

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to introduce a group of eight patients from the Cancer (Patient) Lodge here in the city of Regina on Dewdney Avenue. They're here with us to watch question period and do a tour of the building. They are accompanied here today by the lodge manager, Shirley Murray — I believe they're in the Speaker's gallery; yes they are — and volunteer workers Myrna Kew and Mary Backman. I'm sure all members will want to join with me in recognizing these individuals and welcoming them here to the Assembly.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pringle: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly, a group of grade 7 and 8 students from St. Bernard School in Saskatoon, 29 students, and they're accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Len Thomas, and chaperons Sister Juliana Heisler, Linda Smithwick, Darlene Parchewski, and Greg Johnson.

It's a particular honour for me, Mr. Speaker, to introduce this class. While I've introduced other guests in the legislature, I've not had the opportunity yet to introduce a class since my election victory of a year ago, so I'm privileged that this is the first class. We'll be meeting later for pictures and questions and comments. I hope that the students enjoy question period and their tour of the legislature, and I would ask that all members extend their usual expression of welcome.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have some young guests in the Assembly that I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the entire Assembly, some 28 young people from the constituency of Regina South who traditionally make an annual visit to this Assembly, Mr. Speaker. They are sitting in your gallery. They are grade 4 and 5 students from Grant Road School. They are accompanied here today by their teacher, Mrs. JoAnne Friesen, and I understand that the principal is with them today as well, Mr. Keith McNeillie.

Hopefully they will find their visit today just as informational and as much fun as they have in prior years. It's not the same group, but the school, and I look forward to meeting with them a little bit later for pictures and drinks and seeing how they enjoyed their visit, Mr. Speaker. I wish all members to welcome them to the Assembly.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I wish to remind our guests, and I appreciate they'd like to join in the applause, but we ask our guests not to participate in the proceedings.

Mr. Martin: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, a group of grade 8 students, numbering 24, in the west gallery, from St. Marguerite's School in my constituency, Regina Wascana. They will be in the Assembly for some time and then will be out having an opportunity to tour the facility, the buildings, and then later this afternoon I'll have a chance to talk with them.

So please, I ask the members of the Assembly to join with me in welcoming the students from St. Marguerite's School.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Sauder: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to colleagues here in the Assembly this afternoon a group of individuals from my constituency, from the town of Nipawin, and Carrot River, I guess, and Codette area. First of all, there's the mayor of Nipawin, Mr. Jim Taylor; council person, Mr. Ron Folstad; the president of the chamber of commerce there, René Rusk; and Mr. Bill Hamilton, the reeve of the R.M. of Nipawin. And accompanying them are two council persons from the town of Carrot River, Mr. David Stanger and Glenn Engele. I think the economic development officer from Nipawin, Mr. Wayne Tebbutt is along as well, but I'm not sure that he's in the Assembly yet with us. I'd just like to ask all members here to welcome them here this afternoon.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Grant to Game Farm

Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the minister of privatization. Mr. Minister, will you tell this House whether or not in your time as minister of SEDCO or subsequent to that time, you used any influence with anyone to expedite the \$120,000 mortgage SEDCO supplied the Northern Lights game farm, of which your son Robert is a partner and manager.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — No.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Another question to the same minister, the minister of privatization. Mr. Minister, I have here an April 27 press release from the Department of Agriculture which says that Tanka Research, one of your government's polling firms, is doing a market study for game farms. Can you tell this House how much your government is contributing to that research?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I'm not the Minister of Agriculture. I have no knowledge of that research.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Another question to the same minister. Mr. Minister, these are just a couple of linkages and coincidences we see about game farming, and particularly the Northern Lights game farm and this government. As a cabinet minister, you know that every piece of legislation has to come before and be approved

by cabinet. And, Mr. Minister, I would like to know, when the Bill or any amendments relating to game farming legislation came before cabinet, if you exempted yourself from voting? Did you abstain? And I would like to know if you notified the Premier and your colleagues about the potential for conflict, or perceived conflict, and have you got this notice in writing?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — There is no potential for conflict. The Premier was aware of the operations that Northern Lights were looking at from the beginning.

Mr. Anguish: — To the same minister, Mr. Speaker. The minister knows that his wife sat, or possibly still sits, as a member of the federal Farm Debt Review Board. When that board considered and allowed the Toronto Dominion Bank to seize nine quarters of land owned by one Doug Lyke, and then later sold to the game farm, your wife chose to absent herself from the meeting.

Was she aware at that time of your son's interest in purchasing the land, and as such did she declare a clear conflict of interest with the board? And was that her reason for absenting herself from the decision of the Farm Debt Review Board in the foreclosure of the nine quarters of land owned by Doug Lyke?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I don't sit in on the Farm Debt Review Board. I have no idea what took place at the meeting.

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Minister, you would be aware that, if not formally, at least informally, there are consultations between the western diversification office and the Government of Saskatchewan prior to grants being approved. Can you tell us: did this government inform the western diversification fund of a potential conflict of interest prior to the approval of a grant for \$466,000 to the Northern Lights game farm for research and development of which your son is involved?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, as I said previously, there is no conflict that I'm aware of at all, and certainly I don't know if there's any discussion between this government and the WD (western diversification) office regarding that.

Mr. Anguish: — Well I would think that a \$466,000 grant would be to the attention of members of cabinet. I would like to ask the minister whether or not you can explain why such a grant would be needed for \$466,000 when the New Zealand government would have made a book available for the very same type of information for \$29.70. And it's actually . . . On checking today, we find that it's not in the Legislative Library, but the Department of Agriculture library does have the book that outlines the very type of information that the grant was received for some \$466,000. Can you tell us about that, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I've no idea of a \$29 book that he's talking about. I do know that the grant to Northern Lights was for research into game farming, and I think if you want to find out more you should probably contact Dr. Jerry Haigh, who is one of the leading wildlife biologists and veterinarians working on this out of the University of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Anguish: — Well we wanted to contact you, Mr. Minister, in this legislature . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. Order. Would the hon. member just indicate if it's a new or a supplementary question.

Mr. Anguish: — A new question, Mr. Speaker, to the same minister. People have been contacting us because they're concerned about a perceived conflict of interest with a member of the cabinet of this government.

Now, Mr. Minister, the principle of any conflict of interest is that there should not be or appear to be any conflict of interest. Now you said, Mr. Minister, on June 10, 1980, and I quote:

To me, this Bill deals entirely with declaring assets, and perhaps more important than that is the ability people have to influence.

You made those statements concerning debate on conflict of interest legislation on June 10, 1980 in this legislature. I would like to ask the minister, do you still hold this opinion, and if so, will you table all the relevant documents in order to erase any perception of conflict of interest by you as a member of cabinet, sir?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well certainly, as I say, there are no documents that include me in any way, shape, or form. I've long since learned to question what the member is quoting from, and I really can't recall what I said on June 10, 1980, but I would look in the record and see.

Mr. Anguish: — I can recall what you said on June 10, 1980, because I looked it up in *Hansard* and read it, sir.

My question to you is that in regard to the \$120,000 loan approved by SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation), and the \$466,000 grant approved by the western diversification fund to the Northern Lights game farm, of which your son is a shareholder, will you please table any documents that have access to the provincial government that could possibly remove this perceived conflict of interest with you, sir.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well I don't believe there's any perceived conflict of influence, and as I said previously, I have no documents.

Mr. Anguish: — I did not ask that the documents had to be in your possession, sir.

I have a new question. Will the Premier give his undertaking to this legislature that you will search the records in regard to this case and any records that are available within access to the Government of Saskatchewan? Will the Premier undertake to search that out and table those documents before this legislature?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I will always satisfy myself that there is no conflict, and if there is, I deal with it. I will examine anything that I think that should be examined as a result of anything that you've raised here, and I'll look at it. I, on the surface, don't see a conflict, but

I always have to satisfy myself that that's the case, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Anguish: — New question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, I'm sure that you must have been aware of this situation prior. We're talking about large sums of money; we're talking about a cabinet minister in your government. Have you already satisfied yourself that there is no conflict of interest in the situation of the Northern Lights game farm versus one of your cabinet ministers, sir?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that there's no conflict, but the hon. member raised it and I will review it so that I can be satisfied that that's the case.

Public Hearings on SaskEnergy

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the deputy leader, and it's in regard to the public meetings which are presently being held by SaskEnergy.

And I want to say that, given yesterday and last night, the travelling road show is off to a rip-snorting start. I noticed that while you had the meeting in Elbow last night, there were 12 people, and in Herbert there were about 13; Rockglen, about six.

I want to say to you, Mr. Minister, in light of the fact of the overwhelming coming out of people to these meetings, can you now tell us how much these meetings are costing the taxpayers? Is it running about 200 a head, 300 a head? How much money are you wasting of taxpayers' moneys on this foolish idea of these meetings?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, first it was all of the support that we have against . . . for our position, taken against the public participation exercise in SaskEnergy. Then it was all of the support they had for walking out and ringing the bells for two weeks, going on strike for two weeks, and costing this place, the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, \$300,000. And then he said, Mr. Speaker, this thing is just a propaganda machine that's going to whitewash the whole thing. And then he said, Mr. Speaker, that taxpayers' money ought not to be spent in brainwashing the people of Saskatchewan. And now he says, but, Mr. Speaker, nobody is interested.

Well he can't have it both ways, Mr. Speaker. Nobody is interested? I think the opposite of what he says, Mr. Speaker. People are quite prepared, quite prepared to accept what the Premier and the Minister of Public Participation and myself and my colleagues in caucus are suggesting, and that is the public participation in SaskEnergy, Mr. Speaker, is a very exciting economic opportunity for the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Now as it relates to cost, I'm going to answer the question.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, these meetings are so exciting that we see tens of people coming out to each of

them. I want to say that in contrast to the thousands of people who are coming out to legitimate meetings, expressing concern about the privatization of SaskPower.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, my question deals with a letter on PC stationery sent out last Thursday by the Progressive Conservative Party, signed by one Corey Olynik. And I want to quote from the letter that was sent to PC executives, dealing with the very meetings we're now talking about. And in the first paragraph this person indicates:

Your association has been contacted to get our members out to these meetings. I cannot stress enough the importance of using (using) these public meetings to get our message across.

Now we see that the Progressive Conservative Party is using these meetings at taxpayers' expense to get your message out. And I want to say to you that this is not an accepted policy by this government of wasting taxpayers' money to promote the Progressive Conservative Party line. And I ask you why these meetings are not being paid for out of party funds, rather than taxpayers' money.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, a couple of points to be made here. Number one, while I am a member of the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan — I think my membership is current — while I am a member, I do not run the party. But to people who do run the party, I would hope have the presence of mind to take political advantage of any event that might be done out there by either you or us — number one.

Number two, number two, Mr. Speaker, I don't understand why on the one hand he's squawking and whining over there because we're holding these things, and on the other hand nobody's showing up. You should be happy that our executive director isn't doing his job very well.

Number three, I would never want to be accused, Mr. Speaker, of holding these meetings only in Tory ridings. So we're going to let them go until we get to some of the NDP ridings and see what kind of turn-out we have there.

And number four, Mr. Speaker, for that member to talk about horrendous costs of offering information to the public by SaskEnergy is a little bit contradictory and hypocritical, because this is the same group that hijacked this place for \$300,000. That's the same man who's suggesting that we should put together a committee on rules and tour them around the world for a couple of years to see if we should change the rules of the House. Mr. Speaker, from that member, it's simply not credible.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — New question to the minister, and it too surrounds the sell-off meetings that are going on. And I want to quote again from the letter from your staff person in the PC Party. They go on to say that: most importantly,

we must organize, educate and stand up for what we know is best for our province — we, the Progressive Conservative Party.

Mr. Speaker, seldom have the people of this province seen that kind of arrogance from a government, that they will decide . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — . . . that they will decide what is best for the people of this province, not listen to the 70 per cent who are opposed to privatization of SaskPower, but the party will use government funds to go out and propagandize this issue at public meetings.

I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, why don't you quit bullying the public of this province and let them have their say on SaskPower, get rid of the Bills, end the hearings and the meetings you're having. The people don't want it. They don't want their tax dollars spent on propagandizing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I have no idea what goes on over at party headquarters, the PC Party of Saskatchewan. I have no knowledge of that letter, nor am I very concerned about that letter at all, Mr. Speaker, but let me remind you, Mr. Speaker — because I'm sure that it slipped the mind of some here — when he talks about propagandizing, it wasn't me, Mr. Speaker, that took NDP propaganda into a grade 4 class in Regina . . . (inaudible) . . . It wasn't me, Mr. Speaker, that was running around for the nomination buying memberships for the poor people, Mr. Speaker. It wasn't me, Mr. Speaker, that was trying to buy my way into this legislature, Mr. Speaker. Don't talk to me about propagandizing, Mr. Speaker. They wrote the book on it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order.

Mr. Romanow: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Premier, and it has to do as the consequence of the last series of questions and answers by my colleague to the Deputy Premier.

Mr. Premier, I think the facts are, judging by this memorandum from Mr. Corey Olynik, the executive director of the provincial PCs, that the provincial PC Party is out to politicize the SaskEnergy hearings. I think there's no doubt about that. The facts indicate that, based on the questions.

I think under these circumstances, where there's a deliberate attempt to politicize, thereby undermining the credibility of the SaskEnergy exercise and, I might add, the officials, there comes a time when a solution by a Premier representing all the people of the province of Saskatchewan is required.

I ask you, sir: would you in your capacity as Premier of all

the people of the province of Saskatchewan, in the light of this damning evidence, do the right thing, save thousands of taxpayers' dollars and cancel immediately these SaskEnergy hearings?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, it obviously is an important issue that we're facing in Saskatchewan with respect to offering to the people the possibility to invest in the gas business — natural gas.

Let me say to the hon. member — and I throw it out because if he's really interested in the public knowing what it's like to have the opportunity to invest in the gas business, and he is so concerned — and I like to assume that he is concerned — that it is not the right thing to do, then I say to hon. member with greatest respect, if you think that people are really going to reject this, why not just let the legislation come in and let us debate the legislation and pass it, and allow, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan to participate in the gas business and see if they like it, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well all right, if you want to . . . Okay look, I'm quite prepared — and I want the media to watch this — I'm quite prepared to bring that legislation back here, and we will debate it and we will pass it, Mr. Speaker, and we will allow the people of Saskatchewan to participate in that. And then they'll know the truth, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Now I just throw out the argument. We both know the game of politics, Mr. Speaker. They walked out of here before the people could see what was actually going to be available to the people of this province, Mr. Speaker. And if he thinks they're not going to like it, why don't we just put it out there and let them participate and let the people see the facts, Mr. Speaker. And if they don't like it, obviously they'll vote NDP; and if they like it, they might just support it, Mr. Speaker. And that's what I believe that they're afraid of.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the Premier, based on his answer. Mr. Premier, your argument is that SaskEnergy needs to get the facts out. But it's apparent by this memorandum that your political machine, your political party, your Deputy Premier, and perhaps you, sir — maybe you don't know about this — are out to undermine the credibility of this exercise which yesterday you were portraying to the people of Saskatchewan as being a credible and honest and straightforward exercise. And it turns out now that what you're doing is not only demeaning the exercise, but you're demeaning the officials that you were defending as a part of that.

Now clearly as a Premier you've got on occasion to rise above your party interests, including the party actions in this case which have so totally destroyed this exercise. All I'm asking you, sir, is how about displaying some leadership and doing the right thing. Save the taxpayers thousands, if not millions of dollars, and cancel these meetings. Simple question. Why not an answer to that?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the key is to do the fair thing and the right thing and to provide the people of Saskatchewan the opportunity to see what's before them. And I will say again, I will say it again to the hon. member, if he thinks — and sincerely — if he thinks that this legislation and the chance to participate in developing the natural gas business is so awful, then he should just let me do it, and for sure he would win.

Let's try it, Mr. Speaker. So I'm calling it, I'm calling it, Mr. Speaker, because we have seen Saskoil and we have seen WESTBRIDGE and we've seen Weyerhaeuser and we've seen other opportunities world-wide, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, come on. I'm calling you on it. I'm saying, let the people have an opportunity and see if they like it. No, let them have the opportunity.

See, Mr. Speaker . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. I'll give the Premier a few moments to wrap up his . . .

Hon. Mr. Devine: — As we know, as we know, the opposition, Mr. Speaker, knows that you normally have four to five years to deliver programs to the people of Saskatchewan, or any other province. All right? If that's the case, and they believe this is so wrong, why don't they just allow the people to participate? And obviously they'd think they wouldn't like it at all. I say, Mr. Speaker, they know the people of Saskatchewan will like this, and they will vote for us when they're given a chance, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I've a very short supplementary question to the Premier. I agree with you; the people should decide. Call an election right now to see whether you have the mandate to do what you're doing, because I say you don't. Call an election right now.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I've always known in my heart of hearts, Mr. Speaker, that when they walked out of here at the time that they did, that they were afraid the people of Saskatchewan would like what they saw if they ever had a chance to develop Saskatchewan natural gas and to see lower rates, Mr. Speaker. And I'm more convinced today than I've ever been in my life.

I will call an election when the people of Saskatchewan see what it's like to own shares in Saskatchewan and build this province like they never have before, Mr. Speaker. That's when I'll call an election, and you'll watch the results.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Appointment to Barber Panel

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I say this to the Premier: Mr. Premier, don't hold your breath. They'll never, never see this Bill pass the light of day.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Premier, my question to you is this. My question to you is this, sir. For you to spend money to promote the PC ideology is your business; for us to protect the taxpayers' money of the people of Saskatchewan is our business. Will you confirm, sir, will you confirm that in your blind push to privatize, you have now appointed noted Tory lawyer, Gary J. Drummond, as counsel to the Barber commission, thereby joining such impartial people as that famous privatizer, Dr. Lloyd Barber, and Miss Ford, the other lawyer who has gained financially at trying to privatize the potash corporation? Will you confirm that Mr. Drummond has been appointed by you for another waste of the taxpayers' money in Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — We've seen, Mr. Speaker, the opposition be against free trade because we're going to give them all our water. We see the opposition against the fact that we're going to save the water here. We again see the opposition afraid of the fact that the rates are going to go up, afraid of the fact that rates are going to go down. Why doesn't the hon. member, if he believes, Mr. Speaker, that natural gas and having the opportunity to participate in it is so bad, why doesn't he just stand in his place and say, all right, why don't you do it, Mr. Premier, and let the people see what it's like and then call an election. But he won't do that.

Mr. Speaker, we've got a natural gas commission and a SaskEnergy commission out there because the NDP walked out of the House, because they wouldn't tell the people of Saskatchewan the truth. We're going to tell them the truth, and then we'll call an election, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTION UNDER RULE 16

Use of Government Funds for Advertising

Mr. Anguish: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Friday last I gave notice of motion that I would be rising on this topic today, and at the end of my remarks I'll move the motion which is seconded by the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake.

Mr. Speaker, this government has had a long history of financial mismanagement and waste and incompetence to promote their privatization plans in the province of Saskatchewan, and one of the things that we've heard loud and clear, Mr. Speaker, is that Saskatchewan people have had enough; they're saying that this government has gone too far. They're saying that there won't be anything left for the future of this province of ours after years of putting together an economy that would work in the province of Saskatchewan, a mixed economy made up of the private sector, which is important and we recognize that — mainly the small businesses and small firms that have grown in Saskatchewan and developed in Saskatchewan and make up a very important part of our economy.

Secondly, the co-operatives, co-operatives that sprang up during the days of Depression, and some prior to that, such as the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and the rest of the co-operative movement in the province of Saskatchewan. They grew up out of the necessity of not being served by the private sector and the necessity of survival on their own, because governments would not assist them at that point in time. The governments wanted nothing to do with the co-operative movement.

The governments at that time, when the co-operative sector was developing in Saskatchewan, saw their role to help the private sector alone, for that to be the only engine of the economy. But many people in Saskatchewan, mostly from an agrarian background, saw the wisdom at that time to build a very strong co-operative movement in this province.

And thirdly, Mr. Speaker, is the public sector, and the public sector came into prominence in Saskatchewan especially in 1944 upon the election of Tommy Douglas and the CCF (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation) government at that time, in which there had to be public sector involvement, otherwise how would farm families in Saskatchewan get electrification? How would farm families in Saskatchewan be able to compete, being so many miles from ports and international markets?

How could people in this province compete on any level without a strong public sector that had more than just a profit motive; that had a motive of giving opportunity to Saskatchewan people to grow and prosper with their own skills and develop skills that would lead them will into the 1950s, the 1960s, the '70s — in fact to the present day.

So those three things have made up a very important part of our economy in Saskatchewan, and more necessary here, I would maintain, Mr. Speaker, than any place else in the world, but not exclusive to Saskatchewan. The private sector, the public sector, and the co-operative movement, which makes up the backbone of Saskatchewan's economy — all three of those together, working in harmony, Mr. Speaker.

But what have we seen over the past few years? We saw a Progressive Conservative government come into office in 1982. The government came in with a resounding victory, unexpected even by the leaders and the current cabinet members of the Conservative government of today in Saskatchewan. And when they first came into office, I think they were caught off guard, Mr. Speaker. But it was clear even from the beginning, they wanted to give the upper hand to the private sector in Saskatchewan.

They did such things initially as do away with the department of co-operatives, and for the first time in recent history in the province of Saskatchewan there is not a department of co-operatives to assist the co-operative movement in the province of Saskatchewan. One of the very important sectors of our economy — the co-operative movement — has no direct linkage with government. That has been removed.

And then later on in this government's mandate, Mr.

Speaker, especially getting into their second term after the October 20 election of 1986, we saw this government make an outrageous attack on the public sector. They've done away with the co-operative link to government, and now they were trying to do away with any public sector involvement in the economy.

The list is long, Mr. Speaker, and it's been gone over many time in this House, but I think needs to be gone over again. They did away with Highways workers — gave them an opportunity to work in the private sector, so to speak. They did away with the school-based dental program — 400 dental therapists out of work. They sold the Sask Minerals plant out at Chaplin, a company in the public sector that had made profits every year except one since its inception in the 1940s.

And was it public participation as they state, Mr. Speaker? No it wasn't. They sold Saskatchewan Minerals to a company from Toronto, another company from the province of Quebec. No Saskatchewan involvement. Workers didn't have an opportunity to buy the Sask Minerals operations. Saskatchewan people, Saskatchewan companies, Saskatchewan investors never had the opportunity to buy that very valuable, publicly owned Crown corporation, Mr. Speaker.

But the government is seeing now that they want to change that a bit. They want to give the perception that Saskatchewan people will be involved in the doing away of the public sector corporations in the province of Saskatchewan, but it's an argument they will not win, Mr. Speaker. It's an argument that they will not win because Saskatchewan people know that we have an economy in Saskatchewan that needs to operate on more than just the private sector.

The private sector needs to make profit and that's their bottom line. They have to make profit for the owners, they have to make profit for the shareholders if they trade on the stock exchange, but they don't have to implement public policy for the good of people in Saskatchewan as a total rather than for just a few.

And if they don't have that, Mr. Speaker, where does it come from? The incentive and the push certainly doesn't come from the government to look at the good of all in the province of Saskatchewan. They want to help a few, and hopefully those few will help the many who are much poorer in the province of Saskatchewan, and we do not allow that to happen in this Legislative Assembly, and people will not allow that to happen because we will lead them to not allowing that to happen in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

The privatization of the resources and the public ownership and the co-operatives in this province has got to be stopped for once and for all, and we challenge this government to call a provincial election at the very first opportunity to let Saskatchewan speak in the most democratic and decisive way that people have in this province, and that's with their vote in a general election, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have to look at some of the waste and mismanagement in the province of Saskatchewan

that has been inflicted upon us. Before I do that though, people in the province, Mr. Speaker, say, well will privatization of all this public ownership help us in the province. Well I say no, Mr. Speaker, but the facts are there to back up my no. Have taxes gone down? No, they have not. Are there more jobs? No, there is not. Are there more people moving into the province? No, there are not. Are there more people moving into the province? No there are not; they're leaving the province, Mr. Speaker. Are corporate taxation going up? No, corporate taxation is not going up, Mr. Speaker.

Any measure you want to use, whether it's the welfare rolls in the province or the unemployed, dictate in factual information that privatization is not helping the province of Saskatchewan. We know that in the opposition. People in the province of Saskatchewan know that, and they will stop this government from the privatization of the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

I would look at some of the expenditures. Between the period, Mr. Speaker, of March 1, '84 and September 15, '87, just the one company, Brigdens Photo & Graphics Ltd. — \$1.9 million, just in printing to one company, Mr. Speaker.

(1445)

Mr. Speaker, I want to look at Dome Advertising, Dome Media Buying Services Ltd. from March 1, 1984 to September 15, 1987, Mr. Speaker. How much do you think the government spent on that firm? — \$32,000,877 of taxpayers' money, in most cases to convince people of something that they don't want, this government using our money to sell the privatization moves, the privatization moves of the government that's gone astray.

Rather than spending our tax dollars, Mr. Speaker, many people tell me in the province of Saskatchewan that they would prefer that the government members just go out and listen to people, listen to members in their constituencies, listen to members through the communities of Saskatchewan. They won't have to advertise and sell people on something they don't want. They'll hear very clearly from people in this province of ours that they do not want this government doing what it's attempting to do.

And apparently this government is unwilling to change its ways. It's unwilling to change its ways. And any time a government becomes so arrogant, Mr. Speaker, that it won't change from within, the people, in their democratic right in the province, will change it for them, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to look at another advertising firm. I just mentioned Dome Advertising. Here's Roberts and Poole Advertising for March 1, 1984 to September 15, 1987. The government spent with them \$6.3 million advertising to people for something they don't want. And, Mr. Speaker, these amounts for advertising are for production of ads and the placement of ads, have nothing to do with printing costs. Printing costs are over and above these amounts that I point out to you.

Then in the period, Mr. Speaker, for Roberts & Poole

Advertising from September 15 of '87, where the last one left off, to May 17 of '88, another \$2.7 million spent on development and placement of advertising by this government.

In Dome Advertising from where I left off, September 15, '87, to May 17, 1988, another \$5 million spent selling programs to people that the people of Saskatchewan don't believe in, Mr. Speaker. This brainwashing will do the government absolutely no good — absolutely no good, Mr. Speaker.

I want also to take a look at some of the polling that's been done by this government, not for the good of the people of the province of Saskatchewan, but in fact to gauge how they're going to approach the Saskatchewan public to sell them the things that they are so bent on, like privatization and privatization of public ownership in the province of Saskatchewan.

Tanka Research shows up quite often. Department of Agriculture between September 8, '87, and May 17, '88, the total cost, I guess I would say, for polling in the government was over half a million dollars, Mr. Speaker, over half a million dollars that people in the province of Saskatchewan don't need to be spending.

Commercial air travel, Mr. Speaker, between September 8, '87, and May 17, '88 — about nine months — \$3.4 million spent on commercial travel, Mr. Speaker. This is not money spent on the executive aircraft that the government uses; it's not money spent on the travel pool; it's not money spent on vehicles that are used. This is commercial travel, Mr. Speaker, that we're talking about here.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other things. I could go on to the list of patronage appointments. Almost every Conservative candidate, MLA, even former members of parliament, members of parliament who lost nominations, Mr. Speaker, are on the dole of this government.

The point we want to make today, Mr. Speaker, and I know my 15 minutes is almost up, so I'll move my motion before I conclude — but instead of spending the money in such a wasteful way in the province of Saskatchewan, people want this government to listen to their concerns, to restore the vibrant economy of Saskatchewan with the private sector, the co-operatives and public ownership working together in this province. They want this government to reduce the debt that they've created through wasteful spending.

At the same time, the government reduces this . . . or increases this wasteful spending, I should say, Mr. Speaker, they're not reducing the debt and the services get less in the province of Saskatchewan. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake:

That this Assembly condemns the Government of Saskatchewan for spending millions of taxpayers' dollars on self-serving advertising to conceal their financial mismanagement, waste, and incompetence, and to promote the dismantling of

our province through privatization, while other services in the health, education, and agricultural sectors suffer from lack of proper funding.

I so move, seconded by the hon. member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the outset of my remarks, I would want to say that I don't believe that this is a resolution that any opposition member would want to feel that they should have to deal with in the term of any government.

But, Mr. Speaker, when you look at this government's agenda, when you look at what's happened in Saskatchewan since 1982, and particularly since 1986, it gives all members of the opposition and, as well, all people of Saskatchewan reason to be concerned about the future of this province, and concerned about the direction that this government is moving this province towards.

My colleague from the Battlefords has indicated that every economic indicator that is published by this government or by their federal counterparts, the Mulroney government in Ottawa, tell us that this government has been incompetent, that there has been mismanagement and waste, and that part of the reason, Mr. Speaker, is that patronage has overtaken common sense, and we no longer have a government that listens to anyone but a select few.

And if we compare what's happened to young men and women and business people and farmers in Saskatchewan with other jurisdictions, it gives yet more reason for concern. You can go through the list of people who have left different provinces and who have joined people in other provinces to be part of their economy, and it tells you that Saskatchewan is a unique case.

Now the members opposite will want to say that it's because of agriculture and because of the drought conditions in Saskatchewan. And no one on this side of the House will argue that that hasn't been part of the economic problem in Saskatchewan, but, Mr. Speaker, there's much more.

An Hon. Member: — But we're making headway. I think we're making headway.

Mr. Lautermilch: — The Minister of Education says we're making headway. Well let me tell you, Mr. Minister, how much headway you're really making. Last year there were 14,771 people that had to leave this province because of the atmosphere that your government has created. Now you will want to say it's all because of agriculture, but you know better.

You know it's because of the way you're polarizing dollars. You know it's because middle income people in Saskatchewan can no longer afford your economic development, your open for business, and your future vision of Saskatchewan. You know all that, and if you don't know that, Mr. Minister, it's time you sat down with

some school children in your riding so that they can instruct you as to why they feel that there's no future in this province any more.

You compare the out-migration in Saskatchewan of 14,771 people last year with a province like Manitoba, who experiences drought, who has experienced forest fires similar to what we experienced in my home riding last week — all of the conditions that Manitoba has experienced have been similar — but yet their out-migration is only 6,336. You compare an in-migration in Alberta of some 5,114 people. And you still have the gall and the audacity to sit in this place and say that you're improving things.

Mr. Minister, it seems that your cabinet and your caucus and members of your political party are the only people that feel that this province is moving in the right direction under the stewardship of this Premier. Because you don't see 14,771 people leaving the province, unless you've got a government that cares more about spending money on advertising for the good of its friends — Dome Media, Roberts & Poole — those are where your priorities are.

And that's why you've chased young men and women out of this province, and that's why you see businesses closing and you see downtown Prince Albert with empty stores, and you see small towns like Lafleche, Saskatchewan, as an example, with empty stores all over the place.

It's part of your economic reasoning and it's part of your ideology, your privatization ideology, that are chasing men and women out of this province, because they know under this PC government there's little future, if any, for them and their children.

Forty-six million dollars could have been put towards a small-business program, but it wasn't. Forty-six million dollars that could have been put towards education, but it wasn't. Forty-six million dollars that could have been put towards health care, but it wasn't.

Where did it go? It went to fill the pockets of your friends, to sell programs that the people of this province are rejecting. And it's going yet again in another flurry of advertising.

And every person in Saskatchewan who turns on a radio or a television or opens a newspaper, knows clearly where all of that money is going. And they know that your business friends that are involved in advertising agencies and that you support more than you support the people of this province, they know that they're taking a percentage of their tax dollars in order to sell them something that they don't want.

It's not enough, Mr. Minister, that you hold a round of privatization meetings where you got 6's and 10's to sell an idea that they don't want. That's not enough for you. And, Mr. Speaker, that's not enough for this government because the idea that they're trying to sell the privatization of SaskEnergy, the sell-off of the assets of the people of this province, is a disgrace.

And it's a disgrace when you've got to use the people's

own money in order to sell an idea that they have rejected soundly by the number of petitions that they've put before this legislature. It's enough, Mr. Speaker, that government through regular channels has to do advertising, but to force upon the people of the province a political ideology that they have rejected through petition, through public demonstration, is less than fair.

And I see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that my time is rapidly coming to a close, and I want to close with this. I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the people of this province are going to be rejecting you whenever they get a chance. Each and every member sitting opposite is going to have to go back to their ridings, to the people in those ridings, and explain why they've squandered the heritage of the people of this province.

They're going to have to go back and try and sell them an idea that isn't working in Saskatchewan, that won't be accepted in Saskatchewan, and it will mean that each and every one of these members on that side of the House will be rejected by the electorate whenever another election is called. And I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that members on this side of the House will continue to carry that message to the people of Saskatchewan, will continue to tell the people of Saskatchewan how you've squandered the assets of this province; how you've advertised yourself into a hole; how you've privatized the people of this province into a hole; how you've misled the people of this province.

And I want to say to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, seconding this motion makes only good sense, simply because the people of this province feel the same way about you as we have articulated in this motion. And I want to say that I look forward to the day when you meet the people of this province on the doorsteps so that they can reject you as soundly as I believe, and that they believe, they want to. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — I would want to say that I want to read this motion into the record, and this is the motion that we've been speaking for:

That this Assembly condemns the Government of Saskatchewan for spending millions of taxpayers' dollars on self-serving advertising to conceal their financial mismanagement, waste, and incompetence, and to promote the dismantling of our province through privatization, while other services in health, education, and agricultural sectors suffer from the lack of proper funding.

Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

(1500)

Mr. Petersen: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Well I've been sitting here listening with some interest to comments from members opposite, and before I begin my remarks, I will have to say that I do not agree with the comments previously stated. And at the conclusion of my

remarks I will be moving a motion that will be amending the motion that's before us to read as follows:

That all the words after the word "Assembly" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

urge the government to continue a policy of conscientious communications with the people of Saskatchewan, including informing them of health and life-styles issues, public safety questions, consultations in agriculture, health, education, and public participation, and ensuring that the people are fully advised of the options and the impact of those options available to the government in all areas of public policy.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the motion, as presented by the opposition, presents a false picture not only of the unmatched performance of this government in the fields of health, education, and agriculture, but also the nature of government advertising under this administration.

Under their administration we saw — and I mean it was fantastic; we saw it everywhere — advertising on the family of Crown corporations. Under the NDP government, millions of dollars was spend on the family of Crown corporations. They not only put ads in newspapers, not only put ads on television, had ads on radio, but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you couldn't even go see a movie without seeing the family of Crown corporations on the big silver screen in front of you.

They used every opportunity that there was to propagandize their own particular political beliefs. And then they stand there today and criticize this government for putting out information — information — that is what is being put out to people.

And I'd just like to bring to the members' attention that not too long ago I was at Laird, Saskatchewan, and we had a very interesting meeting, a very interesting meeting.

Laird, Saskatchewan people asked a number of folks to attend a meeting that had been designed to talk about agricultural financing and concerns that were there. And at that meeting, when I stood up and explained to people all of the things that this government had done for people in Saskatchewan, one young guy at the back of the room said: well tell us about this even more; please make sure we know about it; put it out even more; give us more information. And you can check the records of that meeting. Members of the opposition laugh — you can check the records of that meeting. And your member for Humboldt sat there with his head down.

Anyhow, the member for Humboldt was quite embarrassed because, on a number of occasions, just as we see today, members of the opposition said, oh, don't put out that information. What are they scared of? That people will find the truth out?

Well the truth is that in agriculture, in agriculture, programs that have been advertised, information that's been put out, has done people a lot of good. Farm purchase program, value to the farmers, 84 million; counselling assistance for farmers guarantees, value to

the farmers, 21 million; farmers' oil royalty rebates, value to the farmers, 45 million; livestock investment tax credits, value to the farmers, 34 million. Not to mention, Mr. Deputy Speaker, these programs provide spin-offs into a number of other areas — diversification, jobs for the young people that we have.

Well let's take a look at what else we have: a production loan interest subsidy which would be 71 million; a livestock cash advance interest subsidy, 61 million; irrigation assistance, 14 million, and so on and so on and so on.

Now members of the opposition were so proud of their family of Crown corporations that they had to go tell everybody what a great job they were doing. These types of informational pieces, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are information that will tell people how to access, how to access and make use of the programs that we have.

We also have Lights On For Life, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Lights On For Life. The members opposite laugh and chuckle, but you take a look at the number of people whose lives have been saved because of a Lights On For Life program. It's not only backed by safety councils, the police, so on and so forth, but manufacturers even, Mr. Speaker — manufacturers.

The Everyone Wins program — healthy life-styles. The opposition came out against it very forcefully, and the Health critic said, well, Everyone Wins is not a good program. Actually the problem is, when they say that it isn't a good program, they're against 20 organizations, private organizations that back the Everyone Wins program, and they're questioning the credibility of those individuals in those organizations. It may be fine for the Health critic to take political shots at us, but not at those 20 organizations, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The NDP should stop the tom-foolery of claiming that every organization and individual and business that works in partnership with government to put government programs forward is a Tory one. I mean, they always say, they're friends of the Tories. We just heard it. Well that's not exactly true. We're talking about health care associations, professionals who devote their lives to assuring good health for all of us, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And Lord knows I could use some today, because I've got a terrible cold, and I apologize if I have to stop momentarily to clear my throat. However, it could happen to members of the opposition some day too, and I hope they realize that it's difficult to speak when you do have a cold, but I'm trying my best here.

Mr. Speaker, people are not only asking us to continue this program but to expand it. The Everyone Wins program is an excellent one. I mean, what's wrong, what's wrong with trying persuade children not to smoke? What's wrong with that? Does that mean that all non-smokers are Tories? Mr. Deputy Speaker, how can the opposition argue that programs that teach both adults and children proper nutrition is political advertising? I've a hard time with that one.

I can see that they might argue it's unnecessary or that it doesn't work, in which case they'd be arguing with the

health care professionals that I've just mentioned previously. But how can they argue that it's in any way political to try to teach children about nutrition, healthy life-styles, not to smoke, so on and so forth? It goes beyond reason, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it goes beyond reason.

Well, we've also got Crown corporations. They attack the advertising of Crowns like SaskPower, SaskTel, SGI.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to have to stop now because my voice is going, but I'd just like to move the motion that I read into the record previously, seconded by the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — Order, please. Order, order.

Mr. Solomon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to the amendment that the member has put forward, and I support the motion that my colleague, the member from The Battlefords, has put forward: that this Assembly condemns the Government of Saskatchewan for spending millions of taxpayers' dollars on self-serving advertising to conceal their financial mismanagement, their waste and incompetence, and to promote the dismantling of our province through privatization, while other services in the health, education, and agricultural sectors suffer from lack of proper funding.

Mr. Speaker, today is day 37 out of about an average of a 70-day sitting. And I note on the agenda today that after 37 days we are in this Assembly, not talking about issues that are important to the people of this province such as laws which will help the farmers in debt reduction; we're not talking, Mr. Speaker, about tax relief for small business or tax relief for working people and farm families; we're not talking about issues that this government has put on the back burner for the purpose of putting forward and selling their ideology on privatization.

But on top of that, Mr. Speaker, what we've seen is a government that has become really hell-bent on privatization. They seem to be wasting our time on this issue. They're wasting the time of the people of this province on this issue when they know in everyone's hearts that it's an issue that people do not support anywhere in this province.

We've seen them waste millions and millions of dollars. My colleague, the member from The Battlefords, has talked about the millions of dollars that went to Dome Advertising and Dome Media Buying Services. And we've seen them in this last number of days, Mr. Speaker, commit millions of dollars to advertising the sell-off of SaskPower through their privatization TV ads, setting up these phoney panels to go around and take opinions on whether or not the privatization and sell-off of SaskEnergy is a good idea or not.

The true test, in my view, Mr. Speaker, of whether a government is competent and whether a government can manage a province with any kind of efficiency and effectiveness, is the economic indicators of the day.

We've seen, Mr. Speaker, that the economic indicators in this province clearly show that the Government of Saskatchewan has mismanaged the economy. We've seen the debt of this province on an operating basis go from a surplus of about \$150 million, and a Heritage Fund worth about \$1 billion, to an operating deficit of \$4 billion in seven short years, Mr. Speaker.

We've seen as well, Mr. Speaker, the operating or the capital debt of the Crown corporation sector go from about \$1.8 billion to over \$8 billion. This government has encouraged the Crown sector to highly leverage their circumstances, their financial positions, in order to use the money to pay off their friends through patronage, in order to spend that money through advertising. And they've basically wasted the money of this province to the tune of about \$10 billion, Mr. Speaker, in the last seven years.

That wouldn't be so bad if we had jobs created, because the creation of jobs would provide for new tax revenues to make up for their incompetence and their giving away of \$2 billion to the oil companies. But that hasn't happened. We've seen, on the contrary, the highest unemployment rate in the province's history over the last number of years. We now have over 37,000 people unemployed in this province.

We've seen, Mr. Speaker, the housing starts decline to a level unparalleled in the history of this province since 1905. In 1987 there were 6,822 housing starts in this province. In 1988 that went to 3,800, less than half from 1987. And the Regina Home Builders' Association, the Saskatchewan Home Builders' Association said that was the lowest number of houses started in this province in the history.

Yet when you look at the 1989 figures for the first quarter, they are less than half of 1988, which was the worst year — less than half, Mr. Speaker — an example, clearly, of this government's economic record.

We've seen out-migration of people in this province, a net loss in the first quarter of this year of 1 per cent of our entire population. We've seen as well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, total investment in this province decline, from 1987 to 1988, by 20 per cent.

(1515)

We've seen average weekly earnings in Saskatchewan sink to the second lowest in the entire country. We've seen total retail sales growth become the second worst in the entire country out of the 10 provinces and two territories.

And we've seen an unparalleled number of bankruptcies in this province. Yet we see the government spending \$66,000 a month on polling, on paying their polling firms to ask questions about: well, what should we do next? That's what they've been spending.

We see them spending millions of dollars, \$28,000 a day approximately, on advertising, telling people in this province what a wonderful job they've done with the economy. And the people of this province in my view,

Mr. Speaker, are not going to be sucked into that kind of shenanigans.

An Hon. Member: — How much money was that, John?

Mr. Solomon: — My colleague, the member from Rosemont, has repeated the question: how much money have they spent? About \$28,000 a day. Yet, when we want the government to be held accountable for their actions, they hide.

I had an experience last week, Mr. Speaker, from Weyburn, for example. I had a call from the Weyburn radio station to ask me to come and speak, to participate in an open-line show called Teletalk with the local MLA, Mr. Hepworth, the Minister of Education . . . I'm sorry, the member from Weyburn, the Minister of Education. And I said, sure, I'd love to come and debate the issue of the sell-off of SaskEnergy.

I get a call five minutes later and the manager of the radio station says, well I'm sorry about that, but the member from Weyburn is afraid of you. He doesn't want to come on to the radio station the same time you do. He doesn't want to talk about SaskEnergy. But if you would like equal time we could make some arrangements to provide that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I go out the day following the open line show and I'm told by the manager of the radio station that Mr. Hepworth was crucified . . . I'm sorry, the member from Weyburn was crucified on the open line show the day before. He had 12 calls on the issue of the sell-off of SaskEnergy — 12 calls; 11 of them were adamantly opposed to the government's position. This is in a constituency that has been held by the Conservatives for the last seven years, Mr. Speaker. And in my view now, because they can't sell it, they want to advertise and spend millions of dollars . . .

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

Mr. Hopfner: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if you'd be paying attention to the member opposite in his speech, he was twice using the member from Weyburn's name, and he is all of a sudden on the issue of SaskEnergy instead of the Bill that was ahead of us. And I'd like you to get him back on track, please.

The Deputy Speaker: — In reference to the name, the member apologized, or said he was sorry. I accepted that and I will ask the member to stay on the topic.

Mr. Solomon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do apologize for using the member's name. I get caught up in the moment and I tend to forget from time to time. And I appreciate the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster reminding me on that.

What we've seen, Mr. Speaker, is a government that has refused to go out to the public and be accountable for their actions, yet they want to spend tens of millions of dollars annually, 20 to \$30 million a year, \$28,000 every day, 365 days a week, advertising what a wonderful job they're doing. And they want to try and brainwash people to accept their viewpoint, and in my view, Mr. Speaker, that's totally unacceptable. There's no problem spending

money advertising and informing people about the availability of a program, but in my view . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Your time is up, sir.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hopfner: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to take part in this debate, and it does not surprise me as to the motion that we're dealing with here in the House today. Basically I wouldn't expect anything else but coming from the lips of the NDP opposition, a motion of condemnation of the Government of Saskatchewan.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that they've been kind of shaking in their boots for quite some time as to . . . because of the fact of what the record is saying and what the record is showing the people of Saskatchewan, and the popular mood the people of Saskatchewan are actually in. And I want to indicate to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it wasn't here but a couple of weeks past that they've effectively found out just exactly what the mood of the people in the province of Saskatchewan actually has been.

I want to indicate to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it did not amaze me as to what the numbers the NDP opposition have been discussing here today. I want to indicate to you again, Mr. Speaker, that those numbers are not factual, they're not truthful, and it does not surprise me in the least that they come up with uncalculated numbers as they have been spurting off here in the legislature this afternoon.

I want to indicate to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that . . .

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

Mr. Solomon: — A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The member has indicated the figures that I used were untruthful, and I've taken them out of responses that the government has provided in writing as to what the expenditures were for Dome Advertising. So I'd ask him that he is out of order and to stay away from that. Ask him to withdraw that remark.

The Deputy Speaker: — The Chair is not in possession of those figures, has no way of knowing, and it's in the debate, so not well taken.

Mr. Hopfner: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can rest assured that the only reason the member is standing on a point of order is basically it's to interrupt the 10-minute time limit that we have to be able to speak on this particular subject. And I want to indicate to you that the truth do hurt the NDP, Mr. Speaker.

I want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that when it comes to health care in this province, this government is not taking a back seat to anyone across this country or, indeed, across North American or the world.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hopfner: — I want to say that we've been leaders —

leaders, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in health care. And I want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that when we look at our health card system that we have in this province, it is absolutely second to none — second to none. I want to indicate to you that seniors and young people and parents and families have all told me in my riding and across this province, wherever I've travelled, that this is the best thing since sliced bread.

So I want to indicate . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well that's right. And I want to indicate to you . . . I guess it's . . . Anyway, Mr. Speaker, touched the nerve . . . that old saying has touched the nerve of the Highways minister, so I want to indicate to you I'm sorry that I touched a funny nerve.

But I want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, this is what has been told to me. So when the members opposite say that these dollars that are spent on information through advertising and things like this is to bring this information to the public of Saskatchewan, to allow them to learn about the programs and to know what the government programs are about. I want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that's not wasteful spending; that is useful spending. And that is spending that every taxpayer out there appreciates, to know the programs of a government and to know that there are various programs available such as health care, such as the essential services that government put out.

And I want to indicate to you that when they talk about those dollars should be spent in the areas of health care and education other than getting the information to the public, well I want to indicate to the members opposite, although we give that expenditure in advertising in the programs to the people and show the people what are there for them, we have also increased in health care since we've come to government. We've increased health care expenditures 91 per cent, Mr. Deputy Speaker, 91 per cent.

And that is something that I want to tell the NDP opposition about this afternoon. I want to tell them about that fact that this 91 per cent increase in health care expenditure has now been more than doubled what they had spent when they were in government, Mr. Speaker, through the good times.

I want to also indicate to you, sir, that when we look at health care expenditures in the expansions in hospitals and nursing homes and health care equipment and new equipment every year, Mr. Speaker, I want to just indicate to the members opposite that it was this administration that has been pouring the dollars into health care, not stymieing it, not trying to centralize health care, but decentralize health care.

Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to you that when I hear the members opposite talk about mismanagement, they tend to have a short sight and are promptly looking at their track record and in sheer amazement, and cannot understand the fact that we've done so, so much in so little of a time — this government.

I want to thank my Minister of Health, my Minister of Education. And I want to indicate to you, sir, that

education, they said how was it affected. Well I would say in education in such a short time, in a period of about six years, we've more than doubled the education expenditure in this province. And we've expanded out in information services and advertising and telling the students and parents and teachers just exactly what's available to them in education.

And I want to indicate to you, and I can list off some of the things we've done in education. And this here has been tabled in this House, on the floor, for the NDP and government's information . . . members' information. And this was from the Minister of Education. Saskatchewan's four institutes and urban colleges will be emerged under a board of directors. And that had been done. The province will sign a \$160 million training agreement with the federal government. That was done. Rural community colleges will be restructured into a network of regional colleges offering expanded training in university programs. That was done. A \$3 million distance education fund will be set up. That was accomplished, sir. A distance education council will be established. That was done.

A trade language centre will be established at the University of Regina in conjunction with the Luther College. The centre begins operation this summer.

An Agricultural Commodities Institute will be set up at the University of Saskatchewan. Plans are virtually complete.

Mr. Speaker, first and second year arts and science courses will be offered off campus at an expanded number of locations. That's being done.

And, Mr. Speaker, like I can go on and on, and I intend to. Saskatchewan will host a post-secondary education forum in Saskatoon. The forum was held last October, and it was a great success, sir.

And then the minister promised to advocate a national literacy campaign. The secretary of state introduced just such a campaign last summer. I promised . . . "And this government," he says, goes on, "has promised to set up a provincial literacy council in Saskatchewan, the first of its kind in Canada." The council is in place, and several hundred adults already received help.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I can go on and on and on about the different programs that have been put into place, programs in health and education and services. And I'll tell you, when I hear members from the opposition stand up and condemn this government for giving and allowing that information to be accessed to the people of this province of Saskatchewan, I want to warn the people of this province that if they would get their way, they would not be allowed the knowledge of what governments are doing for the people in the province. And what they are, they're absolutely, they're absolutely afraid, Mr. Speaker, for the truth to get out to the public in Saskatchewan here because they know they're on a downturn.

I can point out to many of these people across the floor that come the next election, Mr. Speaker, they will not be sitting over across that side of the House. I can point to them, and there's a member from Saskatoon Nutana, the

member from Regina Rosemont. I can name you many of the NDP opposition that will not be coming back to this legislature because they have not been truthful with the people in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hopfner: — Mr. Speaker, my constituents are happy about this government's commitment to them. We've kept our word. We've delivered services to the public at large, and to rural Saskatchewan as well as the urban centres. We've been fair right across this province. We delivered facilities that have never been delivered before . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Time has elapsed.

(1530)

Mr. Koenker: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to this motion today that condemns the Government of Saskatchewan for spending millions of taxpayers' dollars on self-serving advertising to conceal their financial mismanagement, waste, and incompetence, and to promote the dismantling of our province through privatization, while other services such as health, education, and the agricultural sector suffer from lack of proper funding.

Now the member who just spoke from Cut Knife-Lloydminster talked about the truth. If the people of the province only could know the truth about this government, and yet, Mr. Speaker, I say it's this government opposite that does not want to share that truth . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Koenker: — . . . that does not want to share their own information and their own actions when it comes to the tabling of information requested by the opposition in orders for return. The people of Saskatchewan should know that it takes up to two years to get information, to get the truth from this government when we ask questions about the government's expenditures.

And when we find out from the government's own information, when they table responses to questions about government advertising, the cash register bill rings up to \$45.8 million, from 1984 to 1988. And, Mr. Speaker, those aren't New Democrat figures; those are figures of government spending, money spent by the PC government to ensure their own re-election and not to serve the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Koenker: — If the people of Saskatchewan were to take a calculator out and to divide that \$45.8 million by the number of days covered by those orders for return, the total would come to \$33,000 a day — by the government's own admission — in advertising and spending costs for advertising. And I say that's no longer acceptable for this government to use the taxpayers' money in that kind of fashion. And yet they continue to do it when it comes to the privatization of SaskPower.

And the people of the province know that full well as they see what's unfolding these days. The people of Saskatchewan know that this government has \$9 million to celebrate the so-called 85th anniversary or birthday party of the province — \$9 million — at the same time that people across the province have to go to food banks because the Social Services isn't providing adequate services for people to allow them to live in dignity.

And, Mr. Speaker, I'm indignant when I look at some of these figures. I'm indignant when I look at some of the specific figures in the orders for return, and I see that the Department of Consumer Affairs can spend, in eight months, \$129,396 on advertising with just one agency, Dome Advertising services. That works out to about \$20 for each and every individual in Saskatchewan that deposited money with Principal Trust, only to see their life savings vanish by this government's negligence and its failure to regulate.

Looking at it another way, if you take the total of all of the government's advertising in only an eight month period to one agency, Dome agency, that would work out to \$800 per Saskatchewan depositor in the Principal Trust company that went belly-up because of this government's failure to regulate. If you take the total figure for all of the government advertising to this one agency, Dome Advertising, from March 1 of '84 to September 15 of '87, there would be \$5,000-plus for each and every depositor in Principal Trust to be compensated.

And I say that would be a far fairer way to use government money than to pay for advertising services. At least there would be, Mr. Speaker, some restitution, some justice for those people who lost their life savings because of this government's negligence. And I say that's symptomatic. It doesn't just come to a matter of advertising with Dome agencies.

This government, this Minister of Consumer Affairs, will have money to pay for an observer to go to the Code inquiry and sit for a year watching the proceedings in Edmonton; will have money to pay for an observer to go there and to report back on a daily basis to himself and to the Minister of Finance; and at the same time will have no money to share any kind of information or details with the Saskatchewan people who lost money in the demise of the Principal Group of companies. I say that's totally unacceptable. I say that government is covering its own actions, its own ineptitude, with public funds.

And the same sort of situation applies to when we look at free trade. This government has spent \$6,250 a month in payments to a Michael Cohen to promote the free trade agreement with the United States — from September 1, 1985 to August 31, 1988.

The same government has spent \$4,000 on the free trade agreement — \$4,000 a month to one individual, Norman Andrews, to promote the free trade agreement with the United States; \$7,000-plus to a Cyril MacDonald to promote that same free trade agreement; \$7,000 a month to Art Wakabayashi to promote that same agreement.

And then — it's not just to individuals, Mr. Speaker —

then in these motions for return, these orders for return that are tabled in the legislature, the government admits that its department of trade and investment has \$88,000 for a free trade conference that took place in Saskatoon a year ago in March 1988; \$88,000 dollars for a free trade conference to promote its own linkages to Grant Devine and to save his hide. And I say, Mr. Speaker, it didn't work, because the people of Saskatchewan turfed out their federal Conservative members.

This government doesn't stop with the Americans to promote its own ends and its own re-election. This government opposite, the department of privatization, has \$27,000 dollars to pay for Mr. Oliver Letwin to come over to Saskatchewan from England and to promote privatization. Mr. Letwin was in Regina just this past February to talk to the issues and technology dinner at the University of Regina. And it costs the people of Saskatchewan \$27,000 for such a trip by Mr. Letwin.

We have another privatization study carried out, in the same information tabled by the government — these aren't invented figures; they're government figures — a privatization study conducted by S. G. Warburg, for which the government paid \$390,000.

The government, the people of Saskatchewan will know, promised before the 1986 provincial election, that SaskTel would not be privatized. And when challenged on that issue, that there had been a survey or a study conducted by the government, the government said that's not the facts. Well the facts come out, in the orders for return, that Pemberton Houston Willoughby was paid \$77,000 for that privatization study — \$77,000 for a study that the government said at the time, before the election, was not conducted into privatization.

And no wonder, then, we see Saskatchewan people leaving this province, when the government has money for its own priorities but not for public priorities. And it's no wonder, then, that in the first quarter of this year 9,000 people plus have left the province of Saskatchewan — a net loss of some 9,000 people plus — because the priorities of this government are wrong.

They aren't in the . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Time has elapsed.

Mr. Gerich: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have listened with interest to the members opposite as they have spoken to the member from North Battleford's frivolous motion. And I particularly listened to the remarks during question period to the members opposing the communications program of SaskEnergy, and I would like to deal with this a bit at a time.

Mr. Speaker, what this motion says and what the remarks during question period reflect, are simply self-serving words of silliness. Now let's consider the case about whether or not SaskEnergy should be allowed to hold public meetings at which the people can appear and ask questions, as well as make their own concerns known.

Now on the one hand the NDP tells us that we should listen to the people, then if we have public hearings they

tell us that we shouldn't listen to the people. Then they say we should listen to the petitions that we've collected and that's enough. Well, Mr. Speaker, some 40 per cent of the people in this province voted for the NDP in 1986, and they have succeeded in collecting only one-half of 1 per cent of the population's names on their petition.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP were unable to get most of the folks who voted for them in 1986 even to sign their petition, and yet they say that we should not hold public meetings to listen to the people? Well, Mr. Speaker, these meetings are legitimate and they will be held.

I listened to the member who seconded this motion rant on about people leaving the province and about the population's size in this province. Let me tell you, to the members opposite, the population of this province in the NDP's best year has never been up to what it's been in our worst year, and that's right. Our worst year has been better than their best.

So it isn't enough to say that we New Democrats are really new now. They're not enough, because everyone knows that they're the old NDP Party who spent huge amounts of money on advertising their ideology and philosophy, and that had nothing to do whatsoever with the average person.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP advertising that is going on right now is an example of the same kind of hypocrisy that this motion represents.

The Leader of the Opposition says the government is selling SaskPower, and he says talking about SaskEnergy is a shell game. Then I challenge him, Mr. Speaker, I challenge him to stand before the media this afternoon and say that there's no difference between the public participation in SaskEnergy and an announcement that the hydro dams and the power lines and all the electrical systems are up for sale. That's what the Leader of the Opposition is saying when he's telling us that SaskPower is up for sale. It's untruth and it's . . . it is an untruth, and it's in advertising the same as we've got when the members opposite formed the government.

And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that kind of propaganda was taken to a grade 4 class here in Regina and put to nine-year-old children to listen to and to believe in. Well it's reprehensible.

Mr. Speaker, the people have the right to know what government is up to and they have the right to be informed of the choices available to them. We have an obligation to advertise the many programs of the government, and the opposition know full well that advertising budget goes to providing such information as reminding people when a deadline for crop insurance approaches.

Should we stop advertising such information as that, Mr. Speaker? Should we stop advertising the heritage grant for senior citizens? Should we stop informing the people how to apply for their home improvement grant of nine and three-quarter per cent interest to protect their homes. Obviously, these programs should be continued and the opposition know it.

Mr. Speaker, the biggest beef is the advertising being done with SaskEnergy. Well I think there's a genuine need for a sound communications programs on a matters that affect a broad range of people on matters on which people must make a choice. Clearly, the purchase of shares in SaskEnergy is a matter of choice. Clearly, before deciding whether or not to get involved, a public participation of SaskEnergy is one that most people would want information on before they make that choice.

(1545)

As an aside, Mr. Speaker, I noted that the member from Regina North stated that we were here today . . . he said today we're talking about issues that are of no importance, and I have to agree with that assessment. The main motion put before us by the opposition is not important, but rather a frivolous attempt to get attention.

And what's more, Mr. Speaker, the member from the North West mentioned that it was 32 days into the session and the opposition is still holding the Assembly hostage with extended and witless speeches detailing the staffing of potash companies, and a rambling silliness designed to obstruct the work of the Assembly. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that today our caucus office, we counted almost 2,000 letters demanding that the opposition allow the Assembly to get back to work and quit with their stalling tactics.

As this resolution on advertising, aside from the clear fallacies it contains, is simply another stalling tactic. Well the people are increasingly tired of hearing the NDPs repeat their arguments of the 1960s and the '70s, and we're looking at this Assembly to get on with the work before it.

Mr. Speaker, I would briefly return to my primary theme, that the need for a sound communications plan for the government . . . that there is a need.

Let me read to you, Mr. Speaker, in the NDP resolution that was passed, and emphasize that it was passed and has never been repealed, to my knowledge. But it is important to know that it was passed because the opposition likes to pretend that most of the crazy resolutions never got passed.

The point, Mr. Speaker — the following policy of the NDP — is government advertising should be fully controlled by political considerations, and I quote resolution no. 6275 of the 1980 convention:

Be it resolved that a cabinet committee oversee and co-ordinate all major advertising campaigns by government departments and agencies.

Well you know why they want that, Mr. Speaker. And I must say that since it is still their policy, I will consult my colleagues and see if we might be able to accept the policy of the NDP and perhaps implement it, as it calls upon the government and not upon the NDP government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, my time is almost out, and I'd like to

support the amendment and oppose the motion.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Mr. Speaker, clearly the debate on this motion is about the misspending of money by this government on advertising and what the advertising is being used for.

What has happened over the last two years of this government, Mr. Speaker, and particularly during this session, is that the government has found itself on a mission of privatization which is not being accepted by the people of Saskatchewan.

The people of Saskatchewan have asked members of the opposition, and I assume they would have also asked members of the government, to just hold off on this privatization scheme, to hold off on it. But instead of holding off on it, the government has made up its mind in a different direction and has decided, well the people . . . and I assume has said, well the people don't really know what we want to do, so we'll advertise it.

I interpret it a slightly way, Mr. Speaker. I interpret it as a government that's bull-headed, that does not want to listen to the people of Saskatchewan any longer, and a government that is going to try to push its agenda on the people of Saskatchewan whether they want it or not. And the government that believes like an advertiser does, or a government that believes like a salesman of soap does, that you can eventually sell it if you just repeat it often enough and sell it often enough to the public.

In this case, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, it won't work. In this case, Mr. Speaker, I tell you that not only won't it work but it's going to work against the government, because the people object to having their money misspent in this fashion.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan have had several experiences with privatization. And the money that we're talking about being misspent here is money to be spent on the advertising for privatization and the privatization schemes, whether it be privatization of potash or whether it be privatization of SaskPower.

But the people of Saskatchewan have had some experience with privatization. We saw our highway equipment sold, \$40 million worth of highway equipment sold for about \$6 million. What was the result of that privatization? Really it didn't benefit the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan saw the dental program privatized. That was a privatization initiative. We didn't see any benefits result to the people of Saskatchewan; didn't see any cost saving. If there were any benefits at all that were positive in this privatization move, the people of Saskatchewan would definitely have recognized them by now. But we haven't, Mr. Speaker.

What we see instead of any benefits is a continued increase in our debt; we see continued increase in our debt, Mr. Speaker; we see continued increase in taxation, Mr. Speaker, in taxation; and at the same time we see decrease in services. Taxes going up, debt going up, and services going down — exactly the opposite way as was

promised.

And now what's happening is, to add an insult to that injury, we're getting a government that's coming out and saying, we're going to spend more money to convince you, the people of Saskatchewan, that you're wrong, and that we, the PC government, is right.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that what the government should be doing is instead of hiring a commission at the cost of \$1,200 a day — the Barber commission, that's a form of advertising — instead of sending out civil servants from SaskPower to 80-some meetings, they should take the message out themselves. If they really believed in what they said, they could take this message and go to the people themselves. There's a couple ways of doing it. One is simply to get in your car and go and travel to your neighbour. Let him go see; let him go see.

If they haven't got the guts to do that, to go and see their constituents and ask them about that and reverse a decision, if they haven't got the guts to do that, the least the government could do would be to call an election on this very important issue. They could call an election, then the people would decide.

I find, and the people generally find it rather objectionable to be subjected to brainwashing on television, through commissions, and through committees travelling around the province doing the work of a politician, the work of a politician which should be to go and listen to the people. They're using this as a stalling tactic.

What I don't like in particular, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that this stalling tactic is costing the people a lot of money. Last year this government spent \$46 million in advertising in total — \$46 million in total.

The SaskTel bond issue in itself cost, I would say, well over \$2 million, probably between 2.5 and \$3 million in terms of advertising. Now think of it. Advertising SaskTel bonds, something that people already believe in, this government spent \$3 million on. How much is it going to cost to convince the people of Saskatchewan to accept this SaskPower privatization? Just do a comparison on that — something the people have already rejected. Is there going to be any limit to the amount of money that this government is willing to waste on advertising?

Now I would say that the task is at least tenfold. Are they prepared to put in three times 10 — \$30 million into advertising this? If it was such a good idea, the people of Saskatchewan would be knocking down their doors and saying yes, do it; yes, privatize it. That's what they were doing. That's what the people of Saskatchewan would be doing. Instead they're doing the exact opposite. The people of Saskatchewan are going to the members, are going to the opposition, are writing letters to the members, I'm certain. They're talking . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Time has elapsed.

MOTIONS

Resolution No. 2 — The Problem of Unemployment

Mr. Hagel: — I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, may I first of all say I am pleased to see you back into the Speaker's chair and to say to you that while you were absent and unable to perform your role of service to the people of Saskatchewan, that my thoughts and sympathies were with you, and I'm pleased to see you back here today, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is my combination of pleasure in terms of opportunity but sadness in terms of necessity to have to address today resolution no. 2 in the private members' motions. It seems to me, quite simply, Mr. Speaker, that in Saskatchewan today these are times of tragedy — times of tragedy for many, many, literally thousands upon thousands of Saskatchewan families.

I noted with interest, as I listened to the debate on the previous motion, that these are not times of tragedy for Dome Advertising or for Roberts & Poole advertising — not times of tragedy for those corporations of preference by the PC government today, Mr. Speaker, in their mad rush to advertise anything that's unpopular, and Heaven only knows that that list is increasing every day, Mr. Speaker. And so these are not times of tragedy for those advertising firms.

And I noted with interest, Mr. Speaker, as well, that as the government members stood in their place to speak about this previous resolution condemning them for the excess waste of literally millions upon millions of taxpayers' dollars spent in advertising a government perspective, many times what would be most appropriately spent as partisan political advertising, I noticed that none of the government members, when they stood, even gave the slightest recognition that maybe there was something slightly erroneous about that kind of perspective, and that there are other matters to attend to; that in making those decisions about priorities which are the responsibility and the prerogative of government day after day, week after week, month after month, year after year, that somehow it just might be appropriate to reduce the amount of excessive taxpayer dollars that are being spent on public advertising, political advertising, when they could and should be spent on a number of other issues.

And it's on one of those other issues, Mr. Speaker, one of those crises that faces the people of Saskatchewan today, that I want to focus my attention and direct my remarks this afternoon.

We are seeing in the province of Saskatchewan, in the late 1980s and possibly into the first year or so of the 1990s, a headlong rush towards privatization at the initiative of the Government of Saskatchewan today. And while the PC government engages in this privatization mania, Mr. Speaker, people are fleeing the province, literally fleeing the province, looking elsewhere with hope that their dreams and aspirations can be realized somewhere in our nation other than in their home province of Saskatchewan.

And so, Mr. Speaker, when I look at the facts — and I intend to share a good number of facts this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, with the members of the Assembly and those who pay attention to the debate of this legislature — the

facts tell me clearly that there are two undeniable crises, two undeniable crises going on in Saskatchewan today. What are they?

Number one, Mr. Speaker, is our loss of people. People are literally fleeing the province of Saskatchewan. And the other undeniable crisis, Mr. Speaker, and not unrelated — it is intimately related — is our crisis in unemployment in the province of Saskatchewan. And you can't talk about one without the other because largely the reason that people are fleeing the province of Saskatchewan is because there is so little hope that their employment aspirations can be realized in this beautiful province of ours.

And so accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I give notice to the Legislative Assembly that at the conclusion of my remarks I will move a motion to the effect:

That this Assembly regrets the total failure of the Government of Saskatchewan to address the tragic problem of unemployment, which has caused a dramatic increase in the out-migration of Saskatchewan young people in search of education and employment opportunities elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin then with a recitation of some of the facts, the undeniable facts, the source all of which is the Government of Saskatchewan in its own documents. And let me relate to this debate and to this Assembly some of these facts that depict a tragedy going on in the province of Saskatchewan today.

(1600)

Mr. Speaker, it's a fact, a fact that over the past 16 months there has been a net loss, a net loss of over 24,000 people from the province of Saskatchewan. Now I'm not talking about the number of people who have left the province. That number is substantially higher. When I talk about net loss of people, Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the fact that some people move into our province and others move out. And when I say 24,000 people in the last 16 months, let me make it very clear that I am referring to the fact that 24,000 more people have left this province than have come into Saskatchewan over the last 16 months alone — 16 months.

And is it getting any better? Is it getting any better when we review the government's own statistics? Has the government recognized that there's a problem here which needs to be addressed, a problem which is impacting on literally thousands upon thousands of Saskatchewan families? Is it getting better? Well sadly to say, Mr. Speaker, it's not getting better; it's getting worse.

In 1989, in the first four months of this year alone, Mr. Speaker, in 1989 literally 10,700 people more have left this province than have come to choose Saskatchewan as their place to live. In the first four months of 1989 alone, nearly 11,000 people have fled this province with shattered dreams and loss of hope for a future here in the province of Saskatchewan.

Do you know what's saddest of all, Mr. Speaker? And set

aside the fact that if you extrapolate that over an entire year, that would mean that we would suffer a net loss of over 30,000 in our population this year alone. I shudder to even consider that possibility, Mr. Speaker.

But you know what's saddest of all? When I look at the characteristics or the categories of people who are leaving this province, 35 per cent, over a third of the people who are leaving the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, are in their twenties, between the ages of 20 to 29.

And clearly Saskatchewan is undergoing a brain drain and at the same time a youth drain. The crisis can be summarized, Mr. Speaker, by saying what we have going on in Saskatchewan today is a human energy drain, a human energy drain. And can any province, can any province cope with that kind of loss of our most prized, our most valuable resource, our people. And especially, Mr. Speaker, when those who are fleeing this province are those who are usually considered to be the future, to be the future of a province, the young people. Those who have the greatest amount of energy and creativity and initiative, those are the very ones, Mr. Speaker, who have been most affected by this crisis in Saskatchewan. Those are the ones we are losing to the largest degree.

You know, Mr. Speaker, this brain drain just didn't begin this week or this month or this year. This brain drain has been going on for some time, and some of it, I contend, Mr. Speaker, has been specifically cast as part of the game plan by the government opposite. It was part of the agenda of the PC Government of Saskatchewan to initiate a brain drain from our province.

Now I don't tend to be one, Mr. Speaker, who approaches life looking for bogymen. I don't tiptoe around the house looking into dark closets wondering what might be there, Mr. Speaker. I prefer to think the best of people and to be optimistic in looking at what's going on. But I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, when I look at the realities, when I look at the realities, one can conclude nothing other than that the brain drain began by design back in 1987 — by design.

Now many of us in this House will remember in those times, 1987, the first year following the re-election of the PC government in the province of Saskatchewan.

In the fall, in October 1986 we came back to this House for a short two-week session before Christmas. And while the government was assuming that the people of Saskatchewan weren't paying attention because they were doing their pre-Christmas shopping and attending to personal family matters and those sorts of things, we had a Bill No. 5 go through this Legislative Assembly, giving this government the authority to create and disband and manoeuvre and change government departments without ever having to set foot in the Legislative Assembly. That could all be done behind closed cabinet doors. Significant changes in the very structure of the delivery of services and the administration and enforcement of legislation could be done behind closed cabinet doors.

And that was a crucial issue. Obviously it was — we had

to come here within two months of the election, in December 1986, to deal with this very important matter. So we're led to believe.

And then when did we come back? We did not come back to this Legislative Assembly until nine months, I believe it was, nine months after the actual election, in the middle of June 1987. And I recall, as I hope all of us in this Assembly recall and never forget, the literal devastation, the deprivation of the spirit of the people of Saskatchewan that was experienced by citizens and by our constituents all across the province as day after day announcements were made, brutal announcements about cuts in services, wiping out organizations.

And then in that whole environment, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Finance at the time said, oh my goodness gracious, you know, before we went into this election we knew that there were some financial problems and it was in control, but my goodness gracious, we thought that the deficit was going to be less than \$400 million this year, and whoops, after the election we discovered it was \$1.2 billion; we made a little mistake folks, but now times are tough and we're going to have to start cutting to the bone. And that message was given to Saskatchewan people through a series of cuts in services like this province has never known before.

And mixed into this whole mood of the province of Saskatchewan that we were going through a psychological depression that I'm sure, although I wasn't around in the times of the Dirty Thirties, the economic depression that was as devastating psychologically to the people of Saskatchewan as the Dirty Thirties were, was introduced an early retirement package, this government called it — an early retirement package.

And I recall, Mr. Speaker, receiving several phone calls from constituents who were long-time civil servants who had served the people of Saskatchewan proudly as a statement of a professional career, but who were over the age of 50, and who were simply devastated by the coercive overtones, the coercive overtones that were part of this government's hack-and-slash mentality; wondering, wondering, Mr. Speaker, whether they should take this coercive early retirement package that was being "offered" — and I use that word in quotes, Mr. Speaker — that were being offered to them by the Government of Saskatchewan. Literally devastated.

And the Government of Saskatchewan justified all of this by saying, well we made a monumental mistake, but what the heck, we're only human. So what if we made an \$800 million mistake. Somebody's got to pay the price, and the person who's going to pay the price is you. That's what this government said to the people of Saskatchewan and said to its own employees.

And so the early retirement packages were offered. And what happened in the province of Saskatchewan? A large number of dedicated professional civil servants who had served — many of them had served at least three different political stripes of government; under three different political stripes of government, had served the most important people in this province, and that's the people of the province, not the politicians — were faced with a

critical decision: do we take this early retirement or do we stay and run the risk of being cut and left with nothing?

And it seems to me as I look back at that, Mr. Speaker, there was the beginning of a divine plan, a plan to create in the province of Saskatchewan a brain drain, to remove from this province some of the most capable professional people who best understood what conduct of good government was all about and the implications on the people of Saskatchewan. And we saw it. We saw people leaving the civil service by the hundreds, by the thousands.

And who was leaving? It was those who had the most experience; in many cases, those with the most education, those who were, I suppose another way of saying it, the most expensive on the payroll — without any sense of cost-effectiveness and recognizing that people with experience and professional training and dedication, who have proven it under several stripes of government, have got something to offer any government, and most importantly the people that it serves.

And so we saw back in 1987, in the spring of 1987 the beginning of a brain drain in the province of Saskatchewan, initiated by design by the PC government of the day.

And what's going on today, now, Mr. Speaker, is simply a continuation of something that started over two years ago. And the brain drain in this province is trickling down. These folks love the trickle down theory. Well it's trickling down all right. It's trickling down to people who are in their 20s.

Two years ago we saw people in their 50s leaving this province, devastated by the vicious decisions of the government of the day. Today, Mr. Speaker, we have literally thousands of families in Saskatchewan feeling devastated by the brain drain that's going on among the young people who are leaving our province; many of them people with young families, just newly out of school — academic training, high school and post-secondary education — and looking to establish a future for themselves and their families with the hopes and the aspirations that all young people have, that they will realize the opportunity to make their mark in the province of Saskatchewan and to provide security and opportunity for themselves and their families.

Many of these people with young families themselves, and many others of course, Mr. Speaker, who are the children of long-time Saskatchewan residents, families in this province who had the hopes that their children could grow up and be educated and find their professional niche here in the beautiful province of Saskatchewan, being devastated by what is going on in Saskatchewan today.

I don't think a single week goes by when one of us in this Legislative Assembly doesn't have at least several conversations with constituents who are concerned by the fact that their children or their brothers or sisters or neighbours or good friends are either packing up and leaving or have already left, because there just isn't an

opportunity for them to realize their dreams, to realize their aspirations, to realize their hopes in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

And so we've got depression by design, depression by design brought to us by the PC government of Saskatchewan today. Well, Mr. Speaker, 24,000 fled the province in the past 16 months — 10,700 this year alone.

Let me share some other facts, Mr. Speaker, facts from the bureau of statistics of Saskatchewan, the Government of Saskatchewan today. These are not my numbers; these are the numbers that are published by the Government of Saskatchewan today. I've talked a bit about the numbers who are leaving this province. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that in Saskatchewan today — the most recent statistics being from last month, from April — in Saskatchewan today, literally 8.9 per cent of the people of Saskatchewan are unemployed and looking for work. That's up.

I said before, is the situation getting better? Is it getting worse than a year ago? Well, Mr. Speaker, it's kind of obvious, and it's kind of sad; it's worse. That number is up 0.6 per cent, over half a per cent from a year ago. And so when you compare — because it's not always fair to compare one month to a different month of a different year — compare April of this year to April of last year, what's happening for the people of Saskatchewan? The picture's getting worse.

(1615)

Literally in Saskatchewan today, one out of 11 — one out of 11 Saskatchewan people are unemployed, 42,000 in total; 42,000 men and women in this province unemployed and registered as looking for work, 42,000. Mr. Speaker, that's more than either our second or third largest city, Moose Jaw and Prince Albert. More people than every man, woman, and child — you could probably include the pets — in those two cities to make up the total number of people in this province who are unemployed and registered as looking for work. And how does that compare? Two thousand worse than a year ago. April of last year there were 40,000 unemployed; in April of this year, Mr. Speaker, 42,000 unemployed.

Well, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . my colleague asked me how that compares to 1982, and I'll deal with that a little later, Mr. Speaker.

Because it seems to me, and I want to get a clear . . . paint a very clear picture of what it is we're dealing with today and make some recommendations as to how we can address those kinds of problems. Because in fact the province of Saskatchewan has addressed very effectively the significant responsibility of government to employee and to provide the opportunity and the environment to create employment for its own people before. There are some principles that have been applied effectively and that can be applied effectively again, and I'll address those a little later.

We can talk about the other side of the coin; we can talk about employment. Maybe some of the members of government will say, well yes, unemployment

percentages are up, but goodness gracious, population numbers differ and maybe there's more people working in Saskatchewan. Maybe there's some success, if you look at it that way, Mr. Speaker.

Well the fact of the matter is, again from statistics Saskatchewan, from the bureau of statistics, that the number of people employed in Saskatchewan today is down — down literally 9,000 fewer people working in the province of Saskatchewan today than a year ago, than in April of last year. The number of people fleeing the province is up, the percentage of people unemployed is up, and the number of people actually employed is down.

An Hon. Member: — What about drought?

Mr. Hagel: — Well the member from Weyburn raises drought, and we'll get to drought. We'll get to drought, Mr. Speaker. We'll get to drought and we'll get to there in good time, because there are a number of facts, Mr. Minister, that you may want to attend to. If you are not feeling uncomfortable with the performance of your government and trying to stimulate a little common sense action in your cabinet meetings and in your caucus meetings, then you may want to.

And let me give you a few facts, sir, to back up what any kind of initiative you may want to take to get the Government of Saskatchewan working for the people of this province again. We'll get to that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Well, Mr. Speaker, another measure of success of a government can be the size of its labour force. I've talked about out-migration, I've talked about the percentage of unemployment, I've talked about the number of unemployed. What about the actual labour force itself, the size of the labour force — the number of men and women who are available to work in the province of Saskatchewan. Has there been any measure of success there, Mr. Speaker?

The fact of the matter is that the bureau of statistics of Saskatchewan tells us that there are 6,000 fewer people in the labour force in the province of Saskatchewan today as compared to a year ago — 6,000 fewer in the labour force; 6,000 fewer men and women available to work in the province of Saskatchewan.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, and again I refer to the Saskatchewan bureau of statistics, is that the Saskatchewan unemployment rate today, the Saskatchewan unemployment rate today is higher than the national average for the sixth straight month.

Now never before, Mr. Speaker, since unemployment statistics were kept, never before has the province of Saskatchewan had a higher rate of unemployment than the rate of unemployment across the nation. We've always been better. We've always been better, but in Saskatchewan today under PC government, we hit yet another new low, Mr. Speaker. For the sixth straight month, for the first time since statistics have been kept, the unemployment rate in Saskatchewan is higher than the average across the nation.

And so clearly, Mr. Speaker, it is undeniably true that in Saskatchewan when you look at unemployment, no matter how you want to measure it, no matter how you want to look at it, we're worse than we've ever been before, and we're worse than Canada as a whole.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, if we want to speculate a little bit it gets even worse. The fact of the matter is that the only reason that our unemployment figures, our unemployment statistics — and let us not forget that those are not numbers; most importantly those are people — the fact of the matter is that the only reason that they're not worse is because people are leaving. The reality is that if those who have fled this province had stayed at home in Saskatchewan and looking for work, Mr. Speaker, our unemployment rate in Saskatchewan today would be approximately 14 per cent or one in seven, and we would be right in there with New Brunswick and Newfoundland.

And how long have those of us in the western part of our country looked at what's going on in this nation and said the most deprived economies, the most deprived provinces in which to live have been some of the Maritimes, Newfoundland, the most frequently quoted.

And so here we are. If our people were not fleeing our province, the reality would be that Saskatchewan would be another Newfoundland when it comes to unemployment. We already recognize that Saskatchewan is another Newfoundland. We're second only to Newfoundland in the rate of poverty in this province, Mr. Speaker, and the devastation for Saskatchewan families goes on.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at the number, at the impact of employment on young people, maybe there is this massive unemployment going on, and somehow it's affecting those who haven't caught the stream or haven't jumped onto the raft, going with the flow of technological change. Maybe what's the problem, this government may suggest, is that some of our people who have been at the same job for a long time just haven't been able to make change.

Well the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that one group that is particularly paying the price are our young people. That's the sad fact of the matter. When I look at the numbers again, the government's own statistics, from the bureau of statistics of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, it says to me that the number of young people working in this province between the ages of 15 and 24 years old, is 74,000. There are 74,000 young people between the ages of 15 and 24 years working in the province of Saskatchewan today.

How does that compare, Mr. Speaker? Is that better or worse? Sad to report, Mr. Speaker, that that is down literally 10,000. There are 10,000 fewer young people between the ages of 15 and 24 working in the province of Saskatchewan today than there were a year ago at this time.

Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, sometimes we can get caught up in debate and place a bit of an over-emphasis

on numbers. We politicians perhaps spend a little too much time on occasion looking at numbers and not enough time looking at people.

I was doing some reading through some of the newspapers of the province, Mr. Speaker, and I draw the attention of the Legislative Assembly to an editorial by the editor of the *Prince Albert Daily Herald*, that was in that paper on April 15 of this year. The title of the article that I refer to, Mr. Speaker, is, and I quote, "Leaving the province becoming thing to do." Leaving the province becoming thing to do. What a sad statement! What a sad statement about what's going on in the province of Saskatchewan.

Let me just draw a couple of . . . three or four paragraphs from this article, comments of the editor of the *P.A. Daily Herald*, Mr. Speaker. He writes, and I quote — he leads off his article this way:

One of the more popular things to do in Saskatchewan, it seems, is leave.

The province suffered a net loss of 16,000 residents to other provinces last year. It is the largest loss in the country.

Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker. "... the largest loss in the country." That is a factually correct statement.

He goes on to say:

It is Saskatchewan's highest net loss in 20 years.

Then he continues the article, Mr. Speaker, by saying this:

Sadly, it is most often our young people who are leaving. They hear about the booming economies of Ontario and other provinces. They look at their prospects in Saskatchewan. They leave to find their fortune.

They leave to find their fortune.

It is understandable that Saskatchewan young people are dreaming of a better future. People without dreams are no longer young.

Is there a more explicit way that it can be said than that, Mr. Speaker, when we try to understand the tragedy of unemployment and out-migration affecting Saskatchewan people today, when Mr. DeGurse says in his editorial:

People without dreams are no longer young.

Young people in Saskatchewan today, Mr. Speaker, are growing up fast; they're growing up quickly because it's getting tougher and tougher to dream in the province of Saskatchewan.

So we have a crisis on our hands, an undeniable crisis on our hands no matter how you look at it — whether you want to look at human beings and look at your neighbours and your friends and your relatives, or if you want to look into the government's own bureau of

statistics and see what it has to say about employment and people leaving the province of Saskatchewan.

And what has been the response of the PC Government of Saskatchewan? Let's assume the kindest for a moment, if we may, Mr. Speaker; let's assume that this government recognizes that there is a crisis going on in Saskatchewan today. Let's assume that this government has the insight. What have they said then? If they've said we have a crisis on our hands in the province of Saskatchewan, what has been their response? Their response has been to say, give them more of the cause. Give them more of the cause; that's what they say.

Piratization, Mr. Speaker, piratization has been the cause, and piratization has been what this government has promised to people in Saskatchewan — more of the cause. They say: you think there's a problem now; hang on folks, because you're going to get more of the same. That's what we promise you — more of the same. What a bunch of unadulterated balderdash.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the member from Weyburn raises, he raises — he said, what about the drought? Well let me take a moment, Mr. Speaker, to reflect on the drought, because I admit we've been having a drought and that's made it more difficult for the economy in our province. Not denied at all. But has the drought started at the western border of Saskatchewan and proceeded across this province and ended at the eastern border, end of drought?

If the drought is the cause of the problem, Mr. Speaker, then we either accept that Saskatchewan is the only province to have had a drought or we look at those provinces that have had a drought and see how they compare to the province of Saskatchewan. If we want to be realistic, if we want to be realistic . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member from Morse will have an opportunity to debate this too, and I invite you, sir, to take a look at the facts.

If there's a drought anywhere, Mr. Speaker, the drought goes on in the minds of the members opposite. That's where the real drought is.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Speaker, Statistics Canada has recently released the in-migration and out-migration numbers for the provinces and the territories in Canada. And let me take a look at these and review them and put them into context and specifically look at what is going on in Saskatchewan compared to the rest of our country, Mr. Speaker.

In 1988, according to Statistics Canada, the province that had the largest in-migration, the largest number of people coming to their province, was Ontario, over 79,000, followed by British Columbia at 46,000; Quebec, nearly 12,000.

Alberta. Now has there been a drought on in Alberta? Has anybody noticed whether there's been a drought in Alberta? Mr. Speaker, have those rain clouds been coming over from the Pacific Ocean across British

Columbia and Alberta, dropped all their moisture and then got to the Saskatchewan borders and went dry? Or has there been a drought in Alberta? Does Alberta have any agricultural economy? Do they grow any grain in Alberta? Mr. Speaker, some of the best grain in the world comes from the southern part of Alberta.

And what's happened in Alberta? While Alberta, our neighbour to the west, has suffered this same drought in 1988, they've managed to have an in-migration of 5,114 people. While Alberta has been going through this same drought, their population has been increasing because people have been coming there.

(1630)

Well, Mr. Speaker, Prince Edward Island — Prince Edward Island had an increase in population, 740. Not many, but some. And then the Yukon — the Yukon increased its population by nearly 300. Mr. Speaker, last year six provinces and territories literally increased their population because people were moving to those provinces or the territory of Yukon.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there were six — six provinces or territories that had a net loss. A net loss. When I referred to these before, those were net in-migrations; that's a net increase. There are six provinces, Mr. Speaker, that had a net loss in population in 1988, and who were they?

Well the sixth worst, Northwest Territories, they lost 382, a net loss migration of 382. Nova Scotia had a loss of over 700 people — they were the fifth worst.

Newfoundland, Newfoundland had a loss, and we sometimes count our blessings that we don't have to deal with the hardships and the difficulties of Newfoundland. Newfoundland had a loss. They had the third worst . . . sorry, New Brunswick, New Brunswick was fourth worst at a loss of 962, and then Newfoundland was third worst — a little over 2,000.

The two provinces that affected the most — and here, I admit we see a reflection partially of the drought — Manitoba was the second worst in 1988 with a little over 6,300 net loss out-migration of its people.

But, Mr. Speaker, when I look at the Statistics Canada, who do Statistics Canada say had the worst record in the nation? Who had the worst record in the nation by more than double the next? Saskatchewan! Here in the province of Saskatchewan, according to Statistics Canada, we had a net loss of 14,771 people, Mr. Speaker — a net loss of nearly 15,000 people last year alone.

Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, these rain clouds that came across the Pacific and dumped moisture on British Columbia and Alberta, because somehow they were removed from the drought, and then leap-frogged over Saskatchewan and then started to dump rain in Manitoba again, what a ridiculous explanation, what a ridiculous explanation.

Obviously it didn't happen. Obviously Manitoba had a drought that was at least as harsh as that here in Saskatchewan, and with a population base greater than

ours, suffered a loss of only 6,300 people, while here in Saskatchewan, here in Saskatchewan, we said goodbye to nearly 15,000, to nearly 15,000 people. And that's the reality.

So when someone tells me from the other side, Mr. Speaker, that the explanation for our population loss for 1988 was drought, I say balderdash. Balderdash . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, here's the member from Shaunavon. He says we don't know anything about it. So I tell you, I tell you, I can read government statistics that your government puts out. I wish, sir, that you would read them, that you would understand them, and you would understand the implications and would start putting a little pressure on your front-benchers here to start doing something about it. Then you'd be doing your constituents and the people of this province a favour for a change.

Do you . . . Is it your contention, sir, is it your contention that these rain clouds, that leaped over Saskatchewan and brought us drought, started dropping moisture at the Manitoba border? They rained up to the Alberta border, went over top, and then started dropping moisture in Manitoba? Will you get real? Will you get real? Will you start looking at fact, and most importantly, will you start looking at the future and what needs to be done for the people of this province?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — And so what have we got? What have we got today, Mr. Speaker, in the province of Saskatchewan today? We have a government that says privatization is the only thing that matters. That's what distinguishes us. That's what distinguishes us from Manitoba and Alberta — two provinces, one on each side of us, that had the same drought that we've had here. What makes us different? If it's not the weather, then what makes us different? And I contend, Mr. Speaker, that when we look at what's different, what's different is the political agenda of the Government of Saskatchewan.

We have in this province a government that says not only that privatization is the thing, they say it's not only the thing, it's the only thing. That's what they say, Mr. Speaker, and they say, Mr. Speaker, that if we right-wingers . . . we are right-wingers, and if we go down in the next election, we're going to take the people of Saskatchewan kicking and screaming with us. If you look at the actions, that's got to be the message, Mr. Speaker.

Well part of that prediction, I think, will come true. They will go down, but it will be Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition that would be doing everything it can to keep this government from taking the people of Saskatchewan kicking and screaming when they go down, the next time that the people of Saskatchewan have a chance to make a choice.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — So when will they learn? When will they learn, Mr. Speaker? Is this a new phenomenon that just cropped up this year and has been going helter-skelter, hell-bent for leather? The fact of the matter is, Mr.

Speaker, when I look back at the government statistics again, the fact of the matter is this: the privatization agenda largely began in 1984 and 1985. That's when it started, not that long before the last election, although this government — and I'll make reference to that shortly — was quite hesitant to admit that that's what it was about. Didn't want to talk about privatization in an election.

But the agenda had already begun. And when I look back, Mr. Speaker, over the last four years, over the last four years, shocking as it may seem, Saskatchewan has had a net loss of over 41,000 people in the last four years — over 41,000 people have left this province with shattered dreams over the last four years. What a measure of success, what a condemnation of the performance of a government!

We have a Premier who likes to say we're number one. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to many of the most negative numbers that impact on people's lives in the province of Saskatchewan, sadly to say, without even being close, we are number one — we are number one.

And I say for the benefit of the member from Wilkie, who seems to have a little difficulty grasping what's going on here, that this is a sad time for the people of Saskatchewan. And it is a sad time because of the kind of leadership that has affected the lives, the lives of literally thousands upon thousands of Saskatchewan people and their families.

And what's been the record of privatization? Has this been the employment boom that it was supposed to be? I mean, has privatization been working wonderful? Has privatization reduced our debt, or has it reduced our taxes, or has it increased our services, or has it reduced our out-migration, or has it increased our employment? None of those, Mr. Speaker, none of those — none.

When we look at the reality and this government's record on privatization, going back to 1984, when the former minister of Highways, in his offhanded kind of way, referring to the cuts of highway workers — they were going on and saying they were going to transfer them to the private sector. We had the Highways workers being cut — 400 jobs went lost; went lost, Mr. Speaker. And they weren't picked up by the private sector; they just went lost. The fact of the matter is, what little Highways work was being done was often being done by out-of-province firms and out-of-province employers and employees who went back home and paid their income tax, because that's where they lived on December 31 — 400 jobs lost as a result of privatization.

What about the dental care program? We celebrated the 25th anniversary, to the day, of the introduction of medicare in this province by taking the school-based children's dental care program out of the schools and transferring them to the private sector — another 400 jobs lost; 400 dedicated, professional dental therapists who were effective at working with children and teaching them good dental health. Best doggone preventive health care program that this . . . not only this province — this country and this continent have ever known — gone. And not only that, 400 workers — gone from the province of Saskatchewan.

Saskoil — did the privatization of Saskoil, all the great wonders of Saskoil — and we can reflect on all of these as we see Bill No. 20, The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, before us.

And all of the tunes sound familiar, Mr. Speaker, how we're going to expand and diversify and provide investment opportunity and create jobs, and how all the people of Saskatchewan are going to become rich and profitable and create employment, and the province will boom.

Saskoil was privatized. Within two years, three-quarters owned outside the province of Saskatchewan, the shares. And within six months, within six months, 25 per cent of the jobs gone — privatization — from Saskoil.

And so what does this government say? Well we know, they're saying, we know, we took Highways and we privatized it. We privatized it and it lost 400 jobs. And we know that we took the school-based children's dental care program, we privatized it and it, and we lost another 400 jobs. And we privatized Saskoil and we lost another swat of jobs. And we know that people are fleeing this province, and we know that unemployment is up and we know that employment is down. So what are we going to do about it? We're going to give you some more. That's what they say.

And how do we know that? All we have to do, Mr. Speaker, all we have to do is take a look at the documents that we get every day in this Legislative Assembly, and remind ourselves of the legislative agenda of the Government of Saskatchewan today. Bill No. 1, the first Bill brought into this Legislative Assembly, presumably because it's such a high priority to deal with the problems of the people of Saskatchewan today; Bill No. 1, an omnibus privatization Bill that gives the minister of privatization the right to do whatever he wants, wherever he wants, however he wants, without having to wiggle his big toe in the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan. Boy, is this what we've been looking for! We've hammered here for the last four years, and we're going to hit you again, they say, to their legislative agenda.

And then along we move; we move to Bill 20, to privatize the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Never mind the fact that back in the '70s private potash companies were refusing to pay their taxes and royalties; never mind the fact they refused to open their books to the Government of Saskatchewan; the people of Saskatchewan, by the Canadian constitution, owned those natural resources — never mind all that; never mind the fact that they refused to allow the government to influence the extraction of potash from Saskatchewan soils. Never mind all that.

And so how did the people of Saskatchewan respond? The people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, responded with pride, and they responded with assertiveness. The people of Saskatchewan, through their government of the day, said: those natural resources belong to the people of Saskatchewan. The people of this province have the right, by the Canadian constitution, to benefit from those God-given natural resources below the surface of our soils, and if you're not going to pay your taxes and allow

for the government that represents the people, the democratically elected government, to influence how that happens, then we're going to have to get into the business ourselves.

And it happened. And by 1982 the original investment, without one single penny having been charged to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan — not a single penny — by 1982 the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan had been completely paid for, had paid dividends and royalties in excess of over \$400 million.

(1645)

Yes, the Minister of Health laughs. Yes, I guess it would be kind of humorous when you look back. Those were the good old days, weren't they? Those were the days when the Government of Saskatchewan was managing the economy of Saskatchewan, where the benefactors of the management, most importantly, were the people of this province.

And it strikes us all a little odd today as we look back, as we look back at what was once done with good quality management, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan having been completely paid for. And in addition to that, Mr. Speaker, some \$271 million in taxes and royalties paid to the province in addition, as well. While that \$413 million profit was paying off the original investment, another \$100 million dividend to the general revenue to the province of Saskatchewan — money to keep down the taxes charged to Saskatchewan people, and money to provide improved services to the people of this Saskatchewan.

And people were working. My goodness gracious, you need only look at the statistics. People were working — 4.1 per cent unemployment at that time. I was kind of shocked by the fact that more than one in 25 people in Saskatchewan had to look for work back in 1982, Mr. Speaker, when I first ran for election to this Assembly. I was ashamed of that, to tell you the truth, but my God, compared to today it sounds like heaven.

And so what have we got? We've got a Government of Saskatchewan saying, well never mind the fact that people are fleeing, never mind the fact that people aren't working, never mind the fact that we've been hammering away at privatization for over four years now, we're going to give you some more of the same; we're going to privatize the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. And somehow this is going to provide a solution to all our problems. What a joke! What a joke!

An Hon. Member: — That's Bill 20.

Mr. Hagel: — That's Bill 20. And then they come in and they're going . . . not only that. I mean, never mind the fact that it's not working, we're going to give you an omnibus privatization Bill that lets the minister do whatever he wants. Never mind the fact that the potash corporation, when the New Democrat government was managing it, made money, and it loses money when the Tories are in charge of it; never mind all that, we're going to privatize it, too.

Then we're going to privatize the SaskPower, the natural gas side of SaskPower. That's going to be the solution that we're looking for, Mr. Speaker. That's going to really be the breakthrough in terms of bringing down rates in both gas and the loss of the cross-subsidization for electricity rates for home owners, business people, and farmers. That's really the breakthrough that we're going to be looking for.

And then yet, the minister of privatization tells this Assembly: and there's more to come. Never mind the fact that we keep swatting you over the head, we're going to give you an SGI privatization Bill, too, just to prove how good this all is for you.

And the people responded, Mr. Speaker.

I find it kind of interesting. Every now and then there is an intellectual breakthrough on the other side, Mr. Speaker. I find with interest . . . I note with interest as I look at the *Moose Jaw Times-Herald* in January — I believe it's January 23 of 1985 — prior to the last election. At that time the member from Kindersley, who was the minister of Finance, came to Moose Jaw. And what did he have to say, Mr. Speaker, when he came to Moose Jaw prior to the 1986 election? As I note with interest, when we went through the election, whenever the word "privatization" came up, my goodness gracious, none of that. They weren't going to have any of that. What did the minister of Finance have to say before the election?

Well it's reported in an article entitled, Mr. Speaker, "Crown corporations aren't for sale" with a picture of the Minister of Finance. In the article it says, and I quote, Mr. Speaker. There is some reference to some Tory resolutions . . . If the member from Redberry, member of Redberry would like to reflect on party resolutions, and just gives me a shout here, we can get in, we can get into party resolutions.

But the coverage of the article, Mr. Speaker, and making reference and following some coverage of PC Party resolutions, says, and I quote:

Some party members see the sale of Crowns as a method of raising capital for a cash-starved government currently facing a billion dollar cumulative deficit.

Oh, Mr. Speaker, that was back in the good old days, compared to today. In 1985 our deficit was only a billion dollars. We've had the best business minds of the PC Party just applying their little calculators ever since, Mr. Speaker, and we're now up to \$4 billion cumulative deficit.

So that's what it says. But then it goes on to say, and I quote, ". . . but Andrew doesn't agree." It says that the Minister of Finance doesn't agree with the pressure being brought by the PC Party members. Well what does he have to say? It says, and I quote — the Minister of Finance, the PC Minister of Finance in 1985, Mr. Speaker, he says, and I quote — "Privatization is yesterday's theory." Well there is the intellectual breakthrough that we've been looking for, a glimmer of hope in the cabinet of the PC caucus.

And why does he say it doesn't agree? Because he didn't want to make a wild ideological statement. He had a reason for it, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Finance went on to say, and I quote: "It doesn't make sense for one government to build these things and for the next one to come and sell it all off."

Well whatever happened to that worldly advice to the PC government from its Minister of Finance prior to the 1986 election? "Privatization is yesterday's theory." And I think, Mr. Speaker, I finally found the statement that the now Minister of Justice and I can agree upon. I agree, privatization is yesterday's theory. It's the economic theory that took us kicking and screaming out of the 1920s and into the Dirty Thirties here in the province of Saskatchewan.

The Minister of Finance in 1985 had the insight to recognize it, and if he could just get his colleagues to recognize the wisdom that he had back in 1985, the people of Saskatchewan would be a lot better for it, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if you see a drowning man, you don't throw him an anchor. You don't throw a drowning man an anchor, and you don't help unemployment and out-migration with privatization mania, pure and simple.

And that's the nub of the question, Mr. Speaker. Privatization is yesterday's theory. It's the economic model, the unfettered free enterprise, free market, market determination understanding of the world that took not only this province but this country and much of the world into an economic depression of the 1930s.

And so it's a joke. You know, I have to laugh, Mr. Speaker, when I see the members opposite talking about moving into the '90s and the turn of the century with privatization. My God, do we need to look any further than the government's own statistics to understand that already their 1930s economic theory of privatization is taking this province back to the previous biggest disaster it ever knew.

And that's exactly where it's taken us. This province has known privatization before. It knew it from the '20s and throughout the '30s, and out of that time, Mr. Speaker, was born a political movement, a political movement made up of farmers and labourers and business people and educators and working people — people who believed, who believed that the privatization economic model of the '30s didn't have to be the way it's done. And they created a new political movement to put that into force, Mr. Speaker.

And we will all know our Saskatchewan history, our Prairies history. They created the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, the forerunner of the New Democratic Party, to begin to turn around that archaic, outmoded, ineffective, unfair economic system now known in 1989 terms as privatization. That's what they were changing.

They were changing. They were people motivated by a vision, a vision of social fairness and justice where ordinary men and women would have the opportunity to see their dreams realized in the province of Saskatchewan. And what they were motivated to do, Mr. Speaker, was to take the privatization economic model of the day and make it part of Saskatchewan's history, never to be seen again.

And so here we have the great forerunners of the future in the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan today saying there is nothing so terrible that we can't learn from our mistakes all over again, intending and consciously leading this province through the kind of depression that we saw back in the 1930s, taking us there all over again, Mr. Speaker.

And so I say, I say very simply, Mr. Speaker, that when I look at the facts of the matter, privatization is not the cure, privatization is not what will cure what ails us in the province of Saskatchewan; privatization is the cause. And it's privatization that's got to go, not the young people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Speaker, clearly what we need is a government plan that will keep our young people home in the province of Saskatchewan and that will let the ideologically motivated privatization economic model go. Clearly that's what we need.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we can go beyond the facts, we can go beyond the facts and we can draw from the information. What I've said so far has been factually based. I've quoted my sources and you know that. What I can draw now . . . And if you want to debate the wisdom of this one, I guess we can do that too. I'd like to make reference to the government's own labour market and population forecasts . . . projections into the future that were done by a policy secretariat of the Premier's Executive Council, a confidential economic forecast for the period of 1987 to 1995 that, to say the least, Mr. Speaker, indicated that the prospects for the future are not encouraging in the province of Saskatchewan.

And so what did the Premier's own economic forecast, confidential forecast, say, Mr. Speaker? It illustrates the implications of the Tory government's mismanagement of the provincial economy over the last few years, and forecast . . . it forecast at that time significant out-migration because of the poor economic opportunities here. The report stated, and I quote:

Economic prospects in Saskatchewan are worse than in central Canada encouraging people to leave the province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, with all of that — and my colleague will have more to say — it is my privilege to move in the Legislative Assembly at this time:

That this Assembly regrets the total failure of the Government of Saskatchewan to address the tragic problem of unemployment, which has

caused a dramatic increase in the out-migration of Saskatchewan young people in search of education and employment opportunities elsewhere.

I move that, Mr. Speaker, seconded by my colleague from Saskatoon Eastview.

Mr. Pringle: — Mr. Speaker, I've got some comments to make on this important motion. Given the time, I'd like to adjourn the debate at this time. Thank you.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do now adjourn.

The Assembly adjourned at 5 p.m.