

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Acting Clerk: — It is my duty to inform the Assembly of the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Anguish: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce through you, and to members of the Assembly, a group of some 40 students from the Stobart High School in Duck Lake. They are accompanied here today by Walter Epp, Doug Tarassoff, and Bill Brace.

I do this on behalf of the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake, who is unavoidably absent today. There is a very serious forest fire in his constituency in which a lot of personal property, and in one case, unfortunately, the death of an individual . . . Some people have been moved from Lily Plain to Macdowall, I understand, and he was unavoidably absent here today.

I'd like members of the House to join me in welcoming them. I would like to point out that I will not be able to join you for pictures and drinks at 11 o'clock, but the member Regina Lakeview will join you at 11 o'clock for pictures and drinks. And I would like the members of the House to welcome these students and their guests from Duck Lake.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, I would like, through you, to ask the House to welcome the 52 students from the grade 6 class at the Confederation Park School in my constituency. They are here to tour the building, and I'll have drinks and pictures with them later on this morning. I'd like you to welcome these students from Confederation Park School.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Crisis in Farm Debt

Mr. Upshall: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, my question is to the Acting Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, I have in my possession a document which purports to be a draft of your Farm Finance Act, a Bill you've promised in both the throne speech and the budget speech.

This Act would give yourself and your cabinet sweeping powers. It has nothing specific to say about what you would do, however. Mr. Minister, can you tell this House and the farmers of Saskatchewan if you have any specific plans to attack the mounting crisis in farm debt?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Speaker, when our

government is ready to make further announcements relative to responding to farm concerns, whether they be drought, farm debt, international grain trade wars, the Premier will make those announcements and present that legislation in its proper time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Upshall: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, at the proper time. We see a crisis in debt in rural Saskatchewan, a crisis of income, and it's not the proper time?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — Mr. Minister, if you will not tell us if you have . . . or obviously you've told us that you have no plans at this time to tackle the mounting farm debt. Another area that this Bill that we have says is that there's nothing happening with foreclosure actions and nothing happening with legal actions against farmers. I ask you: what actions are you taking to prevent these foreclosure legal actions, and also what actions are you taking to help our farmers get access to operating capital during spring seeding?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the initiatives of this government have been many over the past several years, whether the issue has been droughts, grasshoppers, high interest rates, international trade wars, floods — you name it. To back up our farmers, we will continue to do that.

Specifically as it relates to operating loans and credit there, protection from foreclosure, obviously things like farm security Acts address those questions; the guaranteed operating loans, those kinds of things, Mr. Speaker, which many, many farmers have utilized and appreciated; production loans at low interest rates. I think the reason for the success for many of these programs, albeit that by themselves there is no single solution for what is occurring in agriculture today, Mr. Speaker, there is no simple, magic solution. Rain still is fundamental to our well-being, both for farmers and as well to our economy.

But why these programs have enjoyed, I think, the measure of success in backing farmers up to the degree that they have, that they've been put together in consultation with the Premier as Minister of Agriculture, this Agriculture caucus, in consultation with groups like the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, the wheat growers, the stock growers, Mr. Speaker, the very people who themselves understand, along with our caucus, what will work in rural Saskatchewan. And we'll continue to use those kinds of measures, Mr. Speaker, to put proper programs in place.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I also want to address a question to the Acting Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, attached to this draft Bill, called the farm finance Act, is a memorandum dated April 20, 1989. It indicates in that draft that there's a considerable amount of work to be done before it is even finalized.

I want to ask you: could you tell this House why you have waited so long into this spring session to bring forward any legislation to deal with the farm crisis facing Saskatchewan farmers? Why have you brought forward privatization Bills and not agricultural Bills?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reality is that this government, this caucus, has been over . . . well, for example, last year on the whole question of farm finance, a number of the MLAs from this caucus were out holding meetings across rural Saskatchewan to get a sense of what further initiatives might be useful, Mr. Speaker. Some of these have been outlined in a blueprint form, if you like, in the throne speech just a few weeks ago, and consultations are important to making sure that these programs work effectively.

It's a recipe that's worked for us in the past, and it's one we intend to stick to in the future, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Koskie: — I have a supplement, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Minister, I ask you: are you so out of touch with the reality of what's going on here in the province of Saskatchewan that you will in fact bring in this legislature and debate, and debate the potash privatization, the privatization of SaskPower, and will not in fact deal with the real issues facing the people of Saskatchewan?

I ask you: will you rearrange your legislative agenda, pull your privatization Bills, and deal with the Bills dealing with agriculture and the crisis that's facing Saskatchewan farmers?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, we will be putting our farm platform, future farm platforms, before the legislature. The Premier will be introducing it at the appropriate moments. And this is not a single or simple track for this government, Mr. Speaker, because we, as well, are very much of the view on this side of the House that developing and diversifying and building that farm economy, broadening that farm economy, is very much part of what farmers want and what this economy needs, Mr. Speaker.

And I speak specifically of diversification measures in agriculture, that whole business of taking our raw resources, our raw products, and processing them, adding value to them, whether it be pork processing, beef processing, special crops, Mr. Speaker. All of those things in the past that we've undertaken have proven very successful, and we look to doing even more of those in the future, Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with the farmers across this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — . . . (inaudible) . . . Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Minister, I ask you to address to the people and the farmers of Saskatchewan: why have you announced in the budget and in the throne speech that you had action

that would help Saskatchewan farmers? Why haven't you brought that forward rather than privatization, a mania that has taken over this government?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Further responses will be tabled in due course, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Acquisition of Apnea Monitors

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. Mr. Minister, following an inquiry from a Regina woman, I've looked into the situation respecting apnea monitors for infants and I find the situation appalling.

You will know, Mr. Minister, that a number of babies suffer from a condition where they simply forget to breathe and that apnea monitors watch them for this precise situation. But the total cost of these monitors is not covered by MCIC (medical card insurance commission) and their acquisition is difficult because demand outstrips supply.

Has your department taken any steps, Mr. Minister, to correct this serious problem?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, my information is that these monitors that the hon. member refers to are paid for by the hospital services branch, but as she's quite right in saying that there are some aspects of these, the calibrating and some of the other aspects of this that have been done by other agencies or by the individuals themselves in the past. And yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are looking into the whole area of these monitors to see what can be done, and we believe, frankly, that there is something that should be done.

Ms. Simard: — Supplementary, Mr. Deputy Speaker. As you know, Mr. Minister, these babies right now who can't get access to these monitors have to remain in the hospital, and if they don't have access, will be in the hospital for six to 12 months of the first year of their life, which is an extremely expensive procedure as far as hospital costs are concerned.

It is costing low income families \$110 per month, Mr. Minister. And I understand the Red Cross is filling the gap, but they indicate they're going to have to quit supplying these monitors because they are having trouble meeting their costs.

I want to know, Mr. Minister, when we can expect the government to take some firm steps. When, Mr. Minister? A study isn't good enough. You've known about this problem now for some time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, Mr. Speaker, this issue of these monitors has been around for some considerable time, I want you to know, and they have been responded to by this government. Now just so that you get the facts

straight, Mr. Speaker, and so the House knows the history behind this whole issue, the member is quite right in the assessment of the Red Cross who has had a role in this for some period of time. And the Red Cross is having some difficulty with some of their fund raising, ongoing fund raising that they've had over a number of years, which was related to junior Red Cross and Red Cross in schools which isn't quite as active as it once was, and so on.

But the other point is, Mr. Speaker — and it's an important one to make — these monitors that are being referred to today by the hon. member from the NDP were not covered at all while they were in government, and in fact when we asked it in opposition that they be provided, it was refused by the former minister, the present member from Saskatoon South. They were put into place; they cost about \$2,600 each. They were put into place, and full coverage was provided by hospital services under this Progressive Conservative government.

I have acknowledged in my first answer, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there are some aspects as it relates to the cost of calibration, the cost of some of the other maintenance of these, and some extra costs in there that have in fact been covered by the Red Cross or are covered by the individual families. We are looking into that. We understand the concern that the member is raising, but I want the member to be sure that she understands very well there's a history to this, and it's not something that just started now when she's discovered these monitors and the issue as it surrounds the Red Cross.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — Supplementary question, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Minister, you have been the government for seven years. You've had seven years to correct this problem, and I don't think that \$110 per month is too much to pay for the life of a child, Mr. Minister.

Now you had no hesitation, the minister of privatization had no hesitation setting up the commission for \$1,100 per day — no hesitation. But when it comes to apnea monitors, after seven years of government, this government still has to study the problem. Mr. Minister, what are your priorities?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me tell you where our priorities are; let me tell you where our priorities are. I've lost my second son to sudden infant death syndrome. I was a member of the opposition, and I pleaded with the NDP to bring in apnea monitors, and it fell on deaf ears. When I became the Minister of Health we put apnea monitors in the hospitals of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Meeting on Public Participation

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the same minister who just answered on behalf of the Minister of Health, and it's come to our attention that on May 18 in Saskatoon you intend to host an invitational meeting on public participation. And at the meeting, registration is

supposed to take place at 5:30, and there's a — get this — there's a free buffet supper beginning at 6:30.

I'm wondering if the minister could tell us: is your position so weak on privatization in the province of Saskatchewan as you have offer free meals to attract people to convince them of something they don't want?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — It's the only way to get the NDP there — they always liked their free lunches.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — My seat mate says some of the NDP may turn up for the free lunch. That wouldn't surprise me.

I just want to say to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that about a week ago I had a group of young people in Regina, about 400 of them, and we spoke about the opportunities in public participation; and more than that, we spoke about the truth, the truth in SaskEnergy, and not the sale of SaskPower. And I can tell you from the response of that group, from the response of that group, I think it is only fair you offer that opportunity to other young people in Saskatchewan, in Saskatoon.

And there will be other meetings of young people in the province because they support public participation. They want part of it, and they will be there. And I'm sure they will be there in large numbers to hear the truth and to support these new initiative because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, these people in that group — not the group that turns out to hear the Leader of the Opposition tell about his misguided and untruth to the people of Saskatchewan, but that young group, 18 to 35 . . . And I remember the press person that was there; he said, a well-groomed, enthusiastic group. They had that opportunity in Regina; they're going to have it in Saskatoon; they'll have it in Yorkton and Lloydminster — wherever young people want to hear the truth, I'll go and tell it to them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I can assure the minister there's no free lunch in the NDP. We work; people work; people come to our meetings. You'll remember, while we tried to preserve democracy in this legislature, we had thousands of people come to meetings . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order, order. Does the member have a question?

Mr. Anguish: — The question I have to you, Mr. Minister, is: will you today stand in this House and give the address of the place of the meeting and invite publicly today all those people who can't afford shares in your privatization and privatization moves in the province? And the people who have to rely on food banks — ask them to come for a free meal and try and convince them of your privatization moves. Will you do that?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — It seems rather strange to hear the member opposite talk about work when we went on

strike for about 15 days in this legislature here. My colleague here brings in work for welfare; he opposes it. So he stands up as the great disciple of work.

Certainly we will be having the meeting, and certainly there'll be many young people there. And I invite people to come, those who wish to want to come to hear the truth about public participation, about SaskEnergy, about potash, about the buy-outs by the employees such as Bruce Solilo and the people in the yellow pages and the people in Sask Government Printing and the welder, property management, who now has a shop of three people.

I'll tell those stories because those are true facts about public participation, and I welcome young people to come and hear them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — People in Saskatchewan know all they need to know about privatization, especially Tory style.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Will the minister undertake to put this funding not into government-sponsored brainwashing sessions to try and convince people of something they don't want in this province, and put the money into food banks and into social support programs in the province of Saskatchewan, and not waste it on free meals to your friends?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — It seems to me that he's very concerned about the lunch. I tell you that the lunch will be provided by the business communities, not by government, as it has been by the business community of Regina. And he talks about brainwashing — he talks about brainwashing. And I'll be talking to the media in a short time about brainwashing because the member from Regina North saw fit to go into a grade 4 class-room in Regina with nothing but blatant political propaganda right from the NDP caucus, untruths that he took to grade 4 students. I say, that's brainwashing. I say, go back to that school and apologize; you should be ashamed of yourself.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. I can't hear the member from Saskatoon Fairview.

Appeal of Court Decision re Rafferty Dam

Mr. Mitchell: — My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Deputy Premier, and it concerns the appeal that has been launched by the Government of Saskatchewan from the decision of the federal court respecting the Rafferty-Alameda dams. He will know, Mr. Speaker, he will know that the federal government has announced that it is not proceeding with an appeal; it is not filing an appeal itself. In other words, the federal government has acknowledged that the decision is going to be binding upon them, and they will now proceed to undertake the environmental review, and indeed I think they've made some announcements in that respect.

Now in light of that, the question for the Deputy Premier is this: will you confirm that the provincial government will drop its appeal from the decision of Mr. Justice Cullen and save the Saskatchewan taxpayers a lot of useless expense in connection with that appeal?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I know that that member is a reasonable member, and I know that that member, Mr. Speaker, did not design that question himself to come in here. Mr. Speaker, we will not drop the appeal. We will not drop the appeal, Mr. Speaker, because we have a right to clarification of the law.

We believe that we have a shot, or as the lawyers say, we believe that we have a good chance at winning the appeal. We believe that if we win the appeal that the project will be back on track. We have asked for an accelerated hearing, or an expedited hearing, and if that happens, we'll be back on track.

But let me say, Mr. Speaker, when that member said to avoid the cost of the appeal, would you please announce that you're going to withdraw the appeal, do you know what it's costing us every month that that project is stopped because of members opposite, Mr. Speaker? Members opposite stopped that project. The member for Regina Rosemont took great delight in saying, we've got it delayed for at least three years, and it's costing us \$2 million a month. My God, Mr. Speaker, don't talk to me about the cost of an appeal.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — A new question, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That is unbelievable arrogance, Mr. Deputy Speaker, unbelievable arrogance.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — We stood in this House week after week telling you that you were not complying with the laws of this country and you went barging ahead with your plans anyway, and finally the federal court stopped you in your tracks. And now you have the arrogance to blame us for it. That's the height of arrogance and silliness.

Now what we've got here is the federal government in effect admitting that the decision is correct and that it did not comply with its own environmental laws. And that's the issue here. Now how does it make sense at all that the Saskatchewan government should take a position opposite to the federal government? How is it your business to tell the federal government that they did comply with their own laws when they're admitting that they didn't? How is that, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I'm getting . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It's the applause from members opposite that keeps me from answering, Mr. Speaker.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the Shand-Rafferty-Alameda projects were in full compliance at all times. At no time, at no time, Mr. Speaker, did that project make one move without being fully licensed — fully licensed at all times — Mr. Speaker.

Based on SaskPower and Souris Basin Development Authority believing at all times they were in full compliance, we have spent almost, almost a quarter of a billion dollars on those two projects, Mr. Speaker, almost a quarter of a billion dollars, all of the while in full compliance of the law with valid licences from the federal government.

Now when, Mr. Speaker, members opposite and certain of their friends from central Canada decided to challenge this, and they did, and the court ruled in their favour, and we complied once again, we complied once again by putting a stop work order in it, the Rafferty-Alameda project. But do you know what it's costing us while that project is stopped, Mr. Speaker? Two million dollars a month — \$2 million a month.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, we had people come from Tisdale to Estevan to work on that project. They were on site for one day and they were out of work, young people with families working on the Rafferty project, and they put them out of work, Mr. Speaker. They came down looking for a six-month job, and they worked one day, and they were put out of work by the NDP. We're spending \$2 million a month on the project while it's stopped. People are out of work, and they have the gall to ask us to stop the appeal because it's costly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

TABLING OF REPORTS

The Deputy Speaker: — On behalf of the Speaker, I hereby table, pursuant to section 222(1) of The Election Act, a report respecting the Returns of Election Expenses incurred by candidates in the Assiniboia-Gravelbourg by-election held in the province of Saskatchewan, December 15, 1988.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

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. Anguish: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to be back in this debate. It seems that we're still sacrificing the important issues in this province, like agriculture, with the obsession of the government towards privatization.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — When we see the Minister of Public Participation, I think we should start calling it puppet participation because now they can't get the support of Saskatchewan people. They have to offer free lunches to have people come out — a selective, invitational group — to try and convince them that privatization is a good move in the province of Saskatchewan.

I maintain to you, Mr. Speaker, they've failed in the past — dismally failed — and they'll fail again in the future because people in Saskatchewan are smarter than to be bought by free lunch.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — I think people in Saskatchewan understand there is no free lunch. You might be able to offer free lunches in Great Britain and maybe in the province of Alberta and other places, but you can't do that in Saskatchewan.

And to attest to that, I'd just like to point out an example, Mr. Speaker. It's not uncommon in the province of Saskatchewan to have about an 80 per cent turn-out of the electorate of the eligible voters in an election campaign in the province of Saskatchewan, whereas you look at the province of Alberta just across the way, last provincial election less than 50 per cent of the population turned out.

Now I think that people in Saskatchewan are more aware, more in tune than possibly anywhere in North America, and they certainly won't be swooned into supporting something they know is a bad deal for themselves and a bad deal for the province of Saskatchewan and a bad deal for those people who have to suffer in the future because of this government's incompetence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, during the time while we were obligated to walk out of this legislature in support of Saskatchewan people, in support of Saskatchewan farms, in support of Saskatchewan families, in support of Saskatchewan small business, in support of Saskatchewan working people, in support of Saskatchewan poor, there was a poll done; in fact there were several polls done, and I want to point out some of the items that were given to the press, to what the press reported in terms of privatization in the province of Saskatchewan. In the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* on May 3, Wednesday, May 3 of 1988, front page headline, Mr. Speaker, "Privatization showdown." Next subtitle, "Poll shows 67 per cent reject selloff." Now this was a poll that was done by Angus Reid Associates, and it found two out of every three respondents opposed the Saskatchewan government's plans to privatize SaskEnergy by making a public offering of shares in the company, while only one in about five, or 22 per cent, supported the idea. The remainder had no opinion or would not state it.

Now what this has done, Mr. Speaker, is it's pointed out to many, many Saskatchewan people that not only is the sell-off of an important utility like the Saskatchewan Power Corporation a bad deal for Saskatchewan people, but it's brought to Saskatchewan people's awareness that

the whole plan for privatization has gone astray. It's an obsession by the government. They've gone too far, and there won't be anything left for people in the future in the province of this . . . of this great province of ours.

Now the first thing that's listed in the poll done by Angus Reid Associates. Number one, the question was asked: do you support or oppose plans to privatize SaskEnergy? Support — 22 per cent; opposed — 67 per cent; don't know — 10 per cent. Now that's overwhelming. I have not seen a more devastating poll against the government anywhere in the province of Saskatchewan in the time I've been involved in politics over about the past 15 years. And I think that this government should soon wake up and smell the coffee and understand that Saskatchewan people are sending them the strongest possible message. The only message that could be stronger to this gone-astray administration would be for them to call a provincial election and let the people reject this government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — They say they won't call an election, but there are other ways to stop this government from doing what they want to do, Mr. Speaker. And I'll go into some of that a little later on after I've gone through some of the polling results, to just go through step by step as to how Saskatchewan people and how this opposition will make the government accountable for their actions and lack of direction and lack of action in the important issues such as hunger, agriculture, small business, the economy, working people — the very important issues that have not been dealt with during this session of the legislature because of the obsession of the government with privatization.

The second question, Mr. Speaker, that was asked in the poll was: do you support or oppose privatization in general? Twenty-seven per cent supported privatization in general. Do you know how many opposed it, Mr. Speaker? Fifty-eight per cent. Over double opposed it as to those that supported it. Those that didn't know were 15 per cent.

And I would maintain to you at this point in time, Mr. Speaker, after the great heightened awareness of Saskatchewan people of exactly the betrayal and what this government is up to, the percentage that oppose privatization in the province is not going down; in fact it's increasing.

And the government know that through their polling with Decima. Decima does all their polling. In fact I understand people from Decima had to phone the government and beg them not to call an election, because they didn't even know they would lose an election if they called one. I understand the Premier wanted to call an election. People from Decima had to phone and plead with this government that pumps all kinds of money into their organization: don't call an election because you'll lose; please don't call an election.

The Premier had to be convinced not to call an election. He was going to show the member from Riversdale just what was going on out there. And we wish that Decima

hadn't phoned and convinced the Premier not to call an election because the people of Saskatchewan would have shown this government decisively what was going on in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Third question in this poll that was released on May 7, Mr. Speaker: do you support or oppose privatization of PCS? PCS, for your information, sir, means Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. In support, 28 per cent. Well, a little over a quarter of the population support the privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. How many oppose it? Fifty per cent of the population in the province of Saskatchewan oppose the privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

And that's the one where they've been laying the message out about the NDP wasting money buying empty holes in the ground. Yet even in the 1988 annual report there's \$106 million profit from these empty holes in the ground. And I went on at some length yesterday explaining how investors, when they want to offer the share offering, wouldn't be whitewashed into buying shares in a corporation that only had assets that were empty holes in the ground, Mr. Speaker.

Now they're going to be going into an advertising campaign — the free lunch in Saskatoon on — when is it? — on May 18, I believe. That's only one portion of it. Come and get your free lunch; we'll convince you that privatization's good in the province. They will also, I predict, Mr. Speaker, be spending millions of dollars on advertising to convince the Saskatchewan public that privatization is good for them.

It's like convincing a child that something is good for them. And the child even knows it's really not; the parents know it's really not; the grandparents know it's not good. But there's a little few that are obsessed with an idea, and they've been proven wrong and they'll be proven wrong time and time again, Mr. Speaker. If an election doesn't come soon, if the election comes later, they'll continue to be proved wrong because they're dead wrong on their moves for privatization. People in the province of Saskatchewan are too well aware, too informed to be baffled by a government that's gone astray.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — In the fourth question, Mr. Speaker, there's a little diagram there. I know I can't show an exhibit in the legislature, but it almost looks like a bomb exploding; you can see that there in the paper. Actually it's a dinger going against the gong; it's the ringing of a bell, is a little picture there, and it's exploding.

Well there was an explosion, Mr. Speaker, there was an explosion of an outcry from Saskatchewan people, led by the Leader of the Opposition, to inform Saskatchewan people of the astray plans of that government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — But the number four question that was

asked was that, do you support or oppose the NDP tactics — NDP means New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker — do you support or oppose the NDP tactics in the legislature? Support — 49 per cent. Oppose — 39 per cent. Don't know — 12 per cent.

The “don't knows,” I predict, you do know now. And if that poll was done again today, the opposition to the bell-ringing would drop and the support for the bell-ringing was increased because people know that was the only point of democracy since the last provincial election on October 20, 1986.

Well there's other questions, Mr. Speaker. The fifth question that's headlined in the *Star-Phoenix* was: should there be an election on SaskEnergy? You know how many said yes? Well let me tell you. Fifty-two per cent of the people in Saskatchewan said yes, there should be an election on the issue of SaskEnergy; 40 per cent said no; 8 per cent don't know. There's hardly anybody in Saskatchewan at this point in time that doesn't think an election would be a good idea as soon as seeding is over.

An Hon. Member: — Sooner the better.

Mr. Anguish: — Sooner the election comes, the better. And I think the government should gear up and call an election in June. Forget about what Decima says, phoning the Premier and saying, don't call an election. Forget about what Decima's saying. If the government in their own wisdom feel they can go out and sell privatization to the public in Saskatchewan, go out and do it. We wish them all the best.

But we'll be out there with the Leader of the Opposition, leading the forces in Saskatchewan, those masses of people that are opposed to this government, that have been hurt by this government, that want to send this government the strongest, democratic message possible, and that's a resounding defeat in the next provincial election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Now here is one of the most telling questions asked in the poll. Now remember this was done on May 3. We were still passing out the message to Saskatchewan people. Saskatchewan people were still rallying. There were tens of thousands, by this point over 100,000 names on petitions that were still being gathered.

The question was asked back then: if an election were held tomorrow, which party would you support? Thirty-three per cent, Progressive Conservative.

(1045)

An Hon. Member: — That high?

Mr. Anguish: — Yes, it was higher than I thought, but the member from Saskatoon Eastview asked if it was higher, higher than he thought. Well it was higher than I thought too, but it's going to go down. And I predict since May 3 when this poll has been released, it has gone down.

And the government members should maybe tell us what the Decima polls are saying. Are the Decima polls treating you well? Could the member from Kinistino regain his seat in the legislature? Could the member from Canora regain his seat in the legislature? The only way he would retain his seat in the legislature is if he came to his senses and sat as an independent because we believe him to be a good member.

Would the member from Melville retain his seat? No. Would the member from Weyburn retain his seat? For sure not, the member from Weyburn. In fact, the member from Regina North West has been out there. If the member from Regina North West ran in Weyburn, he'd defeat the current sitting member because people are so disgusted with what your government has been doing.

But let me finish question six. I'll repeat the question again. If an election were held tomorrow, which party would you support? I've already pointed out what the Conservatives would get. The New Democratic Party, do you want to know, Mr. Speaker? Through you to members of the government, do you want to know? Yes, they say. Well the New Democrats would have 54 per cent of the vote in a general election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — And Linda Haverstock and the Liberals would have 11 per cent of the support. And others would have two.

Well the others may be growing because those disaffected Tories out in Saskatchewan that can't bring themselves to voting Liberal or New Democrat will likely go off and form some other party. And by the time the next provincial election comes around, because of their desire to privatize the potash corporation, privatize SaskPower, privatize anything that moves — people can't stand it. They're fracturing the face of Saskatchewan.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think those are worth going through just once more: if an election were held tomorrow, which party would you support? Progressive Conservative — 33 per cent and dropping, as I have explained; NDP — 54 per cent and likely rising, but I don't want to gloat about that or predict that because we'd be happy having 54 per cent of the people of Saskatchewan vote New Democrat; Liberals — 11 per cent; other — 2 per cent.

Now something that I think members of this House, on this side of the House at least would agree with, is the most embarrassing question that was asked by the Angus Reid poll. Number seven: do you generally approve or disapprove of the leaders' performance? Premier Devine — approve — 40 per cent; disapprove — 50 per cent; don't know — 10 per cent.

Now if the Premier was left on his own, without all the interference from Decima and the Deputy Premier and the Minister of Finance and the embarrassment of the member from Melville, and all the things that happen out of his cabinet that portray him in a negative light, I'm sure that 50 per cent wouldn't disapprove. But he is so weak that he allows those members of his own cabinet to run roughshod over him, run roughshod over their leader to

drive him into the dirt.

He can't even trust . . . the Premier can't even trust turning over the Department of Agriculture to one of his back-bench members. What is wrong? Do none of those back-bench members have the capability to be the Minister of Agriculture. The member from Yorkton used to be in the cabinet. He's not in the cabinet any more. Why doesn't the Premier put him in as Agriculture minister?

There's all kinds of talent, I would think, on the back benches. But if the Premier doesn't have enough of a job being Premier in the province, does he have to take on being the Minister of Agriculture as well? That is a big problem, Mr. Speaker.

So that's why in this poll on privatization such things that were taken into consideration as the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, the Bill that we're studying here today; if he doesn't enough problems with that, he has all these other burdens to bear as well.

Now, Opposition Leader Romanow: approve — 58 per cent — 58 per cent of the people in the province of Saskatchewan. How many disapprove? This is very telling. Disapprove — 23 per cent — less than half of what disapprove of the Premier of this province. The Leader of the Opposition has a very high rating. Nineteen per cent don't know. But our leader, the Leader of the Opposition has come out with such devastating strength within the past month that people are moving towards our leader, the Leader of the Opposition in Saskatchewan, because they know he could do a good job as Premier. They know . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — They know that he fronted the fight when members like the current Minister of Finance sat in the Liberal caucus and criticized the coming into being the Bill that brought about the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan in 1976.

Nineteen seventy-six was an historic year. It put into place one of the most profitable Crown corporations under public ownership in the history of the province of Saskatchewan. That government opposed it. They don't want money going to people in the province of Saskatchewan. They want 45 per cent of that to go to the people that live outside of our country, and that's a shameful testimony that will go down and mark the people and the government, the Conservative government in this province, in the annals of history, and it will show them at the bottom of the heap for what they've done in trying to privatize where privatization is unpopular, Mr. Speaker.

Now I know that . . . I ran through some different things. I just want to close off this poll by running through question 7 again: do you generally approve or disapprove of the leaders' performance? Premier Devine, approved — 40 per cent; disapproved — 50 per cent; don't know — 10 per cent.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order, order. I've allowed the

member a lot of latitude in what he's speaking about, but I would want to remind the member that the Bill before the Assembly is Bill No. 20, An Act respecting the Reorganization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. I would ask the member to relate his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. Anguish: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll certainly do that. I want to go to a speech that had very specific reference to the potash debate, and I know, sir, that you were in the Chair for at least part of the debate. And the actual speaker was there for the other part of this which is also a very historic debate, Mr. Speaker.

I would look at the page 997 of *Hansard*, and it's:

Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, May 8, 1989, 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.

And I'll just quote here, Mr. Speaker, because the debate should be kept relevant in this legislature. And so this refers to the actual debate of Mr. Hopfner on May 8, and I quote . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. Members are not to use other members' names except in quotations, and you said referred to the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster.

Mr. Anguish: — I appreciate that ruling. I should have said, and I quote . . . I want to quote from a speech, Mr. Speaker, that was given on May 8, concerning the debate on the Bill that we're currently debating here this morning in the Legislative Assembly, and I quote:

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 practiced 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 the 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 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 just people just can't seem to present the facts straight and truthful.

But I want to indicate to that 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 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 (ever) 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 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.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that you might have a hard time believing that that was in debate of Bill 20, an Act to privatize the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. I've gone on at some length here, for 10 or 15 minutes; the word potash was not mentioned once. But it is a debate on Bill 20, an Act to privatize the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should in all fairness, I should in all fairness find the beginning of the speech from the hon. member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster. And if we can just leap through it here. I just want to find the beginning of the speech, Mr. Speaker, because the speech had started prior to the supper break, and the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster continued after.

And I want to look at the relevancy of the debate, and I quote:

Mr. Hopfner: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a pleasure to take part in this, what I guess probably may be a historic debate. And I would like to indicate to you that I have listened quite well to what the member from Regina Victoria had to say while he was speaking in this debate.

And other than the fact that of a stonewalling factor that I've envisioned from the member from Regina Victoria, I would say and suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that his remarks to the Bill of public participation on potash has, I guess, probably in all summation, if you wanted to sum up the (total) amount of words and the amount of participation that he put into the Bill, directly related to the Bill, I would say that you could have all of what he said in about two minutes.

Now I want to go on, Mr. Speaker, because in the entire speech from the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster he did virtually nothing but attack members of this side of the House. He attacked individual members, he attacked the Leader of the Opposition, he attacked our opposition party, he talked about privatization, but he didn't talk about the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

So I want to go on to quote to you a debate that comes from *Hansard* on Bill 20, second reading, which we are in here today, Mr. Speaker. I continue my quote:

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that as I get into my remarks on the potash Bill here, you will, as well as the people in the province of Saskatchewan, will begin to understand exactly what the truth is about the most common sense approach that any government can take to public participation.

I want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP opposition have for now, the last hour and a half or so, been continually suggesting that this is a sell-out of Saskatchewan potash mines and the Saskatchewan company. I want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. I find that the relevance and repetition of reading other members' speeches into the record, and I'll read you the rule out of the members' handbook, rule 25(1) on page 15 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan*.

A Member addressing the Assembly, if called to order either by the Speaker or on a point raised by another Member, shall sit down while the point of order is being stated, after which he may explain. The Speaker may permit debate on the point of order before giving his decision, but such debate must be strictly relevant to the point of order taken.

The Speaker, or the Chairman, after having called the attention of the Assembly, or (of) the committee, to the conduct of a Member who persists in irrelevance, or tedious repetition, either by his own arguments or of the arguments used by (other) Members in debate, (the Member) may direct him to discontinue his speech, and if the Member continues to speak, the Speaker shall name him.

But I would ask the member to get back to the debate on Bill No. 20, the reorganization of the potash corporation, with his own remarks.

Why is the member on his feet?

Mr. Shillington: — I would like to speak to the comments you just made, if I might, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I recognize that the member from The Battlefords developed his point rather fully, but his point was: there's got to be one set of rules; that's all we ask.

The member from — not yourself, but the Speaker was in the Chair — the member from Lloydminster was allowed to go on for almost an hour with nothing but personal attacks that had no relation at all to the Bill being under discussion. Thus the member's comments here were on point. The point the member from The Battlefords is making is we simply ask for a single set of rules that will apply to both.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order, order. It is not permissible to challenge the ruling of the Chair, and it is also not permissible to quote at length from other member's speeches.

Mr. Anguish: — Sorry, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — I respect your ruling. I didn't know, when you had first risen, Mr. Speaker, I didn't know there was a ruling because you had mentioned that a member would have the opportunity to explain before the ruling was made. That was your first words that you gave when you rose in your place, reading from the rules.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order, order. I would ask the member, if he wants to continue the debate, to refer his remarks to Bill No. 20, the reorganization of the potash corporation.

Mr. Anguish: — Potash, potash, potash, potash, potash, potash Bill, potash Bill, potash, potash, potash, more potash, potash, potash, Bill 20.

See, Mr. Speaker, who supports privatization in the province of Saskatchewan for things like the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan? Who supports privatization initiatives on many of the public ownership Crowns, public ownership in the province of Saskatchewan? Who supports it?

I can tell you who supports it — members of the cabinet, not even their own back-benchers. Many of their own back-benchers are muzzled. I'm sure that when they go out to their constituencies they don't try and sell privatization; they don't try and sell the potash Bill. They hide in their homes or they hide in Regina because the public certainly do not support the privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. That's very evident — very, very evident.

There are other groups though. Look at things like the . . . this is a publication called *Unbalance: Media treatment of public policy issues*. And who is it put out by? Well I believe it's put out by the Fraser Institute. Now we all know that the Fraser Institute are likely one of the most right-wing organizations in Canada advocating that the only people who should be helped are the very rich. Those that have the most amount of wealth should have more wealth because eventually it'll all trickle down. And so those people who have to work in potash mines, that have to supply potash mines, will eventually get a little bit of the crumbs, as the wealth up at top eats all the bread and allows the crumbs to fall off the table and down the mine shaft. That's what they advocate.

And what about the coverage? They say in this article that:

Not all Canadian legislatures have adopted privatization plans; however, as of the 13th of August, 1988, a Robert Sheppard article reported its chief proponents so far have been Conservative governments in Ottawa, \$2.1 billion worth of public sales; in Saskatchewan, 430 million; Social Credit in British Columbia, 1.1 billion; and born-again Liberals in Quebec, \$827 million.

Now Saskatchewan, of course, stands out in that, because as of August 13, 1988 we didn't have all of these privatization Bills before us, like Bill 20, an Act to privatize the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Since that time, Mr. Speaker, since that time, we've got of course the potash Bill that we're talking about today; we've got the SaskPower Bill. We're talking about Bill 1, a Bill that gives the government unprecedented powers so their Executive Council can privatize anything they want without having to come into this legislature. In fact, if Bill 1 passed, if they put the emphasis on that, they could abolish the legislature and just sell the potash corporation off, because they wouldn't need the authority of this Assembly to sell off a very valuable asset.

So in this article on privatization, out of a publication by the Fraser Institute, it wouldn't be 430 million in terms of selling off of public assets, it would be in the billions that we're talking about, because we're talking about public ownership with assets of billions of dollars — in excess of 1 billion, maybe as high as 2 billion. Somewhere certainly between 1 and \$2 billion are the assets of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Now what about the coverage on this, because this does talk about media coverage. And I quote:

For CBC, the privatization plans of B.C. and the federal government were the only ones that were really discussed. The federal Crown corporations were mentioned in 43 per cent of CBC's coverage of privatization. British Columbia privatization plans were included in 55 per cent of CBC coverage. Coverage of Saskatchewan's plans comprised a little over 1 per cent of total coverage.

That is not true today. The coverage is much greater because of the escalation of this government to carry through their obsession of selling off everything that's in the public sector, things like the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan — the potash, potash, potash that we're debating here today in the legislature, that we will not stray from again, Mr. Speaker.

The Globe and Mail also was looked at. *The Globe and Mail* looked at federal plans most often, and I quote:

Federal privatization was the predominant news story in the *The Globe and Mail*. Three-quarters of their coverage mentioned federal privatization plans. B.C.'s plans comprised 11.4 per cent of the agenda. Saskatchewan's plans comprised 10 per cent of the coverage.

Now here's a very interesting statistic, Mr. Speaker. Why do you think when we were only 1 per cent in CBC, which is quite a bit for the amount of privatizing that was done at that time, but 10 per cent in *The Globe and Mail*? Ten per cent in *The Globe and Mail*, because *The Globe and Mail* know that there is a historic fight going on in the province of Saskatchewan right now.

(1115)

The eyes of North America are on the province of Saskatchewan in determining what it is the government is trying to do and gauging the public reaction, not just of the NDP opposition, but the public reaction of the people of the province of

Saskatchewan. Because they have known since the days of the Depression and before that, that Saskatchewan people are politically aware, they're well informed, and the eyes of North America are on Saskatchewan to see whether the government wins or whether the people of Saskatchewan win.

And we say on this fight, the people of Saskatchewan will end up winning, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that has occurred in this debate, and I won't go back and quote from *Hansard* because I've seen already today, Mr. Speaker, that you don't like me quoting from *Hansard* from speeches that have already been given, so I wouldn't offend you by going back and quoting from *Hansard* again.

But I would ask you to take my words for it that members opposite, if not in *Hansard* through their catcalling, through their catcalling on that side of the House, said: well, you never told anybody that you were going to nationalize potash; you never told anybody that there was going to be real public participation in potash in the province. Well they are dead wrong, Mr. Speaker.

And I've mentioned these articles before, but I want to go into them in some depth. I have copies here of two articles. One is a *New Deal for People* put out by the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan, and it's a program for progress.

And this was put out prior to the 1971 election in which Allan Blakeney and the New Democrats at that time defeated the government of Ross Thatcher. And at least one member over there sat as a Liberal — the Minister of Finance at that time was a Liberal. He got re-elected as a Liberal, and saw his fortunes more in the Conservative Party, so he jumped from that one. He may soon be back with Linda Haverstock and the Liberals, because he certainly knows what the Decima polls are saying about potash privatization . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. I don't see how this is relevant to the potash Bill. I'd ask the member to make his remarks on Bill No. 20. I've been awfully lenient and allowed a far-ranging debate. So I would ask the member to speak on the Bill that's before the Assembly.

Mr. Anguish: — Well I was speaking on the Bill, and I'll go on to speak about the Bill. But I don't know, Mr. Speaker, if I have to mention the word of the Bill, the actual wording of the Bill every few minutes. If you want, I'll do my debate.

I can remember our Leader of the Opposition being called to order as well for being too specific, too specific on the Bill because he referred to the Bill. And now I'm not referring to the Bill often enough, so I get a confused message. But I will try my best to honour the rules that you're imposing on me here today, Mr. Speaker, because I certainly wouldn't want to offend you by what I'm saying about the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan,

Bill 20, An Act respecting the Reorganization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

The Bill should actually read, an Act respecting the privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, or the privatization, or the public participation, or puppet participation, but it certainly isn't the reorganization.

This Bill gives foreign investors control of our precious resource, a resource that we have 4,000 years supply. So I was thinking, maybe you'd give me 4,000 years latitude on either side of the argument, but apparently that won't happen.

Anyway, at the time there was a potash debate going on in Saskatchewan, not one on public participation versus privatization; it was an argument that was assisted by the current Minister of Finance in Ross Thatcher's government, one of his strategists in the back rooms, also a member of this Assembly, who tried to collect taxation from potash companies.

And that's how it's relevant to the debate, Mr. Speaker. It's relevant because at that time that member of this Assembly tried to collect taxation from the potash companies privately operating in the province of Saskatchewan. They couldn't. They even sent Premier Ross Thatcher, the late Premier Ross Thatcher, down to New Mexico, and he was charged for conspiracy against the laws of the United States of America. That minister knows that; that's the argument; that's the history of the argument; and I maintain to you it's relevant to the debate in this legislature.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — But those members say that we weren't up front with what we wanted to do with resource ownership in the province of Saskatchewan. We were up front. I refer you again to this article. It's *New Deal for People* by the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan, a program for progress, issued prior to the 1971 election. And what do they say in here? Well in the index it refers to resource and economic development on page 7. What does it say on page 7? And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, this was a widely circulated document in 1971. It wasn't something that was used by back-room members of the New Democratic Party to orchestrate some devious plot and plan on the Saskatchewan people. It was campaigned with door to door, and anyone who wanted to receive a copy received one. If they wanted to walk into a campaign office during the election, there were copies there for the public to see, the public to read, to absorb, and educate themselves as to why New Democrats wanted to form the Government of Saskatchewan.

So what does it say on this page? Just let me read some of this, Mr. Speaker. But I want to point out item 3 on page 8. No, I think I have to read the other part to put it into context, Mr. Speaker, just to put it into context. The title on page 7 is "Resource and Economic Development":

Saskatchewan's natural resources . . .

And I'm quoting now. But I want to say one of the natural

resources we would have to understand, and I think members at least on this side of the House and the government side of the House, that one of our natural resources is potash. Potash is a natural resource. Potash is being debated in second reading of this Bill 20. And you know the title of the Bill, sir. I go back and I quote:

Saskatchewan's natural resources are the rightful heritage of people in our province, not the preserve of private interests. The New Democratic Party believes that Liberal policy of selling out our birthright is both unwise and unnecessary.

Now you have to realize, Mr. Speaker, that it was unwise and unnecessary at that time. The Liberals were the government up to 1971, and it was not wise what they were doing. And we know from earlier in the debate and what I've said today, is that the current Minister of Finance and the late Premier Ross Thatcher did try and collect taxes from the potash companies and they couldn't. So we thought we're going to have to take a different approach to this. I continue to quote:

We have faith in Saskatchewan people. We believe them capable of developing their own resources for their own benefit. Outside help is sometimes necessary, but a sell-out is not. Development must be aimed at maximizing benefits for people, not maximizing profits for big business and its promoters.

New Democrats recognize the need for research and planning, and the folly of the growth of the state for the sake of growth. We must take into account all aspects of the well-being of citizens, including their right to a healthy environment.

Toward these ends, a New Democratic government will: (1) establish a department of economic development to plan and encourage orderly economic growth, and to integrate and co-ordinate such programs as northern development and urban and rural planning; (2) establish a Saskatchewan development corporation which will mobilize capital for public investment in the economic development from a variety of sources, including direct investment by the province and by share offerings to individuals, organizations, and companies; (3) . . .

Now I want very particularly to listen to this, because this applies directly, Mr. Speaker, to Bill 20 which we're debating here today in second reading, An Act respecting the Reorganization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. I go back to quote:

(3) oppose any further sell-out of our resources.

With respect to new development, the NDP will give first priority to the public ownership through Crown corporations. Co-operative ownership will be encouraged. Partnership arrangements between government and co-operatives or private developers will be undertaken when appropriate. Limits will be established with respect to foreign equity capital, and every effort will be made to

limit foreign investment in resource development to non-equity capital.

That's printed, Mr. Speaker. Prior to the election of 1971, when we became government, we indicated what was going to happen in the resource sector in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, pointed out very clearly. Now let's compare that to an example.

The PC government promised to eliminate the provincial sales tax in election campaign, but it increased it by 40 per cent, from 5 per cent to 7 per cent. It promised to cut income tax by 10 per cent; instead it introduced the flat tax and it's increased it three times. Two broken promises that people voted for. They didn't vote for any broken promises of New Democrats because we pursued what we said we'd pursue.

And here's a good one, Mr. Speaker. The PC government, the Tory candidates around the province at election time promised to balance the budget. And it has introduced eight straight deficit budgets with an accumulated deficit now of nearly \$4 billion. Over a million dollars a day the Saskatchewan people have to pay in interest on a debt that's been created totally by the government of the day, by the Conservative government in the province of Saskatchewan. Poor management, poor economics, still going deeper into debt, and selling off the assets of the province while retaining debt.

What kind of promises is that to the people of Saskatchewan? No wonder they felt betrayed on things like SaskEnergy and will be feeling betrayed on Bills like this because the government is not believable any more. How can you believe a government that continues to break promises and betray the people of the province of Saskatchewan?

Now the PCs promised an honest government. Before the 1986 provincial election the Minister of Finance claimed the budget deficit for that year would be \$389 million — \$389 million. After the election he admitted that the real deficit was 1.2 billion. This with another election on the horizon — he claims the budget deficit is being reduced. Well, unbelievable!

And do you know that we found out that it was an even bigger betrayal in public accounts? Because we find that during that fiscal year the Department of Finance submitted monthly reports that there was access to by the Minister of Finance. He knew long before the election that he would overshoot his budget by 300 or 400 per cent, unheard of in the history of ministers of Finance, I would venture to say, throughout Canada. And he deceived, he lied to the Saskatchewan people about . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order. I'd ask the member to apologize for using the word . . . saying that the member lied.

(1130)

Mr. Anguish: — I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I knew that that word was unparliamentary, and I should not have used it. I apologize for using the term.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — The question I pose under the point of order. During this session the hon. member from North Battleford has, I think at least on 10 or 12 occasions, used that word and has been brought to order by the Chair. It's got to the point now, Mr. Speaker, where it's not a slip of the tongue but is simply an obvious tactic by the hon. member. And I suggest that the Chair review the fact of repeated offences of that particular rule, that stronger action be taken in the future.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Let me just comment on that point of order. That is not a point of order. I think the member knows that, and the member has withdrawn his remark. It was made. He did as you requested, and I think that the matter is now closed.

Mr. Anguish: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now I want to . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — The Chair has no way of knowing whether it's done intentionally or unintentionally. The member has apologized; the Chair has accepted the apology. If there's some stronger action needed, it would have to be addressed by the special rules committee.

Mr. Anguish: — Well I'll just finish this short list here as to why Saskatchewan people do feel betrayed and will feel betrayed when they know the whole story on Bill 20, the Act to privatize the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Here's one. The PCs promised to eliminate the provincial gas tax. Today Saskatchewan has the second highest gas tax in Canada. Promise made, promise broken.

The PCs promised to bring home children. Today young people are leaving the province at a rate of one person every 60 minutes . . . sorry, every six minutes. Every six minutes there's a young person leaving the province of Saskatchewan because they see no hope here.

Potash mines . . .

The Deputy Minister: — Order. Order. Why is the member on his feet?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Point of order is as follows, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is obviously engaged in a filibuster, and that's a legitimate forum in this legislature or any legislature.

I simply say this: when the hon. member becomes involved and initiates a filibuster, then that filibuster must deal with the issue. He can't just simply ramble on on any issues that he wants, Mr. Speaker. And I would suggest to the hon. member, if he wants to know how to conduct a filibuster, he might be well advised to go back and read the debates from the 1976 filibuster on the setting up of the potash corporation.

He does have to stay on the subject matter. He cannot simply move in all directions, whether it's a filibuster or not. And I suggest that a filibuster can be properly done, but it has to be properly done.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Deputy Chairman, the member

opposite may refer to the member's comments on second reading of this Bill as a filibuster. That is his opinion; that is his decision. That is not something for you to decide on.

I remind you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that the debate in second reading is a debate on the principle of the Bill. When one debates the principle of the Bill of this kind, one is debating the principle of privatization. And I submit that the member who has spoken so well on this issue has related what he has said to the principle of privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, and has done that mighty well besides, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. The point of order was relevance. I've been drawing that to the member's attention all morning, and I will continue to do so. I would ask members, all members on both sides of the House when they're speaking on the Bill, to keep relevance in mind.

Mr. Anguish: — The PCs promised never to cut medicare. They privatized the school-based dental program . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order, order. I've asked the member to speak on the Bill. I find that the material that he's using irrelevant, and I would ask him to move back to debating the Bill that's before the House.

Mr. Anguish: — Well maybe when the olive branch committee that was offered yesterday by the member from Kindersley, if it looks at broader things, maybe it could look at the fact that some members on one side of the House can ramble and attack . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. The member's comments are not related to the Bill at all. I can read the rule back to him again.

(The) Speaker, or the Chairman, after having called the attention of the Assembly or of the committee, to the conduct of a Member who persists in irrelevance, or tedious repetition, either of his own arguments or of the arguments used by other Members in debate, may direct him to discontinue his speech, and if the Member continues to speak, (the) Speaker may name him . . .

I'll give you another opportunity to speak on the debate, and your remarks should be relevant to Bill No. 20.

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, you've helped me temper my temper over the years, Mr. Speaker, and I do appreciate your ruling. We're debating here today Bill 20 — An Act respecting the Reorganization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. The Bill has to do with privatization, and so I want to refer to other privatization initiatives because it's in a package. And certainly this Bill is a bad deal for people in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — I have told you before that the

Saskatchewan public are saying you've gone too far. They're saying there won't be anything left because you're selling off everything, like the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Now earlier, Mr. Speaker, I made very specific reference to a document called *New Deal for People*, 1971 election, about resource policy — and potash is a resource — by the New Democrats in the province of Saskatchewan. This document was put out by the New Democrats.

If you recall accurately, Mr. Speaker, New Democrats formed the government in 1971. Liberals were defeated. Minister of Finance of today was obviously re-elected because now he sits here as a Conservative after having crossed the floor. But during the period of 1971 to 1975, our government tried to get the private sector potash which all there was at that time in Saskatchewan to co-operate — to co-operate with the taxation, the production levels, revenue generation. And they said . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Did the Deputy Premier want to speak?

The Deputy Speaker: — Allow the member from The Battlefords to make his comments.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — During the period that New Democrats were in government from '71 to '75, Mr. Speaker, potash was an issue. As the Liberals had tried, New Democrats tried to hold the potash companies, privately owned, in some cases outside of Canadian ownership, tried to hold them accountable to Saskatchewan people. They asked to increase taxation. The privately owned potash companies said no.

The Government of Saskatchewan said, well open your books and show us what kind of profits you're making. The company said no. They increased taxation. There was the Cigol case. The courts ruled against the Government of Saskatchewan. So all this took place over a period of time.

In 1975 the premier of this province at that time, Allan Blakeney, called an election. And the political party that he represented, the New Democratic Party, put together a program called *New Deal '75* Again, as the publication was . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Does the Deputy Premier and the member from Cut Knife-Lloyd want to enter into the debate? The Deputy Premier says he wants to enter into the debate, Mr. Speaker. As soon as I'm done I expect to see him spring to his feet in this legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — So, Mr. Speaker, what happened in 1975? This publication was a public document, again not used in closed back rooms for political strategists. It was available to the public. It was available by door-to-door canvassers. People could get it from constituency offices or from, pardon me, campaign offices during the election campaign. It was called *New Deal '75*. Let's see what it says in here. Okay. In the index, resources, page 4. Turn to page 4, and under the title, resources, and I quote, Mr.

Speaker:

In 1971 the New Democrats promised to act decisively to see that the Saskatchewan resources are developed to the benefit of Saskatchewan people. Under the Blakeney government that has been done.

Direct revenue to the provincial government from minerals alone in 1974 was more than four times what it was in 1970. These revenues will still be higher in 1975. When re-elected, New Democrats will continue to act to see that Saskatchewan people get the greatest possible benefit from our resources in the decades ahead.

And, Mr. Speaker, I know I can't show an exhibit in here, but I'd like you to take my word for it — you can examine this document later — what is underneath what I've just quoted? A picture of a potash mine. A picture of a potash mine.

I continue to quote:

This may well involve new approaches to public ownership, to joint ventures between the government and private enterprise, and to resource royalties and taxation. All approaches will be measured by the test of what will give Saskatchewan people the greatest overall benefits in the decades ahead — benefits in revenue, in industrial development, in job opportunities, in conservation of scarce resources, and in the ability of Saskatchewan people to have a greater control over their own destiny.

Specifically we will defend and protect the right of Saskatchewan people to full benefits from their rightful heritage, the natural resources of this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want specifically to highlight item number 2, and I quote:

(2) Speed up direct government participation in exploration for and development of potash and hard rock minerals to achieve a greater measure of public ownership of these resources and industries.

(1145)

Now I read that again for the Deputy Premier, Mr. Speaker, (2), and I quote:

Speed up direct government participation in exploration for and development of potash and hard rock minerals to achieve a greater measure of public ownership of these resources and industries.

I don't know how much more up front Saskatchewan people could have received than what New Democrats were saying at that time. And any elected member or interested person or student of politics would well remember the potash debate in 1976 when the Potash

Corporation of Saskatchewan came into being. And people were proud once that came in, people were proud.

The member from Regina Wascana, Mr. Speaker, said without a mandate — that we brought in the potash corporation without a mandate. We stated it on the public record what we were going to do, that I've outlined to you today. Even a court of law would accept that we were up front with people. But the member from Regina Wascana cannot understand being up front with Saskatchewan people because this government is not up front with Saskatchewan people. They won't even entitle the Bill, the sell-off of Saskatchewan's heritage. They call it an Act respecting the Reorganization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Reorganized? Hogwash!

So what happened during this period of time? In 1976, after the '75 election, the potash debate came in. A Bill to enter into public ownership of potash was introduced in this legislature, and it was hotly debated — debated for several days.

Some members that are in government side of this House entered that debate, and we have a hard time understanding, after they've seen all the benefits of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, why they would want to sell off our heritage. It would even be understandable if they would sell it to the employees of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan; if they would restrict shares to people in the province of Saskatchewan.

Most people do understand that they currently own 100 per cent of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, because it's 100 per cent owned by the Government of Saskatchewan. The Government of Saskatchewan is not the cabinet; it's not the Progressive Conservative Party. The Government of Saskatchewan is the people of Saskatchewan.

The shares are held in trust by the government, and they do currently own 100 per cent. Now granted, dividends have not been declared directly to individuals, but dividends are received through the programs and services and the support of government programs, of government initiatives, of the dollars that are raised by resource revenue through very important Crown ownership and Crown corporations like the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Dividends that accrue to people in Saskatchewan have been good health care, a good standard of education, social programs that support people . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster says, how much money do they cost? I'll tell you, they cost very little in comparison to the rape and pillage and the sell-off of Saskatchewan's assets at the same time as the government wants to retain the debt.

They say one of the reasons that they're having this privatization move, this obsession with privatization, is that they want to get out of debt. Have they been in debt? Yes they've been in debt. Whose debt is it? It's their debt — the mismanagement of a Conservative government in the province of Saskatchewan.

In terms of just operating revenue, \$4 billion in debt. Has there been one budget where the debt has decreased? No. There's been deficits in every consecutive budget that this government has brought in. The debt has continued to increase with each deficit budget. The privatization moves to date have not reduced the debt by one cent, and I don't think, if the privatization moves continue, will the debt be reduced by one cent.

Now there's more than just the debt, Mr. Speaker, that we're talking about in the operating revenue of the province. There's the debt of Crown corporations which has increased astronomically — astronomically — through mismanagement of Crown corporations and public ownership by a government that's bent on an ideology that doesn't believe in any public ownership whatsoever. They believe in helping their rich friends and helping rich investors from outside of our country take control of a very precious resource.

Mr. Speaker, the debt of Crown corporations has also increased. We will know that a year or so ago the Crown investment corporation, which is the banker for the public ownership Crowns in the province of Saskatchewan, paid off, I believe it was about \$600 million of debt of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

So Crown investment corporation is retaining a debt there, the banker for the Crowns and the public ownership in the province. And so, almost debt free, this government wants to sell off the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan won't have a big debt passed on to the investors. We're retaining the debt in the Crown investment corporation.

Crown Management Board made that decision, a decision made by Conservative, Tory cabinet ministers that *The Globe and Mail* refers to as revenge of the nerds. And in fact they should extend the revenge of the nerds to nerdonomics because the economic policies and privatization and sell-off of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan make no sense.

Nerdonomics should be coined as the economic development and policies of the Government of Saskatchewan under this Tory administration because it makes no sense to anyone in the province other than those who have benefitted, and those who have benefitted are very few. If you got a couple million, they're willing to give you a couple million more. If you got a billion, they'll give you several million. But if you're going to a food bank or you have to rely on unemployment insurance or the unfortunate circumstance of being put on the social service rolls, they have no sympathy.

The minister wants to cut them even further to give them an opportunity — to what? Work in the private sector? There aren't jobs in the private sector right now to any large extent. They even cut youth employment summer programs. They don't want to put people to work. They don't want to use public ownership and government as an engine of the economy. They want to allow the private sector to do all that, and the private sector won't do all that because the private sector is there to make profit and

maximize profits. And I understand that, because if they weren't there to make profit, they wouldn't be in business very long.

But in a province like Saskatchewan, you need public ownership like the potash corporation, like SaskEnergy, those things that make money for the province, because this government doesn't have the intestinal fortitude to stand up and collect taxation where taxation is available, and that's the corporate sector, the big corporate sector friends of the Conservatives that have all the money, and they refuse to tax them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — So nerdonomics Tory style in Saskatchewan is what we have, Mr. Speaker.

Now I want to tell you how much it's helped — and I think it's worth reviewing — I want to tell you how much it's helped our deficit by selling off the Crown corporations. In 1982-83 fiscal year — that's the first year that the government of the day had to bring in a budget — deficit budget. And incidentally, I think it's important to point out that when there was a good portion of public ownership in Saskatchewan under Allan Blakeney's New Democrat government, and will be again under Roy Romanow's New Democrat government after the next election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — There was sound economic management. Public sector participation with the private sector and co-operatives was viewed from all over North America. In fact people from other places in the world would come and look at the Saskatchewan model where you have a vast amount of resources, not a lot of local capital, a sparse population spread out over a large geographic area, and we were able to provide services that people appreciated and weren't given a heavy burden of taxation on. They might have thought it was a heavy burden of taxation at the time, but they hadn't seen anything till nerdonomics came along, I'll tell you that, Mr. Speaker.

So there was, prior to 1982-83, a surplus budget. In fact from 1971 till 1982, every year there was a surplus budget for the operations of government. Never once was there a deficit budget. And Allan Blakeney, I'm sure, did believe that if it was necessary to have a deficit budget, go ahead and deficit budget, but let's have a repayment plan. Let's have a deficit to invest in something that will give us a return in the future, or have a deficit budget as a short-term measure to boost the economy, to create jobs, to be a major engine in the economy.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — This government wants to destroy two engines of the economy, and the third engine of the economy is sputtering because they're running out of gas. They've destroyed co-operatives in Saskatchewan to a large extent. For the first time in many, many years we do not have a department of co-operatives in Saskatchewan, an important part of our economy.

They don't want any public ownership. For a long time it's been an important engine in the growth and development and the maintaining of our economy. All they want is private sector. And where their engine to the private sector is sputtering and running out of gas, is that they're losing support of Saskatchewan people at such an unprecedented rate. It's even boggling the pollsters at Decima, that they have to phone and tell these people that are so far out of touch with the province and the people of Saskatchewan that they shouldn't call an election because they'd hardly win a single seat, even in rural Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

But going back to the deficit that has not been helped by privatization and won't be helped by the sell-off of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan: '82-83, deficit budget; '83-84, deficit budget; '84-85, deficit budget; '85-86, deficit budget; '86-87, deficit budget; '87-88, deficit budget; '88-89, deficit budget — continual, continual deficit budgets.

So they started privatizing, Mr. Speaker, back in the earlier years of their mandate. In fact they started privatizing prior to the 1986 election, but they were discreet about it.

Let's look at some of the things that were privatized that haven't helped bring down our deficit. And this Bill, if we allow them to have this Bill passed, Bill 20, an Act to privatize the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, I predict the debt still will not come down because nerdonomics does not dictate that you should spend money on your province and not give it to wealthy investors, the 45 per cent that this Bill will give to foreign investors — clearly stated in the Bill — 45 per cent to foreign investors, Mr. Speaker.

Let's look at the highway workers. Highways workers were privatized. Did it save the government money? They were privatized starting back in '82-83. That was '82-83 where Highways workers were privatized, wasn't it?

An Hon. Member: — '82-83, yes.

(1200)

Mr. Anguish: — Yes, I checked with some members, so '82-83 Highways workers were privatized. I remember Jim Garner standing up in the legislature — I wasn't a member of this House at that time, but I remember seeing him on TV, saying he was going to give the Highways workers a chance to work in the private sector.

That was the same thing as Ross Thatcher, when he was back in his hey-day, the late Ross Thatcher, saying that he wanted to impose deterrent fees so people could participate in their own recovery in the hospital — not a very good deal.

So the Highways workers were privatized in '82-83 to a large extent. And what happened in '83-84, Mr. Speaker? Did the deficit reduce? Was there less of a deficit? No, there was a greater deficit than there was in '82-83. So has privatization helped?

Well who has it helped if it's helped? Did it help the dental therapists? We saw the privatization of the dental plan, the school-based children's dental plan in the province of Saskatchewan. Did that help . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order.

Mr. Hopfner: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was brought to the Chair's attention a few minutes earlier that when this member tried to ramble on into the area that he's now rambling into, that he was brought to order and he was warned not to get in onto that track and to get back into discussing the potash Bill.

I am now asking you to either reprimand the speaker and . . . or let's move to the next speaker.

Mr. Shillington: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, there are apparently not two certainties in life but three: death, taxes, and the fact that the member from Lloydminster will not be listening to what's being said. This time . . .

An Hon. Member: — Yes, read your own speech.

Mr. Shillington: — Yes, the member from Lloydminster ought to be really an expert on rambling on and getting off the point.

At this time, however, I say to the Deputy Speaker that the member from The Battlefords was on privatization and was talking about potash. Whether or not a repetition of the speech of the member from Meadow Lake . . . from Lloydminster had any bearing on anything is a moot point. But he was talking about potash and he was talking about privatization. This time he's on the point.

The member from Lloydminster who's giving us so much assistance — what a valuable asset — the member from Lloydminster who's giving us all this assistance, apparently wasn't listening.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. Order. I have listened with interest to the debate. I was also aware of the Deputy Speaker and his request that the member from The Battlefords present his remarks on the potash debate. And I believe that the remarks being made just prior to order being called were ranging a little bit beyond the debate on potash, and I would ask the member to again . . . in addressing the House to limit his remarks to the debate on the potash Bill, Bill No. 20.

Mr. Anguish: — The potash Bill is Bill No. 20. It's An Act respecting the Reorganization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. It's privatization. Would you agree with that? I think you'd agreed with that, Mr. Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. I recognize the member from Kindersley.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If I could raise again, when a person becomes involved in a filibuster, which I indicate is perfectly legitimate to do in this Chamber, but when you're involved in a filibuster you (a) have to be relevant, and (b) you cannot simply repeat, repeat, repeat what you've said before.

Now that takes some talent, Mr. Speaker, but you must, in order to filibuster and filibuster properly, you have to be relevant and you can't simply repeat. Now the hon. member is repeating for about the sixth or seventh time what he said today, not only the day before and the day before that.

And he's also straying away from the subject matter tremendously, Mr. Speaker, and therefore he must be brought to order on those points. If he's going to filibuster, you have to know how to properly filibuster.

Mr. Shillington: — I'm not sure how the member from Kindersley would recognize that sort of talent.

Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to you that this is a fairly broad subject. If, for instance, a filibuster . . . And this is not a filibuster. The member from Kindersley calls it that, but I want to give the member from Kindersley some assistance on what a filibuster is if we are ever provoked to that, if we are ever provoked to that.

A discussion of the rule change, for instance, if we had been discussing the member from Kindersley's motion on the rule change, it's a very narrow subject, whether or not there ought to be bell-ringing.

This, however, with respect to privatization and potash is one of the broadest possible subjects, going as it does to the public and private ownership, to government financing, to control of our natural resources. It's a very broad subject.

The member from The Battlefords was canvassing the matter with some care, but he was on subject and he was not repetitious. If the member from Kindersley believes it's repetitious, then he ought to tell the Chair what he believes was repeated, because I was listening with care to these carefully crafted remarks, as the member from Kindersley was, and I didn't hear any repetition.

The Deputy Speaker: — Yes, I've again listened to the point of order, and I find that the debate that has been taking place has been ranging far broader from the principle of the Bill before the House. Therefore I would suggest the point of order is well taken, and I would ask the member from The Battlefords to restrict his comments to the relevancy of Bill No. 20.

Mr. Anguish: — The Bill has to do with privatization. I don't think there's any question about that. What I'm going to do for the balance of this morning is I'm going to relate how privatization has not helped the province so far and how this Bill will not help the province of Saskatchewan. It couldn't be more relevant than that.

An Hon. Member: — But can you say anything on it?

Mr. Anguish: — Oh, the member from Kindersley wants to know, can I say anything on it. Yes, I can say something. I know that people like you want to sell 45 per cent of our potash corporation to investors from outside the country. You should be ashamed of yourself. Did you learn that in law school, or did you learn that after you got to be a Tory? When did you learn that, how to sell off Saskatchewan's heritage and Saskatchewan's resources

to foreign investors? Did you go along with the Premier on the Orient express when he tried to sell 125 per cent of something that only contains 100 per cent? You were likely there. That's nerdonomics.

Nerdonomics goes through not only your deficit financing; nerdonomics goes through the potash sell-off as well. In fact, there's nothing in this Bill to assure that one single share of potash will remain in the province of Saskatchewan, because the other 55 per cent can be sold off outside of Saskatchewan. And when shares get on the stock exchange, how do you control them? You tell us how you control shares once they get on the stock exchange. Know how you control them? If you've got lots of money, you can control them because you can buy them up.

And when people in Saskatchewan are leaving the province, they're out of work, they're sitting on welfare, there's no jobs, how do they buy these shares? How is it public participation; how do individuals get a benefit from this? They don't.

So we know what's in your Bill, mister; we're just trying to show you that other things in privatization haven't helped as well. Other things have not helped in privatization.

We want to know one privatization move, what privatization move has reduced the deficit? Not one. Was it privatization of parks? Has the privatization of SaskCOMP and SaskTel's data centre to WESTBRIDGE reduced the deficit? Has the privatization of PAPCO (Prince Albert Pulp Company) to Weyerhaeuser reduced the deficit? Has the SED Systems sell-out reduced the deficit? Has the SMDC privatization, Saskatchewan Mining and Development Corporation, reduced the deficit? Has PC privatization in general reduced the deficits? Has Manalta Coal sale reduced the deficit? Has the sell-off attempts of SaskEnergy reduced the deficits? Has Sask Minerals reduced the deficits? Has their hypocrisy reduced the deficits in the province of Saskatchewan? Has the privatization of the highways workers reduced the deficit in Saskatchewan? Will the Bill to sell the potash corporation reduce the deficit in Saskatchewan? You know it won't.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — You know it won't. So I would have to say that all of this is relevant to deal with privatization.

In April of 1983 the PC Highways minister, Jim Garner, fired 157 highway workers because he was privatizing the road building function of Sask Highways. He said, and I quote:

These lay-offs are a move from socialism to freedom for the employees who will now have the opportunity to work in the private sector.

And you can look at *Hansard* from April 18, 1983. In March of '84, Garner's further privatization of Highways led to the firing of a further 237 workers. He said:

It's freedom of choice. I'm giving them the opportunity to transfer to the private sector.

That's a quote from the *Leader-Post* on March 23, 1984. Has that helped reduce the deficit? Just like the Bill won't help reduce the deficit. We want you to explain to Saskatchewan people why you're obsessed with the move of privatization.

In May of '84 Garner privatized more than 400 pieces of highway equipment, replacement value of \$40 million. The province received \$6 million for this. Do you think you're receiving good value in what you're proposing to do with the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan?

The Deputy Speaker: — Order, order. I've called the member to order many times on dealing with privatization in general. The debate before the Assembly is Bill No. 20, the reorganization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

When we get into the debate on Bill No. 1, which is the public participation program, the far ranging debate on public participation certainly will be relevant in the legislature. But right now we're on Bill No. 20, the Bill respecting the reorganization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. I'm asking the member again to make his remarks according to Bill No. 20 which is before this Assembly.

The member for Regina Lakeview — why is the member on her feet?

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a comment, if I may, about what the member from The Battlefords . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — The Chair has made a ruling. It cannot be challenged.

Mr. Anguish: — You don't call order in the House any more, Mr. Speaker, when the members yell back and forth across, do you?

Let's look at a very important part of this Bill . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . How long would you like to holler back and forth? Is there a problem?

An Hon. Member: — Well you look good on TV, Doug.

Mr. Anguish: — I'm sure it'll look very good on TV.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order, order. Order. Allow the member from The Battlefords to make his comments.

(1215)

Mr. Anguish: — I can't believe what's going on in the legislature here today. Members of the government side don't want to hear the opposition, just like they don't want to hear people in the province of Saskatchewan. They don't want to listen to the most crucial fundamental debate that's going to face this legislature in many, many years. But they don't want to listen.

They don't want to go out and talk to people in Saskatchewan, what about us selling off the potash corporation. How many meetings are you going to hold?

Why don't the individual members, like the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, how many meetings have you held in your riding? How many times have you been out there holding public meetings on the sale of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan? This many — zero. And that's how they'll treat you in the next election — it'll be zero. Because people are concerned that there won't be anything left.

Part IV of this Bill, conditions relating to the voting shares, and it's number 11(1) in the Bill. It's limitation on holding by non-residents. Now, Mr. Speaker . . .

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

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The point of order is this, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member, knowing the rules on second reading, you debate the principle of the rules. You don't go from section 7(3). That is for Committee of the Whole. That is not for debate on second reading.

Now I once again ask you, Mr. Speaker, that this individual attempting a filibuster, what I would call . . . what might be called, Mr. Speaker, the Dagwood Bumstead filibuster on the potash Bill, has to keep to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, and has to be relevant and cannot deal with the specifics of the section.

Mr. Solomon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the point of order, here we have the Minister of Justice who is trying to change the rules in this House — arbitrarily, initially — is now trying to make some comments to frustrate the speaker of the opposition who is speaking on Bill 20.

In every circumstance that the member from The Battlefords has raised with respect to whether it's a reference to the Bill or he's tied it into the debate, Mr. Speaker. And it's my view that when the Minister of Justice stands up on a point of order, he is off the mark; he is doing it in an arbitrary fashion. And I would suggest that his point of order is not well taken.

The Deputy Speaker: — I find the minister's point of order well taken. Page 224, paragraph 734, the last line:

It is not regular on this occasion, however, to discuss the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Order. The member from Regina North, I'd ask him to be quiet while the Speaker is on his feet.

It is not regular on this occasion, however, to discuss (the) details (and) the clauses of the bill.

It is at this stage in the debate, it's the general principles of the Bill that are debated in the legislature. In Committee of the Whole, every member, opposition and government, will be able to ask questions on a clause-by-clause review of the Bill. He was quoting directly from a clause in the Bill, and so therefore I have to rule him out of order.

Mr. Anguish: — I thank you for the ruling, Mr. Speaker, that debate at this stage is on the principle of the Bill.

That's your ruling and I appreciate that. The principle of this Bill is privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. I don't see how else to debate the principle of this Bill without referring to other privatization moves by this government that have not worked in the past. That principle of privatization has not worked in the past and will not work in the future.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — So we have to look at the principle of the Bill, and the principle is privatization. Privatization has not reduced deficits; it has not reduced income tax; it has not assisted people with more government services or even better government services. There are less jobs in Saskatchewan, more people leaving the province, more people on welfare, more people on waiting lists to get into hospitals, people who cannot imagine why the government is on a move for privatization.

Bill No. 20 is a continuation of the principle of privatization that's happened in the past. What happened with Sask Minerals? Let's take a look at that and see.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. This Bill that's before the Assembly is (An) Act respecting the Reorganization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Bill No. 1, that's in adjourned debate, is the general debate on the public participation. I would ask the member to speak on the Bill that's before the Assembly. I have asked him many times and I would ask him again to keep his remarks to Bill No. 20.

Mr. Shillington: — I want to speak to that, if I may, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — I ruled on what the debate will consist of and that stands.

Why is the member on his feet?

An Hon. Member: — I want to speak to the point you just made, Mr. Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. It was not a point of order. It was a ruling from the Chair and it cannot be spoken to.

Why is the member on his feet?

Mr. Shillington: — I wish to raise a point of order.

The Deputy Speaker: — State your point of order.

Mr. Shillington: — The point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that the Bill involves a good deal more than just the word potash. It also involves privatization, it also involves revenue to the province. All of those things are relevant and that's what the member from The Battlefords was speaking to. He was speaking to revenue for the province. This is a very wide ranging Bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I recognize that you've got a job to do, but inherent in that job is to be fair to both sides. You are not now a member of the government. You occupy an independent position, and I ask you to keep that in mind. The member was on the subject of revenue to the

province and that's perfectly in order and perfectly relevant. He was not outside the scope of this Bill. It's a very broad Bill, and I ask you to keep that in mind, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I would like to speak to the hon. member from Regina Centre's point of order. And in speaking to that point of order, Mr. Speaker . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. The member from Regina Centre's point of order is not well taken. The debate is on Bill No. 20, an Act respecting the Reorganization of the Potash Corporation (of Saskatchewan). As I have said before, the general debate on public participation is on Bill 1.

It's up to the member to find ways to make his point within the rules, and if the member continues, if the member continues . . . Order. If the member continues to use irrelevance, I will have to refer back to the rules in the general handbook and ask the member to discontinue his speech. With that, I will recognize the member from The Battlefords.

Order, order. Order. I would ask the member from Regina North East to rise and apologize to the Chair. Threats to the Chair are not allowed.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I agree, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I so will apologize and withdraw.

Mr. Anguish: — I think that we have to really look, Mr. Speaker, at the potash companies that have and are operating in the province of Saskatchewan, to put the debate into context. And the potash companies of course that operated in Saskatchewan up until 1976 were all private sector potash companies, most of them owned from outside of the province of Saskatchewan, if not all owned outside the province of Saskatchewan.

Now I would like to go through some of the companies just sort of firm by firm to summarize the development of each in the history of the potash resource in the province of Saskatchewan.

And first off, Mr. Speaker, there's the Potash Company of America. This firm is one of the pioneers in North American potash and was the first firm to begin a major potash development in Saskatchewan, except for the abortive effort at Unity. It now operates a division of Ideal Basic Industries Inc., having merged with Ideal Cement Company, a large cement producer, on December 31, 1967.

The Potash Corporation of America also mines potash in the state of New Mexico. Production was commenced at Patience Lake in late 1958, but operations were suspended in 1959 because of water seepage into the shaft at this New Mexico mine. It took six years actually to repair the shaft, and that tells something, Mr. Speaker, about the complexity of the potash industry, that a shaft would take six years to repair.

They rehabilitated the underground works and installed some new mill equipment, and production was commenced again in 1965. A second shaft was completed in early 1969 and, while it at present serves the function of the mine ventilation and supply, it has been designed to allow the Potash Corporation of America to expand its output, after construction of a second mill and refinery, to about 3 million tons of KCl annually. That's 1.8 million tons of K_2O . The ore reserves in the vicinity of the original shaft were estimated at 35 million tons, grading 27 per cent K_2O . Now that's quite amazing, Mr. Speaker, that that production capability of that particular mine and the percentage of grade at 27 per cent, at least at that time was very, very high.

The other company that I want to refer to that has some ownership and involvement in the potash industry, Mr. Speaker, is International Minerals and Chemical Corporation (Canada) Ltd., but the (Canada) Ltd. on that company is a little deceiving. You will know, Mr. Speaker, you will know that International Minerals and Chemical, in fact, supplied the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan with Chuck Childers, who was formerly with that company. And to dismantle the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, they in fact brought him in from a competing company to run down our company.

(1230)

Now this debate, I have much more to say on this that is relevant to the principle of the Bill. But at this time, Mr. Speaker, I would move that the debate adjourn on Bill 20 — An Act respecting the Reorganization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. I so move adjournment to the debate.

The Deputy Speaker: — The member cannot move adjournment on debate. He had moved to adjourn . . . (inaudible) . . . I believe the hon. member already adjourned debate last day and cannot re-move to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Anguish: — The company, International Minerals and Chemical, as I was mentioning . . . (inaudible) . . . clearly by the name of Chuck Childers who was hired by the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to come here and run the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Now what administrators of nerdonomics in their right mind would bring someone from a competing firm to another firm to run the business? It doesn't make much sense. And in some point in this debate I want to go step by step, Mr. Speaker, through who the people are that worked for other potash companies throughout the world that are now in place in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

But I think that first it's important to talk a bit — you're being very fair, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I think it's important first to go through who some of the actors are in the potash industry in terms of companies, and then what we'll do is we'll go into who some of the individuals are in the particular companies that we're going to discuss here this afternoon.

Now the International Minerals and Chemical Corporation of Canada, Ltd., is totally owned by International Minerals and Chemical Corporation. It's incorporated in New York, with the head office in Illinois. And I believe that the head office, Mr. Speaker, is in the city of Chicago, or in that greater area of Chicago, at least.

The parent company is the world's largest producer, and hear this, the world's largest producer of chemical fertilizer and fertilizer material. It produces and sells rock phosphate, potash, phosphate concentrates, nitrogen phosphate, and mixed fertilizer, as well as buying and selling other fertilizer materials. It also engages in world-wide trading and other mineral production operations.

The parent company is a multinational operation with a diversified line of mineral, chemical, and food products for industry, agriculture, and the home, with operations in some 300 locations in 30 different countries throughout the world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we're not talking about any small players coming into this, because when this government wants to sell 45 per cent of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, those are the people we're talking about. What interest have they got in Saskatchewan people? Getting to be the point where we're less than a million people. Do you think that some company that operates at 300 locations in 30 different countries throughout the world gives a hoot about Saskatchewan people or the revenue accruing to this province? They care about their own welfare, not the welfare of Saskatchewan people.

And Chuck Childers has been sent from this company and hired by this government to destroy the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan — no other reason. And as I said, we'll go through the list of other people that have come from multinational corporations to work in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to not push its sales so that Canpotex can market sales from private companies, so that the private companies can prosper while the publicly owned company that accrues revenue to the province of Saskatchewan is run into the ground.

Mr. Speaker, we'll make those arguments in the course of this debate.

This company, International Minerals and Chemical Corporation (Canada) Ltd., the company has an operating agreement to mine ore from Amax Potash Limited. IMC was the first company to overcome the troublesome water problem in the Blairemore sands. It has two mines at Esterhazy, K1 and K2, and they're connected underground, incidentally, and IMC has a potash mine in New Mexico. So IMC are one of the biggest, if not — I don't know what it is right today at this moment — but if not biggest, they're one of the biggest players in the potash market in the entire world. And again, it baffles people when they find out that Chuck Childers was hired from this company to run the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, to run it into the ground, Mr. Speaker.

I think we also want to have a look at a third company that operates in Saskatchewan. It's Kalium Chemicals Limited, at the time of this writing owned 100 per cent by

PPG Industries Incorporated. That's Pittsburgh Plate Glass, a huge multinational with operations that net sales of about \$1.2 billion annually — \$1.2 billion annually, Mr. Speaker. That's no small player in the potash industry throughout the world.

And here we are with . . . the only thing that we seem to have lately that's in the magnitude of \$1.2 billion is deficit budgets after the Minister of Finance has got up on his feet. One point two billion dollars is a big player in the potash industry, Mr. Speaker. What if Kalium Chemical in their head office in Pittsburgh — I believe it is, somewhere like that — or Pittsburgh Plate Glass buys out the foreign shares of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Now this was the first . . . Kalium Chemicals, incidentally, was the first solution mine in the world, right here in Saskatchewan. It was a great piece of technology that was developed for that particular mine. It still operates, I believe, as a solution mine. And since that time, Texasgulf has converted its conventional mining operations in Utah to a solution mine as well, but with limited success. It depends a lot on the conditions, and who knows whether or not the mines that are currently owned by the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan will . . . whether or not be able to use a solution mining technique.

Right now I believe all the PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan) mines are mines that are using a shaft system with the drills and everything, and you've got to use conveyor belts to get it out of the ground. And I don't think that this Bill, Bill 20, will help find new technology in mining, and new technology is very important. It's important for worker safety; it's important for having improved methods of getting the ore from the ground up to the top.

And I see nothing in this Bill to assist and to assure that happens, because the private sector are so consumed and responsible to their shareholders for profits, they don't look at new technology, they don't look at worker safety as much as they should. They have to be held accountable by governments, and we're starting to question whether or not this government will, in fact, be accountable to people of Saskatchewan when they want to privatize the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

We want to make sure that there is technological development; that there is use for the mines; that at some point the waste from the mines will be disposed of. We want to make sure that the safe environment, the new technology, the environmental protection is there. The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan has been a leader in those things, and we're afraid that if it goes back to the private sector in 100 per cent total, then those things will not be honoured and people in the province of Saskatchewan will have a great deal of disappointment over what is now called Bill 20, which we do not intend to see pass very lightly in this Legislative Assembly, Mr. Speaker.

Now the Kalium Chemicals has a patented process there, so we should be looking at working more co-operatively with them. It's also originally started a joint operation

with Armour and Company, but in 1971, back at that time, Armour sold out its interests to Pittsburgh Plate Glass, and the parent company is also known to have undeveloped deposits in California.

So when I'm talking about the parent company of Kalium Chemicals, again no small player in the potash industry throughout North America, Mr. Speaker, and certainly a biggie in the potash industry throughout the world — and I don't think they need more potash like the potash that's currently owned by the people of Saskatchewan, which this Bill wants to take away from the hands of Saskatchewan people. Again I reiterate, 45 per cent foreign ownership is what this Bill states.

And that brings up the whole thing about the free trade agreement that can't be stressed too often and too much. Once they put through the one-time exemption for a Crown corporation, we can never again limit the amount lower than 45 per cent for foreign ownership in our potash industry, and I think that's a shameful tie for long-term obstruction of people's wishes in the province of Saskatchewan.

What if some government comes along in the future and wants to own 90 per cent of the potash industry in Saskatchewan? They can't do that, Mr. Speaker, because this government has tied our hands for ever because under the free trade agreement foreign ownership will have 45 per cent.

I predict the majority of that 45 per cent will be American interests, and because of the free trade agreement we can never again limit the Americans to less than 45 per cent ownership of our potash industry in the province of Saskatchewan. And I think every member on that side of the House should be ashamed for the long-term consequences that you have performed by this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — There's a fourth company I want to refer to, Mr. Speaker, in the potash industry — the Allan Potash Mine Operators Limited. This mine was owned 40 per cent by Texasgulf Potash Company, 40 per cent by U.S. Borax and Chemical Corporation, and 20 per cent by Swift Canadian Company Ltd., a wholly-owned subsidiary of Swift and Company of the United States — totally owned by American interests, Mr. Speaker. Ore reserves were estimated in 1971 to be 50 million tons proven, grading at 26 per cent of K_2O ; 50 million tons probable, and 500 million tons inferred — 500 million tons inferred. Texasgulf acquired its 40 per cent share in 1969 from Homestake Mining Company.

Now I want to go on to talk about the companies that own Allan Potash Mine Operators Limited. The one company I mentioned was Swift Canadian Company. Now this is a Canadian incorporated company which is — get this — a hundred per cent owned by Swift and Company, which is held by Esmark Incorporated, a large multinational operation in food, chemical, and industrial products, petroleum, and insurance. No small player in the corporate elite.

Swift Chemicals Company, held by another company,

Estech, Inc., which is also held by Esmark Inc., purchases all of Swift Canadian Company Limited's potash production from Allan. Swift produces phosphate rock and fertilizer products in the United States and retails fertilizer in other products. I mean, this the big, big corporate elite, Mr. Speaker. We're not talking about any small group of companies here.

The other company that I mentioned in regard to the Allan Potash Mine Operators Limited, with that particular company, was Texasgulf Incorporated. Texasgulf Incorporated owns 100 per cent of Texasgulf Potash Company. The parent company is the world's leading producer of sulphur and has interests in mining operations, many of them in Canada, and also has some oil and gas interests, which is not surprising.

The company has a gross revenue figure approaching . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order, order. Why is the member on his feet?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have leave to introduce some students.

Leave granted.

(1245)

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and to all members of the legislature a group of students in the Speaker's gallery. These are 23 grade 6 students, Mr. Speaker, from Arcola School in Arcola, Saskatchewan. With them today, Mr. Speaker, are their teacher Ms. Bernadine Armstrong; chaperons Linda Pow, Lucille Weber, Maureen George, and Karen Riddell, and as well their bus driver, Jim Pow. I invite all members, Mr. Speaker, to offer a warm welcome to these students from Arcola.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 20 (continued)

Mr. Anguish: — The company Texasgulf Incorporated has, in the year that the article that we researched was done, had gross revenues of approximately \$300 million and assets after depreciation and amortization of some \$670 million, Mr. Speaker. This is the second company that makes up Allan Potash Mine Operators Limited.

The third company I mentioned, U.S. Borax and Chemical Corporation, is a subsidiary of Rio Tinto Zinc Corporation Limited, a world-wide British mining company, which also controls Rio-Algom Mines in Canada. U.S. Borax sold its old New Mexico mine, which was closed in the '67-68, in that period, to Continental American Royalty (U.S. Potash and Chemical). This mine was since sold to Teledyne Corporation and then to Mississippi Chemical Corporation, which is trying to develop more economic means of mining low grade ores.

And Mississippi has made numerous announcements about its plans to build a refinery, but while there are some doubts about its future, it must be considered as part of the potash picture. They're certainly involved in mining and they are involved in potash. And certainly we wish them well in terms of doing a better job of extracting low-grade ores. So that gives you a picture of those three companies, of what the Allan Potash Mine Operators Limited consists of.

I think that we'd now want to look at the Duval Corporation of Canada. This is a Texas incorporated company which is owned by Duval Corporation, which in turn is owned by Pennzoil Company, a multinational national resource company incorporated in Delaware, with head office in Houston, Texas. It has extensive interests in oil and gas. Its total revenues in 1971 were \$736 million, while its total assets after depreciation and other charges were \$1.5 billion.

And now we're not talking about a small player here again. We're talking with big financial backing of multinational companies when we talk about who the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan has been competing with throughout the world and, I maintain, since '76 been competing very well until Childers and others were brought in from International Minerals to run the potash corporation into the ground.

The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, with Saskatchewan people at its head office doing its marketing, can compete with these large multinationals and should be allowed to compete in the future. We are Saskatchewan. We're proud of what we're able to do. We don't need Americans, and we don't need other people to run our business. We've run it in the past, and we can run it in the future. And I think this government should be ashamed of denying success for Saskatchewan people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Now Duval Corporation, Mr. Speaker, it operates a potash mine at Carlsbad, which had a capacity of 315,000 tons per year of K₂O and is primarily a sulphate operation. Now it's just part of their multinational connection.

The sixth company I want to mention in the scheme of the potash industry on the principle of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is the Alwinsal Potash of Canada Limited. This is owned, not by Americans this time, Mr. Speaker, but it's owned by French and German potash interests. The mine construction commenced in early 1964 and was completed in late 1968.

Now again you can see — four years to construct a potash mine. That gives you some idea of the complexity and the cost and the work that has to go into the construction of a potash mine. Substantial investment, substantial work, work for Saskatchewan people, and should be to the benefit of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Now a sales subsidiary of Alwinsal Potash of Canada Limited, the Potash Company of Canada Limited, markets the potash in the mid-western United States and Canada. This sales company was originally incorporated in

Canada as the sales outlet for European potash to exports to Canada.

Mr. Speaker, another company that I want to talk about is Cominco Limited. Now Cominco is a large Canadian mining company controlled by Canadian Pacific Investments. Not a Saskatchewan company, Mr. Speaker, but nevertheless, a American company.

And Canadian Pacific Investments is truly an international company. It is one of the largest chemical and fertilizer manufacturers in North America, possibly throughout the world. In addition to potash, it mines sulphate rock in the United States and produces a wide range of nitrogen and phosphate fertilizers.

Potash production is marketed in the United States through an American subsidiary, Cominco American Inc. The mine shaft was flooded at their mine in October of '70, and rehabilitation work was completed there in late 1972 at a cost of about \$9 million, which may be recoverable from the original contractor, I guess, but that's a long, tedious process.

Now that tells you something about the danger, again, of mines, Mr. Speaker — the complexity, the large amount of work that has to go into them, and we feel that the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan has been leaders in the potash industry for promoting health and safety, for looking at new technology and providing a return to Saskatchewan people by Saskatchewan people and for Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker.

Now provision was made in the construction of the mine and the plant for doubling the capacity, should the market conditions warrant it. And so there's a good deal of planning has to go into the potash industry in Saskatchewan. Now, Mr. Speaker, while the mine was flooded, arrangements were done to serve Cominco potash markets from the production at the Duval mine. So you can see how some of these mines in the past, before the potash corporation came into being, were willing to co-operate together to meet production levels when they couldn't meet their commitments, or to share production levels when they couldn't meet their commitments.

The only thing that the private mines didn't share in was contributions to the province of Saskatchewan in proportion to the returns they were getting from the resources that were owned by Saskatchewan people. They shared with each other, but they didn't want to share with the people in the province, Mr. Speaker.

Now an eighth company that is a player is Central Canada Potash Limited. This is an Ontario incorporated company, owned 51 per cent by Noranda Mines Limited and 49 per cent by C.F. Industries Inc. of — where? — Chicago. C.F. Industries is owned by about 20 farm and co-operative organizations, including one in Ontario, and markets about 25 per cent of United States potash consumption. C.F. Industries markets more of Central Canada's production.

And the mine was developed by Noranda and transferred after completion to the newly formed Central Canada Potash. Noranda then sold a 49 per cent interest in

Central Canada Potash to C.F. Industries. Share capitalization of Central Canada Potash is \$24 million, Mr. Speaker, and the remainder of the \$89,900,000 cost was covered by \$65,900,000 of mortgage income bonds held by Noranda. Noranda Sales Corporation markets this portion of the production not taken by C.F. Industries.

The indicated reserves at the time of this research were over 600 million tons averaging 28.2 per cent C D220, of which one-third can be extracted, Mr. Speaker.

Now there's another company that is not totally Canadian owned, it's 49 per cent American owned. It was 51 per cent Canadian, but not Saskatchewan owned, Mr. Speaker, not Saskatchewan owned like the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. And they can't use the argument of empty holes in the ground any more because we know it's fact. The potash corporation, 100 per cent owned by the people of Saskatchewan, made a profit for people in the province of Saskatchewan.

And the other argument that destroys their investment of empty holes in the ground is the fact that you could not get investors, either the 45 per cent foreign or the 55 per cent Canadian, you could not get those investors to invest in something that would not give them a return. So hog-wash to the government's argument of empty holes in the ground and of bad investment. The investment in the potash corporation was good in 1976 and it's a good investment for the people of Saskatchewan in 1988.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — I want to talk about another company, Mr. Speaker, Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting. They have complete ownership of a Sylvite mine at Rocanville, and this mine is the principal supplier of potash for a fertilizer company, Terra Chemicals International Inc., located where? In Sioux City, Iowa. Terra also acts as the U.S. sales agent for Sylvite.

The Anglo-American Corporation of South Africa through its Canadian subsidiary, Ammercosa Investments Ltd., owns 38.5 per cent of Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Co. Hudson Bay has a 51 per cent interest in Terra Chemicals. Proven reserves of potash ore were 350 million tons at December 31, 1974.

And the final company I want to mention, Mr. Speaker, while I still have a few moments in the debate is Amax Potash Limited. This company is 100 per cent owned by American Metal Climax Inc. of New York, a huge multinational mining and industrial firm which owns potash mines at Carlsbad, or a potash mine I should say, at Carlsbad, New Mexico.

Its sales are about 800 million and its total assets after depreciation are about \$1.25 billion. It purchased ore reserves from IMC and then contracted IMC for mining of the ore. It's reduced production at Carlsbad on completion of this arrangement.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in 1976 all of Saskatchewan's potash industry was owned outside of the province and most of it, in fact 85 per cent was owned outside Canada. Our government tried to work with the

industry; the industry didn't want to work with us. That's why the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, in 1976 came into place by a Bill before this legislature.

People were told that New Democrats would bring in such a Bill. The Bill appeared; there was debate; it proved good for Saskatchewan people; and this Bill to dismantle the potash corporation to give it to foreign interests will prove to be a disaster for people in the province of Saskatchewan. It's an example of nerdonomics at its best, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — Being 1 o'clock, this Assembly stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday.

The Assembly adjourned at 1 p.m.