

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Population Loss in March

**Mr. Romanow:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question today is directed to the senior minister on the front bench, who's with us this Friday morning, and it has to do with his own department's statistics from the Bureau of (Saskatchewan) Statistics, which have the latest figures out for the population loss in Saskatchewan for the period in March. And according to your figures, in March Saskatchewan suffered a net loss of 1,400 people — that's 1,400 in March, 1,600 in January, 6,000 in February — for a grand total of about 9,000 people in the first three months of this year.

My question to you, Mr. Minister, is: in the face of these startling numbers, why didn't your government introduce a job creation plan in the recent budget?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, the Government of Saskatchewan has, as its main focus on job creation, the attempting to diversify the economy of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, attempting to diversify the province of Saskatchewan. And that diversification comes in many ways — that is involved with government programs; that is involved with the private sector programs.

Now for all this week what we have seen is the members opposite, as they have done for the last two years, attacking a major program in south-western Saskatchewan . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — South-east.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — . . . south-eastern Saskatchewan. Not only, Mr. Speaker, to save the water, to save the water that otherwise would flow into the United States for the benefit of south-eastern Saskatchewan, but in so doing to create many, many jobs; many jobs, more than what he has referred to, Mr. Speaker. And they stand against that. Now they stand up and say, what are you doing to create jobs? I ask them: what are they doing, other than trying to destroy jobs in this province?

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the Minister of Economic Trade and Development, which surely must be one of the weakest answers the minister, for whom I have a great deal of respect, has given.

Mr. Minister, if you're hanging your hat on the diversification policies of this government for job creation, then how in the world is it you can explain the fact that there are 36,000 people, 4 per cent of the total population, who have left this province because of the diversification policies, so-called. What's gone wrong?

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

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, as we have indicated many times before in this Assembly, the province of Saskatchewan has gone through some very difficult times in the field of agriculture, and those difficult times have been a product, quite frankly, of two areas. Number one, that we haven't had any rain for a number of years; and number two, that the prices of those commodities are down significantly. The statistics, if they wish to read them, show that there is problems in the drought-related areas of agriculture in the province, but on the other hand there is significant growth in the area of processing and manufacturing.

And every time, Mr. Speaker, that we bring in a new announcement of a new project, the members opposite are against it. You go through Weyerhaeuser; Weyerhaeuser has created many, many new jobs in the area of Prince Albert. The members opposite are against it, Mr. Speaker.

We have expanded in North Battleford, in the Hunter's and in the food processing. The member from North Battleford is against that project, Mr. Speaker. We have developed many other programs in diversification. Over 3,000 jobs, additional jobs, by privatization and public participation have been created, Mr. Speaker. The members are against that.

Mr. Speaker, this government continues and is committed to the concept of diversifying the economy. That is the way we're going to preserve jobs, and that is the way we're going to build this province.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the minister. And if I may say so, Mr. Speaker, this is proof positive of how the rhetoric doesn't match the reality.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Minister, your rhetoric talks about privatization. Your rhetoric talks about diversification. Your rhetoric talks about everything and anything except the simple facts which are: that this year alone 9,000 people have left this province, 40 per cent of whom are basically between the ages of 15 and 29, and that's in the first three months of 1989 — 9,000. We're heading for 36,000 people leaving this province if this record continues. That's the record in the face of seven years of privatization, deregulation and PC-style diversification. How in the world can you explain that population loss? Don't give us speeches, give us concrete programs to get Saskatchewan people working and living here.

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

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I would simply ask the member opposite, the Leader of the Opposition, to take some time and go out and attempt to understand what happens in rural Saskatchewan when the commodity prices are very low and there is no rain and there's no production. What happens when that happens, Mr. Speaker, is that farmers do not have the product to take to

market, and therefore there is various jobs associated with the agriculture industry which the member opposite, which the member opposite, in his own words, Mr. Speaker, has indicated that they do not have a policy to deal with and they don't terribly understand rural Saskatchewan. That is demonstrated once again today.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing is diversifying the economy. In the city of Saskatoon, Intercontinental Packers, which is in his riding, Mr. Speaker, have expanded their operation, created several hundred new jobs. The member opposite stands against that. There is a new rendering plant being built in the city of Saskatoon. The hon. member is against that. There is new projects being built in Swift Current, being built in North Battleford, being built in Melfort, being built in Hudson Bay, being built in Prince Albert, being built in Meadow Lake, and the members stand against that, Mr. Speaker.

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

#### **Payment to Law Firm for Out-of-court Settlement**

**Mr. Anguish:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Justice, the same minister. Mr. Minister, yesterday in public accounts the Department of Energy and Mines was before the Public Accounts Committee and we were looking at the 1986-87 *Public Accounts*.

I asked the question of the deputy minister as to an expenditure made to the law firm of Shirkey Ulmer Ottenbreit Shirkey & McIntyre in the amount of \$234,666.67. The deputy minister responded, Mr. Minister, by saying that that money was paid to settle a court action out of court. Could the minister tell us today, since his department — and he was the minister at that time — represented the Department of Energy and Mines, could you tell us what the settlement was for and who was the plaintiff in that action?

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

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with those types of details. That's a normal question that would be asked in estimates, or a question that's asked in public accounts. This is question period, Mr. Speaker, and I would undertake to take notice of the hon. member's question and bring an answer back.

**Mr. Anguish:** — A question to the same minister, Mr. Speaker. I'm wondering, Mr. Minister, how many out-of-court actions have been settled in the magnitude of a quarter of a million dollars against this government during an election year that you have no knowledge of, Mr. Minister. Can you tell me how many out-of-court actions in the magnitude of a quarter million dollars during an election year of public accounts that you can't remember?

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

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the most recent negotiations that I understand where there was an out-of-court settlement is with regards to the Squaw Rapids dam that has been going on for about 10 years, that the hon. members were in government. And we, in

fact, settled that agreement, Mr. Speaker, and I think we're quite proud of settling that agreement.

That was a project that was built by the former NDP government. It flooded a number of acres of land in northern Saskatchewan; it robbed many of the native people of their livelihood, Mr. Speaker. There was never any compensation paid by the hon. members when they were in government. We sat down and negotiated that, and we should not apologize for anybody for negotiating that matter out of court.

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

**Mr. Anguish:** — Mr. Speaker, new question to the minister. This particular settlement is a little different. It's secret. The deputy minister responded that it was part of the out-of-court settlement, that he was not allowed or did not have the authority to release any information. We assume, Mr. Minister, that there must have been a statement of claim filed with a court in the province of Saskatchewan. We had a search done at the Regina court-house yesterday. There is no statement of claim. Do you not recall, Mr. Minister, an out-of-court settlement with no statement of claim from a law firm that usually represents the government, instead they represent a plaintiff; your department, sir, represents the department; you hand over a cheque for a quarter million dollars and you can't remember?

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

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I simply indicate that that's a type of an information that ministers are not expected to have at their fingertips when they come to question period. I indicated to the hon. member I'll undertake to investigate this thing, but what I can say, Mr. Speaker, is this. When the member opposite brings those allegations before this House in the normal way, they're almost always, Mr. Speaker, proved to be wrong once one looks into the matter.

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

**Mr. Anguish:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No allegation — fact, Mr. Minister. Question asked in Public Accounts Committee yesterday morning by myself, a member of the Public Accounts Committee; deputy minister of Energy and Mines says, Mr. Minister, and I quote that it was for:

Yes, that money was paid to settle a court action out of court.

Mr. Minister, as far as we can determine, that is fact; it comes from a deputy minister of the Crown, before testimony in committee. He has said that that money was paid. A search of the court-house has no statement of claim filed. The allegations you make against this side of the House are the only ones that are false, Mr. Minister. This is fact. We want to know why your government paid a quarter million dollars in an election year to someone, we don't know for what or to whom, and I don't believe, Mr. Minister, that you can't remember that.

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

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I simply indicated to the hon. member that I would undertake to look into the file and bring the information back. If the hon. member persists, after having asked that question and I giving that answer, asks five more times the same question, I don't understand the process in here.

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. Order. I would like to remind the hon. member that after the minister does take notice, further supplementaries are actually out of order and, if asked, they provoke debate. So the process is that you can certainly ask for further information, but not further supplementaries.

#### Press Releases by Joytec

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the minister responsible for Science and Technology, and it concerns the lack of response to a question from the member from Saskatoon Sutherland the other day, so I'll ask it again.

Mr. Minister, will you tell this House when your government became aware of the fact that Technigen, Joytec's parent company was releasing untruthful press releases about that company's activities?

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

**Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn:** — Well I find it interesting, Mr. Speaker, that the opposition is still interested in a company that they were successful in chasing out of this province. With regard to Technigen . . . it's quite obvious they're not interested in the response.

The only company that I have been dealing with, Mr. Speaker, is Joytec, and as far as Joytec is concerned, that was a company that was formed back in 1983. Technigen, I believe, took over the company in late 1986.

Now it's beyond me why they are so interested in what's happening with Technigen at this particular point in time. As far as the involvement of the company is concerned, it was Joytec Equities that were involved in getting the money to get this company going, the venture capital corporation. It was Joytec that was involved in getting a grant from the Department of Science and Technology back in '85-86. So with regard to what's happening now with the BC securities, I don't see what impact that that has or what reference that has really as far as Joytec is concerned.

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — New question to the same minister. Mr. Minister, I can believe that you don't understand what that has to do with Joytec. I can also . . .

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

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — I can also, Mr. Minister, believe why the people of this province have \$1.1 million in jeopardy.

My question is this, Mr. Minister: last year Joytec lost \$3.5 million, never sold one golf simulator, and I want you to tell this House where Joytec is going to get the \$1.1. million to repay the people of Saskatchewan for the

money that you blew.

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

**Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn:** — Well I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, if the member opposite will just be patient, I'm sure that he's going to see, with the amount of work that is now being done in Japan with regard to the golf simulators, that there will be moneys that are going to be flowing into this company. Unfortunately, they're not going to be flowing into Saskatchewan, they're going to be flowing into British Columbia.

But as far as the concern that he's indicating this morning with the \$1.1 million, the company full well understands that with the agreement that they have, that there has to be negotiation carried on with the province of Saskatchewan. In fact, that they are liable for paying back the money that was given as a tax credit back in 1986.

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — New question to the same minister.

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

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — Mr. Minister, your display of incompetence and lack of caring for the people's money, the people of this province's money, is absolutely beyond belief. My question is this: Mr. Minister, is there anything that your government is doing to ensure that the people who invested in this venture capital corporation, that those investments are going to be protected from unscrupulous operators and stock manipulators and from the incompetence that your government is displaying?

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

**Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, for the member opposite to be talking about incompetence that's been displayed by this government, is just . . .

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

**Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn:** — Mr. Speaker, as far as the member opposite indicating . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order. I think the hon. member from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden knows that exhibits are not allowed, and using a newspaper . . .

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

**Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn:** — Mr. Speaker, every precaution has been taken with regard to investors that have invested in Joytec. As far as the venture capital corp . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order. We're having a great deal of difficulty hearing the minister and I'm sure we all want to hear his answer, so let's give him that opportunity.

**Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to assure the member opposite, Mr. Speaker, that Joytec is in full compliance with regard to the regulations that are laid down in so far as the investments that Saskatchewan shareholders put into this company, and every move has been taken to ensure that

these people are going to be protected.

I would add also, Mr. Speaker, that we must keep in mind that Joytec and Technigen have invested some 6 to \$8 million in this project, most of which was spent in the province of Saskatchewan creating jobs here and taxes and revenues for the city of Saskatoon and for the province. And I think it is unfortunate that because of adverse publicity, part of which was created by the members opposite, that this company has now moved out of the province.

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

### **Increase in Interest Rates**

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Before the Minister of Finance graced this Chamber with his charm and presence, Mr. Minister, the Minister of Economic Development and Trade said that Saskatchewan was experiencing some difficult economic times. Growing numbers of Saskatchewan people are concluding that those difficult times have been made worse by Conservative economic policies, foremost of which is the increasing rise in interest rates.

The minister will be aware that the interest rates went up 10 points again yesterday — yes, 10 points. One-tenth of a percentage point, 10 points — same thing.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order, order. The member from Regina Centre is having great difficulty in being heard. He's having great difficulty being heard due to constant interruptions. I would ask the members to allow him the courtesy of putting his question.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Just a slight correction, Mr. Speaker. I'm having great difficulty in dealing with the former minister of Finance, but then he had great difficulty as minister of Finance, so perhaps we're even.

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

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Finance minister, 10 days ago your government introduced a motion on interest rates which would have sent a strong message to Ottawa that Saskatchewan is hurting under those interest rate policies. Mr. Minister, you've been playing hide-and-go-seek with it ever since. My question is: when are you going to climb out of Michael Wilson's back pocket and move that interest rate?

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

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — I'm pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member, for the first time, did not ask a question of an article in the *Leader-Post* as the basis for question period. I was expecting the member . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. I once more remind the hon. member that exhibits are not allowed.

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Every other day they use the *Leader-Post* as the basis for question period, and noticeably not today, Mr. Speaker. Let me indicate to the hon. members opposite that it was not 10 points interest

increase. Mr. Speaker, there's a big difference between 10 points and 10 basis points. I could give a long dissertation on the difference if the hon. member wants it. It would probably be for the best interest.

Let me advise the hon. member, as we have done in the past, that this government has taken a strong position against the interest rate policy of the Bank of Canada. We do not think it fair. We do not think it appropriate in the circumstances in that the stated reasons for the policy is the fear of inflation. Inflation is a fact of life in only one part of Canada. It is harmful to our farmers; it is harmful to the people of this province.

But let me tell the hon. member, because in his question he said: what are you doing about it. Let me tell him what we're doing about it.

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

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I believe we'll move to the next question.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Minister, if it isn't appropriate and it isn't fair, then why don't you move the motion which you yourself drafted and which was patterned after one we put forward? Why don't you move the motion if it isn't fair?

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

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Let me indicate to the hon. member that it is only the people of the province of Saskatchewan that have interest rate protection for the average home owner, Mr. Speaker. It is under this government, this Premier, that we have helped Saskatchewan people keep their homes in the light of high interest rates with, Mr. Speaker, mortgage interest protection — something opposed by the NDP, Mr. Speaker.

We have subsidized loans for our students so that they can go to university. Mr. Speaker, we have subsidized loans for our farmers. We have production loan programs at a subsidized interest rate, Mr. Speaker. We have programs for interest rate protection for public housing projects. Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on and on — loans to municipalities subsidized, Mr. Speaker. We have taken concrete action to protect the people of this province against high interest rates, something not only that you did not do when you had the chance, but secondly, Mr. Speaker, that no other government in Canada has taken the interest rate protection that this government has.

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

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Minister, if your protection were that all-encompassing, then I suppose the motion which you move would not have been necessary.

Mr. Minister, I wonder if you'll admit that your lack of courage, your vacillation on this motion is in fact doing more harm than good. It's signalling to Ottawa that they can expect no serious opposition from this government on the question of interest rates. Will you admit that your failure to pursue that motion, as you've said you'll do

twice, is sending the wrong signals to Ottawa?

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

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — I ask the hon. member how sitting on their hands and doing nothing when interest rates were 21 per cent sent any type of signal, except it sent a strong signal to the people of this province.

Let me indicate to the hon. member that strong signals, strong messages have been sent by this government to the national government and to the Bank of Canada. But not only strong signals, Mr. Speaker; we've taken strong action, Mr. Speaker, that no other government in Canada has taken in many cases. No other government in the world has taken the action that this provincial government has done to protect the people of this province against high interest rates, Mr. Speaker. You get ample opportunity to debate the issue.

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

#### Bill No. 20 — An Act respecting the Reorganization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move first reading of a Bill respecting the Reorganization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

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

The division bells rang from 10:31 a.m. until 10:33 a.m.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

#### Yeas — 30

Devine	Pickering
Muller	Toth
Duncan	Johnson
McLeod	McLaren
Andrew	Hopfner
Lane	Petersen
Taylor	Swenson
Swan	Martens
Maxwell	Baker
Schmidt	Gleim

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order. Order. We're having difficulty hearing the vote. There will be ample opportunity for debate, and I just ask hon. members to be patient. Order. Order.

Gerich	Neudorf
Hepworth	Gardner
Hardy	Kopelchuk
Klein	Saxinger
Meiklejohn	Britton

#### Nays — 21

Romanow	Solomon
Prebble	Anguish
Rolfes	Goulet
Shillington	Hagel

Lingenfelter  
Koskie  
Thompson  
Brockelbank  
Mitchell  
Simard  
Kowalsky

Pringle  
Lyons  
Calvert  
Lautermilch  
Trew  
Van Mulligen

The Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to introduce some guests.

Leave granted.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Martens:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to indulge the House today by introducing some students from Wymark, Saskatchewan. They're seated in your gallery; there's 21 students. They're grade eight students and they're being chaperoned today by their principal, Mr. Knelsen, Betty Funk, and Wanda Olfert, and Shirley Friesen is the bus driver. I want to welcome them here and I'll be talking to them later on.

I just want the Assembly to know that these young fellows and girls have won the south-west basketball, and they did it in competition against my son who they're going to have a little trouble with next year, I assure them. And we're going to be visiting about that later on, and I thank you for coming and I hope you have a good time here.

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

### MOTIONS

#### Referral of Bills to Standing Committee on Non-controversial Bills

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day and with leave of the Assembly, I would move, seconded by the member from Meadow Lake:

That an order for second reading of Bill No. 10, An Act to amend the Public Trustee Act, be discharged, and the Bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Non-controversial Bills.

Motion agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, with leave of the Assembly, I would move, seconded by the member from Meadow Lake:

That an order for second reading of Bill No. 14, An Act respecting Consequential Amendments to certain Acts, be discharged, and the Bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Non-controversial Bills.

Motion agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the member from Meadow Lake:

That the order for second reading of Bill No. 15, An Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act, be discharged, and the Bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Non-controversial Bills.

Motion agreed to.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

#### SECOND READINGS

##### Bill No. 11 — An Act to amend The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading today of an amendment to The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, 1989.

Under the The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, a board is established to grant compensation to innocent victims of crime. The compensation is paid to persons who are otherwise unable to obtain compensation for their injuries, or the death of a family member which results from the commission of a crime. The amendment now proposed will improve the board's ability to fulfil these obligations. The board is given authority to make interim payments to applicants who are in real financial need where it is likely that the board will make an order for compensation to them.

The board's ability to recover the compensation from the person responsible for the injury or the death is improved. The Act is clarified to provide that costs may be reimbursed only to applicants who have been awarded compensation. The board is given discretion to refuse to grant compensation to an applicant who refuses to co-operate with the police in solving the crime that caused his injury or the death of a family member.

To improve the administrative efficiency of the operation of the Act, two changes are being proposed. The list of offences which compensation may be paid is moved from the Act to the regulations. The Lieutenant Governor in Council is given authority to make regulations respecting the calculation of awards and determining the ability for . . . or eligibility for compensation.

I might also say, Mr. Speaker, that the amendments to The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act should be read in conjunction with a later Act that I will introduce and give second reading to today, and that is victims of crime, Mr. Speaker.

This is part of the strategy of government, to deal more effectively with those unfortunate people who have suffered as a result of criminal activity. They are innocent. They are the victims of that activity, and this is a further enhancement that society moves through the legal system in order to provide compensation to those innocent victims. Too often they are the unsung people — the people that you don't hear about or don't see — and yet they are, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, the most unfortunate

people of all involved in crime.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of an Act to amend The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to make a few brief comments in respect to the Bill. I think in general, the amendments that are being proposed, I don't think we have any problem with. We are wanting to check out in more detail in respect to taking of the crimes . . . or the schedule of crimes that compensation is paid for, which is under the Bill at the present time, and putting them into regulations.

We want to assure ourselves that that will not detract from the crimes that are covered, and we're checking that out to see if there's satisfaction with that being transferred to the regulations, and accordingly I move that we adjourn debate at this time.

Debate adjourned.

##### Bill No. 12 — An Act respecting Regulations

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With this second reading, I propose to make some changes to The Regulations Act, 1989.

This new Act will replace the existing Regulations Act, establishes a new test to determine what is a regulation. Presently it is necessary to make an interpretation as to whether a particular statutory provision is legislative in nature before knowing whether the power in that provision must be exercised by a regulation or a whether an order in council, minister's order, or simple policy guide-line are required.

In the proposed legislation, if the authorizing Act provides that the power must be exercised by regulation, then the regulation will be required. The use of the word "regulation" will be the sole determining factor, and the decision as to whether a regulation is necessary will be made by the legislature at the time of the passage of the authorizing Act, rather than by a subsequent interpretation. This removes a good deal of confusion regarding the issue of what is or what is not a regulation.

As is in the existing Act, the new Act will provide for the filing of regulations with the Registrar of Regulations, the publication in the *Saskatchewan Gazette*, and other procedural matters relating to regulations. Provisions respecting referrals of regulations to the committee of the Legislative Assembly and the power of the Assembly to repeal and make changes to regulations remain intact.

(1045)

Mr. Speaker, to put that into a different, perhaps, tone, what we are attempting to do with this Bill is to better define what is a regulation, so it becomes the function of the legislature to define that, rather than having to refer to the court for the court to interpret what in fact a regulation is. We hope that this will allow for a better interpretation of this Act and avoid a fair amount of confusion.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of An Act

respecting Regulations.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. There are a number of substantive changes here. I want to have the opportunity to review the remarks of the minister, and also I want to get the feedback in respect to the effect of the changes that are being contemplated, and accordingly I want to move to adjourn debate on this Bill.

Debate adjourned.

**Bill No. 13 — An Act respecting Certain Amendments to Certain Acts resulting from the enactment of The Regulations Act, 1989**

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is legislation consequential to the Act I just moved, and as a result of the replacement of existing statutes respecting regulations with The Regulations Act, 1989, certain amendments are required to several other Acts. These amendments will clarify in each of these Acts whether a power is or is not to be exercised by regulation.

And in so doing, I think, Mr. Speaker, from the comments of the member from Quill Lakes, which is the concern he raised in his reference to the previous Act that we spoke of, this is an attempt to clarify through this consequential amendment as to what particular statutes we would see this applying to.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I would move An Act respecting Certain Amendments to Certain Acts resulting from the enactment of The Regulations Act, 1989.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since Bill No. 14 is consequential to Bill No. 13, and having asked to adjourn No. 13, I therefore ask to adjourn debate on Bill No. 14.

Debate adjourned.

**Bill No. 16 — An Act to amend The Clean Air Act**

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased today to rise to speak to second reading on the amendments to The Clean Air Act. The Clean Air Amendment Act, 1989, which we are considering today, is required to facilitate the preparation of regulations in the proclamation of The Clean Air Act passed a year ago.

When drafting the clean air regulations, a problem was identified with clause 24(2)(e) of The Clean Air Act. The existing clause required industrial sources to be classified first before they could be regulated. This is not the intent. The new clause requires individual industrial sources to be regulated and also, if necessary, to regulate the classes of sources. In addition, minor changes to section 5 and 18(1)(a) of the Act were identified. These changes are of a housekeeping nature to clarify the authority provided by the Act.

The Clean Air Act represents a substantial improvement in environmental legislation in this province. It is a tough but fair piece of legislation which will not only bring Saskatchewan into line with other Canadian legislation, but it will also help to protect and enhance the quality of

life for residents of this province.

This Act is welcomed by the general public and those with an interest in the quality of our environment. It will also be favourably received by industry. The Clean Air Act will ensure, with minor exceptions, that air pollution emissions from all industrial sources, incinerators, and fuel-burning equipment will be subject to an approval issued by the department.

The existing Act only applies to new sources constructed after January of 1976, and this has led to an unacceptable double standard. At present, new industries and facilities are required to obtain an approval and to control air pollution emissions while older operations are exempted. By requiring every major facility to obtain an approval, this Act will ensure that all operations are treated equally and fairly.

The Clean Air Amendment Act, which we are considering here today, is a high priority for this Legislative Assembly in order to finalize the clean air regulations and enable the speedy proclamation of this progressive environmental legislation. I invite the support of all members for this Act.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to move second reading of The Clean Air Amendment Act, 1989.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Given this government's spotted record on the environment, this caucus, the opposition wants to take every opportunity to examine this legislation.

It's fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that this government uses all the right phrases but does all the wrong things when it comes to clean air and the environment. The language the minister has used in his comments is unobjectionable. What this government has done, however, over the last two months, is highly objectionable and it's got this government into difficulty.

The member from Kindersley looks so surprised. Your record on the environment hasn't exactly been your finest hour this week, has it? If the member from Kindersley and the other members of the cabinet had actually believed in the legislation and the law of this land with respect to environment, they wouldn't be in the difficulty that they're in with respect to the Rafferty dam.

Now, Mr. Speaker's going to tell me this may be a little outside the parameters of The Clean Air Act, and that may in fact be. But that is by way of background . . . I say that by way of background so that the members of this Assembly will understand that when this government talks about the environment we want to see what they're doing, and we want to take a great deal of care in examining what they're doing.

For those reasons, we'll want to examine the legislation in the light of the minister's comment, and I beg leave to adjourn debate on this Bill.

**The Speaker:** — Please move the adjournment of the debate.

**Mr. Shillington:** — I did.

**The Speaker:** — Don't beg leave, just move the adjournment.

**Mr. Shillington:** — I'm sorry. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Debate adjourned.

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

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to move second reading of The Victims of Crime Act.

The way in which society, and more particularly the justice system, has historically treated victims has been recognized, I think in all circles, as being inadequate. Progress has been made through restitution programs and through criminal injuries compensation, but more progress needs to be made.

The federal government has recently passed legislation which, once proclaimed, will substantially enhance the rights of victims. It will enable victims to seek restitution in many, many more cases. It provides for the establishment of victims impact statement program. Victims counselling and other services are contemplated.

The federal legislation also authorizes a federal victims surcharge on criminal offenders. Moneys collected through this surcharge will be received by the province for victims programming.

The legislation before this Assembly today establishes a fund for victims programming. This fund will receive money from two sources — a federal surcharge and a new provincial victims surcharge on fines collected under provincial legislation. This legislation authorizes that provincial surcharge.

The fund will be used for a wide variety of victims programs. They include promotion and delivery of services and benefits to victims; research into victims services and needs; and information services and crime prevention. Initially we will use the fund to expand our restitution program. This will ensure that the victim's claim for compensation will be placed before the court in every appropriate case.

We are also considering the early establishment of a victims impact statement program. These programs are intended to ensure that the court understands the effect of a crime on the victim, enable the victim to participate in the criminal process.

These initiatives are consistent with the principles adopted by the Canadian attorneys general. These include, one, victims should be treated with courtesy and compassion, and with respect for their dignity and privacy. Two, victims should suffer the minimum of necessary inconvenience from their involvement in the criminal justice system. Three, the views and concerns of victims should be taken into account, and appropriate assistance and information should be provided to them

through the criminal process where appropriate, and consistent with criminal law and procedure. Four, whenever reasonably possible, victims should receive, through formal or informal procedures, prompt and fair redress for the harm that they have suffered.

We believe this is an important recognition of the rights of individuals who have paid a personal price as a victim of the crime.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is very important progressive legislation where society does in fact recognize that in every crime there is also very often a victim, and that victim for too long now has not received his or her proper attention through the criminal process.

With this, I believe we will move forward towards the beginning of redressing that concern. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of An Act dealing with Victims of Crime Act.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to make a couple of comments on this, and it will be fairly brief. With respect to the thrust of the legislation itself, this provides a significant — at least would appear to provide — a significant extension of the crimes compensation Act passed many years ago under the Thatcher administration, actually in the late '60s, and which has received really no changes since then.

On the surface this would appear to provide a useful extension of the benefits of that program and I take no objection to the program that the minister's outlined, and may well wind up voting for it after we have a look at it. We'll have to see.

I do object though to the method of financing. I think it is inappropriate to be earmarking certain funds for certain purposes. It seems to me to be a much more rational purpose to decide what the public needs are and then to put all the money into a common pot and to dole out enough money to fund them. The problem with this kind of a scheme is that some of these needs are underfunded and some are overfunded. This is, if I may say so with every affection to our good neighbours to the south, this is the American system of financing a government. Take a fund of money, earmark it for a certain purpose, and often the needs of society get badly out of whack.

So I think the method of financing this is unfortunate. On the surface, however, I see nothing wrong with the program itself. We will want to examine the Bill in the light of the minister's comments and I, therefore, move the adjournment of this debate.

Debate adjourned.

(1100)

### **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

#### **SECOND READINGS**

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



**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much. I want to address a few comments on this Bill and on the general subject of privatization. This is one of these watershed issues which affects our society from time to time and it is one of those issues, too, which mark a clear line of demarcation between the government and the opposition. The members opposite are on a campaign to privatize everything in sight. It has become something of a holy war, holy crusade, with them.

In its naivety and in its pure, unbridled destructiveness — I tend to remember the children's crusade, actually, when one talks about a crusade — this appears to be the children's crusade.

This government is . . . I may say, Mr. Speaker, by way of general background, there is nothing innately wrong with the notion that some government assets should be disposed of. As government grows and takes on new functions, old functions may be completed. There's nothing therefore innately wrong with government disposing of some assets and picking up some new ones. However, this government is disposing of assets which we need, which are going to require . . . and which have made money.

I want to take a couple of examples, and I'll take the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, since that happens to be in the public eye at the moment. We, for policy reasons, in the mid-1970s the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and the potash companies in Saskatchewan — I'm sorry, I meant the private potash companies in Saskatchewan — said in 1975, we're not paying the taxes, and just dared us to make them. As a policy reason, therefore, and not with any ideological need to own a major portion of the potash industry, we said, we need a window on the industry, and we took over some 40 per cent of the industry.

Partially through good management — and here I credit the former member from Elphinstone, Mr. Blakeney — partially through his good management, partially through good luck, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan made a lot of money over the years. The year we were . . . the last year we were in office, \$120 million was paid into the Consolidated Fund. That funded hospitals, roads and all manner of government services. That's true of most of the Crown corporations which have been privatized. Earlier this government privatized the Saskatchewan . . . Saskoil. Measured in terms of its return on the investment we put into it, which was not very much, that was the most profitable Crown corporation we had. And one sees this pattern emerging. One sees the government selling off the profitable Crown corporations — and the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan has been a profitable Crown corporation, as was Saskoil, as was Sask Minerals — has privatized these Crown corporations and is retaining those corporations which aren't so profitable.

And one of the things that I find most objectionable about this, is that in this process of privatizing Crown corporations, the taxpayer's being lost sight of.

Let us look at what you're doing with the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Completely

unnecessarily, totally unnecessarily, you took . . . this government took over the debt of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. There's no need for that. Nothing about the balance sheet suggested that that corporation was in imminent need of that sort of money. It was done, a year and a half ago, a couple of years ago, to make the corporation saleable . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right, it was a prelude to today.

Now you're going to sell the corporation for a great deal less than it was worth. The gentleman from Georgia's name escapes me, I think it's Mr. Douglas, has said that, the person you hired has said that you're going to sell the corporation for a great deal less than it's worth and you're not selling the debt with it. You're retaining the debt. You're giving those shares away at a lot less than they're worth. And what we see here is the height of irresponsibility.

You people . . . I must say, your vision of the future has never been clouded by a sense of responsibility to the taxpayer. You certainly have not allowed yourself to be distracted in this by any thought for the taxpayer. Because it's the taxpayer that's going to have to pick up the debt that you people have, by this mechanism, elected to retain. The same disregard for the taxpayer is seen in SaskEnergy for a variety of reasons over the years. SaskEnergy has made money. The electrical system at best has broken even. It doesn't take a great deal of imagination to know which half of the company you're selling; you're selling the one that makes money, and in doing so you are short-changing particularly the rural people. It is urban people, by and large, who utilize and make use of natural gas. The distribution system is so costly that it is a slow and difficult process taking it out to farms.

Rural people who live on farms are great users of electrical energy. When you sell off the gas system, it's the rural people in this province whom you're short-changing. And I say to members opposite, if that fact hasn't dawned on you now, it's going to be when you call the next election. The privatization of SaskPower is going to be a very, very negative issue.

It is also totally irrational. The philosophy which lays behind privatization is that competition breeds efficiency; competition breeds a competitiveness and a lower cost. But what on earth, I ask, is the sense in privatizing a monopoly? What on earth is the sense in turning a public monopoly into a private monopoly? You then simply have a corporation which is even less sensitive to public needs and even less amenable to the public will.

So you people are bent on privatization. You're doing so with no regard for the taxpayer. The taxpayer is being short-changed in this process. It is the height of irresponsibility to be selling companies for less than what they're worth, particularly where there is debt remaining that the taxpayer is going to have to pay off. It is just, as I say, the height of irresponsibility to be doing what you're doing.

At the very most, the assets ought to be sold for what they're worth. The very least the taxpayers deserve, Mr.

Speaker, is fair value for the assets. That's the very least they deserve.

It is a cheap, contemptible trick to sell assets for less than what they're worth so that those who buy them will achieve immediate profit and will be pleased with their investment. That is a cheap and contemptible trick, cheap and contemptible because it's transparent. It is stated by the gurus of privatization as something that should be done.

It's contemptible because you're short-changing the vast majority of Saskatchewan people who never buy equities. The vast majority of Saskatchewan people invest in interest-bearing securities and wouldn't think of buying an equity. By doing what you're doing, you may be delighting those who invest in them, but you're really short-changing the public of Saskatchewan because they're left with the debt, and the assets have been sold for less than what they're worth.

In addition to that, you are short-changing the taxpayer because, in some cases, the service which is going to be provided to the taxpayers cannot possibly be as good. And I want to raise in this context, Mr. Speaker, I want to raise the Saskatchewan Government Insurance office.

It was brought into this province . . . Well I see the member from Thunder Creek finding these comments objectionable. I say to the member from Thunder Creek that the Saskatchewan Government Insurance office was brought into being to provide adequate insurance coverage through the length and breadth of this province. The insurance . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — In the forties.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Yes, that's right, in the 1940s. And, Mr. Speaker, let us look at what the province was in the 1940s. City of Regina had around 30,000 people; Saskatoon was much smaller. There was a much larger population in rural areas in the 1940s. In order to provide cheap economical insurance, you have to adjust the claims. Selling insurance is not like selling combines or tractors. When those items move off the lot into the farmyard, it doesn't matter a whole lot to the dealer whether he sells it in Estevan or five miles out of Regina, five miles from his lot. The profit is approximately the same.

That is not true of insurance. When you sell the policy, you've got to service it. That means you've got to have people relatively close by. This means that Saskatchewan, with a relatively sparse population, is an expensive jurisdiction in which to sell insurance.

The theory behind SGI when it was set up was that the same kind of insurance coverage, at the same cost, would be available in Regina and in Coronach or Big Beaver. When you . . . and that, by and large, has been maintained. SGI, by and large, has made money in the cities, and the rural areas have been much more expensive to service because a large part of selling insurance is servicing the claims when they finally come.

When this government sells SGI, once again you're not

short-changing the people that live in my riding. The people who live in my riding, downtown Regina, have always had a choice available to them. They can buy SGI or they can buy The Co-operators or they can buy Royal Trust or they can buy Wawanesa, and the list goes on and on and on. But that's not true of the people who live in Big Beaver or even, for that matter, some of the communities in a place like Shellbrook. All of those companies are not available. The industry is not competitive and it's a lot more expensive.

But when you sell what is virtually a public utility, what you're doing once again, you are short-changing the rural people of this province . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well the member from Meadow Lake says in caustic terms, you're defending the rural people. I say to the member from Meadow Lake, you'd better start thinking about the rural people.

**An Hon. Member:** — We have been.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well your actions don't show it. The member from Meadow Lake, in this ongoing dialogue which is contributing so much to the debate, the member from Meadow Lake says they have been thinking about it. They may have been thinking about it, but their actions don't suggest that. Their actions suggest that they have completely forgotten the make-up of this province . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well if the members opposite want to call an election on this, I'll tell you what, we're ready. Are you — are you?

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

**Mr. Shillington:** — That's one challenge you won't take up, I'm quite certain of it.

Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons I will be voting against this Bill when it comes up for a vote.

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

(1115)

**Mr. Trew:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to join this debate today. I want to start by simply starting my speech with the premise that we are in Saskatchewan and not New York. Things that work in the major trading centres in the United States do not always work well on the farm in Saskatchewan, don't always work well in the town of Waldeck, don't always work well in my home town of Beechy where I was brought up.

Saskatchewan has a long and proud history, Mr. Speaker, of working together, of co-operating, neighbour with neighbour, friend with friend. When something needs to be done, we all chip in and we make whatever it is that needs to be done happen. Community halls, community recreation facilities, service clubs, all rely on that special Saskatchewan co-operation, on that special Saskatchewan knowledge, that understanding that we're in it together and we have to always work together. And that's just simply the Saskatchewan way, and we're quite proud of it.

What this privatization Bill is all about is destroying the

Saskatchewan initiative, the Saskatchewan way. It is all about having Saskatchewan Crown corporations sold primarily to out-of-province corporations. A good example is Kam-Kotia, which took over our sodium sulphate mine in Chaplin and the other one in Fox Valley, and as part of that deal I understand there was the peat moss operation in Carrot River.

Crown corporations previously all had their head offices here in Saskatchewan. Now we have — I realize I can't show it, but I can certainly look inside of the Kam-Kotia Mine's annual report for 1988 which previously would have been the Sask Minerals annual report, and what do I see but the smiling faces of four people, I believe all of them from Toronto, certainly none of them recognizable from previous annual reports where there were Saskatchewan people in it.

Not only now does that mean that the profits from Sask Minerals are flowing out of Saskatchewan — in this case to Kam-Kotia — but it also means that for the six people in Chaplin alone that have lost their jobs, it's pretty devastating because you can't just go any place in Chaplin and expect to find a job, expect to find meaningful employment. So for those six people and their families, the sale of Sask Minerals to Kam-Kotia of Ontario has been devastating.

And, Mr. Speaker, that's really what this debate is really all about. It's, do we choose to stand up for Saskatchewan workers; do we choose to stand up for Saskatchewan profits, profits that can be used to pay for hospitals and education and various health services; can be used for building highways; can be used to fund social services. And indeed because of the profits that come from our Crown corporations, it reduces or eliminates the need to increase personal income tax.

Because the Minister of Finance doesn't give a hoot whether he gets the money from me as an individual citizen or whether he gets it from the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, or from Sask Minerals, or from SaskTel, or from SaskPower, or from SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation). It matters not. The fact is he'll spend that dollar, and indeed he's shown he will spend that dollar several times over and borrow very heavily on our future.

But the point I'm making here is the Minister of Finance doesn't care where the dollar comes from in the budget. The fact is he needs the money to sustain our provincial economy and sustain the things that the provincial government is expected to do for us all.

It is interesting, while I'm talking about the Minister of Finance, in his budget he was explaining, well yes, we are very heavily taxed. Yes indeed, Saskatchewan taxes have not decreased 10 per cent as they promised before they were elected. Indeed they've gone up well in excess of 10 per cent, but he said, Saskatchewan people are still better off because of three things. And you'll find that in the *Leader-Post* if you care to look at it. Not today's, but the *Leader-Post* of a day after the budget.

The three arguments the Minister of Finance used why Saskatchewan people are indeed better off than people in

many other provinces are: one, we have lower home heating rates. Lower home heating rates. Two, we have amongst the lowest insurance rates in Canada, and the third was the telephone rates. The third reason was the telephone rates.

Mr. Speaker, I've just listed three Crown corporations that they're going to sell. The Minister of Finance says we're better off in Saskatchewan because SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) provides cheap insurance, low-cost insurance, both on automobiles of all kinds and on homes and businesses, that sort of thing.

Now we see grandiose announcements that SGI is going to be sold. Well what does that mean for Saskatchewan people? What does it mean for the many hundreds of people who are working in SGI's head office? Not in Toronto or Winnipeg or New York or Tokyo. Not in any of those places. The head office is right here in Regina, in Saskatchewan. Sons and daughters of farmers and working people and business men all across Saskatchewan are working in the SGI head office building right here in Regina and have for a good number of years.

So in addition to providing the best insurance rates in Canada, we're providing many hundreds of jobs right here in Saskatchewan. Not in New York, not in Winnipeg, not in Tokyo, not in Yew York, but right here in Regina. That to me is one of the greatest arguments for maintaining SGI as a Crown corporation. Forget this insanity of trying to sell it off or give it away just to a few select friends, a few big money friends, a few people that perhaps — not likely just perhaps, but in all likelihood will, make donations to the Conservative Party.

Instead of that, let us keep the best insurance system in Canada. Let us keep the many hundreds of SGI employees employed right here in Saskatchewan. And let's keep the profits of SGI right at home.

When SGI was first set up — Tommy Douglas and the CCF set it up in the mid-1940s — the major reason for setting it up, Mr. Speaker, was quite simply that the other insurance companies refused to insure many of the farms across Saskatchewan; refused insurance at any cost. And indeed the premiums were very high in the cities of Regina and Saskatoon where we had fire-fighting capabilities, but the premiums were higher in Saskatchewan than they were elsewhere.

Right within two years of SGI being set up, the private insurance companies had their schedules, their insurance schedules laid out, and they had a rate for western Canada and it said, deduct 10 per cent for Saskatchewan — deduct 10 per cent for Saskatchewan.

So the insurance rates plummeted right after the inception of SGI and insurance was provided. Many, many people across this province know exactly what I'm saying. They were refused insurance by other carriers, and SGI stepped into the breach and sold them good, basic insurance.

One of the other reasons that the Minister of Finance said the cost of living was going to be lower in Saskatchewan, he was using the example of home heating costs. Well that's what we're debating today in that this Bill deals

with the privatization of SaskPower, the natural gas portion. In other words, the home heating portion of SaskPower is going to be privatized.

Up until now, Mr. Speaker, we have only . . . all SaskPower has needed to do is generate enough income to maintain its facilities and pay off whatever debts it has incurred in building those facilities, but in the long term there has been no need for a profit for shareholders from Ontario or shareholders from the United States or shareholders from Europe or anywhere else. You can't make money, you can't make a profit from yourself, so SaskPower simply operates with the lowest rates it can in maintaining its infrastructure, and we would wish nothing different than that.

But under this Bill we're going to see the natural gas portion of SaskPower privatized. Then we see quite simply the profit motivation stepping into the picture. We're going to see SaskPower natural gas rates jumping up. And why are they going to jump up? For no other reason than so they can pay a dividend to the shareholders.

I wonder what the Minister of Finance will use then in other years, how he will justify Saskatchewan having a higher tax rate, a higher personal tax rate, plus he won't be able to go and say we've got lower home heating costs than other provinces. He won't be able to say we've got lower insurance rates than other provinces.

And indeed they're taking steps to eliminate any of the benefits that we've had with SaskTel. And by that I'm talking, of course, of the privatization that has already occurred with regards to the computer operations of SaskTel, WESTBRIDGE having taken that over. Now it's privatized, so when SaskTel needs their computing work done, they farm it out and pay a price to WESTBRIDGE, and WESTBRIDGE wants to make a profit. I don't object to WESTBRIDGE wanting to make a profit, but what I object to is why would we privatize a portion of our Crown corporation simply so that we can pay the money out to a private company. It makes no sense at all. You've added about 20 per cent cost to the previous cost of doing the computing.

The latest example we see in SaskTel is the privatization of the telephone directories. Telephone directories which . . . you take all of the telephone directories in Saskatchewan, and they have been making between 7 and \$14 million profit in each of the last four years for SaskTel; 7 to \$14 million profit, annual profit, for SaskTel.

The profit, Mr. Speaker, is there, then used to do any number of things. One might be to make improvements in equipment; one might be to help keep SaskTel rates lower. Because if SaskTel is losing out on, for example, \$10 million profit this year, they have to find that money somewhere, and increasingly it is being found in our monthly phone bill — the monthly telephone bill that all users of SaskTel pay.

So in another year we're not going to have that argument either. And just watch, later this year, later this year there's going to be deregulation of long distance telephone calls, opening up the market for competition

from private industry. SaskTel is going to be the biggest financial loser of all telephone companies in Canada; of all telephone companies, SaskTel loses the most money under this deregulation and privatization. It's going to be real interesting to watch government members trying to oppose this deregulation of long distance telephone lines.

I ask the people of Saskatchewan to think about it long and hard this summer when they see the minister responsible for telephones standing up and saying, well I'm opposed to this long distance deregulation. Well where is the minister responsible for telephones today? Where is the government today? Silent on that issue, because it hasn't hit the public yet. But mark my words, later this year deregulation of long distance lines is going to come up.

We on this side of the legislature are firmly opposed to that deregulation of long distance lines because it's going to mean increased cost in our monthly rental for our telephones. Our monthly rates are going to have to be elevated simply to replace the lost revenue that SaskTel will in fact be losing.

(1130)

Mr. Speaker, before the election government members were promising no privatization of public utilities; no privatization at all of public utilities. But I don't know how that squares with what we're here debating today.

How does that "no privatization of utilities" square with the privatization of SaskPower's natural gas arm? How does the promise by the government that they would not privatize any utilities, how does that square with the sell-off of SGI insurance? How does that square with the privatization to sell off the computer services at SaskTel? How does it compare with the virtual give-away, but I'll call it a sell-off, of the telephone directories at SaskTel? How does it square with the deregulation of long distance telephone calls that is going to be taking place later this year?

And the answer is, quite simply it does not square. The people of Saskatchewan were misled prior to the election, and now we're reaping the benefits of a government that has gone completely out of control, doesn't care a whit about the people, doesn't care a whit about their promises. They think that promises made, whether it be during an election or any time before that or after, promises are just meant to be broken.

Not much wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the general public holds politicians in such low esteem — not much wonder. I resent it because it reflects on us on this side of the House — on this side of the House, we who have a long and proud tradition of keeping our election promises. We have faithfully, since Tommy Douglas was first elected in 1944, we have faithfully tried our level best to keep our election promises.

You talk about elections on issues — 1978 the election was fought . . . one of the major issues of the day was the NDP plans to purchase into the potash industry and to set up the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. We fought an election on that, or members then on this side of the

government fought an election on that very issue.

Not one peep from the government opposite about privatization before or during the election, and now they come in with this massive game plan to fundamentally change our province in a very, very hurtful, negative, harmful way that's going to put workers out of work, going to move head offices out of Saskatchewan, going to drive whatever profits there are out of Saskatchewan — out of Saskatchewan.

And we've seen a government that has taken \$139 million surplus, turned it into a nearly \$4 billion debt and they're now saying: trust us; trust us just one more time. Everything we've tried so far has gone sour, but if we roll the dice enough times, one of these times we're going to get sevens, they're saying. Trust us; trust us. How long, Mr. Speaker, can we be expected to keep going on in this blind faith that something somewhere is going to turn out right for the government.

People in my constituency are fed right up. They have seen the property improvement grant snatched away from them. It was \$230 a year. The election promise that Allan Blakeney and the New Democrats had in 1982 was that \$230 property improvement grant would be moving to \$260 annually — not one penny of it now; not one penny of it now. They're fed up.

There's people in my constituency who bought used cars, and remember when you had that infamous used car tax?

**An Hon. Member:** — Another cash grab.

**Mr. Trew:** — Another cash grab. A used car sales tax imposed on primarily middle class and poorer people, because the wealthy tend not to buy a whole lot of used vehicles. It's some of the rest of us who buy used vehicles.

Now we see further injury added. We see a 2 cent tax on unleaded gas, unleaded gas which is going to disappear, is it the end of this year?

**An Hon. Member:** — End of '90.

**Mr. Trew:** — End of 1990. Within two years unleaded gas will be unavailable anyway because the refiners are going to stop manufacturing it. But we see another tax grab on the poor from the members opposite, the government, particularly the Minister of Finance, 2 cents a litre imposed on drivers of primarily older vehicles. And people who drive older vehicles, as I pointed out, tend not to be the wealthy people that the Tories want to represent. They tend to be the people that are struggling and just trying to get ahead. And at every turn they're met with problems. They buy a used car; suddenly they have to pay the education tax on it. They were renting; the renters' rebate disappeared. They buy a house; the property improvement grant disappears. They see their school taxes escalating annually. They see the civic taxes going up, and why?

**An Hon. Member:** — Privatization.

**Mr. Trew:** — Because of privatization and this government's inability or lack of desire to share some of

the revenue with the municipalities and the local school boards, so we're being taxed to death.

If we're not taxed by the member for Lumsden, the Minister of Finance, we're being taxed at the more local level, but simply because the revenue sharing is not there to the extent that it was under the New Democrats. It's a level of . . . there are levels of funding needed for municipalities and for school boards, and I very much look forward, Mr. Speaker, to being part of a government that again moves in that direction, that again moves towards increased revenue sharing to the local areas where the tax revenue can be used.

I mentioned that Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan was an election issue in 1978. The government privatized the PAPCO (Prince Albert Pulp Company) pulp mill at P.A., and they were telling us it was losing \$91,000 a day. I very much . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Let me talk about it. Sit down and I'll talk about it.

**Mr. Trew:** — You want to talk about the big sheeter again? I very much disagree that that mill, that pulp mill was losing \$91,000 a day. We are on record of talking about how that plant had made money under the New Democrats, had made lots of money under the New Democrats, and only lost money under the Tories. But I'm going to use their argument, I'm going to use your argument. You sold it because it was losing \$91,000 a day, so you say. Well you say that Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is making nearly \$300,000 a day profit for the people of Saskatchewan in 1988 — nearly \$300,000 a day to fund schools and education, and if you chose, you could put it even into highways. Obviously you haven't chosen to do that.

But if ever there was an argument for maintaining a Crown corporation, Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan with \$106 million profit last year for the people of Saskatchewan, that is an argument for not privatizing; that is an argument for keeping Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, along with a good number of the other Crowns.

Incidentally Mr. Speaker, Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is one company. There are — is it five or six other potash companies in Saskatchewan? It matters not whether it's five or six. PCS is the only company that has its head office here in Saskatchewan. It's here in Saskatoon; head office employing just shy of a hundred people. I suspect if you counted the building maintenance people and so on, it would be in excess of 100 people. That's 100 jobs in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan — not in New York, New York.

**An Hon. Member:** — Why is it here?

**Mr. Trew:** — Why is it here? my colleague from Regina Victoria asks. Why is the head office of Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan here in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan? It is here because Allan Blakeney and the New Democrats bought into the potash corporation, into the potash industry, created Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and moved that head office from New

York to Saskatoon, Saskatchewan — a hundred jobs.

Members opposite may laugh about a mere 100 jobs, but I suspect if you paid a little bit more attention to a mere 100 jobs here, a mere 50 jobs there, a mere half a dozen jobs at Chaplin, if you'd paid attention to the multitude of little things that have gone wrong, we wouldn't be faced with the massive out-flow of people that Saskatchewan is faced with today. People are leaving because, well it's only 100 jobs, or it's only six jobs.

But whether it's 100 jobs or six jobs or just one job, Mr. Speaker, if that job happened to be your job, it would profoundly affect you. If it happened to be my job, it would profoundly affect me. For the person losing the job it is absolutely devastating, and there are not any great number of jobs to be had out in Saskatchewan. Although I do confess, I think it's part of the privatization scheme.

I was reading the April 13th *Western Producer*, and I see there's a tender call out for mowing of the ditches, as my colleague, the member from Regina Elphinstone pointed out. We sold PAPCO to Weyerhaeuser from Tacoma, Washington, allowed them to move in their management expertise, allowed them to tell us how to run a pulp mill. We were saying quite clearly to Weyerhaeuser and to the world, well obviously Saskatchewan people aren't good enough to run a pulp mill, aren't good enough. So we bring in their expertise so they can tell us how to run a pulp mill, but we can still tell them how to mow ditches. Mowing ditches is plenty good enough for Saskatchewan people, but managing a pulp mill is not.

Running a potash company is not good enough for Saskatchewan people. You're saying, by your movement towards privatizing, you're saying we will let out-of-province and, in many cases, out-of-country companies come in, run our businesses. They can take all of the cream off it; they can use and exploit our workers however they want. We'll let them do that, but we're going to keep all of the jobs that really don't require a huge amount of training.

And I do apologize to anybody who mows ditches that I may have offended. I realize that it's not nearly as easy as what I'm suggesting, but I also realize that they didn't need to go to university for four years to learn how to do it. There's a great many safety considerations come into mowing ditches, and indeed it can be a dangerous job because of the danger of vehicles tipping over and that sort of thing. So I want to assure people who mow the ditches of Saskatchewan, my comments were not intended to be personal.

I'm going to go back to Sask Minerals in Chaplin, which I started my speech with, Mr. Speaker, and I have mentioned that the picture in the Kam-Kotia annual report, which should have been the Sask Minerals annual report, has four people . . .

(1145)

**An Hon. Member:** — And they're smiling.

**Mr. Trew:** — And smiling, and they have every right to be smiling — four people from Toronto. Kam-Kotia, a little

operation that had some shares in a worn-out uranium mine, had a few shares in that, and were essentially given Kam-Kotia. Certainly . . . or pardon me, were essentially given Sask Minerals.

The company, the Sask Minerals Crown was grossly undervalued, grossly, grossly undervalued, in excess of \$5 million undervalued, sold it to an Ontario firm. As a result now six Saskatchewan people in Chaplin alone are out of work, six people. Where are the profits going now? Certainly not into the provincial treasuries. The profits are now going to shareholders primarily . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Those smiling.

**Mr. Trew:** — Yes, the smiling shareholders, primarily from Ontario, Mr. Speaker.

So Sask Minerals, though it was small in the grandiose scheme of things, in the scheme of Crown corporations in Saskatchewan, it is symbolic and very, very important because as they did with Sask Minerals, so they want to do with everything else. Undervalue, grossly undervalue a company and then sell it for less than you value it for, and then sell it to shareholders primarily from out of province. And that's a shame, because we're losing control of our province.

The deal selling Sask Minerals was good for the buyer, but it was bad for the people of Saskatchewan, bad for the taxpayers, and it was devastating for those six individuals who have lost their job in Chaplin, devastating. But you don't hear anything from the government about those jobs lost.

A final footnote on the Sask Minerals operation. It was sold, Mr. Speaker, for a price that equalled three years profit of Sask Minerals, equalled three years profit. Now I can hardly blame Kam-Kotia for wanting to buy Sask Minerals under those terms. Anybody would be an absolute fool and an idiot — and I'm not accusing the Kam-Kotia people of that — anybody would be a fool or an idiot not to take up this government on the chance to take over a going concern, an operation that made money every year since 1944 with the exception of one year when they showed a loss of something less than \$100,000. And not a peep, Mr. Speaker, before they sold to the workers. They never asked the workers if they wanted to buy.

This Sask Minerals sale in many ways goes back to one of the earliest sales that the government made, and that was in 1982 or '83 when they sold the Manalta coal-mine — sold the coal-mine down at Coronach to Manalta Coal from Calgary — Manalta owned by a Mr. Mannix, a multimillionaire who resides, actually has an estate in downtown Calgary with a nice creek running by his property.

This coal-mine, Mr. Speaker, cost SaskPower \$137 million to develop the coal mine, to get it where they start bringing coal out. One hundred and thirty-seven million, and what did they give it away for? One hundred and two million dollars, and that isn't even the half of it. Eighty-five million of that 102, 85 million was guaranteed and financed by the Government of Saskatchewan at an 8

per cent interest rate. And that's called a good deal!

It is ludicrous to think that the government members opposite are even capable of making a good deal, because you can't stand up and you can't point to one single good deal that you've made. All of your privatization schemes have resulted in loss of money to the people of Saskatchewan, loss in potential profits for evermore, and in most cases it's meant loss of jobs, loss of jobs.

And what are we all here for but to look after our constituents, whether they be in Regina North or whether they be in Saltcoats or whether they be in Regina South even, or anywhere in the province. We are here essentially to look after our constituents. The sale of the coal-mine down at Coronach clearly did not look after my constituents' interests, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest to you they didn't look after yours either. You were not well served in sitting on your hands and allowing that give-away to take place. That's what part of what this debate is really, really all about. Who is going to control Saskatchewan? Do we want it again to be controlled by out-of-province wealthy companies, or do we want to maintain some control of our province right here in Saskatchewan.

I'll take you on a little historical trip, Mr. Speaker. In 1944, when Tommy Douglas came into office here in Saskatchewan, civil servants would take their pay cheques to the bank and they would say, can you cash this pay cheque? And the banker, depending on whether the government had been able to scrape together a little bit of money that day or not, would say, yes I can cash your cheque today, in which case it was quickly done and the person took all of the money with him, because they were afraid that the government would find out the cheque was not good; or what also happened was cheques were not cashed because the government had not been able to make a deposit.

Within three years, Mr. Speaker, of that taking place, within three years of Tommy Douglas and the CCF being elected, we in Saskatchewan had our financial affairs pretty well in hand. We were not a wealthy province. We were still a have-not province, but Tommy Douglas and the CCF introduced hospitalization. You were still responsible to pay the doctor's bill, but the hospital was provided free of charge. So it took that out. And then it was some 15 years later when full-bore medicare became a reality, started in North America right here in Saskatchewan under Tommy Douglas and the CCF.

They had managed this province so well, Mr. Speaker, partially through the creation of Crown corporations, and the wealth that that produced was used by the Government of Saskatchewan for the people of Saskatchewan. We had full medicare, as we understand it today, funded 100 per cent by the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. The government of Saskatchewan had run this province so well that we had full medicare, medicare which, the Minister of Finance is so quick to point out, is the biggest single item in the budget, in the provincial budget — medicare, the biggest single item — but today the costs are split between the province and Canada. Not so for the first number of years. Not so. We funded it

collectively 100 per cent here. That's Saskatchewan's greatest gift to Canada. It was our absolute greatest gift to Canada, one I'm very proud of.

Then the people of Saskatchewan in their wisdom decided that the CCF(Co-operative Commonwealth Federation) needed a little bit of a break, and perhaps they were right — I guess they were right; the voters always are — and they elected Ross Thatcher and the Liberals. Well the Liberal era, from 1964 to 1971, saw the sell-off of Crown corporations, saw the sell-off of Saskatchewan's assets that Tommy Douglas and the CCF had worked so hard to build — sold the assets off. And many of us will recall the 1967 election when there was literally thousands and thousands of political highways paved.

I recall the highway coming down from Macrorie past Lucky Lake in 1967, and they got about a half a mile west of Lucky Lake on the road towards my original home town of Beechy, and there was a pile of asphalt still sitting there. There was all the equipment sitting there. They shut it down on the Friday and, you know, that never turned another wheel.

The election was held; the equipment disappeared the next day; the highway we had been promised simply was not delivered. And to make matters worse, the highway that they had paved to Lucky Lake broke up within two years because it was such a thin, thin layer of asphalt and they hadn't done the necessary preparation. All they were interested in was make it look good for the election, and it worked. In 1967 it worked.

But I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, in 1971 it sure didn't work. One of the proud things I recall that day, the Liberal candidate came around to our school; we kicked him out. We students kicked him out. We ran him off the property. We'd had enough of their broken promises, enough of their corruption, enough, enough, enough. We wouldn't talk to him. He was gone and he never came back. Indeed, he didn't get elected either.

But I was quite proud of that, Mr. Speaker, simply because the people of Saskatchewan in 1971 had had enough of the Thatcher Liberals, had enough of that free enterprise government that was taking them nowhere. They saw their farms were in desperate shape. They saw that the towns and villages and hamlets of Saskatchewan were going downhill. They saw that the only people that counted to that government was the wealthy corporations and the most wealthy of people.

So Allan Blakeney became the premier then, in 1971, with his new deal for people — Allan Blakeney and the New Democrats. And we in Saskatchewan enjoyed very good times. People coming out of high school today, Mr. Speaker, I know whenever I say it to them they just find it almost impossible to believe. But I graduated from grade 12 in 1971. I have never in my life been refused a job. When I was unemployed, the first place I asked was where I got a job. And that sure isn't the case today. I'm delighted that I'm not unemployed today. The member for Saltcoats says I was probably working for the CCF. Yes, my first job was working for the local co-op garage.

**An Hon. Member:** — Same thing.

**Mr. Trew:** — Same thing. Another job was working for an Esso service station in Saskatoon. Oh, same thing, same thing, he says. How ludicrous!

People in Saskatchewan through the 1970s, Mr. Speaker, many of us considered ourselves to be essentially non-political. I know I was very happy with the opportunities that there were around Saskatchewan. My neighbours were all doing well. I was advancing at my work, raising a very small family, but it seemed like there was opportunities abundantly for everyone. Things were going ahead.

Indeed, I talked to the member for Saltcoats about my first job in 1971, working at the local co-op garage. I was paid \$1 an hour; that was the minimum wage. Dollar an hour — minimum wage in 1971. By 1982 the minimum wage under Al Blakeney and the New Democrats had increased by \$3.25 to \$4.25. There was two more 50-cent increases on the books, ready to be implemented. That would have taken the minimum wage to five and a quarter today, if there had been no other changes. But what's the minimum wage today, Mr. Speaker? Four dollars and fifty cents. There's been one miserly, two-bit increase in minimum wage in seven sorry, long, Tory years — two bits.

(1200)

The government opposite has given up saying, oh well, we're the government of the working people. They've given up on that, and as they should. Action speaks volumes. Action speaks far, far louder than words. A lousy two-bit increase in the minimum wage clearly shows what this government thinks of people starting employment and people working at the minimum wage jobs that do not require a university degree, do not require a course from a technical institute.

There's some conflict as to the amount of people, Mr. Speaker, in the province that are on minimum wage, but I've heard anything from 40 to 80,000 of Saskatchewan's working men and women are on minimum wage. Forty to 80,000; I don't care, use your own number, but for a minimum of 40,000 people, actions of this government have been absolutely devastating.

Mr. Speaker, I've been making an argument against privatization of Crowns, based on a number of things: one, the revenue that will come into the coffers of the government; second, the job loss; a third argument I've been using is the control that we would have for Saskatchewan people.

But I just want to talk about the revenue for a minute, and what that means to Saskatchewan people. Since 1982, Saskatchewan farm property tax has gone up from 80 to \$116 million, or a 45 per cent increase — a 45 per cent increase since the Tories came into power, at a time when agriculture is in a crisis.

Electrical and telephone expenses have gone up in the same time period 38 per cent. I'm talking 38 per cent, from 50 million to \$69 million, Mr. Speaker, all of those increases necessary, in part, because this government is

afraid of Crown corporations. They are afraid to make them work, because if a Crown corporation works well, it means those horrendous socialists — me and my colleagues — maybe are right, maybe we're right.

So I liken it, Mr. Speaker, to if you wanted to buy a confectionery . . . you have two people wanting to buy a confectionery. One of them is convinced the confectionery is the greatest business to be in and it'll make money. The second person thinks a confectionery simply means all kinds of long hours; means most of the customers will shop-lift; it means high business taxes; got to pay wages to employees; you can't make a go of it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, of those two people, you know which one is going to make a go of it. It's the one that thinks the confectionery business is the greatest business in the world to be in. The one that doesn't make a go of it is the one, the person who thinks the confectionery business is no good.

And that is exactly what this government thinks about Crown corporations. They think it can't work. Despite that from 1944 to present, we have had a history, a long, proud history in this province, of Crown corporations being used to the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan.

Despite that, government members opposite are just in a mad dash to give away all of the Crown corporations. The terms don't matter. Just get rid of them. The terms don't matter. They showed that with the Weyerhaeuser deal — a quarter of a billion dollar give-away. Then . . . bad enough that they gave away a quarter of a billion dollar asset with no down payment; bad enough for that, but then they turned around and paid Weyerhaeuser of Tacoma, Washington for the roads that PAPCO had built, paid them for the roads that PAPCO had built. Close to \$6 million in cash went from the provincial treasury to Weyerhaeuser to pay Weyerhaeuser for roads that PAPCO had built.

It doesn't somehow sit right. The people of Saskatchewan know it doesn't sit right. They want this tired, worn out, rusted government to get out of the way, let the New Democrats govern, let the member for Saskatoon Riversdale turn this province right side up. And that day is coming, and it's coming faster than government members think it is. It's certainly coming faster than you will want it.

I urge you to call an election on this privatization issue because you've never asked the people of Saskatchewan for a mandate on privatization. You have ignored it in campaigns; you have ignored it in your campaign literature. I urge you, call the election. If you're so cocksure of yourselves that this is the way to go, call the election; let the people of Saskatchewan decide. And they will decide, and they'll make the right decision. They'll make the right decision . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — You're history in Regina North anyhow, Trew, so it doesn't matter.

**Mr. Trew:** — The member for Regina South, I hear him saying he's going to come back and run against me in Regina North. I'm glad to hear that. That's not exactly what he said; he said I'm history in Regina North. I



thought that meant that you would be coming back to the constituency you represented before you knew you didn't have a snowball's chance in Hades of getting elected there.

Mr. Speaker, I started by saying that Saskatchewan is not New York; this is not New York, this is Saskatchewan. Things that have worked in New York don't always work here.

We in Saskatchewan must continue the tradition, the very proud tradition of neighbour and friend helping neighbour and friend, working together, making the three engines of Saskatchewan's economy work, those three engines being private enterprise; the co-operative sector — ignored by this government, but which will be rejuvenated under the New Democrats — private enterprise; co-operative sector and the Crown corporations, the Crown sector which is a vital and important part of our Saskatchewan tradition, our Saskatchewan heritage. It's a part of Saskatchewan that you members opposite are going to have to explain to your children and to your grandchildren, if they're still in Saskatchewan, if they don't join the thousands that are fleeing the province. You will have to explain to them why it is Saskatchewan is going to be perpetually, for ever, a have-not province, because you gave away the Crown corporations.

So I end my taking part in this debate, Mr. Speaker, simply by urging government members to get out, talk to your constituents, find out what they're saying. If you're that certain that you're on the right track, call an election. Legitimize this thing. Call an election. Let the people of Saskatchewan decide.

Mr. Speaker, I am firmly and adamantly opposed to this privatization, piratization — whatever you want to call it. I am firmly opposed to this give-off, give-away, of Saskatchewan's assets. I fear for our very future, for the jobs, for the taxes, the profits that are going to be lost. I will be opposing this Bill.

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

**Mr. Anguish:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to be able to take part in the debate on Bill 1 today. Bill 1 is an Act to establish the Public Participation Program put forward by the Minister of Public Participation, the member from Indian Head-Wolseley.

I do find it very interesting, Mr. Speaker, that not one member from the government side has risen in their place to debate this, which is a very important Bill for the history of the province of Saskatchewan. It's important to the history of the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, because it drastically changes the face of Saskatchewan from what we have known Saskatchewan to be in the past, and it certainly is not something that all people in Saskatchewan are happy with.

I would say that the people who are most happy with it are not the members opposite, but their friends in big business, the corporate sector, the card carrying Tories throughout the province who have reaped benefit in their own pockets at the expense of Saskatchewan taxpayers

and Saskatchewan citizens. And I think it's a very sad day when this Bill passes. And it likely will pass because the government has such a large majority.

I do find it disgraceful though however, Mr. Speaker, that not one member on the government side has risen in their place to put forward their case as to why there is a need for Bill 1, An Act to establish the Public Participation Program in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a very short Bill; many longer Bills than this. It's just a matter of a few pages. In fact, the total content of the Bill including the cover page, is a total of six pages. And in those six pages we identify two separate parts to the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

First off, the Bill's first section is somewhat worrisome to us. And the first part, it appears that it gives the minister enormous powers to privatize or piratize anything that the minister wants to privatize or piratize. And I think public participation is an inaccurate term. As I mentioned, it's more an item of privatization. In some cases it is piratization because the people of Saskatchewan get no benefit. The people who are receiving the benefit are those who are in favour with this Tory government, Mr. Speaker.

Now the minister says that this first section is not to be worried about. He says that it's . . . this sweeping omnibus powers are really not sinister and alarming. But if they're not sinister and alarming, why would they want to have that section in the Bill, Mr. Speaker?

And I want to talk about the very essence of this Bill a little later. But first, the second part has to deal with the protection of employee benefits for those employees that are affected by privatization, those people who have worked in the public sector, either for a Crown corporation or an agency that has been privatized by the government. And I would welcome an explanation from that side of the House as to how this Bill will in fact protect or give benefits to employees who are displaced by the cruel and harsh treatment that has been taking place up to this point by the privatization plan of this government.

And now I find it astounding that this Bill comes in at this time, when we look back over the past number of years, in fact since 1982, at the number of things that have been privatized in the province of Saskatchewan. There are many of them, and I'll go on to listing those a little later.

I maintain to you, Mr. Speaker, that the only reason the government puts forward this Bill now is because they want to try and develop it into an election issue. The government is in trouble. They need something as an issue to stand on that would maybe balance the scales in their favour, and they think that this Bill on privatization is going to be the item that they can go into the next election campaign with. Well I tell you, Mr. Speaker, this is not the item that they're going to win the next election on. It doesn't matter what item they go on, they're not going to win the next election in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a useless piece of legislation, other than the government looking for that election issue. If you look at the government's record from 1982 when they

were first elected up until October of 1986, they were fairly moderate in the changes they made to the face of Saskatchewan and the way the public, private, and co-operative sectors interacted with each other. In fact, the only major one I can remember during that period of time was the privatization of Saskoil.

And, Mr. Speaker, we all know today what happened with Saskoil. Saskoil had shares trade on the stock exchange. Today we have 75 per cent of those shares owned outside of the province of Saskatchewan. People in the province of Saskatchewan no longer have the ownership of Saskoil, the first big privatization move by this government.

(1215)

Immediately upon the privatization move of Saskoil, many of their operations moved outside the province. Some of the operations in Saskatchewan were closed down. I can remember an operation in the heavy oil patch by Meota, close to the area I represent, Mr. Speaker, where Canterra and Saskoil — Canterra was the operator; Saskoil was a partner — Saskoil pulled out on an enhanced recovery project in the heavy oil patch. Where did they pull out and put their intensity in their operation? Into Alberta, Mr. Speaker. What happened to employees? Hundreds of employees were laid off from Saskoil because of the privatization move.

And now they're saying in this Bill, Mr. Speaker, we're going to provide protection to employees. We have a section in the Bill that actually deals with employee benefits, and it starts on page three and runs through to pretty well the end of the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Well you tell those employees from Saskoil that were laid off how much protection they got.

Will this protection, Mr. Speaker, be retroactive for all the people that you members on the government side have devastated in the province of Saskatchewan? I don't see any retroactivity in the Bill. So the Bill is a farce, Mr. Speaker.

The only other thing besides Saskoil between 1982 and 1986 that was privatized were really minor services that didn't receive much attention in the media, and the people in the province were really very much unaware of the thrust of the government towards privatization, Mr. Speaker.

But then people really became aware of what was happening after the election of October 20 in 1986, when this government never asked permission of anyone. It didn't ask permission of the Legislative Assembly. I don't even know if they asked permission of their own caucus. Maybe it was just the inner cabinet got together with the cheer-leader from Albert Street South, and decided well we're going to privatize this, we're going to privatize that. They certainly didn't ask anybody in the province of Saskatchewan because people in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, would have said no, if for no other reason, just on the basis of what had happened with the privatization of Saskoil.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what are some of the things that

happened, and there are many. Let's look at SaskCOMP. Let's look at the SaskTel computer services and SaskTel's data bank. All of a sudden, WESTBRIDGE comes along. WESTBRIDGE acquires a very good deal from this government, from the inner cabinet to acquire SaskCOMP and SaskTel's computer services.

And now that brings up some very interesting questions, Mr. Speaker. What about the security of information in the data banks, security of information that was taken care of by people who were in jobs, who had the interests of the citizens of the province at heart as their primary, number one responsibility?

What about WESTBRIDGE, Mr. Speaker? Is their number one priority security of information in data banks? Will they give us their assurance that information about people's medical backgrounds and histories, about people's personal information will be held with confidentiality? Is that WESTBRIDGE'S number one responsibility, Mr. Speaker? No, it's not. The number one responsibility of WESTBRIDGE is to make a profit, to make a profit for their shareholders because that's the nature of the private sector.

And I don't criticize profit, Mr. Speaker, because the private sector is very important. But when you're dealing with the vital interests of the province and the people of Saskatchewan, number one should be a responsibility for confidentiality of the information that's contained in the computer systems and the data banks that were under the public sector prior to the government privatizing those public sector operations and putting them into the hands of WESTBRIDGE, Mr. Speaker. That's only one little thing that happened. It's a big thing, but it's a little thing in the overall scheme.

Mr. Speaker, look at the school-based dental program. Four hundred dental therapists fired; called into a room by the Minister of Health and fired. No forewarning, nothing. They turn over the plan to private sector dentists. What's the objective of private sector dentists, Mr. Speaker? Well I would say it's the same as WESTBRIDGE. It's to make a profit, because that's the reason they're in business.

I don't criticize that again, Mr. Speaker, but why should we pay more for a program that provides less service to children throughout the entire province of Saskatchewan? A world-renowned program, Mr. Speaker, that was acknowledged to be the best in North America, at least the best in North America, if not anywhere in the world.

People from underdeveloped countries, people from developed countries, industrialized countries, looked at the school-based program that was started in the province of Saskatchewan, because they know throughout the world that Saskatchewan has been the leader in health care since the beginning of public health care anywhere in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I maintain that that was a bad move, and that happened well before this Bill came in. Does the employee benefits section of this Bill give any protection to the dental therapists that were laid off and fired in the

province of Saskatchewan? No, I don't think so, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't provide them any protection at all. In fact the dental therapists should be on to the minister, asking whether or not they're going to get the same protection as this Bill provides for the glossy times that this government wants to put into place, to call an election campaign, Mr. Speaker.

Those dental therapists should be writing, phoning, asking the minister what's going to happen with them. Do they get benefit? What was their benefit? They were turned out to give a chance to work in the private sector. Have they got jobs, all of them? No, Mr. Speaker, because everybody knows there are less jobs in Saskatchewan today than there were five years ago, six years ago, 10 years ago. There's going to be less jobs in Saskatchewan every day, Mr. Speaker.

Month of February, 6,000 people left the province of Saskatchewan. The number of unemployed goes from 21,000 in '81 to about 37,000 or more . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Forty-three now.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Forty-three thousand now. The hon. member from Moose Jaw tells me that it's 43,000 people in Saskatchewan on unemployment right now.

So this turning out to be able to work in the private sector is a farce, Mr. Speaker. That was the famous words of the flying Jimmy Garner who was the former minister of Highways. That's something else that happened, Mr. Speaker, before the last election. I shouldn't have said that was a minor thing because he laid off hundreds of Highways workers in the province of Saskatchewan to give them a chance to work in the private sector.

**An Hon. Member:** — Are they working?

**Mr. Anguish:** — Are they working? No, they're not working. Why aren't they working? Because the private sector highway firms that are Saskatchewan-based aren't working very much either, Mr. Speaker. Truckers who drive over the highway between here and Saskatoon, when they get out of their trucks after they've reached Saskatoon and reached Regina coming in the other direction, they sound like they're stuttering, whether they have a speech impediment or not, because the road is so rough in their trucks their voices vibrate. Ask any trucker who has to haul over highways in the province of Saskatchewan. So I guess those Highways workers that were given a chance to work in the private sector didn't have the opportunity to work in the private sector because there's no work in the private sector either, Mr. Speaker.

I notice the member from Regina South is gibbering from his seat. If he wants to make an intervention on this Bill, I'd be very happy to hear his comments in defence of this regressive legislation, some of the most regressive in the history of the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

**An Hon. Member:** — Sit down.

**Mr. Anguish:** — He's asking me to sit down, Mr. Speaker. The member from Regina South, if he would rise

immediately now and give his government's position in the defence of this piece of legislation, then I would consider taking my seat and allowing him to rise in his place. There's a 35-minute period left before adjournment, and we'd be very happy to hear what the minister has to say about this Bill, but not one of them has stood up and spoken yet, Mr. Speaker.

Why is that that you have not spoken on this Bill? Second reading on the principle of the Bill: the most important part of debate on any Bill is during the second reading. They won't defend their actions, Mr. Speaker.

Let's look at Sask Minerals, Mr. Speaker. Sask Minerals was sold under value. Kam-Kotia got a very good deal. Now they're talking about closing it down. There's workers being laid off. Sask Minerals was a Crown corporation, Mr. Speaker, since the 1940s. Every year they made a profit. Maybe one year . . . I recall one year, I think, looking at the record, that they maybe lost money, a small amount of money. But all the other years from the 1940s to the present made money that went into the Crown investments corporation every year. And the Crown investment corporation, Mr. Speaker, is sort of the bank of the Crown corporations. The profits that are made go into Crown investments corporation. Crown investments corporation sometimes gives money back out to fund other programs in the province of Saskatchewan.

And I've noticed most recently, Mr. Speaker, and the members would have to acknowledge this, that in the budget that was brought down by the Minister of Finance, that we just concluded the debate on and we're currently in Estimates, there's \$200 million going from Crown investments corporation into the general revenue to make the books almost balance. They don't balance; it's still the . . . the debt side has got the heaviest weight there. But \$200 million going from Crown investments corporation into general revenue in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Well I guess Sask Minerals won't be putting any more money into Crown investments corporation. So if Crown investments corporation isn't getting money from that Crown corporation and other Crown corporations and other public sector ownership, how is Crown investments corporation in the future going to be able to put money into the general revenue of the province of Saskatchewan? Well I guess, Mr. Speaker, they might not be able to.

So what does that mean for people in the province of Saskatchewan? More taxes. More taxes, Mr. Speaker, because the government is going to obliterate any other source of revenue other than personal taxation. They might say no, we have a corporate tax. Well corporate tax continues to decline, Mr. Speaker. And if you draw a line across the top of the scale, eventually corporate tax will disappear, Crown investments . . . money going into general revenue will disappear. Then what is left? Personal taxation, Mr. Speaker.

And if the government continues on the this course, we will see the highest taxation in the history of any place in North America, maybe throughout the world, Mr.

Speaker, because there's no other source of revenue if the government continues to go on the path that it's proceeding on.

The government did say at one time, Mr. Speaker, that they weren't going to privatize public utilities, those things that are important to the vitality, to the vital interests, I should say, of the province of Saskatchewan. So let's look at Sask Power Corporation. They split it into a gas division and an electrical division. And do you know what happened, Mr. Speaker, what people were astounded by? They ended up getting two power bills. They get one for their electricity and one for their gas. It used to be on one bill. People in the province can't understand why you'd pay double the administration, double the postage, to send them out their power bill.

What was wrong with the way it was before, Mr. Speaker, where you got one bill and it itemized your gas and it itemized your electricity? Why do we have to now pay 74 cents to send the same bill out when it used to go out for 37 cents, Mr. Speaker? People in the province can't comprehend why this government would do that.

But what a lot of people don't understand, Mr. Speaker, is that the electrical division of SaskPower always had to be subsidized, Mr. Speaker. How was it subsidized? Do the members opposite know? It was subsidized by the gas division of SaskPower because the gas division always made a profit. So profits from the gas division subsidized the electrical.

And now, Mr. Speaker, we hear the government saying they are going to sell off the gas division of SaskPower. What does that mean, Mr. Speaker? Well that means we're selling off the most valuable part of the asset and we're retaining the part that loses money. And because of the philosophy and the ideology, I suppose I should say, of this government, they're not going to subsidize it through a broad tax base. It's going to mean that electrical rates are going to go up in the province of Saskatchewan because the profitable side of SaskPower is being sold off and the liability side is being retained, Mr. Speaker. That is not fair for people in the province of Saskatchewan. It's unfair to deceive people by calling this public participation.

(1230)

There are some things that are popular, Mr. Speaker, and I would want to acknowledge that, but they are very few and small compared to the magnitude of the rip-off in the province of Saskatchewan of selling off our assets. The things that appeal to people are things like the TeleBonds, things like bonds for SaskPower, Mr. Speaker, because people can understand that they should have an opportunity to invest in money that's used by publicly owned corporations in the province of Saskatchewan, just as they have the opportunity to invest in the stock exchange for a privately owned company that may or may not deal in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. And the reason they see the logic of investing in Saskatchewan public corporations is because they might as well get a return on that investment rather than having their tax dollars going to paying a bank, or another financial institution, or some European market, or a

Japanese market, or an American market, where we pay taxpayers' dollars in interest.

So that makes sense, but that is where the sense stops, Mr. Speaker. It's like using Canada Savings Bonds, but that's where the sense stops, Mr. Speaker, because what's happening? We're selling off our assets and retaining the debt.

The government members during the last election campaign said that PAPCO, Prince Albert Pulp Company, was losing 91,000, or some amount of dollars per day. That was money being paid on the debt that PAPCO had.

So they said, we've got to sell it. And so they went into an agreement with Weyerhaeuser and, Mr. Speaker, there wasn't one volume; there wasn't two volumes; there wasn't three volumes of the agreement, Mr. Speaker, there was more. What happened? Well let's look at the document, Mr. Speaker. They decided, Mr. Speaker, that PAPCO was worth, in the agreement, page two, volume one — \$248 million.

**An Hon. Member:** — 100 million too cheap.

**Mr. Anguish:** — And the member says, one of the members says, Mr. Speaker, that was 100 million too cheap. Well it may have been. I wonder who wrote this agreement. Did Weyerhaeuser's lawyers write this agreement? Well I would think so, because it's not very good for people in the province of Saskatchewan.

Why is it not very good? Because although it was worth, according to this document, \$248 million, we never got a cent — never got a cent. And so that means that if Weyerhaeuser now has the Prince Albert pulp mill, the Big River saw mill, the chemical company in Saskatoon, and 7 million acres of forest, prime forest in northern Saskatchewan, they got that — for 20 years it says in the agreement, they've got the forest. What will be left of 7 million acres after 20 years? Nothing, nothing!

We never got any money. They got the asset; I've got to assume we've still got the debt. So we're losing now more than \$91,000 a day, Mr. Speaker, because of the rotten deal that's contained in this document, this document that was written by some Philadelphia lawyer. And I hope we have a lot less Philadelphia lawyers after the next election campaign, because they're ruining the province, Mr. Speaker.

So let's look just a little more at this agreement. What are they doing here? Well, Highways don't build roads any more. Weyerhaeuser tenders the roads. Here's an ad that they got 18.5 kilometres from Cowan Lake forestry access road and 11 kilometres for Revo forest access road, and it's contracted out while highways workers and equipment was sold off at fire sale prices.

Let's see what's in here. Oh, Weyerhaeuser, I guess, doesn't pay for all of it because it says here, and I quote, volume 1, page 9, Mr. Speaker:

(d) Immediate upgrading of road system: Saskatchewan will construct the following structures and roads at its expense in order to

accommodate Weyerhaeuser Canada's traffic on the road system:

Turn the page, page 10, Mr. Speaker:

(i) a new bridge over the Shell River on Highway 3 which will be completed prior to December 31, 1986; and

(ii) a road and interchange connecting Highway 3 and Highway 55 at Prince Albert, such that Weyerhaeuser's traffic does not need to proceed down Highway 2 in order to access Highway 55. Saskatchewan shall make its best effort to complete this work prior to December 31, 1988, but, subject to prompt approval by the Canadian Transport Commission, will complete such work no later than October 31, 1989.

Well we're paying for that road, Mr. Speaker. I wonder what else we're paying for in here? I would imagine we're paying for other things.

And I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that Weyerhaeuser is given exclusive right to harvest timber in the forestry management lease agreement for a period of 20 years, and I think I mentioned that. And now listen.

If the minister receives an application to harvest timber within a reserve timber supply area from a third party (that's someone else other than Weyerhaeuser or the Government of Saskatchewan because they're the two parties to this agreement), Weyerhaeuser Canada shall have right of first refusal on harvesting that area for a period of 30 days after they have received notice of such application from the minister.

So that shows you that they have exclusive rights over 7 million acres of forest in our prime forest area in northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. Now I think it's shameful that the government would give away our resources, our vital resources that take years and years to renew by such an agreement, written not by our people in the province of Saskatchewan but by Weyerhaeuser's people from Tacoma, Washington, Mr. Speaker, and I think that's a disgrace.

So, Mr. Speaker, there's very little that's good about this piece of legislation. The only thing I mentioned was in terms of some of the bonds, people can accept that. But to give away our heritage in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, is a disgrace, an absolute disgrace. And I think people have to ask themselves, in the province of Saskatchewan, what they're getting out of privatization and privatization in the province of Saskatchewan.

What do ordinary families have to show for it? Is more taxes a benefit, Mr. Speaker? I would think not. I don't know many Saskatchewan families who would see increased taxation as a benefit. That's what's happening with privatization. The ordinary Saskatchewan family, Saskatchewan individual, is paying more taxes, because we have retained debt while those bandits over there gave away our assets.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order. I know the member in his enthusiasm perhaps can get carried away, but referring to hon. members as bandits is unparliamentary, and I ask the hon. member to rise and withdraw those remarks.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well I'd certainly withdraw that comment if it's unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker, and I wouldn't even try and qualify it. If that's your ruling, I certainly withdraw the word "bandit." Thank you for drawing that to my attention, Mr. Speaker. I got so carried away with my enthusiasm and my anger for what's happening in the province of Saskatchewan that I guess I just lost control there for a minute.

But have Saskatchewan people got more jobs? No. Forty-three thousand people unemployed in the province. Are more people off of the social service rolls in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker? No. There are more, increasing every day, on the social assistance plan in the province of Saskatchewan. Are there more opportunities for young people in the province of Saskatchewan? Are there?

**An Hon. Member:** — No.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Thank you. Because 6,000 people left the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, in the month of February. Are there more health services? No, there's not more health services.

What privatization has meant for people in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, is lost jobs, lost revenue, higher taxes for ordinary people, huge budget deficits that we will have a long time getting under control, deteriorating public service, and a loss of control to foreign corporations for things that were controlled and owned in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. And I hope that the government gets up and talks on this Bill No. 1, and I hope that they do carry through in making this their mainstay as the issue in the next election campaign, because we won't have to look at those faces on the government side of the House after the next election.

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

**Mr. Goulet:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to start out by saying that a lot of the members from across are chattering away from their seat, but they won't stand up and . . .

**The Speaker:** — I agree with the hon. member that there are simultaneous debates going on. I believe that we respect his desire to be heard, and let's give him that opportunity.

**Mr. Goulet:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would again like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that while the members will chatter from their seats, they will not get up and protect their position in regards to the privatization Bill that is before us right now. I think they're just too ashamed to stand up because they know that the public opinion is against them.

When I look at the whole aspect of the privatization Bill,

Mr. Speaker, it's couched behind some soft rhetoric of public participation, but really in the long history as we have come to know Saskatchewan history, we know that they are going against Saskatchewan history, and that's what I can see in this Bill.

I think I may say, from a general statement, is that they are going against the working-together strategy of Saskatchewan economic history and social history, and also state that we have, here in Saskatchewan, taken a world leadership position in many areas, whether it's in health or education or in mining or in forestry, because we had utilized a mixed economy approach, that indeed we were here looking at our situation from both the business sector, the co-operatives, and also the Crown corporations.

And in order to go about explaining why I am totally opposed to the concept of the privatization Bill, I have to look at it from a concrete, historical basis. And I think I will go back, Mr. Speaker, in regards to the time of the settlement of the West and so on, and look at the period of the 1800s and during the rise of industrialization at that point in world historic development.

One has to look at that and look at even England where when the power of private industry and the merchants were on the rise, a lot of the people developed the concept of co-operatives. They had to be able to withstand the fact that private interest only would lead only to private control of a few rich at the top. It would not benefit a great number of people. A lot of people knew that by the early 1800s, so co-operatives were born to be able to counteract the effect of the 17th century theory of the invisible hand. So the invisible hand met up with resistance by the early 1800s during the time of the birth of co-operatives.

When we look at the late 1800s, we see that the merchants, the private competitive capitalists of the day, had moved into a larger scale, and they had moved into the West at that time. And one has to look at that period in time and history because . . . I would like to say this because that was a period in time when the Conservatives were all hell-bent in giving all the money to the big business interests of the day. And remember, Mr. Speaker, they lost the election in the 1870s just when they pursued that strategy.

And I will recall that when the members from across forget the history, and when they were going only on the private interest basis, one recalls the situation of the CPR. They gave all this money to the CPR and they said, give even not only money, but land. Twenty-three million acres of land were given to the CPR when they came out west. So a lot of the money . . . and there was a lot of corruption and crooked deals that were made during that period in time, and the Pacific scandal came out and the Tories of the day lost the election.

(1245)

When I look at it a little bit later on by the Dirty Thirties and . . . Well before I get into that, Mr. Speaker, one has to look at the initial stage of development that we had to get into extremely cheap labour. And cheap labour was

brought in from all over the world, whether it was in China, or wherever, to bring in the building of the railroad, and so on. And a lot of the money, moneys that we had in the public purse, were transferred over to the big corporations such as in the initial phase of the CPR.

So one of the things that I might say . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — This guy's against the building of the railroad.

**Mr. Goulet:** — The member says I was against the building of the railroad. I'm not against the building of the railroad. That railroad could have been built without corruption. That railroad could have been built with a lot more input from the people of the West at that time than that member doesn't understand as yet. So that simply shifting off a whole pile of dollars to the large-scale industry of the day, proven to be the defeat of the Tories, which will be the defeat of these Tories in the next year and a half.

I might say that during that time there was a lot of cheap labour, and even children were working 16, 18 hours a day at that time because that's the only way they could make the big bucks that were required to keep her rolling.

When I looked at later on, during the 1930s, at that time the private industry was saying, well government should stay out of business. And during that whole period in time, of course, that was the case. But the only counteraction in the day was the co-operatives; the only group working together in spirit, you know, was under the co-operative sector. And then as companies got bigger and bigger and bigger, the monopoly stage, you know, came into sphere during the 1920s, and they were going all over and it was going at supposedly a great scale.

And people look at the 1920s in that fashion, that supposedly this would be the magic solution of the world, that if we leave everything to the private interest and private market we will automatically get, you know, the benefits that accrue to everybody.

But what happened in the 1930s was quite the reverse. What happened is that the big monopolies of the day started hoarding all the money. And it wasn't getting into the hands of the ordinary workers and the smaller business of the day, and the farmers. What we ended up with was the Dirty Thirties situation. You combine that with a drought, and from historical reasons one knows that the drought in the past couple of years was even more dangerous than the 1930s was, but it was combined with economic mismanagement and corruption of the day and also a little bit of the drought. And bingo, here you had a situation where we had a depression. And it was basically economic mismanagement and corruption in the Dirty Thirties, which was created by the Tory government of the day, that caused that.

And a lot of people, when you look at a lot of the older people in the province, they know that history. A lot of the younger people like myself had to read history and so had to learn about that. But I know that the policies of this Tory government, which was the same as the one in the 1870s, they lost the election there. In the 1930s, the Tories did

the same thing; they lost the election when they went only with private interests.

Now we look at 1889. They will lose an election in 1890 if they call it, if they only go on private interest. And that is the reality of the history of Saskatchewan.

**An Hon. Member:** — In 1890?

**Mr. Goulet:** — So the member looks and says that it'll be 1890 from across . . . I must have mentioned that it was 1890, but what I was saying was in 1990 there, Mr. Speaker. And when we go into the 1990s and we look forward into the future, we have to take a closer look at our modern history to see what we have done.

We know that during the modern era we have not only combined the period of co-ops, we have come in to take control of the government and utilize government for the benefit of the people. And during the '30s and '40s, and especially during the post-40s period, we did a lot more in regards to the development of Crown corporations. That we felt that when the assets were in foreign interests — when the assets were in foreign interests, they went outside the province; they left our country.

We quickly found out that we had to control the economy, at least to challenge and provide a competitive base to private industry, through the Crown corporate sector. And a lot of people understood that it was necessary to beat the monopoly giants in that way. There was no way that . . . only the co-operative movement could challenge large-scale business of last 30 years, so the Crown corporate sector came into being.

And the other thing that a lot of the private enterprise of the day knew is that they didn't want a lot of those services to be controlled by private interest because they would be held at ransom in regards to how they developed themselves. Because if one big industry monopolized, let's say SaskPower, or if they monopolized the telephones or they monopolize this and that, they could move into the area of monopolizing the whole economics base that exists right now.

There would be less competition and more roads to greater monopoly. And that has been the basis of this history in Saskatchewan, and that is the basis on which Saskatchewan people fought against this simplistic idea of only providing dollars for private industry. And I think that we have come to realize that the mixed economy approach then is the answer, and has been the answer which provided us with . . . Even when we had crisis conditions in the '74-75 period, in 1978 period — we had a world crisis at that time, but we looked at the record in Saskatchewan government, the NDP, we only had 4 per cent unemployment rate. We looked at the situation of providing greater services in health and education and so on.

When I look at the privatization history I look at, of course, the most immediate thing in regards to northern Saskatchewan. I look at my own constituency. I look at the fact that Saskatchewan people of the day felt that the experience was this. They had the forestry industry that was controlled from New York. They knew that all the

moneys and the assets which were being owned in the forestry industry were being channelled back into the South, and that there was only a great exploitation basis that they looked at northern Saskatchewan forests. In mining we tend to look at it as I-grading, but in forestry there is a similar term. But I feel that what they wanted to do was straightforward exploitation of our resources.

And during the period of course in the past 20 years, we then looked at the development of our own mining and forestry sectors then to challenge the big monopoly basis of the big companies, you know, that were from foreign soils. And we said, let's look at this and re-examine this and challenge them right in our home turf. Let's see that we can prove to the world and what . . . That economic myth that we couldn't get into Crown corporate sector and make money had to be demolished.

That type of myth had existed in the 1800s and also the early 1900s to the middle 1900s, and that myth came to be demolished basically because people said, from way back, that the only way that education, that health, that economic development could ever work is in the private hands. We knew that from the historical background.

During the early 1800s we had to fight for public schools because everything . . . only the schooling went to the rich. We had to fight then for the many situations in health. And there was a big fight in Saskatchewan of course in the 1960s in health education, in the health issue, where a lot of the Tories supported only privatized health. And a lot of them felt it couldn't be done; only the business hand can develop health resources and our health system, you know, at a great rate.

And the history shows that to be completely false, that indeed public school systems throughout the world have shown an example and a leadership in having good education. And what we have shown in Saskatchewan, where we have had medicare, is that most of the world is now following our example, that publicly controlled health is the only way to go.

And the Tories today, in terms of privatization strategy, want us to go back into the Dark Ages of history; that they feel, look, the only way we could develop this is through big businesses and we have to monopolize those things.

I recognize that strategy of privatization, and especially in SMDC. When the privatization of SMDC took place, I looked at it and I said, well here we have a tremendous amount of assets. We have, with the amalgamation of Eldorado Nuclear, we would have close to \$2 billion worth of assets. But what the Tories are doing is that they've privatized it now into a new corporation called Cameco, and through a seven-year period, all of that will be sold off.

And my feeling on that is that we already control, we already controlled quite a bit of the mining industry. We had invested in gold and zinc and copper and uranium and many other things throughout the North, and we didn't do monopoly control in the way that the Tories want. They want monopoly control by big business on this mining. We did joint ventures with business. We felt that it was very important for us to look at joint ownership

with business through SMDC.

SMDC had 16 per cent ownership in one case; 33 per cent ownership in another case; 51 per cent ownership in another case, and so on. But they did not have complete monopoly control on the mining industry because they were doing a diversified approach in terms of investment. You had to be able to invest, not only in uranium, but in copper, because when the prices go up in uranium they tend to go down in copper and vice versa on the different metals. So you had to have a diversified investment in regards to the mining industry. And that's what SMDC did.

And a person such as Roy Lloyd, who got knocked off by the Tories, proved that the SMDC system was working. It was making \$60 million. It was \$60 million which could go back into our health and education systems.

What the Tories are saying is that Cameco now, which now made about 52 million this past year, what they're saying is that that \$110 million should now go into private industry — at a time when we have a 50 to 80 per cent unemployment rate in the North; at a time when we want a lot of services; at a time when I mentioned the issue of suicides and the rising suicide rate in the North. The people want to put it back into the hands of private industry only.

And I feel that's a wrong approach. It's a very narrow-minded approach when they recognize that in terms of international investment that you have to be able to invest in different sectors to be able to withstand, you know, the effects of the large-scale monopoly ownership that's taking place throughout the world. And I really feel that not only is there a sell-off of our assets, I mean nobody goes in and says, my goodness, I'm going to make a long-term economic decision by selling off the farm; I'm going to make a long-term economic decision by selling off my house; that I will sell off everything. And pretty soon you won't have anything left.

Selling off your assets is not a solution. All you're doing is transferring the assets that are controlled by Saskatchewan people over to big-scale monopoly capital, whether it's from Japan or whether it's from the U.S.A. or whether it's West Germany or whatever. And I really feel that this whole aspect of transferring assets is just not the right way to go. We already control it. Those are our crown jewels. We should keep them and use them for the time that we have economic downturns.

It's very ironic that this Tory government this year, the only saving grace that they had was they were able to get \$200 million from the Crown corporations to save them from that \$4 billion deficit that they put us in a hole already this year, Mr. Speaker.

I'll have to adjourn then, Mr. Speaker, because I wanted to speak again later.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 1 p.m.