saying. I'm not going to read them all. They're here. I can get you a copy and send them across for you, if you like. But your own riding — I say, Mr. Speaker, to that member for Cumberland — your own riding believes in a balanced approach: private and crown corporations, for the growth of your constituency. But you don't believe that . You speak about crown corporations. What does it say? Well, let's take a look at one of the resolutions. And this the one from Cumberland:

Be it resolved that the provincial NDP, when it next forms the provincial government, be prepared to joint venture and/or finance development

projects initiated at the community level, rather than emphasize the corporate (that's both crown and private) sectors as has previously been the case.

Now, for the member for Cumberland: there's what the NDP party believes. You don't believe that, as an elected member of that constituency. You don't believe that; your constituency does. It's in the NDP resolutions, and you're making the same mistake that put you in opposition from government. You're not even listening to your own people, your own NDP supporters, that put it into black and white resolutions.

What else does it say, Mr. Speaker? Here's another one:

Whereas the economy is in a crisis for two reasons (two reasons), one, overproduction has been brought on by uncontrolled expansion fuelled by massive federal and provincial handouts to industry . . .

Oh, ho! And just prior to the election, Mr. Speaker, just prior to the election, what were they doing in the potash mine in my riding? They were hiring when they should have been firing! For political reasons. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's a good line. You bet it is. And you come out to my riding. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Shaunavon is chipping away again. I have challenged that member to come into my riding and debate with me any time. And, I'm challenging again tonight. Any time! Out at the potash mine, if you like. You want to see how those members think about potash now . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order please. The hon. member for Moosomin has the floor. I would ask that you give him an opportunity to bring forward the thoughts that he has. I think that there'll be ample opportunity for all of you to get into the debate.

**Mr. Birkbeck:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What else does it say?

People have less and less disposable income with which to buy surplus products, aggravated by wage controls.

Be it resolved, therefore, that the NDP continue to work for a more equal income distribution as 10 per cent of the population receive over 50 per cent of the income, and be it further resolved that the NDP support exchange controls to stop the massive outflow of capital, which could otherwise be spent in Canada to assist in the economic turnaround and job creation.

Well, if your buying potash mines back in 1975-76 wasn't a massive outflow of capital, then I'd like to know what else it was. A massive outflow of capital by a government that you sat in and was part of. Now you sat clean at the back of the row, next thing to being out the back door, but you were still part of it, and you never fought it. And, Mr. Speaker, had the member for Shaunavon had any cares to get up in the House and speak his mind, he wouldn't be sitting in opposition today. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, you were there. You were there, when the government was running a potash company. You bet you were there. You weren't there in '75-76. That's correct. You were Johnny-come-lately. You're trying to tell me you didn't have anything to do with the party at that time? Are you trying to tell me, Mr. Member, that you didn't agree with what they were doing at that time? Highly unlikely. Because you sat as part of that very government administration of the crown corporation that they put together. So, you can't argue

that.

What else? It says:

Whereas the public is unaware of the disposition of funds from resource crown corporations (Golly sakes, let me go on) and whereas this lack of awareness has manifested itself in strong public resentment towards crown corporations, be it resolved that a significant amount of revenue from resource crown corporations in the Consolidated Fund be allocated specifically to the public to affect the economic well-being of the people of Saskatchewan.

Well now, how about that, Mr. Speaker? There you go. And isn't that what put them in opposition as well? Crown Corporations, as I said earlier, that they were ploughing piles of money into, taxpayers' dollars, financing the future generations of our province, into their crown corporations. And the people said enough was enough on April 26th. They gave us a mandate to examine the crown corporations and reassess how we could put some of the money in the people's pockets and not in the government. And that was the mandate we were given, whether you like it or not. And now you still stand there in opposition and criticize us for our approach taken in crown corporations.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it gets even worse. It says (and I'll not go through the whereases and the whereases, I'll just give you the be resolved):

Be it resolved that the education director organize the NDP provincial conference on the nature of capitalism and the socialistic response in the Canadian context.

Now what in the heavens is that, Mr. Speaker, the socialist response in the Canadian context? Well, the only context it's in is in their minds. What they're wanting to do is to educate the people as to, I suppose, the advantages of capitalism versus socialism.

Well again, Mr. Speaker, I come back to an approach that we have been able to take in opposition, and now in government. We have a balanced approach, Mr. Speaker. You know there was a feeling there among Saskatchewan people, and understandably so, that only a socialist government could provide social justice programs. Well they're wrong, Mr. Speaker, because we're not a socialist party, I'm very proud to say, and we're not a bunch of . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Birkbeck:** — . . . and, Mr. Speaker, we're not a bunch of wild-eyed scary right-wingers; we're not capitalists in that sense either. What we are is a government that takes a very balanced approach and it has shown up in the budget where we have increases in education, health, social services — are those not what people consider to be social justice programs? — being delivered by a party, Mr. Speaker, that is not a socialist party.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order please! The question before the Assembly deals with the crown corporations in two contexts: one in the amendment and one in the motion. And it doesn't deal with education and the other items that you are raising. I would ask the member to stay on the subject.

**Mr. Birkbeck:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, all right. As it relates to this motion

condemning this government for undermining crown corporations, what I'm trying to say, Mr. Speaker, is that it has not been us at any time that has ever undermined any crown corporation in the province of Saskatchewan, but rather, Mr. Speaker, that it was the NDP in government and now the NDP in opposition that are undermining the people of Saskatchewan vis-à-vis the crown corporations. That's what their intent was and they're trying to get us into that position now.

Mr. Speaker, that's a very important motion. And they didn't move it just for the fun of it. And they don't want to debate it all night just for the fun of it. They're trying to make a case in point here; that we as a government, are in some way anti-crown corporations. And the member from Shaunavon nods his head. He nods his head. He thinks that we're against crown corporations. What I'm trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is to prove a case where we have not undermined crown corporations to be run fairly, in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan, with the people of Saskatchewan understanding their crown corporations, knowing what they're all about, and being able to benefit from those crown corporations. And yes, if they can't be that way, Mr. Speaker, then we have to take a position in opposition to a crown corporations from time to time.

Saskoil was a good example of that, where in fact, it was one of the only players, in fact the only player in the oil game that lost money — the only player in the oil game that lost money. And it was a crown corporation. Do the people of Saskatchewan want to lose money to a crown corporation like that? I say no, they don't. I don't as a taxpayer, and I don't know of anyone that does. So, you know, why would we not want to take a responsible position in correcting a crown corporation? So when we take a corrective measure, they say, 'Ha-ha, you're undermining crown corporations.'

Mr. Speaker, that argument has to be put to rest. That argument has got to be put to rest, Mr. Speaker, and that's what I'm trying to do tonight. And I have apologized for sometimes deviating a bit, and maybe not staying right on the motion as it reads in the book, in our blues. You know, it's very difficult to do that, because it's a question of philosophy. We have a different philosophy than the socialist mentality of the NDP in opposition. We have a different philosophy. If we didn't have a different philosophy, we wouldn't be over here. We wouldn't be government.

And I think that's very important. It's very important, Mr. Speaker, to me and to the members of this House — on this side of the House — to the members of the government, and to our government members sitting on the opposition floor of this House, to your left, Mr. Speaker. It's very important. It's the crux of the whole issue here. It's whether the people of Saskatchewan want socialism, or they want some form of balanced approach to government. And that's what this motion's all about. And it's a deviation.

They're using that motion, indicating that we're wanting to undermine crown corporations, to get us off into that track — to derail us, if you like. And if they would just take a little time to take a look at some of their own motions, and the kinds of motions that they could be moving, where they might be considering how they might derail Pepin and save the farmers or something, it would make a lot more sense.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I have in my hand enough evidence to keep the NDP in opposition for the next 10 years. And there's only 10 sheets here — a sheet a year will do. So, Mr. Speaker, obviously I would have to be opposed to the motion, and would thank the Assembly for the time of the House tonight.



**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to become involved in this debate. What started out, I think, as a very logical motion, one which . . . we appreciated the amendment from the member from Wadena, who put forward a very straightforward and logical debate from his side, till we got to the member from Moosomin, who went into his usual tirade. And as he was known when he was in opposition as The Windmill from Moosomin, carried on in fine style, and I want to congratulate him for not changing simply because he's in government.

He made some interesting comments on the crown corporations, one of them being, had they been in government, they would have been firing instead of hiring, and I think that that will be a line which will come back to haunt him over the next few years, especially at the time of the next election. It seems like every once in a while, there's a member of the Conservative party, whether they're in opposition or in government, who give us the lines that can be used very effectually . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. Is the hon. member debating the motion, or is he making a speech on something that may happen in the near future, or in the distant future?

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, as relates to the motion which we are discussing, and the amendment to it, I was responding to some of the remarks made in the same debate by the member from Moosomin, and I thought I would use the same type of language as he did. But I will try to stick closer to the words of the motion and the thrust of the motion, as you have so appropriately mentioned to me, and I will attempt to talk of the motion, as you have so appropriately mentioned to me, and I will attempt to talk more on the topic of crown corporations and their role in the Saskatchewan economy.

Mr. Speaker, since the early history of Saskatchewan after it became a province, crown corporations have played a very important role in the development of the province, and I think that all members will agree with that. And it wasn't because the government of the day, whether it was the Liberal government, or CCF, had a devious plot to take over the private sector; it was simply because at that time there was a need to develop crown corporations because a void existed.

I think that if you look at Saskatchewan government organization, which was established to supply the needs of insurance for the people of the province, it was because the people of the province voted for it, and voted for it any number of times. And the members try to attempt to say that the people of Saskatchewan didn't know what they were doing in electing a CCF government from 1944 to 1964, who believed that crown corporations were an appropriate way of using the public's money to develop what was needed at that time, that being crown corporations.

As well, Mr. Speaker, in 1975 when the election was fought at that time, it was a well-known concept that we would look at potash corporation and the possibility of gaining, having public sector involvement in the potash corporation, or the potash development at that time. It was discussed at conventions, and it was discussed at executive level over and over again.

Mr. Speaker, during 1976 when the potash debate went on, it wasn't a matter again of the terrible socialists going out and fighting with one of these Saskatchewan companies, but it was because the taxes which were payable at that time were not

forthcoming. And, Mr. Speaker, if the member for Moosomin were wise enough to study even the history while he was sitting in the House, he would know that the debate at that time went into the background where the taxes were not being paid by the potash corporation, and that played a big part in the fact that the government of that day got into the development of the potash corporation.

You went on to say that there weren't any jobs created, but I would like to ask him about the buildings that were built in Saskatoon by the potash corporation, the head office staff that were hired there, and whether he thinks that the private sector would have done the same thing. He seems to be somehow against buildings being built by the crown corporations. I suppose he would much rather see them being built in Chicago or New York, because this is what Conservative governments in the past have believed in, that Saskatchewan didn't deserve the benefits of having the head offices, that they belonged in the United States, or Germany, or Great Britain.

In our party, we believe that the head offices of whatever corporations are going to develop the province, be they crown corporations or private corporations, that they deserve and owe the people of Saskatchewan that the head offices be developed and built in the province of Saskatchewan. And for that reason, we did develop the potash corporation, and we were proud of it, and we're still proud of it and I'm sorry that the government of the day is doing what it can to undermine it, and the main intent of the motion when we started out here was to prove that that undermining is going on at the present time.

I think we need only look at the sales of potash offshore to find that the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is losing sales, and losing sales at a great rate because of the mismanagement of this government in gaining sales, and also dealing with the sales that it had in its hands at the time they took office, because you will see that the percentage of offshore sales has decreased by the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. And this is because the government does not have the commitment to that crown corporation. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Chairman, the member from Regina North West from his seat says, 'Very narrowly.' But I would like to remind him that in crown corporations . . . And I believe that he was in the chair the day that we found out that the potash corporation's share of the market had decreased by several percentage points and that in a matter of a couple of, of a few odd months. And if this keeps up for the four-year period, we will see that the potash corporation's share of the offshore market will be decreased by at least 10 per cent. And that's a significant amount. A 10 per cent drop in the sales of that corporation will make the difference whether it survives or not.

So to say that you're not undermining it is completely wrong and I believe that over the next year when we find out the profits of that crown corporation, we will see that there is little if any profit, and that as a design of this government to prove that crown corporations don't work. And if that's your intention, then I suppose you being the management, you can prove that very easily simply by causing them to lose money and then selling off a major share of those crown corporations.

Mr. Speaker, SGI, I believe, is another example of a crown corporation which the Conservative government is attempting to do in. And I think there is a reason for that. If you look at the administration that they now have with a Mr. Black, Don Black, who is running the corporation, you will find that the way the operation works is that a certain

amount of incentive is built into that manager's position so that if he shows a profit, then his salary or commission is increased. And so you will see that last year there was a bit of a loss, and money were shifted into the past year so that the profit record of that corporation will look better and the incentive to the president of the corporation will go up. And these kinds of things I think the Conservative government owes an apology to the people of Saskatchewan for.

But I suppose in looking at the crown corporation, that being SGI, one wouldn't be surprised that that insurance company is being done in because I believe it is a, was a promise of this government — if it formed the government — to get rid of SGI to the private sector. And when you look at the donations that have come from many insurance companies to the Conservative Party, I don't suppose that's too surprising. And by raising the deductibility from 350 to 500, they have opened up, or will open up — they're still saying as of July 1st — a whole new lucrative area for the private sector insurance companies to become involved in, and to become involved in in a big way in Saskatchewan for the first time. Because as you will know that area between \$1 and \$500, that insurance bracket includes a great number of dollars that will then flow out of Saskatchewan and will not be helping that crown corporation create a profit. But instead here again, we will see the rates that SGI has to charge go up because the profits will flow out in terms of money going to the private sector.

The member from Moosomin mentioned Saskoil in his speech, saying that this was a corporation which served no useful purpose and one which he believed was not doing a good job. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the fact that the upgrader has been lost to Saskatchewan as a result of the inactivity of Saskoil is an example of what a crown corporation could have been doing, and should have been doing over the past year. I think that Husky Oil who are now very much interested in building an upgrader in the Lloydminster area when it could have been located in the north-west of Saskatchewan or at Moose Jaw, Mr. Speaker, I think is a sad commentary on the inactivity of this government in terms of using crown corporations of a tool, both to develop the province and to create employment. But given the fact that the member for Moosomin is saying that had he been in power over the past number of years he would have been firing rather than hiring, I don't think that that is too surprising.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will certainly be voting against the amendment and voting in favour of the motion.

Amendment agreed to.

**Mr. Hopfner:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for recognizing me. I'm sure that the people in Cut Knife-Lloydminster will also appreciate the fact that you have recognized me and allowed me to speak in this Assembly tonight.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, I've listened to a lot of rhetoric coming from across the floor. The opposition — the ones that will remain in the Assembly while I do speak to the motion - would probably learn by staying here and listening to some . . . to an individual that speaks from the heart and does not speak on behalf of just trying to gain political points for a party out in the various areas across Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the motion here, and so I may speak to the motion, is: that this Assembly regrets that the Devine government's undermining and mismanagement of Saskatchewan Crown corporations and the resulting loss of earnings from jobs for the Saskatchewan people. Well, to me, Mr. Speaker, this is absurd.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order please. The question before the Assembly is the amended motion. And the amended motion reads:

That this Assembly supports the Devine government's steps to assess the operations of the crown corporations through . . .

And so on. It doesn't include what you're indicating.

**Mr. Katzman:** — Point of order, if I may. My point of order is: I understand on the amended motion, and as now amended, we have the latitude to speak on all the debate that took place because we were doing motion and amendment simultaneously. Is that incorrect?

**Mr. Speaker:** — I will find that your point of order is not in order, and that at this point the discussion will be centred on the amended motion, and the amendment really deleted all of the old motion except 'That this Assembly.' That's all that remains of the original motion. Now, the member can refer to some items that were taken up in debate, but cannot refer to the complete motions that has . . . off the floor.

**Mr. Hopfner:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I accept your judgement on the question at hand.

I would just like to say that this government is looking at the crown corporation as a business, and a business that will operate profitable, and profitable for the people of Saskatchewan. When I look at taking examples, such as Sask Tel, that the members opposite have risen in this Assembly, well, Mr. Speaker, when I talk to the people from Sask Tel, and I've talked to many of them since I've been elected, I find that we've had low rates in Saskatchewan for many years. I don't rebut on their statements for saying such things like this.

I understand that the low, low rates had been maintained, but, I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that what we had 20 or 25, or 30 or 40 years ago does not stand to today, and to today's industry. Our industry today, Mr. Speaker, is moving steadily; it's moving ahead at a pace that apparently the opposition cannot maintain or keep up to today. I would suggest that Sask Tel's equipment today is becoming obsolete and has to be replaced, as the individuals from out there, out in the real world, suggest to me. And, they tell me, Mr. Speaker, that it is unfortunate that you as a new government have to inherit this misfortune of millions and millions and millions of dollars of costs to bring in new equipment so that we can maintain the service to the people of Saskatchewan.

Talking about Sask Power, there's generators that have to be replaced that are obsolete — you can't even buy the parts for today. And, here the members opposite say, 'Well, why increasing rates for Sask Power?' Well, Mr. Speaker, again the same thing comes back to me from the people that are out there working, the people that were working under the past . . . (inaudible) . . . and now are working of us are saying that it is unfortunate that we have to inherit these costs. Who is going to pay for these? The people understand they have to pay for a service. They want a substantial service that they can go home and they can rest assured that they're going to have lights, and they're going to have heat, and they want to know that if they go away on vacation, they can come home, and their home is not frozen in the cold winters — that they've got heat and power when they're home.

Talking about Saskoil, Mr. Speaker, on Saskoil I live in the oil country. I understand the oil business, and I understand, Mr. Speaker, that Saskoil could be an acceptable company, could be a business corporation out there, and profitable, and those profits turned back to the people of Saskatchewan. But, Mr. Speaker, as of yet today, Saskoil has not been able to show that profit, and we are now, as the Devine government, going to make them come up and show profit, and not come to the government and say, 'Hey, dad, we need bucks to survive.' Dad has made Saskoil go out there and become professional themselves.

They talk about crown corporations. They got into the meat-packing industry. What happens? Burns in Prince Albert disappear — private sector disappears. They talk about capitalism. Capitalism, Mr. Speaker, to me is not a swear-word. Socialism to me, Mr. Speaker, is not a swear-word. But what works?

Mr. Speaker, if you take socialism, what it gives in comparison to the real world, to the crown corporations, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that socialism is a word that sings, and is good music, is music to the ears. What I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is that the only way I can feel that socialism would work is in the story-book. It's a fairy-tale. And I think that's exactly the way the members opposite have been running their crown corporations. They're running them like they were some sort of a fantasy out there, that one day they might strike it rich. They might strike oil, or they might strike gold, or they might strike something. But it didn't happen. It cost the people of Saskatchewan millions and millions and millions of dollars.

Potash. They talk about potash. Well, I'll tell you, I want to thank the minister in charge of potash. He's finally brought it around to a reality. He's finally entered a potash corporation into the real world — the PCS. He's brought it into the real world, he's bringing it into a competitive reality.

And Mr. Speaker, the member opposite, he was talking about the lay-offs. He was talking about how we had forced hundreds of lay-offs. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't understand where he could even think such rhetoric. He had been misleading the people of Saskatchewan, the member from Pelly has been misleading the people from Saskatchewan from the time he entered in this House, since April 26th till now. I would think that the biggest mistake that was made in Saskatchewan on April 26th was the election of eight members across the floor.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hopfner:** — But getting back to the potash. Potash now is becoming once again viable. And it's through determination of this government to make it acceptable in the markets out in today's world, and becoming competitive, that we are able to have an announcement of sales from this province, and for this province, and to create the jobs, and give the people out there jobs. You know, they talk about it's still going on that there's lay-offs. Well, if they would go out into the real world, they would understand that these people are once again working, and that they're assured of having jobs, and that we're going to work hard to assure that they keep their jobs.

They talk about the experts. They say, 'Well, where are the experts in all these crown corporations?' They talk about how many experts they had. Well, I'll tell you,

I'm a business man, Mr. Speaker, and if I operated my business with their type of experts. I can imagine I'd be in business about a month. But I'll tell you something. I'd like to know just exactly where their experts came from. I would like to know how they expected the people of Saskatchewan to grow with that type of a mentality that they've had brought to us through their expertise. They've chased the investment out of Saskatchewan, they chased the people that were here — families; they broke the families up. They chased them out of Saskatchewan and to other provinces where they could make a living, where these other provinces such as Alberta, our neighbouring province, had allowed investment and allowed the enterprise to carry on and the people to have jobs and to make what they could of themselves.

And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if we look at it, Alberta had one of the highest standards of living across this country. And this we're now going to bring back to Saskatchewan. We're going to bring the people back to Saskatchewan. We're going to bring investors back to Saskatchewan. We're going to bring dollars back to Saskatchewan. And we're going to have all sorts of programs.

They talk about the programs that we've cut since we've been in power. They talk about all this cutting. You ask the real people out there in rural Saskatchewan or the cities, Regina, Saskatoon, Prince Albert, Yorkton, Melville — you talk of all of them and they can't see one cut. The cut in services . . . The only cut they can see is the cut in taxation and those taxes is what is a reality out there.

They talk about the crown corporations. They talk about the crown corporations and how SGI, for instance, Mr. Speaker, has been mistreating the people. We're going to increase the rates. Well yes, Mr. Speaker, we are going to increase the rates. We are going to increase the rates to the high-risk individual out there. It's like any other smart business corporation would do. They would increase rates to any high-risk individual. The person that is not going to have an accident does not have to worry about a high risk. The person that is not going to have to be attentive, misrepresent his corporation in his situation where he may be honest within his corporation and through tendering and bonds, etc. . . . We're not going to take risks with high-risk individuals. They're going to be legitimate people, Mr. Speaker. Legitimate people are going to come and buy a premium and say that in case we are in an accident and we are not at fault, then we are entitled to an insurance. This is what is reality, not the way members opposite have been twisting. They seem to twist for no apparent reason.

A member opposite talks about the upgrader. That is probably . . . It really touches me right here. The member from Shaunavon, he says, 'An upgrader.' Well, the Premier has mentioned in this Assembly and on many occasions that this upgrader that the opposition member from Shaunavon has brought up was nothing but a word. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's exactly correct. If you go into the department and ask just exactly where that upgrader was prior to April 26th, and they would have told you that there wasn't such a thing as an upgrader, other than the word, which if you would like, I could spell it out for the member opposite. But I'm sure that he has enough intelligence to know how to spell that.

Well, I'm going to tell you something, Mr. Speaker, that that upgrader is more of a reality today than it has ever been. He talks about Saskoil as being one of the major, one of the consortium. Well, true enough, it was one of the consortium. But it was not this government that broke that consortium up. It was not Husky's fault, or Gulf's fault, or

Shell's fault. They were not ready to react as a consortium, so this government accepted that. But Husky come along with a proposal and we were out dealing with it.

There's another route to take, a co-operate route. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that if we can get any type of an upgrader in this province, it will enhance the heavy oil recovery in Lloydminster heavy oil fields, and I'm sure that the people out there in Cut Knife-Lloydminster, in my constituency, in the main of that heavy oil will appreciate any effort from this government to get the oil out of the ground, get it into production, and create jobs out there.

I can remember, Mr. Speaker, and I'm a business man out there, as well as the MLA, and I can remember that in 1980-81 we enjoyed a few months of fairly good business because there was a lot of people there. Three months out of 11 years, three months, Mr. Speaker, how long, you know that's worse than their counterparts down in Ottawa, the Liberal counterparts.

Every so often you hear a promise — we're going to get this, and we're going to get that, you know. Well, Mr. Speaker, we heard that from the crown corporations. The government opposite, they said, 'We're going to purchase this and the people this and the people of Saskatchewan are going to benefit from it.' Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the only benefit I got out of it was being able to read about it in the newspaper. I didn't see any money in my pocket. All I seen was money coming out of my pocket because I had to pay higher and higher taxes to pay for their blundering mismanagement and, Mr. Speaker, that is not going to happen any more.

We promised the people of Saskatchewan that we're not going to allow it to happen. We're going to bring these people about to make sure that they are going to justify their actions in these crown corporations. Mr. Speaker, I'll be the first one in this Assembly to stand up and say. 'Let's get rid of that crown corporation,' if they cannot profit. If they're going to cost the taxpayer in my constituency a dollar, let's get rid of it. I can't afford to be a welfare supporter to a crown corporation. If it is an essential service, Mr. Speaker, I can understand keeping the crown corporations. If it does cost the people of Saskatchewan a few bucks, I can understand it, if it is an essential corporation. But I don't call a hide-fur outfit an essential corporation. If I'd been out there . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hopfner:** — If I'd been out there, I'd been hunting or I trapped — I used to do it when I was a kid, I used to go out there and snare a rabbit and I'd skin it out and sell the pelt. But I didn't believe the Government of Saskatchewan would start buying those things . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Mr. Speaker, the member brings up the mongoose, Mr. Speaker, if it was allowed, I would bring that mongoose into this Assembly and we'd see how the members opposite would jump. It seems to me I got a couple of them jumping when I showed them my pet mongoose here last session.

**Some Hon. Member:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hopfner:** — I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that when we look at the crown corps I would think that we should give them a chance under this administration, that we should allow them to justify their means, their directions — justify them under our rules. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, I can almost guarantee that those crown corps are going to begin to justify their positions or situations and they're going to become profitable. But like I said, if they don't, I'm going to be the first one to talk . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take up too much more time because I'm sure there's other speakers that want to speak. But by gosh, I don't like to see the member from Cumberland over there accuse this government through the crown corporations by suggesting that we do not create employment for natives of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I have three reserves in my constituency — three reserves that I respect — and I respect the natives of this province. And I want to say that I do not separate the white from the native and the Chinese from the Ukrainian from the French. I respect a Saskatchewanian as a Saskatchewanian, or I respect the individuals out there for their incentive. And if the member from Cumberland has a problem that his natives are being mistreated in an unjust situation, then I would like for him to come and visit me in my office and I will gather all my colleagues in my office . . . Well, I'd have to get them out of my office because my office isn't large enough to handle such a large membership. But I want to guarantee that member that I will fight for the rights of the native and the natives to getting jobs alongside of the whites in this province . . . (inaudible) . . . with the crown corporations or any corporations of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hopfner:** — But I would suggest that you quit twisting the truth, because you are listening to the members that have been around this Assembly for far too long that have listened to too much of their own rhetoric. And what I'm saying is: if you listen to it long enough, you're going to believe it. And let me tell you something: this country you ought to stand up and be proud of, because Saskatchewan today is the leader across this country.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hopfner:** — And Saskatchewan today . . . You can travel down to Quebec, you can travel into Toronto, and they will look at us, and they will look at us, the way we handle our crown corporations, and they'll look at us the way we're handling the lessening of taxes, the introduction of Saskatchewan for bringing in investment, so it's not that apparent that a government has to go out there and ask the people to support crown corporations that cannot profit.

People work and get ahead through initiative and incentives. And if you don't give those incentives and don't allow the people to use the initiatives, how in God's green earth can you possibly expect them to profit . . . to make corporations profit that mean nothing to them? And I mean absolutely nothing to them because let me tell you something. If I have to get up in the morning and go to work for a crown corporation, I can imagine where my heart is. It's for next pay-day and that would be about it. And I am not suggesting that we have a lot of civil servants out there that don't earn their bucks, by any means. What I am suggesting is that the expertise that was up there running those corporations weren't allowing those individuals to crawl the ladder through their own incentives and their own initiatives. Those are the people that I blame for the crown corporations not profiting, and those are . . . You take any incentive out of an individual and you're got nothing left but a corpse. And I've yet to see a corpse be productive. . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to speak a little bit about the costs — the costs of crown corporations. Those costs . . . they talk about, they talked about the costs. I want to talk



about the costs if I may a little bit . . . is because when they went out and purchased a meat-packing industry, when they went out and purchased all these crown corporations, where did they get the money from? From the taxpayers. But where did they have to go? They went out of country to borrow the money. What's the interest rate sitting at today.

And then I hear the Leader of the Opposition, many years ago in a question period under SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association), when one of the members happened to stand up and ask a question as to what are these benefits or these crown corporations going to do, so it might lessen the tax burden on the rural municipalities and the urban centres. He gets up and he says, Mr. Speaker, he says 'You know,' he says, 'you know it's like Bell Canada or it's like Westinghouse.' He says, 'It's an ongoing thing; it's an ongoing expense,' Well, it's an ongoing expense. That's how he answered. He didn't answer about the profits because he knew there wasn't going to be any profits. He had to borrow money from heritage fund to pay off all his dog gone promises that he made to the people of Saskatchewan here.

You know, Mr. Speaker, they talk about balancing budgets. Well I'll tell you something. If the opposition had to balance a budget honestly, we would have been in debt 11 years ago. We'd have been in debt 40 years ago. We'd have been in debt as long as politics ever existed, as long as parties ever existed. Where does the dollar come from? Well, it all goes back to the taxpayer.

I want to say something, too. When the members opposite brought in this idea of buying up crown corporations, you know, they thought they really had Saskatchewan in hand. Well, April 26th it was proven wrong. And, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say thank you to the people out there in Saskatchewan, because now we have a chance to make things profitable. We're going to give the French jobs. We're going to give the Ukrainians jobs, Germans jobs, Saskatchewanians jobs, Albertans jobs. We're going to bring the people back, and we're going to profit. We're going to build and bring about the investment in this province that should have been brought here many years ago. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinson:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to acknowledge an inept opposition whose position this evening, on one very important segment of this province — the crown corporations — I think has not only placed them in a position of indignance with the House and with the government side of the House, but has placed them in a position of indignance with every resident in this province and from coast to coast in this country.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinson:** — I would just like to read the amendment to the original motion.

. . . support the Devine government's steps to assess the operations of the crown corporations through the report of crown investments review commission, and its determination to put Saskatchewan crown corporations on a firm managerial and financial footing.

Now, I believe that on the basis of debate in this House on crown corporations, we have

to take ourselves back to the initiation of crown corporations in the mid-40s, when, yes, as a member said earlier tonight in this House, a former CCF government led by Tommy Douglas came to power and decided that governments, through control of equity and control of capital, should get involved in the everyday business of everyday people in this province. They did so in service industries initially, and they did so in a manner that was beneficial to the people of this province.

I want you to keep in mind two figures: 11 and 22. I don't know if they mean anything to anybody. I suppose if 22 was the last number in a bingo, you'd find it very interesting. But 11 corporations were established in the first 26 years after the first CCF government was elected in Saskatchewan. The first three years of the Blakeney administration, from 1971-75, or four years, there were 11 more corporations added to the fine family of crown corporations.

Now, the debate is on whether or not, Mr. Speaker, we're addressing a necessity and a service to the people of Saskatchewan, or whether we're addressing a philosophy — a philosophy founded on controlling, controlling equity, and controlling capital. That philosophy, which is well documented in any history book in this province in the libraries, that philosophy is one called socialism. Now socialism does nothing more than control — through the gun, through the government — control capital on behalf of government, not on behalf of people.

Adolph Hitler got elected in 1933 on a platform of socialism. Where did he go? Where did Hitler wind up? He would up introducing a platform based on something we have to include in this debate with simply a definition, Mr. Speaker, of why this government took us on a tack — a tack of control, of control, Mr. Speaker, of control of capital in this province. What single benefit to a taxpayer like myself was the acquisition of half the potash industry in this province? What single benefit did I get? There wasn't a job created. There wasn't a single hollow; there wasn't another mineshaft dropped. I did not benefit. Only a control-orientated government, a control-orientated government led by Allan Blakeney and his socialists benefited. And we still are not reaping any benefits, because it was all here. It was capital we had. It was capital we had established in this province.

And, I've noticed over the years, one of the most closely and tightly held secrets of the socialist government opposite is socialism. How often do you define it? When do you explain it to the people? You run down something called capitalism; you go into this; you go into that. Capitalism is a freedom to own capital. And I think every one of us in this province, everyone of us in this province believes in that freedom. And I think if we go out in this province and we drive from end to end in this province, we will find people who believe in owning capital — every farmer, every home-owner, every business owner; even the NDP believe in it.

But coming back to the amendment, I think we've defined the position taken by different governments. The people respect that. The people in the province want that. We do not stand for, we never have stood for, and I don't know if it's ever been mentioned in this House by any member on this side, that we support control of capital by government's — we do not. If a potash mine is sold to whoever it might be sold to anywhere in the world, if Cominco sell their mines to IMC, are you going to say that's an unfair transaction? Sure you are, because you didn't buy it. You don't have the opportunity. You're no longer the government, no longer the government, and we will not be acquiring any more potash mines.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinsson:** — Also, just one point I'd like to clarify for the member from Cumberland. And we're not picking on the member from Cumberland. I want to explain that to the House, Mr. Speaker. But if you go through the Saskatoon phone book, if you go through the Saskatoon phone book, you'll find five mining companies. I believe, I stand to be corrected — there's between five and ten. But you won't find any more. SMDC is listed as one of the mining companies. Okay? Now if you go into Vancouver and you look in their phone book, you'll find 800-plus mining companies that are involved in an area similar to Cumberland. It's probably smaller.

Now as a member from that area, how can you support a government who has closed down offices in the mining sector in this province? They've closed them down, they've never opened, they've never been given the opportunity to open those mining offices. And they're proud of it. I've heard in this debate this evening, regarding the operation of crown corporations, their expansion of government ownership and the capital in this province is a heritage government should follow. Well on the 26th of April this year, it's a heritage the people of this province decided they don't want their grandchildren to inherit.

They want their grandchildren to come into a province where they can be serviced. And I've asked myself many times in this debate, you know, when we look at improvement of services since 1971, can we honestly say that with an additional approximately 14 or 15 crown corporations since 1971, can we honestly say their level of service has increased? Can they honestly say their level of service has increased?

The opposition cannot demonstrate in any manner, way, shape or form, that the level of service (and that's what we're talking about with crown corporations, Mr. Speaker, is the level of service); but what do we get? Why don't we have what we've got? They cannot demonstrate an increase in that level of service within the public sector that wouldn't have been looked after adequately by taxpayers like myself and others in this province who were here and were very willing to do business in this province. They've driven business out of the province. And they say socialism doesn't have an effect on business. That's what they say.

Are you listening, members of the opposition? Very few are, and very few are in here most of the time. They're busy planning, they're busy planning. And I just want to quote. Some of their planning . . . They get together and they plan things like undermining, they plan things like undermining, they plan things like mismanaging, they plan things like mismanaging. They were well organized in the mismanagement area in this province. They plan things like loss of earnings. They plan those things, they plan them. There's nothing else to do. They also plan things like loss of jobs, that's all I've heard from that side of the House. Their caucus meetings are based on their own resolution, their own resolution right in the blues indicates where they spend their time and what their effort goes into.

The other thing I would like to just address momentarily, and it's been of very little importance to the planners opposite, is, on Monday past, Statistics Canada did announce some figures based on Canadian job creation, unemployment, on basically and increase in the number of people working in various . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order please. Is the member going to relate this comment to the subject? You seem to be along ways away from it.

**Mr. Sveinson:** — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your interruption, but it is directly related, directly related to the amendment in that what we have done on this side of the House since we've been elected is working. It's working; it's creating jobs. And we have done that not by eliminating crown corporations, but by working with them in trying to entice other businesses into this province. Crown corporations are an integral part of everything we do as a government in this province and we recognize that fact. But we also want to bring businesses into this province that those members opposite have not acknowledged since 1971.

And you smile. The member from . . . I can't remember where he's from. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member from Pelly is laughing. He thinks it's a joke. He can probably recall a number of people that we've driven from the farms; we've driven from the towns; we've driven from the city. And that relates to the amendment. We're going to bring these people back. People of Saskatchewan heritage who have Saskatchewan expertise will be involved in Saskatchewan crown corporations.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinson:** — And I heard earlier in the debate — and it again directly relates to the amendment — the word 'dividend.' You know, again in the socialist doctrine the word 'dividend,' in their doctrine, takes a firm dive into obscurity because it isn't there. Dividends the member from Quill Lake mentioned earlier today. He had it confused with some of the rhetoric I've mentioned just a moment ago. He had it confused with undermining; he had it confused with mismanaging. That's all they think about. A dividend is simply the end result of a productive endeavour. It's nothing more. It's the final result. Now it doesn't matter whether you're in a crown corporation, or whether you're in a private company, or whether you're on a farm, or whether you're in a dentist office, you can pay a dividend.

Now I think maybe we should put a package together and send it into the caucus opposite and they can study what actual good practice I business means. It means arriving and creating and paying a dividend. That's called profit. And they can't relate to it, and they don't relate to it.

Their illustrious leader from Ottawa was just in Peru addressing the world socialist convention — a convention of socialists from around the world. He came down heavily in his address on endeavours relating to corporate enterprise. He came down on endeavours relating to corporate enterprise. He was talking to the converted. He's talking to the world socialist convention. The PQ in Quebec and the NDP in Canada are fighting over who should get the floor at the world socialist convention. Well we don't want the floor at the world socialist convention; we want to speak directly to the people who we owe our government to, and we're a government as good as the people.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinson:** — Now as I was saying, I hate to get into the philosophy of what's happening in politics and the faces of political organizations. I see the member opposite from Cumberland. He's got a very sombre look on his face. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member from Cumberland. He's listening. He's listening. The man

is interested in what we have to say. And I can tell you why.

I wear a button tonight from the good people of Duluth, Minnesota, a little town about size of Regina. Or, if you're somewhere else, if you're in Regina, it's a big city. But this is Duluth, Minnesota, U.S.A., U.S. of A. These good people from Duluth are hosting the Silver Broom in 1984. And we're very proud to be their neighbours, and I would like to say to the Americans that are in the village today, or in the town today: welcome, welcome! We welcome your capital. We welcome your investment. We welcome your participation. And this is directly related to the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinson:** — But we do not welcome flag burners from Manitoba.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinson:** — I fielded a question earlier in this Assembly, and this again relates to this, because we're talking about attitude, Mr. Speaker. Attitude. That's what creates enterprise. And when you've got an attitude that your most functional and your most energetic activity goes into starting a fire on an American flag on the steps of the Manitoba legislature, believe me, you've got a government that's not leading you. It's not representing you. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It's totally related in an indirect fashion to the amendment, because attitude's a big part of moving capital from place to place in Canada or in the United States of America.

And upon addressing the members earlier, I asked them if they found a flag that was burning, would they put the fire out? They said no. No. Listen, they said they wouldn't put the flag fire out. Well, I would.

Mr. Speaker, we have addressed a problem very, very, very close to the hearts of all people in this province. We have addressed the necessity, the absolute necessity for crown corporations to function within our communities. On this side of the House we recognize that necessity and we support it 150 per cent. But there are corporations that were established in this province, not in the interest of necessity or service, but only the selfish interests of a philosophy that left this province on the 26th of April.

I support the amendment, Mr. Speaker, the amendment to the motion. I support the motion as amended.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinson:** — And I'm waiting with bated breath for a reaction from the members opposite that will offer some positive direction, some positive attitude, to the province of Saskatchewan. And without it, I ask the people of this province in the next election to finish the job. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Dirks:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The fervour and intensity with which my fine colleague from Regina North West has just spoken is indicative, I believe, Mr. Speaker, and representative of the deep consternation that the people of this province feel towards the manner in which the crown corporations of this province were managed by

the former government.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it's important for the members opposite to understand very clearly who their opponent really is in this debate. And I'm pleased to see the member from Regina Centre here this evening because he made some remarks earlier on which I think need to be addressed, and which need in fact to be corrected. It's axiomatic that in any competition, if you're going to be successful you need to know your opposition. And it's clear to me that the members opposite clearly do not know their opposition. They do not know what Progressive Conservatism is all about.

The member from Regina Centre stated earlier on today in our discussion about crown corporations that the present government does not believe in public enterprise, that Conservatives do not believe in public enterprise. That was his statement. He also stated that Conservatives find the whole concept of public investments abhorrent. That was what the member from Regina Centre said.

Well I recall the other evening the member from Regina Centre made some quote from the father of conservatism, Mr. Edmund Burke. And I believe if he would have read on just a little further, he would have found, in fact, that true conservatism has no antipathy to the use of public enterprise to accomplish public good. That has always been a function of true conservative philosophy to use public means, in this case, to use crown corporations, to accomplish the public good. The problem is that the former government was guilty of a gross distortion, a gross imbalance, a gross over-emphasis upon the role of crown corporations in this province.

And I want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that in the last 10 years here in Saskatchewan, and I want the people of the province of Saskatchewan to understand very carefully, that the crown corporation emphasis of the former government, as opposed to this government, resulted in a tremendous growth in bureaucracy here in this province. And I note that the motion before us talks about taking steps to assess the operations of crown corporations and I think that's crucial and needs to be done here in the province, for I am sure that our citizens are not interested in seeing another 10,000 or 12,000 citizens added to the bureaucracy here in the province.

And I think, Mr. Speaker, that we compare the operation of crown corporations under the Devine government with the operation of crown corporations in provinces governed by NDP parties, in order to determine whether or not the policies of our government with regards to crown corporations are in fact working, because the Opposition would attempt to convince all of us that in fact they are not working.

Well I ask the member from Regina Centre then to compare the record of the socialist government in Manitoba at present with the socialist government in . . . with the Conservative government here in Saskatchewan. Unemployment in Manitoba, at present, under the NDP government, is two points higher than it is in Saskatchewan. If your crown corporation policies were working, then they should be lower in Manitoba — in fact they are higher. The deficit in Manitoba is almost double what the deficit in Saskatchewan is at present. In addition to that, here in this province, the latest statistics indicate that we have created, in the last three months, 10,000 new jobs. Not only that, but if you take a look at the inflation record, you will see that the lowest inflation rate in Canada today is not in Quebec city, it is not even in Winnipeg. The lowest inflation rate in Saskatchewan is in the city of Regina, a city in a province governed by a Progressive Conservative government.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is clear, just from that brief resume of statistics, that the policies of the Devine government here in this province with regards to crown corporations are working just fine, and the people of this province certainly can have confidence that they will continue to work just fine, that we will see jobs continue to be created, unemployment will be reduced, and certainly that is what all of us look forward to.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I shall be supporting the motion as amended.

**Mr. Katzman:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of comments I would like to make. It's interesting to note that the members opposite did not make any reference when they spoke earlier to the amount of borrowings that the crown corporations did prior to the change in government and how they related to the dividends declared. It seems a strange situation, to declare a dividend to the government, and yet have to go out and borrow that money so they can declare the dividend — I mean it's a strange way of getting a dividend. And I think one of the members earlier referred to that particular point. You know, it's interesting to watch.

I understand that in the times before the NDP took government in Saskatchewan, our crown corporations were not as indebted percentagely as they are today. And what happened over the past while, the former government kept borrowing money against the assets, and percentagely kept putting us further and further in debt, where if they would have paid off the debt, they could provide service for a lot less cost to the people of Saskatchewan, because they don't have to service that monstrous debt. And I didn't hear the members talking about that.

You know, the members talked about many things — SGI was one of them earlier today, the crown corporations, and I still remind them that it was the former attorney-general that suggested that the deductible should go to 500. We didn't invent that idea; it was invented by the former attorney-general, I believe it was an NDP member. He flew the flag prior to this last election. You know, there's lots of other things that you people did in government, and today all of a sudden you've switched places and you don't believe in the same rules.

You know, you took over the potash, yes, that's right. Mr. Richards talked in 1972 to a meeting of a group, and I spoke that speech in the House on January 12, 1976. I referred to the way they planned it over years, and so forth, and Mr. Speaker, I think that the Devine government has done the right thing, and this amendment is excellent, because it says we are looking at a property to make sure they do the function that we want it to do, and, therefore, I totally support this motion.

Motion as amended agreed to on division.

**Hon. Mr. Schoenhals:** — Mr. Speaker, as it is near 10 o'clock, I will move adjournment in a moment. But I would like to make a couple of brief comments, if I might, prior to that.

As a first time member in this house, Mr. Speaker, I have watched the proceedings this evening with a certain amount of interest and a certain amount of concern. Certainly some of the tactics have left me a little bemused. I think if the member from Regina Centre wishes to take the time in this House to play Don Rickles and . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order please! I'm just wondering on what order of business the hon. member is speaking. I don't think there's any place on the agenda for what you were

about to do.

**Hon. Mr. Schoenhals:** — In that case, Mr. Speaker, I move that this House now adjourn.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:57 p.m.