

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Acting Clerk: — It is my duty to advise the Assembly that Mr. Speaker will not be present to open this sitting.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's my pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to the Assembly, some distinguished guests that we have in the Speaker's gallery. I had the opportunity to have lunch with these individuals, and it is the Premier's round table on the environment. The National Task Force on the Environment and the Economy recommended the formation of provincial and national round tables to facilitate a co-operative effort among governments, industry, non-government organizations, and the public, so that we might have a national strategy on the environment and sustained economic growth.

It is my pleasure today to introduce the members of the round table to the Speaker and to the legislature. And perhaps they would stand and be recognized when I call out their name.

Miss Beverly Brennan, vice-president, finance and administration, Philom Bios, is not with us but she's one of the members on the committee.

Mr. Frank Arnie, past president of the Saskatchewan Wildlife Association and past director of the Canadian Wildlife Federation.

Doug Chekay, provincial manager, Ducks Unlimited Canada-Saskatchewan, and member of the Canadian Association of Resource Managers, and the director of the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation Habitat Trust Fund.

Chief Roland Crowe, chief of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations.

Another member that's on it that is not present is Mr. Bill Duke, past president of the Western Canadian Grain Growers.

Bill Gayner, vice-president and general manager of Saskatchewan division of Weyerhaeuser Canada Ltd.

Jon Gilles, associate professor of agricultural engineering, University of Saskatchewan.

Dr. David Henry, associate professor of science, Saskatchewan Indian Federated College.

Another member that is not with us is Dr. Steuart Houston, professor of radiology, University of Saskatchewan.

Darla Hunter, an attorney and a lawyer with MacPherson, Leslie and Tyerman.

Rev. Austin Jagoe, minister, Meewasin Valley United

Church.

Sister Phyllis Kapuscinski, professor of education, University of Regina.

Lindsay Milne, vice-president, exploration and production, western Canada, Husky Oil Operations Ltd.

Another member that's not with us, Mr. Speaker, is Ken Naber, president of Focus on Inputs, and past president of the Canola Growers Association, reeve of R.M. 428.

John Nightingale, president, Key Lake Mining Corporation.

And finally, a special guest, Mr. Speaker, an individual that came to Saskatchewan to tell us about round tables and how they are to function and operate and was a member of the original task force — Mr. Clifford Lincoln, former minister of the environment of the province of Quebec and currently an MLA in the province of Quebec. Please welcome those guests.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to introduce some students on behalf of my seat mate, the member for Lumsden-Qu'Appelle who is not able to be present today. I'd like to introduce 45 grade 5 students. They're situated in your gallery, Mr. Speaker. They're from the Lumsden Elementary School. They're accompanied by Sandy White, Peter Wiebe, and Ray Tourney as their teachers. I welcome them here and I'll look forward to meeting you after question period. I hope you enjoy the deliberations of the House, and meet you for pictures and refreshments. Welcome to the legislature.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's a pleasure for me to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the legislature, 35 grade 8 students from Lindale School. Lindale School is a rural school in the city of Moose Jaw. It's all rural students who are bused into that particular learning institution. They're accompanied today by their teachers, Bob McLarty and Bev McIntyre, and I understand they've had a tour of the building and met with my colleague, the member from Canora.

My apologies to the students for not being here. We had a little mix-up with my office and the guide service. I hope the visit was enjoyable. I hope that question period will be informative. And if possible, I'll pop out for a few minutes and have a short visit with you. Please help me welcome the students from Lindale.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Public Hearings on SaskEnergy

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to address a question to the minister in charge of the

Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Mr. Minister, we see that you're planning some 80 meetings across the province of Saskatchewan to sell your Saskatchewan Power Corporation privatization to the people of Saskatchewan who have clearly told you in recent weeks that they are against it.

Mr. Minister, since you have commissioned the Barber Panel at a cost of over \$1,100 a day in salaries, and Heaven knows what in expenses, why do you need this other set of hearings running almost concurrently, in fact running before even that panel begins to do its work? Is it that you realize now, Mr. Minister, that the Barber Panel is not going to hear what you want it to hear, so you're setting up stacked meetings to give your point of view the image of credibility?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — I don't know how they can call them stacked meetings, Mr. Speaker. The meetings are public meetings. The meetings are designed to provide information to the people of Saskatchewan relative to the public participation opportunity that will exist at SaskEnergy.

An Hon. Member: — Who's paying for it?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — And the hon. member says, who's paying for them. I'll tell you this, Mr. Speaker, they will cost a whole lot less than members' opposite cost the people of Saskatchewan by walking out of this place for 17 days — literally taken, hijacking the legislature, Mr. Speaker. It will cost a whole lot less than that.

Now the Barber commission is something altogether different. While SaskEnergy people will give their story, it's providing information, Mr. Speaker; the Barber commission, on the other hand, will be receiving public input, doing their own economic analysis and making recommendations to government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, Mr. Minister, obviously you're not interested in knowing the opinion of the public. Your only interest is to try to tell them what you want them to hear. And that's why you've got these 80 meetings.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Now, Mr. Minister, I see also that now you've started a massive television propaganda machine out there to try to sell your opinion, to try to tell the public what they're supposed to think of all this. Would you care to tell this House what you intend to spend on this advertising campaign to sell Saskatchewan people on an idea that they have already in large numbers rejected, Mr. Minister.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I'm interested in these large numbers that the member opposite talks about. I think he tabled something like 60,000 names . . .

An Hon. Member: — Less than that.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Less than that? Less than 60,000? I thought you had more than that in your membership. Couldn't you even get your own membership to sign this petition, Mr. Speaker? That's number one.

Number two, I think the people of Saskatchewan are interested, Mr. Speaker, in things like discount on electricity rates; discount, assignable discount on gas rates; long-term protection through regulation; security of supply — all of those things, Mr. Speaker.

What the people are interested in knowing, Mr. Speaker, is the other side, the truth of the distorted story that those folks — those folks, Mr. Speaker — tried to take to the people during their two-week strike.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — New question to the minister, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Minister, I think 73 per cent of the people who in the polling have shown that they oppose what you are doing, should be a pretty convincing argument to tell you what they think.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Can I ask you, Mr. Minister, going back to my original question: how much are you spending on these public meetings? Is it \$80,000, is it \$100,000, or what is it? You're saying through your Minister of Finance that there isn't any additional money for municipalities, so you freeze their revenue sharing. You're saying to hungry children in Saskatchewan, there isn't enough money to put in programs to help them.

How much then are willing to spend to try and sell to the people of Saskatchewan an idea which they don't want, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, let me . . . I was going to say that was the same pollster that said, go in April . . .

An Hon. Member: — And go on the Crow.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — . . . and go on the Crow, but I won't. I won't, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, the poll tells me one thing. Had they phoned me and said: Mr. Speaker, would you . . . or Mr. Berntson — that's me — Mr. Berntson, would you support privatizing SaskPower, I would have said no. I think 73 per cent of the people in the province said no to that question, Mr. Speaker.

So to answer the question, I am . . . I have a high degree of confidence, Mr. Speaker, a high degree of confidence, that when the people of Saskatchewan get the truth as it relates to the opportunity that exists through public participation in SaskEnergy, they will endorse it in large measure, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy

Speaker. My question is to the Deputy Premier, and it's along the same lines as the questions that my colleague, the deputy leader, has been directing.

I notice that the Deputy Premier talked about 73 per cent who would be opposed to the privatization of SaskPower, and tried to draw a distinction between SaskPower and SaskEnergy. Of course he neatly overlooked the fact that the question asked by Mr. Angus Reid was whether the people of Saskatchewan favoured the privatization of SaskEnergy, and nearly 70 per cent said no to that, which still means you're flying in the face of public opinion. But my question to you . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — But my question to you, Mr. Deputy Premier, is this: forgetting about your shell game, the business of SaskEnergy and SaskPower, surely you must admit that what you're doing by spending thousands, if not millions of dollars, in a combined public hearings/advertising campaign by SaskEnergy in advance of the Barber commission, surely you must admit that what you're doing is making a total farce and mockery of the Barber commission.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, on the one hand he says people don't have enough information; people don't understand what it is that SaskEnergy and this government's trying to do with public participation thrust. On the other hand, he says that people haven't had their input into this public participation thrust. And then again he says, and the cost, the cost of this; and it's a whitewash — why would you do it in any event? This from a person who took his caucus out of here for two weeks — 17 days — at the cost of something like \$300,000, went on strike, took the legislature as hostage, Mr. Speaker. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan won't forget that for a very long time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Deputy Premier. I agree with one thing that he said in his answer: the people of Saskatchewan will not forget what you tried to do, and what we did. You're dead right about that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And I'll tell you something else, if it costs this legislature \$300,000, which I do not agree, but if it did in the fact of the bell-ringing episode, that is a drop in the bucket of the money that we saved by virtue of your attempt to privatize SaskEnergy and SaskPower.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, my question to the Deputy Premier comes at it from another way. Notwithstanding the fact that you've made a total mockery and a farce out of the Barber commission, my question to you, sir, is: how in the world do you justify a civil servant, Mr. Oscar Hanson, getting out there with his

officials, obviously propagandizing a highly politicized position — one which no civil servant can decide?

This is a policy decision which only the electorate and the voters of Saskatchewan can decide in election. What is the propriety, and how is it that you direct your civil servant to get into the political arena on an issue which he ought to be out of? This is no room for civil servants to be politicized. How do you justify that?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I've known Oscar Hanson for about eight years, give or take. Oscar Hanson is a long-time servant of SaskPower, Mr. Speaker, and, more recently, president of SaskEnergy, Mr. Speaker. At all times — at all times — Mr. Hanson has behaved in a very professional manner. I believe that Mr. Hanson today is behaving in a very professional and objective manner and, Mr. Speaker, just because what he's saying isn't in accord with what members opposite think doesn't mean that he is not professional.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have a new question for the Deputy Premier. I make it clear that my argument for the moment is not against Mr. Oscar Hanson. My argument is against your government forcing Mr. Oscar Hanson to get out there into a highly political area. Your government was forced to withdraw this legislation because the people of the province of Saskatchewan said no to the privatization of SaskEnergy, and you're sending Oscar Hanson and the hard-working people of SaskEnergy out there, on an 80-town, or more, tour paid at my expense, when I don't agree with that policy or philosophy — paid at the expense of thousands of taxpayers who don't agree. That is a misuse of the civil servant, a respected civil servant.

And I say it's an abuse of the Barber commission, and it shows to me that you people can't be trusted at all to keep your word on this issue. You've simply given up.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, the legislation has not been withdrawn and that should be made clear, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition obviously has mistaken on that particular point. The legislation . . . In fact, if you look at the blues today, they're sitting under second readings.

And we fully expect, Mr. Speaker, subject to the recommendations coming from the Barber commission, that we will, in due course, proceed with that legislation.

An Hon. Member: — Oh, but I sure hope you do.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — And now he's supporting me, Mr. Speaker. Now he says I sure hope you do. Which side of the argument are you on, anyway?

Mr. Speaker, they have been against almost everything we've ever done in terms of economic diversification. They're against Weyerhaeuser; they're against Gainers;

they're against Saskoil; they're against Rafferty.

And I mean, in my part of the world, Mr. Speaker, over 75, 80 per cent of the people down there support the Rafferty project. They're against it, they're all opposed to it. Now I'll tell you what, Mr. Speaker. I'll tell you what. I will . . . No, I won't; no, I won't.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, the fact of the matter is he comes in here today talking about spending all of this taxpayers' money, spending all of this taxpayers' money to get the truth out to the people of Saskatchewan. Well the truth is, Mr. Speaker, whether he agrees with it or not, the truth is that what we're talking about is diversification through rate protection, job creation through lower rates.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the greatest opportunities that has ever been presented to Saskatchewan, and members opposite, Mr. Speaker, either refuse to understand it or take their own narrow, partisan view of it and are playing politics with the whole issue. They're not interested in the development or diversification for Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the Deputy Premier. My new question to the Deputy Premier is this: if there is a philosophical or a political dispute between your side and your Premier, and my side and this side — and there is, on this issue — then surely that's a contest between the Progressive Conservative Party and the New Democratic Party. And the people ultimately will decide in an election, which is exactly what we're calling for.

But my question to you, sir, is this: how in the world do you justify the following situation? First of all, you have the minister of privatization spending millions of dollars in meetings all across rural Saskatchewan; then you've got the Barber commission, if not millions, hundreds of thousands of dollars on privatization; now you've got the Hanson propagandization on privatization, hundreds if not thousands of dollars; now you've got an advertising campaign which amounts to millions — I say that without fear of contradiction, and if I'm wrong show me the figures because we're going to be asking you for the numbers — millions of dollars.

Study after study, brainwash after brainwash, TV ad after TV ad — you're doing this at public expense; you're not doing it at party expense. Do you have no shame at all? Is there no decency at all and respect for the public purse? People want money for food banks and for jobs and for education, and not on this propaganda thing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I think where we differ . . . I've heard the member opposite . . . I think the member opposite, Mr. Speaker, has on several times been quoted as saying what folks opposite — those people, Mr. Speaker — how they would diversify our economy is through what they call the mixed economy.

Well, we kind of support the mixed economy too, Mr.

Speaker. And our definition, our definition, Mr. Speaker, of mixed economy is public and private and co-operative and investment and all of those things. Their definition of mixed economy, Mr. Speaker, is — and get this mix — government-owned pulp mills, government-owned meat packing plants, government-owned land bank, government-owned whatever. And coal mine, uranium, potash, that's their idea of a mixed economy, Mr. Speaker. We both agree in a mixed economy. We think ours will grow and diversify and create jobs. That's the difference.

Now when we get to the cost, when we get to the cost of what we are doing in terms of allowing public input and in terms of getting the truth out, I'll take that from a lot of people, Mr. Speaker. But it's that party sitting right over there that is costing us \$2 million a month because Rafferty is stopped, Mr. Speaker — \$2 million a month; \$300,000 they cost us because they took this place and hijacked it, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Now we, in spite of those people, Mr. Speaker, in spite of those people, we are going to diversify Saskatchewan; we are going to create economic excitement, jobs, and opportunities, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Plight of Poor and Hungry People

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Social Services. The minister in charge of Saskatchewan Power Corporation talked about how much better things are. Well my question is about how much better things are.

You'll be aware, Mr. Minister, that a study, done under the auspices of the Regina United Way, indicates that the number of people who are going hungry, the number of people who rely on the food bank, has doubled in just two years.

Mr. Minister, this contrasts sharply with the obscene, lavish expenditures which your government is making, trying to sell the unsaleable — your privatization. I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you don't agree that it's time you devoted some of your resources to feeding the hungry, and a little less to try to selling an idea which has already been rejected.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, we would have to consider long and seriously whether the study referred to is actually scientific. However, leaving politics aside, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are a few children who are hungry, and that few is too many. But they are not hungry for lack of money, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

We must help these children eliminate the cause of the problem. By any civilization's standards, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have moral problems in this province that cannot simply be solved by throwing money on a difficult situation. This government believes that, Mr. Speaker . . .

Do I have to start shouting again so that I can at least hear myself?

An Hon. Member: — You aren't missing anything.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, the member from Quill Lakes would be well to stay in his constituency and shout from there because we could hear him at that distance.

When the members opposite are prepared to sit down, listen to some sensible discussion, then I will answer the question.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I wonder if you could step outside the callous arrogance with which you answered the last question and deal with the poor and the hungry in this city. Mr. Minister, I expected you to offer your usual excuse that if it weren't for the opposition, there'd be so much more that you'd be.

Mr. Minister, I wanted to deal with unemployment. Unemployment, Mr. Minister, has increased in this province. Saskatoon has the third highest unemployment rate in the province . . . in Canada, rather, and Regina is not far behind; all this at a time, Mr. Minister, when you cut back on funding for job creation in the recent budget. And these figures have been aided, Mr. Speaker, by 10,000 people who have fled the province in the first four months of this year.

My question, Mr. Minister, is: don't you agree that your privatization mania should be tempered a bit so you can deal with some of these other problems, such as hungry people in the cities of the province that was once called the bread _basket of the world.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I was trying to point out earlier, yes, we do have problems in this province. We have problems with parenting skills; we have problems with chemical abuse; we have problems with people dropping out of school; we have problems with people who have a lack of pride and haven't developed self-sufficiency.

Unfortunately, Mr. Deputy Speaker, wisdom cannot be purchased at any price. However, this government has spent an awful lot of money trying to have people become self-sufficient and therefore happier and healthier. As we speak today, this government spends \$43 million per year in contract services to non-governmental organizations to try to help people. The great bulk of that is spent in the four largest cities of this province. I intend to publish a list of all of the organizations, what they receive the money for, and what the \$43 million is spent on. If money alone could solve this problem, we would solve it immediately.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the members opposite believe that money alone will solve what's wrong with our society. We have to look into our hearts, they have to look

into their hearts, and we have to get into the hearts of those people who need the help. Because simply handing them money that is sometimes spent on things other than food — and I could list them, and if I list them then people say I'm hard-hearted — I say there is a difference between reality and the fantasy that the members opposite live. We want to help those people. If \$43 million isn't enough, then we'll spend \$53 million, but we're going to have to be certain that that money helps those people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — New question, Mr. Speaker, to the 1989 edition of Marie Antoinette. Mr. Minister, a telephone call to the department of privatization confirmed that you were seeking sponsors so that you could provide a free lunch to the people who attend your privatization meeting. That's simply symbolic, Mr. Minister, of the millions in advertising which you're spending, trying to sell an idea which the public have rejected, money which is badly needed elsewhere.

Will you not agree, Mr. Minister, that some of the money which you're lavishing on your privatization's sales scheme should be redirected to feed children who are hungry through no fault of their own, your comments notwithstanding?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the members opposite have just about finished shouting from their seats, so I will now try to answer the question.

First of all, it is hard to ascertain what the question is. The members opposite wish to be government and they can't even ask a sensible question. The members opposite are talking about food at a meeting provided by business people out of their own money, not out of the money of the people of Saskatchewan. If business people want to buy lunch to some bright and aspiring young people in this province, that's their own business.

We have been talking here about feeding the needy, and the members opposite say we should give more money to feed the needy. I say yes, we will try, but we have to get to the root of the problem and that is, why isn't the money getting to the children? That's the question.

And the members opposite wish to put their heads in the sand and say, more money, and it will magically get to the children. I thought they didn't believe in the trickle down theory. Well I tell you that the money we pay in social services is not trickling down to the children, and I have to figure out ways of getting that money directly into food into the stomachs of the children who need it and not into more people paid to do more counselling and the children still don't get the food.

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: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to continue with my remarks that I started a few days ago. I'm pretty well through my introduction to my remarks on the Bill . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — . . . which is Bill 20, an Act to privatize the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

One of the things I want to talk about today is the whole myth of how this government has stated that the potash sales were poor, the performance of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is poor, because of there being a glut on the world market. Now this is very much a myth, Mr. Speaker. There's not been a glut on the world market, or at least any statistics I can find do not indicate a glut on the world market.

In fact, I didn't go back very far, but I'll take for example one press release from Canpotex Limited. And as you're aware, Mr. Speaker, Canpotex is the marketer for all of the potash that's produced in the province of Saskatchewan.

At one time the Government of Saskatchewan, in their wisdom under premier Blakeney's government, wanted to look at potash sales international, or potash Saskatchewan international, to do the marketing of potash for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. And the reason that this move was made at one period of time is because it seemed that in the future the government of the day had envisaged that a government that was not supportive of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan may well market private firms' potash through Canpotex before they would market the potash that was produced at the mines owned by the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Now as I say, I didn't go far back in terms of the press releases from Canpotex, but I just want to refer to one press release here from January 10, 1989. And it's not undifferent from other press releases in the period of 1982 until the current year, in which it shows good sales through Canpotex. The problem is that this government chose not to market the potash, or the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan as we had envisaged many years earlier. This government chose to promote the private sector firms that are involved in the mining and the production of potash in the province of Saskatchewan.

I would just want to quote from this press release, Mr. Speaker. It's dated January 10, 1989. It's for immediate release, and the headline is: New sales record, and I quote:

Erik Ekedahl, president of (the) Canpotex Limited, announced today that the offshore marketing

agency for the majority of Saskatchewan's potash set a new sales record for 1988.

"We shipped 4.7 million tonnes of production," Mr. Ekedahl said, "which was about 540,000 tonnes more than in 1987 — also a record year."

"Prices for 1988 averaged about \$15.00 CDN per tonne higher than in the previous year and Canpotex's total sales value reached a new record of close to \$500 million CDN.

To put a sales volume of 4.7 million tonnes in perspective, it would take a train of nearly 52,000 railcars stretching almost to the half-way point between Saskatoon and Vancouver to carry the total tonnage. The tonnage would fill more than 150 ships and is equivalent to the total production capacities of the Lanigan mine — the world's largest potash mine — and either the Central Canada or Cominco mine.

Canpotex sales for 1988 set individual country records in China, Korea, Malaysia, Taiwan, Argentina, Chile, and Italy. Sales to China totalled 1.25 million tonnes, the first time that shipments of Saskatchewan potash to any offshore country have exceeded one million tonne level in any twelve-month period.

Canpotex is owned by Saskatchewan potash producers and sells potash to offshore markets in Asia, Latin America, Europe, Oceania, and Africa.

For further information, please contact Rod Heath or Howard Cummer at (306) 931-2200.

Now it seems to me what this press release from Canpotex indicates, Mr. Speaker, is that there is no glut on the world market. There is a very buoyant market throughout the world right now for the sale of potash — potash that comes from Saskatchewan mines, produced by Saskatchewan peoples, but soon not to be produced by Canadian and Saskatchewan potash companies because of this government's move to sell off one of the best and most prosperous Crown corporations in the history of the province of Saskatchewan.

And I'm not using rhetoric, Mr. Speaker, as some of the members on the government side have used. I'm using factual statements, at least factual as far as Canpotex is concerned. And they should know what they're talking about since they market potash for private companies in the province of Saskatchewan that produce potash, as well as the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, a corporation that is 100 per cent owned by the people of Saskatchewan.

Potash corporation: the employees are from Saskatchewan; the profits stay in Saskatchewan; the dividends stay in Saskatchewan; the royalties stay in Saskatchewan. It's truly a Saskatchewan company which was a dream in the early '70s, came into reality in 1976, and paid hundreds, I say hundreds of millions of dollars to the people of Saskatchewan in royalties and taxes and profits, and in later years, dividends to the people in the

province of Saskatchewan.

It's money that we've relied on in the past to make sure that there are good programs and good services provided by administrators and administrations of government regardless of what their political stripe is.

But now we have today Bill 20 in second reading before this legislature, the government asking that they be allowed to sell off 45 per cent of the potash corporation to foreign investors. That means outside of Saskatchewan and also outside of Canada. The other 55 per cent is sold to residents, and residents is not defined in the Bill as Saskatchewan residents, Mr. Speaker. It's very clear in Bill 20 that the 55 per cent sold to residents will be sold to investors in Canada, not Saskatchewan.

And to me it matters little whether or not it's some wealthy individual or company in Toronto on Bay Street, or whether it's in New York on Wall Street, or whether it's somebody from Tacoma, Washington or Montreal. The fact remains that the profits will go away from Saskatchewan people to the investors who can afford to buy the shares, the large investors to buy the 45 per cent foreign ownership, and the wealthiest of the Canadian investors who can buy the other 55 per cent of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the picture even gets better for the sale of potash into the future. I have here another press release from Canpotex Ltd., and the headline is, "New China sale," and it's dated March 10, 1989, a matter of a couple of months after the initial press release that I quoted from. And I want to read the press release to you and have it on the record so that Saskatchewan people who may be watching today, or people who will read in *Hansard*, have a fairly detailed picture of what's happening with potash in the province, with the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, and with this heartless government who has an obsession with privatization in the province of Saskatchewan.

If it moves, they want to privatize it; and if it has a large debt attached to it, they want to retain it so that people in the province of Saskatchewan will have to pay through their own taxes for many, many years for this government's give-away of resources and resource revenue in the province of Saskatchewan. And I quote from the press release, Mr. Speaker:

(1445)

Eric Ekedahl, President of Canpotex Limited, announced today that a new contract for the supply of potash has been concluded with China.

"If Sinochem exercises all the options available under our agreement, total January to June shipments could reach as much as 700,000 tonnes. If this level is achieved, first semester shipments would be about equal to our record shipments to China in the first half of last year," Mr. Ekedahl explained.

Shipments from Vancouver will begin at once and are planned to average 100,000 to 150,000

tonnes per month. The FOB Vancouver value will be about C\$80 million.

Since 1972 China has purchased more than six million tonnes of Saskatchewan potash from Canpotex. Last year purchases exceeded one million tonnes for the first time.

Canpotex is owned by Saskatchewan potash producers and sells potash to offshore markets in Asia, Latin America, Europe, Oceania, and Africa.

For further information please contact Rod Heath or Howard Cummer at (306) 931-2200.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as long as New Democrats were in government, with the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan being a sound investment, initially, and a good return for Saskatchewan people, those that we had in senior management positions from the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan dealt aggressively with Canpotex.

Sometimes we didn't get as much of our potash sold as we wanted to. Private sector firms maybe had a bit of an inside hand because there were more players involved in the private sector firms than there was in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, even though we were the major producer of potash in the province. The very structure of Canpotex left it open to a good deal of manipulation.

Mr. Speaker, I'd want to point out to you that back in the 1980s, the early 1980s, before this administration came into place, there was a move by the government of the day, by Allan Blakeney's government and the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to strike a new marketing firm called PCS International. And the reason that the wisdom was there to put PCS International into place so that we had our own very aggressive marketing firm to market Saskatchewan potash produced by the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, by Saskatchewan management, by Saskatchewan people, by Saskatchewan workers, by a Saskatchewan head office, that would have the interests of the people of Saskatchewan first and profits of the private sector firms secondarily, because the private sector firms seem to be taking care of themselves quite well, thank you very much.

But Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan Sales in North America, marketing subsidiary of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, during 1981, changes in the organizational structure of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and its subsidiaries resulted in the appointment of Douglas E. Logsdaile as president of PCS Sales. Sales are administered from the subsidiary's head office in Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker — not Chicago, like International Minerals, or in New Mexico for the mines there — but in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.

Two national account sales managers located in Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker, were responsible for the sales contracts to large fertilizer manufacturing companies in the United States. District managers for field accounts in Canada report to the Saskatoon office, Mr. Speaker, while

the 13 American district managers reported to a field sales office in Atlanta, Georgia — not the head office, but a field sales office — to supply the American market.

And this is what the potash corporation have actually started to do in the early 1980s and possibly even the late 1970s. It was certainly discussed then. I'm not sure . . . I don't have the figures before me. My memory . . . I wouldn't want to be in error on the exact date it started, but Saskatchewan potash corporation, or the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, was in fact doing a lot of their own marketing, and by this they were very successful.

And you can see that as one of the major, major reasons why the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan paid so handsomely in terms of taxes and royalties and dividends and made additional profit that they weren't making when the Conservatives came into government in 1982.

In 1982 the government seemed to throw up their hands and say, well we'll leave it all up to Canpotex. And the private sector firms, Mr. Speaker, ran roughshod over the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, saying me, me, me, me, me, allow me to market my potash first. You're the government, you shouldn't be interfering in the private sector.

So you can see, Mr. Speaker, there was no aggressive marketing of potash from PCS Sales, which I think only operated in North America — the PCS Sales. And there was no aggressive marketing to Canpotex. So therefore we found profits dropped drastically.

And in my presentations over the past three days that I have spoken on this Bill, Mr. Speaker, I have laid out what the profits were, so I'm not going to go through that quite yet at this point in time again. But those profits were there and they've drastically declined in the early 1980s . . . I should say from 1982 onward, because there was no aggressive marketing of the potash from the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

In 1981, PCS Sales continued as a member of Canpotex Ltd., a producer-owner marketing company responsible for offshore sales of potash from five Saskatchewan producers. Now you see, Canpotex was still doing the international marketing outside of the North American continent, but the North American sales were done by PCS Sales, and they had done a very good job.

I would say that effective on June 30, 1982, PCS Sales membership in Canpotex was to be terminated, and the corporation's new offshore marketing subsidiary, PCS International, was to begin selling directly to overseas customers, and PCS Sales was to retain sole responsibility for marketing in North America.

But what happened? Mr. Speaker, what happened was that before June 30, 1982 came along there was a general election. People spoke decisively that a Conservative government should be elected in the province of Saskatchewan, and they were — overwhelmingly; one of the biggest majorities, if not the biggest, in the history of the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Now people since that time have found out this is not a good deal, because not only did we lose the PCS Sales as an aggressive marketer in North America, the Conservatives decided not to proceed with PCS International to do the good job internationally that PCS Sales was doing domestically and in the North American market, Mr. Speaker. And as a result of that it wasn't a glut on the world market; it wasn't a devastating drop in potash prices by the tonne; it was mismanagement and the lack of aggressive marketing by the Conservative government.

It was also a removal of top management in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to replace top management of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan by political cronies from the Conservatives, that were put into place to deal with a billion dollar company that they knew nothing about. Some of them I'm not even sure had business experience. They were moved into a billion dollar company to try and aggressively move that company into the international market place.

Now I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that during 1981 PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan) sales marketed a total of 3.88 million tonnes of potash, 3.88 million tonnes of potash. And remember, Mr. Speaker, PCS sales was just the North American market — 3.88 million tonnes of production.

Now in May of 1981, PCS sales adopted the generic name Sas-K, pronounced Sask, for the purpose of marketing its products. Now the products that were offered were Sas-K Granular, Sas-K Coarse, Sas-K Standard, Sas-K Suspension, Sas-K Soluble, Sas-K Industrial, Sas-K Refined. And so when this government talks about diversification, there was a great deal of diversification in the potash industry in Saskatchewan because of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. And the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan had this wide and diverse amount of fertilizer, amount of potash, in different . . . in varying forms.

Mr. Speaker, I want to look at North America for a moment. In 1981 the company sold 2.11 million tonnes in North America, compared to 2.45 million tonnes in the year before. The North American agricultural sector suffered during 1981. High interest rates and continued inflation increased costs of production, forcing many farmers to tighten their belts because of the cost-price squeeze. Grain and livestock processing fell, due in part to the strong U.S. dollar.

And, Mr. Speaker, there were some tough times there in the North American market in the early 1980s, but even then the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan performed at record levels, I maintain better and more profitable than any private sector company. And if that can be proven wrong, Mr. Speaker, I challenge the members to get up opposite and tell us any potash company in Saskatchewan that has done better, that has out-performed, that out-profitd the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. And they can't do that, Mr. Speaker, because there is not a private potash company in Saskatchewan that has done better than the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. It's a history of success, and it will be success in the future, but not by the current

government, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Now, Mr. Speaker, the offshore market in 1981 was characterized by strong sales in the first half of the year, followed by a decline in shipments in the second half. Economic problems in many importing countries caused customers to have their inventories used up rather than maintaining import levels. For example, Brazil was a major importer of potash and they experienced a lot of problems with their exchange rates, inflation, and as well there were some severe weather conditions in Brazil at the time.

Now I want to talk a little bit about market development. Within PCS sales, service departments provided strong support for the sales effort. There was the marketing research department, and it played a valuable role in future market planning.

One major development back in 1981 was the computerization of sales data for North America. Such data provided shipment breakdowns by state and by province, also by grade of production level, and it did that on a monthly basis. And this allowed a more detailed analysis of the market position, and as this data base was expanded, more sophisticated marketing analysis would have been able to have been put into place.

But this government didn't see the wisdom of that. They're obsessed with their privatization move, and I think that if they sat down and thought about it or explained the whole story to people in the province of Saskatchewan, people wouldn't want the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan sold because of the hundreds of millions of dollars in revenue that's able to come and able to be generated from a very precious Saskatchewan resource which, incidentally, we have years of supply — some 4,000 years of projected reserves of potash in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

(1500)

So we're talking about the future, not just the past, in the history of potash and the future of potash in the province of Saskatchewan.

In the market development department, there is a program that was designed to maintain existing markets and to assist in development of new potash markets by planning, developing, and implementing comprehensive promotional strategies. Internal programs had been implemented to increase communication and allow for an interchange of information between head office and field personnel.

And you see, what was happening there, Mr. Speaker, was that they worked in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan as a team. It wasn't a few individuals like Chuck Childers, who this government had to bring in his daughter as well from the States to work for the potash corporation. Why, Mr. Speaker? I maintain to set it up for sale to the private sector, possibly to IMC (International Minerals and Chemical Corporation) out of Chicago.

But in the past, in the past, Mr. Speaker, we had a team of people that worked together. People from head office communicated with miners, miners communicated back through to head office, and they had an operation together that was a team that was proud; the esprit de corps was there. There was a lot of pride in working for a Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan because they were Saskatchewan people. They had Saskatchewan pride. They were producing a Saskatchewan product and Saskatchewan was competing as a major — the major player in the international market — head to head with private potash companies throughout the world. And the people of Saskatchewan were winning, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — There was also, Mr. Speaker, the technical services department, and it acted as liaison between mines and PCS sales. It was responsible for production, quality surveillance, claims adjustments, and ensuring adherence to legislation pertaining to product quality and development. Technical services was also responsible for the presentation of technical reports at external seminars and conferences.

Mr. Speaker, in that whole market development — the market research, market development, technical services department — those three areas or those departments made up the market development team, you might say. And they had a world-class act.

You could send people from the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, born and educated in Saskatchewan, working in Saskatchewan on a world stage with a world-class product that we had a lot of pride in, and they could go head to head with anybody in the world concerning the development, the production, the occupational health and safety, the environment, the marketing, the sales. Anything you want to think about that would enter into mining and the potash industry, Saskatchewan was first-class, first-class people with a first-class product on a world-class stage with a world-class vision, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — A world-class vision. And the reason there was a world-class vision there, Mr. Speaker, is because out of all the things that are produced in resources and manufacturing in Saskatchewan, there's no other product, there's no other item, there's no other resource where we can dominate the world market. And we can dominate the world market; we can be leaders. We have the control to do on the international stage what other countries do with products that they sometimes almost have a monopoly on.

Now we don't have a monopoly on potash, but with 4,000 years of reserves in the province of Saskatchewan and a production capacity where we are able to sell in excess of 4.7 million tonnes on the world stage, we are world-class, and we do have the clout to influence what happens in potash in the world market, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to the argument that has been used by the Conservatives like the member opposite

from Weyburn who likes to holler from his seat but doesn't get up in the potash corporation debate. He'll shout across the floor, Mr. Speaker, but he won't stand on his feet and debate the privatization of potash and the privatization of other resources in the province of Saskatchewan.

He won't speak on the Crown corporation utilities in the province of Saskatchewan because he knows his constituents beat him up on that. He had an open line show in his very own constituency in Weyburn and the calls were crucifying him — 11 out of 12 calls against his government's moves towards privatizing such things as our utilities, such things as the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan where we get services and we get revenue for the province of Saskatchewan.

We have members requested from this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, to go out to Weyburn constituency and other constituencies around the province to detail the facts as to what's happening in privatization in the province of Saskatchewan, because it seems that all they get right now from the government members is rhetoric, rhetoric that is old rhetoric, it's tired rhetoric. And when they blame a lot of these on things that happened prior to 1982 on the NDP, nobody buys that argument. I mean for Heaven's sake, Mr. Speaker, New Democrats have not been government in the province of Saskatchewan since April of 1982, and this government, when something goes astray, they still try and blame it on the NDP.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they don't give the people of Saskatchewan much credit for having good common sense, and I tell you people in Saskatchewan have good common sense. That's why people in Saskatchewan are now aware, and they're aware to the extent that this government should be calling an election. And when they do, they'll be removed by a resounding defeat in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — So I want to point out another — I don't know the parliamentary word to use, Mr. Speaker; it's difficult when can't use all of the words in the English language in this Chamber — but the misleading of Saskatchewan people, I suppose that's parliamentary enough, is that this government has said that the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is not doing well because of a glut on the world market.

Now I tried to dispel some of that just because of the Canadian production, the Canadian sales that have taken place from the province of Saskatchewan. But I don't want to rely on just that alone.

I want to look at the period between 1982 and 1988 of new potash that came into production during that period of six years. Now new production between 1982 and 19 — we might as well say 1989 — came onto production in larger quantities in at least four locations in the world, Mr. Speaker.

One was the province of Saskatchewan because of an expansion at the Lanigan potash mine, called Lanigan phase 2. Another location was in the province of New

Brunswick which brought a couple of new mines on. In fact, I believe it was their first two mines, two new mines that opened in New Brunswick. They increased production in Israel and they've increased production in Jordan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Lanigan phase 2 increased the productive capacity of that mine by about 1.9 million metric tonnes of KCl per year. And the Conservative government will tell people that, oh, it was the NDP that brought that on when there was a glut on the world market.

Well there are two betrayals of the truth there, Mr. Speaker. One happens to be is that the Conservative government approved to proceed with phase 2 of Lanigan. I admit that New Democrats in government wanted it. They wanted the expansion. We saw the possibilities on the world market, but when the election came in April of 1982, this government, especially the cabinet members, know very, very well they could have stopped the expansion of Lanigan phase 2.

It was their decision to proceed. It was a good decision. But the bad decision was, Mr. Speaker, is that this government refused to market potash from the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. They said to the private companies: look, we'll give you the upper hand; we'll let you make your profits; we'll let you maximize your profits, and we won't push very hard to compete against you, but we have to have the mines producing a bit because we want to keep people working — a less, significantly less number of people now than what there was prior to 1982.

But they didn't market the bloody potash. They gave someone else the upper hand, Mr. Speaker. So that's something about Lanigan phase 2: one, the government could have stopped it; and there was no glut on the world market, secondly.

Mr. Speaker, what about Israel? Israel's potash company is called the Dead Sea Works. It increased capacity during the period '82 to 1988 by half a million metric tonnes. And it is planning to bring onto stream another 300,000 more metric tonnes this very year, if it hasn't done so already. But the plan is for 1989, another 300,000 metric tonnes. And incidentally, if I'm not mistaken, I believe that the Dead Sea Works, Israel's potash company, exports 90 per cent of its production — 90 per cent of its production.

Now if there was a glut on the world market, Mr. Speaker, during the period '82 to 1988, how could a country like Israel, who has something like 20 per cent or more of their gross national product going into their army and their armed forces — a very serious situation there in the Middle East — if there was a glut on the world market, how in heaven's name could they put 90 per cent of their potash sales into the export market and at the same time increase by 800,000 metric tonnes of potash?

Mr. Speaker, we'd like the members opposite during this debate to stand up and answer some of those questions. But when they've had the opportunity, they don't answer those types of questions; they give their rhetoric. They

blame all the problems over the past six or eight years on New Democrats. None of it's our fault. Anyone who takes the time to study the record will know that this government has a legacy of mismanagement, a legacy of waste and patronage, and it's not washing well with people in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — It washes so poorly that the salinity off of these members opposite is stronger than the salinity that comes out of the Kalium chemical solution mine, which is a solution potash mine out towards Moose Jaw from Regina.

Now that's just Israel. What about Jordan? Now we know that Jordan and Israel aren't very close. In fact sometimes they fight a lot amongst each other. The Jordan Potash Company is called the Arab potash company. And what do you think happened between 1982 and 1988, Mr. Speaker? Jordan increased their production capacity — 1.3 million metric tonnes. So there you have two countries, Israel and Jordan, who spend a large, large amount of their gross national product on a war effort, or on military defence, however you want to describe it — both countries. And together during that period of time they increase their capacity by 2.1 million metric tonnes.

(1515)

An Hon. Member: — How does that break down again?. Break that down. How much did Jordan do?

Mr. Anguish: — Jordan doing 1.3 million metric tonnes; Dead Sea Works in Israel, 800,000 metric tonnes, at the same time as they're preoccupied with all kinds of problems to a greater magnitude than we've ever experienced.

Young people in Saskatchewan are lucky, Mr. Speaker, and I'd even include myself into the young people of Saskatchewan. People 40 years of age and under have never had to experience war in Canada, they've never had to go off to an armed conflict unless they were part of some UN peace-keeping force. Mr. Speaker, we've had a good life, an easy life in Canada in terms of that hardship.

Countries like Jordan and Israel have grown up with war. They've grown up with deep religious conflicts between them, which to . . . The heart of the troubles there seem to be religious differences to a large extent, the search for homelands, the want for more land, the dispute as to whose land is whose — border conflicts.

We haven't experienced that, Mr. Speaker, but we are in for similar experiences in terms of poverty and hunger and lack of housing, lack of opportunity, lack of education, lack of health care, lack of services. Why? Not because of being preoccupied by war, not because of being preoccupied by border conflicts, because we have a peaceful neighbour to the South. We've never had a border conflict in recent history.

Why? It's because Conservative governments are bent on privatizing all the revenue-generating tools that we have at our disposal, Mr. Speaker. Except for the

small-business people, the farmer, the wage earner, that's the only taxation base they want to have left. They don't want to use resources to the good and to the benefit of Saskatchewan people. We are a land that could be so much more, Mr. Speaker. We are a province that could be so much more. But this government seems to be bent on making us so much less than we are today, so much less than we are today. Why do they want to do that?

I guess the government believes in something ideologically different, Mr. Speaker. It can't be religion that causes them to do this. It can't be a lack of education that causes them to do this. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this government is so far out of touch with Saskatchewan people, they don't know what side of the potash mine is up and which side is down.

And I think it bears repeating again, Mr. Speaker, about another argument that this government uses, about the NDP buying empty holes in the ground. That's not an argument that washes any more, either, Mr. Speaker, not an argument that washes at all, because if they were empty holes in the ground, how could they have returned hundreds of millions of dollars in profits, hundreds of millions of dollars in revenue and taxation accruing to the people of the province; how could it have paid hundreds of millions of dollars in dividends — and it has. I've put those specific statistics on the record in previous days, Mr. Speaker. So how could people believe that there were empty holes in the ground and a waste of money?

The other argument that dispels that rhetoric by the Conservative members, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that by this Bill 20, the Act to privatize the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, they wish to sell shares — 55 per cent in Canada, not necessarily Saskatchewan, and 45 per cent foreign. Who in their right mind, Mr. Speaker, especially investors who study the market, they study the productivity, they study the economic evaluation, the analysis before they buy . . . They don't throw their money out and hope to get a return. They make wise investments with their money because they want to make profit; they want to maximize their returns.

Do you really think, Mr. Speaker, that this government would be able to bamboozle private investors to the extent that they could sell them shares to empty holes in the ground? False, Mr. Speaker, they can't do it. This government, even with their rhetoric, does not have the ability to bamboozle investors into buying empty holes in the ground, because they're not empty holes in the ground, they are potash mines that are productive, that have productive people working there, that have a chance to dominate and control the world market. And what does this government want to do? They want to give away the controlling interest — 45 per cent to foreign investors, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk just for a moment about New Brunswick, because during the period 1982 to 1988, New Brunswick had two new potash mines come onto stream. Denison built one potash mine and the Potash Company of America built the other mine. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the Government of New Brunswick had to give much incentive because those companies, Denison and the Potash Company of

America knew that the long-term outlook for potash is increasing, not decreasing.

If there ever is a glut on the world market, it is a very temporary glut on the world market and certainly does not affect sales. Because when you're into spending millions of dollars on mines, millions in marketing, a billion dollar industry in Saskatchewan alone, you don't look at the short term, you look at the long term. Because in the long term, potash will bring handsome rewards for Saskatchewan, as it will for New Brunswick, as it will for anyone who has a good productive capacity in potash regardless of where they are in the world.

But, Mr. Speaker, Denison and the Potash Company of America, in those two new mines that were brought on stream between '82 and '88, they have a capacity of 1.6 million metric tonnes — 1.6 million metric tonnes of potash. Now would they bring that on if it was true what this government said about the potash industry, that there was a glut on the world market? That glut on the world market, as they call it, brought sales of potash down drastically for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, but not private sector companies, Mr. Speaker. Those private sector companies did quite well.

And what do we see happening in 1988, Mr. Speaker? In 1988 the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan made a fairly good profit. They made a profit of \$106 million. And the reason they made a profit of \$106 million is because this government wanted to look good again because it had looked bad for so many years under their administration that they wouldn't be able to sell shares, likely, because people would start believing that maybe they were empty holes in the ground. If you repeat the rhetoric long enough, people might start believing the rhetoric and not buying the shares.

So they pushed a little sale of potash through the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, through Canpotex. They had a record year, and they made a profit of \$106 million, Mr. Speaker. That just shows something of the value of potash in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to just look a bit at the potash sales for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. The period of 1977 to 1981, the North American sales for potash were 0.8 million tonnes of KCl; 1978, 2.06 million tonnes of sales in North America, of KCl; 1979, 2.75 million tonnes of KCl; 1980, 2.45 million tonnes of KCl; in 1981, 2.11 million tonnes of KCl sold in North America. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a lot of potash to be sold in the North American market.

And you must remember, Mr. Speaker, that potash isn't sold to any large extent in Saskatchewan; farmers here don't use potash. So most of this . . . we're talking about an export market before free trade, but also, more importantly, before a Conservative government came into place in the province of Saskatchewan.

How about the offshore sales for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan? And now those first figures I gave you, Mr. Speaker — I'm not talking about all companies in total, I'm talking just about the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Offshore sales: 1977, 4.5 million tonnes of KCl sold; 1978, 1.22 million tonnes of KCl; 1979, 1.45 million tonnes of KCl; 1980, 1.96 million tonnes of KCl; 1981, 1.76 million tonnes of KCl. And you can see those sales, except for the odd glitch, were gradually going up, Mr. Speaker, and were gradually going up because of PCS Sales, and would have been going up even more if PCS International had come into place and not been dismantled by the Conservative government allowing Canpotex to give preference to private companies' potash. Unfair, Mr. Speaker. Totally unfair.

Now I think we should be aware of how much potash we're talking about in terms of total sales. In terms of Canadian producers, and remembering that Saskatchewan was the producer during this period of time . . . other mines that have come on in different places in the country since. I've pointed out the two in New Brunswick, Mr. Speaker, and that's the increased capacity. And of course Manitoba has a bit of potash there now as well that they're producing, and they've got some capability there.

But in 1977 total sales by Canadian producers of potash reached 9.31 million tonnes of KCl; 1978, 10.6 million tonnes of KCl; 1979, 11.73 million tonnes of KCl were sold; in 1980, 11.66 million tonnes; and in 1981, 10.39 million tonnes of KCl. That's total sales for Canadian producers. And during that period of time, we're basically talking about the province of Saskatchewan, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, working in harmony with the private companies that were here that wished to maintain their own operations. They were taxed accordingly; they were happy to remain and are still operating here.

And I see articles in the paper about the potash industry in Saskatchewan overjoyed with the government bringing in this Bill 20, a Bill to privatize the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Well of course they're overjoyed, Mr. Speaker, because the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan as a public revenue producing Crown was a very tough competitor — tough competitor in the North American market, tough competitor in the offshore market. And most of all, they had no reason in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to deceive the government or the people of Saskatchewan, which is one and the same.

(1530)

If there is not publicly owned Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, we go back to the period of the 1960s when we don't know what's happening in the industry, because the industry will not tell the government what their profits are, what their production capabilities are, how much they're going to produce, what their plans are to the future.

But as long as we have the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, we have, so to speak, a window on the industry so that people in Saskatchewan know with honesty and with integrity and a sense of value to the province what is happening, what is capable of happening in the potash industry in the province of

Saskatchewan.

And for that reason even alone, Mr. Speaker, this government should not be selling off the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to foreign interests to the magnitude of 45 per cent, which would be a controlling interest in a company as large as the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — I just want to speak a bit more about PCS International, Mr. Speaker. In September of 1981, PCS International was established as a fourth subsidiary designed to meet the needs of offshore customers. Edmond Price was appointed vice-president of marketing of the new subsidiary. Mr. Price was a well-known person in the industrial fertilizer markets and had extensive experience in potash marketing. And he worked with a team of people — again I stress that — a team of people within the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, discussions were held with all major customers in the offshore potash markets. In a period of six months, the PCS International would be an active player in the selection and appointment of representatives and the finalization of contracts with buyers in all established overseas markets. A marketing team was being assembled in Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker, and again I stress, in Saskatoon. I'm not talking about Chicago or Augusta or Atlanta or some other place within the world, I'm talking about establish in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

It was being assembled in Saskatoon to cover the principal market regions of Asia, Latin America, Oceania, and Africa. It was backed by supplying all grades of potash from the five producing divisions of PCS mining.

As well as the PCS transportation delivery system, PCS International was to offer to customers a reliable, competitive, and comprehensive service, all made in Saskatchewan, done in Saskatchewan, for Saskatchewan people's interests, to supply an international need to produce more food through the use of potash in areas of the world where they require food to feed their people. Well the potash will still get there, I'm sure, but I'm not sure it will be as competitive and as comprehensive and as sure.

But, Mr. Speaker, the losers will be the people of Saskatchewan, the people of Saskatchewan who relied on the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to provide a good level of revenue, a number of jobs, and pride in the province of Saskatchewan. And this government wants to take all of that away, Mr. Speaker. It's unbelievable, unbelievable, Mr. Speaker.

Now I want to talk about a few other things, Mr. Speaker, in terms of who's in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan now. When my leader spoke at the initial stages of second reading on Bill 20, he thought that there may be a conspiracy between the PC government and the private potash companies. If there isn't, Mr. Speaker, we'd like the members of the government side to tell us why PCS would be reducing its production levels, why is

it firing workers, and why is it closing down production capacity of its mines, while at the same time the private potash companies in the province of Saskatchewan have maintained their production levels.

The government closes the PCS Cory mine, throwing hundreds of workers out of work, and hardship on families and children — very, very hard. A hard decision by crass people, and using the reason for there being a glut on the world market. We pointed out that myth about the glut on the world market.

And at the same this was happening, could you explain, you members opposite, why the Potash Company of America invests at the same time millions of dollars to convert its Patience Lake mine near Saskatoon from a conventional mine to a solution processed mine so it can reopen. If there was a glut on the world market, the Potash Company of America would be investing its money elsewhere, not in Saskatchewan, converting an old shaft mine into a solution mine, Mr. Speaker.

Those are facts. Those are also questions that we ask the members opposite when they get up to speak. We want those members there to address those concerns and explain up front to Saskatchewan people why they're doing what they're doing.

Our sources in the industry tell us, Mr. Speaker, that in 1988 the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan was operating at 67 per cent of capacity, while the private potash producers of Saskatchewan were operating at 88 per cent capacity. That's what I talked about earlier, Mr. Speaker. There's a great deal of aggressivity in the private sector, but they're not aggressive at all in terms of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. I guess they don't believe in Saskatchewan people. They think they have to get some Americans or somebody from another place in the world that is an expert to make things work better. You see private producers benefit and the potash corporation people of Saskatchewan lose, Mr. Speaker, because of a heartless, ruthless Tory government.

Mr. Speaker, about individuals in the potash industry. The president of our public potash company, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, is Mr. Chuck Childers of the United States. Used to be Mr. David Dombowsky, a Saskatchewan person, Saskatchewan background, pride in Saskatchewan, pride in his team at the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, pride in what was happening, with vision to the future in the wealth and the resources of this province. But because the New Democrats had hired him, this government had to fire him. Just like **The Globe and Mail** reported, it must be revenge of the nerds, Mr. Speaker.

So what do they do? They hire Chuck Childers of the United States. He is a former executive from IMC, International Minerals. It's the biggest private sector competitor in the province of Saskatchewan. Now why on earth would someone do that? Why on earth would someone bring in a former executive, directly from IMC, to run our firm, and they're the biggest private sector competitor in the province of Saskatchewan?

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, it's to keep the publicly owned

potash sales and production down to allow the private sector firms to be more buoyant and more prosperous, increase their capacity, and increase their profits at the expense of Saskatchewan people and the burden that will be created for Saskatchewan taxpayers, not International Minerals, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at the president of PCS Sales. PCS Sales is a man by the name of Mr. Bill Doyle of the United States. And guess where he worked before coming to PCS Sales, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: — Where was Bill at?

Mr. Anguish: — Well I'll tell you where Bill was at. Bill was a former senior executive of International Minerals, a company out of Chicago, our biggest private sector competitor in the potash industry in the province of Saskatchewan. Two top executives, Mr. Speaker, two top executives from United States of America, both from the same company, to run our Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan which used to be run by Saskatchewan people.

Facts, Mr. Speaker — facts of today, facts of yesterday — are that it was profitable. It ran by Saskatchewan people, it was the pride of Saskatchewan people. It was a Saskatchewan team operating on international markets, in international circles, on an international stage, as a major, major player, Mr. Speaker.

Now what do we have? Those Saskatchewan people are gone. This government seems intent on bringing into place people from International Minerals to run our potash corporation. I maintain they're running it into the ground, Mr. Speaker.

Do you know where Mr. Doyle in fact runs PCS Sales out of, Mr. Speaker? Do you know the answer to that? Mr. Speaker, Bill Doyle runs PCS Sales out of Chicago. Its head office, Mr. Speaker, used to be in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan — not Chicago, not New York, not Tokyo, not Hong Kong. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. Now it's in Chicago; head office in Chicago.

And the sell-off that they want to do of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan hasn't even been completed yet — hasn't been completed yet. And we tell you, Mr. Speaker, as long as I have anything to do about it, as long as I'm around this province I'll do everything I can to stop the insanity and the obsession of this Conservative government with privatization — privatization of the SaskEnergy, privatization of SaskPower, privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, people in Saskatchewan say they've gone too far and they must be stopped. If they're not stopped, Mr. Speaker, there won't be anything left.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, still on the personnel within the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, I note that the vice-president in charge of human resources for PCS is another former executive of International Minerals out of Chicago. Former executive of IMC is now vice-president

in charge of human resources for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Well human resources, Mr. Speaker, is something that is very intricate in dealing with the team, the team of Saskatchewan people. Why do we need an executive member from IMC, a president, a vice-president from IMC, somebody in charge of PCS Sales from IMC — why would we need those people to run the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan? Since they've been running it, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan has been going downhill.

When Saskatchewan people were in charge of the potash corporation, they were a Saskatchewan team. They made money every single year when Saskatchewan people ran it. They made money and profits for people and services in the Government of Saskatchewan. What's wrong with those Saskatchewan people, Saskatchewan people working in a Saskatchewan head office that have been sold out and betrayed by a Conservative government at our expense, Mr. Speaker?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Now I also understand that it goes on from there. The notes that I've had researched say that the current head of Canpotex, the agency that sells all Saskatchewan potash overseas, is Mr. Eric Ekedahl, a former executive of . . . Do you want to know where he's from? A former executive of International Minerals out of Chicago — IMC.

(1545)

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the members opposite on the government side are starting to get a picture of what's happening. I wonder why the back bench members don't ask the cabinet, just wait a minute, what the heck's going on here? Why are Saskatchewan men and women not good enough to run the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Are you ashamed of Saskatchewan people? Are you proud of people from Chicago coming in and taking away jobs from Saskatchewan people while running down the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan?

Now, Mr. Speaker, we challenge the members opposite to answer these questions. We wish to point out other items in this debate on Bill 20.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that there is a special order on today at 3:45, and rather than getting into more items on this debate, I would move that we now adjourn the debate on Bill 20 — An Act to reorganize the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh you're not ready to adjourn?

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that motion. I understood that there was a special order on at 3:45, and in a sign of co-operation with the House I was going to move for adjournment of this debate. But if this debate is still going to continue, I have other things that I want to put onto the

record.

Mr. Speaker, many people throughout Saskatchewan have asked me personally to do whatever we can to stop the obsession and the wrongful thrust by the government to privatize everything that's in the public sector that we have relied on in the past. They've asked me to stop the government, to make them listen. And we've done that, Mr. Speaker, during the SaskEnergy Bill.

We left this legislature and we went out over a period of two weeks, talking to Saskatchewan people. And they gave an overwhelming response. By current . . . to date, I believe there is in excess of 100,000 names on petitions. There are many people who have written letters. There are many people who have made phone calls. And I'm sure, sir, that many of the back bench members and the cabinet members have also heard from their constituents, that there's something wrong with what they're doing.

Well I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that we came back into the legislature last Monday for a number of reasons. One was that we didn't want to cause hardship on Saskatchewan people. And this government, because of their obsession with privatization, has not dealt with the budget for the current year. There's a procedure called interim supply that governments or legislatures use when budgets aren't approved, and we came into the legislature to approve an interim supply Bill for a period of spending.

And as of May 12, I believe it was, the government would have virtually been broke. They couldn't have paid bills to hospital boards and school boards and others, and we thought it was unfair at that point, because we had heard long and clear and loudly from Saskatchewan people that privatization in Saskatchewan must be stopped.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we came back in to approve the interim supply Bill. Some people had asked, well why an interim supply Bill? Why don't we just let them run special warrants like they did back in 1987 when they never called the legislature until, I believe, it was June 17, well past the end of the fiscal year. The end of the fiscal year is March 31, '87. They never called the legislature in till June 17.

But what many people didn't realize is government can't operate by special warrants. Special warrants are done by cabinet in the isolation of the Executive Council. But when the legislature's in session, as it was during the bell-ringing episode, they couldn't pass special warrants because the legislature was in session. So firstly we came back in because we did not want hardship to be inflicted on Saskatchewan people by the Conservative government.

Secondly, we were successful. We had a resounding victory in terms of making this government withdraw the Bill to reorganize the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, the sell-off of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, and that Bill is no longer before this legislature.

They have the capability to bring it back in, Mr. Speaker. They have the capability to bring it back in. The member from Meadow Lake says it's not true. It's true to the extent

that it's not being debated. It's passed through first reading, but, Mr. Speaker, that Bill is not currently before us in the legislature, but they continue with privatization. Now it's Bill 20, Bill 20 on privatization.

So the second reason was that we had that victory; that we wanted to come back in and declare that Saskatchewan people, yes, we heard you. And the third reason was we wanted to come back in with tens of thousands of names which were gathered. In less than two weeks there were over 50,000 names on petitions; by this time, there's over 100,000.

So the third reason was, Mr. Speaker, we wanted to come back in this legislature to table at least 50,000 petitions to say to this Conservative government that Saskatchewan people are speaking to you; Saskatchewan people are saying that we do not want the Progressive Conservative government to proceed with the privatization of our utilities.

We also heard loud and clear that there were other issues. The focus, certainly during that time, was on the SaskEnergy Bill — the privatization of SaskPower, the destruction of a utility that both the Premier and Deputy Premier had promised would never be privatized in the province of Saskatchewan.

But there were other issues that cropped up, issues that people didn't want the potash corporation being privatized either, because they understood the returns that we had received since 1976. And as the people in the province become more and more aware of what Bill 1 means, they will want us to stop that Bill at any means we have at our disposal, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, the members need to be aware that Bill 1 is a Bill dealing with privatization. In fact it's the first Bill that was brought in by this government when the session came in, and that Bill gives overwhelming power, new and unusual power, to the cabinet members. If they want to sell off a Saskatchewan asset any more, they don't have to come before this legislature if this Bill passes, Bill 1; they don't have to ask their caucus; they don't have to ask the opposition; they don't have to ask the Saskatchewan people; they don't even have to ask this legislature, Mr. Speaker. They can just go ahead and sell everything in the province of Saskatchewan.

Behind the closed doors of the cabinet meeting, the Executive Council, those few members that sit on the front benches of the Conservative Party here in this Legislative Assembly can take all that power, they can take away all that democracy from the province of Saskatchewan and sell every public asset in the province. Privatization in private, Mr. Speaker, is what we call it.

Now we want people in Saskatchewan also to be aware of the stages that these Bills all have to go through, Mr. Speaker. They seem intent right now on continuing the debate on the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Now Bills get introduced, Mr. Speaker, and Bill 20, the Bill before us now, was brought in at first reading and there

was no debate.

The next stage, the stage that we're at right now, Mr. Speaker, is called second reading, and at second reading there's substantial debate. And I would recommend to those people in Saskatchewan who follow the legislature and what happens by this process, would refer to my leader's speech of April 19 and April 20 on second reading of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — It is one of the most informative presentations I've ever seen on the potash industry in the province of Saskatchewan. It lays out the history, Mr. Speaker, it lays out the dilemma of not only the New Democrats in the early '70s, but also the Liberals. It lays out the situation in the debates of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan coming into being. It talks about the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan's success and the proud workings and the pride that Saskatchewan workers and Saskatchewan people had in the potash corporation, and it pointed out the proud history of the potash corporation. And sadly enough, the speech also pointed out the demise of the potash corporation under this government, the Progressive Conservative government in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

And I would encourage people in this province to phone in to our caucus office at 787-1911 and ask for a copy of the speech of the Leader of the Opposition on Bill 20, the privatization Bill on Sask potash.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — That number, Mr. Speaker, was 787-1911. Now that's only on second reading, Mr. Speaker. The next stage that Bill 20 would normally go to would be the committee stage. In Committee of the Whole, this whole House in committee will study Bill 20 clause by clause. And we intend to bring expert testimony before Committee of the Whole to point out the benefit of Saskatchewan potash to Saskatchewan people and how this government is destroying a history and a future for the province to provide us with substantial revenues for the service of Saskatchewan people, by selling off and dismantling a Saskatchewan company run by Saskatchewan people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — When dealing with expert testimony, Mr. Speaker . . .

The Speaker: — According to previous arrangements, I now interrupt the proceedings. I am informed that His Excellency Wan Li is now here to address the Assembly.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

The Speaker: — It is a privilege for me to introduce to this Assembly some distinguished visitors from China: His Excellency, Wan Li, chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China, and Mrs. Wan.

I also want to introduce other special guests who are accompanying Mr. Wan Li: His Excellency Mr. Zhang, Ambassador to Canada from the People's Republic of China, and Mrs. Zhang; Mr. Cao, Deputy of the National People's Congress; Mr. Zhi, Vice-minister of Foreign Affairs; and Mr. Gu, member of the Standing Committee.

I wish also to welcome from Ottawa, the Hon. Andrée Champagne, MP, assistant deputy chairperson of the Committee of the Whole House.

It is an honour for the members of this Assembly to be addressed by His Excellency Wan Li, a most distinguished legislator. Will you please welcome our guests to this Assembly.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of all the colleagues, my colleagues in the Legislative Assembly, and I'm sure I can speak for not only this side but both sides of the House, and I believe the Leader of the Opposition will extend his welcome, indeed all the people of Saskatchewan welcome His Honour, and it's my honour to welcome with the support and hospitality that we can find here in the province, His Excellency Mr. Wan Li and Mrs. Wan to our province and to these legislative chambers.

Mr. Wan Li is the Chairman of the People's Congress, and only in a few times in our history have we had the privilege to welcome such a distinguished visitor to the very heart of our government and to the democratic process here to address the Assembly and the citizens of Saskatchewan, and indeed all of Canada. Today we are honoured that His Excellency has accepted our invitation to speak to us all here in this Assembly.

I was hosted by Mr. Wan Li when I was in Beijing, and we talked about many things, and obviously the extensive two-way communication and trade that we have between the province of Saskatchewan and Canada and the People's Republic of China and our sister province, the Jilin province.

And we've just had a delegation return, and our discussions with respect to distance education, computerized literacy training, grain handling and storage equipment, telecommunications, hogs and beef production, apple-pear production in the province of Saskatchewan, co-productions of films and the film industry, as well as our extensive trade in wheat and potash, were many things that we agreed we had in common, and we look forward to an even better relationship.

The twinning agreement that we have between the province of Jilin and the province of Saskatchewan has deepened our mutual understanding, and it's promoted enhanced trade contracts between the province and our country. In fact, our trade from the province of Saskatchewan and China has increased from about \$400 million in 1982 to 1.2 billion in 1988. We have a very, very unique relationship in agriculture, in trade, in education, in industry, in science and technology.

Mr. Wan Li, it's a pleasure, Your Excellency, to have you here. Mr. Wan Li is an avid tennis player. He is also an excellent bridge player, and he's noted in China for introducing and supporting sports to young people all over the People's Republic of China, particularly at the level of the Olympics. He has been active in political life for decades and decades in the People's Republic of China and is well respected and certainly loved.

It is my distinct pleasure, personal pleasure, to welcome Mr. Wan Li and his wife and his delegation to the province of Saskatchewan and to this Assembly. Welcome.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I join with the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan on behalf of the official opposition to welcome the honoured guest, His Excellency Wan Li and Mrs. Wan and the delegation that we have to the Saskatchewan legislature today.

As the Premier has pointed out, throughout the years the people of the province of Saskatchewan have been working very hard to build close ties and enduring ties between the People's Republic of China, the people of Canada, and the province of Saskatchewan. And your visit today, sir, symbolizes the success of that ongoing historical effort.

I might add on a personal note that I had the opportunity and the privilege of visiting China in 1979 in a non-governmental delegation of about 20 people, led by a former premier of our province, the late Tommy Douglas. Your government at that time was involved in its modernizations program, and I was very much taken by the beauty of the country and the drive and the dedication of the people. And the program from what one can see and read seems to be indeed progressing well.

Today, as a result of all those efforts, we enjoy a more successful trading relationship. And as the Premier has pointed out, I think the future can only hold greater promise for even more success in areas ranging from education, cultural exchanges, new technology. These all will work to develop a lasting and mutually beneficial relationship. As everybody knows, His Excellency is also going to be receiving an honorary degree, Mr. Speaker, on his visit here. Let me, sir, take this opportunity to offer to you our heartfelt congratulations with respect to the honorary degree that you'll be getting from the University of Regina tomorrow.

On behalf of my colleagues, permit me to welcome you again to Saskatchewan, and may you see in this province the kind of beauty that I was privileged to see in your country during my travels there. Thank you very much.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by my seat mate, the member from Melville, that by leave of the Assembly:

That this Assembly do now adjourn in order to

hear the address of our distinguished guest, His Excellency Wan Li, Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China.

Leave granted.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:01 p.m.