

EVENING SITTING

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

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. Hopfner:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before dinner I was basically trying to point out the issue, and I'll just back up a little so that the member from the opposition will understand what I was trying to put across.

The member from Regina North will take note as to what I've got to say. When the member from Regina Victoria had indicated that they were a party that believed in Canadian ownership and believed in the national Canadian ownership and were promoting Canadian nationalism in this province and across Canada, I wanted to draw to your attention and to the people of Saskatchewan's attention, basically that if you look at where he was coming from in speaking in regards to agriculture, I want to indicate to you that the philosophy of the NDP opposition is not that at all and is not being practised like that at all, Mr. Speaker. Because basically when you look at the agenda of the NDP, they have never, never gotten outside the boundaries of Saskatchewan enabling outside interest to participate and partake in agriculture or anything like that.

So I'm going to indicate to the members opposite — and this is a challenge to them — that if such a decree does happen to . . . and a decision does happen to come about in the province of Saskatchewan that the agricultural community wishes people from Alberta, or their sons and daughters from Manitoba or wherever, to participate in the family farm, we'll see what side of the fence they're on in that issue. Because they have never, never wanted anybody — the son or daughter or anyone — to own that particular family farm if they happen to have had a job in, say, Alberta or Manitoba or elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to you that the member from Regina Victoria had also touched on the fact of the spending and the amount of dollars going out of province, and I had briefly touched on that, but I want to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that it is not the case that the \$50 million that was . . . The member from Regina Victoria was saying that would leave the province. I hope, I hope that as they go around the province and talk about their ideology and that they would be factual and truthful with the people in the province and not use that as part of their argument because they know, they know very well that that is not fact.

And when I say going around, the member from Regina Victoria also indicated that as they were out of the legislature here for the last two weeks or I think it was 16 to 18 days, as they were travelling the province and talking to the people about public participation . . . Well no that's not quite the fact either, Mr. Speaker. They were

not talking about public participation; they were talking about privatization, and there's two different meanings there. I'm talking about public participation, Mr. Speaker, and those people just can't seem to present the facts straight and truthful.

But I want to indicate to you that the member from The Battlefords . . . And I hope that all the members of the opposition pay attention to this because, Mr. Speaker, I will quote to you. As that member from Battlefords was in my riding, he was being interviewed by the media, and this is what the member from The Battlefords had to say to my media when they were out there trying to suggest the fact that they were . . . we were selling out Saskatchewan, privatizing.

But he indicated to the media there that this was the only way that they'd come back here: the government withdraws the Bill; an election is called; or the people of Saskatchewan tell the NDP to call off their protest. Pardon me, the member from The Battlefords says he doubts Saskatchewan voters will give the NDP the last message, and the last message was that the people of Saskatchewan tell the NDP to call off their protests.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as you will have seen, the Bill has not been withdrawn from the legislature. As you will have seen, an election is not called. Well, Mr. Speaker, that only leaves one thing left. It only leaves one thing left, and accordingly it's got to be fact because the member from The Battlefords stated it, that the people of Saskatchewan have told the NDP to get back to the legislature and start debating public participation.

The only reason they're back — they lost out there, Mr. Speaker, because if they wouldn't have lost out there, if they would not have been told to get back to the legislature, Mr. Speaker, well then they would have still been out there because we did not call an election, and the government definitely has not withdrawn the Bill.

So these are the kinds of things that, Mr. Speaker, the members of the opposition, when they talk about the blood and guts of issue, they do not have the issue at hand. They do not have the feeling for Saskatchewan and for the youth and for the seniors and for the entrepreneurs and the labour force. They don't have the feeling, Mr. Speaker, and as you would well have seen through the various different forums that they've held in the various different auditoriums across this province. They might have had about 1,000 people or something show up discussing the public participation of potash and energy and etc.

And I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, well will I tell you and the people of Saskatchewan that the NDP opposition had to bus those people in from all over the province. And I'll tell you something, Mr. Speaker, that when it comes down to the fact of being able to only house 1,000 or 1,100 people by busing them in from all over the province of Saskatchewan, well far be it.

I am well, well interested in seeing just exactly what their petitions have got to say here, Mr. Speaker, because they might have thousands of names on those petitions, Mr.

Speaker. But I'll tell you, when I look at the amount of thousands and thousands and thousands of people that support this Progressive Conservative government . . . And, by the way, those people have gone out and asked for people to sign these petitions and not putting the facts out. Well, Mr. Speaker, once we get into that particular debate and fight, we'll see who comes out on this. And, Mr. Speaker, there'll be no doubt in the world that the youth and the seniors and all those people that were misled by the opposition on public participation will definitely come back and will realize that they have been misled.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to relate to you now some of the things that I have jotted down in a speech here — and so I don't wander off, some of the points that I want to make sure that are gone into and get on to the record.

I want to ask the members opposite to pay attention because, basically, if they will listen to what is documented in this speech and to what they've had to say so far in this whole debate, they may gain some knowledge.

And I hope they're open-minded enough to absorb some of the various different information articles that I have here. And then if they are discussing public participation, they may want to use some of this information in their deliberations, because I'm sure my people are going to be receiving the documentation, and they're not going to be misleading my people.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that when we look at the future of our province and its great potential, the securing of an industry is vital; the expansion of an industry is vital; and the diversifications and the long-term security of jobs are vital. In this day and age, Mr. Speaker, people are looking for that security, they're looking for the long-term security, and they're looking towards this government to deliver that.

Mr. Speaker, our government has had that vision — has had that vision to expand in industry, to allow diversification to happen, and to create jobs. We, no doubt, Mr. Speaker, have been through some difficult natural problems here with the drought and everything else, Mr. Speaker, but as you will well know, our government has not turned the back on Saskatchewan people.

My comments on Bill 20 would not be complete without the reference to the speech made in this legislature by the Leader of the NDP. The Leader of the Opposition opened his speech with a quote from the supporters of free trade, and I found that very astonishing. In the trade debate the supporters — and I'll notably mention one, Trade Minister John Crosbie — said the critics in the NDP were walking backward, backward into the future. Well, Mr. Speaker, I've got a point to make with this. You can imagine my surprise when the NDP leader, humbled by his failure to stop free trade, elected to use the same quotation in this debate, in this debate.

Walking backward into the future. This is a very telling quotation and this is why I am mentioning it. For this particular NDP leader, the member from Riversdale, it is a

classic example of self-description — a yesterday's man, advocating yesterday's solution, yesterday's rigid NDP ideology, as the answer to today's economic issues. It's no wonder he uses this phrase, walking backward into the future. It has a direct application and meaning for the opposition leader and his party. Intellectually, philosophically, and practically they are tired and empty, and they are walking backward into the future. That's the NDP opposition.

Bill 20 will give the people of Saskatchewan the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to participate directly in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan through share ownership. This Bill provides a way for us to attract new money, new investment, and new growth into the potash corporation. The government will be free to regulate, tax, and benefit from the profits of the corporation without having to own the mines and equipment that extract the ore.

(1915)

And I ask you, Mr. Speaker, does government need to own a potash company in order to manage it? Obviously, there are ways that an enlightened, modern, and sensible government — and I'm describing the Progressive Conservative government — there are ways that a government can ensure that all of us benefit without risking the future of our children, without using taxpayers' money, without borrowing against our heritage and staking everything on the management of bureaucrats, government administrators, and politicians. Well, Mr. Speaker, Bill 20 provides safeguards to ensure that the new modernized public potash company remains in Saskatchewan and that it will be a major player in our economy.

Let's look for a moment at the history of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. In 1976, when the NDP government nationalized the potash industry, they said that the American-owned potash companies had to go; they had to be kicked out of Saskatchewan. This is, and I want to say, this is particularly noteworthy, given the comments of the NDP leader who now boasts . . . He now boasts about how he personally led the attack in 1976.

So just what did he do? What was his answer? The NDP, as I had indicated earlier, Mr. Speaker, borrowed money from the American and European bankers to buy up American and European companies. Brilliant. Really, that was really brilliant, wasn't it?

Today, Saskatchewan's people are still paying back that debt to the American and the European bankers. Well I indicated that earlier . . . in my earlier remarks, Mr. Speaker, who really owns it? The same money invested in our economy, and to say that same money that the NDP had invested in the potash companies, if that same money was invested into our economy, into, say, maybe a savings account of a credit union, would be worth approximately now, Mr. Speaker, about \$2.5 billion today. That fund would actually support our health care system for nearly two years.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask you. Did the NDP look to the investment capability of our own people? Did the NDP

look to Saskatchewan, to Saskatchewan's vision to participate? No. They borrowed money from American and European bankers to buy out American and European potash companies. And this was done by the NDP in full knowledge that the potash industry is a cyclical business, its fortunes rising and falling with world international fertilizer needs.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the potash business was good — and I agree with the member for Regina Victoria — the potash business was good in the mid-1970s, and it's good again; it's good now. But how did the NDP think that the government ownership would carry this resource business through the market slumps and declines? I ask you. The old, tired NDP answer is that the taxpayer can always be tapped for more money. And that is what it is, Mr. Speaker, just that. That is the philosophy of the NDP. It's not even good sense when the losses and expenses of a government company are borne on the backs of the taxpayers and our children and our elderly and those in need. It's just not good economics, Mr. Speaker.

And I say to the members opposite — they may not care — but I say shame on them. I say shame on them. Shame on you for having the audacity to exercise the power of government to trick the people of Saskatchewan. That's what you people did. You tricked the people of Saskatchewan.

A duly elected government has the obligation, Mr. Speaker, to conduct the business of the province with foresight and vision. As we examine the history of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, remember that this NDP leader, the member from Riversdale, had as his vision, government money, government control, and narrow government ownership as the answer in both the good times and the bad — the good times and the bad.

But I ask you to look at the facts. This NDP leader, the man who boasts about his role in the past, borrowed money at 11 per cent, Mr. Speaker, in your name as taxpayers. Over time it has yielded a return, it has yielded a return, and I hope the members opposite, the member from Riversdale, will listen to this because he was pointing out all sorts of facts and figures that just didn't calculate, but the taxpayers and over the time had to . . . and only observed a yielded return of 3.7 per cent, 3.7 per cent return on the investment — borrowed the money at 11 per cent and had a return of 3.7 per cent.

Now I'm not finished yet. I asked the taxpayers of the province, would anybody you know borrow money at 11 per cent and put it in the bank for an interest rate of 3 per cent? Would you? No, I don't think so.

Well at this point I want to examine some statements made by the NDP leader and the member from Riversdale. And this I'm going to . . . The opposition leader says that Saskatchewan people have not benefitted from public participation. He says the public participation has not helped drought victims, difficult farm times, and escalating health care costs. Well this is rather confusing coming from the NDP. Public participation is just one year old in Saskatchewan and there have been plenty of success stories to tell on both a large and a small scale.

Government employees have started their own companies, become entrepreneurs. I look at DirectWEST, Printco Graphics, Media House Productions, and the Meadow Lake saw mill. Now I have to ask, what are you talking about no benefits? I ask . . . You have to ask them, Mr. Speaker, you have to ask that question of the NDP: what are they talking about? There are just a few examples there. And here are some more. Weyerhaeuser, WESTBRIDGE, and Saskoil have brought new jobs, growth, and investment into our province. You know, what are the NDP talking about, Mr. Speaker, and especially the Leader of the Opposition, the member from Riversdale?

And what about the bond issues we've promoted during the past year? Power bonds, TeleBonds, sensible and secure investments for Saskatchewan people. We've raised, Mr. Speaker, \$824 million through the bond sales and kept at least \$80 million worth of interest in our province. That's money that doesn't . . . And that's money that doesn't go to line the pockets of the American bankers as the NDP would so have the Saskatchewan people believe.

And look at the White Track ski resort, Mr. Speaker, the SARCAN returns depot — direct involvement by Saskatchewan people in putting under-used government assets to work and creating jobs and benefitting the economy. Public participation in potash, and in energy, and in the SGI are major undertakings. They are major undertakings, Mr. Speaker, but not one share has been offered for sale. The specific investment opportunities are not yet public knowledge and yet the NDP has jumped to the conclusion that no one has benefitted — simply amazing.

I want to say . . . And I want to say to the NDP opposition, just wait, just wait and be patient. We have started by creating over 400 new jobs and many new opportunities already in public participation, and if you'll be patient, just wait and see — just wait and see the new investment diversification and many opportunities that will come to all Saskatchewan people through public participation in potash.

Now look, at the risk of hurting the rather sensitive and delicate feelings of the Leader of the Opposition, I must say how disappointed I was with his speech on potash. His speech was truly a sad example of self-serving platitudes — yesterday's hero spouting disjointed memories of the past. Well, Mr. Speaker, nowhere did I hear constructive criticism — nowhere. Nowhere was there support for Saskatchewan men and women in the non-government sector, volunteers actually participating in our economy. Nowhere have we heard that, nowhere.

All we heard, Mr. Speaker, is negatives, worthless reminiscences of the past, yesterday's man invoking the spirits of the past. There's no boss like a government boss, says the NDP leader. Well we all remember potash. Commercial business, in fact the Cornwall Centre right here in Regina, we all remember that. Land banks, auto body shops, even SGI proposing to sell life insurance. They were going to get into the funeral business. That was the mentality of the NDP government.

These were all on the NDP's agenda. Governments as the master and not as the servant — a noble philosophy from the Leader of the Opposition, Leader of the NDP.

The people of our province remember, and they have good memories, Mr. Speaker. The NDP's blind ideology mind-set doesn't work any more. The quick fix of state ownership is unrealistic and simplistic. The NDP approach is not rational. It is not a common sense alternative. And like their leader, the NDP is locked into yesterday; the answers of the past trying to work in a challenging, complex future.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the NDP are good at scare mongering. They scare the sick and the elderly and the needy with vulgarities and half-truths about public participation. Mr. Speaker, as it is in health care, they are doing it now with potash.

(1930)

As I deal with Bill 20 it is ironic, almost humorous, to hear the Leader of the NDP blame the losses of the potash corporation in recent years on the change in Saskatchewan's government. And they're doing it here this evening as well, Mr. Speaker. They are putting . . . They're saying that the debt was not their fault.

Well, Mr. Speaker, well, Mr. Speaker, the member from The Battlefords is still upset, but he says it was still . . . It was smaller; it was smaller. That's his answer from a small-minded member from The Battlefords.

And what is the North Battleford chamber of commerce members, what do they think about their member from The Battlefords that is against everything — against private people getting involved in the running of the province and getting into the . . . and becoming a participant, publicly participating and helping run the resources in this province — allowing the outside of the bureaucracy to participate finally and to take part?

The NDP opposition, they don't agree with that. It's just not . . . They haven't got a thumbs on, Mr. Speaker. They just don't and aren't able to carry on governing unless they know they've got full thumbs on control of every little individual in this province. That's just the way they are.

Nowhere does the NDP leader mention declining world potash prices and declining demand for product. Nor when he criticized . . . criticizes the management of PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan) in 1982, does he seem to recall that these managers were the exact same people who ran PCS under the NDP government. The same management that he criticized in 1982 ran that potash corporation when they were government, and they point the finger at this administration, at this government.

And the leader of the NDP has a credibility problem. And that's no . . . And I ask the people of the province, wonder why. I wonder why he has a credibility problem. Well it's just basically things that he's been saying on one side of his mouth, speaking out of the middle of his mouth, and

talking about something totally different on the other side of his mouth. Three different directions, Mr. Speaker, and possibly even a fourth. Who knows what he is saying elsewhere?

Certainly there is no doubt that the past few years have not been easy ones for the potash corporation. The difficult times, however, have given us two very good reasons to look favourably at public participation in the corporation. First, the investor base of PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan) should be wider. Taxpayers should not be the only base of support for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan but many more investors from private citizens to businesses to others who want to actively participate. Investors from countries outside our borders must not be discouraged. And in Bill 20 there are safeguards to keep foreign investment to 45 per cent and voting control to 25 per cent, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, when the member from Regina Victoria was speaking about foreign investments, and he didn't know what kinds of people would be investing, you know, are they going to be Chinese or are they going to be Indian or what are they going to be . . . we're not going to know. Well, Mr. Speaker, in his tone of voice here today I'd almost think that there was a prejudiced, racial kind of slur about his type of conversation, and I want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that I was mighty disappointed. But it does show up, it does show up when we talk about public participation, when we talk about the opportunity for the private sector to . . . and the individual out in our province to participate.

But I want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is just unruling of the member from Regina Victoria to indicate that those people are not as good as we are. If they're good enough to purchase our grains, if they're good enough to do trade, then, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that they should be good enough, good enough to invest and live and become part of our province and to allow . . . and take part in the growth of our province.

But no, Mr. Speaker, the members of the opposition, the members of the opposition don't favour that. The Leader of the Opposition, the member from Riversdale, talks about the heritage, talks about his background and where his grandfather came from the old country . . . or his father and talks about his heritage. Well I take my heritage serious too, Mr. Speaker, and my grandfather, when he immigrated to this country, was of that belief in building this country as well. But he didn't ask whether the member came from, or people came from China or Japan or the United States or Germany or wherever. They all worked and got along in this country and province, to build this Canada and this Saskatchewan to what it was today.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the operations and headquarters . . . And I want to indicate to them, as they had indicated earlier, the member from Regina Victoria indicated earlier that this potash corporation was going to leave Saskatchewan. Well it isn't leaving Saskatchewan. The operations and the headquarters of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan will stay in Saskatchewan. The industry control will always be in Saskatchewan with government laws, regulations, royalties, taxes, and

special agreements.

Mr. Speaker, those are serious, serious things that will be discussed in the Bill, and serious points I have referenced, that I am making and putting on the record right now. Because the members, led by the Leader of the Opposition, the member from Riversdale, led out his troops into the public and told them totally the opposite, totally the opposite from what is actually taking place, because they would not allow the Bill to be properly debated in this House so as to find out exactly what was in this Bill.

And I want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that if the member from Riversdale could control his radicals on that side of the House, he may well get along better outside the province instead of having the pressure come from the private sector out there, the farm organizations and the business world and the labour people, and tell them to get back into this House and start debating.

And I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that those are some of the issues that I wanted to put on record because that is fact, and if anybody that is watching this debate tonight, if they question it because of the next speaker that may stand up and because of the ideology stoop that the NDP are in, because they're going to counteract from what I've said, I ask those people to phone in. We'll give them a copy of the Bill, and they'll see for themselves. They'll just read the Bill and not listen to those people.

They wanted to talk about a phone-in the other night. I'm prepared to send them a Bill so that they don't have to listen to those particular nonsense mistruths that the NDP seem to float around the province.

On a broader base of shareholders, also, Mr. Speaker, they will lessen the impact on taxpayers. Market losses and expansion costs in potash are presently costing our taxpayers about \$220,000 a day. And you know, that's \$220,000 every single day — money that could be used for essential government priorities, Mr. Speaker, like health care, education, and helping the needy.

And, Mr. Speaker, that's just basically something that I want to revert back to, too, is to what the member from Regina Victoria had indicated earlier about waiting lists and farm crises and young people and better where the money could be spent. And I agree, that's where this kind of dollars could be spent, Mr. Speaker, on just that.

Well we've inherited that problem from the NDP, and we've been fighting that through these economic times. Things are beginning to turn, and people are beginning to realize that the deficit will be coming down and will be getting under control here. And I'm just saying here, when you look at being able to put another \$220,000 that we are now spending, and it's costing the taxpayers on the losses and expansion costs that the potash had incurred, and be able to put it into these other essential services, Mr. Speaker, it will be enhanced even further.

The member from Regina Victoria had indicated about the fact of the mismanagement of this government and that we've done nothing in that regard to health care or anything else. But I want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker,

and remind the member from Regina Victoria that it was this government — this government — that took the moratorium away on hospitals and nursing homes in this province, had once again decentralized health care because of the . . . and took it back to the rural parts of the province. And Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to remind the member from Regina Victoria of that as he had indicated that we were mismanaging the dollars in that way. But I can indicate to him that if he comes into my riding I can introduce him to all our brand-new facilities, health care facilities, and nursing home facilities, etc.

By maintaining . . . The second reason, Mr. Speaker, what I would like to put across to you as the reason for public participation in the potash corporation is to provide an opportunity for the potash corporation to expand and diversify. If the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan can diversify, then the company will no longer be as dependent on the single market, and it won't be dependent on the market ups and downs of potash sales. By maintaining the status quo, the only way for the company to expand is to borrow more money, Mr. Speaker, and with the taxpayers once again responsible. However, by broadening the shareholder base of the corporation, access to the funds necessary for expansion and diversification should be more readily available.

And I think that's a big step forward, Mr. Speaker. It takes it off the taxpayers' back and puts it directly into the investor. And I think everybody would favour that. So as I'd indicated earlier, those taxpayers' responsibilities are basically . . . could be designated into the essential services area.

(1945)

But expand into what, you might want to ask, Mr. Speaker. And at the present time the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan provides the U.S. foreign industry with one of three key fertilizer components, potash. The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan does this through an established distribution network.

In Saskatchewan our farmers use very little potash. Our largest fertilizer demand is for nitrogen-based products and the potash corporation does not carry or produce it. It has been suggested that the corporation could diversify into other fertilizers like nitrogen and use its distribution network to make the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan a dominant player in the entire fertilizer industry. It's obvious that diversification with new investment will strengthen the potash corporation. A broader shareholder base will make this possible, and public participation can make it happen.

The Leader of the NDP, in his rambling discourse in this House, talked about many other aspects of potash . . . of the potash aspects that will be addressed by other members of our government.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to begin my closing remarks, but in that I want to say that as I am closing, I want to quote, and I want to quote something that the NDP Leader had made on one of his statements, and this is a quote from *Hansard*. The member from Riversdale was indicating this about the kind of future for our great province, the

future for ourselves, our families, our children, and our children's children. This will determine how our province will manage, develop, and sell our most important non-renewable resource — potash.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to the opposition leader, that is what this Bill 20 and this debate are all about — a potential world-class, diversified, international company, based right here in Saskatchewan, developing, expanding with the world on its threshold, jobs, expertise, and more building in our province.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a good idea and it is an initiative of this government. I warn that these things will not happen by embracing the tired approaches of the past — governments running businesses like potash companies and limiting their growth. Our future and that of our children, Mr. Speaker, will be guided by men and women who are genuinely committed to those who want to unlock our true potential, those who have vision, determination, and drive.

We have the potash, Mr. Speaker. We have the expertise and the ability to take on the world. We do. Our government and all of us, as citizens, will reap benefits through a larger, diversified, and more profitable potash company that pays its fair share of returns back to the government through royalties and taxes.

Public participation in potash will free Saskatchewan to broaden its economic base and build a stronger economy, one that will support our social foundation now and in the century ahead.

Mr. Speaker, there is no room for people that are frightened. There is no room for the NDP ideology, because, Mr. Speaker, they are frightened. The NDP are afraid of their own shadow. Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to you, as they were travelling around the province there were young entrepreneurs, men and women, young men and women were gathered, finding out about public participation, finding out how they could participate more, eager to go, not afraid of their shadow, Mr. Speaker, not afraid of the future.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP are afraid of the future. Mr. Speaker, a Progressive Conservative government is not afraid of the future. Mr. Speaker, the young people, the people of Saskatchewan, the majority in this province, are not afraid of the future and that's what it's all about, Mr. Speaker. It's the march ahead in full force to diversify, expand, create jobs. It's for the young people, Mr. Speaker. That's what it's about. It's for families, young families. It's for this province to grow and prosper, Mr. Speaker, not for those reasons that the member from Regina Victoria had indicated earlier.

Mr. Speaker, if the people in the province of Saskatchewan thought like the member from Regina Victoria thought, well I want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that there would probably be no reason to get out of bed in the mornings because there would be no reason to do anything — absolutely no reason. The member had not once, as you will well know, that not once stood and gave one good, positive thing; never

through his debate speech mentioned one good, positive thing that the NDP would do if they were ever government. Mr. Speaker, that's because they have no vision. They have no vision. They've been trying to grasp for some sort of a survival.

But I want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that when you look at the member opposite, the Leader of the Opposition and his radicals over there, I want to indicate to you that instead of him allowing those people to stand and speak the way they speak, Mr. Speaker, that they should get behind this Bill, Bill 20, help diversify the potash corporation, Mr. Speaker — get behind the Bill, help create jobs.

And, Mr. Speaker, I know that the people out there are looking for good opposition as well as good government, and what they tell me is they've got the good government, but they're certainly tired of this opposition. They haven't got a positive thing to say ever, whether it be through the media, be through this legislature. Mr. Speaker, people just shake their heads when they think of what they have in opposition to this day. They want an opposition with vision as well as a government.

So I invite the NDP opposition to sit down and rationalize this Bill, and to come forward and say, for a change, that hey, yes, look, there isn't . . . It isn't so bad. It's going to do all these nice things. It's going to allow our youth to have the opportunity to have new jobs, to go into new business, and to be able to look at long-term security in this province.

That's what it's about. It's not about you and I any longer, Mr. Speaker. It's about giving the young people of this province the opportunities that we once had when we were young people. And I want to go back to what I said earlier. As I was young . . . When I was young and went out into the work-force, I could choose the job, Mr. Speaker. Today that's not the case. The job chooses the person. Well, Mr. Speaker, wouldn't it be great, wouldn't it be great to see it once again in this province? And it can happen through public participation that the individual will once again be able to choose the job.

I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to thank you very kindly for taking the time to listen to my remarks that I had. Be what they may, they weren't meant to be too negative against the members of the opposition. I always hope that they would pick maybe a few of the remarks that I made and take them to heart and come onside.

Maybe that's not their role as opposition in this day and age. Maybe they feel that since the TV cameras and the radio and the electronic media is just that much more busier today, that their role is to holler and scream and rant and rave. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think really if they wanted to become professional about it and everything else like this, they would get behind us on this Bill, and I once again invite them just before I take my place. And once again I just want to say, thank you.

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

**Mr. Anguish:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before entering too directly the content of this debate, I would like to

respond somewhat to some of the comments from the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster. He asked that we get behind him on this Bill. I would like to tell you, Mr. Speaker, we're so far out in front of them on this Bill that they'll never catch us.

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

**Mr. Anguish:** — The second thing that the member asked was that if they did what the NDP are saying, it wouldn't be good; if they did what they were saying, that there would be a future, there would be some kind of future for the people in the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, there is no future for people in the province of Saskatchewan. And we've heard that over the last 16 days that our members were out listening and talking to people about what is happening in the province of Saskatchewan. And very loudly, Mr. Speaker, we heard people saying, one, they've gone too far; secondly, there won't be anything left.

The people, by a vast majority, Mr. Speaker, are asking us to stop the government on their obsession with privatization in the province of Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Anguish:** — Now the member opposite, I saw you allowed him a good degree of latitude, Mr. Speaker, in debating this Bill, as you did members on our side of the House, and I appreciate that. Because the potash Bill we're debating here this evening ties into a much broader issue, a fundamental issue for the province of Saskatchewan; and people, how they've seen their affairs develop in the province; and in particular at this time, the whole area of privatization, because since we came into this legislature, Mr. Speaker, the government has spent far too much time on privatization issues.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, almost like an obsession with privatization. And the important issues for debt restructuring, for farmers, for small business, jobs for people, working people's concerns in this province, the unemployed, those that have had to go to welfare — Mr. Speaker, every individual across this province is concerned. The vast majority of those people are opposed to what's going on.

And it's not a political issue any longer, Mr. Speaker. It's an issue that crosses all political lines.

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

**Mr. Anguish:** — The petition that we had going around this province, that we still have going around this province, Mr. Speaker, people don't say, I'm a New Democrat, I want to sign that petition. People are saying, I voted for them in the last election, I want to sign that petition because they've gone too far, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Anguish:** — Now the member from Cut Knife-Lloyd was saying how closely he listened to his constituents. I have an article referring to the Deputy Premier in a *Meridian Booster* newspaper here, the newspaper from

Lloydminster. I have another article referring to the hon. member. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to go through this article. It's from the Lloydminster *Meridian Booster*, page 4A, on April 5.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that you've made rulings in the past that we can't use members' names even in quotations from articles. So if it's . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. The hon. member is partially correct. Yes, that had been the rule, but some time ago in this House the rule was discussed anew and it was decided at that time that if members don't abuse the rule they can use the names of hon. members within quotations.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. You've certainly made my task a little easier here this evening because I have several quotes from papers I want to use. I was going to use "beep" for members opposite and "yours truly" for myself as I was quoting these articles, but now I know that I can use the names.

As I say, this first article is from Wednesday, April 5, 1989, Lloydminster *Meridian Booster*, and it's written by Dave McCullough. It's an editorial in the paper. I bring this up because the member who has just spoken, the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster, was saying that he's in touch with his constituents. When I went there and the Deputy Premier went there . . . that he pointed out I wasn't listening to people, I wasn't looking at the issues. Now I want to quote from this article.

The headline, Mr. Speaker, is: "Hopfner ignoring Border City." Now I hope the hon. member listens closely to this, Mr. Speaker.

**An Hon. Member:** — Read it again.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Read it again?

**An Hon. Member:** — Read it again.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well some members want to hear this again: "Hopfner ignoring Border City." That's the headline, Mr. Speaker, and I quote:

Let's put aside all our preconceived notions about Michael Hopfner. We'll forget about his performance in the Saskatchewan legislature — which is easily done, since it's nothing if (it's) not forgettable.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order. Why is the Minister of Social Services on his feet?

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a point of order with respect to the speech of the hon. member for The Battlefords.

The point of order is as follows, that the debate here is not based on personal attacks on members of this House. And we might allow him to use the name of members in a quote, but his personal attack on the member for Lloydminster is totally off the topic and is not relevant to the debate here, adds nothing to the debate, and lowers

the credibility on the stature of this house, and I ask you to rule accordingly, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — I was hoping, Mr. Speaker, to speak to the point of order. The member opposite, Mr. Speaker, indicates that this is a personal attack. If this truly was a personal attack, Mr. Speaker, what would happen is the member from Lloydminster could easily have sued the paper involved. In the House like this, all he's got is a quotation and he's using it to make his argument in rebuttal in this particular debate, Mr. Speaker. And surely a person is allowed to quote from a paper which is a public document and is liable to all kinds of legal action should words in it be libellous.

**The Speaker:** — I'd like to . . . I've listened to the point of order raised by the member for Melville and to the remarks to the point from the member for Prince Albert, and I'd like to draw your attention to two rules in *Beauchesne's*. One is rule 316, which indicates that:

Besides the prohibitions contained in S.O. (standing order) 35, it has been sanctioned by usage that a Member, while speaking, must not . . . make a personal charge against a Member.

Now I would like to say that the member isn't making a personal charge but is certainly introducing personalities into his speech, direct personalities of a member opposite. Now let me also quote to you from rule 325.

When the Speaker takes notice of any expression as personal and disorderly, and tending to introduce heat and confusion, and calls upon the offending Member to explain . . .

Now originally one of the main reasons why the use of members' names wasn't allowed is that we don't introduce personalities into our debates and, in this way, provide heat and confusion which may come as a result.

Now the member from Battleford . . . of course, I'm not sure exactly what's in his article; however, I would say that if it wasn't directly related to the Bill under discussion — directly related — I would certainly have to rule it out of order. At the same time, earlier I indicated that the rule will remain in place where members' names can be used if it isn't abused. And, quite frankly, if a member just starts using member's names over and over and over . . . This was one of the original reasons why we disallowed it, and I'll have to disallow it again.

**Mr. Anguish:** — I appreciate your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I have no intention of laying a personal attack on any member opposite. What inspired this . . . It was a bit of a rebuttal, Mr. Speaker, and I don't question your ruling at all. I did distinctly hear the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster, during his intervention into this debate, refer to me and the chamber of commerce in North Battleford, and tied that into his argument. And I'm just pointing out that when he says he's listening better to his constituents than we are, I want to just quote from a news article. And I'm sure that the member from Melville had no intention of interrupting my speech either. So I'll just start the quote over.

The title, Mr. Speaker, is: "Hopfner Ignoring Border City".

Let's put aside all other preconceived notions about Michael Hopfner. We'll forget about his performance in the Saskatchewan legislature, which is easily done, since it's nothing if it's not forgettable.

We'll give him another chance to prove his worth, judging him on his success and three important challenges. Remove gas tax inequities. Hopfner, who is either ignorant of what's going on or powerless to stop it, sat idly by in the legislature Friday while Finance minister Gary Lane imposed a harshly unfair new gasoline surtax. The surtax has some valid objectives, encouraging the use of unleaded gasoline, for example . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order.

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Mr. Speaker, a point of order I raise is that so far, whether or not the speech of the member opposite is a personal attack, it certainly has not yet, in any way, been related to the Bill before the House here, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan or anything to do with potash, as a matter of fact.

And the member opposite, if he has anything relevant, we would be pleased to hear him. However, Mr. Speaker, I raise the point of order that he is off the topic and trying to indulge in a personal attack.

**Mr. Shillington:** — I'm just going to make the . . . I think that the point that's obvious . . . One, is that the member from Melville, who is now laughing and smirking, I think is attempting to do nothing but interrupt the member from North Battleford. I'd suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a little . . . some control over members opposite to raise without coming anywhere near anything which is recognizable as a point of order ought to be sat down.

Secondly, I say with respect to the member from North Battleford, and I said this earlier in the House, the point of this is that the members opposite have neglected their duties, their constituents, and the needs of the province with a blind ideological privatization rush. And that's all he's . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I think I've heard enough. I think I've heard enough. And I've asked the hon. member earlier that it should be directly related. I don't know how long his article is; it could be 10 or 15 minutes or whatever. However, so long I certainly haven't heard anything that directly relates it. And I'm afraid that on that basis I will have to rule that the point of order is well taken.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Mr. Speaker, I will certainly show you before the end of my intervention on this debate how this ties in. I commit myself to you on that.

And basically just an overview of it, is that that member was saying that their caucus and he are listening to people in the province of Saskatchewan on the issue of privatization, and more particular, the privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.



And I am painfully well aware, Mr. Speaker, that this is a debate on second reading of Bill 20, An Act respecting the Reorganization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Even the name on the Bill is deceiving, Mr. Speaker, without going into extensive background.

And I'm not going to sit down within a short period of time, Mr. Speaker. I have many, many things to say on this Bill. And I do commit to you, Mr. Speaker, that this will tie in, and it basically ties in the fact that they say they're listening; we say they're not listening, Mr. Speaker, resoundingly not listening.

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

**Mr. Anguish:** — So, Mr. Speaker, I'll summarize part of this and I will then conclude, since you don't want to hear all of it, and obviously it causes far too much pain for the members opposite to listen to.

But they said in this article, and I'll quote. I'll start again at one point.

We'll give him another chance to prove his worth, judging . . . his success on three important challenges:

(1) Remove gas tax inequities

(2) Act on the wish list

I'd really like to go into explaining that and quoting from that too, but I'm summarizing it.

(3) Shake up Stone Age thinking.

Okay. And now, Mr. Speaker, instead of going through this, and you know editorials usually aren't 10 or 15 minutes, but I will read the final few paragraphs of this article. I go back, I quote again:

Perhaps the biggest challenge of all for our MLA is to convince (him) certain Regina bureaucrats that Lloydminster is indeed a part of Saskatchewan.

Some of them haven't clued into the fact, as was apparent when the Electoral Boundaries Commission drew up a new map that left the Border City entirely in Alberta.

(2015)

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order. Well, I'm afraid the hon. member has more or less gone through the article and it's like saying, let me read the book because at the end it's going to be relevant. I'd just like the hon. member to simply make his point, make his point. So far, his article has not been relevant. I'd like to . . . He may tie what he wants to say in a summary form to his remarks, to Bill 20, but I'm just once more reminding the hon. member that I think that what he's saying, he should tie it directly to Bill 20 and there'll be no problem. But the argument that somewhere at the end it will be relevant, well I'm sure the hon. member appreciates that that isn't that strong an argument.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly am hampered in what I want to say by your ruling. But in all respect for you and your Chair, Mr. Speaker, I'd have to honour that ruling here this evening.

Now in regard to potash, that member and members opposite don't know any more about the reaction to the potash privatization Bill than they do to the electoral boundaries Act that left out the city of Lloydminster. Mr. Speaker, they've also said in Lloydminster about this particular member of the legislature:

The most recent evidence came on the weekend, when someone let slip that the Saskatchewan government doesn't approve of construction of an elk processing plant here. (Well they don't approve of the potash corporation either, Mr. Speaker.) The official reason is that we don't have enough water, even though our water supply is among the best in the province.

They don't know that, Mr. Speaker. Just like they don't know people are against privatization in the province of Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Anguish:** — The real reason is that some economic benefits might trickle outside the boundaries of Saskatchewan; an example of provincial thinking in the very worst sense of the word, just like they have terrible thinking on the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Anguish:** — In a certain article, Mr. Speaker, it concludes by saying:

There you have it: three good challenges to test the mettle of the man who has represented Cut Knife-Lloydminster without distinction for the past six years.

End of article, Mr. Speaker. Now I still think it was well worth the debate, Mr. Speaker, in what's been going on, to have had that quoted onto the record in this provincial legislature so that people can see not only in Lloydminster, Saskatchewan, in the reading area of the Lloydminster *Meridian Booster*; so that people all across Saskatchewan can know what members opposite are doing, because they certainly don't broadcast it with a great degree of accuracy that is expressed in some of the provincial print media around the province, Mr. Speaker.

Now the member opposite, in his intervention, referred to an article in the Lloydminster *Meridian Booster*. Now he specifically referred to this article, Mr. Speaker. I distinctly remember it, and that's why I went and got it. The article comes from Wednesday, April 26, 1989, Lloydminster *Meridian Booster*. And on the front page, Mr. Speaker, it says, "Bells toll in the legislature. Berntson, Anguish clash over SaskEnergy."

And it goes on . . . I suppose I can't quote from this article,

Mr. Speaker, but I'd like to try it because how it ties into this Bill on the reorganization of the potash corporation, which is privatization. I think you would grant me that, Mr. Speaker.

This article ties into privatization as well, Mr. Speaker. It's on SaskEnergy, and I think people in the province and members of this Assembly would be well aware that the privatization string runs through both of these issues. And I want to make a comparison between this in the Lloydminster *Meridian Booster* and this Bill 20, An Act respecting the Reorganization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. The article goes on:

The bells are ringing in Regina this week, but the battle lines have been drawn in Lloydminster.

At issue: the proposed sale of SaskEnergy.

Doug Anguish, NDP MLA for North Battleford, told Border City reporters Tuesday the privatization of SaskEnergy is a betrayal of the (Saskatchewan people).

No sooner had Anguish left town than Deputy Premier Eric Berntson arrived, decrying the Opposition tactics.

The NDP walked out of the House Friday morning when a bill was presented for first reading proposing the sale of SaskEnergy, the natural-gas division of what was formerly SaskPower.

The bells calling for a vote clanged all day Friday, resumed Monday and will continue to ring until one of three NDP conditions is met:

The government withdraws the bill;

An election is called; or

The people of Saskatchewan tell the NDP to call off their protest.

Now that's the final line that the member from Cut Knife-Lloyd referred to, Mr. Speaker, in his intervention on this Bill this very evening. People did tell us to come back to the legislature to present the petitions, to give impact, to pass interim supply, because this government needs to know what's happening in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the article goes on to say, and there's one key point right at the end of the article, Mr. Speaker. I'll quote again:

Anguish says he doubts Saskatchewan voters will give the NDP the last message. "Saskatchewan people feel betrayed by the government's plan," says Anguish. "They recall the premier and the deputy premier promising time and time again that the government would never privatize public utilities, such as the power corporation."

Berntson denies he or the premier made such promises.

While Anguish claims Berntson denied in the legislature that the government was planning to privatize Sask Power last May, Berntson says he merely said privatization was not the reason for the split of the electrical and natural gas divisions.

Berntson says privatization hadn't been considered at the time of the split, was not the reason for the split and was only seen as an opportunity later.

Anguish notes that in January of 1988, Premier Grant Devine said utilities such as SaskPower and Saskatchewan Telecommunications would not be for sale.

Berntson admits Devine referred to SaskPower, but he says the premier was referring to the electrical utility, although the natural-gas division was still under SaskPower at the time (oops).

The province can't afford to lose the estimated \$200 million SaskEnergy generates every year, says Anguish. "Most provinces rely on resource revenues," he says, and the perception of new wealth will not turn into a reality in the long term.

But Berntson counters that the revenues are closer to \$325 million and likens the opportunity to that of the early Alberta Gas Trunk, which became the diverse Nova Corporation.

"I wonder how many dollars in taxes Nova is paying to the government of Alberta?" asked Berntson.

The government was elected on a platform of a diversification and public participation, says Berntson, and the sale of SaskEnergy will help fulfil that promise.

He says that while the amount generated and the cost of shares can't be speculated on, at least \$10 million per year for four years will be invested in diversification projects.

Berntson also counters NDP charges that the government is selling the public utility to a few wealthy out-of-province investors.

Initial share offerings will be limited to Saskatchewan residents, head office will remain in Saskatchewan and two-thirds of the directors must be Saskatchewan residents.

End of the article, Mr. Speaker.

Now what I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, is that there is nothing in the Bill that we saw here today in this legislature that limits it to Saskatchewan participation. Some investor from Toronto can acquire 8 per cent. It's even worse in the potash Bill, Mr. Speaker. What we're pointing out here is deception of Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker, so why should Saskatchewan people believe anything about the sale of the potash corporation

when there is so many contrary facts about other privatization members in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Anguish:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, on the whole issue of being caught in contrary facts or whatever you want to call it, I would look at this. Following the last provincial election, the Premier of this province guaranteed that Saskatchewan's public utilities would be exempted from his privatization. The Premier was asked what corporations could be privatized. And I quote, Mr. Speaker, from the *Regina Leader-Post* on January 25, 1988. And I quote:

All Crown corporations with the exception of such utility Crowns as SaskPower and Saskatchewan Telecommunications could be for sale if the price is right and the interests of Saskatchewan people are protected, Devine said.

Mr. Speaker, very clearly the Premier committed to us, utilities would not be sold. Why should we believe anything that is told to us now by members opposite in this debate about the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan? You can't believe it, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Anguish:** — Now the minister responsible for Saskatchewan Power Corporation has denied in this very Legislative Assembly, Mr. Speaker, about the plans for privatization of SaskPower. He was directly asked if the government was planning to privatize the natural gas portion of SaskPower. I repeat. He was . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order. I understand that the hon. member wishes to make a point, but quite frankly, listening to his remarks, it doesn't really sound much like he's discussing Bill No. 20. And while he's certainly permitted to make remarks and bring in material that's relevant, I think that he should get more on the topic.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, you may have hours more that are very, very relevant to the topic. And I know I sometimes have trouble getting a little focused, because if you get too diverse and away from the Bill, Mr. Speaker, you're not on the topic. And I noticed when my leader was up speaking at the initial stage of this debate, he was too specific because he referred to clauses in the Bill. So I respect all your rulings, Mr. Speaker, so if I get out of order, you just call me to order and I'll listen to your ruling and I'll get back up and I'll try and do my best to stay relevant in terms of the rules of this Assembly.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order. The hon. member from Regina Rosemont seems to be directing some remarks to the Chair. If he has any remarks to make, I advise him to stand.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm happy you finally called somebody else to order. I thought you were calling me to order again, and I didn't know for sure what I had said that time.

When major changes, Mr. Speaker, happen in a province such as Saskatchewan, people in the province have to have confidence in their leaders to know that what's being said to them is accurate; that there is a degree of honesty and integrity and some degree of moral fibre so that the people at large who are interested can have some assurance that what they're being told is factual and correct.

And I'm trying to make points, Mr. Speaker, so that the members, when they address this Bill, don't give rhetoric on the other side and don't give misleading information; that they will give facts that are relevant and disclose the true situation to people in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

I want to, in light of that, finish off a quote, Mr. Speaker. At one time in this legislature — in fact the question was asked, Mr. Speaker, on May 9, 1988. The Deputy Premier of this province was asked if the government was planning to privatize the natural gas portion of SaskPower. And I quote:

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, to that rather lengthy straightforward question, the answer is no.

Now is this what we can expect, Mr. Speaker, from the debate and the comments from members on the government side concerning Bill 20, An Act respecting the Reorganization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan? I hope not, for the good of the province, Mr. Speaker. I hope not, for the good of people in this province. They have to be able to have full information. They have to understand and at least see their members that are represented have some integrity and are portraying the situation honestly and as accurately as they can possibly do that, Mr. Speaker.

And I think this should be labelled as the betrayal in the province of Saskatchewan — the whole privatization, in particular the potash corporation, in particular SaskEnergy, SaskPower. It's a betrayal of people in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Anguish:** — I did want to, first off, go through a report card from the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster. This comes from *The Meridian Booster* and it's titled, "MLA evades responsibility," just like he's evading responsibility today by saying the things that he said in this legislature.

(2030)

I could not believe what he was saying to the people of Saskatchewan through this respected Assembly. And that's the same same "MLA evades responsibility." A quote from one short section:

The following is a short list of major local events and Hopfner's record of attendance at those events. January '87, Marcel Masse Border City visit, absent; June '87, Michael Wilson visit, absent; July '87, Canada Day celebrations,

absent; August . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. The hon. member is unfortunately introducing material about the actions of another hon. member in the House. And alleged or otherwise, it's not for me to judge that, but I don't think that that is the spirit of this Assembly. And I believe that, you know, if hon. members begin to do that, quite frankly there'll be no end to this. So I'm just bringing this to the attention of the hon. members.

I ask the hon. member from The Battlefords to take that into consideration in his remarks.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Did I hear the member from Regina South using unparliamentary language, Mr. Speaker? I would really appreciate, Mr. Speaker . . . I honour your ruling. I'm not going to quote anything more about Michael Hopfner because I've tried my best to make that impact, and I just won't quote any more of that. But what I'd ask you to do, Mr. Speaker, is would you take a look at the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster's speech tomorrow and have a look at what he said in his address? And do you think, or do you recall, Mr. Speaker, him referring to this member who happens to be on another side of the Assembly?

I just ask you, Mr. Speaker, to take a look at the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster's intervention tomorrow, and I'd ask you, with all due respect, to make a ruling on his speech. I didn't notice him being interrupted tonight, and I'd appreciate . . . Maybe I hear wrong. Maybe I say one thing, and I don't hear it quite accurately . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order. Order. Order. I think the hon. member's belaboured the point well enough, and I think the best thing to do is that he would simply get on with the rest of his speech.

However, I'd like to take this opportunity . . . and here's an excellent example — speaking in all sincerity — of what happens when hon. members make personal attacks on each other, regardless of which member this is. It leads to this kind of thing: that one hon. member does it; the other hon. member does it; the other hon. member does.

And I'm just bringing this to your attention that in the future — and all members, I'm certainly not singling out anybody — I'm just making a general statement that all members should refrain from making personal attacks against each other. I mean that's a basic rule of this House, and the House will certainly function more smoothly if hon. members will remember that.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. My legs are getting tired from getting up and down, not from the amount of standing I'm having to do here this evening.

Well, Mr. Speaker, Bill 20 — I'll try and confine my remarks to that as best I can now — it's An Act respecting the Reorganization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Now the word reorganization is very, very deceiving. In fact, members opposite try and call it public

participation. They created a department called Public Participation. Well is it public participation? Is it reorganization? No, it's privatization.

Now some things in Saskatchewan, TeleBonds and some of the bond issues have been important, and people can understand in the province of Saskatchewan investing like that in their own corporations within the province of Saskatchewan. It's better to borrow money from Saskatchewan people than it is to borrow money from international financiers or people on Bay Street.

But, Mr. Speaker, I repeat again: what people in the province say is that they've gone too far. There won't be anything left. Public participation is good, Mr. Speaker, but an obsession with privatization is not good, Mr. Speaker, because they've gone too far. They don't know when to stop.

As other members have referred to in this debate, maybe it's from old wounds they suffered in debates before coming into government. *The Globe and Mail* refers to it as the revenge of the nerds. Is it nerdonomics that propels these people, Mr. Speaker? What is it that would make an apparently sane government go to the insanity of selling off all the assets of the province and at the same time retaining the liabilities; so people pay the liability, sell off the assets.

Mr. Speaker, never before in the history of the province have we seen anything like this. I think not even the Keep Our Doctors crisis and the medicare crisis of the '60s and issues before that do not impact as heavily on Saskatchewan people as the potash corporation sell-off, the SaskEnergy sell-off, all the sell-offs that are happening, Mr. Speaker.

I heard a story the other day, Mr. Speaker, that I'm sure you'd appreciate. You come from a rural area of Saskatchewan; many of the members opposite do. But it's the two fellows who were out on a hiking camp for the weekend, and they were both hiking through the hills, and it was grizzly bear country. But the first night they camped they never saw any grizzly bear; they're doing quite well. Next day they got up at the break of dawn, started hiking again, and all of sudden on the trail they come upon a grizzly bear — ferocious bear, Mr. Speaker. And the bear rears up on his hind legs and is obviously ready to attack the two buddies that are out on the camping trip. And all of a sudden, the one fellow gets down and he opens his packsack and he gets out a pair of running shoes. He takes off his hiking boots and puts on the pair of running shoes. And the other friend says to him, he says, those running shoes won't do you any good, you can't outrun the grizzly bear. And the guy looks back and says, I don't have to outrun the grizzly bear, I only have to outrun you.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that speaks highly, I think, of what this government does in terms of privatization. They don't want to have to outrun the grizzly bear; they just want to outrun the people in the province of Saskatchewan, and they'd better start running soon, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Anguish:** — I think, Mr. Speaker, we have to put this debate into a bit of perspective. Mr. Speaker, going back, you'll remember well that on April 21 the government introduced a Bill in this legislature to privatize the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. And the bells started ringing and members on this side of the House walked out, and today is the first day that we have come back into the legislature.

And there's two basic reasons, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we are back in this Assembly: the one issue, the overwhelmingly important issue that we're back in this legislature, Mr. Speaker, is the vote on interim supply. The government said to us on many occasions that they're running out of money, they're broke, there's no budget passed. And when I posed this to people in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, they said, well why don't you let them run special warrants like they did a few years ago; they didn't call the legislature in till June sometime. They didn't even present a budget before the end of the fiscal year. They likely broke the law, Mr. Speaker. So the people are saying now to me in my constituency, because the legislative process gets to be very complex.

You're saying, well why doesn't the government run on special warrants? Well, Mr. Speaker, they can't run on special warrants because the legislature was in fact in session, and when the legislature's in session, anyone who follows the legislature or parliamentary practices or knows the operations of government knows that you can't have special warrants. You need interim supply when the government is in session and the budget has not actually passed.

So we came back, one, to provide interim supply because we're not into hurting people in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, not like this government that would threaten people by saying we're going to run out of money before the middle of the month; we've got to pay our bills; we've got no money; please come back into the legislature. They came in every day and sat down, marched down quite promptly, get the media attention, sat down on the seats and said, we're ready to do business for the province of Saskatchewan — where's the opposition?

**An Hon. Member:** — Where did they hide today?

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well where were they today? Mr. Speaker, we sent a letter to you, Mr. Speaker, at 11 o'clock this morning, with a copy to the Deputy Premier . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. I believe the hon. member is wandering far from the topic, and I'm sure he's quite capable of speaking on information that's quite relevant. And I once more, I once more must remind him.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Potash, potash, potash, and here we are debating the potash Bill, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Anguish:** — Mr. Speaker, instead of debating this privatization Bill on potash, we should be voting on interim supply in this Legislative Assembly and not

hurting people in the province of Saskatchewan . . .

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

**Mr. Anguish:** — . . . instead of debating this Bill, Mr. Speaker. And we'll go into lots of detail on this Bill because the more people know about it the more they'll be worked up, just as they're worked up about SaskEnergy and the sell-off of the Saskatchewan Potash and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, Mr. Speaker.

Now there's a second reason why we're back in here, Mr. Speaker, and the second reason is that we have tens of thousands of names on legislative petitions signed by people in the province of Saskatchewan opposing privatization, just as privatization of the potash corporation does not set well with people in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

One, we're back to provide interim supply. Two, we're back to table petitions. We are not here to condone the sell-off of Saskatchewan assets. We never will be.

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

**Mr. Anguish:** — Mr. Speaker, this is the second reading of this Bill. People need to know that this Bill and other Bills like the privatization Bill on SaskPower have to go through more stages. Mr. Speaker, people need to know, on Bills like this, that there is a first reading — first reading is passed on this Bill. First reading is passed on the Bill to sell SaskPower Corporation. We're now in second reading on the potash Bill. After the second reading comes the committee stage, Mr. Speaker. And on the committee stage, I think you'd instruct us that we go through the Bill clause by clause, one at a time. And I hope that the government provides very expert witnesses and testimony during that time on these Bills that are fundamental to the province of Saskatchewan. After the committee stage, Mr. Speaker, we go to third reading. And after third reading these Bills require Royal Assent by the signature of the Lieutenant Governor on the authority of Her Royal Highness the Queen.

So many more stages for these Bills to go through, Mr. Speaker, and people in the province of Saskatchewan should know that. People need to know that because they say: how can we stop the insanity of this government on privatization? We want them to know, Mr. Speaker, that the fight has only just begun on privatization in the province of Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Anguish:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, the reason I would stray from this Bill a bit is it's hard for the public to understand, in Saskatchewan, how this day in the legislature is April 21, 1989. Most people would think that this was another day.

**An Hon. Member:** — May 7.

(2045)

**Mr. Anguish:** — Is it May 7 today? Most people . . . well, we'd better check here. Mr. Speaker, it's May 8 today.

The orders every day in our books, on our desk, in the Assembly and in our offices here in this building, we get a copy of the *Routine Proceedings and Orders of the Day*. This is dated Friday, April 21, 1989, Mr. Speaker. But today, for anybody else in the real world, it would be May 8, 1989, Mr. Speaker. So I would hope you'd allow me to vary somewhat, because how would you expect the average constituent out there to figure out how it's April 21 in here and it's May 8 out there?

So, Mr. Speaker, during this entire privatization, there were a series of pieces of correspondence that went back and forth between our House Leader, the member from Regina Elphinstone, and the government House Leader, the member from Souris-Cannington, who also happens to be the Deputy Premier. And the first letter, Mr. Speaker, was written on April 26. This is five days after we left this Assembly. The letter was a compromise trying to break the stalemate. Now the letter is written from our House Leader, the member from Regina Elphinstone, to the Deputy Premier, and I quote:

Dear Mr. Berntson: There has been some indication that people are concerned that the current impasse in the Legislative Assembly will carry over to the programs funded by the government.

And therefore that's what I'm trying to explain here this evening, Mr. Speaker. I continue to quote:

To this end, I would like to reiterate the position that our caucus has taken. At any time your government is prepared to give us a written undertaking that you will stand your Saskatchewan Power Corporation bills, we would be pleased to return to the House to conduct any other business, including, but not restricted to, an interim supply bill, if needed. We believe it is time to get on with legislation to protect farmers, small business operators and working people, and to address this province's massive unemployment and growing crisis in population drain.

At the same time, we would point out that an interim supply bill was passed April 12, giving your government the financial wherewithal to continue to operate until at least mid-May.

I would like also to point out that your own Minister of Finance, Gary Lane, told the press yesterday that the government has two to three weeks before financing will become a problem.

As such, we would consider it a gross misrepresentation of the facts if your government were to take the position that the Opposition is preventing you from maintaining your financial commitments at this time.

To do so would be nothing less than a dishonest attempt to blackmail the people of Saskatchewan into accepting your plan to privatize Sask Power.

I reiterate that at any time your caucus is prepared to get back to the real work of governing this

province, rather than political and ideological posturing, we are more than willing to co-operate. Sincerely Yours,  
Dwain Lingenfelter, Opposition House Leader.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that letter was responded to on May 2, some six days later by the Deputy Premier of the province of Saskatchewan. He writes on May 2, 1988:

Dear Mr. Lingenfelter: In my capacity as Government House Leader, I am writing to you in a spirit of conciliation and co-operation in the hopes of getting the legislature back in session. We are all elected by the people of this province who naturally expect us to perform our necessary roles in the legislature. These roles of government and opposition cannot function if the legislature does not sit. Democracy itself, is threatened, if this impasse continues. It is in that spirit and the hopes of perserving our democratic institutions that I write to you.

While the government believes it has not only the responsibility, but the duty to initiate legislation and have it debated in the legislature, nevertheless we are prepared in these circumstances to offer a compromise. A way out of this impasse must be found. The cost of operating the legislature with no work being done is burdensome on the people who elected us all. It is eleven days since the bells began to ring. We will start running into difficulty with supply and appropriation. Some departments will run out of money earlier than others. It will not be long before social service clients, schools, hospitals local governments and others will be in some degree of difficulty.

While we firmly believe that the debate on public participation in SaskEnergy should take place in the legislature and while it is virtually unprecedented that the duly elected government of the day is prevented from having first reading of any bill, so that it is available not only to members of the Legislative Assembly but, the public as well, it would appear that your party sees the process differently.

In order to break the impasse, the government is prepared to offer a proposal, whereby the general public would have input into the legislative process. It would work as follows:

1. At 2 p.m., May 3, 1989, we return to the legislature and vote on first reading of the four SaskEnergy bills;

- a) The (Sask) Energy Corporation Act
- b) The Distribution of Gas Rate Regulation Act . . .
- c) The Public Utility Companies Income Tax Rebates Act
- d) The Power Corporation Amendment Act —1989

2. This government will establish a panel of prominent Saskatchewan people. (The) panel

will hold public hearings on the public participation of SaskEnergy throughout the province and report back to the legislature by June 5, 1989.

It is to be hoped that you will find this proposal sufficient to enable you to return to the legislature. I am sure you recognize that this proposal in no way, diminishes the government's dedication to diversification of our economy in all appropriate means, including public participation in the crown sector. Sincerely, Eric Berntson, Deputy Premier and Government House Leader.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the potash Bill, the potash Bill, which I seem to have misplaced here somewhere, Mr. Speaker, but that's all right for the time being . . . the potash Bill should be discussed. It shouldn't be in the narrow, narrow scope, Mr. Speaker, the narrow, narrow scope of SaskEnergy. We should be discussing many, many things. If this government wants to promote a panel going around the province, why can't Bill 20, which is doing the same thing as the SaskPower Bill, all be heard?

Well, Mr. Speaker, a couple of things are indicated in here. One is that the government is seriously concerned on May 2 that some departments will soon be running out of money, won't be able to pay social service clients, schools, hospitals, local governments, and others will be in some degree of difficulty.

So we had a meeting, Mr. Speaker, and we discussed what should we do about this. Many people in Saskatchewan didn't want us back in here, Mr. Speaker. Many people in Saskatchewan wanted us to take this government to the wall. And the public support, mark my words, is there to do it, Mr. Speaker, on things like the potash Bill, on things like the SaskEnergy Bill, but we come back in to approve interim supply.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we made a response to the letter of May 2 on May 2 from our House Leader to the Deputy Premier. The Deputy Premier, Mr. Speaker, was told this . . .

#### **Lack of Quorum in the Legislative Assembly**

**The Speaker:** — Order, order.

**An Hon. Member:** — I don't believe we have a quorum in the House, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** — Would the Sergeant-at-Arms secure the doors? Would the Clerk count the members.

I would like to instruct the Clerk to rise and therefore ask . . . rather, I would wish to instruct the Clerk to take the vote and therefore ask all members to rise.

As I believe I just said, would all members rise.

McLeod	Swenson
Hodgins	Martens
Gerich	Britton
Klein	Lingenfelter
Toth	Anguish

Johnson

**Clerk Assistant:** — Mr. Speaker, including yourself, there are 12 members present.

**The Speaker:** — The Clerk has informed me that there are 12 members present. The required number for a quorum is 15.

This House now stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m.

The Assembly adjourned at 9 p.m.