

EVENING SITTING

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

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

Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, prior to the supper break I was able to bring a few of my introductory comments to this Bill to the debate. I have much, much more to say, but in order to facilitate the arrangement made earlier this day with the Government House Leader, I would now like to move adjournment of that debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Lane that **Bill No. 20 — An Act respecting the Reorganization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan** be now read a second time.

Mr. Romanow: — Well thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you very much to my colleagues. During my remarks yesterday I explained why the debate on this legislation is so vital to the future of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. I talked about how potash provides the people of this province with a unique economic development opportunity for the 1990s, and into the 21st century, because it is a resource in which we here, in the province of Saskatchewan, dominate the world market.

The legislation before us, Bill 20, as I explained, will determine how our province manages, develops, and sells this important non-renewable resource for years and years to come. Yesterday as well I explained what I believe to be the fundamental question in this debate. And that fundamental question, Mr. Speaker, is this: should we, the people of the province of Saskatchewan, manage, develop, and sell our potash ourselves for our own benefit, or should we let others do it for us for their benefit? That's the question. That's really what this debate is all about.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the PC government to your right proposes to turn over control of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to foreign investors and to investors from central Canada. That's what Bill 20 does. I said yesterday, and I repeat again, that there is nothing in this legislation — absolutely nothing — which requires a single share of the privatized PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan) to be owned by a Saskatchewan resident. Let me repeat: nothing in this legislation requires that a single share of the privatized or soon-to-be-privatized PCS to be owned right here at home by one Saskatchewan resident.

And we on this side of the House say that this is wrong, that this is the wrong way to go. We say that this represents a sell-out of Saskatchewan's economic future. We say that's turning the clock back to the 1960s and the 1970s when the foreign owned and controlled potash

companies called all the shots in the Saskatchewan potash industry. We say that's wrong, and we're going to oppose this Bill with all the force that we have.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I said yesterday, without repeating my remarks again at length, that it's wrong because it hasn't worked. In the 1960s and 1970s I described him the consummate free enterpriser, Ross Thatcher — truly a political giant in this legislature, even though I disagreed with his philosophies and programs. That consummate free enterpriser did and worked under a regime because he believed in it, what Bill 20 wants us to do in the 1990s.

Thatcher believed that through regulation and through taxation, he could control the resources of this renewable, unique resource, potash, for the benefit of all the people of Saskatchewan. And soon he found out, as I recounted yesterday, that for the trouble of all of his efforts he ended up being charged as an unindicted co-conspirator, actually an alleged felon under the American laws because the multinational corporations that controlled the potash industries balked at that effort, balked at the effort that we took over subsequent to 1971 because regulation and taxation proved to be ineffective. And in effect they called the shots of the potash industry; they held the people of the province to ransom.

We, the people of this province, learned from that experience. That's why PCS was set up. It was a pragmatic response based on the philosophy that the resources of this province belong to all the people of this province and not IMC (International Minerals and Chemical Corporation Ltd.), and the government opposite wants to turn the clock back and we're not going to let them turn the clock back.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — You know, it's funny how it is that we as Canadians permit in Quebec the Quebecois to talk about being maître chez nous in French — masters of their own house. And in 1971 when we took office, we in the province of Saskatchewan promised to be maître chez nous, masters of our own house in the light of that circumstance that I've described to you.

And we created the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan because we said people in this province can prove the job, they can do it; that we can determine our destiny; that we can be masters in our own house; that we have no desire to give that up; that we want to build a future for our children and for their children. And we did.

Now the PC government today under this Bill doesn't believe that Saskatchewan people can be maître chez nous. They do not believe that we can be the masters of our own house. They don't think that the Saskatchewan people, with PCS, can compete with the multinational potash companies in the world; compete and beat them at their own industry game in the world. That's how little faith they have in the province of Saskatchewan.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, as I said yesterday, that we did. We met them on the competitive playing field. We didn't export our young men and women to Chicago or to Hong Kong or New York to do it. We met them on the international export because we're masters of our own house. We met them right here in Saskatoon and Regina, and we beat them to the PCS and the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And what a record it was, as I explained yesterday, which I will not take the time of the House again to repeat in detail. But in the six years since we established potash, in 1976 to 1982, before we were defeated, and every year, Mr. Speaker, the government and potash corporation turned a handsome profit and returned taxes and royalties to the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

We paid off in that six short years, Mr. Speaker, our entire investment for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan which, by the way, wasn't nationalized. That potash was set up through the free bargaining and negotiations between PCS and the corporations that were involved, and we paid it off on \$400 million investment within that six years. We paid it off. And more than that, Mr. Speaker, we returned royalties and revenues to the people of the province of Saskatchewan to provide hospital care and health care and education facilities and roads, unparalleled in the history of the province of Saskatchewan . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And then of course we did not plan . . . Nobody could foresee, of course, what happened in 1982 as my friends opposite assumed the office and took over the government of the province of Saskatchewan.

And their record — unlike ours, six out of six with profits and returns — their record showed up to be a record, a dismal record of losses, very quickly, although they still managed to, in effect, rob the treasury of PCS to pay dividends to the Crown investments corporation and to themselves to try to balance their burgeoning deficit, as I explained yesterday.

Not even they could totally botch it up, but the result is that four out of the six years they did not succeed. And today we just had, finally, Mr. Speaker, finally the 1988 annual return of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan tabled.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I'm a little bit proud about one small victory — it's a small victory in this whole major debate that we're involved in — but the victory that we got in the government tabling that 1988 potash report. They tabled it and they weren't going to table it. Mr. Speaker, they tabled it only because we in the opposition demanded that we would not proceed further in this debate until they did so, and they did table that 1988 report.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — A small victory to be sure, Mr. Speaker, but given the way this government acts, the way this government in effect tries to cover up; the way this government tells a bit of half-truths from time to time; the way it unveils policy on a piecemeal basis; the way it sort of comes back afterwards, after the debates are done; this indeed was a victory for democracy and for this opposition, and for the people who may be watching this very important debate.

Now this 1988 report . . . This afternoon I've had a chance to study it and it's been released. And it shows the PCS position for the 1988 year. And what it shows to me, Mr. Speaker, are a number of things.

First of all it shows to me that, notwithstanding the mismanagement and the waste of the PC Party and the government opposite, even the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan couldn't help it — they made a profit of \$106 million this year, notwithstanding the incompetence of the administration opposite.

It shows me something else. It shows me that the potash industry is a cyclical business. Like any major resource industry, Mr. Speaker, there are periods of down time and there are periods when it goes up. There are periods when we are going to lose some money and there are periods when we're going to make lots of money. But on balance the chart will always show that the chart is going up; all the time the returns are going up. And even here, in 1988, in spite of, I might add, the mismanagement of all of those people who now run PCS, and the government opposite in particular, they made a profit of \$106 million.

And this 1988 annual report itself talks about a corporation which is totally owned by the people of our province — right here, totally owned. We are the shareholders right now making a profit for our province, for our people.

That report shows that there's a relatively healthy PCS. It could have been much healthier if this government had really rolled up its sleeves and done the job that it was intended to do from 1982. But nevertheless, even out of the PCs and the Premier of this province, it turned a profit of \$106 million in 1988 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right.

Members of this Legislative Assembly — a profit of \$106 million. A profit for the people of the province of Saskatchewan, not for the people of Dallas, Texas and not for the people of Hong Kong. A profit of \$106 million for the people of this province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — What an investment. What an investment, Mr. Speaker. An investment which pays dividends on an ongoing basis.

And this 1988 report also shows that the potash corporation had a successful year from production. In 1988 the PC mining production operations produced a record, they say — 5.1 million metric tons, more than a half a million than the previous production period.

On page 7 it says the following in the annual report:

In short, PCS mining produced record tonnes with record high efficiencies, record low costs, and outstanding safety figures.

An efficient and productive corporation, Mr. Speaker, making a profit for the people of the province of Saskatchewan — \$106 million. And the question then has to be asked: why in the world are we debating Bill 20 which wants to give away that profit of \$106 million to the people outside this province?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, they've gone too far in this privatization.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1915)

Mr. Romanow: — They've gone too far.

And what about sales? They turn a profit of 106 million, they turn a record production year. According to their annual report they had a strong year for sales as well. According to this record — for this report, Mr. Speaker, for a change — there was a significant increase in the level of off-shore sales over the levels of the past several years. And the total off-shore sales were more than 2.3 million metric tons. And the total sales, domestic and off-shore together, were more than 4.7 million metric tons.

Once again I quote the annual report which I have in front of me: record production levels last year, record sales volumes last year; they say it's a record year for sales. In short, Mr. Speaker, again, even under the PCs — even under all of the things that these people have tried to do to hobble this great corporation, even under them — we have here an efficient corporation which took advantage of the world market, that met the people of their competition on the world market, and this year at least, beat them; a profitable corporation of \$106 million made for the people last year.

And what about the future, according to this report? Well according to this report, Mr. Speaker, the future is laced with these kinds of descriptions. On page 8 they say, "Our outlook for 1989 is positive." On page 9 they say, "... we are looking for increased sales into North America ...". On page 9, we expect the off-shore market to remain strong. On page 5, we're going to improve our position from 1988 and 1989. And on page 9 again in this annual report, Mr. Speaker, they say, "We look forward to the future, eager to take advantage of market growth as more and more countries provide better diets for a growing world population." Get this from the annual report: "PCS is well positioned to respond to this anticipated increase in world demand for potash."

Now, Mr. Speaker, they say that PCS is well positioned. Well positioned now, not with the sell-offs, not with the give-aways, not with the privatization. They don't need the extra capital; they're well positioned now. What in

the world are we doing selling it off?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize the point — \$106 million profit this year and they're well positioned for 1989. They didn't say in that annual report they need extra capital or outside foreign investors. They're ready and they're positioned, according to Mr. Childers. They say they can do the job for all of us, and goodness knows, with the 4 billion dollars-plus deficit that these people have racked up, we could use the money to tackle that deficit, or at least to improve health care and education.

They're well positioned, and so the question has to be asked: why are they doing this? Why are they privatizing it? Their own advisers, their own managers are saying they don't need this privatization. They say, we've done the job for you. They say, we've produced a profit notwithstanding the way that you're standing in the way. The question that has to be asked and answered is why in the world are they doing this, Mr. Speaker. I'll tell you why they're doing this, because they are so ideologically right wing, and out of touch, and old-fashioned, that they are determined to destroy PCS and Saskatchewan with it because of that ideology. That's why they are doing it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Well the Hon. Minister of Urban Affairs sort of mocks that statement. I'll invite him to get up in the debate and tell us why they're doing it; why they're doing it when the president of the corporation says they shouldn't be doing it, when the results of the 1988 annual report says they shouldn't do it. When you take a look at the continuum from 1976 to 1988, from '76 to '88, that's 12 years you can say even after all the losses, they ought not to be doing it. Why are they doing it?

The member from Regina can be mocking my statement all the way, but no other rational conclusion can be made except that the Premier of this province is confused. In the last election campaign, he tried to run as Tommy Douglas; now he doesn't know in the future campaign whether he's going to try to run as Allan Blakeney or a Maggie Thatcher. That's the answer — they're confused.

These people opposite, the only answer can be, their only motivation for doing this is because they are so old-fashioned, they are so right wing, they are so tied to the large, multinational corporations, they have lost so much touch with the grass roots. They came into office with some good ideas in 1982, Mr. Speaker, and now they have lost that after seven long years in power. There can be no other explanation as to why they've done this, no other explanation.

A hundred and six million dollars in 1988 alone even under their administration, Mr. Speaker. And that is profit, as I say, for this province, that's profit for the starving children right here in this province. We have the second highest rate of poverty in all of Canada — shocking. We could be using that money to provide a hot lunch program for schoolchildren right here. But they're going to sell it off and deny that profit to the people of

Saskatchewan.

A hundred and six million dollars for schools and for highways and for hospitals and for other important public services like the hungry children that I've talked about, but they're going to sell it off. A hundred and six million dollars, that's this year's profit. And once they privatize it — and I'm going to say a word about as to how extensive this privatization can be in a moment — once they privatize it, that's a once-in-a-lifetime benefit only, gone, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, \$106 million, this year only, this year only that would pay for the entire budget's . . . Get this. And I draw this to the attention of the member from Regina, the minister of municipal affairs, that \$106 million would pay for the entire budget costs of the following provincial government programs for a full year without a penny's tax.

The hearing aid plan — do we need it? The home care plan; the dental plan — do we need that in rural Saskatchewan? The school for the deaf, regional colleges, day care, family income plan, Opportunities '89 student summer jobs program — do we need that, Mr. Speaker? Do we need that with 6,000 people leaving in February this province alone, and another 1,600 in the month of March? They could pay for the veterinary services program of the Department of Agriculture. They could pay for the entire provincial Department of Environment and Public Safety, and goodness knows, we need that money there for sure.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And that, Mr. Speaker, is for this year, because this is only a one-year profit — \$106 million. If you had that profit each and every year, just think how you could apply that profit in the variety of ways that could be applied to this province, how you could apply that for the benefit of working men and women and for farmers and for small-business people. And if they privatize it, if they give it away, if they sell it off, where is that money going to come from next year, and the following years, and the years after that, to pay those programs?

Talk about, Mr. Speaker, a short-sighted party. Talk about a government that has lost a vision. Talk about government and a party that has lost the guts to govern for the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Talk of a party that wants to take us back to the past of Ross Thatcher. That's what this party wants to do. They want to take us back 20 years. This is the old party, the PC Party, I'm talking about. They want to turn back the hands of time. They want to go all the way back to the 1960s and the early 1970s. They want to go back and pretend that they're Ross Thatcher, and I want to tell you, he couldn't do it, and these people couldn't carry Ross Thatcher's shorts to the hockey game to do the job.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Talk about, Mr. Speaker, a party that is out of touch. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and I say to the Premier and the minister in charge of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, for your short-sightedness, for your mismanagement, for your deliberate ideological approach to turning the clock back 20 or 30 years, back to the Bennett buggy days and perhaps as early as that, for all of your failings, I say to you, Mr. Premier, and to all of you members opposite, you are going to pay a political price come the next provincial election. Mark my words for it. The people will not let you forget.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — But there's another aspect of this which speaks now more to process. I want to just touch on this very briefly on process. Mr. Speaker, we have here a major Bill, obviously. Tomorrow, sadly, we're going to have a privatization of yet another victim of PC privatization, SaskPower. They broke their solemn word when they said they would not privatize SaskPower. Tomorrow will be even perhaps a darker day than today's debate on potash because they broke their word in a very basic public utility like power.

And I raise power because I want to come back to the potash Bill about process.

We are being asked and we are debating this Bill. The only thing that we have in front of us, of course, are the public clippings and the press statements of the minister at the time of the briefing that the minister had of the potash Bill, and some clippings from the Premier when he was on the orient express, although those confused everybody in Saskatchewan and were of no help whatsoever.

We are debating, Mr. Speaker, a major piece of legislation which perhaps all of Canada is watching — I won't say only potash, I will say power as well — as they dismantle this province brick by brick, mortar by mortar; as they do away with your heritage, sir, and my heritage and the future of our children.

They are doing all of this, and they won't even on this potash Bill give us any of the details of exactly what they intend to do and how they intend to do it — nothing. They won't answer the questions as to what shares they're going to retain and what amount they're going to offer for sale. They don't tell us which assets they're going to retain and what amount they're going to offer for sale. They don't tell us any of the terms and the conditions of the share offering.

We don't know if there's going to be such a sweetheart deal made, that yet we pay another premium — we, meaning those who can't afford to buy the shares — a premium to those who can afford to buy the shares; if we're going to be subsidizing the rich in that way. They don't tell us the details. They don't tell us who's handling this. They don't tell us who's going to be making the profit in handling this deal. They don't table any of the appraisal reports. I mean, we don't even know what we're selling here.

The government's own advisers say that the corporation

is worth \$2 billion. The government shillies and shallies and says, oh maybe it's \$1 billion, maybe it's \$1.2 billion. And we, the journalists in the province of Saskatchewan, are letting this government get away with that.

Yes, the member from Regina municipal affairs is again laughing on this thing. It is outrageous in a democracy, Mr. Speaker, it is outrageous in a democracy. Maybe you can't table every document; I realize some documents are sensitive and they can't be tabled. I know that. We took that position. Every government needs to take that position — past, present and future.

But it is outrageous, Mr. Speaker, that in a democracy at least the basic fundamental facts of exactly what is being proposed, and how it's going to be achieved, are not being told to this democracy, to this democratically elected Legislative Chamber. I say that is an affront to democracy. I say that's an affront to the people of the province of Saskatchewan. It's an outrage. It's an attack on democracy and that is reason enough to defeat this government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Where in the world has our sense of democratic commitment gone, Mr. Speaker? Do we simply believe . . . Does the government simply believe that it can hold, as it will tomorrow on the power Bill, a press conference with my colleagues in the journalistic press gallery at 8:30 and give them the technical briefing on how they're going to sell off power, and then give them the 9:30 political briefing as to how they are going sell off power, as they did with potash? And that's it. Get the big headlines and don't worry about any of the details. Don't worry, we're not going to tell the opposition if we ask the questions. Just trust us. Just like they said in another area, trust us, we won't do away with the drug plan. And of course they did away with the drug plan.

(1930)

I mean, where in the world is this province heading? What kind of ideals to democracy are we speaking to? What kind of vision of how this parliament and this legislature is all about are we're talking about? Do these people think that we're simply rubber stamps who are going lay over and accept their plans to destroy and dismantle the future of the province of Saskatchewan, to destroy the future of these young men and women that we're all working for, without at least accountability? Yes, they have been elected to do this — maybe. But they weren't elected to do it and do it in secret. They weren't elected to do it by cabinet decree. They weren't elected to do it by press release.

And may I say, when I ask the question, were they elected, I don't recall, in 1986, the Premier of this province running around the province of Saskatchewan saying, elect me and I'm going to privatize the power corporation. Do you recall him saying that? Do you recall him saying that?

I don't recall the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan running around this province saying, elect me and I'm going to privatize the Potash Corporation of

Saskatchewan. Do you remember that, sir? I don't remember that.

I'll tell you, the only thing I remember the Premier, in 1986, running around and telling the people of the province of Saskatchewan — not telling them — begging Mr. Mulroney for a billion dollar bail-out that saved his hay, saved his bacon in that election. That's the only thing that he talked about.

He was not telling the people all the facts in that election. He was not coming clean. He has no mandate to do what he's doing.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, he has no mandate to do this — absolutely no mandate. And I want to tell you something else. They were inconsistent, and they are inconsistent in their positions.

The minister who introduces this Bill, the minister in charge of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, when he was a Liberal back in 1976 . . . 1975, in opposition to what we were doing with the potash corporation, as a pragmatic response . . . You know he had some other colleagues sitting to his left, and those were the Conservative members. And he got up, and he criticized the Conservatives about our legislation. He said, quote: "The Conservatives, obviously, Mr. Speaker, have not read the Bill." He refers to his now colleagues. He goes on to say: "You know that the government is not accountable for what it's doing."

He attacks us for not tabling the reports that we tabled and the documents that we presented. And then he goes on to bitterly attack the person who is now the Deputy Premier of the Conservative Party. That's the Liberal member as he then was, the member from Qu'Appelle.

Now of course he and the Deputy Premier are in league. Little did we know how history and how time works, that these two Liberals and Conservatives would come together now, and in 1989 pull off this hijack of Saskatchewan's interests — this heist of Saskatchewan's interests.

But they didn't get a mandate, Mr. Speaker. I say to the people of the province of Saskatchewan that the Premier and this government did not get a mandate to get on its privatization. I don't only mean potash but I mean power. I say what he ought to do is resign and call an election on the entire issue of privatization. Let's have this out right now.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — No, but they won't do that, Mr. Speaker. They won't do that, not until the polls show them something else, or if they can get these . . . if they can sell off all of our Crown corporations. They got power on the chopping block tomorrow. They got potash on the chopping block today. They got SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) on the chopping block the day after tomorrow. They got SaskTel on the chopping block. Once they get a nice little kitty of all kinds of returns, then

of course they'll get this money and then they'll try to bribe the voters one more time to get in. That's when they'll call the election. That's what the game plan is. Well I've got news for the Premier and the PCs opposite. We're up to that trick right now, the people of this province are, because we don't want fast buck, short-change artists who have no vision. The people of this province want a party and a premier that leads with conviction and determination to build for the future — and that's this party right now, right here.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to move to another area before I take my place, and that is the legislation itself. And I invite, again, the members of the press gallery and others who are watching this debate on television tonight and those in the legislature . . .

An Hon. Member: — You've got to be kidding.

Mr. Romanow: — Well I . . . The minister of municipal affairs says I've got to be kidding because I'm suggesting anybody would be watching this debate. Well I tell you, the minister of municipal affairs says that I've got to be kidding, but I tell you, I think the minister of municipal affairs is hoping that nobody is watching this debate tonight. That's what I've been . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — But I invite you, sir, and I invite the Conservatives opposite and I invite the new member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, I invite him, for example, to take a look at this Bill, Bill No. 20, the sell-off of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Read it, Mr. Minister . . . Mr. Member. I invite the member from . . . Who's sitting beside him?

An Hon. Member: — Melville.

Mr. Romanow: — The member from Melville, read the Bill. He's in the . . .

An Hon. Member: — I wrote it.

Mr. Romanow: — He wrote it. Now they wrote it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member from Melville wrote this Bill then we're in deeper trouble than I think we are, Mr. Speaker. We're in very deep trouble.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I want now to review this legislation, because as I closed yesterday I said that I wanted to use this debate to put my detailed objections to the provisions of Bill 20 before the House.

I've talked about the principles, the objects of this legislation in philosophical terms, and I want to make one point on philosophical terms. This is not a debate only of philosophy, although there are visions of Saskatchewan

which are clashing here. This is a debate also because of history and learning and pragmatism. I've gone through that — the Thatcher period — I've talked about that.

But now I want to review the legislation because I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that there are some things which concern me there very much. I direct your attention, sir, to sections 2, 3, 8, and 12 of the legislation. I want to say a few words about each one of those sections.

I want to begin by referring to section 2. And this section is important because it defines the terms used throughout Bill 20. Now there, Mr. Speaker, if you take a look at section 2, subsection (1), you will see that there is a definition of resident and non-resident for the purposes of the Bill.

And what's clear from these definitions is that the shareholders of a privatized Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan are to be divided into two categories: residents of Canada and non-residents of Canada. Listen to this, Mr. Speaker: residents of Canada and non-residents of Canada. Non-residents of Canada: that is foreign governments, foreign corporations, or individual investors are to be allowed to buy up to 45 per cent of the privatized PCS. Residents of Canada are allowed to purchase the other 55 per cent.

Note what I said earlier, Mr. Speaker. The Bill does not — note — the Bill does not require a certain percentage of the shares to be owned by Saskatchewan residents. It only says that they be residents of Canada.

That is why I've said earlier in this debate, and continue to say, there's nothing in this legislation to require even a single share of a privatized PCS to be owned by a single Saskatchewan resident. Under this Bill, 45 per cent of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan could be owned by foreign interests, and the remaining 55 per cent could be owned by investors from Ontario and Quebec.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. members opposite: how is that public participation in the potash corporation for the people of the province of Saskatchewan? Mr. Speaker, get what I'm saying. If the objective is to give the people of the province of Saskatchewan the right, the power, a meaningful right to participate actually in the ownership of this corporation, how is it so, how is this objective achieved, if 45 per cent can end up in foreign hands, and 55 per cent in non-Saskatchewan Canadian hands, outside the province of Saskatchewan? How is that participation?

Mr. Speaker, today every man, woman, and child in this province owns a piece of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan today. I don't need a share. I know that I am an owner of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And I'll tell you one thing, Mr. Speaker. I sure as heck don't need a share signed by the Hon. Premier, Grant Devine or the Premier of this province of Saskatchewan, to tell me that I'm a shareholder of this corporation either. Every man, woman, and child can benefit from the success of this resource corporation.

There may be down times, but overall the success of the corporation, because that's the history. Under this scheme, under this Bill, 100 per cent of the ownership of PCS could be outside this province.

Now I want to move on to section 3 of the Bill which sets out the basic approach to the privatization. I want you, sir, and the members of the journalists' gallery to follow me on my reasoning on this.

Under section 3, this sets out the basic approach, that is that PCS and its various subsidiaries will transfer assets to a newly publicly traded corporation called the purchaser corporation. That's what this Bill sets up. The language used in this section is very broad and very vague, and it gives the provincial cabinet very wide powers to dispose of the assets of the potash corporation — very wide powers — in any way that it wishes.

I want to read section 3 into the record for your benefit, sir, and for the benefit of the public that may be listening and watching this debate tonight. Section 3 says in part as follows, quote:

... subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council (that's the cabinet):

- (a) PCS;
- (b) a PCS subsidiary; or
- (c) PCS acting jointly with a PCS subsidiary;

may enter into transactions that provide, directly or indirectly, for the sale, assignment, transfer or other disposition of all or substantially all of the PCS assets and the assets of PCS subsidiaries to the purchaser corporation on any terms and conditions that the Lieutenant Governor in Council (that's the cabinet again) may approve and for any consideration that may be approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council (that is the cabinet again).

Note the words "all" or "substantially all" of the PCS holdings.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this means that the PC cabinet is not required to transfer all of the assets of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to this newly publicly traded company, the purchaser corporation as it's called. And why is this important? It's important because the purchaser corporation, and only that corporation, which has on it any restrictions with respect to foreign ownership that I've talked about.

So, Mr. Speaker, under clause 3 of this Bill, the PC cabinet could sell off any portion of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to anyone at any price before it transfers anything to this newly publicly traded company that it talks about — without any limitations at all of 45-55. For example, the PC cabinet could sell off the PC reserves at Esterhazy to IMC of the United States.

Yesterday I said that this government had a scheme about to sell off PCS's interests at Esterhazy to IMC. I invite the minister to rebut me when he closes the debate. Or it could sell the PCS Lanigan potash mine, or a portion of it,

to communist China outside of this provision. Or it could sell it to India, or to any other foreign ownership matter because the foreign ownership restrictions of this legislation would not apply. They only apply to the purchaser corporation.

Mr. Speaker, in short, section 3 of this Bill gives the cabinet total freedom to sell any portion of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to foreign interests over and above the 45 per cent referred to in this Bill.

What I am saying is this. You set up the purchaser corporation. They are limited to 45 per cent of what they get to sell, but what they don't get to sell, they're not limited to 45 per cent. You could sell 100 per cent of it to IMC if you want, or to communist China. That's the way this Bill is worded. So it's not true to say that foreigners are limited to 45 per cent. They are limited on the purchaser corporation, but the way the Bill is structured, this PCS is empowered to go beyond that, to virtually sell all of it off if this government in one of its whims decides to do that, and they've put that in this Bill purposefully to achieve that result.

Now let's move to section 8 of this Bill, which the government claims is supposed to give Saskatchewan people protection with respect to the privatized potash corporation. The Bill says that the newly publicly traded corporation shall have its head office in Saskatchewan.

The Speaker: — Order. Order, order. It seems to me from this vantage point that the hon. member is quoting from the Bill, and rule 734 in *Beauchesne's* reads as follows:

The second reading is the most important stage through which the bill is required to pass; for its whole principle is then at issue and is affirmed or denied by a vote of the House. It is not regular on this occasion, however, to discuss in detail the clauses of the bill.

It is regular to discuss in detail the clause of the Bill in Committee of the Whole. And I know that the hon. member will be able to discuss the issues he wishes, without actual quotes from the Bill.

An Hon. Member: — Mr. Speaker, may I speak to your ruling, may I speak to the point you just finished making, Mr. Speaker?

The Speaker: — You may call a point of order, but it's . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well you can't speak . . .

An Hon. Member: — I'll call a point of order.

The Speaker: — Yes, fine.

(1945)

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Speaker, it is virtually impossible to deal with the principle of this Bill without dealing with the substance of it.

The second reading is the point, as is the period during which we deal with the principle of the Bill. It is impossible to discuss that principle without discussing

the Bill itself. The member from Riversdale was not discussing the clauses section by section, he was discussing some fundamental principles which underlie this privatization, this piratization. And in doing so, it is necessary at times to make reference to some of the sections. He went no further than that. The point of what he was making had to do with the principle; it was an ancillary reference to the sections. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that his comments were in order.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I have listened to the hon. member's point of order and I have made a ruling. And I would just like once more to point out to the hon. members a long-standing practice of the House — it isn't something that's suddenly occurred — that in second reading, the individual may speak in general terms about the Bill, but in the past we have not allowed direct quotes. That's the point I'm trying to make, direct quotes from the Bill. Without that the hon. member can speak as specifically as he wants.

If the hon. member wishes to raise a point of order on the ruling, there is no allowance for debate on the point of order, on my ruling. So if he wishes to raise a different point of order, he is allowed to.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I am referring to *Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, Fifth Edition, which you were referring to as well. And I want to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to page 220, rule . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. If the hon. member is raising a point of order on the ruling I have made, his point of order is not in order. And there is the point I'm bringing to his attention.

The member from Battlefords is interfering in the proceedings of the House and I ask him to restrain himself.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I think you referred to a different section of *Beauchesne's* than I did. If you will follow me closely for a moment, I perhaps can explain my position on the point of order. I am referring to page 220, rule 712, which deals with stages of a Bill. Perhaps, if I get your attention, Mr. Speaker, from the members opposite, I can read what it says under second reading. Seconding reading:

The purpose of each stage is as . . .

The Speaker: — Order! Order.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Rule 712 says:

The purpose of each stage is as follows:

And then it lists first, second, and committee, report stage, and third reading, which don't apply in this legislature. But second reading in almost its entirety applies in this legislature.

The stage of second reading is primarily

concerned with the principle of a measure (which we're in agreement there, no problem). At this stage, debate is not strictly limited to the contents of a bill as other methods of attaining its proposed objective may be considered.

And that's all of the rule that applies to this Assembly. And I think the . . . What is happening here is the member cannot discuss an important principle unless he makes reference to the Bill.

The Speaker: — Order. There is no point of order and your comments are out of order.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I have been around this Legislative Assembly for quite a number of years and I respect your ruling. I'll try to abide by it.

I want to say that my intention is, I think, to make some very important points about the principles of the Bill which the government advocates — not in debate, I might add, but in press releases — advocates about what this Bill does. I'm trying to rebut their contentions and I'm trying to validate my arguments by references to individual sections, not for the sake of debating those sections, but for the sake of my colleagues and for the journalists and other members of the public who might be watching, to know that what I'm saying is not a concoction, that it's rooted in an analysis of the Bill, in principles.

Now I understand your ruling, sir, and therefore I will endeavour to honour it. But I must say, sir, that I don't know how I'm going to be able to make the point which I'm trying to make, that under, for example, section 3, the power is reserved unto the government to dispose of all of Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan without limitations of ownerships.

I want to be able to say that in the clause. And I want to say if I can — I've made that point on section 3; moving on — that there are other principles which the corporation now is under which do not jibe with the government's explanation of what it says and intends to do.

In another section of the Bill, the government claims that Saskatchewan people are given protections with respect to this privatized corporation. Now I've read the Bill, and it says that the newly publicly traded purchaser corporation that I was referring to, before I was interrupted by yourself, sir, shall have its head office in Saskatchewan. But I say to you that in this legislation there is no definition of head office in the Bill. The new privatized PCS has no definition of head office, and it could comply with simply having a post office number in the province of Saskatchewan.

I put this proposition to you, sir: if 45 per cent of the shares of this new potash company are owned by foreign countries, and the other 55 per cent are owned from central Canada, how long does any reasonable person think that it will take for the real PCS head office to be gone to Toronto or Montreal or elsewhere? You can have a post office but where will the decisions be made?

Where will the advisers, where will the senior management and the senior bureaucrats be located?

Another section of this particular Bill, Mr. Speaker, says that: "The majority of the directors of the purchaser corporation shall be resident Canadians." Now I ask, sir, Saskatchewan people to consider whether that provision is really any protection for Saskatchewan jobs or investments. Were the majority of directors of Fleet Aerospace resident Canadians?

An Hon. Member: — Yes.

Mr. Romanow: — They were, as my colleague points out. And did that save the jobs at SED Systems in Saskatoon? Of course it didn't. Were the majority of the residents and the directors of Technigen corporation residents of Canada?

An Hon. Member: — Yes.

Mr. Romanow: — And did that save any of the jobs and the public investment of Joytec Ltd. in Saskatoon? Far from it. In fact there's story yet to be unfolding on Joytec.

Mr. Speaker, that so-called protection that the government says, that the minister referred to in his second reading speech, is no protection at all for Saskatchewan people. That's the point I'm trying to make.

And there's another provision also in this Bill. It says purportedly that at least three directors, three directors of the new privatized PCS shall be residents of the province of Saskatchewan — three, Mr. Speaker. I ask: three out of how many? Three out of 10, three out of 20, three out of 30? The government hasn't told us.

This is the first time in a major debate on second reading — I spoke about process and democracy — where the mover of the Bill didn't even tell us the basic details on that one little fact. Three are going to be Saskatchewan directors out of how many. They don't tell us. It's secret, much like everything else that the government plans about this operation is secrecy.

Either way, I can assure you one thing, Mr. Speaker. The Saskatchewan directors will be a small minority on the board of a new PC-style privatized PCS, that's for sure.

And let me review the one other section, without referring to it — this section of the Bill which purports to protect the interests of Saskatchewan people by limiting the total amount of shares in the privatized PCS which can be held by any one person or corporation, to 5 per cent. Now the government suggests that this 5 per cent ceiling will prevent any one corporation or major investor from taking control of PCS. But that argument ignores the fact that in a widely traded public corporation, as little as 10 per cent of the shares can provide any one group with effective control of the company. It's being done all the time in private business.

For example, Conrad Black of Toronto could get two or three of the corporations of which he has interest in his vast business empire, as I read the Bill, to each purchase — each one of those corporations — 5 per cent of the PCS

shares separately and take effective control of that corporation overnight, and this Bill does not prevent him from doing so.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in this Bill to prevent that — nothing to prevent control of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan from going to a corporate group in Toronto or New York or even Hong Kong or Beijing or for some other operation, if I may put it that way, for some other profit, for some other purpose, that kind of control leaving the province of Saskatchewan.

Now I think that is a serious threat to the independence and the ability to control our economy right here in the province of Saskatchewan. And I'm not taken very often to quoting the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* in support of my arguments, but even the *Star-Phoenix* in one of its editorials on April 18, 1989, under the headline: "Vital to keep PCS in Saskatchewan" — vital to keep PCS in Saskatchewan, talks about the proposal and says this, the very point that I'm making about share structure, quote, it says in the editorial:

There will be a heavy political price to pay if those who can afford shares (get those — if those who can afford shares) turn out to have made windfall profits on the purchase.

"A heavy political price," the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* says. I say, Mr. Speaker, there will be a heavy political price if that turns out to be the case. And that will turn out to be the case.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — No controls, Mr. Speaker, as to shareholders; no control as to where the head office is to be located — the real head office is to be located; no control as to the 5 per cent being able to be actually monitored and policed.

Other provisions in the legislation, the sections that I've identified, those give the PCS corporation and this government wide hand to, in effect, disperse of this corporation sooner or later, almost immediately.

Oh they may not try it before the next provincial election, but mark my words, Mr. Speaker, and mark my words the people of the province of Saskatchewan, if they get by the gate in this next provincial election, which I doubt that they will, but if they do, they will try this for sure, because their philosophy is to privatize this and to turn it over to the hands of the big, multinational corporations. That's the danger in this legislation. And our heritage will be gone.

Now those are my comments on the Bill. But there is one other aspect of this legislation which is also very critical and deserves study, Mr. Speaker, which I want to refer to, and that is the Canada-United States free trade deal and this Bill.

Now this legislation, as I've said, purports to restrict the foreign ownership of the new privatized PCS to 45 per cent. But the free trade agreement signed by Prime Minister Mulroney and supported by the government

opposite so enthusiastically, requires the following: national treatment for investors of the United States within Canada with respect to measures affecting the establishment of new business enterprises; acquisition; conduct operation; and sale of business enterprises located in Canada — national treatment.

And referring to the free trade deal, Mr. Speaker, article 1602, subparagraph 2 of that free trade deal, further prevents Canada from imposing on any United States investor a requirement that a minimum level of equity be held by Canadians. The government, no doubt, argues that this is not a problem, because it says the free trade agreement provides an exemption, an exemption from the so-called national treatment obligations that I have talked about with respect to existing Crown corporations. But that's only partly true. That only tells half the story, Mr. Speaker.

There is one crucial limitation on these Crown corporation exemptions. That limitation is that the exemption can only be used once, Mr. Speaker. In other words, once this legislation has been passed, once this Saskatchewan legislature passes this Bill allowing up to 45 per cent foreign ownership of PCS, no future government could ever reduce that percentage, Mr. Speaker. I ask my colleagues to note that. Once this Bill passes, no future government could ever reduce that percentage of 45 per cent foreign control, or even pass a law requiring that a certain percentage of the corporation be held by Saskatchewan residents, or even pass a law requiring that a certain percentage be held by Saskatchewan residents.

(2000)

In other words, under the free trade deal, the national treatment provisions of the free trade agreement then take over. And we can never again, never again in this legislature, Mr. Speaker, put restrictions on American corporations or American investors which are not also put on Saskatchewan investors and Saskatchewan corporations.

Mr. Speaker, we in this House have given up our sovereignty in this area. That's what we've done. Mr. Speaker, I say that's a dastardly sell-out of our birthright by this legislation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, they've tied our hands. They supported the free trade deal with 1602(2) in there, with that provision. Now they've introduced Bill 20 with that provision. And once this Bill gets enacted and passed, they have tied my hands, they have tied our hands, they have tied their own hands, they have tied the hands of every young man and woman who should aspire to be an MLA. They have tied the hands of every political party and every politician who aspires to build a greater Saskatchewan, who sees it his or her responsibility to govern in the best interests of the people of this province right here from this Chamber.

They have made this Chamber into a eunuch. They have done, through a combination of the free trade deal and

Bill 20, the sell-out of our birthright. And for that I say this party will never ever be forgiven, and we will never forget. You will be defeated like you've never been defeated before.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Imagine that, Mr. Speaker. Imagine that situation. Imagine that legal situation and that constitutional situation. And you know I asked the question a little while back: why are they doing this? Remember I asked, why are they doing it when they've racked up a profit of \$106 million this year — why are they doing it, I ask myself.

And I said they're doing it because they are ideologically committed to some world of the 1930s and 1940s or 1950s, these Neanderthals politically who are so far back in the Dark Ages. And they laughed at me when I said it, but why are they doing this in the context of the free trade deal? Why are they doing this?

Well you know, about the only thing that I can think of is a little exchange that I ran across in Crown Corporations Committee which took place on February 3, 1988 when my colleague, the member from Saskatoon Fairview, was examining the Deputy Premier, the member from Souris-Cannington, on the proposals of the sell-off of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, and the question was asked to him in this context. And the Hon. Deputy Premier is quoted at saying in the February 3, 1988 Crown corporations *Hansard*, page 349, as follows, Mr. Speaker. He said, this is the motivation for doing this, quote, the Deputy Premier said:

I think that can happen here as well (referring to the consequences I've talked about). We're going to do what we can, though, to make it very difficult for you people (meaning us) to take it over again when you get back into power, if that ever happens, because our desire is to have these things (done) as broadly distributed as possible so that it's very difficult for you folks, if you should ever get back into power.

That's the motivation. Revenge, as *The Globe and Mail* said, revenge of the nerds, revenge of the nerds.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — They are doing this because they don't want us ever to be able to build for the future for the province of Saskatchewan again. They want us tied in to the free trade deal, of course, which they are strong advocates of. And now this is the first example of the free trade deal coupled with Bill 20, with the consequences that I portray are going to happen to the future, because these people don't ever want to give any other political party a chance to try to build that which they have brought down and destroyed.

Is that where we are in political life in Saskatchewan today? Is that where the government is reduced to? I am doing this, the Deputy Premier says, because I'm never going to let you people ever again build or respond. I mean, it may be, it may be even in their circumstances

that a multinational-corporation-controlled large resource industry like potash would require action, some form of action which would require perhaps rolling back the clock on this particular Bill. And they have tied their hands. They have given away our right. They have surrendered the sovereignty of this legislature in doing so.

And the free trade deal of Canada, section 6, confirms that, because section 6 now makes it superior to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . 16, I'm sorry, 16, which makes it now superior to all of the provincial legislatures. And, Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Premier laughs. They did this voluntarily, Mr. Speaker. Nobody brought a gun to their head. There wasn't an invasion, there wasn't a foreign country that came over and won this province over. They walked over, willy-nilly, to the negotiating table and they signed this away, and they're doing it now with section 20, Bill 20, with respect to potash.

This is a resource like Saudi Arabia. In almost no other resource in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, do we control the world, in some senses. We're the largest producers outside of the Soviet Union. Everywhere else, wheat and hog and cattle production, we're dependent upon the world, we have to react to them to compete; but here we can manage the world. And these people opposite they voluntarily turn over the tools to build for the future for our schools and our hospitals. I say shame on them. They will pay a political price they will never ever forget.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — See, Mr. Speaker, these people can laugh at me if they want. I don't care. I tell you, I've been laughed at political professionals in this legislature over the 20 years that I've been here, and from those people next door, that doesn't bother me at all. What I challenge them to do is to give me an analysis which counters the one that I advance for the people in the province of Saskatchewan.

The history of government, Mr. Speaker, is to build, one government on top of the other. We don't have to buy everything that a government does. But anything that a government normally leaves behind, there's something which is of benefit. Not these people. They're following the scorched earth policy. Simply because the New Democrats did it, it's got to be automatically wrong.

And they say, we've got to do it because that's the way the world wants us to do it. Everybody is privatizing, they say. Nobody is privatizing like this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, giving away our right — nobody. Everybody says that they're privatizing. They say that's the way of the world.

Well I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, and I want to tell all of the members of this House that that argument isn't going to cut like that with me about what the rest of the world is doing, because we had that argument in Saskatchewan in the Dirty Thirties about what the rest of the world were doing. And we fought back because we said back in the Dirty Thirties, there's another way to do it. And we set up our co-op movements, and we set up our wheat pools, and we set up our CCF, and we set up our medicare, and we set up our power corporation, which they're going to undo tomorrow. We set up our potash

corporations because we did it together. People working together. I tell you, I'm not afraid of the fact that all the world's doing it. We never did it the way the rest of the world did it. We are doing it the Saskatchewan way to build the hope and future. A better way, that's what we're doing.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — A better way!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, I may not convince *The Globe and Mail*, and I may not convince the *Leader-Post*, and I may not convince the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and I may not convince CTV (Canadian Television Network), but I tell you, I am as confident as I'm standing here, I'm going to convince the people of the province of Saskatchewan of that point of view.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I don't expect the media or the journalists to be on side of our vision, because after all this is where they come from. I don't expect that at all for one moment. But I have faith and confidence in the people of this province, that there is a great future with great vision, with people with ability and determination. That's how we built. That's what this debate's all about, and it's not potash. It's power tomorrow, it's the power corporation tomorrow and after that it's SGI. Because we believe that the people of the province of Saskatchewan know our history and tradition, and they're going to stand with us and they're not going to stand with the CBC (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation) and CTV when it comes down to it. We know that.

Now let me close, Mr. Speaker. I've touched on how the potash corporation was set up — not an act of ideology as much as it was an act of pragmatism and philosophy of Saskatchewan; how we performed and how we did and the jobs we created, and the headquarters. I've talked about the legislation. I've talked about the impact of the free trade deal. I analysed the 1988 annual report, which is proof positive that they ought not to be doing what they're saying they're going to be doing.

And now I want to close by saying that there is a better way, in the few minutes left to me, a better way to do this.

Some people may say, well you know, you're wrapped up in this debate because you piloted the potash Bill back in 1975-76 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Sorry, I didn't quite hear what the hon. member from Weyburn said, but it doesn't matter in any event. It doesn't matter in any event.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I am . . . If I'm feeling passionate about this debate, it's not because of what we experimented with in 1975 and 1976 in response to the circumstances that were before us — an experiment that worked, a Saskatchewan experiment. That's not what's motivating me, although I'm very proud of what we did with the mistakes that we made.

This is not a defence of the past. I am not defending the past. I think that if we had been re-elected in 1982 we would have moved the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to the future, to the next plateau, to the great opportunities that I think it still has under some government some day in the future. But we were denied that when we had this gang elected, deciding to turn the clock back to the 1960s and 1970s.

This is not an emotional thing with me. What is emotional, Mr. Speaker, for me, is that I think that future and that policy, that vision of a better way, is one which is the way that we as legislators ought to be working and building towards for the people of this province. My vision, and our vision, is a vision not which tears down strengths, but it's a vision which builds on those strengths.

Our vision is a vision of a mixed economy, Mr. Speaker, where private entrepreneurs and business people supplement what government and co-operative people do — where they lead, where they innovate, where we reward entrepreneurial risk, where we put our emphasis on Main Street, Saskatchewan, not Bay Street, Toronto. That's my vision, the mixed economy.

My vision is not to eliminate a department of co-operatives as these people have and put in a minister of privatization. For the first time in modern history in Saskatchewan we don't have a minister of co-ops, but we have a minister of privatization. That's not our vision.

Our vision, Mr. Speaker, is to build on our strengths and to build through co-operation and to build on the mixed economy in that tradition that I've talked to you about. And PCS is central to that.

A New Democratic government would work with the people of this province to create new jobs at PCS, to generate new profits, to come back for schools and hospitals and roads — new profits for exports, to provide new avenues of research and development for our universities and our technical schools.

(2015)

This is a high-tech business. It can be a high-tech business, working with the synergy of high education which in itself spawns off another level of economic activity apart from a process of learning and growing and maturing. Potash corporation can work, and industry and resources can work hand in hand to develop that.

Our vision of the 1990s is a vision where men and women and young people have a future of economic growth and renewed hope and increased opportunity, not one where a select few who can afford to buy the shares are going to benefit, but the rest of us don't.

We see PCS as a bright light in that future. A properly managed PCS, owned and controlled by the people of this province — right here — can be a powerful economic development tool to keep Saskatchewan people right here. And the possibilities are almost limitless.

As I've noted to you, Mr. Speaker, the reserves are almost

endless — 4,000 years. We have the most efficient mines. We already have 25 per cent of the total world market. We can get more. It's there to get, with a three and a half million dollar a year pie out there waiting for our share to increase.

I see a strong vibrant corporation, 100 per cent owned and controlled by the people of this province, with a real head office right here, with all the functions that any real head office, major international corporation would see perform — right here. That was our dream; that is my dream; that is our dream for the future.

I see a head office which creates research and development, works in harmony with our technical schools, provides jobs for the graduates of our technical schools and our universities. You know the current government closed down, closed down the research and development division of PCS and shut the door on the dreams of young men and women.

We would renew the PCS commitment to research and development in Saskatchewan. That's good, not only for PCS because it keeps the company a world leader in mining technology and in the development of new product lines, but it's good for the province as a whole. The graduates will have new jobs and opportunities if we succeed. They won't have to leave the province as they're doing, at 6,000 a month. They can stay here and build their careers and take on the world, right here from Regina and Saskatoon and Yorkton.

The universities and the technical schools can benefit from joint ventures where they sell knowledge and expertise to major customers. PCS can fund agricultural research in nations like China or India because that research can help increase long-term sales of Saskatchewan potash, and do it, not necessarily for profit, but to do it because we are also our brothers' keepers in the world, and we want them, too, also to have hope and opportunity.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — We could develop new product lines to be processed and manufactured right here with jobs, and exported to the world. When the current government closed down PCS Cory last year it closed down a major initiative in this whole diversification area. It closed down the potassium sulphate pilot plant which was developing whole new lines of speciality fertilizers for the citrus and tobacco industries. They shut it down. This is a whole new sector of the fertilizer market which is growing in importance in Saskatchewan, and we can be a world leader right here at home.

And I see the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan marketing it aggressively all over the world. Why shouldn't, Mr. Speaker, the largest potash company in the world have its own international sales force seeking out long-term contracts right here with nations like China, India, and Brazil? Why can't we do that? We can do that. Why shouldn't we be competing head to head with the private multinational companies for these markets, and beat them? And I think we can do it. We've done it in the past before.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And you know, Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen opposite, the ladies and gentlemen opposite, they talk about competition. How about some true competition? How about some Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan people-owned and run competition against the large privately profit-motivated corporations competition? Let's see who can do the best job in marketing and selling. We can do that. We can compete, we can play by the rules of economics and by the market-place. We've done it before, we can do it again.

We say PCS can sign long-term sales deals with the nations of the Pacific Rim. That's the future, the Pacific Rim. And we don't have to sell them shares in our potash mines to do it. We sell them our wheat, but we don't sell them our farms, Mr. Speaker, so why should we sell them our potash mines?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, a secure supplier who lives up to contracts and delivers quality product at the best price is going to break into any market anywhere in the world and do well. We've got the confidence and the ability of our Saskatchewan young men and women to do it right here. That kind of aggressive global marketing scheme would be the kind that PCS has produced in the past; it would see in the future PCS mines working at full production. We would see PCS going ahead with its expansions at Bredenbury and elsewhere.

Why should Israel and Jordan and New Brunswick and New Mexico be increasing production while we stand on the sidelines and watch our market share fall?

Where are these people? Why aren't they standing up for jobs at our mines here? That's what a future can do for the province of Saskatchewan under a PCS owned by the people of the province. That's the way to build a prosperous future.

And why should PCS stop at being a basic supplier of raw products? Why can't Saskatchewan become home to a fully integrated world-wide fertilizer product corporation — world wide fertilizer product corporation. That's a dream, perhaps. I think it's a realistic one — a corporation which would own, process, and sell its product line right from the mine gate to the farm gate and do it probably for a change without ripping off the farmers in the process of doing that as well.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, the dreams are endless, if only we dare to dream and if we act on our dreams. The dreams are endless not only in terms of product development, and mining opportunities, and selling in the world. The dreams are endless in making the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan more responsive to people. They're endless in terms of whether or not we should be electing people to the boards of directors under a future government, to make sure that they are responsive in that sense; to a variety of other similar

schemes and ideas which have been advanced by many people. The dreams are endless.

All of which, however, would not detract from but would enhance the central issue of this debate. And the central question that I ask again in closing, as I did at the beginning: who do we want developing our future and the future of our children? Do we want the IMCCs and the Chinese and the Indians and the Toronto and Montreal investors, or do we want the people of the province of Saskatchewan to build our futures in our communities right here? That's the choice. Are you standing with *The Globe and Mails* and with the IMCCs and the big, large, multinational corporations, or are you standing with the farmer and with the business men and the people of this province? That's the question that's before us.

And that dream, our dream, not only my dream, but the dream that started with Tommy Douglas and went through Woodrow Lloyd and Allan Blakeney and even Ross Thatcher — even in his own way with Ross Thatcher — all of that dream is now standing at risk at coming apart, because we have in office men and women of little faith and little vision and little hope, those who are surf-board economists; those who say they can't control the world. They say they simply want to ride the surf-board, they can't control the waves. We can only stay on the surf-board; we can't manage our direction, we can't manage our hope and our future. I am not going to support those defeatists. We are building for tomorrow because we can do it. We must do it, if this province survives. That's the dream, that's the challenge.

Mr. Speaker, working men and women and farming people and young people and those who are entrepreneurs, everybody who believe and love this province, know what I am talking about. It's not only PCS, but it's the power Bill tomorrow and the SGI Bill; it is all of this privatization mania which is captured here that's at issue.

I ask you, sir, and everybody else, anybody watching this debate: how has privatization helped your income taxes? Have they gone down? How has it helped your health care? Is it improved or has it gone worse? It's gone worse. How has privatization helped education? Do we have quotas on universities? Do we have quotas on post-secondary education? Has it helped you? How has privatization helped the \$4 billion debt that these people have rung up in seven years? It's gone up. How has privatization done anything except turned us over lock, stock, and barrel to those who do not understand Saskatchewan, don't love Saskatchewan, and don't have the faith in Saskatchewan that we do?

Privatization is a failure. This Bill symbolizes that failure. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against it. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I think you will agree that you and I and members of the press and members in this legislature just witnessed a very historic speech.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — We witnessed a speech, Mr. Speaker, which I say that if every member in this House took and showed to their constituents that there would be no more need for any campaigning. Our member from Riversdale would become the Premier in the next election. You could call the House to an end.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — And I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that what I'm going to do with this speech is I'm going to ask the member from Riversdale for a copy, and I'm going to ask him for a copy of the tapes that he spoke on today and the previous day. And I'm going to offer them to any member in the viewing public and to my constituents to look at because I think they should take a look at. And I think my members, the members on this side, will be doing the same. If there's anybody there, if there's anybody that wants to take a look at the speech and have it to show to their friends, just get a hold of their MLA in any of the cities. Any New Democratic MLA will be more than willing to send it to them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — And just for the proper comparison, Mr. Speaker, we will also send them, if they really insist, we will send them the Minister of Finance's speech, the member who introduced this speech, just so they can do the comparison. His four- or five-minute, or 10-minute blurb on it, his impassionate blurb on it, let them compare.

Let them look at the people and ask themselves . . . Let the people ask themselves the question: who is it that cares? Who is it that really loves this province? Who is it that's got the passion and the vision to lead us into the 1990s just like Tommy Douglas did in the '50s and the '60s, Mr. Speaker?

We are going to, and the members on this side, Mr. Speaker, are going to see to it that this member becomes the Premier of the province when the next election is called.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — Mr. Speaker, I waited a minute before I got up out of my seat today because the tradition of the House is, in a major debate, that you alternate, as you should, from this side of the House to the other side of the House, and we are giving them the opportunity to come up and speak. But I see that they are not too interested in speaking and defending, and standing up and defending this. What they are expecting to do instead is they're expecting, they are expecting their multinational friends to fund a great, big media campaign, to fund it so they don't have to do any work. They haven't got the guts to defend this stuff.

(2030)

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — Mr. Speaker, when I first was advised of this year in this legislature, the government side said that they were going to privatize SaskPower and SaskTel and Sask Potash, I thought to myself, these guys must be nuts, absolutely nuts! It just didn't make any sense — no sense at all. Just think, Mr. Speaker, of what you can do when you've got the finances in your hand to put programs into place. Just think what you can do!

We know that we've got schools that need funding. We know that we've got hospitals that need funding. We've got roads that need building. But what are they doing with something that's going to provide us with some funds this year — 106 million; we just got the report today. They're going to sell it off. That's like going into your herd of 50 cows and selling the one that gives the most milk. That's exactly what it's like, Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what it's like. Now who's going to be left holding the can? Who is going to be left to pay for that? If all of this is . . . If all of the potash is privatized, where is the money going to come from — the money to put these programs into place, that we wanted in place and the people of Saskatchewan need in place.

It's interesting, Mr. Speaker, about how this government set up this whole operation, the whole scenario to sell the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. What did they do? First of all they took a few years, first four or five years of it just to discredit the corporation.

You know, that's right out of the textbook of Maggie Thatcher. If you want to privatize something, if you want to privatize something, what you've got to do is you've got to establish the atmosphere for it first. If the people of Saskatchewan — and in this case they did — if the people of Saskatchewan really liked the benefits that they were getting from potash, first of all you had to turn them against the potash mine, see. So what do they do? They run the thing into the ground, Mr. Speaker. That's exactly what they do. They run it into the ground.

Mr. Speaker, if you take a look at the record of the PCS, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, and you see what happened to it, whether it was making money or not, you can see . . . And I have a graph here before me and this graph tells me that from the years 1978 to 1981, the potash corporation was increasing in profits all the way through until 1980, dropped a little in 1981. As a matter of fact, in 1980 it peaked with a profit of over 130 million, over 150 million by the looks of the graph.

Well as a result of this, and this is all the time . . . during the time while it was repaying its debt as well — repaying debt on the principal borrowed to buy the potash mines and contributing dividends to the people of Saskatchewan, a total of \$431 million, Mr. Speaker, a total of \$431 million. That's enough to pay . . . Would that be enough to pay the interest on this year's debt?

An Hon. Member: — Just enough to pay it.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Just enough, just enough to pay the interest on this year's debt. But then I look further on this graph, Mr. Speaker, and I see what happened after the PCs took power. Well in this graph that I've got, it shows that it's got . . . The potash corporation had showed a

slight profit in 1983 and 1984, and then by 1985 and '86 they had driven it completely into the ground.

But all at the same time, even though there was a downturn in the market, you would expect that the profits wouldn't be quite as high — and I grant you that. But at the same time as the potash corporation is unable to make money, they're extracting dividends so they can cover up the debt set up by this Minister of Finance, the member from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden.

Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, the potash corporation, if I get back to those numbers, came up with \$413 million in profits during the time that the NDP was operating it. In addition to that it paid the provisional . . . That was the profits. What it did from that is it paid the treasury — the people of Saskatchewan — 270 million in taxes and in royalties, and it paid taxpayers of Saskatchewan \$100 million in dividends.

All this time the potash corporation, in addition to doing these things, was employing 2,200 people. That's a significant thing, Mr. Speaker. That's a very significant thing, because at these mines our own people were actually able to train, work their way up through the corporation. The head office of the corporation was in Saskatoon. It was a major world head office right here in Saskatchewan. So it gave us access not just to the labour jobs and to the clean up jobs, good paying jobs with the corporation and the rest of the potash corporations in the province, and good head office jobs. We didn't have to import the whole cadre of experts from outside of Saskatchewan for this.

As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, in 1982 what happened there was the profits were about a million dollars. This was the year that the potash market started to decline. But even though the profits were only a million, this government, this bunch of bandits, what they did is they took \$50 million of a dividend from the potash corporation. They started to run it into the ground. That's what they were trying to do. They were trying to make the corporation look bad, as I said earlier.

Now it's interesting that at this stage of the game, when they're ready to sell it, all of a sudden they turn the picture around hoping that the people of Saskatchewan would have a rather dim picture and dim view of the potash corporation. Turn it around, and we've got a company that shows \$106 million profit.

Now we're trying to sell \$400 million worth of corporation. Now that's not a bad price for a corporation that just made \$106 million. And I think if I was offered that kind of a deal, and if I was given it under the conditions where I didn't have to pay any interest, and if I didn't have to pay anything unless I made thirteen and a half per cent, I think I'd take that deal. Would you take that? Anybody is liable to take that kind of a deal.

But you know what's happened? In the interim period, while they're preparing for this particular case of privatization — that's a difficult word to say, Mr. Speaker — this case of privatization, they had tried to privatize several other things, and they managed to do so. And you know, I had a couple of cases of privatization in my home

town, and I want to talk about them briefly, Mr. Speaker, and I want to refer to them.

And if you want to call the Minister of Social Services in, you might advise him that I'm going to say a few things that I think he should hear tonight. I'm going to be talking about the privatization of North Park Centre, Mr. Speaker, and how it fits into this whole privatization scheme of this government here; how it fits in, and how they're trying to save money by pushing out residents and causing residents of North Park Centre to go through a period of suffering — and 13 of them ended up dead. And 13 of them ended up dead so that they could save money and get into this privatization scheme, because they knew that there wasn't going to be any money left once they sold a thing like the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

I'm going to come back to that issue in a minute, Mr. Speaker, and the member from Kinistino might want to hear it as well because it's something he should take a look at real carefully, real carefully. And this is the first time I've ever mentioned this in this House, and the first time I've mentioned it any place because I had too much respect for those poor people whose lives you jeopardized and suffered on account of your careless and your non-caring attitude — your attitude strictly to privatize.

Mr. Speaker, we have a situation here where, as I mentioned earlier, we have a historical debate; historical debate because it's around this debate, the privatization of Saskatchewan's potash, of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, SGI, and SaskTel, that brings out the real contrast and the real difference of the vision that they have — the Progressive Conservative Party in government have — and the people of Saskatchewan represented by the New Democrats on this side have, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — And it's sometimes worthwhile just putting into a little bit of a historical perspective, Mr. Speaker, because I can remember going to see Tommy Douglas when I was a teenager and listening to him speak. And those were the days when Mr. Douglas was talking about hospitalization for everybody, and he was proud of the fact that he had brought in hospitalization right across, using a technique where people together joined in government to do something that they could not do as individuals. And using that same technique, he organized and set up the power corporation. The New Democrats set up a power corporation. Why? So that the people of Saskatchewan could get together and pool their resources through government to do something that they could not do individually.

And I'll bet you, Mr. Speaker, that the member's farm from Shellbrook-Torch River, the member's farm from Shellbrook-Torch River would not have received power from any private company out there in Shellbrook or your neighbours in Canwood or somebody in Hoey or wherever would not have received it, would not have received it if hadn't been for SaskPower. And now at this stage, what do we hear? They're going to sell the potash. They're going to get rid of the cash cow. They're going to

get rid of SaskPower. Why? Because of a principle, their principle of what I call raw capitalism — every man for himself.

It wasn't just SaskPower, Mr. Speaker; there were the roads in Saskatchewan. And I know that you could talk to . . . in the 50s and the 60s you could talk to any traveller that had come through Saskatchewan and he'd compliment us on the roads that we had in Saskatchewan because we used the same principle to build the roads as we did to set up the potash corporation. The people working together, using the government as a tool to do together what they cannot do as individuals, Mr. Speaker, — to do what they could not do as individuals.

And the same thing happened later on with the Blakeney government when we started talking . . . when we set up the corporation to monitor the oil and the oil profits in the province. Now we already had the experience, Mr. Speaker, of Sask Potash. We had a window on the potash world. We, the people of Saskatchewan, through a New Democratic government, had a window on it. They were able to tell us just how much the companies needed to make a fair profit, to pay good wages to their employees, to keep the working conditions clean and safe. And then in addition there was a windfall, because in the case of potash, there was a monopoly.

And in the case of Saskoil, there was a monopoly very similar to that shared with Alberta. And so they established the Saskoil corporation to do the very same thing, to set it up. And through that, by setting up the Saskoil corporation, we were able to get a window on the world, a window on the world of the oil industry. And following that, you were able to set royalty rates, which in comparison to that set elsewhere, in comparison to what we were getting before, we're able to take that money, like the money from the Sask Potash Corporation, put it into the treasury, and use it to build our schools and use it to build our hospitals and use it to set a denticare plan for our children, which you destroyed, and which this government subsequently destroyed.

But they don't understand that. They don't understand that that was what happened. It just happened; all of a sudden it just happened. Forgot their history, forgot that in Saskatchewan we've got a million people scattered over millions of acre. We're not living side by side by side in three major cities and that's it; over half of the population of Saskatchewan is in the rural areas. It's switching slowly. But when these things were done, three-quarters of the population of Saskatchewan was in a rural area. We were scattered around. We needed to set up tools for ourselves, tools that were unique because we had a unique situation. But they've forgotten that, they don't care.

(2045)

Now, Mr. Speaker, we're still a rural province, we still need to work together, we still need to set up schemes and economic plans where we can put the resources of our province and put the will of the people together so that we can accomplish those things which we cannot do as individuals and which no foreign corporation will do for us as individuals.

You know, Mr. Speaker, with Saskoil and SaskTel and Sask Potash corporations, we had people trained right in the corporation, sons and daughters of our neighbours, trained in the corporation, work their way up, were able to compete and get jobs in any place in the country and any place in the nation. And you know that a lot of them are moving out right now, of course, because you're privatizing everything. Nine thousand this year alone, Mr. Speaker, moving out as a result of what's happening here, privatizing the potash corporation along with SaskPower and the rest.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just go back one minute before I proceed with my address because I want to mention once again, as I did at the beginning of my delivery on this Bill, that I had . . . I've sat here and I've listened to our leader as he put forth his vision and the vision of this party in this legislature on this very historic debate.

And I want to reiterate that my colleagues and I are more than willing to send out copies of the speech to anybody who would care to have it, and all you have to do is phone our caucus office. I can give you one number, it's 787-1888, that's my number. And if you phone it, somebody from the caucus office will answer, and they'll be more than willing to take your name and address and send you a copy of the Leader of the Opposition's historic speech on this debate. And you will get it — no charge. You can also call any constituency office, and I'm sure they'll be willing to send it to you.

Now my colleagues remind me that you should probably call a New Democratic MLA if you want to get the authentic speech. The number, once again, Mr. Speaker, in case you would like to phone in and call me about it, is 787-1888. And I've just received another number here from a colleague from Regina Rosemont, and his number is 787-7388. No charge, and he repeats, no charge . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, that's fine, I think I'll repeat those later if you just remind me, colleagues.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I promised you that I would spend a few minutes describing about the tragedy forced upon a few people by this government, by this government's mania for privatization. And I do so now in great sadness, Mr. Speaker. But at the time, a person has to do it at a certain time, and I think this is probably just as an appropriate time as not. Because what I'm going to do, Mr. Speaker, is show how this government, and I will digress a little here from potash, but I'm trying to do it in this context, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, that this government and this Minister of Social Services, who is so bent on privatization and so concerned with writing up this Bill — he said so in the House today, that he wrote up this Bill — that he forgot about 40 people, about 40 people in the city of Prince Albert. And I want to bring a few things to his attention.

See, what happened, Mr. Speaker, is one of the first things that were privatized in Prince Albert was North Park Centre. North Park Centre is a home; it's housed in a large building. It used to be called the sanatorium. It was built back in the mid-40s I believe, Mr. Speaker, and it was built in the days when there was a tuberculosis epidemic. And they built up a beautiful structure on the river bank

on the north side of the North Saskatchewan River.

And when the epidemic had been contained — and I might say that there was a lot of people that went through that building and the father of our current mayor in Prince Albert was a doctor, chief doctor in charge at the time, and I remember . . . I know also that I had some relatives that had tuberculosis, including my father, who spent a couple of years there, and the building I found quite . . . has a historical significance, at least, not only to Prince Albert but also to my family personally.

Well it was a beautiful building, Mr. Speaker. When that epidemic was over, as I mentioned, it was then converted. At a later time it went through a couple of stages, but it was converted to what was known as North Park Centre, a centre for mentally retarded people in the province. We were going into a stage in Saskatchewan when that was converted from private care for mentally retarded to publicly administered care for the mentally retarded. That was what people thought was the right time, the right thing to do.

At this stage we are now going in the reverse direction. We are going again from the publicly funded and public care to private care. And that's a philosophical move, I think, that's accepted fairly well across the province, Mr. Speaker, fairly well across this province. I've had occasion to talk to with members of the Saskatchewan Association for Community Living and they ascribe to that philosophy and I can understand it.

But in this particular case, Mr. Speaker, what we have is something that's slightly different, slightly different. Because at North Park Centre we had youngsters who were mentally retarded who were, first of all, as in their youth, hidden from the public — or if not hidden from the public by their parents because in those days things were a little different — if not hidden from the public, they certainly didn't have the services and the educational services, or the medical services or the care services that we did following that. They just didn't exist.

So people banded together and said: we've got to do something; we don't know how to handle them at home; we can't handle them at home and manage our farms at the same time. And they put these good people into the institution and we developed an excellent care staff there, just like at Valley View Centre — Valley View Centre in Moose Jaw — and they were living there.

And as people aged, some of them went in there in their 20s and 30s and 40s, and there were people there who were generally ageing, probably from the age now of 40 up to 80, ages 40 to 80, and that had become their home. And I had visited North Park Centre many times. In fact, the member from Shellbrook-Torch even visited North Park Centre and passed out his campaign buttons there, only to get what, Mr. Speaker? Well the government in its wisdom — and I am using that word very facetiously in this case, very loosely — in its wisdom decided to privatize. All right, so they're going to privatize North Park Centre.

That wasn't enough. They said they had to have them out by a certain date. Bang. A certain date. I don't know, Mr.

Speaker, what it's like in your family, or your neighbourhood, but if you told your neighbours they had to move out of their neighbourhood by a certain date, I think it would cause a little bit of stress. Yes, it would cause a little bit of stress if you set a deadline. That minister set the deadline, Mr. Speaker.

Well the government was advised, Mr. Speaker, by the professionals and by the families of the people that resided there, but no, there was no listening. We're privatizing, he says, we're privatizing. Well they were warned. They were warned that you had to put things into place to make sure that the care level was up to what they were used to. They were warned that some of these people needed 24-hour care, that their behaviour patterns were such that ordinary people without any training, and without respite from 24-hour training, just couldn't handle. They were warned. They were told; they were pleaded with, Mr. Speaker. They were pleaded with. And the reason for me bringing this out now is because I want to plead with the minister not to do the same thing at Valley View Centre. They were pleaded with.

Well we have the record now, Mr. Speaker. We have the record now of what happened. And to put this in the proper context, Mr. Speaker, I want to say first of all, out of 180 residents, 140 I believe were quite well placed. I don't want to make this sound like it's some kind of an exaggeration. And I think that maybe the rest of them could have been well placed if it had been staged and done when they were ready; if they hadn't have been forced out by this minister.

But you know what happened? I paid a visit, Mr. Speaker, to the people who were doing the monitoring and I says, well what's happened? And I said, well we have a situation where . . . since then I think it's approximately 24 had to be moved several times and 13 of them have died. And I was kind of shocked at this Mr. Minister, and I wondered, gee, what's going on, is that rather unusual?

And so I went to visit the doctor, the doctor that had talked to them. I talked to him and I said, doctor, what's the life expectancy of these people? What do you expect to happen? I was a little taken back. I thought that maybe it was just a little bit out of hand. And the doctor told me, he says, well what are you dealing with? And I said, what do you expect their life expectancy to be? He said, well we were expecting usually from two to five people per year. That's with their age, that's what it was. I said, well why would this have happened? Is there any possibility that the stress of privatization, like privatization, which is part of this whole grand scheme, had anything to do with it? The doctor told me that under conditions like this, conditions of stress, two things could happen. First of all, there's the trauma of movement themselves that could have contributed to it; secondly, that the level of care is reduced could also accelerate this.

Well you listen to this, Mr. Minister, you listen to this. You should already know it. So when I found this out, when I found this out, I wrote the minister, but I guess he must have been too doggone busy writing up this Bill to privatize the potash corporation to pay any attention to the letter I wrote.

So I wrote him a letter, Mr. Speaker. I wrote him a letter a way back, three or four months ago, and I indicated some of the problems, Mr. Speaker. And I'm going to be asking him these questions again in his estimates because I think we still deserve an answer. And I indicated what some of the situation was. I indicated to him that there was a need for respite beds. I indicated to him that there was a need for in-service training for those people who were now taking care of them, Mr. Speaker. I indicated — but he didn't reply. He mustn't have paid any attention at all because he was too busy privatizing the potash corporation.

You know what he did? He wrote me a paragraph . . . I'm sorry, I take it back, two paragraphs. There it is — two paragraphs. And he said:

No, the safeguards and monitoring mechanisms are in place and working adequately.

Mr. Speaker, I was ashamed. I was ashamed, Mr. Speaker, to send that reply to any of the family members who would ask me.

Now why am I doing this, Mr. Speaker? I'm telling you this because, because this is part of the grand scheme of privatization that this government has got itself into that is resulting in a loss of . . . resulting in a loss, Mr. Speaker, of a cash cow, the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation, loss of services like the dental plan, and even the loss of dignity to people and cause suffering to people, some of whom resulted . . . who are now no longer with us, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me get back now, Mr. Speaker, to what is happening in terms of the potash corporation and what we could do in this province, Mr. Speaker, if this thing hadn't have been happening . . . if this wasn't happening. What this Bill does, is it's setting up the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan for privatization — the same corporation which made \$106 million for the people of Saskatchewan during the last year, Mr. Speaker, the same year.

Now do you think that we might need that money, Mr. Speaker? Do you think we need that money in this province? Well I can tell you assuredly that we need that money. I had spent some time, Mr. Speaker, looking through what was happening in the government of Saskatchewan, where the money could be spent. One of the places I was looking at is school taxes. What's been happening to school taxes? Is it possible that the profits from the potash corporation made this year and certainly will make next year according to the annual report — they're very optimistic — could help with grants with school boards?

(2100)

Now we know that school boards need some money. And there's proof positive if you look at the statistics, you see. And while this privatization scheme is going on, what's happening to the tax revenue of the province as being applied to school boards? If you look back at a chart from 1980 to 1988, you will see that the level of funding of provincial grants to school boards has gone down, down,

down, percentage-wise. And I've got it here in front of me and I've taken it right out of the budget. It's . . . and the school boards have verified this, the SSTA (Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association) has verified this, 56.7 per cent in 1980; 1982, down to 54.6; 1984, down to 54.7; 1986, down to 50.5; 1988, down again, down to 49.2 — privatization, privatization.

Mr. Speaker, if it wasn't for the approach that this government is using; if they would just get it through their heads that in this province you can use the Crown corporations to the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan; if you get that ideological thing out of your head about privatization, you could do the right thing and you could straighten this graph right out. It wouldn't have to go down, down, down, down, down, so that our property taxes would have to go up, up, up, up every year. Wouldn't have to do that. Just get rid of that privatization idea; just get rid of it.

Mr. Speaker, you see, part of the problem is, you want to do this because they are tuned in and wound up by the corporation, by the corporate interests of the international . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You're right, by the multinationals. You haven't said no to a multinational corporation since you were born, I'll bet.

Now I have before me here, Mr. Speaker, another graph, another graph to show just what's happened. We know we need money in this province. We're so far in debt, I don't know if we're ever going to get out under this group. But we know we need money. But look, what's happened when they're collecting taxes?

And I'm going to do a contrast for you, Mr. Speaker, to show you what's happened to the individual income tax since these people have been in government and the corporate income tax. When I take a look, Mr. Speaker, at the graph of how much individual tax has been collected from income tax, that's from our pockets, yours and my pocket — income tax, we're just busy filling out the forms.

And before I go to that, I might just remind this government of the booboo, of the booboo that their Finance Minister pulled again this year — totally incompetent. We've got 18-year-olds in this province, everybody that's got an 18-year-old who's earning under . . . when the family's earning under \$36,000, this government is charging them an extra 200 bucks this year which they shouldn't have if the Minister of Finance hadn't boobooed — just like he's boobooing here with this Potash Corporation. Just like it. All it needed is a little attention on his part, and cross out the 1981 and put in 1980, and he'd have had it. But no, he refused to do that, and even when he was told — no, he's busy taking care of something else. He's busy privatizing, privatizing the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Corporation income tax is what I'm getting back to, Mr. Speaker, and individual income tax revenue. Individual income tax revenue would not have to go up, would not have to go up if we maintained the profits from our Crowns and maintained the services — would not have to go up.

So what's happened to the individual income tax revenue? From 1985 through to '89, the figures that I have before me, every year they've collected more money from the pockets of the people of Saskatchewan — your pockets, my pocket, Mr. Speaker — up from 626 million to 699, going higher, 752 million, and this year a record amount collected from the people of Saskatchewan through income tax, 831 million. And they say we're running out of money. It's not running out of money, it's mismanagement, Mr. Speaker. They've collected more income tax than anybody has ever collected in this province, in the history of this province.

But at the same time . . . Okay, if they're able to do that, at the same time why didn't they do the same thing with corporations? Why didn't they do so? And when I look at the corporate income tax, I don't see a graph that's increasing as you go along. I don't see that at all. What happens is it bobbles up and down like this. Back in '84 it was 156 million. This year it's projected to be 148 million; in fact, that's a decrease.

What they did is they gave a 2 per cent decrease to the corporations. Why? That shows that they just don't believe in taxing them, Mr. Speaker. They don't believe in taxing them. They don't believe in using the corporations for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan like we were using the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, like we were using it. It was just a tool, Mr. Speaker, just an excellent tool — just an excellent tool to get done together what you and I couldn't do as individuals.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, we need the money from corporations like the potash corporation, like Saskoil before it. Not only the money, but also the window on the world into that industry. Because when you take a look at what's happening to our deficit and our debt since this government took office, Mr. Speaker, it's enough to astound you.

At this stage, we came from a profit in '82, when we had the vision of a potash corporation and when we were taking dividends from the potash corporation, at the same time paying off its debt. Now, they took some dividends, but they didn't pay off its debt until they were forced to in order to make it look good for this year. But during that period of time they put the province into debt — \$3.9 billion. That works out to \$3,900 per woman and man and child — everyone. Anybody had a child born this week, that child is born with a debt on its head, born with a debt on its head.

The cost of servicing that debt is 381 million — 381 million; that's \$381 for every woman and man and child. That, Mr. Speaker, is almost as much as they're going to get from selling this corporation, almost as much, what they expect to get for selling this corporation. But that's 400 million they're expecting to sell it for, but you know, it made 100 million this year. It made 100 million this year, and they're going to sell it for 400 million.

Mr. Speaker, that's a little bit about the finances of Saskatchewan and some reasons why we shouldn't sell it because of the finances and the help it could give us.

Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat something I mentioned

twice here, because we know that we've had people that have called in and asked about a possibility of getting a tape of our leader, the member from Riversdale, when he spoke in this historic debate today and when he spoke about it yesterday. Now if you phone the caucus office or any one of your New Democratic members, and you might want to do so, Mr. Minister of Education, and see if I'm telling the truth, we will offer you and we will make sure that you are able to get either a copy of his speech or a bit of a tape that you might be able to use in your VHS. And I've been handed, by the member from Saskatoon University, a phone number that you might call if you want to, and you can call in right away and you will be given this, and the number is 787-1892. And if you . . .

An Hon. Member: — Call toll free at that.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Call toll free. The member tells me that you can ask that the charges be reversed. You will not have to pay for the tape. You will get the tape with a smile, and the phone call will be answered with a smile as well.

Mr. Speaker, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, I say, was a unique, successful experiment which was done and set up by the people of Saskatchewan, unique in this world, unique in this world just like rural electrification was; just like rural roads and the highway network that we have in our province; just like medicare; just like the school dental plan; just like the prescription drug plan — all pioneered by the New Democrats, the people that sit on this side of the House.

And we now see this thing slowly being tried to get pushed out the door by the members opposite. We see them trying to do this, and they've come across . . . they've done it one step at a time, one step at a time. We've experienced it slowly, but now they've finally brought down the big whopper, the PCS corporation along with SaskPower and SaskTel.

And this, Mr. Speaker, the Premier opposite has said is going to be the Waterloo. We will see whose Waterloo it's going to be, Mr. Speaker, because the decision on this Bill, that this government has made, is going to be rendered by the people of Saskatchewan in the next election. Mr. Speaker, it's going to be rendered in the next election.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to mention a couple of other things about the potash corporation just in case people are still . . . or anybody might still have the idea that the potash corporation is not really such a great thing. I want to say that we have, and we know we have, the richest deposits in the world. And I've been down one of those mines, Mr. Speaker, and I know the number of people that depend on those jobs and how the communities benefit from those jobs.

And I note that in annual reports previous there were other people that agreed. In a 1982 annual report, the chairman, who now sits as a member opposite there, said, "It is our firm belief that a new and stronger PCS can emerge." Do you remember saying that? Do you remember saying that? What happened? He said:

With this belief in mind, the board of directors

supported management's recommendation to continue with all our major projects in Saskatchewan. I refer to the PCS mine in Lanigan, phase 2 expansion which is now under way.

Well, you know, something happened to that member. At one time he made a little bit of sense. And now? He had the opportunity to stand up and at least say why he changed his mind. He wouldn't do so. No. Why? Because they bought lock, stock, and barrel into some idea that Maggie Thatcher is setting up in Great Britain, and they think they can apply it here in Saskatchewan. What a ridiculous idea.

And he can't see through it — either that or he doesn't have the guts to tell the members on his side, hey, we've gone too far, boys. We better hold back or we're going to get kicked out of office. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what has happened. They have gone too far and they are going to get kicked out of office.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — You know, Mr. Speaker, the minister responsible for the Crown Corporations Committee, who sits on the front bench there as well, he said this at one time:

I think that we're doing better in our management. Certainly the board of potash corporation has confidence in the management of potash corporation.

Well that was in 1983. I guess he's changed his mind as well. Now he's also dancing to the tune of Maggie Thatcher — privatization.

You know, Mr. Speaker, what the people are telling me when I go home? They've experienced the privatization of our highway equipment, and they're asking the question: are our roads any better? And the answer they're saying is no. They're thinking: are the roads any better? No. And they're asking the question: well, we privatized our dental plan; are our children getting any better service? No. The answer is no, absolutely not. Part of SaskTel has been privatized. Are our telephone rates going down? No. Are our insurance rates going down? Not at all. Not at all.

(2115)

Mr. Speaker, we need, we need the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to do those things together which you and I can't do as individuals, Mr. Speaker. We need it for that. We need it.

The people of Saskatchewan fear, Mr. Speaker, that by the time these guys are finished privatizing there will be nothing left. There will be nothing left. They will have run every corporation into the ground and there will be nothing left.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close now with the similar type of remarks that I made earlier. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I feel quite privileged to have sat in this House and listened to the member from Riversdale when he gave

what I consider will be the historic speech of this session. It will be the speech that motivates the members on this side and New Democrats across Saskatchewan. It will be the speech that will motivate us enough to throw those guys out of office whenever they call the election. And I don't care if it's this fall or next spring or the year after, or they wait until Her Honour has to come in and force them to call an election. But that's what's going to happen.

And, Mr. Speaker, if the people of Saskatchewan, or anybody who might be watching television now, would like to get a copy of that speech, the speech from the member from Riversdale, or a copy of the speech either on tape or in print, they can phone in. They can phone any one of the members of the New Democrats . . . any New Democratic constituency office, or any New Democrats here that are sitting in this House. And I've got a few numbers which I'm going to give you here. The member from Moose Jaw North says you are quite welcome to call him, call him on reverse, he'll give it to you. His number is 787-1884. I'll repeat that. The member from Moose Jaw North, his number is 787-1884. You can call collect. I'll give you another number in a minute.

The member from The Battlefords is here, and he says that you can call his office number, and his office number is 787 . . . so anybody in The Battlefords or that area who want to get a hold of him — 787-1623 is his number. I have another number here, and that's the number from the member of Saskatoon University, I believe, and his number is 787-7388.

And if you can't remember any of these numbers, if anybody's listening, what you can always do is call information and straight to the caucus office in Regina, the New Democratic caucus office, and we will be more than pleased to receive your call — call us collect.

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for the opportunity to speak to this debate.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hesitated, like the previous speaker, in getting up. I had thought that one of the opposition members might have risen to his feet or her feet to join in this debate, a debate that will be seen by many in Saskatchewan now and probably in the future as a historic debate; a debate about the very soul and the heart of this province; a debate about the function and the role of government; a debate about the role of foreign influences in this province.

The people at home may not necessarily know this, but it's customary when we debate a Bill, or any other proposition for that matter, it's customary for one of the government members to get up to speak to the Bill, and then for someone on this side of the House to get up to address the Bill, and then to listen again to a government member, and back and forth, so that all points of view might be taken into account.

We are immensely surprised, greatly surprised by what we perceive to be a wall of silence on the part of the government, a wall of silence in this House. And whether

it's an inability or whether it's a shame on their part — whatever the reason, it's manifesting itself in not getting up and participating in this debate.

Even the member who moved the Bill, who moved it on second reading, the minister responsible for the potash corporation spent only 20 minutes in putting forward his viewpoints, not in any detail, and mostly that was rhetoric. So we are very surprised, Mr. Speaker, very surprised to hear the silence, to see the inactivity on the government benches when it comes to debate on this Bill.

Whether it's because they can't think of anything to say, or again, whether they're ashamed to say or to contribute to the debate on this Bill, we're not sure, and at some point they'll have to explain, and they'll have to come clean with the people of Saskatchewan and explain everything.

It's also been suggested that perhaps some of the government back-benchers don't understand the provisions of the Bill, and that may well be the case, but that certainly shouldn't excuse some of the front benches, some of those who sit on the front benches, and who ought to know about the provisions of this Bill, from participating in this debate.

It's a sorry day, it's a sorry day, Mr. Speaker, when the government of the day, when the government of the day refuses — refuses to account to the public of Saskatchewan, the people of Saskatchewan in the forum that is set aside for such accountability; refuses to account to the public; will only give them advertising on TV as a means of explaining what it is that they're trying to do.

An Hon. Member: — Slick ads, no ideas.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Slick ads, no substance, that's this government.

And I'll get back, Mr. Speaker, to the business of slick ads, but it's a sorry day, it's a sorry day that the government will not take the opportunity that is provided in this legislative chamber and through the broadcast of these proceedings to explain its point of view to the people of Saskatchewan, in substance, in detail, in principle, but chooses instead to sit silently, to sit silently; and the only explanation that it can afford of its actions are a number of slick television ads about so called public participation, which the public know as privatization, and that is the only information that the public is going to receive from the government opposite. I say it's shameful, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was doing some travelling and I stopped for supper in a small café in a small town and two or three hours from Regina. And I don't want to say which small town, it's not important, and the name of the café isn't important. This, I guess you might call it, was a triple C café, a Chinese-Canadian cuisine café, which is common to many small towns in Saskatchewan, and the café was empty, the café was empty . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again I don't want to mention the town or the constituency that

this café was located in, for fear, Mr. Speaker, that somehow some narrow-minded PC back-bencher will see it as being necessary to go and address the person that I am going to be talking about, and to bring down the heavy clout of government on that person, because that's the nature of that government.

That's the nature of that government, to drive fear into people, so that whenever anyone speaks out about the smallest thing, it's to strike fear into those people so that they are afraid to speak out.

And this person I talked to in this café is a waitress, and the café was empty when I came there, and I talked to her. She was a middle-aged woman, energetic, helpful. She and I talked about the weather, the fact that that part of the country was dry and that that was a problem.

We also got to talking about her family. And she told me, Mr. Speaker, that she has three sons. Two have finished high school; one is 19 years old; one is 17 years old; the other, I think, is 16, is just completing high school or will be finishing school shortly. She was just so frustrated, she was so angry, and she was so afraid, Mr. Speaker, of the future for her children and what it might hold.

And the Deputy Premier and the Minister of Education and the newly elected member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg and the minister of rural affairs and the member from Kelvington-Wadena, they may laugh. They may laugh, but this is no make-believe story, this is no make-believe story, Mr. Speaker.

This woman had three boys. None of those boys had been able to find any work. I want to correct that. One of the boys did find some month's work in Ontario, some diamond drilling work, but has come back. But no jobs in Saskatchewan except for the odd job at harvest time. And if they're not unemployed, then they're underemployed.

And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, this woman was frustrated, she was angry, but mostly she was very afraid of the future; afraid of what was in store for her sons; afraid of what opportunities there might be.

And as I listen to the government members in their brief explanation of this Bill, I ask myself, and many people in Saskatchewan are asking themselves: how will the Bill make any difference for those kids? How is it going to provide some opportunity for them? How will this privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, how will that translate into jobs for that 19-year-old, for that 17-year-old, for that 16-year-old? How will that mean that they're going to be given some opportunity that they can plan on, that they can think about getting married and raising families in rural Saskatchewan?

They can't, Mr. Speaker, they can't. There's nothing in this privatization of the potash corporation Bill about hope and opportunity and future and jobs for young people. The government may make you want to believe what this is all about. And the minister, in introducing the Bill, used words like "new economic direction"; words like "building in Saskatchewan and diversifying here"; words like "companies building and expanding."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan have been hearing that line since 1982. And whether it was the Premier talking about, gee, we're open for business, and we're open for business now, so come on in. I mean, the NDP is no longer in business and they're no longer in government, so we're the government and we're open for business. So come on in and let's see a lot of investment here and growth and expansion and economic development.

(2130)

And it didn't happen. So he said, well I've been using the wrong lines. I can't say we're open for business. I've got to say things like "we're building and diversifying here," maybe that'll attract them.

Well that didn't work either. In fact, some of the people in the press think that was a big joke. The joke around the press gallery that time was that, when they talked about building, it was — what was the line? — building until you puke. That was the line they used. That was the line they used.

I'm not sure what comments they might have had about your open-for-business direction, but the point is that the people of Saskatchewan have heard all these lines. They've heard all these lines from the Premier. They've heard all these lines from the Minister of Finance. They've heard them from all the cabinet ministers. And it's like the past doesn't exist, like that there's some big black hole from 1982 to 1989, some big black hole about past performance that doesn't exist. They don't want to talk about the period from 1982 to 1989 — that's kind of a black hole. It doesn't exist. It's not there. It's just not real.

What we want to talk about is the future because we want to build and diversify and all those wonderful things. And it's going to happen with the potash corporation. The privatization of the potash corporation is going to result in all these wonderful things.

If you really think the people of Saskatchewan are that foolish . . . Well I guess maybe that's why they're spending millions of dollars in those advertising campaigns because the public of Saskatchewan, the people of Saskatchewan believe an entirely different story, Mr. Speaker. They've seen this government. They've seen their operation. And it's going to take more than hype and advertising to now convince the public, the people, that this privatization of the potash corporation is going to be a good thing.

You know, like, they've undertaken . . . I mean, it's not as if we're dealing with a new thing here, that privatization is an entirely new thing that somehow, you know, is some new economic instrument. You know, the public might say, well gee, we've got to give it a try. We've got to get behind the government. They're doing it for the first time, so we should help them out. We should at least believe them.

An Hon. Member: — Is it the first time?

Mr. Van Mulligen: — It isn't the first time.

These people have been privatizing since 1982, but it hasn't resulted in this massive economic expansion. It hasn't resulted in a massive business development. The picture is one that is very contrary. The privatizations that these people have undertaken . . . I think the one that most people will remember, the very first one, the highway maintenance, where the minister of Highways at that time said, well I just fired — what was it 3 or 400? — 400 highway workers here today because the private sector is going to take over all those jobs.

And when asked: do you have any concerns about 400 people losing their jobs in Saskatchewan? He said, well we didn't really fire them, we just gave them the opportunity to transfer to the private sector. I think that set the tone; that set the tone. That's simply one of the most callous statements that has ever gone down in the legislative history of this province — transferred to the private sector. No owning up, no fessing up about what it is that you are doing, but just display an insensitivity and a callousness. And that was the very first privatization that these people indulged in.

An Hon. Member: — And it didn't work.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — And it didn't work. I mean, you know . . . Whatever else one might think, as a city MLA, that I don't drive much beyond the road between my house and the Legislative Building. I want to let you know, government members, that I do get out of town once a week, and I do spend time in some of your ridings. I do spend time in some of your ridings, and so I am in a position to comment on the state of the highways in this province.

Now I'm not a highways engineer and I won't comment from that perspective, Mr. Speaker, but I tell you from the viewpoint of a user I can comment, and also from the viewpoint as one who talks to others and who have comments to make. That was their very first privatization, and I think the general agreement is that it hasn't resulted in any improvement in highway driving conditions in Saskatchewan. In fact, it's gone the other way. People kind of chuckle about the highways in this province.

That was the first one, and there have been others. I think the one that a lot of families are especially angry about, and I don't think they're going to forget very quickly, is the children's dental plan. This is a government that in 1987 arbitrarily, without prior consultation, fired 400 dental nurses, 400 dental nurses, young professionals, mostly women, who lived in communities throughout Saskatchewan, part of community life, and provided a valuable service, and were part of providing the very best children's dental program in all of North America, and one of the best in the world.

And this government said, we can't have that; we don't want it; we have to get rid of it. They said at that time it had something to do with saving money, although they haven't been quite able to explain how in the long run we'll save money by what they did. But that was another one of their privatizations. And again I ask, where are the jobs in that one?

Someone gave me here a copy of *Hansard* from April 13,

1989, and these are remarks by the member from Kelsey-Tisdale, the minister of rural affairs, and what he had to say about the dental care and the dental program. And the minister of rural affairs said:

Mr. Chairman, the dental care beyond the children . . . I mean, but children are very, very important.

Well we can all agree with that point. He went on to say:

The dental care being available to take them to a dentist, professional dentist, I believe, can't be . . . at least it has to be . . . Those people are as good as or better than a trainee that may be out there working on those children's teeth. I don't say that they weren't. It wasn't . . . At the point it was, it might have been okay. But I believe that a professional dentist who has seven years of training has to have, and should have, a better knowledge of what is needed for not only the children, for the grown-ups and the rest, and it's part of building rural Saskatchewan.

An Hon. Member: — Read that last part again.

Mr. Van Mulligen: —

. . . I believe that a professional dentist who has seven years of training has to have, and should have, a better knowledge of what is needed for not only the children, for the grown-ups and the rest, and it's part of building rural Saskatchewan.

Well, now you had, you had 400 professionals throughout . . . dental therapists throughout rural Saskatchewan. You had these people working in communities such as Assiniboia and Gravelbourg and others. Part of that community providing the service, and even if the Minister of Rural Development believes what he just said, experts in the field, people from dental colleges in other jurisdictions who have no axe to grind but might tend to side a little bit with professional dentists, had done evaluations of that program, and said that in terms of the work that the dental therapists were being paid to do . . .

The Speaker: — Order. I've been listening very close to the debate and I can't see where the member is relating it to Bill 20, which is the Bill before the House. The Chair is . . . Order, order . . . The debate . . . Order, order. Order . . . The Bill before the Assembly is Bill No. 20, and I'd asked the member to make his comments on Bill 20.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. What I was talking about was the children's dental program, and it was an example, I believe, of a privatization, a public participation, if you will, that has been undertaken by this government. And I was illustrating a point in connection with my remarks to this Bill, which is about the privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

But I respect your comments, Mr. Speaker, that if you don't want me to range too far afield, then I won't do that.

But I did want to point out that this privatization of the Potash Corporation is not the first privatization in Saskatchewan. And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, if this group, these PCs, ever get re-elected in Saskatchewan, it ain't going to be the last privatization in Saskatchewan. It won't be the last privatization in Saskatchewan. But I was simply making the point that this was not the first privatization.

It's not a matter as if the public should be expected to support the government in this venture because it's something new and therefore the government should be given an opportunity to display or to put into practice, so that it might be evaluated, you know, given an opportunity of chance, if you will, with this Bill to show the people what they had in mind.

The fact is that there had been privatization — privatization such as Sask Minerals — which is a very appropriate, I think, example to talk about in the context of the potash corporation. This was the Saskatchewan Minerals Corporation, owned by the province of Saskatchewan, owned by the public, returned a profit to the people of Saskatchewan and sold by the PC government to Ontario and Quebec interests, people who have no interest whatsoever in the province of Saskatchewan. And they call that public participation.

We're still trying to track down somebody from Saskatchewan who's got a share in those Ontario and Quebec companies and therefore might be publicly participating, but we haven't found one yet. And maybe there's one out there somewhere, Mr. Speaker. Maybe there's one out there somewhere, but we haven't found that person yet. Well they call that public participation. What they mean by that, Mr. Speaker, we just don't know any more.

In any event, there are lots of examples of privatization for the public to be able to form an opinion about whether privatization has worked in their best interests; whether privatization has meant an expansion in the Saskatchewan economy; and whether privatization has helped stem the flood of people leaving rural Saskatchewan and leaving Saskatchewan for other provinces; whether privatization has resulted in better services for the people of Saskatchewan; whether privatization means, as an example, that you're getting your SaskPower bills on time and more consistently — which seems to be a question — because I don't think that most of the public is aware that the mailing out of the SaskPower bills has been privatized, Mr. Speaker.

SaskPower used to mail it out themselves; they've now turned it over to a company, I believe it's called D-Mail, which is a company set up by a former principal secretary, or whatever, to the Premier. I mean, it's not as if new companies haven't been started in Saskatchewan; it just seemed that a lot of them seem to have Tory connections. But in any event, this aspect of SaskPower has been privatized, and the bills are now sent out by this company.

And I had a call the other day, Mr. Speaker, in this connection — speaking of privatization — I had a call from constituents who didn't get a bill the previous

month, didn't get any bill, wasn't delivered to them, and now this month they're getting a late payment charge because they didn't pay the previous month for a bill they didn't get. These are people who've lived in that address for 35 years, have always paid on time, and all of a sudden some private company can't do it right. The service gets worse, and these people are hounded by the bureaucracy on account of this government's mismanagement.

(2145)

So the point that I'm making, Mr. Speaker, is that Saskatchewan people have had ample opportunity to judge this government on the whole question of privatization, whether it's good for them, whether it benefits them. And their impression is that it's not good, and they don't support this Bill. They want to see this government gone. They want to see them ended. They want to see an end to foreign ownership of Saskatchewan resources.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Van Mulligen: — But this government believes all those things. I mean, they must believe all those things to do so many stupid things. You wouldn't do them if you were just plain stupid. They must be doing it if they believe them.

And we call it, on our side, nerdonomics — nerdonomics, Mr. Speaker. This in reference to the recent article in *The Globe and Mail*, which, in discussing the privatization of the potash corporation; the heading is: Potash and pabulum. And it starts out: "Is this the Waterloo of socialism or the Revenge of the Nerds? When Saskatchewan Premier blank, blank . . . and I respect your ruling that I shouldn't use the name of a member or the present . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . "I can do that?"

When Saskatchewan Premier Grant Devine announced plans last month to sell off three provincial Crown corporations he predicted a battle royal with the opposition New Democrats. This is their Alamo. This is their Waterloo. This is the end of the line for them, he thundered. Now he has unveiled a Bill to privatize Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and he shows a disappointing failure of nerve.

Well this is nothing new to the people in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Former NDP Premier Allan Blakeney was wrong to nationalize Saskatchewan potash industry more than a decade ago (Well that's their opinion.), but at least he showed the courage of his convictions.

And now we have the sad spectacle of Mr. Devine who has trumpeted the return of capitalism with such a sickly quaver that it can only cheer those on the other side of the battlefield.

Cheers, Mr. Speaker, cheers. But anyway . . . Is this our Waterloo? Is this our Waterloo? And you got to remember in Waterloo there were two armies, Mr. Speaker, one was

the army of Napoleon, the other was the army of Marlborough, I believe.

We speak of nerdonomics. When they talk about privatization, Mr. Speaker, we talk of nerdonomics, because only a bunch of nerds could devise the kinds of things that they've been devising, in terms of privatization. You know, it really isn't funny, some of it, but when you look at it, that these people would fire 300 dental nurses and say this is good for rural Saskatchewan — 400 dental nurses and say that's good for rural Saskatchewan. When these people would sell off highways equipment at 10 cents on a dollar — now there's a good business deal for you. You know, we call that nerdonomics because only a nerd could get away with such a nerdy deal, and on and on it goes.

Only a bunch of nerds could sell off something that makes money every year, Sask Minerals, and somehow lose \$400,000 in the process. Only nerds would turn over the mailing of the SaskPower bills through a private company, only to have people calling up in arms about: where's my bill? And why am I getting my bill late? Why is there a late payment billed? Why didn't I get that? Then sending out two bills instead of one bill. Nerdonomics, Mr. Speaker, nerdonomics. Nerdonomics.

Mr. Speaker, I was talking earlier about young people and young people leaving Saskatchewan in droves. There is some that would suggest that the Premier is, in fact, the new Pied Piper, the Pied Piper of Saskatchewan. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, the Pied Piper of Hamelin who was paid by the leaders of the people of Hamelin to pipe the rats out of Hamelin. And then when they refused in payments because all the rats were gone, he promptly piped all the children out of Hamelin.

Well I'm not sure whether the Premier is doing in that exact order. And we know that he's trying to pipe the rats out of rural Saskatchewan because he's announced a bunch of money to do that, although one wonders why he cut back on that program a few years ago only to reinstitute it now. But that's probably another one of those nerdonomic things, Mr. Speaker.

But he's, in a sense, been called the Pied Piper of Saskatchewan, because in a very real way his tune of privatization and mismanagement has hastened the droves and droves of young people who are leaving rural Saskatchewan; who are leaving Saskatchewan for better economic opportunities elsewhere. And that is why he is called the Pied Piper.

And it's a serious, serious matter, Mr. Speaker, that so far this year, in the first three months of 1989, 9,000 people — 9,000 people have left Saskatchewan . . . or 9,000 more have left Saskatchewan than came to Saskatchewan in search for jobs and economic opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, in 1987 the net out-migration, the net out-migration in Saskatchewan was 8,000 people; in 1988 the net out-migration was 13,000 people; in the first three months of 1989 the net out-migration, the net out-migration, Mr. Speaker, is 9,000 people. And at this rate there will be a phenomenal loss of people from Saskatchewan. And the very sad part about this, and

getting back to this waitress in a café in this small town, is that the majority of these people leaving our province are young men and women between the ages of 20 and 29.

Our future, our most precious resource, leaving Saskatchewan because there is no hope and there's no opportunity; leaving because the Premier of Saskatchewan has been playing and calling a tune of privatization and mismanagement. And they will continue to leave in spite of this Bill. And they will not come back to this province until there's a government who understands the problems facing Saskatchewan, and especially rural Saskatchewan; will deal with them, and will provide hope and opportunities for the people of Saskatchewan. That's when they will start to come back, Mr. Speaker.

And I just might say that, as an aside, that I for one cannot understand, given this tragedy that faces our young people — this tragedy resulting from privatization — that this tragedy facing our young people, Mr. Speaker, that this government, at a time that young people are crying out for economic opportunities and jobs, that this government would cut back, cut back on the programs that have historically been provided in this province to assist young people through troubled times, to give them some chance of jobs — that this government would cut back. That the Minister of Human Resources, that the Minister of Human Resources would somehow take pride in the fact that he's cut back the funding for things like the opportunities programs that are provided on an annual basis, and where we see less people being helped by the government to find jobs on an interim basis than was the case three or four years ago.

This is shameful, shameful, shameful indictment of this government, Mr. Speaker. A shameful indictment, and one that just, you know, one that frightens young people. But I'll tell you the group that are most concerned about this are the elderly. The elderly people that I've talked to — and there are many in my constituency — who are just deathly afraid of the lack of opportunities that exist for their grandchildren.

And they fear for this province, they fear for this province that they built up and that there are simply no opportunities in a government that doesn't seem to care; a government that turns its back on the challenges and the problems facing Saskatchewan; that says we don't want to deal with the real issues of the day; we want to turn our backs to the real issues of the day; we want to deal with privatization, as if privatization was somehow a solution to these problems. We say it's part of the problem. They say it's a solution. We say it is part of the problem. And that's all they want to talk about. All they want to deal with is privatization.

You know, the Bills they call forward in this Legislative Assembly — Bill No. 1, privatization. And which Bill have we spent all our time on, or most of our time on, until this time? What was the subject? Privatization. Which Bill are we spending time on now and will be spending time on for some considerable time to come? Privatization.

You'd think that there was no other problem in Saskatchewan. You'd think that there was no problems of

unemployment. You'd think that there was no problems in agriculture. You'd think that there was no problems in health care, that there was no problems with the economy, no problems with the provincial debt, no problems about trade or other things that Saskatchewan people need. You'd think that the only problem in Saskatchewan was privatization, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

You know, if you ask people, if you ask people, what do you consider to be the most important issue facing the province of Saskatchewan today? the chances are that they would say, in order of importance, the following: unemployment, agriculture, health care, the economy, the provincial debt, and free trade. But not one of them would say the most important problem facing Saskatchewan today is a lack of privatization.

Mr. Speaker, you know, if you were to ask people in rural Saskatchewan about the most . . . if you were to ask them to pick the most serious concern facing the people in rural Saskatchewan from a list of eight, and ask them to rate those as, you know, the most important, the most important concern of people in rural Saskatchewan would be the lack of jobs for young people, then the drought, the world price of wheat, maintaining the family farm, financing farm debt, the cost of farm inputs, retaining rural services and businesses, the need for farm management training.

But nowhere, nowhere do the people in rural Saskatchewan say our greatest, most pressing problem is the lack of privatization or too much public ownership. They never say that. It's not a concern of theirs. They don't see it as a priority in their lives. They have a whole different set of priorities as to what they think the government should be doing, what they think the government should be getting involved in.

And it's especially the people in rural Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, that are so concerned, I find, about privatization. These are a group of men and women, farmers in our province who understand, who understand the concept of ownership, I suppose, more so than many others in Saskatchewan. These are people who are tied in with the land and production, and many of whom will own their own properties, understand ownership and understand what special significance that has.

So they understand, they understand things like when the people of Saskatchewan own something, as opposed to something being owned by outside interests. They understand those concepts; they understand those concepts very clearly. And they are not amused, they are not amused when their government would seek to limit local ownership, would seek to promote foreign ownership of Saskatchewan resources.

You know, the government may delude themselves about what a wonderful job that they're doing for rural Saskatchewan, but I think these people are caught up in their rhetoric. I think these people sit around and talk to each other and say, boy, what a wonderful job we're doing for the farmers out there. Don't you believe that? Yes, I do. That's what they're believing — their own rhetoric. They've lost touch with the people of rural Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Van Mulligen: — They sit around and tell each other about what a great job it is that they're doing. But I tell you, the people of rural Saskatchewan no longer believe your rhetoric.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to go on in that vein, I want to go on in that vein at an early opportunity, but I see that it's a few seconds before 10 o'clock, so I beg leave to adjourn the debate at this time.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 10 p.m.