

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

Prayers

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

#### PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING, SELECT AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

##### Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills

**The Acting Clerk:** — Mr. Petersen, chairman of the Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills, presents the fifth report of the said committee which is as follows:

The committee has duly examined the undermentioned petition for private Bills and finds that the provisions of rules 56, 57, and 60 have been fully complied with. The petition is for the Sisters of Charity (Grey Nuns) of Alberta, of the city of Edmonton, in the province of Alberta.

**Mr. Britton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the member from Prince Albert:

That the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Saxinger:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, a group of students from my home town, Cudworth. They are grade 8 students; there are 19 of them. They are accompanied by their teacher, Jim Bridgeman. I hope they will enjoy the question period. I will be meeting with them at 3 o'clock for pictures and refreshments. I ask the members of this Assembly to please help welcome the students.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the member from Humboldt, I'm very pleased to introduce to you 27 students who are here with their teacher, Curtis McCoshen, in your east gallery. They are grade 8 students from Bruno School in Bruno, Saskatchewan, and they will be meeting with Mr. Koskie, or Mr. Upshall, or one of us, at 3 p.m. for pictures. Welcome to the students from Bruno.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to introduce to you a group of people who are here today from the Pioneer Village here in Regina, in the Rosemont constituency. I want to introduce them on behalf of my colleague from Rosemont. And I know that all people will want to join with me in welcoming them here today, pioneers who helped build this province are here to watch question period. And we'll be meeting afterwards for refreshments and a discussion on the Assembly.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

#### Second Look at Environmental Studies on Rafferty Dam

**Mr. Romanow:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the Premier, and it has to do with recent news reports. The federal Minister of the Environment, Mr. Lucien Bouchard says, according to newspaper reports, that the federal government will: "... take a second look at environmental studies done in connection with Rafferty."

On April 11, just a few days ago, the Manitoba government wrote to Mr. Bouchard saying that Ottawa should adhere to the requirements of the recent judgement and that no licence be reissued until the full study is completed, (paraphrasing the words of the letter).

Mr. Premier, my question to you is this: is it the position of your government that you should follow the lead of Mr. Bouchard in Ottawa and the Manitoba government, and namely to fully comply with today's environmental laws, federally and provincially, as interpreted by the courts of the land; or is it your government's official policy that somehow Mr. Bouchard, federally, has so-called ministerial discretion to ignore the laws and the judgements of the courts of the land? Which is your position?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the question. I have answered that question several times to the media today, and I will say very quickly and very succinctly that we fully intend to live by the letter of the federal law as well as provincial law and international law. And we have to date been operating under federal licence, and if they decide that it is the appropriate thing to do to further study the water project or the power project, I'll say to the hon. member, we will comply with the law. I don't necessarily agree with the decision that was made with respect to this project, but I fully respect the federal jurisdiction.

I can finally say, Mr. Speaker, that we had concurrence by the federal government in Canada, the United States federal government, the Government of North Dakota, and the Government of Manitoba, as well as our own, plus our own environmental impact study under the watchful eye of the federal government, and have been operating under that agreement for the last few years, Mr. Speaker.

So we will respond and honour the law and certainly respect the environment, Mr. Speaker, and am quite confident that this is a very good project for the people of Saskatchewan and the people of the United States and the people of Manitoba.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. In light of his most recent answer to me, with respect to this first question, can we assume accordingly that your government has abandoned the notion of an appeal of the federal decision?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, we haven't abandoned any of the alternatives that would be before us.

As I said at the outset, I don't happen to agree with the decision that was made. I respect the fact that the decision was made, but I don't agree with it. And if there are alternatives that would include appeal or any other legal things, we're certainly going to review them because it's so important to the people of this province to have water and to manage water. So we're going to review all the possibilities, and if it includes appeal, certainly I wouldn't be afraid to appeal. We'll see what is necessary.

Put it this way — we would like to co-operate to the fullest extent so that we can manage this water and this project and have it financed in part by the United States so that we can all have water year round. And under the present conditions, Mr. Speaker, it's just impossible because, although we're entitled to 50 per cent of it by international law, 98 per cent of it leaves the province, and to date we haven't been able to keep it.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Premier on this subject matter, and perhaps the Premier could enlighten myself and the House when I give a very brief preamble to this question.

Mr. Premier, on or about October 30, 1986, in a memorandum from your own Department of Justice to one George Hood of the Souris Basin Development Authority, the memorandum, among other things describing the legal aspects, both federally and provincially on this matter, says among other things and in part the following:

... define federal projects as those initiated by federal departments and agencies, those for which federal funds are solicited, and those *involving federal property*.

Underline the word "involving federal property."

Now, Mr. Premier, obviously your government should have known and does know that about 4,100 acres of federal Crown land would have been affected by this project. Ottawa knows that, Manitoba knows that, everybody knows that. And the Justice department flagged that legal opinion to you and your officials, sir, two years ago, almost three years ago now. In the light of all those facts, how in the world is it that you explain the failure of the federal government to carry out, and the failure of your government apparently to recognize federal jurisdiction in this area, resulting in this unfortunate result today.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, perhaps one of the more helpful ways to respond to this is that one of the federal employees, Mr. Halliday, was interviewed today by Dennis Gruending and the CBC (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation), and Dennis said to him after Mr. Halliday went on and on — I can give you a copy of

the . . . what he said — and Mr. Halliday said:

Well, we will probably just review all the literature in Saskatchewan and in the United States studies which have been done, and then we may just decide — and it will be the minister's discretion — that it's fine.

And so Dennis Gruending came back and said:

Let me understand this then. You may decide after doing what is mainly a study of existing literature that there's going to be no significant effect, and you may recommend then to the minister that the project simply go ahead.

And Mr. Halliday said:

That could be the decision.

Now what it means, Mr. Speaker, is that the federal government looked at this and said: we don't have money in it. And the 4,000 acres in property, in terms of the magnitude of this is, as you know, in any common sense is almost incidental. And it's international, Mr. Speaker, and that's why we've joined with the United States and with the Army Corps of Engineers and two governors of the state of North Dakota — one Republican and one Democrat.

People on both sides have said this would be good for them and good for us. And if we have to turn the books, if you will, Mr. Speaker, upside down and examine them another way so that we can do it federally, so that it's examined, we're prepared to do that. But what the federal bureaucrat said is that we just may decide that the federal review of this has been done completely and the project can go ahead, and that would be a ministerial decision. It was a ministerial decision to give us the licence, Mr. Speaker, because under his judgement no more research needed to be done. And I agree with that today, and I agreed with that then, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Premier. The very same Robert Halliday that the Premier quotes, also the director of Environment Canada is quoted as saying that the wildlife federation was right to take the court action. And he also said that his department did not act in a manner which is consistent with the federal guide-lines. In fact, forget about Mr. Robert Halliday; Mr. Justice Bud Cullen of the Federal Court of Canada said that the federal government did not act in accordance with the guide-lines and the laws, notwithstanding the fact that there are 4,100 acres involved.

Now, Mr. Premier, my question to you is this. There seems to be rather an inexplicable omission, 4,100 federal acres of Crown land not being considered, an inexplicable omission, which the justice described as being negligent — a very harsh word indeed. My question to you, sir, is this: how is it you explain, or do you have an explanation, for Ottawa's acceptance of the issuance of a licence on a project of this cost and this magnitude, as

you've described it, sir, in the bare face of the facts that 4,100 acres of federal land was involved; what could be the possible explanation for this failure of the federal government to conduct what needs to be done, namely a full, complete environmental study?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what words the courts use, but I'll use the word that most people would like to think that decisions are made on matters like this, having to do with the environment and people and so forth, that they use common sense. If in fact there was a quarter section — let me finish, Mr. Speaker — if in fact there was a quarter section of land or a part of a piece of land or a road allowance that was under federal jurisdiction, would you expect a double study of the complete environment of an international waterway, Mr. Speaker? And I don't expect so. Now you know the magnitude of acres involved in this project and in that river, and if you're saying something like a section and a half or two sections of land would make that kind of difference, you know that's not very fair.

With respect to the wildlife federation, the wildlife has said over and over again that they're not against these projects. They wanted to test the process . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well that's exactly what they said. Mr. Speaker, I have — and I can't wave it around, so I won't — I have before me an ad by the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation on the Rafferty and Alameda dams, and they say at the bottom of it: we do not oppose the construction of the Rafferty-Alameda dams. Now if the wildlife people don't oppose them, Mr. Speaker, and they said they wanted to test the process in law, all we're saying is, that if the hon. member says "the process," well fair enough.

We are talking about thousands of people's lives, about Saskatchewan receiving federal money from all across Canada because of drought. We're concerned about rural population. And if they are testing the process because of a few acres of land in the grand scheme of international waterways, then common sense would say, common sense would say there's been enough study over the last 50 years to let Saskatchewan people manage their resources, Mr. Speaker. And I believe in the original decision, and I would encourage them to make that kind of decision again.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Premier. I agree that common sense says a lot, and it would be nice if he and his government followed common sense from time to time.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — I'm not talking some federal roadway; I'm talking about sufficient lands that your own officials and your own Department of Justice said posed a serious legal problem in this regard. You people were forewarned to that effect. You were forewarned and yet the federal government went ahead and issued the licence, notwithstanding the requirements and notwithstanding Mr. Justice Cullen's decision. That is the case.

You knew all about it. There's an expenditure that's out there. Who bears the responsibility for this fiasco and this mess? I say to you, Mr. Premier, that your government, fully aware of what the circumstances and the law and the requirements are, pushed this deal indecently in your own ridings. The responsibility falls on the shoulder of the Deputy Premier and George Hill, and they ought to resign for this fiasco.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion we are going to see these water projects in the future, Mr. Speaker. We are going to see them because common sense will prevail.

The hon. member knows that on 4,000 acres of land, the net cost to the federal government is zero because of mitigation. It doesn't cost . . . and those 4,000 acres mean nothing in terms of the international waterway, so he is as bad as anybody I've seen picking this thing apart to stop it.

Now look, we don't know . . . we know, Mr. Speaker, that we have been building a lot of projects. And, Mr. Speaker, I know that the opposition is against public participation, and they're against water projects and power projects and upgraders and paper mills and meat-packing and diversification and processing and manufacturing, a uranium — all the things, like they were against every one of them. Now I know they're in opposition and they have to be against things, Mr. Speaker, but when it comes to water for the people of Saskatchewan, if the Leader of the Opposition thinks he's on the side of right and common sense to deny my people or any people in the province of Saskatchewan water, he'll be sitting in an opposition till his hair's a lot greyer than it is today, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the Premier. I'm not against what the Premier says. What I am for is this government and every government following the laws of the land. That's what I'm for.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — And I want to say to you, Mr. Premier, that it was your government and your Deputy Premier who committed the money. It was your government and your Minister of Environment who pushed ahead the environmental impact study regardless of what the people of Saskatchewan thought it being insufficient.

It was your government that foisted it upon the federal government, as well as part of a deal for the Grasslands (National) Park, according to Miss Elizabeth May. It was not us who launched the lawsuit, it was the Canadian Wildlife Federation. And it wasn't us who stopped it, it was the judge of Canada who said that what you did was unlawful and illegal. The responsibility is yours. You owe that responsibility to all of those people in Estevan and throughout all of Saskatchewan, and why don't you admit you made a mistake.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm sure some day

we'll get the chance to test whether that statement was right or whether we're right, Mr. Speaker. And I'm fully confident most of the people in Saskatchewan know who had common sense in trying to manage water.

Let me just say to the hon. member, with respect to the law — two points, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the law. I believe when the hon. member was deputy premier and attorney general, he brought in the only retroactive expropriation law in the history of Canada because he had to have the Cornwall Centre, Mr. Speaker. The only one to bring retroactivity and broke his own law.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the PCBs. He can laugh about the law in PCBs, Mr. Speaker. It was that government that put 10 feet of cement over the PCB spills in the city of Regina, Mr. Speaker, and covered it up for two years. He better be laughing today, Mr. Speaker, because the people of Saskatchewan won't let him laugh when they get a chance to choose the next time.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### Share Offering for PCS

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Premier, and it deals with his recent trip to Asia where he went about asking the governments of those countries to, in fact, buy the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Upon returning to the province, he has since then been doing damage control and saying that he's going to keep the share offering in the province of Saskatchewan.

I wonder, in light of that fact, can you square that with a statement made in *The Wall Street Journal* by your previous cabinet minister, Paul Schoenhals, and I want to quote:

Paul Schoenhals, the potash company chairman, admits the government won't be able to sell 800 million to 400 million worth of shares anticipated in the initial offering in Saskatchewan alone. It's too big to do just locally.

I wonder in light of that, Mr. Premier, can you tell us what portion of the shares will be sold outside of Saskatchewan when the Bill is introduced?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the Bill will be tabled tomorrow; it will be introduced tomorrow — first reading — so you'll be able to see it in detail. What I'll say to the hon. member is that we plan to diversify this province and diversify the potash industry and the potash corporation to create jobs and to broaden our economy, Mr. Speaker. And yes, we will offer opportunities for people outside the province of Saskatchewan to invest and you're going to see a very tiny amount that any one individual or corporation can have, Mr. Speaker. And I'll add to the hon. member, if you talk about firms that are major consumers of ours, that are the potash buyers — and I'm sure when you were in opposition you must have met with them when they came into the province of Saskatchewan from Japan or from Korea or from India or from China, Mr. Speaker. These are private firms that buy

potash and distribute it to the farmers in those particular countries.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out to the hon. member, if our major customers can help diversify the Saskatchewan economy because they have a small investment here, it is similar to the fact that if you and your family were on holidays and you're going to come downtown at the end of a long day, Mr. Speaker, and you're going to fill up your tank with gas, Mr. Speaker, and you happen to have a co-op membership — just assume you had a co-op membership — guess where you're going to buy your gasoline, Mr. Speaker? You're going to stop at the local co-op and fill it up because you're going to look after yourself. The same thing applies to potash, Mr. Speaker. And they know it and the people of Saskatchewan know it. Diversification helps build Saskatchewan rural and urban.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, the students here probably thought they were going to miss story time this afternoon, but I can tell you that they're not going to miss it at all.

I want to say to you, Mr. Premier, that . . . I have a story here from *The Financial Post*, and I want to quote to you from that story. It says:

The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, the government, also have chosen the leading underwriters. Sources say the finalist to handle what will be a \$400 million-plus issue are Wood Gundy, Merrill Lynch and Credit Suisse. The inclusion of the Swiss firm indicates the government is prepared to have a wide international distribution.

Can you tell me how much of the share offering in fact will be outside of the province of Saskatchewan? Can you answer that question.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, the legislation will be introduced tomorrow and he'll be able to read it in detail. I will say, Mr. Speaker, that the lion's share of it will be in Saskatchewan, and Canadians indeed will be offered the opportunity, as will people world-wide, Mr. Speaker.

And you can find out how much for the people of Canada and the people of Saskatchewan, tomorrow. And you can debate it for as long as you like, Mr. Speaker. We will be diversifying the economy, and I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, as we said before the session opened, we'll hear howling and screaming against diversification, but we plan to diversify Saskatchewan and make it stronger, despite the fact that many people over there wouldn't like to see it happen.

**Mr. Mitchell:** — That same article in *The Financial Post*, Mr. Premier, says that the shares will be offered at a price designed to reward investors very quickly. And I think that you'd agree that the most common interpretation of that idea is that the shares would be undervalued so that the purchasers will be able to unload them fast for a quick profit, and that's right out of Oliver Letwin's manual on

how to sell off Crown assets.

My question, Mr. Premier, is: what kind of controls will you have in place to ensure that the small investor in Saskatchewan, if he or she is to sell those shares to get the quick profit, that those shares are made to Saskatchewan investors only and that control of the corporation will stay in Saskatchewan? Or will we have here another situation like Saskoil, where very quickly control of the company passes outside of the province of Saskatchewan altogether?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can answer it by referring to the NDP's document in their board of directors meeting in 1982 when they talked about their share offerings. And it says, Mr. Speaker, this . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well you were there, sir, and you passed it, and you acknowledged. And he said and he agreed that the shares would be listed on the Canadian stock exchanges to provide the required liquidity, Mr. Speaker.

And he goes back . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Of what?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Well, and he says what. Let me go back and go through it. It goes: potash, aspen, heavy oil, ammonia, iron ore reduction, uranium mines, and natural gas, Mr. Speaker. Come on.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Well let them look at their faces. I want the media and the children and the seniors to look at their faces. Mr. Speaker, I'll go back to it. They agreed it would be a good idea that the shares would be listed on Canadian stock exchanges — for what reason? To provide the required liquidity, Mr. Speaker. Now what does that mean? What does that mean? Mr. Speaker, that means that they had already decided to sell shares in potash and uranium. Imagine, from the minister from the great north-west. They were going to sell shares in uranium. I don't know if they told you or not, but they were . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — That's what that means, Mr. Speaker. Now they're going to close them up.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — I'd just like to remind the hon. member that I believe we're getting into debate, and I don't think it's in the best interests of the House that we do so.

**Mr. Mitchell:** — I take it from that outburst, Mr. Speaker, that there will be nothing at all in the legislation to ensure that subsequent purchasers are from Saskatchewan at all. I take it that question won't be addressed.

Let me come at the subject from a slightly different perspective, Mr. Premier. One easy way to accomplish the same thing is to undervalue the value of the corporation, something that has already been suggested

in the media and elsewhere. And this claim of undervaluation is being made by Dr. John Douglas of Alabama who is a man that your government has relied upon in the past, glowingly referred to . . . your . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order, order, order.

**Mr. Mitchell:** — Dr. John Douglas is your expert on potash, and he said this, as quoted in the *Leader-Post* for March 14, 1989:

Contacted at his consulting business in Florence, Ala., Douglas described the government's estimated value of PCS as "way undervalued."

"One billion is not half of its value, said Douglas." And then quoting further, "It's way to hell and gone too low."

Now, Mr. Premier, he says that you're undervaluing PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan) at least a billion dollars in order to make a quick sale. And I put it to you, Mr. Premier, that this is precisely the case. Isn't that where your privatization mania is taking this province?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, we could only hope, Mr. Speaker . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We can only hope, for the sake of the children in the audience and the children and the young people across the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, and the men and women in towns and villages, that indeed this corporation is that successful and worth that amount because the people of Saskatchewan, by the hundreds of thousands, will not only have a say, Mr. Speaker, they'll have the opportunity for a share in this company which will be a national and international company with its headquarters here, Mr. Speaker.

And if you're right and if the man that you mentioned is right, that this company will grow and expand, then every one of these young people will have an opportunity that they've never had before, Mr. Speaker, to take advantage of diversification and growth and building and processing and manufacturing that they've never had in the history of this province before.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

### Bill No. 19 — An Act respecting Victims of Crime

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill respecting Victims of Crime.

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

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### ADJOURNED DEBATES

#### SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Hon. Mr. Taylor that **Bill No. 1 — An Act to establish the Public Participation Program** be now read a second time.

**Ms. Smart:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, a number of my colleagues have spoken already on this Bill, and we are going to have many other points that we want to make, so I join this debate as one of the 26 speakers on this side of the House to speak regarding Bill 1, which is the Act to establish the Public Participation Program.

This program has been going on already for a year, Mr. Speaker, but we now have the opportunity to discuss it here in the House. And while we all represent, on this side of the House, our party positions and many points will be similar, we also have an opportunity when we speak like this in the House to speak a bit personally and speak in terms of who we represent in the legislature, our constituents, and also from our own personal experiences. And that's what I want to do in part when I speak on this Bill today.

Mr. Speaker, I've been listening to what's been said about public participation, or privatization as it's more rightly called, and some things that have been said lately, and I think we've had examples of it right here in question period today, have alarmed me, perhaps most deeply, and that is what I see as the sell-out of this government; the sell-out to out-of-province and out-of-country investors. That to me is a very serious and very destructive move on the part of the government.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Smart:** — And I know, Mr. Speaker, that it hurts very much the seniors in this province and, as the critic for seniors, I've made this point before and I will make it again, that they are watching what they have worked so hard and so long to build up in this province, being bulldozed to bits by the government opposite, Mr. Speaker; being jackhammered into oblivion because the government opposite has no respect for the history of this province, for the programs and the services that had been built up over the years. And because they have no respect for the history of this province, they are jackhammering into oblivion the future of this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Smart:** — And it hurts older people; it hurts people like myself who've been living and working in this province for some time to see that happen, because we were hoping to leave more to our children than what this government will leave us with.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I said that we speak personally, and I speak personally as someone who come to Saskatchewan in 1972 to join the public library in Saskatoon, and to

work as a public servant for many years in Saskatchewan before having the honour to be elected to represent that downtown area in the legislature.

My mother comes from a farming background in Manitoba and is very much a prairie woman. My father was American and came from North Carolina, and I've been brought up partly in the United States and partly in Canada. I have my sister living in Florida and I have connections, both relatives and friends, with the Americans.

I have no criticism at all of American people as such. They are just as fine and good as any working people in Canada or any other part of the world. But I have a real interest and knowledge about the way the Americans do business, the Yankee trader syndrome. The fact that they come from an economy that believes very much in this so-called free enterprise which turns out not to be free; it turns out to be a way of increasing wealth among a few people and making other people impoverished.

And so, Mr. Speaker, because I have that background and that understanding and that experience, I want to discuss in detail what the minister of privatization said when he was supporting this Bill in the House when he introduced it in second reading — some things that I found quite startling and quite unacceptable.

I said I came to Saskatchewan in 1972. I came here with the New Democratic government in power, and I really appreciated as a public servant in the public library, and as a single parent, mother, living on a fairly good income, considering other people's incomes, but still having to struggle to afford housing and food and clothing for myself and my daughter; I really appreciated what the New Democrat government had put in place in this province, valued it very much, and watched in the 1970s as the government developed the ownership of resources and services here in the province of Saskatchewan. And I was very supportive of those moves, Mr. Speaker. And because I know how much that means to myself and to the people of this province, I was really upset to hear the minister of privatization, the minister from Indian Head-Wolseley, talk about, first of all, the great expertise in this province, the fine Saskatchewan people that live and work here, the wonderful things that people have been able to do in this province, and how the privatization program that he was bringing in was going to be just another wonderful development along the way.

And what did he use as the very first example, Mr. Speaker, of the value of Saskatchewan expertise and ability to do things on their own? The very first thing that he used as an example, Mr. Speaker, was selling out the Prince Albert pulp mill to the Weyerhaeuser corporation of Tacoma, Washington. That was the first example he used. No faith in the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, to run that pulp mill and to survive through bad times and good times in the economy and to come out with a good investment for the people of Saskatchewan with a company that would work for the people of Saskatchewan. Oh no, his example of what was good for the people of Saskatchewan was to give that thing away — give that pulp mill away to Tacoma, Washington, to an American multinational.

Another example that he gave, Mr. Speaker, when he talked about contracting out under this privatization program, as an example of the benefits of privatization, would be that Saskatchewan people could get contracts in Saskatchewan to mow the ditches in the highways. And I heard him say that, Mr. Speaker, and I must admit that I was really quite shocked to hear that example of what could be for the people of Saskatchewan once this government had given away their pulp mill to an American multinational. They can be left digging the ditches of Saskatchewan.

The Premier has spoken at a PC gathering in Moose Jaw and told his followers there, the people that are willing to sell out this province, that what he wants for this province is cheap land and cheap labour, and that's what he's going to offer the investors, Mr. Speaker. And I find the reality of those statements absolutely horrifying, Mr. Speaker, for what the people in this province have built up over the years and what they're losing now.

And it struck me when I was questioning the minister of privatization in question period the other day about what was going to happen to Carling O'Keefe brewing industry in Saskatoon Centre. There's a large factory there, as you all know, and it's going out of business, it's going to fold, and Carling O'Keefe has merged with Molson's, now become Molson's Australian — another investment from out of the country — and that the brewery workers are being put out of work; they're losing their good paying jobs. They will no longer be able to afford the mortgages on their homes, and they won't get a good wage. They're looking at Mickey Mouse retraining programs that will put them into jobs at minimum wage, if there are any jobs at all, and there have been no job creation programs in this budget, Mr. Speaker.

But what the minister of privatization told me when I questioned him about those brewery workers and what the plans were in terms of ensuring them jobs when this brewery goes under, what he said to me was that they're looking at ways of turning, perhaps, Carling O'Keefe into a distribution centre for American beer, Mr. Speaker. That's what they have in mind for the brewery workers of Saskatchewan — to distribute American beer, and yes, he admitted that they would do that on lower salaries, which ties in with the cheap labour.

And, Mr. Speaker, it hit me the other day when I was thinking about what's going on in the province. It suddenly hit me with an understanding at the gut level, which sometimes happens to us, I think. We hear things intellectually and we learn them on one level, and all of a sudden something happens and it hits home with a big punch, right? Well, that's what's happened to me with this privatization issue, and it was all tied in of course with the debate on free trade, and I was very much opposed to free trade and worked hard in the federal election to defeat the minister in Clark's Crossing, the member for Clark's Crossing.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Smart:** — I must say I was so delighted, and so were so many of the older people in Saskatoon Centre

constituency who came out to vote in that election, because that was an election against free trade and, by gosh, we won big in Clark's Crossing, which is part of Saskatoon Centre.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Smart:** — Because the older people know what I'm talking about, Mr. Speaker. They have worked through the decades in this province. It's a province with a harsh climate and a harsh economy. We've had to work hard in this province and have done so, and the free trade deal was also part of the sell-out to the Americans and the give-away of our resources in Canada to the Americans. And I've quoted some other examples here that the minister of privatization, who's supporting this Bill, has brought forward in the House.

And, Mr. Speaker, when I say about the kind of gut level understanding that I've had just lately. I suddenly realized what people mean when they talk about the comprador class in society. Now that's a term that's foreign to us. It's a term that we're not used to using. It's a term that comes from Chinese history. It was originally a term used for Chinese agents who were paid by foreign investors to help control the Chinese employees in foreign firms, and also to help sell out Chinese resources to foreign investors in the centuries earlier, in the 19th century.

And, Mr. Speaker, that term applies to the government opposite. I suddenly realized, Mr. Speaker, when I heard the minister of privatization speaking about the fact that we had to sell our pulp mill to the Americans in order to run it properly, that we have to have our brewery workers distributing American beer, that we're all gung-ho on free trade, that we're gung-ho on selling our resources in the potash corporation to another country, to a foreign investor, the government opposite is saying all these things.

The government opposite has put an American in charge of the potash corporation for some time now to help us . . . to help them sell out the potash corporation. That is, Mr. Speaker, the comprador class in action. We are seeing it right here in front of our very eyes. The comprador class.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

(1445)

**Ms. Smart:** — I looked it up in the *Webster's Third International Dictionary* before I came in here to speak. Mr. Speaker, a comprador is one held to be an agent of foreign domination or exploitation, and I can't think of a better term for this government than to say they're compradors.

This is foreign domination and exploitation, from out of province and from out of country, coming into Saskatchewan, and we're going to be left as cheap labour mowing the ditches and distributing American beer. Nothing left, Mr. Speaker. Nothing left for the people of Saskatchewan from their long heritage and their long struggle.

And the government opposite should be deeply ashamed

of itself for doing this to the people of Saskatchewan. And the people of Saskatchewan should rise up. And I say to the people of Saskatchewan, particularly the seniors: get organized and fight back on this. Get organized and fight back.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Smart:** — You've done it before in Saskatchewan; you've lived through the Dirty Thirties. You know this is a burden that you have to pick up as you're older, to do it again.

But if the province needed the senior citizens any time in its history, it sure needs them now. If it needs the working people at any time in its history, it sure needs them now. It sure needs the younger people who are leaving this province in great droves now, Mr. Speaker. It needs them here right now to fight for what this province has been in the past and what it can be in the future, Mr. Speaker. It can be a whole lot better than what we've got now with this government, let me tell you, Mr. Speaker. I feel very strongly about this, Mr. Speaker.

When the potash corporation Bill comes through tomorrow, it's going to be absolutely devastating. That was a natural resource that belongs here in this province, belongs to the people. But the Government of Saskatchewan is badly confused in trying to sell off the potash corporation, and I want to make some points about this in particular.

The Premier first started offering to sell our potash resources to just about every country in the Far East, when he had that trip to the Far East, and every time he spoke during his trip his plans for the potash corporation changed. He started off by telling Saskatchewan people he would be willing to sell part, or all, of PCS to foreign countries in order to pay down the corporation's \$800 million debt.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the first problem is that the Premier of this province misrepresented the truth in terms of that debt of the potash corporation. It's just a bit over a hundred million, and the corporation is expected to make a profit of more than \$50 million for 1988, Mr. Speaker. And so it's a very good resource to stay here in the province and not to be sold off or given away to a foreign company.

And the Premier didn't explain how selling controlling interest in PCS to the Chinese or the Indian governments would mean public participation for Saskatchewan people. He's changed his story. He said he had no intention of selling off more than 15 per cent of the corporation to foreign nations, but shortly after that he offered 20 per cent of the corporation to the Indian government alone, and apparently offered to subsidize the sale with some sort of 10-year holiday on their investment. Now if that isn't comprador, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what is.

Upon his return to Saskatchewan, the Premier tells Saskatchewan people that there has been no decision on how much of PCS will be sold. Then he tells us that 20 to 25 per cent could be sold to foreign investors, 40 per cent

sold in Canadian share offerings, and 50 per cent retained by the Government of Saskatchewan. And those numbers have totalled 110 or 115 per cent, which only shows that the Premier isn't thinking any more clearly at home than he did while he was on his travels.

Mr. Speaker, I say that Saskatchewan people will not support the sale of their potash resources to foreign interests. And I have the feeling, as I've been talking to people around the province, that this move is becoming more and more unpopular as people see more and more clearly what the government is up to.

It's very much like the free trade deal, Mr. Speaker. It started out with a lot of hype about what it was going to do and how wonderful it was going to be, and as people looked underneath and began to realize what it really meant, the people in Saskatchewan fought back, and they fought back strongly. They fought back to the point where we had 10 MPs from this province go to Ottawa. They went to Ottawa on the vote against the free trade deal, one of the most important votes in the history of this country, and I'm very proud that the people of Saskatchewan voted against that deal.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Smart:** — The people of Saskatchewan have fought long and hard for control of our resources in this province. They don't want to give them up solely on the basis of this government's faulty economic theories. The people of Saskatchewan have a right to know the government's plan for PCS, or if in fact there is a plan. And now is the time for straight answers. Now is the time. Now is the time to peel away the smoke and mirrors and get down to the business of what the government really intends.

And I know that it's been discussed already in question period, that what the government intends is this kind of share offering that's offered at a low price to a great many people in Saskatchewan to buy them up, if they can, and then sell them off at a profit. And like the Saskoil shares, we will see the control of that resource go out of province in no time at all. Saskoil is now owned 75 per cent outside of this province.

And I think my colleague, the member for Nutana, made a good point when she was the critic for privatization, when she said that the PC share sales don't make economic sense. She said, plans by the PC government to have major share offerings in four Crown corporations in 1989 make no economic sense, as there is not enough investors in the province to make it work.

The plan calls for the sale this year of 15 per cent of the province's equity in the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation, worth \$47 million; 60 per cent of the equity in the general insurance side of Saskatchewan Government Insurance, worth about another 21 million; 100 per cent of the equity in SaskEnergy, worth 310 million; and 100 per cent of the equity in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, worth 1.147 billion. And that adds up to new share issues totalling \$1.525 billion this year alone. And, Mr. Speaker, in all of Canada in 1988, the total value of all new share



issues was just 2.5 billion. The Government of Saskatchewan is proposing to put up for sale, share offerings totalling some 60 per cent of all the share offerings in the entire country last year.

In 1986 shareholders in Saskatchewan and Manitoba combined totalled 6 per cent of all shareholders in Canada. In those two provinces, 14 per cent of adults owned one or more shares in a company. Yet these are the people that the PC government want you to believe will purchase shares amounting to 60 per cent of what was sold in all of Canada in 1988.

What this means is that Saskatchewan people are not going to buy up the shares in privatized Saskatchewan Crown corporations. What we are going to see is a large portion of ownership going to people in other Canadian provinces or, more likely, in other countries. And this is what the PC government terms as public participation by the people of Saskatchewan.

And, Mr. Speaker, obviously one of the points to be made very clearly is that the brewery workers who've just been put out of work, the workers from SED Systems, the 400 highway workers who were laid off when the highway equipment went down to the United States and to other parts of the country . . . I went to that auction sale, by the way, Mr. Speaker, when the highway equipment was sold off, and I saw the licence plates of the cars coming up from the States — North Dakota, Montana, and many other states — as well as from Alberta and Manitoba, to haul our highway equipment away from this province and put 400 people out of work here. And the people from the Saskoil, 25 per cent of those employees were laid off; employees of the potash corporation have already been laid off.

How do those people afford shares in the province, Mr. Speaker? They don't. They've paid for those resources already and they own them, as all of us do. Everyone has an ownership in the potash corporation in Saskatchewan right now, everyone who's a resident here. That's real public participation, Mr. Speaker. What the government is doing is privatization and privatization of our resources. What the government is doing, Mr. Speaker, is functioning as compradors, as I've said. They are giving away so many of the resources, so much of the heritage, and so much of the future of this province.

Privatization is now in trouble in Great Britain. Services are falling apart; services are more expensive than they used to be.

The privatization issue is one that's going to be debated around the world. The government is tying in with an ideology that's old and tired, and an ideology that the people here resisted and rose above a long time ago. Privatization, the PC vision, is not the future, Mr. Speaker, it's a vision from the past. It's something from a long time ago that has been proven not to work, not to give people the control in their resources that they should have and deserve.

Mr. Speaker, the minister for privatization has failed the test in the objectives that he laid out a year ago. And I know my colleagues have made this point, but I want to

make it as well because it involves some of the very basic issues that people in this province are concerned about. In March of 1986, when the PC privatization minister, Graham Taylor, published what he called the objectives and guide-lines of the PC privatization strategy, he stated that the privatization policy had the objective of ensuring that the people of Saskatchewan receive full benefit from the use of public assets to increase employment and create economic and investment opportunities.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I've already mentioned that the privatization of the highway maintenance work meant the loss of 400 jobs in this province; that within six months of the privatization of Saskoil, 25 per cent of its work force were laid off. Within a year of the privatization of SED Systems, the new owner, Fleet Aerospace of Ontario, had laid off 70 SED workers in Saskatoon. The privatization of the children's dental plan meant that more than 400 dental workers were fired.

Mr. Speaker, privatization isn't working in terms of increased employment. It is not working at all. It hasn't worked in any other country in terms of increased employment unless, of course, the people of that country are prepared to grovel on their knees and to work for absolutely the lowest possible wage that the company can squeeze out of them.

And when I hear the Premier of this province boast about being able to provide cheap land and cheap labour, I fear for the working people of this province, and I fear for the farmers of this province. Both those groups of people are in great jeopardy with this privatization scheme and with the policies of this government.

The minister of privatization said that his policies would increase opportunities for personal and employee ownership. The opportunities for individual ownership are demonstrated by the privatization of Sask Minerals which now is owned by two non-Saskatchewan companies, one from Ontario and one from Quebec.

I mentioned already the privatization of PAPCO (Prince Albert Pulp Company), meaning that all of its assets were sold to Weyerhaeuser, and not one share of the Weyerhaeuser Canada is owned in Saskatchewan. The PC government privatized the assets of SaskPower, selling a drag-line and a coal-mine to Manalta Coal of Alberta.

I've already mentioned, as well, that Saskoil shares are now owned privately outside of Saskatchewan. And now they're bringing in the Bill to sell off the potash corporation. PC privatization is not creating opportunities for individual ownership, it's selling out Saskatchewan.

And I want to also take this opportunity to reflect how shocked I was one night when I was speaking and I heard one of the members opposite shout out that people could afford these share offerings even if they were on minimum wage because they could have that taken off their wage package.

And that is just as appalling to me as saying that the brewery workers can get a lower paid job distributing

American beer; to say that the farmers can get work mowing the ditches of Saskatchewan; to say that the example of our expertise in Saskatchewan is to sell off our pulp mill to American investors. It's shocking to see those kinds of examples, because obviously the member opposite had no understanding — and I think it was the member for Regina Wascana that said that — no understanding of what it's like to live on minimum wage, no understanding of how much money you actually have to buy the essentials that you need in this province, let alone get shares and participate in investing. That is not a possibility for the majority of people in Saskatchewan. They are being left out of this ridiculous sell-out and give-away of the resources of Saskatchewan by the group, Mr. Speaker, that I call the comprador class in Saskatchewan.

That term, as I've said, means something to me now. I've seen it demonstrated. I've seen it made real. I've heard it from the minister of privatization as he spoke to this Bill. I understand what it means to see your own fellow Canadians, your own people, people in their own province, devastating their province, selling out to foreign domination and exploitation.

Someone must be lining their pockets. Someone must be making it nice for a few people to do this. Someone must be getting paid quite a bit to go along with this, because it is a complete devastation of this community and this province. And they say they're doing it because the forces of the world market are so strong no one can control them. Perhaps the payments are so high that they're being controlled completely.

(1500)

Privatization is the wrong way to go, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is the wrong thing to do. The programs that have been in place for the last year are absolutely unacceptable to the people of Saskatchewan. I know this, as I've said, that older people are upset by it. I'm upset by it.

I came to this province in 1972 to put years of work, along with all my colleagues and my friends, into the development of this province through some very good years when we had the resources to get access to things like our potash, to control our potash and our other resources, come from a history of ownership of utilities here in the province.

When I came from Ontario, Bell Canada controlled the utilities there and the telephones, and the cost was a lot more expensive than what we had here with SaskTel. And I came very quickly, after moving to this province, to have a deep respect for the people who put this system in place, a deep respect. I wasn't born here. I was brought up by a prairie woman, but I was not born in this province. Some of the members opposite were born here. Some of the members opposite have lived here all their lives and they don't value what they've got. They're prepared to sell it away. They're prepared to let it be exploited and to let it go, prepared to be dominated by forces outside of this province instead of standing up to them and taking some control over their own lives.

Shame on those cowards opposite. Shame on those

people opposite to do that. Shame on them for developing what really is a comprador class in Saskatchewan, and a class of people that have to be fought against by every resource that we can muster.

And so I ask the people who are listening today, and I ask my colleagues — I know they will — that we join hands and we fight this issue all the way, so that we can restore Saskatchewan to the glory that it was.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I take part today in Bill No. 1, the public participation program Bill.

I want to discuss with the Assembly today just what public participation means to Saskatchewan and in Saskatchewan. Really it's just another word for privatization. We take a look at this government bringing in a Bill now on public participation. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I tell you that public participation in Saskatchewan started as soon as a Conservative government got elected in 1982.

They started off, and now they're just continuing that rampage of our province, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It started off . . . One of the first items up for participation or privatization, of course, was the coal mines in Saskatchewan. It started off by selling off the drag-line for 30-some-million dollars to Manalta Coal up in Calgary. Then they followed that by selling off the coal mine.

And we just have to take a look at what that really meant to Saskatchewan and what it meant to Manalta Coal up in Calgary. It was an asset that was owned by the citizens of Saskatchewan, the drag-line and the deposit of the coal. And not only did the Conservative government come in and sell that drag-line and then sell the coal mine, they provided the money for that group to buy it. They signed the promissory notes for Manalta Coal. Then they turned around and leased back the drag-line and the coal for another 30 years.

I say to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I could have purchased the drag-line and I could have purchased the coal mine with those terms. The government puts up the money, gives you a 30-year guarantee that they're going to use your drag-line to produce Saskatchewan's coal to produce energy for the province. That's how public participation started in this province under the Conservative government.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thompson:** — And I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that that was a bad deal. And then they just followed suit. Next to come was the Highways department. And all of a sudden then you could see what was taking place. It was a government that were imposing their ideologies on the citizens of Saskatchewan and on the backs of the citizens of Saskatchewan. It didn't matter what they did; it didn't matter how many families or how many individuals they destroyed, as long as they could carry out the ideologies

that they believed in.

Their ideologies, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was that they wanted to tear down everything that the socialist governments of the NDP and CCF had built up in this province. They wanted to tear down the security that we had, and they wanted to tear down the 4 per cent unemployment that we had in this province and that we enjoyed. They wanted to tear down the balanced budgets that we'd always seen in this province, in a province that was run properly and a province that gave security to its employees.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thompson:** — What kind of security, Mr. Deputy Speaker, do you suppose were given to the Department of Highways workers, over 400 Department of Highways workers who lost their jobs? What do you think it did to those families and those individuals? No warning. And they started off with a bang.

The former minister of Highways stood up in the House, without any notice, and announced that 225 Highways workers would be laid off — no forewarning at all. This is what they did to those individuals. And there was individuals who had 15, 20, 25 years seniority, who had worked, had bought homes, had raised families, were in the process of raising families. And here they thought that they were secure; they thought that their children were secure. They thought that they would be able to provide the proper education for those children. And what happened? Their dreams were shattered with one stroke of the pen. That was 225 in one shot. And then that continued.

And you take a look at what it has done to the Department of Highways. And sure the ideology of the Conservative government was that well, Department of Highways shouldn't be in the road construction business anyway. That was for the private sector. But I want to point out to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Department of Highways constructed only 10 per cent or less of the highways in this province. The other 90 per cent, or above, was constructed by the private dirt movers such as South Construction, and Evans Construction, and crews like this.

And I tell you, since this Conservative government has got in and they've destroyed the Highway department, and you can see what's happened to our highways — they're deteriorating.

You can drive out to Ipsco where Kramer Tractor sells Caterpillar tractors, and when the NDP was in government, that yard at this time of the year would be full of new equipment, all destined to go out to projects all over this province. That's not happening now. That's not happening. Even the Highways equipment that was sold, that's not even in the province. It's not here. It went to south of the border and to other parts of Canada.

That department, as I indicated, only built about 10 per cent of our highways, but they carried out an important function. They looked after the maintenance of our highways. They had a bridge crew, they had a

construction crew, they had a maintenance crew, they had an engineering crew. And that was an important department. And that's why you see today when they got rid of the engineers. And where did all those engineers go?

Well they're gone. They lost their jobs, so who's doing the engineering of our highways in Saskatchewan? Who's out there putting the stakes up that tells the construction crews and the operators how much dirt to cut and how much to fill? They're not Saskatchewan engineers. You'll take a look and you'll see that they're consultants from Alberta, and they're even driving trucks with Alberta licence plates on. That's who's doing the work.

You have taken the jobs away from the individuals who had worked all their lives to contribute to an important department in our province, the Department of Highways, and what do we have? We just literally destroyed those families. And they said, well, you can become a part of public participation. We're going to give you an opportunity to leave these positions and go out into the private sector and take part and be a major contributor to public participation.

We know that that's not happening now, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We just have to take a look at what's happening to the highways in this province and the road system. It's deteriorating and will continue to deteriorate under this policy.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we have to take a serious look at what has happened to the Department of Highways and such assets that we have now lost, and we're never going to get those back. We've sold them for less than \$6 million — \$40 million worth of equipment. Now if we have to replace that, it's going to cost the treasury a lot of money.

And it continued. This was just a start: Manalta Coal, then they moved to Highways, so it just continued.

Then they decided they were going to privatize the public campsites — campsites that I say to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and your family and your friends and relations and your constituents have used on many occasions, and they were always there. They were always well maintained by crews that were working for Parks, Recreation and Culture. They've prided themselves in keeping those campsites clean, well stocked with wood, water, and you could come in there any time of the day or night and it was always there. And now what did they do? They decided, well we'll privatize those. They didn't sell them; they gave them away.

I can think in my constituency where many of those were turned over to Conservative hacks, if you want to call them. One individual, the president of the Conservative Party in my constituency; another beautiful campsite, and a large one, Besnard Lake, to Red's Camps. And I believe his wife at that time was the president of the Conservative Party in Cumberland, or the vice-president, but most certainly an important part of that Conservative executive up there.

They were leasing out the public campsites to their

friends in so-called private sector or public participation.

And many of those individuals who used those campsites over and over, year after year, all of a sudden came there at 11 o'clock at night, as they'd been doing it for 20 years, and they thought that they had a place to stay, and the campsite was there and the wood was there and everything was there and no charge. They pull in and what do they find? They find a gate. They find an individual there who wants to collect from them.

These were public campsites and they're gone. You're taking them out to the private sector. And let me tell you, the citizens of Saskatchewan, the senior citizens, the boy scouts and the girl guides who used those campsites, they know what's taking place and they're concerned about it, and well they should be.

I want to now turn to another amalgamation and . . . which is part of public participation and will end up in privatization, and that is the Crown corporation, Eldorado Nuclear (Ltd.), and the federal Crown and the provincial Crown corporation, SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation). That amalgamation, which was done to create the largest uranium company in the world and was to secure jobs and finances for this province, well I say — and I said at the time, Mr. Deputy Speaker — that this amalgamation was a dangerous precedent that was being set.

At no time should the uranium industry or nuclear energy of any sort ever be in the hands of the private sector. Never, ever should we allow a resource such as uranium to get into the hands of the private sector. Because first and foremost, we have to look at environmental safety, and health and safety to our workers. And I say, I say to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that once the amalgamation took over between Eldorado and SMDC and now it's going to be privatized, then it gets out into the private sector, and first and foremost is going to be profit. And you just watch.

(1515)

And it's already starting to take shape, already been announcements that there's been major lay-offs in that industry. There's going to be another major lay-off up on Rabbit Lake for six months this summer.

But I think what the people of Saskatoon have to really be cautious of, of this amalgamation, is the amalgamation of all SMDC assets and Eldorado Nuclear's assets and creating one head office in Saskatoon. Because we know that Eldorado Nuclear has a head office, Rabbit Lake has a head office, Key Lake has a head office, Cigar Lake has a head office, Amok Cluff Mining has a head office.

But all of a sudden we're going to see an amalgamation and a privatization and profit-orientated company coming in and saying: well, we'll shut down these offices because SMDC own 50 per cent of Cigar Lake and they own 50 per cent of Key Lake, they own 20 per cent of Amok, and here you're going to have lay-offs in the head offices in Saskatoon. And instead of having all these head offices, you're going to have one major head office. And I say to the citizens of Saskatoon that they're going to have

to watch this very closely because you're going to see, I predict, more lay-offs as they amalgamate, create one company, which they've already done, called Cameco (Canadian Mining Energy Corporation), and then privatize.

And I sincerely hope that some of the members on the other side will take an approach and stop the privatization of this company because privatization of the uranium industry is something that should never, ever take place. And I most certainly am opposed to it. I can't speak for my colleagues, but I'm sure that they would be opposed to any, any such deal to privatize that industry.

And I say to some of the members over there to stand up and to fight against this privatization. This is what's taking place; this is public participation, Conservative style. And public participation, Conservative style, means lost revenues, it means lost jobs, it means lost protection for our workers, it means lost protection for the environment and things that we feel are very important. But a Conservative government who is going to privatize really are not concerned about that.

I want to now turn to another major privatization that has taken place in the province in public participation, and that is Weyerhaeuser. What really took place there again, Mr. Speaker, is that a large pulp company from the United States, from Seattle, Washington, comes in and get a hold of the assets of the Prince Albert Pulp Company and the Big River saw mill and the chemical plant at Saskatoon, assets I would think in excess of a billion dollars. And then not only that, they give them 8 million acres of our prime forest land. They have access to 8 million acres of Saskatchewan's prime forest land. And they have access to it.

And here's what's really happening. They came in with no money down. The provincial government guarantees the money, give them 30 years to pay it back at eight and a half per cent. And I know that you and I, Mr. Speaker, most certainly can't go out and borrow any amount of money and be guaranteed eight and a half per cent interest on that loan. But it was available there, guaranteed by the taxpayers of this province for Weyerhaeuser.

They also received an inventory, a large inventory. And not only that, they knew full well what was taking place, and the government opposite knew full well what was taking place in the wood industry.

All the predictions have come out and indicated that the forest industry is going to be a bright spot in our economy in Saskatchewan and in the rest of the world. The wood industry has 25 years of good years ahead of it. They knew what they were getting into. They knew that they had a golden egg when they came in here. And let me tell you, they took advantage of it.

So they came in, and what are they doing? Well the first thing that is done, they get their roads built for them, automatically. That was just automatic that the government would build the roads. And then they impose some of their own values on the workers in this province. For instance, if you want to go and work at Weyerhaeuser

and you fill out your application, and they have a question that asks if you have a grade 12 education, and if you haven't got a grade 12 education, Mr. Speaker, then you are not eligible to work at Weyerhaeuser. And I say, Mr. Speaker, they are imposing their values on the citizens of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thompson:** — I have a very large number of my constituents, Mr. Speaker, that don't have a grade 12 education. But a lot of them that don't have a grade 12 education have a trade — they're electricians, they're plumbers, they're carpenters — but that doesn't apply when you apply for a job at Weyerhaeuser. You have to use the rules that they use in the States, and that is that you have a grade 12 education or your application is turned down.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, they're now starting to administer Saskatchewan's Forest Act; they're starting to administer Saskatchewan's Forest Act. If I wanted to go out and cut firewood in their forest management lease, then I have to get a licence and pay a royalty to Weyerhaeuser.

They talk about reforestation. They're talking about planting three million trees this year. Well I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that when the NDP was in we were putting new trees in the bush to the tune of eight million trees a year, not three million, and we administered that. And we raised those trees in our nurseries and what has this government done? They've come in and they've already shut down two satellite nurseries in this province, and those individuals who worked on those satellite nurseries have been laid off and they have lost their jobs.

Can you imagine a foreign corporation coming in here, Mr. Speaker, and administering our Forest Act? Well, let me give you an example of how it operates. You have a post cutting operation up in Pinehouse, and they want to cut posts and sell them; they haul them down to Prince Albert to the post dealers and the treatment plants. So in order to cut those posts, they have to apply to Weyerhaeuser in order to get a lease to cut those posts because they live within the forest management lease agreement of Weyerhaeuser's. So . . . and they will give them 40,000 posts, and that's all. Each licence allows them to cut 40,000, and then they have to pay a royalty up front to Weyerhaeuser for reforestation. They have to pay up front before they're allowed to go into the bush and cut a post down, a royalty to Weyerhaeuser.

Not only that, not only that, Mr. Speaker, I want to give you another example of just how they're administering our Forest Act and how they've come in and taken over. Narcees Marasty who is an 82-year-old gentleman who lives in Sled Lake, Saskatchewan, not far from Dore Lake and not far north-west of Big River, lived there all his life, and has always used wood out of the bush for his fires to do his cooking and heat his home. Always done that; went out in the bush, cleaned out the forest, and always done a good job.

He went in last year, was told that before he started to cut his firewood, you better come in because you got to get a

permit. So he went into Dore Lake to the conservation officer's headquarters, thinking that he would get a permit to cut firewood. And this is what he got: okay, he can go out and cut his firewood, but he had to pay a permit fee of \$1; he had to pay a total to the provincial government of \$5 to cut his firewood.

But then underneath, there's another thing here, Weyerhaeuser reforestation dues, 10 cords of firewood, \$1.20 a cord, another \$12 to be paid directly to Weyerhaeuser. And what is it paid for? Reforestation.

We're paying, our senior citizens and everybody else in this province are paying, for the reforestation of our forests that they are taking out and making profits on. They don't even have to do the reforestation. It's . . . really it's unbelievable that they can get away with these things.

Another thing is the highways bans. They are allowed, Weyerhaeuser, to take their trucks that haul pulp and sawdust or shavings, or anything that they want, on a year-round basis on our highways — on a year-round basis. They don't even have to get an overload permit in the spring when bans are put on all the rest of the highways. Bans are put on the highways that they use by other individual truckers, but Weyerhaeuser is exempt. They can use those highways, and they can smash them up all they want when the frost comes out, and they don't even have to get an overload permit; they are exempt from that. And I think that this is not fair.

And this is going to come back, this is going to come back to haunt this government across here. All these things are building up, and the individuals out in Saskatchewan are talking and they believe that this government's life is short. And I believe that myself.

Then we have the Premier. He goes to Ottawa and he gets into the first ministers' meetings and he talks about regionalism and how tough things are in regions of the country, and that we have to go in and we have to try and solve the problems in the regions of our province.

I want to give you an example of regionalism, Conservative style, and I want to take you up into my constituency and my neighbouring constituency of Meadow Lake. Last summer the Conservative government, the Premier and the ministers, were all up in Meadow Lake in July, I believe, June or July, and they had a massive picnic, a massive barbecue. I even had individuals who are working up in the North were told that they should come down to that barbecue, and they were on payroll, and that has taken place.

And what did they announce in this big barbecue? Well they announced about a hundred million dollars worth of capital projects to be built in the Meadow Lake area. All the raw material was coming out of Athabasca constituency, but all the capital projects were coming into Meadow Lake. So everybody in Meadow Lake was waiting for this big capital project and who was going to build it. But it was going to be built by a firm in Alberta . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes, the member says it still is. Well the folks up in Meadow Lake are still waiting too for that \$80 million mill.

So what do they do? They go all summer, they go all winter, and there's nothing done. Now all of a sudden they hold another meeting, and they take a bunch more individuals and they go on another trip to Alberta. And then they come back and they make another announcement. They say that the \$80 million mill that they were going to put in Meadow Lake, well, we've decided that it would fit in better over in Hudson Bay, so it's going to go to Hudson Bay, and we're going to build another one in Meadow Lake and this is going to be public participation at its greatest. The money's going to come from the provincial government. And who is going to build it? Well, not Nortek Energy, no, but it's going to be another outfit from Alberta, and I believe it's called the Millar company.

So we're getting . . . we're into the third year of the term of the Conservative government, so they think, well, that \$80 million pulp mill, that's not going to get the member from Meadow Lake re-elected. So they decide, we'll move that over to Hudson Bay where the member from Hudson Bay is probably not going to run again — and I suggest the member from Meadow Lake probably won't run either — but we'll build a \$250 million pulp mill in Meadow Lake.

So here we have, within a span of about eight months, two announcements, two pulp mills, one for 80 million, now another one for 250 million — all Alberta firms.

**An Hon. Member:** — And you're against them both.

**Mr. Thompson:** — No, I'm not opposed to it. But I think that the individuals in Saskatchewan could also build these here pulp mills that you're talking about.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

(1530)

**Mr. Thompson:** — We don't have to go out to Whitecourt, Alberta and get Millar Western. We don't have to provide the money for Millar Western out in Alberta to come in and build a pulp mill. We've got timber; we've got human resources. We have the capabilities in this province like we have demonstrated when we were in government. We could build saw mills and we could build pulp mills. We could harvest our forest and we could turn those profits into security for the rest of the province.

But there's no security in this. Millar Western, they were asked a question: what are you going to do with your effluent? And the company said, well we don't really know how to handle it, but if we can't do it right, then we won't be doing it. So I don't know about this \$250 million pulp mill; it may not come in.

Then they sort of suggest that, well I think the \$11 million chopstick mill is still on stream. But they're not sure of that, not sure.

But that's not what they said when they were holding that massive barbecue in Meadow Lake last summer. They had everybody there. The whole cabinet was there, and they had steaks and hamburgers and they had a real party.

And there was no problem; it was coming in. But that, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that just may not happen — and all government guarantees, all government guarantees.

That is public participation; that is Tory style. That is Tory promises. And so far we've seen quite a shift in that promise; we've seen quite a shift, Mr. Speaker. That \$80 million mill has been switched over; I don't know why, but it's gone to Hudson Bay. And I suspect Hudson Bay hasn't seen anything yet that . . . any construction on that.

And what does all this privatization and public participation mean to the province?

**An Hon. Member:** — Lost jobs.

**Mr. Thompson:** — That's right — lost jobs; you better believe it. And I mentioned some of them, and I will get into more of them as I go on.

But before they sold off Manalta Coal and the coal-mine, which was their first privatization venture, we had an unemployment rate in this province of 4 per cent. We had a budget that had \$139 million to the good. Now we see what privatization and public participation has done. Now we have a total debt in this province of approximately \$4 billion — \$4 billion on our operating debts in accumulated debt since 1982, since privatization started.

We have a total debt in the province — and this is long-term debt — of \$13 billion. That's what we get from privatization and public participation.

We're now paying a million dollars a day or more on the debt that has been accumulated since privatization and the Conservative government took over this province. We are paying a million dollars a day on interest charges alone. And just think what we could do with that money. Just think what a couple of days of that would do to one of our communities in northern Saskatchewan. Well, it would build saw mills, it could build hospitals, it could build highways, it could build roads. There's so many things that could be done with that money, that interest that we're paying to the big money-lenders of the world. And we keep going down and down and down. Unemployment is running rampant.

We had another big celebration in this province two years ago. We had a celebration to celebrate the millionth person in this province, when we had a million population. I tell you that we don't have a million people now. We don't have a million people in this province now. It is under a million and we are losing — in February alone, 7,000 people had to leave this province to look for work.

And who is being hurt by this privatization and public participation? I tell you, it's the citizens of Saskatchewan and especially our young people, Mr. Speaker, young people with no futures in this province. Young people are telling me, I've just got to go to British Columbia, or, I've got to go to Alberta. And a big majority of them are going to B.C., and there's good reason because the folks in B.C. are pretty happy right now because they see on the horizon that they are going to have a New Democratic

government back in B.C. And you just mark my word, in the next year or so there will be a New Democratic government and things are already starting to get ahead in B.C.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thompson:** — Because when business see that there is a light at the end of the tunnel, they will start moving; they'll move towards that light. And I say, in B.C. it's going to happen, and I say that the light at the end of the tunnel is getting brighter and brighter in Saskatchewan also. That is what's going to happen in the province of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thompson:** — Population. Just imagine, they have a party because we reached the millionth person. Well I'll tell you there was no fanfare when the millionth person left this province to go and look for work. And it's going down and down and will continue to go down as this province has a Conservative government with a philosophy and an ideology to destroy everything that was built up, and to privatize, and public participation. It is going to go the other direction.

As I indicated, privatization — the highway department, high unemployment — a policy that pits the rich against the poor. As the Tory hand-outs continue, Mr. Speaker, they continue to the Weyerhaeusers and the Pocklingtons and the Manalta Coals, and the list goes on.

We see what they done to the 400 dental nurses, Mr. Speaker. Four hundred young women who had dedicated their lives and had trained for years to provide a service to the children of this province, and these were dedicated young women. And what happened? You just cut the rug right from under their feet. You literally destroyed those young women. You fired 400 — over 400 — dental nurses in this province and took away a service that was needed, and now it's coming back to haunt you as individuals tell you that.

Northern development — privatization. I'll tell you, my constituents are not involved in public participation. The type of public participation that we see in northern Saskatchewan is government buildings and government agencies moving from northern Saskatchewan down to Meadow Lake.

And I want to give you a good example of a department that has been moved, a department that should be in there to create activities, economic activities in the North, an economic development branch. And we had one. They had an economic development branch in Buffalo Narrows. And where is it now? It's in Meadow Lake. They take the economic development branch office and they move it from northern Saskatchewan to Meadow Lake.

So my constituents come and say: where is that economic development branch office? I said, "Well, I don't know. It's in Meadow Lake; it must be in the government building." So then I go and I try to find out what government building is the economic development branch office in — this is the northern development . . .

economic development branch. So I go and check in the government buildings; it's not there. So then I make a phone call and I say: well where is your office? Well, they said, it's in the plumbing shop; it's in the plumbing shop in Meadow Lake. In the plumbing shop, I said, what are you talking about? He said, well they've moved our office down to Meadow Lake and we're situated in Ron's Plumbing and Heating building where he runs his plumbing shop out of.

And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to the members over there, that there has to be a stop to this. You have a minister and a member from Meadow Lake who's out to destroy everything that was put in there by DNS (department of northern Saskatchewan). He was always opposed to DNS. He always referred to it as the buckskin curtain, and he wanted to tear that down, and not only has he torn it down, but he's destroying northern citizens while he's doing it.

And here we see they get so bold. First they move the fisheries, they move the fisheries branch from Buffalo Narrows down to Meadow Lake. You just tell me, Mr. Speaker, where there's any commercial fishing taking place in Meadow Lake. Not a bit, but they moved the head office down there.

We had the supervisor of resources in Buffalo Narrows. Where did he move? Moved him down to Meadow Lake. And now they take the last thing that we had that could keep northern Saskatchewan going, the economic development branch office, they move it down to Meadow Lake and they put it in one of his . . . Ron's Plumbing and Heating shop. And I believe that they are both members of your party, sir, or the member from Meadow Lake, and I think that maybe one of them is on his executive.

And I say that that's not fair. When the Premier talks about regionalism and we have to solve those regional problems, and here what you do, you have a minister who is creating regional problems by doing this. And it has to come to a stop.

I think, Mr. Speaker, these policies are just driving the citizens out of this province. They're driving our young men and women out to other provinces, and they are an important part of our society. And if we don't have those young men and women from this province in here, taking over the jobs, training, and keeping our society going, well we're going to be in real trouble. We're going to be down to 900,000 people. And that won't be long if this out-migration continues.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, and I say to the members opposite, that you don't have a mandate to carry out this type of privatization and destruction that we see taking place in this province — you don't have that mandate. There's absolutely no way that this should continue. You have never went around the province in 1986 saying you were going to do this.

You were going to eliminate, you were going to eliminate the sales tax. You eliminated the gas tax and then you put another one on. You've increased the sales tax. And this, I say, Mr. Speaker, is not the way that a government should

operate.

I say that what should take place in this province is a provincial election. I say that this government, the Conservative government, are afraid of an election. Because in the last year there were 17 electoral tests in this province, Mr. Speaker, 17 electoral tests, and out of those 17 electoral tests the New Democratic Party won 12 and the Conservatives won five. We won 10 federal seats and we won two by-elections. The Conservative government won four federal seats, and one by-election they squeaked in on.

So I say that they don't have the mandate, and the citizens of Saskatchewan spoke loud and clear on privatization and public participation in the last federal election and in the last three by-elections we had in this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thompson:** — And I think it's time for the back-benchers or the private members on that side to stand up, to stand up and tell the 21 to 23 members that are never going to seek re-election in this province again — there's at least 21 there that will never seek re-election in this province again, and yet they are controlling the government. They are the ones who are making the decisions. They are the ones who are destroying this province, and they are going to destroy the political lives of individuals who just got in for their first term on that side. And I think it's time for them to stand up.

And I say in my closing remarks, Mr. Speaker, and I ask those members to stand up, and I say, don't allow, don't allow the senior members, don't allow the senior members to destroy yourselves and your careers and to destroy the province of Saskatchewan while they're doing it. I say, stand up and fight back.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

(1545)

**Mr. Pringle:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in this debate today, I do so knowing full well that this will be one of the most crucial debates in the current session of the legislature, and perhaps in the life of the legislative history, Mr. Speaker. And I note that no government members are speaking in this debate, and I'm not at all surprised, because the Bill doesn't make any sense.

The policy course being proposed, Mr. Speaker, by this government is one that is designed, as has been pointed out by my colleagues, to make fundamental changes to the economic and social life in the province of Saskatchewan. In saying this, I am not stating anything that the members opposite would disagree with. They know that this is the precise course they are following, and they know that it is the direction that goes, as my colleague said just a few moments ago, goes beyond the mandate that this government currently enjoys from the people of Saskatchewan.

Over the past seven years, Mr. Speaker, our citizens have witnessed a government embarking upon a policy of privatization, irregardless of whether or not it makes any economic sense or social sense. It's a blind, ideological, blinker approach that this government's been using. Initially, as again has been pointed out by my colleagues, this policy was to fire — indiscriminately to fire, I might add — public employees, only surpassed, Mr. Speaker, by the Lyon PC government in Manitoba in the 1970s. No other government that I know of has been so cruel and harsh in the way it's treated public employees.

Then we witnessed the fire sale auction of highway equipment. First they removed the gas tax, then they fired the highway workers, then they sold the equipment. Now there is no money, there's no employees, and no equipment to fix the roads. Now that's foresight, Mr. Speaker. That's Tory planning, that's Tory management. And of course everybody knows in the province of Saskatchewan the state of our highway system.

Then we had the sweetheart deal with Manalta Coal. Another give-away. In mid-1986 this government proceeded to give away the Prince Albert pulp mill to Weyerhaeuser of Washington, a foreign interest, another foreign interest, just like the plan is with the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. And of course there were a lot of other rumours, rumours we now know to be true, Mr. Speaker. All the rumours to sell SGI, SaskPower . . . well they try and deceive us by changing the name, but to the people of Saskatchewan it's still SaskPower. The rumours to sell SaskTel. You name the corporation, the Crown corporation, Mr. Speaker, it's on the list. Promises made by this government. Promises made by the Deputy Premier, when he split SaskPower, that it wouldn't be sold off. Promises are made by this government to be broken.

**An Hon. Member:** — No, I didn't say that.

**Mr. Pringle:** — Yes you did say that, sir. A promise made by this government, Mr. Speaker, is a promise that's broken and nowhere is this more exemplified by the Premier of the province who should know better and who we should expect to have more integrity.

Mr. Speaker, as a private citizen in this province during the 1982 to 1986 period, these developments, as they were unfolding, disturbed me a great deal. They disturbed my family. They disturbed my neighbours. They disturbed my community, as was certainly reflected in the Eastview by-election, Mr. Speaker. The actions . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Your family all voted for me.

**Mr. Pringle:** — Well listen, I could tell the Deputy Premier that my family didn't all vote for him. Some of them did, but they certainly all didn't, and they won't again.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Pringle:** — Things have changed down in Carnduff. You haven't been there for a while.

Mr. Speaker, the actions of this government didn't make



any sense. They don't make any sense now. During those years, though, when I was a private citizen, what I saw was there was no game plan, there was no sense of an integrated approach or an integrated strategy to public policy development. There was no clear policy direction. What we saw is exactly what the people of Saskatchewan got, Mr. Speaker — haphazard, ill-conceived policy actions in a policy vacuum.

Today, however, this is only partially true. The policy of the PC government is more clear, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately for the people of Saskatchewan. However this policy is dangerous, it's ill-conceived, and it's at least 70 to 100 years out of date.

I don't know what history book the government members have been reading, Mr. Speaker, but I can tell you this — it is not the history of Saskatchewan and Saskatchewan people. Neither, Mr. Speaker, is it a book that deals with the reality and the interdependence of people, the creation of wealth, or the redistribution of wealth within our province.

It is, however, a book that deals with how to redistribute wealth into the hands of the multinationals through the oil tax holiday, the 2 per cent tax break that the big corporation just got while the rest of us got more tax increases. But it's a book that looks at how foreign governments can own increasing amounts of our assets. And they're reading a book that tells them how to remove economic power from ordinary Saskatchewan people. That's exactly what we're concerned about, the loss of economic control of our destiny, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that it is clear to you, as it is to every other member in this House and indeed to all residents of the province of Saskatchewan, that just because a government establishes a policy doesn't mean that that's a good policy. It doesn't make that an appropriate policy necessarily; it doesn't make that a fair policy; it doesn't make a good policy for this province. It doesn't necessarily make it a good policy for the province.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the situation we're dealing with today, a policy that is fundamentally wrong for people; a policy that is fundamentally wrong for our provincial economy; a policy that is fundamentally wrong for Saskatchewan, and it isn't working, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the policy of this government, the actions of this PC government over the past seven years provide ample evidence of the direction that they have adopted. Clearly that direction is one of privatization, as some members have referred to, at the expense of the well-being of Saskatchewan citizens and Saskatchewan families that this government likes to talk to so much about as to how they're supporting. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the Tory direction is one of a blind, naïve, right-wing ideology that has about as much credibility as the tooth fairy.

Mr. Speaker, what does the PC privatization policy mean for Saskatchewan? Well what does . . . what the privatization policy does not mean is a stronger provincial economy. What it does mean in this case is less and less control by the people of the province over their

economic and social well-being, as many of my colleagues have so ably pointed out.

One thing that this privatization policy does not mean is the creation of wealth in our province. What it does mean is the redirection of wealth outside of Saskatchewan.

One thing that privatization does not mean in Saskatchewan is control over Saskatchewan resources by Saskatchewan people. What it does mean is a growing corporate concentration of economic and social decision making outside of Saskatchewan.

One thing that privatization does not mean is job creation. Saskatchewan experience with the PCs is ample evidence of this. But what privatization does mean, Mr. Speaker, is a reduction of jobs and a transfer of future opportunities to places outside of our province.

Mr. Speaker, this PC Government has become so tied to an off-the-wall, right-wing ideological view that it has become blind to the realities of Saskatchewan, the needs of Saskatchewan people, and the principles of economic and social health and wealth, so that it fails to see the future that the province can enjoy in the Canadian and the world economy.

This government has become so tied to a right-wing agenda, imported from the United States and Britain, that it fails to understand that creation of wealth and the distribution of wealth in our society does not happen when the primary concern of government is to meet the needs of the Weyerhaeusers, of Manalta Coal, of Pocklington, of George Hill and Paul Schoenhals and Remai and other corporate buddies of this government.

Where, Mr. Speaker, has the blindness of this PC government and their privatization philosophy and actions taken Saskatchewan?

**An Hon. Member:** — Down the drain.

**Mr. Pringle:** — That's right, down the drain, as my colleague from Saskatoon Centre says. Well it's taken us another way, it's taken us backwards, backwards into the 19th century.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to believe that a major role of government is to allow and to facilitate leadership of its citizens and to provide leadership to the people of the province — leadership into the future, not regressive leadership into some mythical past.

Mr. Speaker, as I see it, there are two aspects, there are two parts to privatization, as I see it and as we see it on this side of the House. The first part, as has been pointed out by my colleagues today, deals with the sale of assets owned by the people of Saskatchewan. These assets vary from the equipment of the Department of Highways to our natural resources and to the intellectual property of Crown corporations such as SaskTel.

The policy of the government to indiscriminately sell these assets is not only wrong and shortsighted, it lacks endorsement of the people of this province. Mr. Speaker, when the federal government embarked on the free trade

negotiations with the United States, the Prime Minister said, and I think quite rightly, that the people of Canada would have the opportunity of expressing their opinion before the agreement took effect. And I give him credit for saying that and for doing that. The Prime Minister did this because he, like the people of Canada, understood that the proposed agreement represented a major and a fundamental change in the role of government, in the role of the economy of the country, and in the nature of the Canadian society.

Surely the same principle applies here. Frankly, the policy being proposed by this government is a radical shift for the province and is well beyond the mandate of this government.

Mr. Speaker, the privatization program of this government necessitates an election to let the people of Saskatchewan decide which kind of future they want. Let the people decide if they want a foreign country to own our natural resources, to own our birthright, to take away our ability to direct our economic future, to take away our ability to create new wealth and redistribute wealth and services to the people of the province.

Mr. Speaker, to sell and to give away the people's ownership in potash, in forestry, in land, in oil, and in sodium sulphate, or any other of our resources to a consumer of the product, to a multinational corporation, or to a foreign power without the say of the owners of that resource, is a travesty of democratic rights and freedoms of the people of Saskatchewan.

The government manages these resources in trust, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest to you that that trust is being broken when, through the actions of this PC government, the people of Saskatchewan no longer have effective influence and control over their economy. We have before us, Mr. Speaker, a policy to be enshrined in legislation that says, in effect, that the well-being of the people of Saskatchewan is best determined by those who don't live here. And this doesn't make any sense to those of us on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, or to the people of the province.

This province was built on the belief that people do and should control, as much as possible, their own economic destiny. Surely, Mr. Speaker, a policy that sets out to destroy what the people of this province have fought for and stood for and created, demands the approval of the people of Saskatchewan.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the people of this province deserve the right to have a government willing to accept the responsibilities of power, to act in the interests of the province, and in the interest of this province alone, in the Canadian context. Clearly this Bill and this policy direction is an abrogation of this government's responsibilities.

(1600)

This policy direction that the Tories are going in is a transfer of power and democratic rights of the people to the boardrooms of Calgary and Toronto, New York and Chicago. This policy direction represents a transfer of

power and democratic rights of the people of Saskatchewan to the governments of China, India, Brazil, or whoever else the Premier decides to offer bargain basement deals for our natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, none of the actions of this government has to do with the well-being of the people of Saskatchewan. The actions of this government has nothing to do with liberalized free trade, world trade. The actions of this government has nothing to do with enhancing the export position of Saskatchewan firms. The actions of this government has nothing to do with creating new jobs. They're losing new jobs faster than the people of Saskatchewan could ever have imagined.

The actions of this government, Mr. Speaker, has nothing to do with creating wealth in Saskatchewan. My goodness, in seven short years we've become over \$12 billion in debt, thanks to Tory policies.

The actions of this government has nothing to do with the enhancement of family life in Saskatchewan. The actions of this government — yes, destroyed family life for many people in Saskatchewan. Many others are getting out before that happens, to opportunities elsewhere.

But the actions of this government, this PC government, through the leadership of this Premier, has everything to do with the concentration of corporate wealth at the expense of the well-being of the people of the province and our citizens. By the way, many of them are giving up hope in the PC government and are leaving. As has been pointed out by my colleague earlier, 6,260 people left this province, an out-migration of this province, in February alone. Now we're expecting the statistics to come out, possibly tomorrow, on March, and there's no reason to believe that the statistics are going to be any different.

Mr. Speaker, it is not so long ago that the farmers of Saskatchewan marched to Ottawa to force the federal government to exercise its power and responsibilities to protect and encourage the prairie agricultural economy. The march was premised on the belief that governments should act in the best interests of people. That fundamental belief held by the people of this province has not changed and is evident today in the growing opposition to the direction this government is proposing to follow.

In a recent small-business survey that I did in Saskatoon Eastview, 85 per cent of the respondents — these are small-business people — 85 per cent of the respondents, Mr. Speaker, do clearly not want to privatize the utility Crown corporations. Over half the people in this survey, over half the small-business people, do not want to privatize other corporations like the potash corporation.

These are small-business people that this government says are friends of theirs. Well I can tell you something, Mr. Speaker, small-business people are not supporting this government any more, not in Saskatoon Eastview, because they feel let down and they feel betrayed by this government, and so they should.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons cited by this government for the sale of the commonly owned assets of the people

of Saskatchewan is to draw down the provincial debt — a debt created by this government, a debt created by fiscal irresponsibilities of members opposite, a debt load which is reason alone to vote this government out of office.

But, Mr. Speaker, there's a principle at stake here, and that principle is consultation with, and approval of, the shareholders of the assets held in trust by this government, before this policy is implemented any further. Those shareholders, Mr. Speaker, are clearly the voters of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, did this government seek approval for its deal with Manalta Coal? No, they didn't.

Did this government seek approval for the sale of Sask Minerals? No, they didn't. Not only that, they wouldn't even provide the details on the terms of the sale. So they make these deals without the approval of the people of Saskatchewan and then they won't . . . in secret, and then they won't even share the information.

How about Saskoil. Did they seek approval for the sale of Saskoil, Mr. Speaker? The answer is no.

Did the government seek approval for the sale of SaskCOMP? Again, the answer is no.

Is the government prepared to seek approval for the sale of SaskPower?

**An Hon. Member:** — We'll see.

**Mr. Pringle:** — My colleague says, we'll see, but not if they follow their usual pattern, they won't. And I can tell the Premier very clearly, if he proceeds with his sale of Saskoil, just that one Crown corporation, he is long gone.

Is this government prepared to seek approval for the sale of Saskatchewan potash? It doesn't appear so, Mr. Speaker.

Is the government prepared to seek approval for the sale of SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance)? It doesn't appear so.

And as they proceed to sell the assets, Mr. Speaker, what do the people get? Well let's take a look at what the people of Saskatchewan get as this government continues into its mandate.

They certainly get higher taxes. This government has been very imaginative there. I don't think there is any possible thing that cannot be taxed. I think they've been very creative and very innovative, and there's simply no new ways left to tax the people of Saskatchewan.

What else have the people of Saskatchewan got? Well, they've got a higher provincial debt. We saw yesterday, and of course in the budget . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — You can thank Devine for that.

**Mr. Pringle:** — And yes, we can thank the Premier for this, but the third highest expenditure in the budget is servicing the provincial debt. Their federal friends in

Ottawa who operate the same way, that's the highest cost, the highest budget item in the federal debt. They've got this government beat. In four years they've doubled the national debt. These are the managers. So much for Tory management.

Well what else have the people of Saskatchewan got as we proceeded to privatize? Well they've got fewer services for people, incredible cuts and slashes by this government. Again, cuts that would never have been imaginable, never would have been imagined four and five years ago.

You also got fewer jobs. I find it interesting that the Premier and the Deputy Premier are so concerned about the 40 jobs in Estevan, as we are, but they certainly have no concern for the 400 highway workers, the 140 Kelsey instructors, the 400 dental technicians. And then if they were so concerned about the construction workers in Estevan, why didn't they commit yesterday that they would provide them with compensation? Again, there's rhetoric on the one hand and there's action on the other, Mr. Speaker.

But what else have the people of Saskatchewan got from the Tory style privatization? Well as I said, fewer jobs — 1,000 fewer jobs just in the budget of a couple of weeks ago, which to young people . . . which was the third year in a row that we've cut jobs to young people going to post-secondary education. No wonder young people are forced to leave the province.

Well we've also, with privatization, got fewer business opportunities. Another legacy of this government is another record of last year, which topped the record of the year before, in terms of small-business bankruptcies. I wouldn't be surprised if the record is topped again this year because small-business people aren't getting support from this government. Small-business people in Saskatoon Eastview, which is a very large riding, do not feel supported by this government, and they certainly do not support this government.

Well, the people of Saskatchewan, what else did they get? Well, they got very few opportunities, but they do have the satisfaction of knowing, I suppose, that they got taken to the cleaners by this government, and that's some consolation. Little wonder that the people of the province are upset.

This Bill does nothing, Mr. Speaker, to create jobs. The throne speech and the budget speech did nothing to create jobs, but this privatization direction does nothing to increase wages to a level that people can live on; it does nothing to provide better working conditions for people; it does nothing to stabilize and diversify and expand the provincial economy.

These are hollow buzz-words that the Premier continues to use, and he used them again today, hollow buzz-words by a desperate Premier who's on his way out, Mr. Speaker. In fact, the Tory privatization ideology and action, in fact, restricts the economy; it restricts the economy to just a few participants, to a few winners and many, many losers, because this is the legacy of Tory governments world-wide, Mr. Speaker.

Well-to-do people line their pockets; corporations line their pockets; corporate wealth is concentrated and the masses live in poverty. This is the situation in Britain today; Britain has got more poor people than it has ever had. It's the situation in the United States — 40 million Americans have no health coverage because they can't afford the insurance. The United States has more poor people today than they have ever had. Now we want to follow . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — They have a democratic government.

**Mr. Pringle:** — Well, they have a democratic government. They have a democratic government which allows more poor people than they've ever had. I mean that's some sense of democracy; that's some real sense of democracy!

**An Hon. Member:** — The member from Morse is quite brilliant. He'll want to enter into the debate here . . .

**Mr. Pringle:** — Well, I hope the member of Morse enters the debate. He's got a lot to say from his seat, so I'm sure he'll want to speak and impart that wisdom to the rest of the people who are watching throughout the province.

But with all these poor people in Britain and the United States — and this is public information; this is not NDP information — why would we want to follow that kind of trend with failed economic policies? Privatization hasn't worked there. It has never worked. It's not working world-wide, and it won't work here. It isn't working here, Mr. Speaker.

This approach restricts the economy to a dependence on outside economic forces in a manner that this province has not accepted in over 40 years, Mr. Speaker. This policy of privatization is like the free trade agreement, supported so strongly by members opposite. It's designed to do one thing, to create an exploitive, unfair, and harmful economic system, just like in the United States and Britain.

The members opposite, Mr. Speaker, like to talk about freedom, getting governments off the backs of individuals. What freedom, Mr. Speaker, is there for individuals in this province if the control and the power over their lives is taken away from them? Well that's some freedom.

Psychologists know, Mr. Speaker, that the greatest stress in people is a loss of control over their own lives. It's been well established. What freedom is there when people no longer have a voice in the important decisions over their economic future? What freedom is there for people when through the government they elect they no longer have the power to make decisions in the interests of this province?

Mr. Speaker, selling off the assets of the province is only one side of the privatization policies of this government. The other side of it, of course, is the elimination of services, again which this government has done in a way that could not be imagined by Saskatchewan people. And

nowhere is the cold, callous, and unfeeling aspects of privatization more evident than in the services lost to the people of Saskatchewan.

(1615)

In this instance, the approach of the Government of Saskatchewan, of this PC government, has been twofold. First, is to turn services over to the private sector, such as was done in the case of the school dental program. This resulted in no savings to the province. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it resulted in an increased cost to the taxpayers, and it provided a much lower level of service to families. The Minister of Health is sitting there; he knows that. The dental program utilization rate was over 90 per cent, and now we're down to about 60 per cent, with some parts of the province having no access to no dental services at all. Why on earth would a government make this kind of a decision to cut needed services and supports to . . . and preventive services to children and families.

The second aspect to this is what I call forced privatization. Since down-sizing of the government is a primary principle of the policy of privatization, the services eliminated or the needs of people that are unfilled are now transferred to the community at large. This transfer does not involve any exchange of money. It does not reduce the size of government and it does not lower taxes. In fact, this transfer to the community, Mr. Speaker, simply places the needs into the hands of whichever charity is able or willing to lend a hand.

Unfortunately, however, these organizations lack the resources to do the job adequately. And now when they try to develop the minimum financial resources necessary to try and provide a minimum level of service, the government penalizes them through a new tax. The only profit from this scheme, Mr. Speaker, accrues to this government as it imposed the tax, supposedly to pay for services it refuses to provide, on those individual community organizations who are attempting to fill the void left by this government's failure in social policies.

What crazy logic, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the effects of the privatization of services to Saskatchewan families has been felt by all. No family has been left untouched.

The long-term effects will be particularly hard indeed. The effects are economic, and we have already seen many of them, as members today have referred to and as I've referred to some of them. Higher taxes. We're the highest-taxed province in the country of Canada, Mr. Speaker. Higher unemployment. For the first time since stats were recorded, a couple of months ago our unemployment level is higher than the national average.

Now that's not performance. It would only . . . it would be worse except record numbers of people are leaving the province and aren't being counted. In addition to that, it would be worse, but many people who are unemployed are not captured in the statistics.

Well what are some of the other economic effects by this privatization approach? Fewer jobs, reduced power for our government in the economy. Well, the effects of privatization are not only economic, Mr. Speaker, they're

also social. Disruption and hardship for our families because jobs are scarce has reflected in this province in greater stress in urban Saskatchewan and on the family farm and in the North. It is reflected in increased physical and sexual abuse, in increased alcohol and drug abuse and, I might say, very sadly, Mr. Speaker, in the level of suicide in the province. These are all desperation moves by people trying to survive under this government's regime.

There are some additional social effects, Mr. Speaker. What we've seen in the province, not only in dental care and to the prescription drug program, but through home care and in our hospitals and nursing homes — decreased health services. And my colleague from Saskatoon Centre talked about seniors being absolutely angry and sick because of the many years that it took them to build up the economic and social structures in this province, and they see this government wiping them out in a matter of two or three years.

And many, many seniors live in Saskatoon Eastview, and they're calling me all the time about speaking on their behalf, holding this government to account for the destruction of the health care system in this province, a system that many of those people increasingly either have to rely on or may have to rely on. And they resent the fact that the Premier of this province has inferred that they're drug abusers, Mr. Speaker.

Well what else, of course, are some of the impacts we've seen? Less money for education. You know this government likes to talk about the value of education and preparing our young people to take on the world, but what have they done? Well they decreased the number of summer jobs for students; they've underfunded universities so badly that computer equipment is antiquated and libraries can't keep up; and they've shifted the burden of education to the student, Mr. Speaker, and in fact so students can't afford the tuition fees; they can't get a summer job; they've placed restrictions on bursary programs and student loan programs, and they simply can't access post-secondary education.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it's a question of credibility with this government. They talk about education and the value of education and the value of preparing our young people for the future, then don't provide them with the supports to allow them to be prepared.

Well other disruptions for families and social impacts — we see privatized adoption services, the province abrogating its responsibility in the adoptions area. We see this government, this Minister of Social Services, supported by this Premier, introducing a Bill that looks at profit-oriented child care. Mr. Speaker, as I look at this list, I can't help but be struck by the fact that these policy initiatives do not represent a positive policy thrust for Saskatchewan people. No sane person could conclude otherwise.

What the list does represent is a list of problems that this government has created for the people and the families as they attempt to create some mythical past. This Premier, this devoted spokesman for families and for youth, could

not have placed, he simply could not have placed more stress and more hardship on families, on Saskatchewan families, if he had consciously attempted to do so.

Well what are some alternatives, Mr. Speaker? Obviously we've got to go in a new direction. The people of Saskatchewan are an optimistic people, they're hopeful people, and there must always be hope, Mr. Speaker, for a better day.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, that the policy of privatization is not a good policy for the people of Saskatchewan, and I have outlined some of my reasons for saying this. A significant part of my argument rests on the belief that the creation of wealth and the distribution of wealth and the fulfilment of the needs of individuals and families in our society rests with the ability of government, acting with and in the interests of a provincial community of people, to ensure that economic opportunities do exist and that the principles of justice and compassion and fairness and equality are abided by.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, this cannot happen where the policy of government is to solely satisfy only one sector of our economy and of our society. The people of Saskatchewan represent many varied interests, Mr. Speaker. They represent different needs and dreams.

For our province to work effectively and to ensure that these interests, needs, and dreams are satisfied as much as possible, government policy must take these things into account and balance them equitably. The people of Saskatchewan expect and they deserve just such a policy in both economic activities in health care, in education, and in social programs.

Such a policy cannot be followed if government is not willing to intervene in the economy or to ensure that people have the ability and the opportunity to participate in the economy and in the society as full, truly full and equal partners.

Mr. Speaker, as I look at the situation faced by this province today, it is clear that the primary goal of any government must be the creation of health and wealth, not the policy of wealth transfer followed by the members opposite. And clearly the lessons to be learned by the actions of this government, and the efforts of governments before it, is that the creation of wealth and opportunities and the assurance of high quality adequate services to people rests with the encouragement of the three sectors in our provincial economy.

What are these sectors, Mr. Speaker? Well there's the co-operative sector that served this province well. Over 25 per cent of the business volume in this province today is done by co-ops, Mr. Speaker. So you've got to promote and encourage the co-operative sector. Well this government phased out the department of co-ops, so that's their commitment to the co-operative sector.

The private sector, the second sector of our provincial economy that's historically played an important role, Mr. Speaker. But not the Pocklingtons and the Weyerhaeusers and the megaprojects; it's the small-business people, the small private entrepreneurs who are the family businesses

who are the backbone of the private sector economy in Saskatchewan.

And the third sector, the third engine of this economic growth, Mr. Speaker — it's been proven in this province over 40 years — has been the public sector; and some balancing of these three sectors.

If the Premier is serious about diversification . . . This isn't a new concept. We were well on the way to diversifying well before 1982. And in fact what's happened in northern Saskatchewan — I lived there for two years, 1975 and '76 and part of '77 — is that the economic infrastructure in northern Saskatchewan in terms of small business was there under DNS. In terms of the economic development branch, and economic development branches in communities throughout the North working with local people, local governments to put in place the infrastructure for northern economic development, and that of course has been pulled out by this government. So they've totally forgotten, they've totally forgotten the small-business sector. They put all their eggs in the one basket: big privatization, corporate wealth, megaprojects, public sector is the enemy — the small-business sector may not be the enemy, but they're certainly not feeling supported, but they're certainly forgotten by this government — and of course co-ops who feel let down by this government.

**An Hon. Member:** — Deserted.

**Mr. Pringle:** — And deserted of course too.

So each of these sectors, Mr. Speaker, has a long and proven record and history in this province. This is why senior citizens are so upset. It took many years to build up these family businesses, small family businesses and co-operatives and the wheat pool and the co-op stores and the other co-operative sectors in this province. It took many years to build those up. And they see, at best, benign neglect in that sector by this government. But each of these three sectors has made significant contributions to the economic and social life in Saskatchewan. To deny the role of any one of these sectors in the future is to deny a future to our families, to our children, and to our children's future.

(1630)

Mr. Speaker, the world, as we know, is full of economic theories, and I suppose the Premier's economic theory of "never say whoa in a mud hole" has some limited applications somewhere, certainly not in Saskatchewan, but I suppose it has application somewhere. No economic theories work properly in isolation from each other. They can work if they are applied in the context of the values, the needs and the objectives of the society at large. That is the common sense approach.

We heard the Premier talking today in question period about the common sense approach. The people in Saskatoon Eastview see him as having no common sense, and so the common sense approach, it certainly has not been demonstrated by the way this government has operated, as we see down in Estevan, as we saw in the dental program. Well you have an idea, you ram it

through and worry about the process later, and then you blame somebody else. That's not a common sense approach; it's not even an approach with integrity.

In Saskatchewan, the common sense approach — there is just no doubt about this; there is no other way, Mr. Speaker — means a mixed economy. It means a recognition of its reality, a recognition of its value, and a recognition of its potential. None of these things are possible, however, if government denies its basic role to provide for the needs and the wishes of all members — of all members of our society, not just to corporate friends.

And this is precisely what the privatization policies of this government do. The policies of this government, they deny the basic role of government to provide for the needs and aspirations of all members in the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, it is the wrong policy for Saskatchewan.

Privatization is the wrong policy for the economy of Saskatchewan; privatization is the wrong policy for the people of Saskatchewan. It is a policy that attempts to recreate a past that was rejected by the people in this province many years ago and will be rejected again.

Privatization is a policy that this government, simply put, has no mandate to implement. It is a policy that will defeat this government. The sooner the better, Mr. Speaker, say the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would just like to say that the people of Saskatchewan . . . Well the members are happy that I'm closing; I hope that they have some intelligent comments to make. The Saskatchewan people do not accept the PC vision of privatization, Mr. Speaker, for all the reasons that I outlined in my comments.

Once again the Premier of this province who doesn't stand up for Saskatchewan on the national scene, but once again our Premier is on the wrong side of the issue, and he will pay the electoral price for this.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot and I do not accept this Bill and we will fight it to the end, Mr. Speaker; be sure about that. The people of Saskatchewan can be sure about that. We make that commitment today.

Thank you very much.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Prebble:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I haven't seen a member of the government side of the House wanting to raise and speak in this debate. Mr. Speaker, I find that interesting that we've debated all afternoon and there hasn't been a Progressive Conservative member of the legislature who wants to speak to this.

And no wonder, Mr. Speaker; no wonder members opposite don't want to rise and defend this Bill, Mr. Speaker, because this little Bill which is only six pages is the Bill, Mr. Speaker, that authorizes the selling out of this province, the selling off of this province, the selling off of the heritage that the pioneers of Saskatchewan worked for

decades to build and that this bunch of members opposite, the government, Mr. Speaker, want to destroy that heritage in a matter of a decade.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Prebble:** — They want to take what people in Saskatchewan have spent 80 years building, and they want to destroy it in eight years, Mr. Speaker. And I say that all members of this legislature will look back after the next election, and members on that side of the House will regret their decision, Mr. Speaker, because the people of Saskatchewan are going to defeat this government over Bill 1, Mr. Speaker.

I believe that when people understand the real agenda of this Bill, which is an agenda of privatization and ensuring that the benefits from that privatization go to the friends of the PC Party, they will defeat the PC Party in the next election, Mr. Speaker. I have no doubt about that.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Prebble:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, this privatization process, this blanket privatization process that Bill 1 authorizes has in effect been under way now for some time in this province. Bill 1 will accelerate that process, Mr. Speaker, and it will allow the government of the day not to have to come back to the legislature with the frequency it's had to in the past to receive approval for its privatization process.

But, Mr. Speaker, the process has been under way for some time, and the fact that it has, Mr. Speaker, allows the people of Saskatchewan to judge what the benefits of this process have been to date, because in the last few years we've seen this government make a decision to sell off Sask Minerals; to sell off Saskoil; to sell off SaskCOMP, our computer company; to sell off their shares in SED Systems, our high-tech company in Saskatoon; to sell off the Prince Albert Pulp Company; and to sell off part of our resources to Manalta Coal, Mr. Speaker.

We've seen a number of those kind of sell-offs, and what the people of Saskatchewan have been asking themselves, I believe, Mr. Speaker, in the last little while is, what have they gotten from all these sales that the government has made? Because clearly, Mr. Speaker, the government has sold hundreds of millions of dollars of assets — assets that the people of Saskatchewan had fully paid for. And one would think, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan would have seen some benefits from those sales, and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to consider, what have the Saskatchewan people gotten from this sale of hundreds of millions of dollars of assets?

Has the Premier managed, in the course of selling off these hundreds of millions of dollars of assets, to reduce the debt of the province of Saskatchewan? No, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that privatization is proceeding at a record pace, the Minister of Finance had to come in, Mr. Speaker, this year and ask the people of Saskatchewan to go in debt another \$230 million just to provide for basic government services, despite the fact that hundreds of millions of dollars of assets in this province are being sold. Even with those sales, Mr.

Speaker, this government is incapable of balancing their books.

Have the people of Saskatchewan been able to look forward to lower taxes as a result of this government selling off all these companies, Mr. Speaker? Not a chance. I live in a relatively affluent constituency in this province. Lots of my neighbours are making in the range of 40,000, \$45,000 a year. Mr. Speaker, they're paying the third highest level of income tax anywhere in Canada. They haven't seen any of the benefits of this government selling off its assets. It hasn't reduced their taxes.

And most people in this province, Mr. Speaker — and there are many in this province who make far less than \$40,000 a year — have seen no benefits at all. Their taxes have consistently risen, Mr. Speaker, at the same time that this government has proceeded to sell off all the assets that they owned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that just means that with less assets in place, generating less revenues in the future, the taxpayers of Saskatchewan won't be able to look forward to lower taxes. On the contrary, they will have nothing to look forward to than higher taxes from this government, Mr. Speaker. Because if you sell off your assets and you're not generating any revenues from those assets by which you can finance public services like health and education, then it just stands to reason that in the future you will have to pay even higher taxes still for those public services, Mr. Speaker. And that's going to be one of the results of this government's privatization actions.

Mr. Speaker, have we seen any benefits in terms of new jobs created from this privatization process? Hardly, Mr. Speaker. On the contrary, we have seen, Mr. Speaker, a loss of jobs, a loss of jobs in line government departments, to begin with, where employees were laid off, where presumably services were to be contracted out to the private sector, and then those services were never delivered in a way that they met the needs of the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

And we see an example of that, of course, in Highways. I remember, Mr. Speaker, that that was one of the first departments that was privatized. And the member for Wilkie who was the minister of Highways at the time and is no longer in this House, Mr. Jim Garner, was fond of saying, Mr. Speaker, that he was going to provide an opportunity for the employees in the Department of Highways to go out and work in the private sector. He laid off 167 employees in 1983 and 247 employees in 1984, and almost none of those employees got jobs in the private sector with private highway contractors, Mr. Speaker.

He privatized the highway work, and ever since he did so, highways in this province have deteriorated to the point where you can't even drive from Saskatoon to Regina any more on the most significant highway system in this province without having your car or the bus hit at least 20 or 30 bumps to the mile, Mr. Speaker. I can't even write on the bus any more when I travel down because there are so many pot-holes along the way that it's impossible to write a letter.

**An Hon. Member:** — It's an adventure up there.

**Mr. Prebble:** — Yes, my colleague, the member from Moose Jaw North says that writing on the bus is kind of like an adventure. You never know when your pen is going to leave the page, Mr. Speaker, there are so many bumps along the highway.

Mr. Speaker, the record in terms of this government and its privatization to date has been one of lost jobs, lost control over our economy, a decline in services. And I want to speak for a moment about the decline in services.

I mentioned highways and how they've deteriorated, Mr. Speaker. We've seen a similar decline, as some of my colleagues have mentioned, with respect to services provided to the public in the area of health care. It was only a few years ago that we had a first-class dental care system in rural Saskatchewan for children, Mr. Speaker; the best in the world, unprecedented anywhere in North America. And governments from all across the world were coming to Saskatchewan, looking to Saskatchewan as a model for how high quality dental care could be delivered to children.

Mr. Speaker, since that service was privatized, we've seen a significant decline in the rate of usership for dental services, particularly in rural Saskatchewan by families. It's been very inconvenient for farm families and families in small communities where there is no dentist to have to take half a day or even a full day off work and arrange for the transport of their children into the nearest centre with a dentist, which is often a drive of over an hour, and often involves, Mr. Speaker, a long wait in the town while their children are having their dental care taken care of.

So we've seen a significant drop, not surprisingly, in the usership of dental care as a result of that, Mr. Speaker. And clearly no one benefitted from that, other than perhaps a few dentists in private practice in the province of Saskatchewan who have seen their practice increase as a result of the children who were being serviced in the schools now having to look to them for service.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think that this Assembly and the legislation that is under debate in this Assembly today demonstrates just how far this government is prepared to go in terms of sacrificing services to the people of Saskatchewan in exchange for being able to implement its privatization ideology. And I speak, Mr. Speaker, of the adoption legislation which is currently before this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I just can't believe that this government wants to privatize infant adoption services in the province of Saskatchewan. I just can't believe it. And the reason I say that, Mr. Speaker, is that this government's agenda is to set up two or three private adoption agencies in this province and in effect have almost all infant adoptions in this province handled through those private agencies.

(1645)

Now, Mr. Speaker, it's not hard to tell where those private agencies are going to be. They are going to be located in Saskatoon and in Regina, and if we're very lucky, we'll

maybe see one in Prince Albert.

Now what will that mean to somebody in rural Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker? There's only about 100 infant adoptions a year in the province, bearing in mind, Mr. Speaker . . . only about a hundred in the province. And right now anybody who wants to adopt a child can walk into their local branch of the Department of Social Services and they can indicate that they are interested in becoming a prospective adoptive parent. And they will be subject to the regular home interviews and other examinations to make sure that they are a fit parent, and they will have to wait probably for some eight years, Mr. Speaker, before they will be in line to adopt an infant. It's a long wait, and that's because there are a lot more people who want to adopt a child than there are infants available for adoption in any one year.

Now what this government wants to do, Mr. Speaker, is it wants to change the rules under which adoption takes place in this province, and it, Mr. Speaker, wants to make sure that the adoption service is primarily available in the large urban centres. It's going to be people in Saskatoon and Regina and Prince Albert who are going to be the first to get on the waiting lists of the private centres. And the person, Mr. Speaker, who lives along the U.S.-Saskatchewan border or who lives in La Ronge is going to find that it is several months before they make their way into Regina or Saskatoon to get onto the waiting lists of one of the private agencies. And they will have to drive into Saskatoon or Regina to access that service, Mr. Speaker. And clearly the people in rural Saskatchewan, the people in rural Saskatchewan who would like to adopt a child, will be at a major disadvantage because they will find that when they register on those waiting lists, Mr. Speaker, they will be well down the waiting list in contrast to somebody in an urban centre who registered early.

The inequity in this adoption legislation and the unfairness in the way that it will treat prospective adoptive parents, demonstrates this government's privatization agenda, Mr. Speaker. The privatization of adoption services are not for the well-being of adoptive children, and they're not for the well-being of most adoptive parents, Mr. Speaker, they are only for the well-being of a few prospective adoptive parents who would like to, Mr. Speaker, as is the case in Saskatoon where we have people who've adopted a child and have waited for less than a year to do so. It's to the advantage of a few adoptive parents. And for every adoptive parent who only has to wait a year to adopt a child, someone else in Saskatchewan who wants to adopt a child will have to wait 12 or 13 years, Mr. Speaker, instead of the average waiting list of eight because, Mr. Speaker, what the system that this government is creating is one of inequity. And I use that, Mr. Speaker, as a little example of what privatization of services is doing in the province of Saskatchewan.

**An Hon. Member:** — Is that a little example or a little exaggeration.

**Mr. Prebble:** — The member for Weyburn says: or is it a little exaggeration. The member for Weyburn will find it interesting when he tells the people of Weyburn that they



can no longer walk into the local branch of the Department of Social Services and make arrangements to adopt an infant, that the people from Weyburn will have to drive up to Regina to register at the private agency in Regina before they can adopt a child.

We'll wait and see, when the Minister of Social Services announces the details of his plan, how the people of Weyburn will like that service, Mr. Speaker. I suspect that they won't, and that's just one example of how services have deteriorated when they're privatized, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about some of the other privatization initiatives that this government has chosen to take, but before I do, I want to comment for a moment about why we on this side of the House believe that public ownership of the resources and of some of the services in this province is important, Mr. Speaker.

We saw public ownership as simply one part of a three part initiative, Mr. Speaker, to expand jobs and build the economy of Saskatchewan. Public ownership was to go hand in hand with co-operative ownership, with joint ventures between the public sector and the private sector, and with private sector ownership, Mr. Speaker — a threefold initiative in terms of building the economy of Saskatchewan. And what we see this government wanting to do, Mr. Speaker, is to destroy one of those engines, to kill the public sector engine of the economy completely.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we saw public ownership as being an important vehicle for controlling our own destiny in this province over our economic affairs. And rather than having key sectors of the economy owned by foreign, non-Canadian firms, rather than having the forest sector of this economy in Saskatchewan controlled by Weyerhaeuser of Tacoma, Washington, or rather than having the potash sector owned partially by the Chinese, as our Premier would have it, or owned, as it used to be, Mr. Speaker, primarily by large American multinationals, our vision, Mr. Speaker, was that the potash sector could be owned in large part by the people of Saskatchewan and controlled here in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

We saw, Mr. Speaker, initiatives like the nationalization of potash and the initiative that was taken to own a small part of the oil sector in our economy as being a way of insuring that the profits from oil and the profits from potash would go for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

And I remind members opposite that the initiative on potash, to nationalize potash, was taken when the private potash companies refused to pay their fair share of taxes to the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. We were, as a government, unable to collect the taxes that were owed to the people of Saskatchewan by the private potash companies because they refused to pay them, Mr. Speaker. And it was when they refused to pay them that we decided that we would no longer tolerate that, that those profits belonged to the people of Saskatchewan, and we took a bold initiative, Mr. Speaker, and we nationalized part of the potash industry in this province. And, Mr. Speaker, that potash industry in the years when we were in government, in the period from 1978 to 1981,

Mr. Speaker, in those four years alone, those potash companies, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, owned by the people of Saskatchewan, made \$78 million in 1979, Mr. Speaker; \$168 million in 1980, Mr. Speaker; \$181 million in profit in 1981, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in those three years alone, in those three years alone the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan made more than \$400 million for the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, more than \$400 million.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, in those three years alone the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan's profits came close to paying for all the assets that were purchased by the New Democratic Party government of the day when potash was nationalized, Mr. Speaker. In just three years alone, Mr. Speaker. And, Mr. Speaker, that's something that the members of the government opposite don't like to admit. That record of profit, Mr. Speaker, is not something that the members of the government opposite like to admit.

Now what this government has done since, Mr. Speaker, is it has chosen to siphon off the equity in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan for its own purposes. It has siphoned it off to the point where it has put the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan more than \$800 million in debt, Mr. Speaker. And now it wants to propose, as a result of the debt that it has created, that it needs to sell PCS off to somehow pay for that debt burden, Mr. Speaker. And it's an example of the kind of waste and economic mismanagement that we've consistently seen from the government opposite.

But, Mr. Speaker, the original purpose of PCS, as was the case with many other of the resource industries that we chose to partially nationalize, was that those profits would go for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan, for the benefit of operating government services like health and education, and reducing the cost thereof to the taxpayers of this province.

Mr. Speaker, we had also seen public ownership as a vehicle for creating jobs in this province; as a vehicle for, for instance in the case of PCS, ensuring that the head office jobs and the jobs in research, instead of being down in Texas, Mr. Speaker, would be based in my home city of Saskatoon. And 600 jobs were created in Saskatoon when PCS was nationalized, Mr. Speaker, jobs that would otherwise never have been in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, those were some of the reasons why we wanted to see resources like potash in public hands. And, Mr. Speaker, we wanted to ensure not only that the resource would be owned by the people of Saskatchewan, but that the next generation of Saskatchewan children would have the benefits of being able to earn profits from the operation of corporations like PCS without there being any debts associated with that.

And I say to the members opposite that they have truly sold out the heritage of the next generation of Saskatchewan children in their proposal now to sell off the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Because, Mr. Speaker, if they had not come to government, in a matter of another four or five years there would have been no

debts owing on the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan at all. There would have been no debts owing, and the next generation of Saskatchewan residents, Mr. Speaker, children like my own — I've two boys right now, Mr. Speaker, who are one and three — and my vision originally, Mr. Speaker, was that my children and all other children in this province, when they turned 18 years of age, they would have inherited a resource in the area of potash with no debts and an equity of 2 to \$3 billion on which they could have earned profits of over \$100 million a year, Mr. Speaker, and this government has taken that opportunity away from them. That is what this government has done, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Prebble:** — That's the record of this government, and it's a record, Mr. Speaker, that is unequalled in terms of shame by any other government in this dominion, Mr. Speaker, by any other government in this dominion.

Mr. Speaker, one of our other visions in terms of public ownership was a vision that not only would the people of Saskatchewan control the resource, but that we would then be able to use that control to better the lives of the communities where those resource companies operated in, and to benefit the occupational health and safety of the employees who worked in those companies, and, Mr. Speaker, to increasingly provide an opportunity for Saskatchewan residents to exercise a real say in how those companies were to operate, Mr. Speaker.

We envisioned, Mr. Speaker, for instance, the opportunity for those Crown corporations to hold annual meetings in local communities where they could be held to account by the local people for how the corporation was being run. We envisioned, Mr. Speaker, an opportunity for employees who worked in companies like Sask Minerals or the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to have real control over the occupational health and safety conditions in their work place. And that was beginning in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan before the government changed, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Prebble:** — Mr. Speaker, we saw an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, for companies like this to create new wealth and new jobs for people all across this province. And what this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is attempting to do is to make sure that that vision that we had as a government, and that the people of Saskatchewan shared, can now never come to pass. Because what this government wants to do is take the unprecedented step in the next 18 months, Mr. Speaker, of selling off one and one-half billion dollars of assets that the people of this province have paid for. They will sell them off probably at no more than 50 per cent of what they are worth, Mr. Speaker. They will go mostly to residents who live outside this province, Mr. Speaker. They want to turn the control of Saskatchewan back over to their multinational friends in the United States and in other parts of this dominion, Mr. Speaker. We will have no part of this, Mr. Speaker, and I will adjourn the debate on this motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.