

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

HON. MR. LANE: — I give notice that I shall on Tuesday move first reading of a Bill, an Act to amend The Provincial Court Act.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's with considerable pleasure that I introduce to you, and to the Assembly, a group who are here on an annual basis. I think they've been introduced for the last several years each year. They're the group known as the independent living skills group. The course offered through the Regina Plains Community College. There are 12 students, 12 adults in your gallery, Mr. Speaker. They are accompanied by their teacher, Betty Nyhus. I'm going to have the pleasure of meeting with them for pictures at 10:30, and then we'll be getting together for a brief period of time to discuss what they have seen and what they have learned here.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and the members to welcome these students here.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DIRKS: — Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you, and to the members of the Assembly, on behalf of the member from Regina North, 28 grade 8 students who are seated in the Speaker's gallery, attending here today from Gladys McDonald elementary school, along with their teacher, Bruce Baldwin, and various chaperons.

I'm sure that you will all have an educational experience here today, and we wish you all the best. I'll have the opportunity to meet with you for pictures later, and I would welcome all members to join with me in welcoming these students to our Assembly today.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MARTENS: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and to the Assembly a group of 16 grade 8 students from Wymark, Saskatchewan. They're seated in the west gallery. They are here today to observe the House in session and to take a tour. I hope they find it interesting and educational. They're accompanied by their teacher, Colin Richert, the principal of the school, Mr. Jake Knelson, and Henry Fehr and Les Harder. I'd like you to join with me in welcoming them here today.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Use of Executive Aircraft by Minister of Highways

Mr. Lusney: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question was going to be directed to the Minister of Highways; however, he's not in his seat, Mr. Speaker, so I'll direct my question to the Deputy Premier. Mr. Deputy Premier, yesterday, when I asked the minister about a \$3,400 trip that the Minister of Highways made or paid for with taxpayers money for transporting his family from Unity to Regina and then from Regina back to Unity — and I'll quote to you the minister's answer — he said:

Yes, I am very sure. It did bring myself, my family into Agribition for a function last Sunday morning, and I did return with them last Monday morning as well.

Those were the minister's words, Mr. Deputy Premier, and a few minutes later the minister went out of the House and changed his story. He then said he was not on the plane with his family on Monday morning.

Can the Deputy Premier tell the public today why the minister lied — excuse me, Mr. Speaker, wrong choice of words — why the Minister of Highways deliberately misled this House in saying that he was with his family when the plane returned to Unity Monday morning?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, the minister will be making a statement to the House later today.

MR. LUSNEY: — A question to the Deputy Premier. Mr. Deputy Premier, the minister was just outside the door a few minutes ago. Mr. Deputy Premier, will you as the Acting Premier at this point, since the Premier is not in the House and out of the province, will you take it upon yourself to clear up this misunderstanding — if that's what it is — with the people of Saskatchewan, so that they would clearly know that a minister of this House and of the Crown would not mislead them, and what he was saying was actually true.

And the one way to prove that would be get the papers, the flight plan, from the Department of Transport to prove where that plane went, why it went there, who picked it up. Bring that to the House so the public of Saskatchewan would know exactly what happened and that the ministers of this House are not abusing the taxpayers' funds.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, in accordance with a letter filed with you, sir, earlier this morning from the hon. minister, the minister will be making a statement to the House later this day.

Unemployment Problem in Northern Saskatchewan

MR. YEW: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct my question to the minister responsible for the Northern Affairs Secretariat. Mr. Minister, my question to you is in regards to . . . it deals with — pardon me — with the chronic unemployment problem which your government has failed to address in northern Saskatchewan.

Unemployment in many northern communities is running at 85 to 90 per cent, which is a tragic waste in both human and economic terms. Mr. Minister, you know yourself that one good way to create meaningful employment in the North is to build some very vital facilities which are needed to secure a prosperous future for northern residents, like better roads, schools, recreational facilities, housing, municipal services, etc. As an example, four years ago our government spent more than \$18 million on highway construction. Can the minister inform the House how much money was spent on new highway construction in the North this fiscal year.

HON. MR. DUTCHAK: — Mr. Speaker, there were a number of items raised by the member, and I'll attempt to deal with them as concisely as I can. He mentions highways and roads, and clearly the highway and road system and the whole infrastructure in northern Saskatchewan has been very important to us, especially in recent years, since we have a great deal of interest in developing northern resources.

I have before me, in fact, the latest copy of the national magazine called *The Northern Miner*, where the front-page deals with the La Ronge gold belt. As the member may be aware, we have announced a major gold mine and mill in northern Saskatchewan. The article indicates that there's more activity in northern Saskatchewan now than before. This is clearly because of some of our

changes in policy in northern Saskatchewan.

We also have been firm with our policy of leaving the uranium mines operating, not closing them down as the members opposite wish to do. We also have encouraged new developments in uranium mining which are spurring on exploration. We have more activity in that sector than ever before in the history of Saskatchewan.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the unemployment rate in northern Saskatchewan is a grave concern to us. It has been since we became government. We've seen in the last 20 years the unemployment rate in northern Saskatchewan get chronic and worse year by year by year. And, Mr. Speaker, this is because of governments that didn't have the answer, didn't have the process to help unemployment. We feel that by building the industrial base will in due course solve this very serious and sensitive problem.

MR. YEW: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I mention the improvement of municipal services, Mr. Minister, such as adequate sewer and water systems as an important and worthwhile job creation plan for the North. Four years ago we provided more than \$4 million in grants to northern communities to upgrade sewer and water systems and to build other community projects such as recreational facilities, etc. We also passed on to local government more than \$7 million in revenue-sharing payments, Mr. Minister. Today, those grants to northern communities are a fraction of what they were four years ago.

Can the minister explain how cut-backs in spending on community services such as sewer and water, roads, recreational facilities and other fire protection measures will create a better way of life for residents of northern communities?

HON. MR. DUTCHAK: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the preamble is indeed lengthy and inaccurate, Mr. Speaker. What the member has said is not what northern people are telling me. In fact, what the member is saying is not what the northern people told him when they bounced him out of his nomination, I realize that the member will not be the candidate in the next election; however, I'd invite him to go to some of the northern communities and find out what the challenges are in those communities, Mr. Speaker.

Specifically, building the infrastructure is a high priority with us. We have been getting housing projects that are innovative into northern communities that were long overdue for seniors and for families. Ile-a-la-Crosse, for example, is the centre of pilot projects that have never before been tried in the history of Saskatchewan, and it's been met very successfully by the people of northern Saskatchewan by getting the people themselves involved in the process. And that will continue to be our direction.

The fact that the DNS did certain things may have impressed the members opposite. They didn't impress the Northerners; they didn't impress me, and in fact, the unemployment rate has increased consistently under the DNS time period.

MR. YEW: — There must be an easier way. Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister recall a letter he received from the Saskatchewan Association of Northern Local Governments on July 3rd of this year, pointing out the same things that I'm pointing out to you presently, Mr. Minister. The letter states in part, for your information:

Northern communities need sewer and water services, roads, street lights, office building, fire halls, fire trucks, sewer and water extensions, roads, housing.

And all these things cost money, Mr. Minister. The letter goes on to say that everyone in Saskatchewan should be treated equal and that northern residents are just asking for fairness and equal treatment. They are asking for some of the same services and programs which southern residents have long enjoyed, Mr. Minister, and I ask you: are basic community services too much for the North to ask from your government?

HON. MR. DUTCHAK: — I want to advise the member that northern capital grants are roughly twice as much as to southern communities. Mr. Speaker, you have to realize in Saskatchewan it's taken decades to build southern communities and, in fact, I refer to northern Saskatchewan as a new frontier.

The fact that the former government made certain errors with the DNS and set the North back somewhat doesn't take away from the potential that Northerners feel about northern Saskatchewan, and this is why they're getting involved, Mr. Speaker, in preserving uranium mines, and getting involved in uranium exploration and building our gold facilities in northern Saskatchewan, because northern people have that view.

And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if the member would spend a little more time in northern Saskatchewan, speaking to the real people in the communities, he would get the same message.

Northern Fresh Food Transportation Subsidy

MR. THOMPSON: — Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Health and it deals with spending priorities, Mr. Minister.

In the past 12 months he has spent more than \$150,000 on payments to SJM Communications Services Ltd., a PR (public relations) firm he has hired to prepare speeches and to send direct mail over the province trying to spruce up his image. But while you see no problem with spending \$150,000 on a PR firm, you told us earlier this year your department could no longer afford the northern fresh food transportation subsidy. This subsidy helped families in remote northern communities put fresh food on the table.

Can the minister explain why he can afford a PR firm to prepare his speeches and letters, but can't afford a subsidy to help northern families buy fresh food, eggs, or meat, and milk for their children?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to have that question from the member opposite in view of the consultation process that we've been discussing in the last week or two — or the last two or three days in the legislature. I'd just like to inform him that probably the next consultation round that I will be having will be in Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, and many of the people that will be invited to take part in that process will come from northern Saskatchewan, where we will be discussing such things as home care for the North.

My deputy and my associates have been in Buffalo Narrows and various places looking at developing a home care program for northern Saskatchewan. I want those people to come down to Prince Albert, and they will be invited, along with the member opposite, to come down and help us direct a program that will provide home care and continuing care services for the people of northern Saskatchewan. I think that's one of the priorities that we need to be dealing on.

As far as explaining the northern food subsidy, I think he knows as well as I do, a lot of that was going to fly-in fish camps, things of this nature; that there were only a few areas in the North that were receiving this. Many of the other areas were not. We decided to cancel that. In view of that, we put in medical services up in the North-west that have never been there before. The member well knows that. I say I look forward to the consultation process with the people of north-western Saskatchewan.

MR. THOMPSON: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, you now indicate, four years into your term, that you are now going to consult with Northerners and are going to ask them to come down to the South.

When you cancelled the \$250,000-a-year fresh food transportation subsidy earlier this year, you claimed that the money saved would help improve health care services for northern families. Can the minister tell the Assembly and the people of those remote northern communities exactly where their \$250,000 a year has gone? What improved health care services have resulted from your

decision to cut that food subsidy?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Well, Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated, I believe that a health care priority for northern Saskatchewan is the continuing care, the beefing up of home care, more than providing subsidized food to fly-in fish camps. He may think otherwise, but I don't agree with that. As I said previously, only a few areas were getting this subsidy, and some of that was going to fly-in fish camps. I didn't approve of that.

He asked where the money went. He knows very well that in conjunction with the University of Saskatchewan, and also with the federal government, we have put in place medical coverage for north-western Saskatchewan that never existed before.

He mentions the consultation. Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence I would just like to read a couple of excerpts from the many letters we have received regarding receiving my speeches and the consultation process. Here is one from the Canadian Cancer Society, Mr. Speaker, executive director, George Thomas, who says:

We very much appreciate the consultative approach you're taking in regard to this planning, and may we assure you again that we will do our best to continue to work with you to identify problems and opportunities and help you . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please.

MR. THOMPSON: — Supplementary to the Minister of Health. Mr. Minister, are you indicating that you took off the \$250,000 as a consultation tool to put out that type of propaganda four years after you became government?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, I listen with interest to the escalating costs of the members opposite. It goes up by about 20,000 every time they get on their feet. I have told you that my priorities, Mr. Speaker, are to have long-term care for the elderly and the young-disabled in this province as a priority. I believe that the money spent on that is better than subsidizing fly-in fishing camps. And furthermore, my colleague of northern Saskatchewan last year stood in this House and asked the members opposite, who's raising the question today, to give him some solutions as to some of the ways providing fresh food can happen in the North by people growing it themselves and things of this nature. There has not been a response.

Northern Development Advisory Council

MR. THOMPSON: — New question, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question now to the minister in charge of the Northern Secretariat. My question is to the minister responsible for northern affairs, and it deals with the latest attempt to take the heat off the disastrous record in the North by appointing yet another committee. I'm talking about the Northern Development Advisory Council, which is supposed to plan economic development in the North. Does the minister not see the job of planning and encouraging economic development in the North to be his role in close consultation with the elected northern local governments, as opposed to politically appointed councils? Can the minister explain why he had decided to attempt an end run on the elected local northern governments with this week's appointment of the Northern Development Advisory Council?

HON. MR. DUTCHAK: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member could repeat the first part of his questions. His colleagues were heckling at that point and I didn't catch the first couple of sentences.

MR. THOMPSON: — My question is to the minister responsible for northern affairs, and it deals with the latest attempt to take off his disastrous record in the North by appointing yet another committee.

HON. MR. DUTCHAK: — Well I find the member's position highly unusual. As the member must have forgotten, I telephoned him asking for his input as far as a set on names, and told him what I intended to do long before the appointment of this council. He, in fact, was kind enough to submit a set of names to me, and I thank him for that. However, he appears to have changed his mind today.

The northern advisory council, Mr. Speaker, is part of legislation, and I've complied with legislation now in officially appointing the northern advisory council. Strange that we should receive the accusation that it's political. That view is not shared by anyone else, to my knowledge, other than possibly some of the people he just referred to that may be active in his political regime.

However, people on the council, Mr. Speaker, include Dr. Walter Kupsch, who is an expert in northern affairs and who, incidentally, was retained by the former government for certain work on the Churchill River study. Now I at this point would have to ask the member to clarify to me the name of any one of those individuals on that 11-person team who would be deemed to be a political appointment. And I think he owes that council, Mr. Speaker, an apology, and Northerners an apology, or else let's have the detail on that.

MR. THOMPSON: — Mr. Speaker, a new question, and if you will permit me to answer that question . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's highly unfair, but I will attempt to get this over here, and I'm going to . . .

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister will be aware that Wednesday, in Prince Albert, that the Saskatchewan Association of Northern Local Governments voted unanimously to refuse to recognize his elected advisory body. They called the council a propaganda move and a bunch of political appointments, so it's not just myself who has talked about the political appointments. And I'm not speaking of Northerners, Mr. Minister, I have no problem with the Northerners.

But a 12-person board, there are five Northerners on the 6-person board, and I have a letter which I gave you, and recommended individuals from northern communities who are involved with local governments, and you totally ignored every one of these names, including the largest town up there, La Loche.

The Saskatchewan Association of Northern Local Governments represents some 20 northern Saskatchewan communities, so how can you claim that the advisory council has the support of northern people, when you have a former Liberal candidate . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. The member is giving information and not seeking information. If you have a question I would like to hear the question, but get directly to it.

MR. THOMPSON: — Mr. Speaker, who elected your advisory council to speak for Northerners?

HON. MR. DUTCHAK: — Mr. Speaker, again I reiterate I find it a little strange that this objection is raised today, when the member went so far as recommending names to me and didn't see anything wrong with the council when he felt he wanted to have some input. And I welcomed that input.

Mr. Speaker, we looked at models across Canada . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . I believe it's difficult for the members to hear the answer if they keep heckling, Mr. Speaker. However if the members look across Canada they'll know that northern Alberta has a very highly successful council that's operating in a similar sense to the operation of the council I've just announced. And I would ask them to have some confidence in the people of Saskatchewan and the people of northern Saskatchewan in bringing solutions to government.

Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the member to take time and review the quality of people involved. Quite frankly, the spokesperson that speaks for the group that he just mentioned was the same one that was, as late as last week, trying to get on the council I've just appointed, and I refused to appoint him. Now he seems to be speaking for the group that allegedly has contacted the member opposite.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who would take the time to review the quality of the board and the functions expected, would be impressed with the quality and would be impressed with the work that has to be carried out, which is so long overdue in northern Saskatchewan.

MR. THOMPSON: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Do you not agree, Mr. Minister, that the former mayor of Green Lake, who I recommended, Mr. Jim Laliberte, could not have chaired that northern council just as well as a retired deputy minister?

HON. MR. DUTCHAK: — Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the member is always slamming the civil service and slamming people who previously had served this province very well.

Mr. Speaker, if the member takes time to understand who the member referred to, namely Mr. Klassen, he'll find that Mr. Klassen was a person highly regarded under the former administration because he was involved in the DNS. He later was involved in our government and then chose to retire. Mr. Speaker, that individual is highly qualified, knows government. We felt we wanted at least one individual that knew about the workings of government. That's the reason for the appointment.

Mr. Speaker, it was a very difficult decision, selecting 11 people from the 75 submissions received from everywhere in northern Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, it's very important that this board function properly and I would ask for the co-operation of the two northern members in the working of this board.

Make-up of Northern Development Advisory Council

MR. YEW: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question related to the make-up of the Northern Development Advisory Council, Mr. Minister. I noted that only five of the make-up of this advisory council are people of native ancestry, the rest are whites. And I noted even that some are from out of province, Mr. Minister. I want to ask you: is that your concept of developing local decision making, local autonomy, local self-government?

HON. MR. DUTCHAK: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer the question, Mr. Speaker, and I'm having some difficulty. Mr. Speaker, the member just asked me about the five native members I believe you referred to. This indicates the primary problem with the fellows on the other side.

Mr. Speaker, there are in fact seven native members on the 11-man committee. It happens that one of the people that the member doesn't regard as a native grew up in Meadow Lake and is now a corporate executive with the Nova Corporation and he's in fact Metis . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Big River, I'm sorry. It's unfortunate that the member opposite doesn't call him a native any longer just because the individual happened to succeed in the corporate world.

The second one was recommended to us, and is also Metis, by the community college system in northern Saskatchewan. This is Anne Hryniuk. The fact that she happens to not have a native last name apparently means that she is not a native, according to the members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, there are seven native people on this committee and I'm proud of that fact.

STATEMENT

Resignation of Highways Minister

HON. MR. GARNER: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, I would like to read a statement to the Assembly. Yesterday in question period I responded to a question, as recorded in *Hansard*. At this time I wish to apologize to you, Mr. Speaker, to the members of this Assembly, and to the people of this province.

On the morning of Sunday, November 24th, a CVA aircraft picked up my wife and our family and myself at Unity. Upon our arrival in Regina I met with staff and officials regarding the announcement

I was to make in the following week and the resumption of the legislature. Following the completion of the meeting with my staff and officials, my family and I attended Agribition. The following morning, Monday, November 25th, a CVA aircraft was leaving for Saskatoon to pick up a cabinet minister. At my request, Mr. Speaker, the aircraft flew my family home to Unity and continued on to Saskatoon.

Mr. Speaker, while I have exercised poor judgement in my reply to the question, I regret this sincerely. I admit, Mr. Speaker, to being guilty of wanting to spend time with my family and allowing that, Mr. Speaker, to cloud my judgement in question period yesterday. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, wish to inform you that I have spoken to my Premier this morning. I have offered him my resignation from cabinet, and he has accepted it.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Schoenhals that Bill No. 119 — **An Act respecting Saskatchewan Oil and Gas Corporation** be now read a second time.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I rise today to enter the debate on the Bill that will sell off one of Saskatchewan's proud and profitable Crown corporations, Saskoil, to a few private and wealthy investors in Saskatchewan and across Canada . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker, I notice the member for Saskatoon Centre speaks again from his chair and says, give your speech in Russian. I know the kind of individual he is, Mr. Speaker, and I know that that's the kind of cowardice we see from him because he never speaks in the House. We never see him speak in the House. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that when individuals like the member for Saskatoon Centre use that kind of tactics in this Assembly, then I say to you, democracy is not far from being removed by members like him. He should be a little careful in his attitude in this Assembly, and he should rise and speak on the orders on the order paper as opposed to calling out names and that kind of slandering that he does of members on either side, which he does continually.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to my remarks on Saskoil and to the Bill itself. The minister will be well aware that in going through this Bill, I suppose we're amazed at the lack of detail that the Bill includes. It's not unusual that this government comes forward with Bills that lack information, because they tend to be very secretive in their approach to bringing legislation into the House. They much prefer to have it in regulations where they can control it behind closed doors of cabinet.

But I say to you, Mr. Minister, this Bill 119, which is an Act respecting Saskatchewan Oil and Gas Corporation, is unusually short on detail and particularly long on rhetoric and red tape, that ordinary people, who you're saying the shares are for, I'm sure, will have a great and difficult time in getting through this Bill that was prepared, not to inform people. But, in fact, to cause more confusion.

I want to say as well that we believe this is a bad Bill. It's a bad Bill basically because it sets out a policy of taking away from the majority of Saskatchewan people and giving it to wealthy investors from across Canada.

We say to you, Mr. Minister, that the tradition of Saskatchewan is one that you won't be able to change that easily, because the people of Saskatchewan have opted over the past 50 years for an

economy which is based on caring and sharing and building together. It hasn't happened overnight and nor will you be able to change it overnight as this Bill is attempting to do.

Since the 1930's the people of Saskatchewan have been able to invest in Saskatchewan and private companies and also have had the advantages of Crown corporations and co-ops, using the public sector to invest in resources. In fact the people of Saskatchewan have been able to use the mixed economy, that has been developed in Saskatchewan, very effectively, to build a strong base on which the economy of Saskatchewan stood until 1982.

And it was and economy, Mr. Speaker, that was based on the use of public funds in Crown corporations, members' funds in co-ops, and a very strong private sector. And a mixed economy is not unusual. It's been used in many countries, used in countries like Austria, and Japan, and Sweden, West Germany. The strongest economies in the world, in fact, at the present time were built using a mixed economy where the private and public sector, along with the working people, built a strong economy.

But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the members opposite that this Bill is selling out. It's selling out a resource and a company that was built by the people of Saskatchewan. A million people in the province have money that is invested in Saskoil. It's money that was invested in Saskoil, a risk was taken, wells were drilled, and oil was produced. At the present time there are about 5 million barrels of oil a year being produced in by Saskoil, and that oil belongs to the million residents of Saskatchewan. They took the risk, they've got wells, and they're now producing oil.

But the government is saying, now that the profits are rolling in, the game is up; we're going to put it on the market. And I find it peculiar the choice of timing when they're going to put this on the market, at a time when farmers have been in a deep recession for a number of years and do not have money to invest in shares; at a time when people have had their wages frozen, in some cases for four years.

I want to tell you a little story. We were down having supper last night, and we were doing a little discussion on Saskoil, and we asked the waiter who was at our table whether or not he was going to invest in Saskoil. He said he would like to. He said he would very much like to invest in Saskoil because he thought it was a good deal. He said there's one problem — he said there's one problem, Mr. Speaker — I don't have any money. That's what the working people of Saskatchewan are saying, is they don't have any money to buy Saskoil, and the people who do have money are the oil companies who have already been taking \$300 million a year in taxpayers' money.

So I want to say to you that people who are going to suffer as a result of this Bill are the majority of Saskatchewan people and many of them, Mr. Speaker, who cannot afford to purchase the shares in Saskoil, the Saskoil shares that are being sold at the present time.

I want to say as well the PCs can, I suppose, take credit for this Saskoil share issue in the sense that they have been advertising it to a great extent. You've seen, Mr. Speaker, the ads that are in the newspapers and on the radio, and around and about, and the glitzy ads that come through, and the pamphlets that have been done — thousands of dollars spent on encouraging private investors, wealthy private investors, to invest in Saskoil. I noticed this morning even the bus stops haven't escaped from the glitz and the glitter of the minister in charge of Saskoil. The bus stop down by the Regina Inn has a big Saskoil share issue advertisement plastered on it. People are saying you can't escape this government — they're everywhere.

And I want to say to you, Mr. Minister, that there's an interesting comparison that people are making between your government and the Saskatchewan Roughriders at the present time, that they find it interesting that the hype is always there, that the advertising is there, that the announcements are there, but when it comes to substance, after two weeks into the season, there's no substance; that while the cheer-leaders are there, and the Saskatchewan Roughriders have the cheer-leaders on the field, when it comes to making the touchdown, they can't get the ball across the line.

And I say to you, Mr. Minister, that your cabinet is very much the same, and I've referred to this before, but you're like a bunch of middle-aged cheer-leaders. You do a lot of cheering, a lot of excitement. I listened to the Premier last night talking about how Saskatchewan could afford the cut in transfer payments — no problem; Saskatchewan has lots of money. Every other premier across Canada was saying, we're going to defend our province, money that we get from the federal government. Here, the cheer-leaders are saying we don't need it.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. We're debating second reading of a Bill, and I would ask the member to stay on the subject. We're not debating what happened in Halifax today.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Minister, I'm very clear relating the actions of the Premier in Halifax, very directly to the Saskoil shares that are being sold off, and the deficit that will result from that along with the deficit that will occur or programs that will be cut as a result of him giving the transfer payments away.

I want to go on to talk for a little while about the same comparison that is made between the Saskatchewan Roughriders and the Saskatchewan cabinet at the present time, as it relates to the Saskoil share sale that is going to be taking place in the very near future.

The interesting part is, Mr. Speaker, that many of the same people who do the ads and the PR for the Riders, and the great hype that is built up, are also the same people that are trying to guide this Conservative government through the wilderness to success. But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the millions of dollars that is being spent on advertising, the people of Saskatchewan are saying, why? They're saying, why the great amount of advertising if they're so popular? I say why is this profitable oil company, which is already owned by the people of the province, being sold?

The editor of *The Shaunavon Standard* had an interesting comment in an editorial two weeks ago. He had it solved. He said, 'The people of Saskatchewan enjoyed so much buying Saskoil the first time that they can't wait to buy it the second time.' And he has it right. Why should people who already own the oil company be buying it again? It makes no sense.

For the answer to the question we can turn to the publicly stated intention of the government. And their intentions were that they were going to stimulate the economy. They were going to create some jobs, and they were going to increase economic activity.

Let's look at those, Mr. Speaker, to see whether there's even a grain of truth in those three publicly stated intents of the minister of Saskoil.

(1045)

First of all, will selling or privatizing Saskoil stimulate investment? Well let's look at the record of the government. Since 1982 investment in Saskatchewan has been lower in terms of constant dollars than year . . . (inaudible) . . . business and the great hoop-la about bringing in the private sector. They were going to bring in corporations from around the world to develop the oil and to build upgraders. And we heard the story over and over again. And the Deputy Premier has flown around the world. He gave us an indication of that Monday night, the places he went to try to bring Toyota and the North Korean car manufacturing company.

But people are beginning to say, is that all there is? Like the old song, Mr. Speaker, 'Is that all there is?'

And I say to you that when it comes to privatizing Saskoil to stimulate investment, there's not a grain of truth that that is the reason that privatization is coming into being.

Well let's look at the other reason that they were talking about — creating jobs. We're going to sell shares in Saskoil to create employment. Well, Mr. Speaker, the public knows that nothing could be further from the truth. Saskoil, which your annual report refers to, in the 1984 report, that Saskoil is a 100 per cent Saskatchewan-owned Crown corporation. Well that won't be able to be what's put in

the report from now on. But in terms of creating jobs, Mr. Speaker, that is the furthest from the truth.

In fact, when Saskoil gives its profits away to the private, wealthy investors from across Canada, how are they going to be able to have an aggressive drilling program in the years to come? It's very clear that a good portion of the money that has been made from Saskoil over the last number of years has gone into a drilling program. The purchase of drilling rights competed with the private sector on an even footing, bought drilling rights to many acres of land in Saskatchewan, and had an active drilling program each and every year.

But now we're seeing in this Bill 119 the opening up that a good portion of the profits — who knows, maybe all the profits — could be moved over to the shareholders. And what will be left, one, for profits for the people who are the major shareholders, you and I, Mr. Speaker? And what will be left for the development of the oil lands that we have purchased over the last 10 years?

Well I say to you that the drilling program of Saskoil is going to be very much reduced in years to come, very much reduced in years to come, and jobs will be lost as a result of this share issue. I want to say as well that there may be the odd accountant who earns some extra money, but, in terms of real work and real production, there will not be jobs created by this extra share issue.

The other issue that the minister says is that this is the first time, of the Premier has said many times that this is the first opportunity that the people of Saskatchewan will be able to invest directly in the development of Saskatchewan oil. Well, the member from Assiniboia, who is a very excellent business person in his own right — everyone in his constituency recognizes that; successful, popular — knows very well that there have been many companies drilling in Saskatchewan that trade on the Calgary, Vancouver, Toronto, Montreal exchanges. They trade and they drill in Saskatchewan and they hit oil, and you can either make or lose money on the deal. You can wheel and deal and you've been able to do that for many, many years under consecutive NDP, Liberal and CCF governments. This is no new operation that you're setting in place.

Ask people like . . . I suppose you could go down the list of companies: Westmin Resources, who trade and drill in Saskatchewan; Universal Explorations, which trade and drill in Saskatchewan and trade on the Calgary Stock Exchange. I've had shares in that company and lost a little and made a little. And in a mixed economy we have been able to do that for many, many years. So that's not the reason that we're selling the shares.

Well what about the story that we are going to increase economic activity, the third point? Is there any truth to that? Well, I think we need only go to the towns in my constituency under your government and look at the economic activity that has been created, and we have the advantage of being in an oil producing area; others aren't as lucky. But I can tell you in the town of Shaunavon, losing two machinery dealerships in 1985 (when we haven't lost a machinery dealership that I can remember and that's getting to be a good number of years) is not a great record; losing two machinery dealerships out of seven in one year under the Conservative operation in Saskatchewan does not seem to me to be increased economic activity in the province.

So I say to you, my friend, in all three cases — stimulating investment to create jobs, or third, to increase economic activity — on all three counts that you have announced publicly your reason for issuing this share in Saskoil, you fail, and fail miserably.

Well I think, then, Mr. Minister, what we have to say is, why? Why are we going about this process of selling off shares in a company that we've established as being profitable, one that we already own 100 per cent. It says in your own annual report — I see the minister's picture in it and his signature on it — a company that is . . . and I quote:

A company that is 100 per cent Saskatchewan owned, with a philosophy that dictates competition without competition without special privileges in the industry while providing a suitable return to the shareholders through the payment of dividends and growth and investment value.

This is what you were saying last year, my friend. Now you're saying that that's not good enough. We've got to get more wealthy investors into Saskoil. I say, why? Well there are some who would say that it's a grab for \$100 million to solve your debt problem. There are those who say that, that the finance minister when he set out his pillars of the economy in the budget, and members of the opposition well remember that budget speech, the most intelligent budget in Canada or in the history of the world or whatever it was — the most intelligent budget, and he listed it out. We ended up paying much more taxes, Mr. Speaker, plus running into debt even further. Some would believe that the reason that we are selling \$100 million in shares in Saskoil is to help solve his problem. Well, I say to you that that will be part of it. That's part of the reason, but it's not the only reason.

Some people in the coffee shop in Shaunavon are saying the sale of shares are really an attempt to allow the people of Saskatchewan to invest in the deficit of the province. They're saying it's opening the door for the private sector or for farmers or for working people to invest in the Minister of Finance and the Premier's deficit that they've run up over the last four years.

Now the reason of the deficit is a logical one. It will be part of the reason that the government is doing it, to get some quick cash for mistakes they've made over the past four years. But I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there's another reason and it's a more narrow reason. It's the one that deals with narrow right-wing philosophy — that the Premier of the province at the present time is not willing to accept the heritage of this province, one built on co-operation, public investment, and a strong private sector.

I think what they're trying to do is to say look, our view of the economy of Saskatchewan is right. It's one that says we shouldn't have the freedom of choice on which investment tool we want to use to develop the economy. We're only going to have one way: that's ours; that's control by the wealthy and the powerful in Saskatchewan. I believe that the main reason that we're selling shares in Saskoil.

And I think that to believe that a few private investors from Saskatchewan and across Canada are going to solve your economic problems, are as wrong-headed as your open for business philosophy which you believed would work in 1982.

Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, the solution to your economic dilemma, I think is clear and obvious. If you would read a bit of the history of this province, study it, you would find what the solutions to our problems are. The solution is obviously turning to the people of Saskatchewan in a co-operative way to solve our problems. It's never been different. In the early days when the people first came here, that's how they built their communities, that's how they built their towns, and that's how this city was built — not through having a great elite who would then allow money to trickle down to the poor, which we are presently becoming involved in at the present time.

There was a report issued two weeks ago which showed Saskatchewan to be the province that had the fastest-growing wealthy people, but also the fastest-growing poor people, of any province in Canada. And I say to you, Mr. Minister, that your attempt to change the structure of Saskatchewan from being a co-operative mixed economy to a right-wing based, having an elite rich and a massive poor population, is going to be rejected, and rejected soundly, at the next election.

Let's look for a moment at just who is likely to benefit most, Mr. Speaker, from this move, this move to sell off a profitable Crown corporation, Saskoil, which has made a good sum of money last year. As I mentioned earlier, risks taken by a million Saskatchewan people through their oil company, the fruit finally coming in, and when it does, the government's saying look, we're going to take it and give it away to a few.

I want to look very carefully at who will benefit from this share offering. Very obviously some of the people who will benefit from the share offering are the people from across Canada who have been benefiting from the oil policy of this government for the past four years. Everyone knows oil companies will be allowed to purchase a certain amount of shares, up to 4 per cent. They have

profits to invest. They've been making 141 per cent increase in profits over the last year. So they will have money to invest and they will benefit from this sale of shares.

In the prospectus that was issued, I believe on October 18th, there's another small group of people who will benefit. Page 31, and I'll just read this:

Saskoil intends to grant options to five senior officers to purchase common shares at the price of \$9, being the issue price of the common shares.

But it's not just an option to buy shares at \$9, Mr. Speaker. It goes on:

The option will be granted following continuance of the corporation under The Business Corporation Act, that prior to the amalgamation, with the wholly owned subsidiary as described under history of Saskoil.

This is the important part, Mr. Speaker:

The options will be exercisable during the period up to February 28, 1986. The maximum aggregate number of common shares that may be purchased under the option will be 50,000.

I want just to explain that for a moment. These five individuals who are employees of the company are going to be given an option on shares, 50,000 of them, at \$9. But not only that, they will be given that option until February 28th of 1986.

Now let's assume that the minister of Saskoil is correct that these shares are going to go up in price. They'll buy them at \$9; they go to \$15; they can be sold for the profit. No tax, because the Mulroney government has solved that problem. For investors, there's no capital gains.

Now take this scenario that these five senior officials decide that they are not going to purchase them right away on January 1st, but sit back. And the price goes up, and on February 28th they buy 50,000 shares at, let's say, \$16, and sell them on March 1st — buy them at \$9, Mr. Speaker, pardon me, I'll correct myself — buy them at \$9, which they have the option to do until February 28th, and then March 1st, sell them for twice the price, having held them for one day.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there would be people in this province who would say that that is unfair. They would ask why these five individuals will be able to make that kind of money if the breaks are right. Now there's also a possibility that the shares would go down. And if they go down, they don't have to exercise their option.

Now I say to you, Mr. Minister, what other group of civil servants in this province is being given that kind of an option? I know how you're dealing with your department staff in all the departments of government. It's the way the member for Saskatoon Centre would deal with them — get out the jack boots and put it to them.

But I say to you, Mr. Minister, when it comes to the wealthy people, you have quite a different option. And you are allowing these individuals 50,000 shares at \$9, which they will be able to make, if your predictions are true that these shares will go up, a very handsome profit without any risk. And I say to you that that is unfair.

I think there are people in the province, Mr. Speaker, who will not benefit a great deal from this share issue. There will be a number of people who will not share in the return of the \$100 million.

(1100)

I suppose if the minister had stood in his place and said look, we're going to sell off \$100 million worth of shares to people across Canada, and in return for that the million people in Saskatchewan

are going to get \$100 each sent to them for Christmas or whenever the money would come in when the shares were issued, he may have had a story to tell. If a family of five who has an interest in Saskoil were going to get \$500 as a result of the sale of shares, they may have agreed with it.

But I say to you, what sense does it make to sell a million dollars of our shares and not give anything back to the owners who are selling it. Where's the return? We're selling something. We're selling a million dollars worth of shares which we now own and we're getting nothing. Now I say that's a good deal. It's a good deal for the person buying them. But how can that possibly be a good deal for the million people selling? It's \$100 million that we're selling. We own it. Where's our money? When is the cheque coming? I haven't heard the minister say we're going to get \$100 each for this share issue.

I think the money is going to go into the general revenue and it's going to go out in royalties for oil companies. I think that's where the money's going. And if it's not going next year, then it's to pay for the ones that have already left.

And I say to you that selling off shares of \$100 million behind the backs of the people who own it and not giving them anything for it is not fair.

Where's the money going? You haven't explained what you're doing with the money. You haven't said that you're going to build a hospital or you're going to build a road or you're going to pay a dividend to the people who are selling the shares. You haven't explained that. You've said how it's going to help the wealthy, how it's going to make money for them. But you haven't told the people who are selling where the money is going.

I want to list out, Mr. Minister, who is not going to benefit from these shares being issued. Obviously the 64,000 people who now find themselves on welfare, who hitherto have at least had a share in that oil company, certainly aren't going to benefit. The Minister of Social Services had made sure of that. We referred to that yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that the people who had a 40 per cent cut in their welfare certainly aren't going to be rushing out and speculating on the stock market. Sorry, we just can't do that. It's a little tough to put food on the table and clothing on the family when you've had a 40 per cent cut in your income without going out and risking a little bit on the Toronto Stock Exchange.

Well, nor will it likely be the 40,000 people who are unemployed at the present time in the province of Saskatchewan; not likely that the 40,000 people who find themselves out of work, a large number of them, either young people or in northern Saskatchewan, are going to be rushing out to become involved in this great excitement that is sweeping across the province, and I'll refer to that excitement again later.

I don't think it will be the 60,000 people on minimum wage — could be, but I don't think the 60,000 people on minimum wage are going to be rushing out to line up to spend money and speculate on the stock market. They haven't done it in the past, and I'm not sure why they would now all of a sudden have money left over after paying for their utilities and other things that people on low income have to pay, that they would have any money left over.

I don't think there will be the tens of thousands of farmers, or small-business people in the drought area. Could be, but I don't think they're going to have money left over, not if the meetings I've gone to are any indication.

I don't think will be a great deal of money left over from the individual from Meyronne who was calling in the other day because his power was cut off in his small business. I don't think he'll be rushing out to buy shares, or the two or three farmers who have contacted me this week saying they can't pay their power bills; or two who have called in saying their phone has been cut off — their telephone has been cut off and that they want a \$500 deposit to get it reconnected. I don't think those people will be rushing out to buy Saskoil shares.

I doubt if the 30,000 students who are desperately trying to find employment, who are either in school or graduated and looking for work, I don't think they'll be enjoying the luxuries of the profits that will come. And I agree there will be profits to some, but I don't think those 30,000 students will be enjoying the profits that roll in as a result of your action.

I don't think any of them will be rushing out to speculate in your new-found game that you people have put together. But I think the most unfair part, I mentioned earlier, is the fact that all of these people, all of these people who I refer to — the 64,000 on welfare, the 40,000 unemployed, the 30,000 students, 60,000 who are on minimum wage — the most unfair part is that you're selling something they did have.

It was part of what they owned, and each year they got profits from that, and they had schools for their children to go to as a result of the profits flowing in. That will be gone to them. You have opened it up in Bill 119 that none of the profits have to stay in the corporation and that they can all go to the shareholders. There's nothing stopping it. And so the thousands of people I've referred to stand at risk of losing \$40 million a year.

Now you may not understand this, Mr. Minister, because I have a feeling after listening to your speech yesterday, the five minutes that you gave on this complicated Bill, that you don't understand anything about it. I think there are other people in control of this government and this Bill. I think the president of the PC party would understand it. I believe Ron Barber would understand what's happening here, and I'll be watching to see whether Ron Barber is one of the first people to line up to get his share of what we're giving away from the people of Saskatchewan.

I would be willing to bet that many of the small oil companies who you have been giving drilling permits to on Saskoil property, will be lining up. I'll bet they'll be lining up. They'll benefit from it.

But I say to you, sir, I don't believe that you understand what's in this Bill, what you're giving away. And I say that because I read with interest the five minutes you spoke on this Bill. It was something prepared by one of your bureaucrats, and you never gave any explanation in this House to the members of the opposition, to your own members, or to the public. And I say, five minutes on a Bill that will give away \$100 million is not being responsible. Five minutes. That's what you spoke.

Now I've been in the House for a goodly number of years, and I've listened before that to members of the Thatcher government when they brought Bills through the Assembly. I say to you, never have I seen giving away \$100 million in a five-minute speech. My colleague from Elphinstone has been here a term longer than I have, or a couple, and he will probably be able to confirm that he has not seen such a lack of involvement by the minister in any Bill of this significance.

So I say to you, Mr. Minister, that in giving away this money to your friends, friends of the Conservative party and the oil companies who have already got 300 million and now will be getting more, I say it's unfair to those many thousands of people who have worked in one way or another to build this province based on a mixed economy. You won't be able to do it. I won't say good luck to you in your attempt to do it because I know that it's going to fail.

I want just to turn for a few moments to the shrewd people who will be able to get involved from other areas of Canada. Now there are many people who say that a 100 per cent ownership of this Crown corporation in Saskatchewan hands was a good idea. You can say that if you're going to set up a new investment, a new upgrader, maybe we should have money coming in, and we can debate that for a long time.

But what I find interesting is that when it comes to setting up new projects, let's take the upgrader at Lloydminster. It was on the boards and close to being ready to go, and the minister in his Open for Business Conference in 1982 said he was going to get all this money coming in. Oh, the oil companies were lined up; they couldn't get here quick enough. Well after four years we don't find any of them lining up to bring money to Saskatchewan, but on the other hand Bill 119 opens the door

very clearly to getting rid of the Saskatchewan control of this oil company. Not only are we giving it away to wealthy investors, they don't have to be, nor will they be, wealthy Saskatchewan investors.

Shrewd operators from Montreal and Toronto will have a great time setting up companies and subsidiaries and friends and partners, getting around all of the guide-lines that you have in the Bill, because this Bill is a lawyer's dream, and they will be able to buy up, I believe, as many shares as they want. And by the time you catch up with them, if you want to, it will be too late; they'll have sold the shares and be long gone. You don't have any control over where these shares are going, and I can tell you that your explanation of the Bill gave us no security that you understand how you're going to control this share issue and make sure any per cent of this share offering stays in the province of Saskatchewan.

I want to turn just for a moment to the principle of whether this is a good buy or not, and there are people who say that this is a good buy. The shares that are bought at \$9 may go to 15 or 20 or they may go to 4. On the stock exchange, the member from Souris-Cannington will well know that shares go up and they go down, and he will be the first to admit that you don't make any money on every share offering that you pick up. Some are good and some are bad, and it will be seen whether the \$9 share goes to \$18 or to 4.

In British Columbia when the BCRIC shares were issued, they were issued at \$5, they went to 7.50 and I believe they're trading around 2 now. I'm not sure of that but I think it's close last time I looked. So the people in British Columbia who picked up shares at \$5 now are at a different price. I mean this is how it's going to work, and I want people to understand that this is not a bond where you buy it at \$9 and then get your coupon and you pick up your 8 or 9 or 10 per cent.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Similar.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Well, the member from Regina North West says similar, but I think that shows how little he knows about the difference between a share offering and bonds. But there is no guarantee that these shares will go up or down or stay different . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Now the member from Regina North East is all excited again and that's one reason he sits by himself is that nobody can sit very closely because he's so noisy. He's such a noisy man, and I understand why the Tories kicked him out . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

But at any rate, the issue is that there's a great deal of difference between a share offering and a bond issue. What I want to say here is that the people of Saskatchewan are being told by the minister that this is a good buy. I don't deny that it's a good buy. It could be a very good buy. The people who can afford to buy \$4 million worth of shares stand to make a good deal of money. I can tell you that the people who take three shares — it doesn't really matter a whole lot, they're not going to make any money. The people who are going to make the money on this issue are the people who can afford to put in \$100,000, \$200,000, and there will be some who will do that.

But I say to you that if it's such a good deal for the people buying, is it a good deal for the people who are selling. That's what the people of Saskatchewan have to ask. It's not like selling a house or selling a car or selling a piece of land. If it's a good deal for the person buying it, if the price is right, and you're going to make a good profit on it, is it a good deal for the guy selling? And I say no. I say for the million people who are selling their \$100 million in shares, they are not getting a good deal and the minister in charge of Saskoil is shirking his duty and responsibility that he was given by the people of Saskatchewan in giving those shares away at a price that he knows is lower than he could get. That's unfair. And for the 85 per cent of the people of Saskatchewan who will not buy shares, they will be losers as a result of his wheeling and dealing.

I would like to turn to one other point and that is: who will control the operation of this company? I see here, I have a list of directors and I want to mention a few of them, Mr. Speaker, the issue being: will it be Saskatchewan people who control this company? I see there are directors like Robert Bentall, a real estate developer from Vancouver. He is going to be a director of this oil company. There's a Ted Hanlon from Calgary; he's with Sage Petroleum. He's been in Calgary since 1982

working with a company out there. Ted is probably the most reasonable of the three out-of-province fellows; at least he has roots in the good town of Shaunavon.

(1115)

But I say to you I would have preferred to have a Saskatchewan resident in his place. There's Theodore Renner, president of a resource company from Calgary. I say why is it, Mr. Minister, that the control of this company, in terms of the three directors, you're not choosing Saskatchewan people. I say here again your search of technology and people to invest outside of the Saskatchewan, and now with people to run the corporation going outside of the province, is not what the people of Saskatchewan want.

So I say to you, Mr. Speaker, to the members opposite, that having watched with a great deal of interest the fanfare and the hoop-la that has gone on, that I, along with many others in Saskatchewan, are not terribly impressed with the sale of these shares at the present time to the people who you are intending to give them away to.

And I say, based on the comments that I have made and on behalf of the many people who have talked to me, I will be opposing the Bill, as I'm sure the members of the opposition will be when it comes to a vote. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SCHMIDT: — Mr. Speaker, there is only one reason why the members of the opposition criticize this share issue, and this is because we are selling back to the people a corporation that is one of their pet socialist projects. There is no reason whatsoever why the government should own an oil company.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do believe that the government should own some things where necessary. But it is not necessary for the government to own an oil company in this province. And in any event . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . it's rather difficult, Mr. Speaker, to make a point here when the opposition insists on speaking from their seats, but I'm sure I can do it. I must have struck a sore point with the opposition on the topic of their pet project, their family of Crown corporations, and this is one of their leading socialist corporations.

Now what I am trying to point out is that the sale of these shares is a good thing. It's a good thing for the province; it's a good thing for the oil industry; it's a good thing for the people of Saskatchewan to have an opportunity to actually own their own oil company. There's a big difference between the government owning an oil company and going around saying the people own it, the people own it, and the people actually having an opportunity to own their own oil company. In this case there is a big difference. There's a big difference between the NDP view of what people should own and this government's view of what people should own.

Now my ancestors and some of my distant relatives still live in East Germany, and some of my wife's relatives still live in the Ukraine, and they own everything. They own all of the business in East Germany, and these fortunate relatives of mine own all of the business in East Germany, and they can't seem to keep up with their relatives in West Germany who really own their own business.

Now there is a difference, Mr. Speaker, and it's a clear difference, and the problem is here that this is a good thing. We are now doing a good thing for Saskatchewan. We are showing the difference, and it hurts the NDP. They don't like to see the difference.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the difference is quite clear. We believe in incentives. We believe that the people should be entitled to do something of themselves. And it is an insult to constituents, Mr. Speaker, that the people cannot afford to buy these shares.

I can tell you that the NDP candidate in my constituency went out and said, only the rich can buy

these; we can't buy these shares. And the people in my constituency approached him and said directly to him, what do you mean, we are so poor that we can't afford \$29 for a share in Saskoil. Twenty-nine dollars is not much more than the price of a large bottle of whisky, and I don't see any shortage of money for the buying of whisky, it would be a much better investment. So don't insult my constituents and say to them that they can't afford \$29.

And I can say that, with pride, I am buying a few shares, that my children are going to buy a few shares, and my wife, and a lot of people. And don't anybody say that my children are rich. My children are not rich, but they want to be given the opportunity in this province to make a profit, because to my children, and in my house, profit is not a dirty word. I know that it hurts the ears of a socialist to say that there should be an opportunity to learn the value of incentive and profit.

In addition, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is a very great irony here in what the NDP say. Yesterday I heard the Leader of the Opposition criticize our support for the building of the co-op refinery and upgrader in Saskatchewan. I heard them clearly say that the province of Saskatchewan should not be taking the risk and should not be guaranteeing what the co-ops are doing.

AN HON. MEMBER: — We didn't say that.

MR. SCHMIDT: — And now they deny it. And yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did speak from my seat yesterday, and I said a very simple phrase, 'Which way do you want it?' They were criticizing our support of co-op, and it seems to me that the co-op is owned by the people. It is not owned by the government, but co-op is Saskatchewan's greatest small corporation. And now they're criticizing it. We should not support the co-op in the oil business, and today they're saying we should not let the little guys, the people . . . They say, oh, yes, they're all rich. Don't tell me my children are rich, and don't tell me that many, many other little people in my constituency are rich.

There is an inconsistency here. They do not want to support the co-op because they prefer socialism. The government should own it, not the people, either personally or through the co-op. Not even through the co-op, an organization that my grandfather helped build. They're now saying that the co-op is some sort of a big business that is a danger to this province.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — What is the point of order?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — The point of order is that the member seems to be debating another Bill and it's perfectly all right with me if we're going to debate them both together. I just want to make the point that I should be permitted to discuss the upgrader Bill under this one as the member for Melville certainly is. As I say, it's perfectly all right so long as the rule applies to both, but I make the point that the member is obviously discussing the upgrader Bill.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Well taken. The Leader of the Opposition's point is well taken.

MR. SCHMIDT: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I accept your ruling, but the reason I got off that topic is because I heard the member from Shaunavon droning on about things that had absolutely nothing to do with this Bill, and I listened to him drone on and on and on, and I thought that the upgrader had something to do with oil, and I will try to limit myself to this Bill specifically.

I am very pleased, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition has made a decision on where he stands on the upgrader Bill, and I'm pleased that he's going to tell us about it. I think I've accomplished something. At least we've got him off the fence. We don't know which side he's on, but we've got him off the fence.

Now this particular Bill has a great benefit to the people of this province; it has a great benefit for the member for wherever he is . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . the Quill Lakes, yes. I'm sure I will remember the new member's name better, but the member for Quill Lakes is acknowledged for the present.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You boys are on your way out. You should have stayed in a ship that's rising.

MR. SCHMIDT: — The member for Quill Lakes has some comments, and we will debate it another time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are unwarranted criticisms of this Bill. First of all, this is one country. This Bill gives preference to Saskatchewan citizens to buy shares, but it does not make foreigners of other Canadians. Other Canadians can buy shares in this corporation, and other Canadians can make an investment if this province, but we are not unreasonable, and we realize we are not going to sell Saskatchewan to even the rest of Canada.

So there are limits on what other people can invest in this province and I forecast that when given the opportunity, the other people of this country will have great faith in Saskoil and the province of Saskatchewan, and that they will participate even more so than the opposition suggests; that they will show faith in this province, and that this share issue will be a success. I also predict that this share issue will be such a success that there will be a hue and cry in Canada that the federal government will do the same thing with Petro-Canada.

We in Saskatchewan are showing leadership to the rest of Canada. Four per cent of this country is going to show what 96 per cent can learn from this. I predict that there will be a great debate in this country on whether or not this principle should be extended to Petro-Canada, because I also suggest that the federal government of this country does not need to own an oil company, that the people of Canada should own that oil company, and that this is a good example of how it can be done.

So in closing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I say that there is a big sore point here. The NDP do not like success. They do not like the people of Saskatchewan to be successful. They do not like the people of Saskatchewan, whether they are rich or small, to own anything. They do not like the people of Saskatchewan to make any decisions for themselves. These wise ones next to me here want to make all the decisions. These wise ones next here want to own everything. These wise ones here want to tell my children that they can't own anything in this province, and that's why they are now only nine of them. They will jump up and cheer, we are increasing in numbers; there are now nine.

I submit to you that is temporary, that the people will not believe their ideas for any length of time, that that is temporary; that my children will prosper in this province under freedom. And that they will not be driven from this province by the NDP.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MORIN: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I appreciate having the opportunity to rise today to speak on Bill 119, An Act respecting The Saskatchewan Oil and Gas Corporation.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that at the heart of this Act is the question of what is appropriate for the government to spend money on. Should governments be investing in operations that are in competition with commercial ventures, or should they be building hospitals and nursing homes, as the government of the day is?

(1130)

Mr. Speaker, we've had some comment from the members in opposition about Saskoil and its history

during their period of time in government. And although they stood up and they were quite proud of the record of Saskoil, I think that they should check their facts and check the record, and they would find that Saskoil was not a particularly shining star during their period of government. In fact, in 1982, if my memory serves me correctly, that corporation lost \$6 million, and that the corporate projections under their administration were that Saskoil would not be a profitable corporation until some time into the 1990s.

Now, Mr. Speaker, upon taking over the government of this province, we took a look at Saskoil, and what we found was not unlike what we found everywhere else where the NDP had had their hands in. We found that they were staffed up at the rate of 10 times a private sector oil corporation of similar size with similar reserves, clearly top heavy, not particularly having a direction, knowing where they were going with their corporate objectives, and frankly, Mr. Speaker, this success story of Saskoil started in 1982. And that corporation has become a good corporation. It's become a corporation that the people of this province can be proud of, and now, Mr. Speaker, it has become a corporation that the people of this province are expressing a considerable interest in wanting to actually own.

Mr. Speaker, the development of Saskoil is quite clear. We saw a corporation that the government owned, and now we see a corporation that we're offering to the people to own. And there's been a number of comments made in the Assembly this morning about who owns what. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the reality is also that the people, the farmers, the small-business people, the average guy in this province, and that, frankly, is the truth.

And I come from an oil-producing area. We're on the fringe of some activity, and Saskoil's participation in that region under the former administration was one of buying in, one of putting up money, playing the banker, in partnership with companies that they claim they don't like. But they would form in and they'd put up the money, and somebody else would do all the work.

There's an opportunity for Saskoil today to become a major player in the Saskatchewan economy. There's an opportunity for the people of the province of Saskatchewan to develop that company to be a major actor Canada-wide, and for them to receive the benefits.

Now there's been some comment about how Saskatchewan was built, and how it was developed, and that we should all read our history. Well I suggest, frankly, that my ancestors were here for quite a while. I'm the fourth generation of my family in this province, and the way that the people where I come from built the province was by having strong individuals, who were prepared to provide some leadership and still willing to co-operate for the good of the entire population, participate.

And I don't think that having the government tell you how you should be running your affairs, what you can and can't own; I don't think that that fosters that kind of an attitude among the people. But I believe that the changes we're proposing to make in Saskoil to allow for public participation does, in fact, foster that attitude; that attitude of aggressiveness, of going ahead and building the community and the economy, and I support this move.

There have been some comments made that, Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the member from Melville, addressed that question, and I'd like to deal with it a little further. The shares in Saskoil are going to cost anyone who chooses to buy them at \$29. For that, what they're going to receive is two preferred shares with a value of \$10 apiece which will carry an interest rate, and they will receive a third share of \$9 in common share which gives them a voting interest in the company and can participate in the profits of the company.

That's basically a blended instrument. It's not quite a bond. It's not exactly a full share. But what the people are getting for their \$29 is not a share but three opportunities to participate in the oil company. For that 29, Mr. Speaker, for the opposition to suggest that people can't afford that is just foolishness. The cheapest Canada Savings bond that you can buy, I understand, is \$50. And grandmothers and parents and aunts and uncles buy those for their nieces and nephews and

children, and have for generations.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we've seen the participation that we initiated in Crown corporations previously through bonds and participating bonds. Mr. Speaker, they were heavily subscribed by the people of Saskatchewan, and they were heavily subscribed by the people in my area who are not traditional investors, and they were running at \$100 a bond. Now for anyone to suggest that people would spend \$100 on a bond and wouldn't spend \$29 on three shares is a little foolish.

I believe that when the results of the offerings for this share issue come in that we're going to find that the people of Saskatchewan have responded very, very strongly, very, very favourably and that they, in fact, want to actually own Saskatchewan Oil and Gas Corporation, not to have the government own it for them; and that they, in fact, will want to participate in more issues like this, and, as was mentioned, possibly Petro-Canada should look at what we're doing here and follow our lead.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to get back to the proper place of government in the ordering of the economy. I'm not adamantly opposed to Crown corporations as such. The Crown corporations have a purpose and they have a natural place where there's a natural monopoly in the economy. And if you look at a thing like the production of power in a province like ours, the development of the telephone network in a province like ours, very likely that's an appropriate place for a monopoly corporation monitored closely by the government.

When it comes to resource corporations, what we've seen is quite simply that we can control them anyway. So why would we want to own them? We set out the royalty rates; we set out the guide-lines under which they operate; we set out all of the environmental conditions that they operate within. So we can control their operation; we can control where they drill, how they drill; we can control any environmental problems, plus we can tax them through royalties and taxation to the point of economic shut-down. Why on earth would we want to own them when we can receive as much benefit as we'd receive anyway without having the risk as a government?

And to properly administrate the tax dollars that we take in from the people of the province, I believe, and I believe it firmly, that we should be putting those dollars into social programs, that we should be putting them into hospitals and schools and nursing homes.

And the clear difference is in the way that we're dealing with Saskoil and Gas here; the clear difference between us and the former government — and I go back to 1976 — would be this: in 1976 the former government nationalized the potash industry in our province. That same year they put a moratorium on the building of nursing homes, and in addition they laid off 400 nurses in this province. Now where were the priorities? They took a tax dollar from the general population, after having squeezed them virtually dry, and they said, I'm sorry, we can't provide health care for you. I'm sorry, your grandmother won't be able to be in a nursing home, but we've got enough money to nationalize oil companies, and we've got enough money to be in the potash business.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to what it's appropriate to do with taxpayers' dollars, I believe that the health of our province, the education of our province, the providing of good roads and those type of things, are appropriate uses of government dollars in our province. And the creation of the economic climate is one that we can do through government legislation and policy, and we can then generate tax dollars to pay for those social benefits.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say that it will be no surprise that I look forward to the vote coming on this Bill. There are many, many people in my corner of the province, who have been traditional NDP supporters, who are purchasing Saskoil shares, who have attended public meetings and expressed a great deal of interest, and I will be very interested to see how the NDP will address those supporters of theirs, who are basically free-thinking, strong-minded individuals who know the difference between what they own and what the government owns, and who want to participate in the development of this province.

And, Mr. Speaker, my final word on this matter would be to commend the Minister of Energy and

Mines for the courage and foresight that he has shown in introducing this Bill in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I rise today to enter this debate on the Saskoil Bill because it is an important Bill — not that it's a good Bill, Mr. Speaker, but it's an important Bill because of the effect that it's going to have in the future on people who live in this province, and people who will in the future live in this province. And I rise to speak on it because it's another move by this government to give Saskatchewan away.

Now I know that some people use the argument, it's selling it away. But when you consider the history and the record, and when you look at the kinds of deals that have been made, I'm hard pressed to call it selling, and I would have to say that when the record is there, that it's giving it away.

I want to congratulate the member for Shaunavon, because after listening to the minister yesterday, we finally heard an explanation of the implications of the Bill, which we didn't get yesterday. It was a good speech by the member, with points well raised. I think that if the minister yesterday had taken any time at all to explain the Bill, we would have certainly been grateful for what he might have had to say.

I can't help but reply to the comments made by the member for Melville, and I wish he was here, because he talked about incentives. He talked about incentives, and he said that people should do things for themselves. Well I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe in incentives, and I believe in people doing things for themselves. That's what this province is all about. But I ask the question, and I'll tell the member who's speaking from her seat, I ask this question: how can they do things for themselves, and how can he call it incentives when that government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, continues to take away from them the opportunity to do that?

Let me give you some examples. Since 1982, out of the pockets of Saskatchewan citizens has gone 19 per cent increase in SaskTel rates, money out of Saskatchewan people's pockets; 30 per cent increase in electrical rates and 26 per cent increase for farm customers, money out of their pockets. While the inflation rate has been about 4 per cent per year, the minimum wage was frozen for three years, taxes went up, and new taxes were imposed.

And the member for Melville talks about people being given an opportunity to do things for themselves. What a joke. I don't know whether he doesn't understand, or whether he really is just saying what somebody in the research staff of this government has told him to say.

Now I agree also with the member for Melville that this is one country. There's no denying that. But the history of this province, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is this: and that is that the people of this province depended on the entrepreneurs from Chicago and Toronto and Montreal to come and do it for them, we'd be in worse shape than is the province of Newfoundland today. In fact, we'd be in worse shape than most South American republics.

Just another example, Mr. Speaker. I've been listening to the Premier's performance over at the first minister's meeting in eastern Canada, and he is totally agreeing holus-bolus with the Prime Minister who is trying to cut, in a very drastic way, transfer payments for the provinces, money that is going to go to health care, to education, and so on. Brian Mulroney says, jump; and Grant Devine says, how high?

HON. MR. LANE: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — What is the point of order?

HON. MR. LANE: — A point of order has been raised by the Leader of the Opposition that members

are to talk on the Bill. I believe a ruling has been made earlier. We're talking about . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . the member perhaps in his inexperience, does not realize that the first minister's conference has nothing to do with the Bill respecting Saskoil.

(1145)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — I would ask all members who are speaking on the Bill to please try to keep their comments on the Bill itself. Thank you.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am quite prepared to do that. I, in my comments, was simply responding to comments that had been made by a member who spoke on the Bill already, and responding to his comments. Surely the member from Qu'Appelle knows that that is quite appropriate and allowed in the debate in this House. If a member speaking on the Bill makes comments, one can respond to them. But I know what you're saying, and I will try to stay according to the rules.

I want to also make some comments about comments that were made by the member for The Battlefords. In talking about the Saskoil Bill and the shares that are being sold through the Saskoil legislation, he seems to have had a confused information source because he talks about Canada Savings Bonds as if they were the same as the shares of Saskoil. Now surely that is a parallel or a comparison that can't be made.

Canada Savings Bonds are guaranteed. Canada Savings Bonds you buy at a fixed rate, and you know what you're going to get at the end of their time period at their expiration. They're not traded on the stock-market, as are going to be the shares of Saskoil. They are not traded out there and have their prices set by the market forces, whatever they may be. And so I don't think one can make that kind of rather strange comparison. Once again, I suspect if the minister had explained this Bill in caucus, the member from The Battlefords would not have made that kind of mistake.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as has already been said by the member from Shaunavon, this is a bad Bill because it's based on a bad policy. And as voters of Regina North East demonstrated so early on Monday, it's bad politics as well. The members opposite should take note of that.

Saskatchewan people are, of course, very much aware that this government, this government led by our Premier, is selling off this profitable and productive asset now owned equally by all of us. And they can hardly not be aware after the millions of dollars that this Conservative government has spent in this advertising that has blanketed the province. They're aware of that, and they're wondering how come.

And like so much else this government has done, as it is doing now with this Bill, the advertising is glossy, and it's glitzy, and it's full of rhetoric. I ask: why is it necessary to do that if this is such a good thing? If it's such a good thing that people are going to swarm to buy the shares, why do we have to spend millions of dollars of Saskatchewan citizen's money that could be better used for putting some staff in hospitals, to sell it the way that it's been done now?

But I want to say that despite the millions in advertising, the people are still asking why. Why is this profitable and productive oil company, which we already own, now being sold? For the answer to that question, we can turn first to the publicly stated reasons given by the government. The government has said that this move is being made for three reasons: one, to stimulate investment; two, to create jobs; and three, to increase economic activity. But not one of those stated reasons stands up to public scrutiny, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and let us examine each of them in turn.

And I ask: will selling off or privatizing Saskoil stimulate investment? Clearly, no. Since the government took office, the real constant dollar level of investment in Saskatchewan has actually declined. The open-for-business policy has failed. To be sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, some big wealthy investors outside Saskatchewan and some Saskatchewan investors may, indeed, buy Saskoil shares. But right now they can already purchase shares of oil and gas companies listed on a

stock exchange and involved in the Saskoil industry. And there are many such companies whose stock people can buy already. Having one more on the market-place will not increase investment.

I ask the other question: will selling off Saskatchewan Oil and privatizing this company we already own create more jobs? And as the member for Shaunavon has already indicated, clearly not. All across this province, in virtually every community and every neighbourhood, jobs and job security are the number one issue on the minds of Saskatchewan men and women. That is what they are concerned about for themselves and for their families. And yet this sell-off of Saskatchewan Oil before us today will not create one new job, will not provide any more job security, and will not provide any more job opportunities. Well then, I ask: will selling off this company the people of Saskatchewan already own somehow increase economic activity, as the government opposite argues? Clearly, no.

The small-business community of Regina or Saskatoon or Prince Albert or North Battleford or Moose Jaw will not see any benefit from this process and this new initiative of the government. They will not see any increase in economic activity, and they are the biggest engines of job creation in Canada and certainly in Saskatchewan.

If you want to create jobs, you have to make it possible for that sector of the economy to be able to do so. This Bill will do none of that. I say no, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Selling off to a few what we all already own will simply not increase the flat or the falling level of economic activity of Saskatchewan, because profits of this oil company that could have been spent in Saskatchewan to create jobs and to do other necessary things are now going to leave this province, rather than being spent here.

Why then is the government moving with such haste to sell a major ownership interest in Saskoil? Well perhaps, as some have suggested, it may very well be just a desperate attempt for the Premier and the Minister of Finance to help plug their massive and growing deficit, the deficit that is now pushing \$1.5 billion. And as one of my constituents put it, perhaps these are sort of like Mr. Devine's deficit participation bonds.

But I don't believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that that is the real reason. I really don't. The real reason, I believe, Mr. Speaker, is a narrow, ideological one. For the government opposite believes that a few private wealthy investors here in Saskatchewan or across Canada should have the chance to buy their own personal share of this profitable corporation, and they say, never mind — those people over there, the government, says, never mind — that it's already owned equally by all of the people of Saskatchewan.

Never mind that it's the men and women of Saskatchewan and the farmers and the workers and the small-business people. Never mind — they say that it's the people of Saskatchewan who took the risk, who established Saskoil and who built it up. Never mind — those members of this government opposite are saying, because the hard rock Conservative ideology holds, that they have to sell off to a few what now belongs to each and every one of us equally. And that's why I submit, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they're selling this productive and profitable company just when it has made \$44 million in profits last year, selling what we already own, and selling it to a select few for the simple reason of Conservative ideology — nothing more and nothing less.

I submit to this House that this Bill is simply an extension of this government's natural resources policy, and I don't even think they'll deny that. They might disagree with our arguments I raise, but I don't think they'll deny that it's an extension of their natural resource policies. And the policies basically say: take out as fast as you can. We've got non-renewable resources; take them out as fast as you can. Let a few people make piles of money, and then leave. And then I ask — and everybody in the province is asking — what's left behind? What's left behind? Rusty pump jacks, empty holes in the ground — that's a phrase they coined over there — no jobs, no revenue to pay for education, and health care, and day care, and home care, and so on.

And I submit that this Bill is in keeping with policy which has resulted in less revenue from oil for Saskatchewan people, less revenue for Saskatchewan people from oil than they have a right to get

and to receive from a non-renewable resource.

I know that the Premier and his Minister of Finance and the minister who introduced the Bill make other arguments. For example, I know that the Premier has been heard to say, and I quote:

In 1985, for the first time in Saskatchewan history, oil has become the number one revenue source for the Saskatchewan government and the Saskatchewan taxpayers.

And he continued to say:

It has even surpassed personal income tax as a revenue source, all because of the PC government's oil policy.

Well, a certain journalist who writes in the *Leader Post* had something to say about that some time ago, and I just want to submit and correct that statement by saying that oil has been the number one revenue source for the Government of Saskatchewan, and for the people of Saskatchewan and Saskatchewan taxpayers, for more than eight years in a row — eight years in a row. It's not something new that's happened all of a sudden.

In 1982 and 1983, personal income taxes brought in \$683 million, and oil revenue was \$700 million. And in 1985-86, interestingly enough, personal income taxes, because of the kind of economy that we have now, brought in \$625 million of revenue to the government, but oil revenues brought in only \$655 million.

Now is that what this Bill is continuing to bring forward? Is that the kind of oil policy that this Bill is continuing to reinforce? Drill more; that's good. Produce more, but get less from a resource that, once you pump it out, put in the barrel or on the pipeline and ship it out, it's gone. You're not going to renew it again. It's not like planting seed in the ground and letting it grow and then you harvest it in the fall. Somehow the members opposite have got to, for heaven's sake, take that into consideration. Because it's the future of their children and my children and children after them — it's their future that's at stake here.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I ask: with Saskoil shares that are being sold, is Conrad Black going to reinvest some of the money that he makes from his shares if he buys some in Saskatchewan? Or you take anyone like that. I'm sure that any member in this House will be fairly sceptical about that. So the arguments that members in the government side have made along those lines, I think, are arguments that cannot stand up and be supported.

The oil companies are making huge profits as a result of that government's policies because of tax holidays, but most of that profit is leaving Saskatchewan, and in fact much of it is leaving Canada. What this Bill will do is, now it will take profits, now we will take profits of Saskoil, which stayed in Saskatchewan, and we'll shoot them out of Saskatchewan somewhere else. That's what it will do. So I think we have to ask the question: is this Bill good for all people in the province of Saskatchewan?

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have seen the production of oil in Saskatchewan increase — granted, I will agree. But we have seen the percentage of revenue from that production for the Saskatchewan treasury decrease from 59 per cent of the value of that oil to 27 per cent of the value of that oil. So you have to ask the question: who is benefiting? So you have to ask the question: in this Bill, who is going to benefit?

(1200)

It's really the philosophical inclinations of a government, and why it does certain things, that determine the result of what they do. And if for three and a half years we look at the record of the result of what they have done, I fear — I fear what the result of this will be. And so the arguments that the member for Shaunavon has made, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are good arguments.

And I hope the minister, when he stands up in this House to close this debate, will be able to address them.

You know, in many ways, this debate on this government's Saskoil Bill is a debate about the economic future of Saskatchewan. That's what this debate is about — and I see that some of them agree — the long-term economic security of the people of this province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is my opinion that Saskatchewan is a first-rate province with a bright and promising future, but there are two different approaches, two very different approaches now before the public: the Devine Conservative policies and the people's policies.

The Conservative approach is simple and straightforward, and we all know what their principles are and have seen then follow those principles into action. And their policy for the future: open for big business; tax and royalty holidays for big oil companies; unfair tax increases for ordinary people; selling off valuable and productive assets, which we already own, to a few wealthy investors. And that policy is simple: open for big business, expensive concessions to big business, and hope — hope. It's interesting that they shouldn't understand that, because they were elected in 1982 because they did offer hope. It kind of turned sour but that's what it was all about. They hope that big outside investors will somehow rescue Saskatchewan, and talk about the results that never are real and hope for the best.

Now if the closing of MacLeods stores, which was announced in the paper yesterday or the day before yesterday in certain centres of Saskatchewan, is an indication of how a large outside company treats Saskatchewan, I would suggest they should re-examine their policies.

Now you know, it's true that the policies of the government with respect to their Bill and other policies may work. It may work for a few — for a few, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It may create profits today and capital gains tomorrow for a few, but for the vast majority, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that policy approach to our future is narrow, is blinkered, and is wrong headed; it's unfair and it's irresponsible.

But there is another approach and that's the people's policy approach. That says that we do indeed have a bright future together; that says that we can all make our full contribution to building this province for our children and for their children; and that says that there is, of course, room for dynamic and vigorous private firms in all sectors of the economy as long as they pay their full and fair share and no more and no less. A policy that says that our scarce natural resources owned equally by all must be developed and managed fairly in the long-term interests of all; a policy that is truly democratic and which says that the hard pressed farm family or the working family has first claim on the valuable productive assets of Saskatchewan over any claims from the new few wealthy investors in Toronto, or Vancouver, or Montreal. A policy from the people of Saskatchewan and for the people of Saskatchewan, and a policy that says that we can indeed have a better and a fairer and a brighter future. Together we can get Saskatchewan working again, which I am afraid is not happening right now.

So when we address this Bill, we have to ask the question, or talk about the fact that the people of Saskatchewan already own equally all of the equity of Saskoil. At August 31st, that equity in retained earnings, I am told and I have read, was conservatively valued in the prospectus at \$224 million — \$224 million owned by the people of Saskatchewan. And the people of Saskatchewan have sole claim to all of the profits of Saskoil, some \$44 million last year.

But after, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government sells a major portion of the company — and we don't know what the limits are in the future — the people of Saskatchewan will own less and they will have less claim to future profits. To be sure, this may be a good deal for wealthy investors outside Saskatchewan, but it is not a good deal for the men and women of this province.

Let me give you an example, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If, let us say, Saskoil makes \$100 million next year or the year after — and that may be a modest figure because I happen to think Saskoil is a good

corporation — but if it makes \$100 million, and if the government opposite sells 33 per cent of Saskoil off, that's \$33 million that has the potential to go to Toronto and Montreal or somewhere else.

Now \$33 million would put a lot of nurses in understaffed hospitals today, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It would provide for school children something I know about, the kind of learning assistance where children in grades 7 and 8 who are having difficulty reading and are going to graduate and go into our high schools without the adequate capability to read, the opportunity to improve those skills, something which is not happening well enough today. It would provide more nursing home beds than 12 in one year, or 30 in one year in Regina, when there is a waiting list of over 1,000.

But it's not only that we would lose the money by pay-outs on the shares when the company makes a profit because, and I read this from an article in the *Leader Post* of yesterday:

It will also change Saskoil from a Crown corporation incorporated under The Business Corporation Act.

This corporation will now pay hefty taxes to the federal government. Maybe the Prime Minister had a chat with the Premier and said, hey, we want you to give us a little help here. That seems to be what's happening . . . is it in Halifax?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Halifax.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — . . . in Halifax this weekend. The Prime Minister says, here's what I want, and our Premier says, how soon?

So I think when we consider this kind of legislation, it may be fine to talk about, Mr. Speaker, all the niceties that it proposed today, but we cannot lose sight of the future and tomorrow and the implications that it might have down the road years ahead, or years ahead in the future.

I notice something on page 31 of the prospectus, and if I misunderstand this, then I'm sure the minister will explain to me when he gets up to close debate on this legislation. But on page 31 of the prospectus, it states that the Devine government intends to make a special deal available to the senior officials of Saskoil. It's called a special share option. Fifty thousand common shares will be made available to them at \$9 a share, and they may exercise their option to purchase at that initial \$9 share price at any time up to February 28, 1986.

Now for three months, they can watch the market for these new shares, they can watch the fluctuating market-place, and if the shares are trading at less than \$9, of course they will not exercise their option to purchase. Just leave them alone. Why bother. Why get into a BCRIC. But if the shares are trading at more than \$9, they will then be able to exercise this special share option, this special deal available only to a few.

Fascinating, Mr. Speaker. A special deal available for just a few, but not available to my constituents, or to my neighbours, or to the constituents for the member for Moosomin, or the member from Regina Centre, or anywhere else. And I ask: is that fair? And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that needs an explanation, and I really hope that the minister will deal with it when he rises in this House at some future date and closes the debate on this Bill.

Now although I spent a lot of time in Regina North East recently campaigning for the by-election, and in the last year getting ready for one, I have had an opportunity to do a lot of travelling around the province as well, as have my colleagues. And we've listened to people about this Bill and lots of other issues, and some of those people have been asking some questions. I want to repeat some of those questions for the benefit of the front benches over there in the hope that they will take them into consideration when this Bill goes into committee.

There was a young woman in my constituency who said — she's a mother of two with a very tight

budget — and she said, why are they spending so much money on this glossy advertising? And I said, well I don't know. But obviously there seems to be a lack of confidence about the whole situation, and so they feel that they have to hire a very expensive public relations firm to even, again in this case, do a sales job.

And another constituent said, why are the promoter's public meetings so poorly attended? I know the minister, when someone was speaking earlier, was sort of making sounds as if that's not the case. Well I want to tell the minister that I'm told that in Wynyard there was only a half dozen or so people; only a couple of dozen or so at Assiniboia; a very small turn-out in Saskatoon. So that this constituent was wondering that, in spite of the massive advertising that is going on promoting the meetings, there seems to be that kind of response.

(1215)

The most difficult question of all, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, was this. It was asked of me by some university students who are from a farm family, and they attend the university of Saskatoon. And they simply asked — and this is the youth of our province; these are the people who are probably more than anybody else concerned about the future — they simply asked, why are they trying to sell something I already own? Why are they trying to sell off to buyers in Toronto what I already own, my share? Because I can't afford, they said, to buy a share; I'm hardly getting through university. My share of the Saskoil profits if it's a good deal for the rich guy in Toronto; it's sure not a good deal for this government to be selling him my share.

And this kind of list goes on and on in great numbers, and yet the members opposite in this government seem determined through this legislation to sell off to a few individuals important and productive assets already owned by the people of Saskatchewan.

And I suppose if this was one isolated case, as serious as it would be, one could sort of talk about it and then that would end. But it's not. It's not one isolated case, Mr. Speaker. We know of the \$40 million sale of Highways equipment. Is that so much different from what's happening in this Bill? We know about the selling of the Poplar River coal mine operation to Manalta Coal of Alberta, in which a government guarantee was provided. And so now we in this province are purchasing coal, when we used to own it and mine it ourselves.

And so once again I say, talk about the Bill today, but think about the implications for the future. Think about the future and what it might do. And think about that old, tried, and now tried slogan of Saskatchewan, open for business, and remember what the results of it have been.

Now I know that the members opposite and the minister and the Premier like to pretend that somehow the people of Saskatchewan have not had a chance to invest directly in Saskatchewan oil and gas industry. I've referred to the opportunities that are there and I think the member from Shaunavon did as well, and so I will not dwell on that at this time.

Now in speaking on this Bill, I want to turn for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to one of the most curious features in the debate, and that curious feature is, somebody said to me, the question of the invisible man — balanced budget Bob. Where, Mr. Speaker, in this debate . . . And I hope next week we will hear both the Premier and the Minister of Finance speak on it because I think it's important that they speak on it, because this is the single most important financial move by this government since the tax increases of last April's budget, and yet the Minister of Finance is not to be seen or heard.

And so I ask this question: has his influence and authority been so diminished that they don't allow him to take part in this debate or, alternatively, is he one of the few who has realized that this is a bad deal for the treasury, a bad deal for the province and a bad deal for the people of Saskatchewan? And you know, because I have a lot of respect for the Minister of Finance, I think it's the latter. I am convinced that he knows that it's a bad deal, and that's my view on it.

And I suspect that if the Premier and the Minister of Social Services and others would quit writing their own budgets, some of the mess that we saw in April — some of the pain that was created in April, Mr. Speaker — would not have happened.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been said in this debate by members opposite and by the minister that people will be allowed, everybody, to purchase shares in Saskatchewan. And I'm glad, but I ask: when you put on a flat tax which takes \$70 million out of the purchasing power from Saskatchewan consumers in the last budget, is that going to allow them to buy shares? When you impose a new sales tax on second-hand cars which low-income and lots of middle-income people can only afford, is that going to help them to buy shares? When you take away a property improvement grant program which is a rebate on property taxes which are already too high, which in Regina takes out \$10 million out of the consumer's and property owner's pockets, I say, is that going to help them to buy shares?

And so the arguments that were made by some members here a little while ago, I think, fall to pieces, and the arguments which we have been making and I have made about, that this will be an investment for the wealthy and most of them out of province, in the long run, is probably the argument that will hold over time.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that when the minister rises to close debate on this Bill he will address some of these questions. I hope he will not only deal in some kind of semantics and take five minutes to repeat the legal statements that are written in the legislation, but I hope he will deal with the social and the economic implications that this might have on an awful lot of people who live here now and will live for many years into the future as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to address a few remarks on the issue of this Bill, I think probably one of the more important Bills to come before — I'm sure one of the more important Bills to come before the fall session, and perhaps this entire session.

I want to begin, Mr. Speaker, by referring to the slanderous comments of the member for Saskatoon Centre . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . A strange name for a person who's capable of uttering such comments, the Minister of Co-ops. His comments were, I believe, to the member for Shaunavon, 'Why don't you give your speech in Russian?' . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well I was about to ask that very question.

What does the member for Saskatoon Centre have against Russian-born immigrants? There are goodly number of people in this province who speak Russian, some of whom live in the constituency of the member of Pelly; some of whom would live in the member for Redberry, and he is of such fleeting brilliance I can't remember who the member for Redberry is at that moment. But there are a number of people around the province who speak Russian.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. We are debating in second reading Bill No. 119. If the member happens to have any comments about Bill 119, I'd like to hear them.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I was getting to that. I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, in a moment, that I think that comment characterized the approach of a government in drafting the Saskoil Bill, because I think this government approached this problem from a narrow, ideological position. There can be no other explanation for this legislation than was characterized by the comment of the member for Saskatoon.

This Bill, Mr. Minister, makes no sense on financial grounds. It makes no sense, Mr. Speaker, on policy grounds. I'm going to get to that in a moment.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill is only explicable from the point of view of the minister, from the point of view

of this government, as a Bill that comes from a narrow ideological approach to this province's resources. I think, Mr. Minister, there's more over there than the member from Saskatoon Centre who would say, give your speech in Russian to us. I think, Mr. Speaker, that's the direction from which they've approached the oil industry.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also make some comments about the minister's speech. I have heard a better explanation given of Bills to amend the Commissioners for Oaths Act than I heard for this Bill which is a major and complex piece of legislation. The minister rose in the debate, I don't think in five minutes, he said virtually nothing about what is a major show-piece of this government.

Well, there are two explanations for that. One is that the minister opposite didn't know anything about the Bill. The second and the only other explanation is that he wasn't very proud of the Bill.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . may be true, may be true. Some hon. members say both may be true. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the fact that six showed up in Wynyard, 12 in Assiniboia, I gather about 25 in Saskatoon — perhaps that's telling the government something about this piece of legislation.

AN HON. MEMBER: — All executive assistants.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, I wonder how many of those people who showed up in Saskatoon drew their pay cheque from the provincial treasury. I'll bet you there was more than one, Mr. Speaker.

That may tell this government something about their popularity. It may tell this government about their approach to dealing with the critical problems which face Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the minister, when he rises to close debate, I hope he addresses some of the issues which I think Saskatchewan people are asking about this Bill.

Some of those questions, Mr. Speaker, were asked of the government in the recent by-election which elected my colleague from Regina North East. As apparent by the results, Mr. Speaker, the answers were not forthcoming from this government. To the extent that the people in Regina North East felt this to be relevant — and frankly there aren't a lot of people in Saskatchewan who think this Bill is an important piece of legislation; I think many people feel there are more severe problems which need attacking — but to the extent that the people understand the Bill, they ask questions such as: does this Bill assist the province in meeting its goals? Will this program contribute to increased investment? Will this Bill and this program contribute to increased jobs? Will this Bill contribute to increased economic activity?

Mr. Speaker, those are areas where the public are demanding action of this government, and demanding it in language that I think this government has finally heard. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, in almost four years of facing this government, I have seen members opposite as sombre as they are this week. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the public have finally had an opportunity to speak in a language which this government can understand. It's the language of elections. I say to members opposite: if you think this is a grand piece of legislation, if you think this is the salvation of the province, then why don't you do what the people ask, and that is, call an election?

The member from Regina North East stated that a number of questions had been asked of him when canvassing. I also canvassed a poll in Regina North East . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Thank you very much. I find that to be useful. A poll taken of the public, Mr. Speaker, is one thing, but a poll which a member takes by walking around and talking to 250 people three times in the space of four weeks is a much more reliable poll.

They also asked me a number of questions which are relevant to this Bill, but, Mr. Speaker, the question I got asked most often was, when is there going to be an election?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — They're asking that, members say, in other parts of the province. Mr. Speaker, if this government thinks this is a grand piece of legislation, if you think it's worth anything, then I say to members opposite, call an election over it. My reading of this province's political mood is that the public want an election; it is time for it. And I say to members opposite, either provide some leadership on some of the issues this province is facing, or call an election — one of the two. Either lead or get out of the way.

Mr. Speaker, another of the questions they ask is — and sometimes they didn't always distinguish nicely between the government and opposition — often they would say, what are you, meaning our government, what are you going to do about . . . And the most common end to that sentence is 'jobs.' What are you going to do about jobs? What are they going to do about jobs? So we come back after the by-election. The only piece of legislation . . . I suppose there are two major pieces of legislation. Another is the agricultural loan Bill. I doubt whether Mr. Speaker will allow me to spend a long time talking about that. We have agreement on that, at least. But suffice it to say, and I won't get into the Bill, but suffice it to say I don't think that that's going to provide a lot of jobs in my riding.

The only piece of legislation which might direct itself to that over-arching issue of jobs is this Bill. That's all you have in the fall session. You have nothing else. You have employment creation programs which are just shambles — just shambles.

What you have done previous to bringing in this legislation is to bring in employment development programs which make a mockery of fair play, of justice. Because what you've done is to provide jobs that last just long enough to get people off welfare and onto unemployment. The programs which we've had to date had lasted just long enough to get young people off welfare, which you pay for, and onto unemployment, which the federal government pays for. You're playing a numbers game with those young people. You are simply in a false way reducing the numbers of unemployed. What you're doing is playing with the lives of young people.

(1230)

This Bill, Mr. Speaker, we are told, is supposed to be something of an answer to that. Because if this Bill doesn't answer that question, then this government is derelict in its duty. The public of Saskatchewan are demanding action on the question of jobs. I say one of the issues to which members opposite need to address themselves is whether or not this Bill addresses the question of economic activity and jobs. Because if it doesn't, then this government should either resign and call an election, or bring in something that does. The crescendo of cries for action on the job front is simply becoming just that, a crescendo.

What does this Bill do, Mr. Speaker? This Bill, I say, will aggravate the problem. I say that this approach is going to, in short run and in the long run, aggravate the critical shortage of jobs which exist in this province.

Mr. Speaker, one of the features of Saskoil to date has been that all of the jobs are in Saskatchewan. I'm sure that statement is true, with a few exceptions. All of the profit stays in this province. I recognize that a government that spends like drunken sailors, that \$44 million may be peanuts. It may not be worth preserving. That may not be worth keeping in the province. I don't think that's the attitude that the public have. I think that the public of Saskatchewan could find a use for the 444 million which you people are giving away. I should find some use for it in my riding if you want me to list a few examples of where I'd put the profit from Saskoil which you people are giving away.

I can repeat some specific examples of people on social services, and they are horror stories. They are horror stories. I remember one person who could use a small chunk of the \$44 million. I'm not going to describe the situation to you exactly. He does live in the city. Suffice it to say that through no fault of his own, and I think that's genuine, he wound up on social assistance. He could not afford

furniture in his house. Mr. Speaker, if you can fathom this, he had four children, himself, and three chairs. That's all that was in the house. The family couldn't sit down to eat together. Now I ask you: do you think that man could find a use for the \$44 million? I think that man could find a more compassionate use of the \$44 million than to give it to outside investors.

Mr. Speaker, in the long run, sending the profits from Saskatchewan resources out of the province is bad for this province's economic development. Forty-four million dollars. I recognize to members that run up a deficit of 300 million last year and 500 million — I suppose it's now probably been revised upward a couple of hundred million. What is a couple of hundred million between Conservatives — I recognize it is now probably up to \$500 million or somewhere there around. Heaven only knows what it'll be next year. To a government that spends in such an irresponsible fashion as that, what is \$44 million? Peanuts. It can hardly be counted. It's only got six zeros behind it. It ain't worth considering, I guess.

I say, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of places to which that \$44 million could be put. There are some crying needs in this province for those sort of profits, and this government's giving them away. You are literally giving away a very large chunk of money which is available.

In the last month, Mr. Speaker, I met another family who I think could make use of the \$44 million or some chunk of it. This particular individual who again, no fault of his own . . . I have the papers. I have written to the Minister of Social Services about it and have not received a response. This particular individual had no food, literally nothing to eat for himself, and I saw three children running around the house. This individual had enjoyed a high paying position, had worked — he's at least 40 years of age — for over 20 years, and through no fault of his own, wound up unemployed and ineligible for unemployment insurance. What did he get after 20 years of contributing to unemployment insurance, after 20 years of paying substantial taxes to the provincial government? What did this man get? Absolutely nothing.

So I say that if you think you can't find a use for \$44 million, you might try the Department of Social Services because you are doing an enormous amount of damage to people who genuinely need some help, and I say that many of them genuinely deserve it.

And if you don't think they deserve it, if you think the people in New York who are going to get the \$44 million deserve the money more than the two gentlemen I spoke of in poll 28, then I say members opposite ought to go out and tell them that. You ought to get out of the ivory tower and go talk to some people. It would just do you a world of good. It would do you a world of good to get out on the street and talk to people.

Mr. Speaker, in the long run this Bill contributes in a detrimental fashion to economic activity. In the long run we are sending out of the province profits which could have stayed here and which I think have contributed significantly to the severe recession in which this province finds itself.

The Premier said this province did not participate in the recession. That is demonstrably wrong. It's the recovery which we have not participated in that the rest of the country has enjoyed. One of the reasons for that, Mr. Speaker, is that this government has decided that there's something tainted about money from resources. It's bad money. Got to give it to somebody else, but for goodness sakes, don't keep it here. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the give-away of the profits of the Crown corporations has contributed significantly to the economic decline in this province, and an economic decline it has been, in spades.

Mr. Speaker, when I saw the minister's speech, I thought I ought to revise some comments that I made on Monday night. On Monday night one of the members of the black art, the fifth estate, asked me what I thought the implications of the North East by-election were. I said, I thought we were going to have a lame duck government, a government that would think with some degree of justification it has no mandate to govern. I think that, Mr. Speaker, was a note of over-optimism. This government isn't a lame duck government; it's a government, I think, in collapse. It's a government

that is collapsing. When I see the minister rise on what is an important and complex Bill and rush back to his seated position, as I say, with less explanation than I would expect from the Minister of Justice if he introduced an amendment to The Commissioner for Oaths Act, I say this government is collapsing.

Mr. Speaker, the question is the question of whether or not this Bill will contribute to more jobs. I say we're going to lose them. I say we're going to lose control of this Crown corporation. I say that head office jobs which are now in Saskatchewan are going to end up elsewhere, because the effective control of the corporation will wind up elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much that the ordinary Saskatchewan citizen is going to buy these shares. I think they are likely to be bought by a semi-sophisticated investor. I think the most sophisticated investor will probably flee from them because so much of the oil company is owned by the government.

I think many oil people, including investors, feel there's already too much politics in oil. This particular oil company is going to have the problem in spades. Not only do you have the normal politics that are involved in oil, but in this case, you've got two-thirds of the company owned by the government. I think sophisticated investors are going to find something else to invest in.

So who is going to invest in this company? Well I know, Mr. Speaker, that not many of my constituents are going to. Before the session began, and before the north-west by-election began, I canvassed some of my own riding. I could name for you a number of people who I don't think are going to buy these shares. I don't think the guy that I met one night who had a mental emotional disturbance of sorts, who had been classed as an unemployed unemployable, who had his social assistance then reduced by 40 per cent, who could not afford a proper diet, and who schizophrenia is therefore aggravated because he can't afford a proper diet, I don't think he's going to invest in these shares.

I don't think senior citizens in my riding whose rent is being increased very rapidly, because the minister who is not now present has decided not to enforce rent controls in a very tight market, whose rent is therefore going up by up to one-third, by up to 30 per cent in a single jump — I don't think they're going to have money to invest in these shares.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if this government thinks that those on minimum wage who have been given a trifling 25-cent increase in three years, and they compare that to the generosity with which members treat themselves, cheerfully spend \$3,400 on a junket for someone's family.

I can list other examples of waste if members think that's a useful use of my time. Those people on minimum wage are just getting by. They see you people flying over the province in the lap of luxury saying the equivalent, that 20th Century equivalent of let them eat cake. I don't think those people on minimum wage are going to buy these shares.

I have not a large number of farmers in my riding, but I have some. I don't think there's going to be a lot of those people buying shares. The farming industry is different than some in that there are broad differences in the available capital which farmers have. Some I find are reasonably well fixed, have pools of capital available to them — pools of capital to buy land, I guess, at the price you people managed to drive the price down far enough. But there's many farmers who do not have any capital, many farmers who owe more than the farm's worth.

I wonder if they're going to buy these shares. I wonder if they're going to see the opportunity to purchase these shares as their economic salvation. I wonder if they're going to see this Bill as the answer to what's troubling them. Because I say to members opposite if, in this fall session, you can't bring in legislation which deals with jobs and deals with the farm crisis — and I don't think you've done either — then you're under an obligation to resign.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first session of the legislature, I think, in the history of the province — I'm sorry

this is the first calendar year in the history of this province in which there has not been a throne speech delivery. I think that's an accurate statement. And I ask myself: why? I was genuinely surprised to see that this government was not bringing in the throne speech. I asked myself: why? There were a number of explanations, none of which do the government a lot of credit. But one possible explanation did do the government some credit. That explanation was perhaps the government does not want to spend eight working days, but wants to bring in some meaningful legislation which will deal with the crisis that faces Saskatchewan and I'm not misusing that word when I use the word 'crisis.' But it seems not.

This government has done nothing. Mr. Speaker, we have not yet sat an evening. This government has struggled to keep the session going for the afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: — I would caution the member that we are debating a Bill and that doesn't give the member the liberty to range all over the waterfront, but rather is to deal with the items in the Bill. I would ask him to get back to the Bill.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was a bit off point, I may say — just ever so briefly, but I was off point.

We have to ask ourselves, Mr. Speaker, why this government is bringing in this legislation. What is the motivation? Does this government see increased economic activity? No one has explained how that might occur, least of all the minister or any other members who took part in this debate. Does it result in increased number of jobs? Scarcely. No one makes that claim. Does it result in increasing investment? Because if it did that would be a worthwhile goal. Actual investment in this province has been decreasing ever since this government took office. That would be a worthwhile goal for the legislation, but this legislation doesn't do that, and no one makes that claim.

(1245)

Why is this government introducing this legislation if it doesn't contribute to jobs, it doesn't contribute to economic activity, doesn't contribute to investment, certainly does not contribute to the proper regulation of the oil industry? What could be the possible motivation for introducing the legislation?

This is where, Mr. Speaker, I return briefly to the comments of the member for Saskatoon Centre, who said, 'Why don't you speak Russian?' The only conceivable explanation for this legislation is that this government is trapped by its own rhetoric, trapped by its own narrow ideology. This government, I think, Mr. Speaker, to bring in this legislation, must genuinely believe, as the classical economists of the 19th century believed, that the least government is the best government.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You bet.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well the member for Saskatoon Westmount says, 'You bet.' All I can say to the member for Saskatoon Westmount is, if you agree with that comment and if you therefore support this Bill on those grounds, then you ought to have canvassed the poll in Regina North East. Not a soul . . . I'm quite sure that the Conservative campaign organization wouldn't allow that. That was an unnecessary remark and I apologize for it.

Mr. Speaker, I canvassed one poll three times . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. I'm going to ask the member now to come back to the Bill and to stay on the Bill. He's straying regularly and I would ask him to refrain.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — No one has said to me that we need less government. No one says that. That's the only conceivable explanation for this Bill, is that you believe the least government is the best government. That is the only conceivable rationale.

Somehow or other, Mr. Speaker, that is a hard thing to articulate. Somehow or other, Mr. Speaker, that philosophy is a very hard thing to articulate in 1985 with a record number of unemployed, and at least since the mid-1930s a record number of farmers facing bankruptcy. Somehow or other it's hard to make the argument that the least government is the best government. Because while that is the only conceivable explanation for this Bill, none of the members who spoke on it addressed themselves to that. The minister addressed himself to nothing at all. The other members who spoke dealt with a variety of other issues, the opportunity for Saskatchewan people to participate in the oil industry — they've got that.

There are, Mr. Speaker, any number of companies listed on the Alberta exchange or the Toronto or Montreal exchange which allow members to participate in the oil patch. If you want to participate in the Saskatchewan oil patch as distinct from any other — apart from feelings of nationalism, I don't know why a person would want to do that — but if you did, there's companies which largely drill just in Saskatchewan. If you want to invest, if you want to really put your money where your mouth is and buy the drilling funds, you could invest exclusively in Saskatchewan. Not a nickel of it will go outside.

So I say to members opposite that I can well believe that you don't bother to give the real reason for this, that you believe that the least government is the best government, because to say it is to realize how patently ridiculous it is.

You know, in 1985, with the complexity of the problems this world and this province faces, to articulate the philosophy which lies behind this Bill is to realize that it's patent nonsense. You people are wedded to a philosophy which is about a century out of date and hasn't been seriously adopted by the community of economists world-wide for at least three-quarters of a century.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Thank goodness. Thank goodness for that.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I regret to say that the world at large may say thank goodness, that nobody believes that the least government is the best government, but this government seems to believe that, and the public of this province are paying a very heavy price for that. They're paying a very heavy price for that.

It is conceivable that part of the reason why you are selling this company is that you need more money to pay for the trips to . . . It would take a person of very considerable powers of recall to remember all the places that the Minister of Economic Development told us he went yesterday. Perhaps that's what you do. Perhaps you see this as a way to reduce the deficit. I say, if that's your thinking, then that is very short-run thinking — that is very short-run thinking.

A society which doesn't care about the future, which lives only for the moment, is a society which will not survive long, Mr. Speaker. I don't think for a moment the public in this province share this government's lack of concern for the future. I think people who grow up in Saskatchewan, who come to understand the changing seasons and the changing patterns of life in Saskatchewan, I think a greater sense of the importance of the future than urban people do. This province's rural background, I think, gives people a sense of how important it is to worry, not just about tomorrow or next year, but to worry about the next generation.

By selling off the farm, as you people are doing, by selling our heritage, by selling our future, you are saying that you don't care about the future, that the future be darned, and we'll worry about today, and we'll worry about the election which this government faces with some trepidation within the next 17 months.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That long.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'm afraid it could be that long.

Mr. Speaker, to sell off resources to raise money, to sell off — I'm sorry — companies to raise money, is, as one member has said, to sell a quarter section, to sell off part of the farm. It may provide temporary relief. Mr. Speaker, it does not provide a long-term solution. And what the people of this province are demanding, whether it be in Regina North East or elsewhere, what the people of this province are demanding is something that looks like a long-term solution. They are tired of this government playing games with them. Urban people are tired of these silly games. They're looking for something that looks like a long-term solution, and this government is completely bankrupt when it comes to any solution that's going to do anything that will have any effect beyond next week. This government is completely bankrupt. It is intellectually bankrupt.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, when I see a government bringing legislation which sells off a quarter to raise money, that, Mr. Speaker, is a government which isn't just financially bankrupt. It's a sign of a government which is also intellectually bankrupt and politically bankrupt.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that this government without any meaningful solutions. If this is what comprises the fall session, if we were called back, Mr. Speaker, to deal with Saskoil and the agricultural program which we will address ourselves to probably next week, then I say, Mr. Speaker, that this government is bankrupt.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a comment about what I think is going to happen to Saskoil if a large number of people purchase these shares. This is not a new idea. I don't think this government's had a new idea for years. This is not a new idea. The difficulty with this government has been that you pick up other people's ideas and totally and completely make a mess of them. Almost every disaster which has beset you people is because you tried to copy something somebody else tried without the confidence to put it together.

There was such a project in Alberta. It was called Alberta Energy Company. The Alberta Energy Company was incorporated. Shares were sold in shopping centres. You could buy them for \$8 apiece. Within two or three years — it may have been a bit more than that; it may have been three or four years — those shares had quadrupled in value. They were selling in the \$30 range. That occurred because the Government of Alberta, knowing the shares in Alberta Energy were widely owned by Alberta people, continued to shove jammy little deals Alberta Energy's way. Alberta Energy got one entire gas field without bidding, Suffix gas field.

I say that if you people succeed — and I'm not at all sure you will — I say that if you people . . . Suffield, I guess it is. I say that if you people succeed in selling those shares to a lot of Saskatchewan people — and I'm not sure you will, but if you do, there is going to be a temptation to treat Saskoil differently than other companies. In the long run, Mr. Speaker, that is bad policy. That is a very poor way to regulate the oil industry, and it is an even poorer way to distribute the wealth that this province has.

This province, Mr. Speaker, has the wealth to deal with the problems I referred to. This province has the wealth to deal with the man with three chairs, the man with no food, but only if we use our resources and our wealth for the benefit of everyone.

What the Government of Alberta did in the mid-70s with Alberta Energy was they directed an abnormally high portion of the province's resource wealth to a few people, the investors in that company. So they directed the wealth of the province to those who already in many cases had more than they needed. The creation of Alberta Energy did nothing to solve the problem that that province had in a variety of areas, and neither did Saskoil.

If you people, as I'm afraid, give Saskoil special treatment, then you are misusing the province's oil wealth. You're seeing that a few people, the purchasers of the shares, get an abnormally large portion of the wealth. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the temptation to do that, if you succeed in selling them

broadly, is going to be very considerable. That's unfortunate. That is really unfortunate.

This province is blessed with considerable wealth. It is not true, as the Premier said, that you can mismanage this province and still succeed. He has proved that. He has proved that nobody can mismanage the province and succeed.

Mr. Speaker, there is sufficient wealth in this province to deal with the problems which have beset us today. There's sufficient wealth in this province . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. Being 1 o'clock this House now stands adjourned until 2 p.m. Monday.

The Assembly adjourned at 1 p.m.