

March 22, 1989

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's with a great deal of pleasure that I introduce to you, and to all members of the Assembly, some 15 grade 6 students from the Pense School; they're in the Speaker's gallery. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Debbie Quinlan, chaperons, Mrs. Marie Whaley and Mr. Dave Ounsworth. I look forward, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. member from Thunder Creek, Mr. Swenson, to meet with these students after question period and join with them for, as I say, questions and refreshments. I ask all hon. members, Mr. Speaker, to join with me in welcoming the students from Pense.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to introduce to you, and through you to all members of the legislature, two people who reside in my constituency, James Mills and Jim Geddes. They're here in Regina as part of their union's attempt to increase the number of qualified journeymen carpenters in Saskatchewan. They are members of the International Brotherhood of Carpenters (and Joiners). I'd like to welcome them to the legislature and wish them all the best in their endeavours to teach Saskatchewan young people to become qualified carpenters.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Cut-Backs in the Regina Separate School System

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Education. Mr. Minister, last night the Regina Catholic School Board announced the closing of six schools in the city of Regina — two high schools and four elementary schools. Today the *Leader-Post* carries a story of those closures, and the headlines I want to put on the record, Mr. Speaker, are: Closure stuns students, parents. Students feel betrayed by closing of schools.

Mr. Minister, this is the tragic result of your cutting of the provincial share of funding for education in this province. It's a betrayal of the education needs of our children by your government. In view of the fact, Mr. Minister, that in 1978 the provincial grants to this school board covered sixty-three and a half per cent of the costs of educating children in that school system, and in 1988 that was only 44 per cent; and in view of the fact that you have obviously shifted 20 per cent of the educational tax burden from the province to the school board and the property taxpayers, would you then care to explain to the parents and to the students who will no longer be able to attend Marian and Sister McGuigan high schools, St. Anne, St. Joseph, St. Patrick and St. Paul's schools, how you are preparing our education system for the 21st

century with that kind of massive cut-back?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Well, Mr. Speaker, as it relates to school closures, what schools are going to have what grades in them, or for that matter where the school buses are going to run, as you well know, that's a decision of the locally elected school boards, and these are not ever easy decisions and there is always a lot of emotion surrounding them. However, I do respect that these people are duly elected.

Now the hon. member tries to suggest that somehow they are having to grapple with these closures as a result of government cut-backs, provincial cut-backs to education. The reality is, Mr. Speaker, that is not true. He brings forth statistics about the percentage of provincial funding that that board receives, and he knows, Mr. Speaker, that that is based on a formula. And for every example that he will bring forward where the provincial share has gone up or down, it's because there's been a formula that's been agreed to by all trustees across the province.

Because you'll bring that example in about 63 to 44, I will bring examples in here where the funding is 99 per cent provincial, 1 per cent local. Northern Lights School Board would be a good starter, because that formula is based on the ability to pay. And the reality is, in Regina they have a broader tax base and they have a larger tax base to draw upon, whereas somebody, for example, in northern Saskatchewan may not.

The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that with the exception of one year, the amount of money that we've spent on education in this province has risen every year and has risen dramatically even through tough times, Mr. Speaker. And that is a fact. Or to put it another way, Mr. Speaker, to put it another way, per-pupil spending in the last seven years of this administration has gone up 60 per cent per pupil, 60 per cent per pupil, Mr. Speaker, and the number of students has basically remained stable.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — New question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, the Regina Catholic school board will need an additional \$1 million a year to keep those schools open. That means about \$838 per student a year. If you would stop wasting \$34,000 a day on leasing empty office space for the Government of Saskatchewan, you would be able to find \$800 per student a year to keep these schools open and keep our education system the way it should be.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — When are you going to get your priorities straight and begin to put our children first instead of your politics first?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Speaker, our government

does have our priorities in the right places for the children in this province, and our spending would indicate that. Health, education — the two things that people like to see sustained through good times or through bad times, Mr. Speaker, and that is exactly the position of this government, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — New question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, the school board that we refer to has done a study of its financial situation and that study tells the whole story. I quote for you one section of that report in which it says, I quote:

Surpluses built up in the '70s and the early '80s have been used up. We operate with no provision for contingencies.

Mr. Minister, they're up against the wall. Under a New Democratic government our schools built up contingency funds. Under your administration they have eaten up those surpluses, and they're faced either with running up massive deficits, as you have done, or closing schools. And you have the audacity to talk about using education as a tool for the future?

Mr. Minister, even you know that to provide education we've got to have schools. And so I ask you: will you stand up in this House today, and will you assure school boards and parents and our students that in next week's budget address this crisis in education will provide the funds necessary to ensure that our schools have the money they need to educate our children?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Speaker, I will stack our record up, the PC record in education compared to the NDP record, any day. And if you'd care to check what happened during the NDP years of the '70s and look at the mill rate increases that were thrust upon local boards when they NDP were in because they squeezed the life out of them, forced it back onto the locals, Mr. Speaker, you will see that those mill rate increases far outstrip anything that's happened during this administration.

And thirdly, Mr. Speaker, do we want to go back to the NDP days? I say no. The NDP days did . . . under the NDP there was not a \$150 million fund put in place to buy computers for our schools, Mr. Speaker, to buy books for our libraries, and to help handicapped children get a better education. There wasn't that fund under the NDP, Mr. Speaker.

The facts are: 60 per cent increase in spending, inflation was only 40 per cent during the same time, and the number of children in our schools has basically stayed level at 200,000. The facts speak for themselves, Mr. Speaker, and we stand by them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Before the next series of questions and answers, I would just like to bring to the attention of the House — I think we all agree that we have an element of

debate going on, and I'd like to ask the future questioners and those who answer the questions to be more in keeping with the spirit of question period.

Grants to School Divisions

Ms. Atkinson: — New question to the Minister of Education. I think that Minister of Education is the only person in Saskatchewan that doesn't want to go back to the good old days of the NDP.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — Now, Mr. Minister, from 1981 to 1988 your government's grants to school divisions dropped from 55 per cent to 49 per cent of total school board revenue. In fact, Mr. Minister, your funding has dropped by more than \$3 million even before inflation is taken into account since the 1986-87 year.

In the face of your cut-backs, boards of education across this province have tried to minimize the impact on the individual taxpayer by dipping into the reserves and by reducing teachers and programs, and they've still had to increase school taxes in spite of their reductions in expenditures.

You say your government is committed to education. The facts show they are not. Why don't you stand up and tell the Minister of Finance that the future of our young people is in education and not in birthday parties? Why don't you put your money where your mouth is?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the question is: do we want to go back to a situation where in '74-75 or '79-80, to use the example the other hon. member used, where provincial funding for kindergarten to grade 12, Mr. Speaker, was 120 million in '74-75 or 228 millions of dollars in '79-80, or do we want to continue onward and upward with numbers well into the 450 millions of dollars under this administration, Mr. Speaker?

But let's set the rhetoric aside. I mean, we've heard terms like betrayal. We've heard terms like crisis, Mr. Speaker. That's sheer overstatement. Sheer overstatement. Is it not a fact, Mr. Speaker, that you can always use more money in education? I mean, we could always use more money. And I think the fact that last year we took four out of our new five tax-generated dollars and spent them in areas like health and education — that speaks directly to our priorities, Mr. Speaker; the fact that over the last six years in the very school district they ask about that there's been over \$15 million of provincial dollars into their capital projects over and above the operating grants, Mr. Speaker.

That speaks very well to the kind of commitment we have in education, whether it's in Regina, Mr. Speaker, whether it's La Ronge, Mr. Speaker, whether it's in Nipawin, Swift Current, Maple Creek, Halbrite, or Midale, we are committed to the education of these children, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — New question. Mr. Minister, why don't you tell all of that to the 1,200 students that are going to have to go to another school because of your government's underfunding?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, your government has given us school closures, increased student-teacher ratios, crowded class-rooms, teacher walk-outs, enrolment quotas, and cut-backs in services to students who are most in need. Won't you admit, Mr. Minister, that our young people deserve better? Won't you admit, Mr. Minister, that your underfunding is depriving our young people of the future that they so much need, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Well the hon. member mentioned pupil-teacher ratios, Mr. Speaker. And I think we're all agreed that any class-room that has 35 or 40 students in it is an undesirable teaching situation. But the reality is, the reality is, Mr. Speaker, in 1985 the pupil-teacher ratio in this province was 16.8 and today it's 16.5:1.

The Speaker: — Order.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — What I was trying to show with those numbers, Mr. Speaker, is that the pupil-teacher ratio is in fact is going down across the province. Am I satisfied with that, Mr. Speaker? The answer is no, because that probably doesn't reflect some of the realities these class-room teachers are faced with — the realities of drug and alcohol abuse and substance abuse, and the pressures that that puts on class-room teachers. So could we use even more help for the class-room teacher? You bet.

But the hon. member is clearly off target when she suggests that there's been cut-backs and a pupil-teacher ratio that's expanding. And I want to make sure that the facts are before the legislature, Mr. Speaker, and that the hon. member is clearly off the mark with that accusation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Drought Payment Program

Mr. Romanow: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the Minister of Agriculture, the Premier. The Minister of Agriculture knows that on top of all of the major agricultural problems that are facing the farmers today in Saskatchewan — in fact another one yet today, the bank rate has gone up yet again, up about four points in one year to something like 12.4 per cent — on top of all these serious major agricultural problems that our farmers are facing is the dilemma and the inadequacy and what can only be described as the badly bungled drought payment program.

Now in making the announcement, Mr. Mazankowski of Ottawa said that the drought payment program would be cost shared equally by the provinces on a 50-50 basis. My

question to you, Mr. Minister, is this: will you confirm that in fact there was an agreement between you as Premier and Minister of Agriculture, on behalf of the province of Saskatchewan, and Mr. Mazankowski, representing the federal government, for a cost share based equally, 50-50, and that since that agreement you and your government have reneged on it? And if that's not the case, then why did you not take objection to Mr. Mazankowski's statement of the 50-50 agreement before this time?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to interest rate protection for farmers, we have several programs out, and you will see in the budget that we will continue to provide new programs for agriculture, particularly for farmers that are facing high interest payments and who are faced with the drought program.

With respect to the federal announcement, I never heard Mr. Mazankowski come out and say that it's going to be cost shared 50-50. If he did say that, I would say that I disagreed with it. It is not the case. There's never been an agreement that that's been the case. So I can flatly deny it today, Mr. Speaker.

I've said to the hon. member before in question period, we have cost shared programs before. We've looked after administration. In some cases we've gone on a share, like the livestock program where it was cost shared between the feds and us. This, Mr. Speaker, is something that we're examining with the federal government and I will be glad to report progress to the hon. member when in fact we've finished those negotiations.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the Premier, the Minister of Agriculture. He has told the House today, I think for the first time, that the provincial government is not going to cost share on a 50-50 basis.

I want to ask the Minister of Agriculture this. If that's the case, namely that the arrangements of cost sharing were not finalized at the time of the announcement of the drought payment program in the middle of the federal election in November, why wasn't that fact made known? Why wasn't the fact that the provincial government in Regina, being in disagreement with Ottawa on the degree of the cost sharing, made known to the farmers Saskatchewan at that time? And if it isn't 50-50, what amount of money are you prepared to offer in order to get this program up and running so that the farmers can get their much needed payments at this point? What is the payment that you advocate?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, the payments are in the neighbourhood \$850 million, with the majority of that coming to the province of Saskatchewan. And the federal government has said that, and the members of parliament are saying that. The initial payment is \$12 and \$7, and the final payment will depend on if you're in the real severe drought area. Could be as high as \$40, \$45.

Now they've got the forms out and they're filling them in.

They said they'd have an initial payment and a final payment. The total amount of money is \$800-and-some million, most of it coming to Saskatchewan.

Now we said that we would help in terms of administration, and they're asking us to help more and more with respect to finances. I'm saying, we're talking about it. The total package is going to be same, regardless.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, a new question, perhaps a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. The Minister of Agriculture, will he please tell the House: what are the sticking points in the negotiations? Why is it that for four months now you've been negotiating with Mr. Mazankowski and Mr. Mayer and virtually every other federal minister, and there's still no agreement? Why is it after four months that you and your government is incapable and/or unwilling to come to a satisfactory agreement? What are the sticking points? Give us the precise details.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the hon. member knows that this is a national program. And I don't think he's heard of any agreements between Ontario and the federal government, or Quebec and the federal government, or Manitoba or Alberta or British Columbia. There haven't been any agreements. This is a federal program. This is a national program, initiated by the federal government and the national government.

They want help from us through crop insurance information, they want help from us through administration, and they're asking for money with respect to financing the project. It's a national program. All the provinces are involved one way or another. We are finally deciding to what extent we can help with respect to information out of crop insurance; how we can help with respect to administration and/or finance.

So he hasn't heard anybody come to any solution. It's a national program; they decided to do it; we said that we would be there and help them where we can and where we thought it was reasonable. All the provinces are in the same boat.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Minister of Agriculture. And with the greatest of respect to the Minister of Agriculture, he can treat me with little respect in that kind of an answer, but please don't insult the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I know that this is a national program. I know that it's a federal provincial cost-sharing program. I know that. I'm not in the House of Commons; I'm not in the Alberta legislature; I'm not in the Manitoba legislature — I'm in the Saskatchewan legislature, and I am asking you, sir, as the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture, what your position is and what the sticking points are from your point of view that prevent this deal coming to conclusion earlier than up to now, four months in delay. What are the sticking points from your point of view? You can give us those answers, surely.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, the national program is unfolding under the complete national administration after they accept the information received from crop insurance. And now they've got the forms out. It has nothing to do with these negotiations at all. The program is designed on the basis of crop insurance data. It is in. In fact, our crop insurance data is in ahead of other provinces, and they will tell you that. So we're co-operating as much as possible.

Now if the hon. member says that Saskatchewan taxpayers should bail out the federal government and fund this program, I disagree with him. The NDP might be saying that; maybe the Leader of the Opposition's going to say, well we'll just go tax the farmers to pay for their own drought program. If he's saying that, Mr. Speaker, I disagree with him.

This is a national program, and the majority of the money's going to come out of the national government, and as long as I'm the Premier of the province, on a national program, the federal government will pay the lion's share, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the Minister of Agriculture and Premier, and I disagree with him. He hasn't got money for a drought program for farmers, but he's got money for a Future Corporation \$9 million birthday party. He's got money for Joytec and the boondoggles there. He's got money for the Rafferty boondoggles, but he doesn't have money for the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan. Yes, I do object to you.

I want to ask this question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister. Why is it, Mr. Minister, that you can explain . . . how is it that you can explain that four months ago you promised the farmers of this province that they'd get 40 to \$45 per acre payment? They'd get it early in 1989, the forms would be there early in 1989. There would be no hassle because they had the problems, faced not only with respect to high interest rates and operating costs, but the spring seeding plans. Why is it that you made those promises then and you're not able to fulfil them now and, worse yet, you're not even intending to fight for the farmers of Saskatchewan. What's the change? Why the change?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition perhaps has a short memory. I can say you . . . I mean, he talks about \$9 million for this and he'll talk about \$3 million for that. We've put \$1.2 billion out, more than the whole federal program, to help farmers. We've got a low interest rate program.

On the last program, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the deficiency payment, it was a complete gift right across the province of Saskatchewan that went to everybody, universal, and the members opposite stood up and say:

well you can't have universal programs. And we provided assistance to every single, solitary person that had a wheat board permit book, and they complained about that. Now we went to the federal government and said, get a drought program out here that will be \$850 million — the lion's share coming to Saskatchewan — and they're complaining about that, Mr. Speaker.

We just put practically \$100 million in a new agriculture college, Mr. Speaker. We've got programs that are cash advance at zero per cent interest rates; we've got nine and three quarters; we've got 8 per cent money; we've got 6 per cent money out for farmers, like they'd never seen before. And the Leader of the Opposition stands up, stands up, Mr. Speaker, because he was burnt a little bit for his own actions on farmers, and he's standing up and says, well you haven't delivered for Saskatchewan farmers.

I'll put our money and our interest rate packages and the cash in farmers' hands up against that member's record, at 20 per cent interest rates, or his own actions in foreclosures.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the Premier. And I say to the Premier that if he says I'm concerned and angry, he's doggone right, I am concerned and angry.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Premier, I am, because you promised the farmers of Saskatchewan, you promised the farmers of Saskatchewan, you gave them their word, you gave them their solemn word that you would give them the drought payment, and you betrayed them personally, Mr. Minister, and you're doggone right, I'm angry about that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And my question to you is, sir, how in the world it is that you can get up now, four months after making this promise, how in the world it is that you can get up now and blame everybody, make speeches which are six or seven years old and watch those farmers go belly up because of your inattention to detail? I'm saying to the minister, why don't you take a piece of advice from the Premier — the Premier should fire the Minister of Agriculture and get a minister full-time to do the job for the farmers of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I think spring must have hit the opposition side of the legislature this afternoon. The hon. member . . . I can recall the hon. member putting his cowboy hat on backwards and said, anything for the farm vote. And he got out there, Mr. Speaker, and they all denied him any kind of support, all across the province of Saskatchewan. They did it in Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, and they did it in '82, and they did it in '86, and they will in 1990, Mr. Speaker, because all the fancy talk and all the rhetoric and all the things that

the NDP propose from land bank to all the kinds of things that they were going to do to limit farm size are not acceptable.

And we haven't heard one new farm policy, not one new farm policy coming from the NDP. The same old line: don't worry that we haven't got a farm policy; this phoney medicare stuff works all the time. Well, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan have figured it out. There's no agriculture policy over there; it's all here, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order, order. Before ministerial statements, I would like to request leave of the House to introduce some guests.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Tusa: — I'd like to introduce some guests to the Assembly this afternoon from the town Raymore. There are six grade 12 students, accompanied by their teacher, Cheri Jordan. They're taking a Law 30 class, and they've been paying a visit to Regina today. They have visited the court-house this morning. I have arranged for them to visit with the Clerks this afternoon, and now they have witnessed question period. I hope they have enjoyed it. I would like all hon. members to please welcome them to the Assembly.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tusa: — I will be meeting with them in a few minutes for pictures and drinks and a short discussion.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 7 — An Act respecting the Protection of Children and the Provision of Support Services to Families

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill respecting the Protection of Children and the Provision of Support Services to Families.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 8 — An Act to Promote the Growth and Development of Children and to Support the Provision of Child Care Services to Saskatchewan Families

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to Promote the Growth and Development of Children and to Support the Provision of Child Care Services to Saskatchewan Families.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 9 — An Act respecting Adoption

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill respecting Adoption.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

MOTIONS

Referral of Bills to Standing Committee on Non-controversial Bills

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, and by leave of the Assembly, I move, seconded by my seat mate, the member for Melville, by leave of the Assembly:

That the order for second reading of Bill No. 4, An Act to amend The Residential Services Act, be discharged, and the Bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Non-controversial Bills.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Mr. Speaker, as well I move, seconded by my seat mate, the member for Melville, by leave of the Assembly:

That the order for second reading of Bill No. 5, An Act to amend The Line Fence Act, be discharged, and the Bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Non-controversial Bills.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 1 — An Act to establish the Public Participation Program

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, I rise today to move second reading of The Public Participation Act. It's a straightforward way, Mr. Speaker, and a straightforward way this Bill establishes the department and sets out the following. It sets out the purposes for public participation, the role of the Department of Public Participation, protection offered employees by the Government of Saskatchewan, and protection of the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, this is a co-ordinating Bill for major public policy initiative of this government. It is this government's stated objective to build and diversify our province through increased economic participation by Saskatchewan men and women.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill will act as a facilitator of public participation policy across government. It will ensure co-ordination with other public policy initiatives of the government. The Bill is complementary legislation. Enabling legislation for initiatives such as widespread equity share offerings will be brought forward through separate legislation in this House for full and proper debate.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the integrity of this Bill rests upon

the respect and recognition of other legislation. On that basis, Mr. Speaker, our commitment to protect the public interest and that of public service employees cannot be disputed.

The Bill recognizes the rights afforded employees in The Trade Union Act and their collective bargaining agreements. It provides for the possible continuation of existing pensions and benefits and for early retirement in some circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill also ensures that standards and practices will meet or exceed current levels, that initiatives are evaluated and that the entire process is open and fair. This protects the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, those are the main comments I'd have regarding the content of the Bill. I'd like now to take a bit of time of the House to explain what public participation in Saskatchewan is all about.

Mr. Speaker, public participation certainly is an initiative that is moving around the world, from all governments of all ideologies. It has different names in different countries. We see that Mrs. Thatcher in England calls it privatization. In New Zealand they call it corporatization. And we see in France and in Russia and in various other countries the same movement is taking place. Governments around the world, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are investigating new ways of delivering service. And we in Saskatchewan are bringing our model to this province, and that is the model of public participation.

Mr. Speaker, we hear many say that public participation is just privatization, was just the selling of assets. And I hope in the next few minutes I can indicate to you and other members of this House that the public participation model, the Saskatchewan model, is much broader than that.

In fact, the public participation model in Saskatchewan has four basic dimensions, Mr. Speaker — four basic dimensions in which we involve the public of Saskatchewan in building this fine province, in building this province in a way that the average man and woman of this province, that their children of this province and succeeding generations can benefit from that building.

Mr. Speaker, I spent a lot of my time travelling the province of Saskatchewan and talking to groups throughout this province. And I can tell you, if there's one underlying cause that people feel and they want to support, they all agree that it is in the best interest to build this province. There may be disagreements as to how it is done, but let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the people in Saskatchewan want to build Saskatchewan, and they want to build Saskatchewan in a manner that benefits them, their families, their neighbours, and their children. And, Mr. Speaker, that's what I want to see happen in this province, and that's what this government wants to see happen in this fine province of Saskatchewan.

Let me indicate to you then how this program, this four-dimensional program, can work to build Saskatchewan and to diversify Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, coming from a rural seat, as many of us do in this

legislature, we understand all too well the necessity to diversify the economy of this province; to decentralize many of the initiatives, and the building, and the new things that will be brought in in this province over years to come, so that we can have a strong and vibrant Saskatchewan; a Saskatchewan with a strong rural base; a Saskatchewan in which we are doing the value-added with the wonderful resources that we've been blessed with.

Mr. Speaker, as you look at this province and you compare it with other areas of the world, there are many who would like to be in our position. Mr. Speaker, we are blessed in Saskatchewan with an abundance of natural resources. Nowhere else will you find potash resources like there are in Saskatchewan. Nowhere else will you find heavy oil resources like there are in Saskatchewan. Nowhere else will you find resources in uranium like there are in Saskatchewan, and Saskatchewan has its fair share of natural gas and of light crude.

Coupled with that, Mr. Speaker, the pulp and timber resources we have, the agricultural land that we have, and the vast potential for tourism in this province, and especially in our northern part of the province. Taking all those ingredients, Mr. Speaker, we sit in one of the most blessed areas of Canada, I believe, and, I believe, of the world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the challenge for this government in this province as we move towards into the 21st century is to build those resources — to build on those God-given resources in a way that it will benefit the people of this province. And I believe through public participation we're giving that opportunity to the people of Saskatchewan because, Mr. Speaker, we have a pride in this province. We have a pride of being a province that can come up with some of the most leading type initiatives in all of this country.

I just look at my colleague over here, the Minister of Health. Across this country today, across North America and around the world the plastic health card is admired. They're saying we're leading the way . . . Laugh, laugh, if you may. Laugh if you so wish, but I can tell you, I can tell you, I have visited people in other parts of this world who have asked to find out about the plastic health card.

Mr. Speaker, look at the initiatives in agriculture. Look at the way that this government, the Devine government, has dealt with very serious situations in agriculture over the past five years.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. I'd ask members not to use other members' names in the House.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I apologize. I'm proud of that name, but I won't use it again, Mr. Speaker. And I share that pride with many in Saskatchewan. That name is a name of pride across this province.

But let us get on with public participation, Mr. Speaker. Let me illustrate to you and to the members of this Assembly where this diversification, the building, the value added — taking our commodities, our raw resources, and using the expertise — because I believe

we're as good as anybody else in the world — and using that expertise and that Saskatchewan pride to build new initiatives, new ways of delivering government services. And that's what public participation the Saskatchewan way is going to be.

Let me illustrate the four examples for you. You know many say, well, it's just privatization. And I will say to you, yes, privatization is one part of public participation. And in my mind, privatization is where you take an asset that is owned by the Crown and you sell it to the private sector. And yes, we did sell one to the private sector.

(1445)

We sold the Prince Albert Pulp Company, or PAPCO — which you'll be familiar with, it's your area, Mr. Speaker — that was losing \$91,000 a day of your tax money and of my tax money, and we sold it to Weyerhaeuser Canada. And yes, Weyerhaeuser Canada did build a paper mill, a state of the art paper mill where the paper that is produced in Prince Albert, Saskatchewan today is as good as any paper anywhere in the world.

And what has that resulted in? As I told you, there is constructing the paper plant, the mill, 700 jobs — 700 on-site jobs; two hundred and fifty new permanent jobs in Prince Albert with about a half a million dollars a month coming in in revenue; and the announcement just two weeks ago of 31 new jobs because not only are we producing paper but now we're going to cut that paper and put it in even a more demanded type of commodity, because from what I understand that paper's going to be used for . . . that paper is going to be used for computers, that paper is going to be used for photostatic . . . and we all know in this day and age those are great demands.

Mr. Speaker, there's a good example of taking a raw resource, the pulp wood of northern Saskatchewan, and not just cutting down the trees, not just producing pulp, but producing the value added — paper, demanded in the world economy.

And that's an example of privatization, and that's an example that I think benefits Saskatchewan people. And I can tell you as I talk to people around this province, they say, right on. Those are the kind of things that should take place to have that value added, to create jobs for our children, and to put our products into the world market.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me look now at the second aspect of public participation. And many of the people in this legislature, I'm sure, have taken part in this, and probably some across the way, and that is in the widespread bonds and shares. You've seen what happened in the Power Plus bonds, Mr. Speaker. The Power Plus bonds — \$343 million sold right here in Saskatchewan; \$343 million sold to Saskatchewan people to service and help SaskPower.

Mr. Speaker, then we came with the SaskTel bond, and again, 108 million. I remember the prophets of doom and gloom said, oh, you won't sell 50 million. We sold 108 million, and we've sold them on the convertible bonds to the small person in Saskatchewan to help them reduce their telephone rate. Mr. Speaker, that's giving the people

of the province, about 73,000 of them, the opportunity to build and to take part in this development in Saskatchewan.

And I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, when I cross this province and I say to people: do you want us to go out to Tokyo, do you want us to go to New York, do you want us to go out of the country to borrow, or do you want the opportunity to invest in Saskatchewan and buy bonds here? Because if you look at that, Mr. Speaker, that's about \$80 million of interest that's staying right here in Saskatchewan, and those spin-off activities will help the economy in this province. And across the piece, when I've talked to people about this, they say, right on, right on. Now I hear the member opposite. He would like to send the province to New York, as they did with their government. That's his choice. I prefer to see that interest stay here in the pockets of Saskatchewan men and women.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I've explained a couple of aspects of public participation. Let me now move to a third. And the third one that I often describe to people is that of contracting out, of contracting out of services.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to give one example of them that happened just a few years ago; we're into the third year of that now, and that is the mowing of ditches in the highways. My colleague, the Minister of Highways . . . Again, you may laugh. You may laugh, but let me just explain a minute here. I want to give you a little example here. Two years ago we put out 10 contracts to the private sector. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you what happened. Let me tell you what happened. Those contracts came in 50 per cent cheaper than if they were done within the department, so we did another 25 contracts this year and the same thing has happened. And the minister will be bringing forth more contracts for the next year.

Mr. Speaker, there are many things that can be done by the contracting out of services. To provide services to the people of Saskatchewan . . .

An Hon. Member: — Mowing the ditches.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well you can laugh about mowing ditches, but I think it's an important part of the beautification of this province. Look, when I was minister of Tourism . . . one thing that people told me, Mr. Speaker, as the minister of Tourism, is that was one of the things that first impresses you when you come into the province of Saskatchewan is the beautification of the province. And if you're driving in on a road and you have a nicely mowed ditch and it has a good appearance, I tell you, you have a good impression upon that visiting public. Now you may like to see them all full of weeds and so on, and if that's your desire, please go ahead. I cite that as an example of some of the aspects of contracting out.

Now they will probably complain about the contracting out of the auditing services to the Crown corporations because, Mr. Speaker, we did that a few years ago too. There's a strong auditing service in this province, and there's no necessity for government to employ all the

people to do these services. So, Mr. Speaker, I see contracting out as a third part of public participation.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me turn to one that I think is of great importance, and I'd like to see the position of the members opposite on this one. And that is employee buy-ins, where we can take the service that is being provided by government and employees can buy that service, start their own company, their own co-operative, their own employee association — whatever it may be — and provide that service.

And I want to give you two or three examples of that that I think are very good examples. We had the whole system of tape duplication in the Department of Education. We put it out for contract; three or four firms bid; an employee won the contract, an employee who's going to form his own company.

Now you can laugh at employees forming their own company, and if you're against that I'm glad to see where you stand. That employee is going to be able to add some dimensions to the tape duplication that we would have had to spend taxpayers' money to do, and he's going to be able to do that and provide the service. And, Mr. Speaker, it's going to be at a \$100,000 saving to the people of Saskatchewan. Let me tell you, if we can provide that service through alternate ways and we can save taxpayers' money in doing it, then I believe that's the type of thing we should do.

The other day, Mr. Speaker, the government opposite . . . they think it's necessary to have a printing company; we believe it is not.

An Hon. Member: — The government opposite, now you're hitting the nail on the head . . .

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well when you were the government you thought you should have a printing company and you thought you should control everything.

They had a printing company — Sask Government Printing. I'm proud to say, Mr. Speaker, that the employees have bought Sask Government Printing. Every employee has a share in Sask Government Printing, and they will be able to do our printing on a diminishing balance over years with the contract they have and go out and compete in the private sector.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, with public participation we are able to take people who are civil servants and allow them to become entrepreneurs.

I remember the other day, the news conference down in the basement here when we announced the initiatives in the yellow pages, and I remember the person from SaskTel that was sitting at the front with myself and Mr. Lane, or my seat mate here, the Minister of Finance . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. It's sometimes difficult to not have a slip of the tongue, but I ask members again not to use other members' names.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — It's understandable when you're sitting with a person for 10 years you get to know them by

their name, but that's fine, we'll continue on.

Mr. Speaker, what I wanted to say was that the employee was sitting there, and when the press asked him — and the press can attest to this — what he felt about this, he said, it is giving me a chance to become an entrepreneur. That's what the employee said. And you're going to see more and more of this.

Mr. Speaker, in my office I have almost 100 proposals of various types. There's a great deal of interest taking place in Saskatchewan for employee buy-ins of services, and we're going to see more of this where people in Saskatchewan can have a real opportunity, where employees can have a real opportunity to own and supply their services, where people can become entrepreneurs and people can build expanding businesses.

Mr. Speaker, we've seen many of these. We look at the WESTBRIDGE computer company. We took some of the SaskCOMP, along with SaskTel, merged it with some private companies, and today we see WESTBRIDGE computer company based here in Regina, state of the art computer company, competing for contracts right across Canada. And that wasn't the case before, Mr. Speaker, but that's certainly the case now. And you're going to see more of these.

I remember being in Meadow Lake one day with my colleague, the Minister of Health, announcing the sale of the Meadow Lake pulp mill. Do you know who bought the Meadow Lake pulp mill, Mr. Speaker? The pulp mill was bought by the 10 Indian bands and the employees of the Meadow Lake pulp mill — 96 per cent of those employees are shareholders in that and we know that there will be added . . . value added developments coming in Meadow Lake. And I can tell you, if you go into the town of Meadow Lake and you ask them what they think of public participation, they were there 3,000 strong that day, Mr. Speaker, to say yes, this is what we want to see happen. We want to see that value added, that development in our town, and it's going to take place.

Mr. Speaker, I can say to you that you're going to see much more of this in the year to come in Saskatchewan. You're going to see three major initiatives take place in debate this year in the legislature. Following this debate on this Bill, we're going to see a Bill brought forward on the potash corporation, on SaskEnergy, and also on SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance).

Mr. Speaker, these are fundamental changes to Saskatchewan. They are changes that I believe will help diversify the economy of this province. They are changes, Mr. Speaker, that I believe will give people in this province true ownership. And, Mr. Speaker, they are changes that I believe will once again grab that Saskatchewan spirit, that pride in our province, that ability to say, yes, we are only a million people, but we are a million people who put things together as we see fit in this province, and we develop systems that are copied throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, other areas, as I said at the beginning, are doing this, but we can't take an idea from New Zealand or France or England or Indonesia or Russia or wherever it is,

and implement it into Saskatchewan.

The other day I was speaking in Rockglen, and I said what may work there doesn't necessarily work in Rockglen, Saskatchewan, but I can tell you, with talking to those people in Rockglen, Saskatchewan, we can come up with models that do fit Rockglen, Saskatchewan, that do fit Saskatchewan in every way, shape, and form, that will help diversify this province, and that will bring about that diversification in such a way, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan will build, will build on the resources, will build on the God-given gift that we're lucky enough to have, will build on those in such a way that the people across this province will benefit from those.

And, Mr. Speaker, that is the motivating force behind public participation, to create that Saskatchewan pride, that first again so that we can stand proud in this country in saying, yes, we did it our way and we did it in a way that will build this province, diversify, and it will benefit not only now but succeeding generations.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to move second reading of Bill No. 1, The Public Participation Act.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I want to take a few moments to outline our opposition to Bill 1, the Bill that will privatize, as the minister says, three main corporations — SaskPower, SGI, and the potash corporation.

An Hon. Member: — SaskEnergy.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — The minister says from his seat, SaskEnergy, but of course everyone knows it's SaskPower.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — SaskPower by any other name is still SaskPower. I mean, the minister can pull out one part of SaskPower and call it by another name and then say, we're now privatizing something else. But the people of the province, when they get their bill every month, know it's SaskPower.

And as the rates go up over the coming years as a result of this privatization, they will in fact know that the minister in privatizing SaskPower, was the creator of these new increases in the power bills that they will be getting in their mail.

I want to say again, Mr. Speaker, that we will be opposing the Bill. And in completing my remarks today, which I intend to keep short, I'll be moving for adjournment so I have time to look at the Bill. Our caucus will want to take time to look at the minister's remarks, short as they were, and then come back at a future day to have a full-blown debate on this Bill.

I was interested to hear from the minister, and I don't want to spend much time on what he said because I didn't think there was much in his speech, but . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — But, Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very important Bill that we're dealing with here today.

The minister talks about how impressive it is that we were able to get rid of PAPCO (Prince Albert Pulp Company), a Canadian and Saskatchewan-owned company in Prince Albert, and sell it to the Americans. How impressive that is to give the management from Saskatchewan people to Americans, and how impressed he was that we can have people from Saskatchewan mowing the highway ditches.

Now that's a nice analogy, that we're now world class, that we can't run our own pulp mills, that we can't build our own paper mills, but have to get American corporations, giant American corporations, to come in and do that for us. But he's very proud that our farmers can mow the ditches of the province because they have no income — because they have no income, Mr. Speaker.

They have no income because this is a government bankrupt of new ideas. The most innovative thing they've done, one, is to allow farmers to mow the ditches along the highways; and secondly, to sell off a major portion of northern Saskatchewan, 7 million acres of forest land, to an American corporation.

(1500)

Now that may be progress. That may be progress Tory style. But I'll tell you, there are many people in this province who do not agree that setting up these kind of projects that basically line the pockets of the friends of the Conservative Party is a good idea. I don't think it is.

The one privatization this minister refused to talk about is one that ties directly to farmers mowing the ditches, and that is the farm equity program. This will be privatization Tory style as well, where we'll get offshore money to come to Saskatchewan to set up a large landholding company, owned in part by Saskatchewan people, but I believe the majority owned outside of the province with the possibility of much foreign money coming in to own the province of Saskatchewan's farm land. That's privatization.

This is very exciting that we lend out money, over a billion dollars to farmers at 6 per cent, entice them to take it; then when they can't pay it, jack up the interest rate to nine and three-quarters; then send out the lawyers to seize the farm; then set up a land corporation, owned by private and foreign owners, to buy up the land. I say to you, this is privatization and privatization Tory style.

At every turn we see this government taking away from the people — farm land, potash corporation, selling it to a foreign government; the forests of northern Saskatchewan, 7 million acres, being sold to an American corporation. I'll tell you, the cartoon I saw in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* two days ago that had an outline, a silhouette of the province of Saskatchewan with a for sale planted in the middle of it, is very, very appropriate, very appropriate.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I say this is not a public participation Bill. This is Saskatchewan for sale Bill No. 1 of this province, because it allows for the sell-off of almost every asset the people of this province have owned.

Now I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I want to outline how we got to the point that we're at in Saskatchewan today. We have an economy, at least up till 1982, that was crafted by successive governments — Liberal, CCF (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation), New Democrat — that after the crash of 1929 when the unfettered capitalism was found wanting, when no regulations were in place, the economy and whole operation of this province, including the farming area, collapsed as a result of unfettered capitalism with no regulation.

We had the Winnipeg grain exchange buying up the farmers' wheat in the fall at harvest time for a few cents a bushel and then selling it for three or four times as much when the price of wheat went up later in the year. We had this before. We had a privatized wheat board like these Conservatives are trying to do here in the province. We've tried this system before.

So the people in the province got together to create wheat pools and force the federal government to set up the Canadian Wheat Board. This wasn't an idea of a socialist government or a Liberal government. This was an idea that farmers getting together setting up co-operatives and demanding of their government the Canadian Wheat Board that would regulate the sale of wheat and take the massive profits out of the grain exchange in Winnipeg, and share it among all the farmers. That's how it worked.

And when they needed power in rural Saskatchewan they got together in groups and demanded of the government that a power corporation be set up that would take power to rural Saskatchewan. And when the power corporation was set up farmers got together to actually set the poles in the ground, dig the holes by hand and tap the dirt around them to set up the power poles. And it was built by people and the government to service the needs of people.

And when the banks were repossessing farm land back in the 1930s when we had Conservative governments, they set up the credit union system to protect themselves against the free market system unregulated. And what we've done in Saskatchewan up to 1982 is crafted a society and an economy that was based in sharing and caring for each other. We believed in the free enterprise system. We had a flourishing private sector which included much manufacturing.

I remember Friggstad Manufacturing in Frontier, an individual farmer who wanted to set up a corporation, and he did, and he built manufacturers and he built air seeders and cultivators. And we gave grants directly to that private sector individual to start a flourishing corporation — private sector. Well even that private sector initiative is now broke; there's no more Friggstad in Frontier. It went broke shortly after this government took power.

And we built a Crown corporation sector that, one,

through the public utilities, we believed that Crown corporations should own the public utilities. We believed in the resource sector, that the government should have involvement but not control; that we should have a window in the industry, in potash and oil and uranium. And then in every other area of the province, where necessary, we involved Crown corporations. If we wanted to develop something and the private sector didn't want to do it, we would then use Crown corporations to do it. And it was a system that was built over 50 years, and it worked together — co-operative, private sector, and the public sector. And they worked together and things flourished.

In 1982 when we left office there was no deficit. In fact we had a surplus of \$140 million that we turned over to the Premier of the province — 140 million by their own documents. In fact the minister of Finance at that time, the member from Kindersley, a few months after the election, issued a document with his signature on it that said in fact there was \$140 million in the till.

And we had an unemployment rate of 4 per cent. The debt was non-existent, as I mentioned, in the Consolidated Fund and there was a small debt in the Crown corporation sector . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The members mention to me it was lowest per capita debt in Canada. In fact it was — and the lowest unemployment rate. And private sector investment was high. Home building was high. We had over 9,000 houses built per year in the last six years of our term.

Well what has happened? Where are we at today? After five years, or four years of privatization what has happened? Is there a glowing province here that is successful, driving young people with jobs, building homes. Where is the example that privatization is working?

I tell you, in every sector of the economy, every sector of the economy, the debt . . . Let's look at the debt — no debt in the Consolidated Fund when we left office; in fact, a surplus of 140 million. It is now \$4 billion in the Consolidated Fund and 8 billion in the Crown corporation sector. That's after we've been privatizing for four years and selling off the assets. And they said that they would be lowering the debt. And many people ask, where did the money go? Who lined their pockets? Where is the money? This is what the people of the province are saying, where did the money go?

Well we know where the money went. The money went to the friends of the Conservative Party. Look at Weyerhaeuser. I want to take one example of Weyerhaeuser profits. In 1985, international Weyerhaeuser had a profit of about \$120 million. In 1987 that profit had gone to over \$500 million, in large part as a result of the drastic increase in pulp prices and the purchase of the P.A. pulp mill for nothing. The P.A. pulp mill was sold at a time when the price of pulp was at a low, low ebb, and all pulp mills across North America were losing money.

Now these are the business wizards of Canada. They have 7 million acres of forest land, the best in Saskatchewan, to sell. They have a pulp mill in P.A. They have a chemical

plant in Saskatoon. They have a saw mill in Big River. This is the package they have. Now the market is depressed, the market is depressed. Would a normal business person decide to sell off those assets when they were depressed? What would you do, Mr. Speaker? You would hang in there until the price of pulp went up, as it is today, and then sell them.

Well what did we get? We sold off a pulp mill at a time when pulp was depressed. We sold off a chemical plant, a saw mill, and 7 million acres of prime forest land. What did we get? We got a promise that we may get \$248 million, which was later reduced by 12 million bucks. No money down. No payments due unless profits were over 14 per cent. And they were saying that the debt of that corporation was losing \$91,000 a day. I remember the ads.

Well even if it were true, where did the debt go? Where did the debt go; where did the debt go? And I ask the Deputy Premier, if we were losing that much money in 1986 when you sold that corporation, where did the debt go to? You got no money. You must still be losing \$91,000 a day and you've got no income. The pulp mill's gone, the forests are gone, our people are out of work. And I say to you, these business wizards of Canada have sold off a major asset and have got nothing in return. I want to say we've got no cash, no money.

One other point. The interest rate that they allowed these people when they were selling it — if they ever had to pay any interest, but they didn't have to pay any unless profits were over 14 per cent — was eight and a half per cent. Eight and a half per cent interest, if any were ever paid — this over 30 years.

And at the end of the 30-year period they would not get any cash after 30 years if they still owed 248 million. Do you know what you would get, the people of the province? You would get some non-convertible shares in this corporation, that you couldn't sell. Now that is an exciting deal and prospect for the people of this province.

And I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that was the first example of Tory privatization, sell-off, Saskatchewan style, Tory style.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well that's one part of the economy that has been a shining example of privatization.

Let's look at employment. What has happened to employment since privatization was held up as the flagship that would take us into the 1990s? What has happened to unemployment?

Well when we left office, unemployment was just over 4 per cent, just over 4 per cent, Mr. Speaker. And I say to you that that has climbed and climbed steady since that time. Last month was the first month since statistics were collected in this country, 1966, that our average unemployment was higher than the national average. The first time — the first time since statistics have been kept, that we've had higher than average unemployment in his province. Unemployment being created by privatization.

I want to list out a few of the places where we've lost jobs. The dental plan lost 400. When we privatized the highway workers and the highway equipment we lost another 400. When we privatized SED Systems in Saskatoon and sold it off to Fleet Aerospace out of province, we lost jobs. When we sold off Saskoil we lost 25 per cent of the work-force within a matter of weeks. At every turn we have lost employment as a result of privatization.

And I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that you know full well the problems associated with people not having work to do and meaningful employment.

You can send the farmers off the land and repossess their land and send them out mowing the ditches of highways, but I want to say to you that is not what farmers want to be doing. They would much rather be farming their land the way they were back in the 1970s, not worrying about having to go off farm, finding little jobs, working for the government mowing the ditches. That they don't want to do. They're not trained to mow ditches, they're trained to produce wheat and sell it in a world market at a meaningful price and getting a living out of it.

But I want to say, the most drastic, and I think the most telling story is the fact of the unemployment of young people; 17 per cent of those young people and families under the age of 25 are now unemployed in the province of Saskatchewan. Poverty and child hunger is second highest in Canada, only behind Newfoundland, who have none of the resources that we have to build the economy on, none of the resources and none of the strengths in terms of the economy that we have.

But when I looked at the statistics for February and saw 7,000 people, most of them young families, fleeing the province, I knew that privatization was not working, and the people of the province know that it is not working.

I say to you on the final point I want to raise today before I adjourn the debate, on services, the final criteria which could convince people in this province that this is a good idea is the area of services. There was a belief created that if we were to privatize, services would be improved in this province. Well I want to say to you that service in every area, whether it's in our parks, whether it's our highway system, whether it's the dental plan and health care — and yes, we are privatizing the health care in this province under Tories — in every area services have been reduced.

So the three main criteria that I base my opposition to privatization — employment: if they could point to the employment being increased and unemployment going down, that would be an argument in favour of privatization, but it isn't. Unemployment has almost doubled. If they could say the debt of the province was being reduced as a result of selling off the assets, that would be an argument that could convince some people, but it isn't. The debt has gone in total from about 2.5 billion in 1982, to \$12 billion. And taxes have gone up at the same time.

(1515)

And if they could say that the unemployment, the outflow of people was going down, or services were increased, all of those are arguments that would convince people. But on every one of those areas they have failed, and failed miserably. On every one of them they are found wanting when it comes to privatization.

I want to conclude by saying that it's unfair for the New Democratic Party to say that everybody loses under privatization. It's not true. We will not be making the statement that everyone loses under privatization. Some people do win. Paul Schoenhals wins, George Hill wins, Weyerhaeuser wins, and the list goes on and on of those people who win. The 75 per cent of the shares in Saskoil that went outside of the province, those people may win. They haven't won yet because the shares haven't gone up on the common shares, nor have any dividends been paid. They may win.

So the list of winners, Mr. Speaker, is very short, and we don't argue that there aren't winners in privatization. But I want to say to you that the few friends of the Tory party who benefit do not outweigh the ordinary families who are going to lose by paying higher utility bills.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I say to you that these assets are presently owned by the people. There's no way in the world that the people don't understand, after 50 years of developing a Crown sector and a private sector and a co-operative sector; getting dividends from their co-ops; getting dividends from their government Crowns by having things like dental programs directly paid for out of some of the Crown profits — people understand that. They own the Crowns, they benefit from the profits, they have service, and they have jobs as a result. People know that.

So I say to you that this idea, this sham that is being put over the people of the province today — and I hear the minister in great, glowing terms talking about taking something that Maggie Thatcher has in Great Britain and bringing it here — it won't work. It can't work. It's been tried before.

This is a march back to the future, Mr. Speaker. It's been tried here before and found wanting. We had this system that you proposed before the Depression, in the 1930s. We had unfettered capitalism, no co-operative movement, and no Crown corporations. And we know what happened to the economy of this province.

Now many people around don't remember. In fact, most of us don't remember, but most of us can read. I wish that the people of the opposite side would take time to study the history of this province, how it was built, the development of this economy that we're now ripping apart.

And I say to you that this does not surprise me that a government bankrupt of ideas, bankrupt of money, \$14 billion in debt, striving to win one more election — it doesn't surprise me that they're making a grab for cash, trying to get a billion dollars out of the potash corporation

for a slush fund for the election for one more promise. That's what this is about.

This is a desperate government that has driven the province into the hole to the tune of \$12 billion. Mr. Speaker, this is not a brilliant strategy by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley. This is a desperate government that is bankrupt. This is a fire sale of assets because there's no other place to get money. The people of the province will know that when you're \$12 billion in the hole and you go to borrow money in other parts of the world, that many of those lending institutions simply don't want to talk to you. This is a last resort to try to rob the bank accounts of ordinary folk in this province to pay for the slush fund that will attempt to get the Tories back in power in the next election. That's what this is all about.

What really disappoints me even more than that though, Mr. Speaker, is this: this government is once again attempting to divide and conquer in the next election. We have seen farmers pitted against non-farmers, and the ripping and tearing in the destruction of the economy that goes on when you have rural versus urban. We've seen native pitted against non-native, and now we're seeing the proponents of the free-market system being pitted against those who believe in public or the mixed economy.

But I want to say that the only way this province can survive and flourish is having farmers working with their urban brothers and sisters to create a society that is productive and meaningful. The only way we can survive in a province with now fewer than a million people, as a result of the outflow last month, is to have native people working with non-native people. The only way we can survive is to have the three sectors of the economy, co-operative, public, and private, working in unison, pulling together to create an economy that will work for the people of this province. That's why . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Those, in brief outline, are reasons why, when the vote comes, we'll be opposing the Bill. But I want to take some time to consult with my colleagues after the minister's speech. I therefore beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 2 — An Act respecting Railways in Saskatchewan

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me this afternoon to introduce second reading of a very important piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker. And when I speak of this new legislation, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking of the new Saskatchewan Railway Act which replaces antiquated legislation that has essentially been unchanged since 1906 — that's since 1906, Mr. Speaker. And many, many times I sit in the legislature and we pass laws, and many of them in each session, and I wonder sometimes, Mr. Speaker, is it really necessary to be updating so many pieces of legislation.

But here with this particular piece of legislation, Mr.

Speaker, there hasn't been a change to it since 1906. So I advance to you, Mr. Speaker, that certainly it is time that new laws be created that reflect the needs of today's changing transportation environment. Progressive legislation, Mr. Speaker, must come from a Progressive Conservative government. And that is why it is this government that has implemented this important and necessary change.

This government, Mr. Speaker, by the very fact of this legislation that I am introducing today, most definitely has its eyes set on the future, the future potential of this province, Mr. Speaker. This government is following the lead of our federal counterparts in providing new legislation that will create a more efficient transportation system throughout this country.

I'm speaking, Mr. Speaker, of the recent National Transportation Act. That Act has created a less regulated environment in all areas of transportation. It will lead this country into a much more streamlined era of transportation. The legislation before the House today, Mr. Speaker, continues this trend by creating flexibility in the rail industry away from the current rigid standards and brings it more in line with transportation issues that are being faced today in the 1980s and on into the 21st century, Mr. Speaker.

The original 1906 legislation effectively met the needs and the issues of that era, but with many changes in the last 82 years, it does not meet the needs of today. The present government is most concerned for the welfare of the Saskatchewan public, and I believe that this is reflected in all decisions related to transportation.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that presently there are many rail lines in Saskatchewan which are generally unregulated. Some of these rail lines, in fact, cross public roads, Mr. Speaker. This new legislation will place railways that are not currently regulated by the federal government under provincial guide-lines. This new Bill ensures the safe operation of all rail lines with modern safety standards.

Guide-lines will also be developed to guarantee equipment operators are sufficiently qualified. I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is a progressive solution for the future direction of rail line industry in Saskatchewan.

I'm speaking, Mr. Speaker, of the concerns Saskatchewan producers are experiencing with the possibility of rail line abandonments by major railways. Virtually all of the grain produced in our province and 90 per cent of the potash depends on our rail system for transportation to market. Mr. Speaker, these industries are vital to our provincial economy, and this government is committed to fighting for efficient and effective transportation service to producers.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier and I are constantly stressing the vital importance of the rail system in rural Saskatchewan to our federal counterparts. These efforts, Mr. Speaker, have been carried out by several presentations and many briefs and letters. These presentations have been well received, Mr. Speaker.

And I'd like at this time to pay tribute to many of the members on the government side of the House from all over rural Saskatchewan who are well acquainted with the facts out in rural Saskatchewan today. These members — many of them who have first-hand working knowledge of what a farm is, how a farm operates, how a transportation system operates — these members on the government side of the House with full working knowledge of what a permit book is; these members on this government side of the House, Mr. Speaker, with an in-depth working knowledge, comprehension and understanding of rural Saskatchewan and the farms that are the backbone of this province; these members, Mr. Speaker — and I have been there right alongside them — when there are rail line abandonment hearings, these members have been there standing with the local people in the community, side by side, fighting to retain these lines.

And, Mr. Speaker, here today I want to give credit to members such as the member for Redberry, the member for Morse, the member for Kelvington-Wadena — all of these members, Mr. Speaker, from rural Saskatchewan and integrally involved in their communities and knowledgeable, Mr. Speaker, about farming and farm life.

But, Mr. Speaker, despite our best efforts, despite all the fight and all the work that we go through, there is still the reality that rail line abandonment to an extent is inevitable. This legislation before the House today provides alternatives to empty rail lines lying around unused.

We have met, Mr. Speaker, with many of the concerned groups of producers, and we are working with this legislation, Mr. Speaker, to provide alternatives and solutions to the problems that exist today.

This new Act, Mr. Speaker, provides the opportunity for a railway to sell a rail line to an independent operator who will run it as a smaller short line service. Not only does this provide more options for dealing with an abandoned rail line, but it could permit a more streamlined, more cost-efficient operation that will benefit both shippers and consumers.

It is an opportunity for producers to ensure that important rail line service is maintained for the people of Saskatchewan. It is an option that the people want, Mr. Speaker. It is an option that the people need.

Mr. Speaker, the public knows what it wants. This government has been listening to those kinds of practical solutions that will move our province into a bright economic future.

This Act ensures that the public interest will continue to play an important role in the development of any independent rail lines.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan, once again, with this piece of legislation, is leading Canada with innovative and progressive ideas.

Mr. Speaker, this Railway Act, is the first provincial

Railway Act to be updated across this country of Canada. Other provinces across this country have been awaiting this piece of legislation. They have been consulting with the people in our department and with myself respecting the specifics of this legislation, and I hazard to guess, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation will be duplicated in many provinces across the country.

And I stand here today, Mr. Speaker, with a fair degree of pride in knowing that here again, Saskatchewan is taking the lead; Saskatchewan government is recognizing that there are changes. We are recognizing, Mr. Speaker, that we are moving rapidly into the 21st century. Some changes have to take place.

This legislation recognizes that operating a provincial railway line is significantly different from operating a national railway. It allows such a railway company to design their operations to respond, to respond, Mr. Speaker, to the specific local needs of people. This may allow such a railway to continue to provide rail service to Saskatchewan communities and producers where the CNR or the CPR have failed to do so.

It allows for private railways to haul their own product without excessive regulations, but does provide protection to adjacent landowners and the travelling public, should the rail line cross public roads.

It makes provision for the private sector, for the private sector to invest in a railway line and contract the operations to others who have the knowledge and experience to operate a railway.

The legislation has streamlined and simplified the complicated process involved with constructing or acquiring a railway. No longer will it be necessary for a prospective railway company to go through the cumbersome, costly procedure of obtaining a private Act.

(1530)

This government recognizes that the service which a short-line railway might offer is similar in character to that provided by the trucking industry. To be successful, the small railway must respond quickly to changes in market opportunities or operating conditions. This new Act allows for quick response through the Highway Traffic Board. It is a progressive step that will permit carriers greater access to rail lines. This, Mr. Speaker, can only lead to a more efficient industry.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, in developing this legislation we have worked toward a more safe and efficient transportation network. I believe this legislation will respond to a more competitive era in transportation as we move into the next century.

Mr. Speaker, specifically, this legislation is new, is innovative. It is long overdue, as I stated at the outset. Since 1906, no changes to this legislation have taken place. I believe that this legislation fits now and will serve us very well in the years to come.

I use a specific example, Mr. Speaker, that comes to mind of where this Act may in fact be practical, and I speak of a

new member in our House, the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg. That member has been working with the local community for a number of months on what we call a road-railer demonstration project. That man was very, very involved with the community in developing this proposal. The proposal is currently under study, but I would say, Mr. Speaker, that that member's firsthand working knowledge of the road railer concept in his own area — down on the Killdeer line — was in part responsible for that man's election to the legislature. It's a pleasure, it's a pleasure for me to have the new member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg with us today with the introduction of this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I do look forward to the comments from the opposition. I would hope and trust that the opposition would pay close attention to this Act. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the opposition will respect that it is time for changes in The Railway Act and that they will indeed support such progressive and innovative legislation that, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I do move second reading of An Act respecting Railways in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I've been monitoring the movement of this particular Bill for some time now, and I was impressed with the minister's verbiage in bringing forward the Bill for second reading at this time. He launched into his discussion about antiquated legislation which is on the books since 1906, and he said there are provinces just waiting for Saskatchewan to forge ahead in this area so that they can copy Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, two Bills the same as these, virtually word for word the same as these Bills, were introduced in this House back in June of '88, June 16 and June 20 — Bill 100 and Bill 102 — the same content in the two Bills, The Railway Act and the consequential legislation. They sat around on the order paper, and finally they fell off the order paper when the last session prorogued. There is no urgency about this Bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker. What the minister is attempting to do is to avoid some of the issue here with regard to this particular Bill.

I listened to his comments about rural Saskatchewan and about rail line abandonment. Well that's true that under this government the fabric of rural Saskatchewan has been ripped and torn, and the people out in rural Saskatchewan are suffering. And the minister who talks about rail line abandonment in rural Saskatchewan, on this particular issue this government has been johnny-come-lately on the issue of rail line abandonment. Right from the first day they were in office they've been johnny-come-lately on rural line abandonment, and still are. They feel that they have to give the impression they're doing something out there in rural Saskatchewan. That's why the minister is talking about rail line abandonment.

It's interesting to note, the minister in his comments never once mentioned the name Manalta Coal — never once mentioned Manalta Coal. I want to spend some time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, talking about Manalta Coal because this

Bill is the stalking-horse for privatization in Saskatchewan by this government; it's the stalking-horse for Manalta Coal. And I want to talk about that give-away because there is some privatization the people of Saskatchewan need to know more about. And I will be taking the opportunity later on to discuss that at some length, and to discuss some of the aspects of the Bill.

I'll want to have an opportunity to discuss or to look over the minister's remarks in moving second reading of the Bill, and will do that in due course and hope to participate and reveal some of the aspects of this Bill which the minister failed to bring to the attention of the House in second reading, some of the very important aspects.

Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate on this Bill.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 3 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments to Certain Acts resulting from the enactment of The Railway Act

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is simply, as it says, a consequential amendments Act respecting The Railway Act itself, and it will go on to be part and parcel of the implementation of a new railway Act for the province of Saskatchewan.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that once again, when we're talking about this piece of legislation, indeed it has many practical areas in which it will be put into place. I say again, Mr. Speaker, that many of the rail lines in Saskatchewan today are unregulated and have been for some time. The member opposite, I know, has taken the position that there's no urgent need for this legislation to be introduced and, indeed, in some respects that is true. But the delay in passage of this piece of legislation means, Mr. Speaker, that the members opposite want to close their eyes, stick their heads in the sand, and not look at any alternatives.

I find it very interesting, Mr. Speaker, that the member opposite, who I know is opposed to the legislation, is the member for Saskatoon Westmount — Westmount, I believe. The member opposite talks about railways and rail lines. I ask, Mr. Speaker, has the member opposite any real true in depth knowledge of rural Saskatchewan? Does the member opposite have any real true understanding of farm problems today? Has the member opposite ever been at a railway line abandonment hearing?

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. Why is the member on his feet?

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the purpose of second reading is for the minister to address the impact and what the Bill is, not wandering off into the wilderness trying to kill time, because in fact the legislative agenda here is not even sufficient to fill in the afternoon and he's wasting the time and the taxpayers' money.

The Deputy Speaker: — I find the point of order not well taken.

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I certainly will talk about the Bill, Mr. Speaker, and it is a Bill that is necessary, Mr. Speaker. In fact the consequential amendments Bill is necessary for implementation of the whole structure of this subject, this subject of what do we do with the future of Saskatchewan, the future of rural Saskatchewan. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, do we stick our heads in the sand? Do we close our eyes? Or do we face the real problems that are out there with respect to rural Saskatchewan and the abandonment of rail lines?

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I would commend and compliment the members on this side of the House, the members who have that intricate knowledge of rural Saskatchewan, who have been there hand in hand, side by side with rural communities, fighting railway line abandonments.

The question becomes, Mr. Speaker, if it was left up to the NDP, would the NDP look at a piece of legislation like this or would they close their eyes? I hazard a guess, Mr. Speaker, that the members opposite who have no working knowledge of rural Saskatchewan would in all fact close their eyes to this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I've stated before that indeed we won't win every fight against rail line abandonment. And the option is close your eyes or take a real look at if there are some alternatives. I believe there are alternatives, Mr. Speaker. I speak of short line railways. I know in the United States there are probably 150 or 160 short line railways operating in rural America. I know, Mr. Speaker, that it is an integral part of many industries in Saskatchewan who need a short railway.

The member opposite, I know, is very familiar with Manalta Coal, and indeed they would be opposed to doing anything that would assist industry to grow and prosper and build and develop and create jobs. But a railway line for such industries as Manalta Coal is exceedingly important. Without this legislation being passed by this legislature, Mr. Speaker, that rail line adjacent to Manalta Coal, and an integral part of their industry, would not be legal.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge members opposite to read this legislation thoroughly. I urge members opposite to study the merits of such proposed legislation. And I do move second reading of Bill No. 3, The Railways Consequential Amendments Act.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am pleased that the minister had an opportunity to get a few remarks off his chest that he forgot to make in second reading of the previous Bill.

Never before has so much been said about so little as Bill No. 3, An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments to Certain Acts resulting from the enactment of The Railway Act. That's about all there is in that Bill, and I recognize that. I've been around this place long enough to recognize that these are consequential amendments, and really there's nothing there to discuss, but the minister has spent a fair bit of time discussing them.

And really what the minister is concerned about is the consequential effects of him not spending a lot of time talking about these two Bills today, because the consequence of that is that he's going to run out of work. And he's the House Leader and he's supposed to have some work here for us to do. We came here to do . . .

An Hon. Member: — Order.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Oh, there's the member from Cut Knife wants to take some more time up with specious points of order. We came here to discuss Bills such as Bill No. 2, to discuss Bills such as Bill No. 2, An Act respecting Railways in Saskatchewan. We get a long, flowery speech from the Minister of Highways, of very little substance, and then he follows up with discussion on the consequential amendments — much more than the consequential amendments warrants. And the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster is upset about this.

The main theory of the Minister of Highways with regard to these two Bills is that he should try and stampede this legislature to put through these Bills because all of Canada has been waiting . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. Why is the member on his feet?

Mr. Hopfner: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have had a point of order raised by those members opposite where our minister had been speaking on the Bill. I know that members opposite don't have a whole lot to say about this because they do not have an understanding of the importance of this Bill. But I want to indicate to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this member has not even referred to the Bill as of yet, and he is . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. Order. I find your point of order not well taken. It's a dispute between two members.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — The member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster should get his hearing-aid tuned up because I read out the title of the two Bills that are under consideration today, and I am the one that introduced the question about Manalta Coal, which the minister forgot to address and which he rushed to address in the consequential amendments that don't relate to Manalta Coal at all. Now I will be taking the opportunity, and since this is just a consequential Bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'll be taking the opportunity later to address this Bill, and as a consequence of that I ask for leave to adjourn the debate on this Bill.

The Deputy Speaker: — Would the member move to . . . Order. Would the member move to adjourn debate rather than ask leave, beg leave?

Mr. Brockelbank: — I'll certainly move that, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Debate adjourned.

(1545)

Bill No. 6 — An Act to amend The Wills Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I rise today to move second reading of The Wills Amendment Act of 1989. The formal requirements of The Wills Act, Mr. Speaker, dates back to the 1800s. These formalities, Mr. Speaker, quite frankly you know, in all seriousness, are important because obviously the testator will not be able to be there at the time to speak to the true intention of the will when it is being interpreted.

On the other hand, the common law jurisdictions around the world have been attempting to temper the formalities in recent years to ensure that whenever possible the court can give effect to the testator's intention. This Bill adopts that approach for Saskatchewan. And as we all, I'm sure, as elected members have heard and have experienced, and certainly as members of the legal profession have experienced, that this can at times become very, very difficult; can stretch what otherwise was a tremendous bond within families.

The law currently requires that a will be signed at the foot or at the end of the document. By removing this requirement, the court will be able to determine the validity of the will on the basis of whether the testator intended by his signature to give effect to the will.

Holograph alterations of former wills are confirmed as being valid. And what that means, Mr. Speaker, for those that don't understand that legal jargon, is that if you were to a lawyer and had a formal will prepared, and then the testator decides to make some alterations — and perhaps it's at a time when he's unable to make an appointment to go to a lawyer — he can change that will or make some alterations by writing on that will, and that becomes a holograph alteration to the formal will.

Substantial compliance test is added to the Act. If the court is satisfied that the document submitted was intended by the testator to be his will, the court may order that it is an effective will. This section has been in force in Manitoba for five years and has been used by the court there to overcome harmless errors which would have otherwise invalidated a will.

Currently, where a person in his will leaves land to a beneficiary and then enters into an agreement for sale of the land, sells the land, and takes a mortgage back or grants an option to purchase the land, the beneficiary receives nothing. The rule of law which causes that results in a reversal by this Bill, so that the person would receive the deceased's interest in that land.

A beneficiary who is also a witness to a will, or the spouse of a witness to a will is given an opportunity to prove to the court that the deceased intended them to receive the gift. If the witness or his spouse can prove to the court that they did not exercise any improper influence on the testator, the court can then declare the bequest to be valid.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that these amendments to The Wills Act certainly are designed for the situation where people can inadvertently do something with their will

causing a completely different interpretation than they intended, where the court is somehow bound by common law and by the law or the Act of the legislature to interpret in a way that the court would not see as the proper intent of the testator.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of an amendment to The Wills Act and would ask that all members read carefully this Act and support this Act. Thank you.

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I want just to make a few brief remarks in respect to the amendments to The Wills Act that are being proposed by the minister. And I think the intent is certainly evident that what he is doing is allowing a greater scope to the courts to give . . . to make a will valid if in fact it represents the intention of the testator.

I think that's a legitimate direction to go. I would want to know whether the minister, and he can do this in third reading, whether or not he got this recommendation from the Law Reform Commission, and also whether he has been in contact with the legislative committee of the Saskatchewan bar for their input into it.

I know what the intention here is, but I also caution to some extent that far more wills, by the leniency of validating them, could indeed end up with more court actions. The one provision, for instance, that you indicated, where the beneficiary as a witness to the will could not in fact receive under that will, if there were a witness to that will. Now of course the provision provides that a beneficiary can be a witness to the will, and in order to prove that there was no undue influence that has to go to the court.

Also in respect to any codicil, that has also been extended, allowing the testator to unilaterally change some of the content of it without his witness and two attesting witnesses. And all I'm saying to you here is that in helping to facilitate the validation of the will, before a validation of the will we have to be careful. And I think only time will tell, but it may lead to substantial more court interpretations.

I think overall we support this. I will ask the minister if he would just indicate whether it came from the Law Reform Commission and whether he had contacted the legislative committee of the bar, Saskatchewan bar. Otherwise we'll be supporting the amendments, Mr. Minister.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

The Assembly adjourned at 3:53 p.m.