

**AFTERNOON SITTING**

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

**Mr. Upshall:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to the Assembly, two special guests seated in your gallery. They are Mr. Derek Fox and his wife Viola Braun-Fox. Derek is the Agriculture critic and the Deputy House Leader in the opposition in the province of Alberta. He is the member for Vegreville. I hope he and his wife enjoy the proceedings here today, and I would like all members to welcome them.

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

**ORAL QUESTIONS**

**Compensation to Investors re Principal Trust**

**Mr. Calvert:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today, Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Premier. Mr. Premier, this morning your colleague in Alberta, Premier Don Getty, announced the compensation package that will be paid to the investors of Principal Trust. Mr. Premier, what he has announced as you will know is that the depositors in Saskatchewan will receive either 18 cents on the dollar or 15 cents on the dollar, depending on which firm they had their money in, bringing the total up, sir, to 75 cents on the dollar.

Mr. Premier, given that your government compensated those who lost money in Alberta in the Pioneer collapse; given that your government ensured that they were compensated up to 100 per cent of their investment, do you think it's fair that your colleague in Alberta is only compensating up to 75 per cent?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — It is, Mr. Speaker, our government's position, and it has been since the collapse of the respective Principal companies, that Alberta should make the full compensation. We haven't changed our position.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, I will again address my question to the Premier, given that it was the Premier of Alberta who expressed the actions of the Alberta government this morning; I will again direct my question to the Premier.

Your Minister of Finance says your position is that the Alberta government should compensate the Saskatchewan investors up to 100 per cent. What, sir, have you done about it, then, to ensure that this will happen?

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

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — We have expressed to the Alberta government our position on numerous occasions, that they should fully compensate the investors.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Well, Mr. Minister, apparently whatever

you've done wasn't good enough, Mr. Minister, Mr. Premier, Mr. Minister of Finance, what do you intend to do from this day forward to ensure that the Alberta government compensates Saskatchewan investors to 100 per cent, just as you did with Alberta investors in regard to the Pioneer collapse?

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

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Well I don't know who's feeding the questions. My understanding is that the NDP in Alberta said don't give anybody else anything. So we've certainly taken the position that we did rely on the province of Alberta, as did other provinces, and our position has not changed.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, my question was very simple. I'll put it to you again. What do you intend to do about this?

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

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — We've indicated our position, and we have communicated, and we will again raise it with the province of Alberta. If you have taken the time to read Premier Getty's statement, Alberta indicates they will pursue this with other governments. Saskatchewan's position will be quite clear that we did rely on Alberta, and Alberta should compensate 100 per cent.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, will you table in this House your correspondence, your communications with the government of Alberta in this regard?

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

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Well certainly we will get the information for the hon. member and indicate . . . I'm advised that there have been numerous discussions again, as well, not only at the ministerial but at the officials' level as well, so we'll have to pull that information.

**Call for Resignation of Minister**

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question again, this time to the Premier. And I specifically address this to the Premier because, Mr. Premier, in Alberta the Premier of the province now has admitted that his government fouled up in this whole matter. He's expressed their negligence in his statements this morning and his actions this morning, and part of what he has done, sir, is to remove Mrs. Osterman from cabinet. And that of course was the correct thing to do.

Sir, will you inform the House today whether you have now demanded or have received from the minister of consumer and commercial affairs at that time, the member from Maple Creek. Have you demanded or received her resignation this day?

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

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — No, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, supplementary. Mr. Speaker, my quick supplementary then is why, Mr. Premier, why? When your minister of consumer and commercial affairs licensed the companies in this province, why is she not now negligent, as the minister has been shown in Alberta?

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

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Finance said, that we hold that Alberta should pay 100 per cent compensation, and the minister here has acted appropriately, and Alberta has admitted that in fact the mistakes were made there.

### Cut-off of Power Supply

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, I took notice of a question yesterday from the member for Quill Lakes on two electric accounts at SaskPower. One of them was dealing, Mr. Speaker, with a farmer in the constituency of Quill Lakes. And I should point out that the member for Quill Lakes called my office at 9:30 yesterday morning and was told prior to his grandstanding exercise in the House yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that SaskPower would, in fact, try to work out an agreement with these people.

But the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, of this farmer in the Quill Lakes constituency is that they have not had their power cut off. They have not had their power cut off, Mr. Speaker. They are in arrears, Mr. Speaker; this account is in arrears to the tune of about \$48,000 — or \$4,800, I'm sorry — and, Mr. Speaker, the degree of arrears is seven to eight months, Mr. Speaker — seven to eight months, SaskPower has agreed, Mr. Speaker, to meet with these people and work out some arrangement to take care of that arrears, Mr. Speaker.

The second account, Mr. Speaker, that the member brought up in his grandstanding exercise yesterday, was a restaurant in Regina, Mr. Speaker. This restaurant was a new account to SaskPower in December of last year. The first bill was sent out, Mr. Speaker, the first bill was sent out in January of this year. There has been one payment of \$250 on that account, Mr. Speaker. The approximate balance outstanding is \$6,000.

There was an agreement made a short time ago, Mr. Speaker, between the owner of that account and SaskPower to have some orderly arrangement, Mr. Speaker, to cover off the arrears. The agreement was not met; there was not one payment made under that agreement, Mr. Speaker. SaskPower on Monday or Tuesday cut the power off. Today, Mr. Speaker, they have that customer in, working out another arrangement to cover off the arrears, I think an eminently reasonable process, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Koskie:** — I'd like to direct a question to the Deputy

Premier. Mr. Deputy Premier, I want to say that the business man in which the problem with SaskPower, phoned in today and thanked us for raising it, because he could get no communication with SaskPower to make an arrangement.

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

**Mr. Koskie:** — I want also to clarify, Mr. Deputy Premier, that in respect to the farmer, I did contact your office at 9:30, and not a single contact has been made with the farmer. And as I indicated, August 1 is approaching. They have 12,000 broilers, 75 dairy herd, and they are in a crisis because . . . the farmer's wife just finished phoning me saying absolutely nothing, no contact has been made to advise them that their broilers and their cattle in fact will be protected. I ask you, have you made an arrangement, have you communicated it to the farmer as you have alluded to in the House?

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

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, the office of the member from Quill Lakes contacted my office at 9:30 yesterday — 9:30 yesterday — at which time he was told, Mr. Speaker, at which time he was told that SaskPower would be contacting these people to make arrangements to cover off the arrears. What those arrangements would be, I don't know, and I'm not the guy that makes the phone call.

He tells me that the customer, the restaurant customer from Regina contacted him this morning and thanked him, and thanked him, Mr. Speaker. I'm not entirely sure that I will take that as gospel. Mr. Speaker, I may well contact the restaurant owner myself to see whether in fact that phone call did take place.

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

**Mr. Koskie:** — A new question to the Deputy Premier. Mr. Deputy Premier, you know the crisis that exists in rural Saskatchewan — 11,132 notices of foreclosure. Those were the statistics that were released — 10,132 foreclosure notices. That's the statistics. And the crisis in agriculture is there. Here is a farmer who absolutely depends upon his operation for power. I ask you: have you communicated to this date with that farmer? Have you worked out an arrangement?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — The Pinocchio mentality of members opposite, Mr. Speaker, boggles my mind. He's got the Leader of the Opposition talking about 10,000 foreclosure notices; now he's talking about 11,000-and-how-many. In fact, it's something like 2,600 or 4,600 or something.

I mean, Mr. Speaker, they couldn't recognize a fact if they tripped over it, Mr. Speaker. And we don't have to apologize, Mr. Speaker, for the support that this government has given agriculture in Saskatchewan — in no way, shape, or form.

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

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — If you contrast, Mr. Speaker, the

programs that this government has put in place in support of agriculture with the lack of even an understanding for the agricultural sector by members opposite . . . At a time when interest rates were running at 22 per cent, Mr. Speaker, they sat there . . . Oh yes, they had land bank. They were gobbling up the farmers' land. And that's all they had, Mr. Speaker.

And now he's trying to suggest that it's right for all customers of SaskPower to be in arrears up to six months, \$6,000, and make no payment and expect SaskPower and the rest of the paying customers, Mr. Speaker, to carry them at no cost. The system doesn't work that way.

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

**Mr. Koskie:** — A further question to the Deputy Premier. Mr. Deputy Premier, the farmers are in trouble because of your agricultural policy, or lack thereof. That's the truth of the matter.

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

**Mr. Koskie:** — And I say that this farmer and his family that are working hard, diversifying as the Premier is calling upon them to do under his policies, they may have arrears with power. But what I asked you, will you give a commitment that by the end of the day that you will contact these people so they can rest assured that they will have power and not have all of their 12,000 broilers destroyed, and also their dairy herd?

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

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, my guess is that had it not been for the agricultural policy of this government, Mr. Speaker, the member's friend from Quill Lakes would have a lot more company in the difficulty that he faces today — a lot more company.

That member doesn't recognize that the real problems in agriculture come from drought, come from prices, come from international grain wars, but I don't expect members opposite to understand that, Mr. Speaker. They know nothing of agriculture or agriculture policy. They're midgets in that field, Mr. Speaker.

As it relates to his friend from Quill Lakes, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that before the day is out someone from SaskPower, assuming they're available, someone at SaskPower will be talking to the family at Quill Lake.

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

**Mr. Koskie:** — One final question to the Deputy Premier. Mr. Deputy Premier, you exposed here the total amount of debt of one farmer that has a problem. He is dealing with the Department of Agriculture with ACS. There's no regulations for restructuring of debt. That is his problem, and they can't meet the commitment to restructure the debt because there's no regulations for the restructuring of it.

I ask you, Mr. Deputy Premier, in light of the fact that the burden rests with the Premier for inaction on agricultural policies, will you apologize to the farmer in Quill Lakes

who here publicly you start exposing his financial difficulties of \$4,800 in respect to it? I didn't expose the total amount. I indicated that there was a problem; I asked you to solve it, not to run at the farmer.

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

**The Speaker:** — I'm going to have to ask the Deputy Premier to withdraw the remark he just directed to the member from Quill Lake.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the remark unequivocally that the member for Quill Lakes exposed his stupidity, Mr. Speaker, and I withdraw and apologize.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Would the hon. member withdraw the remark with no equivocation, and we'll carry on with the rest of . . .

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Without equivocation, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw and apologize.

Now to answer the question, Mr. Speaker, that member and the degree of hypocrisy displayed by that member in his last question is immeasurable, Mr. Speaker, immeasurable. That member yesterday at 9:30 talked to my office, got the assurance, Mr. Speaker, that SaskPower would be in touch with this customer and work out some arrangement. Then what does he do, Mr. Speaker? At 1 o'clock he is the guy that brings it into the floor of the House and does his grandstanding, Mr. Speaker, and alleges that SaskPower, SaskPower in some way have behaved inappropriately in this matter.

And I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that in the circumstances SaskPower has behaved in a very tolerant way, Mr. Speaker, and a very patient way. And they are willing to do more, Mr. Speaker, willing to do more. They are prepared to go out there and help that member's constituent, Mr. Speaker, work out some system to work off these arrears, Mr. Speaker. I think that is eminently reasonable.

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

**Mr. Koskie:** — A final question to the Deputy Premier. Mr. Deputy Premier, I phoned at 9:30, there's a crisis on that farm in respect to knowing whether anything is going to be done. The lady on that farm, the housewife, phoned here today at noon and said: my husband is desperate; I need assistance; I have nowhere else to turn. Mr. Koskie, will you see if you can get immediate response and contact with SPC in order to alleviate the crisis that we're facing here on the farm?

I ask you: what is the delay? Why haven't you attended to it? Why haven't you contacted them?

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

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Let us allow the Deputy Premier to . . . Would the hon. members come to order. Come to order!

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this account is seven to eight months in arrears — seven to eight months in arrears. That member, Mr. Speaker, waited seven or eight months — seven or eight months. I mean, my heavens, how long does it take that member to wake up to realize that there is a problem? Is he representing his constituent or not?

So he phones my office at 9:30 yesterday morning; he got the assurance that it would be looked after, Mr. Speaker. And I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, SaskPower doesn't take these things lightly. SaskPower has worked and worked and worked to try and work out some arrangement with accounts like this. Now in the areas where there's been co-operation, it seems to just work okay. In this case there seems to be no co-operation and so it got to the point where it got to.

But I didn't bring it into the House, Mr. Speaker. That member brought it into the House. And I think that the farmer from Quill Lakes, Mr. Speaker, should thank that member for bringing this to the level that it's got to. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that SaskPower will be out there to work out arrangements with that farmer.

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

**Mr. Koskie:** — Further question to the Deputy Premier. Mr. Deputy Premier, I know you're obsessed and occupied with GigaText, and I know that the president of the power corporation is obsessed with privatization.

I want to relate to you, Mr. Deputy Premier, that these farmers have been working and attempting to get a solution, and in desperation . . . they could get no arrangement worked out and they came to me and asked me to take it. I did as soon as possible, and I expected, Mr. Deputy Premier, that in the light of the seriousness of the problem confronting you that you would have acted immediately rather than running at the farmer.

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

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, two things. Two things, Mr. Speaker. The power has not been cut off — that's number one. The second thing, Mr. Speaker, is it did not have to come to this House. The only reason it came to this House, because the work was already being done to work out the arrangement . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well there is, Mr. Speaker.

The only reason that it came to this House, Mr. Speaker, was for that member to grandstand. Mr. Speaker, for that member grandstand and try to score some cheap political point. And it's also, Mr. Speaker, an indication of the depth of research that goes on on that side of the House, because they've obviously run out of questions.

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

### Grain Transportation Rate

**Mr. Upshall:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture, the Premier, Mr. Premier, you'll know earlier this spring the federal

government by order in council set the grain transportation rate at \$9 a ton, a 22 per cent increase over last year. Even in the light of the fact that the national transportation authority set the rate, or recommended the rate, the government's own body recommended the rate be \$6.79 a tonne less than the previous year — a full 33 per cent over what the rate is now.

Mr. Minister, will you tell this House what representation you made to the federal government to let them know that that was unacceptable, that the farmers of this province with the good example we've just heard cannot afford these unnecessary increases?

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

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, we made representation to the federal government, the results of which are evident today, and certainly with about a billion dollars in payment coming out to the province of Saskatchewan and the prairie provinces where we get almost 50 per cent, which will mean 4 to \$500 million in cash coming from the federal government . . .

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

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — . . . which, Mr. Speaker, is not something that is a loan. It does not have to be paid back. It is cash that comes into the province of Saskatchewan — 4 to \$500 million. And that's the kind of representation we've been making.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the deficiency payments, we received in the neighbourhood of the same amount of money, another 4 to \$500 million that could come out to Saskatchewan farmers. In the last few years the average farmer has received in the neighbourhood of \$100,000 in cash, in interest rate protection, in various kinds of cash advances, in money that goes directly into their pockets — it doesn't have to be paid back. It's the largest support in the history of Canada for agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan from both the federal government and the provincial government, Mr. Speaker, and we will continue to make that very sound representation.

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

**Mr. Upshall:** — New question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, you're allowing the burden in this province to be shifted from the federal government onto the backs of Saskatchewan farmers who cannot afford it. In fact, this will cost Saskatchewan farmers \$62 million more this year, \$72 million more than it would have been if the rate would have been set at the NTA (National Transportation Act) levy — \$72 million more.

Mr. Minister, will you, when you meet your federal counterpart in Prince Albert early next week, will you make representation to him to tell him to reverse this increase and go with the NTA recommended rate before the beginning of the crop year? Will you do that?

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

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't buy the hon.

member's number of \$62 million, and I would appreciate it if he'd table his analysis there because if you look at the amount of grain that was marketed out of the province of Saskatchewan, either he's got a lot bigger numbers than the farmers do or else he's making this up, because you will not find it's that kind of cost.

Mr. Speaker, I will say to the hon. member, we are providing cash to farmers from the provincial government and from the federal government in very large amounts. We know that the capacity of farmers to carry themselves when you face high interest rates, or drought, or \$2 wheat, or international subsidies is difficult; that's why we put together literally billions of dollars in cash to help people.

The hon. member talks about transportation. We have not had a transportation problem in this last year because we haven't had the grain to market. I think he's missed the boat on this one, because if he was really concerned he'd be talking about cash in their pockets, not transportation costs on grain — there isn't any grain to market, Mr. Speaker.

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

**The Speaker:** — Order, order.

At this morning's proceedings, we had called orders of the day. We now move to government orders.

## 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.

**The Speaker:** — I will be recognizing the member from Moose Jaw South to speak, unless the member from Weyburn wishes to raise another issue.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to again participate in this very historic debate, the debate that would have the government opposite attempting to sell off the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to people, to corporations, to governments far removed from this province.

Mr. Speaker, this is the Bill designed to put into private hands this great public asset, this great public asset that has so well served the people of Saskatchewan, and in future could serve this province and our people for generations and generations yet to come, Mr. Speaker.

And the government opposite, through Bill No. 20, want to place this great asset into the hands primarily of people who don't even live in the province of Saskatchewan, to put this corporation and its assets and to put control, therefore, of this resource, this vast resource of potash, into the hands of the

few.

And, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House object. Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House could never support taking this great asset now in the hands of the many and putting it into the hands of the few. Selling it off, selling it off. Mr. Speaker, I've had opportunity to participate in this debate and I'm thankful for that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, at the very outset of my remarks I encouraged members opposite to join in the debate, and I see that the Minister of Education will want to do that at some point today. I was given an indication this morning that the minister from Regina South also wants to participate, and other members opposite. And, Mr. Speaker, I will be taking my place at some point, and I will look forward to the interventions.

**An Hon. Member:** — Please don't.

**Mr. Calvert:** — The Minister of Finance asks me not to take my place. He might encourage me to continue longer.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of the debate and the points that I have tried to raise, I would like to, by way of summary, just touch on those points briefly. Again, if you will permit, by way of summary. Mr. Speaker, I have tried in my remarks to make the case that the government opposite does not have a mandate for this Bill. First and foremost I've tried to make the point that the government opposite does not have a mandate to do what they're trying to do.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — They do not have that mandate because when they went to the people of Saskatchewan seeking the opportunity to govern, they did not identify to the people of Saskatchewan that this was part of their agenda as government. They did not go to the people of Saskatchewan and say, look, if you re-elect us, we're going to privatize SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance), and we're going to privatize SaskPower, and we're going to privatize the potash corporation. No, nothing of the sort; in fact, just the opposite.

Leading members of their government were travelling the province saying, no, privatization is yesterday's theory. We're not going to have out-of-province investors honing in here. It makes no sense, they were saying before the election, it makes no sense for one government to build and for another government to come along and sell off. Well I agree entirely, Mr. Speaker, it makes no sense. In fact, there's nothing about this Bill that makes any sense from my point of view.

So, Mr. Speaker, when they went to the people in 1986 asking for a mandate to govern, if anything they were saying to people, no, we're not going to privatize. So if anything they have a mandate not to privatize.

What we have had since, of course, the 1986 election and the election of this group of men and women, again we have had nothing but privatization. And this session is

perhaps the best example of it. Since we've come into this session way back in March, day after day after day we are asked by this government to deal with privatization. We've dealt with privatization in regard to Bill No. 1, the Bill that would establish the department of privatization. That was the first Bill in this session, Bill No. 1, the first priority of the government was to establish the department of privatization.

We've gone through the attempt of this government to privatize SaskPower, the natural gas division of SaskPower. We saw the public reaction to that, Mr. Speaker. We saw how the people of Saskatchewan rejected that completely. And they are rejecting it today and they will reject it in the future.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — And, Mr. Speaker, no whitewash commission is going to change that, no whitewash commission will ever change that. The people of Saskatchewan want their gas utility and their electrical utility kept in public hands, make no mistake about that. And now we come to the debate on potash, the privatization of the potash corporation. And just as the people reject privatization of SaskPower, just as they would reject the privatization of SGI, so too they reject the privatization of potash.

Mr. Speaker, this government does not have a mandate to do what they intend to do with this Bill. They have no mandate. And therefore, by persisting in this, they make a sham of parliamentary democracy. That's my opinion, Mr. Speaker. They make a sham of parliamentary democracy when a government comes to office having said one thing before an election and then to do just the opposite after the election. Mr. Speaker, that was my initial point.

I have tried to point out in this debate as well how the members opposite, the government of the day, how they seem to have had a change of heart, Mr. Speaker, a striking change of heart, because now what we see is the Premier of the province travelling about the province, saying to the people of Saskatchewan, this potash corporation is an albatross around your neck; this potash corporation is a detriment to the people of Saskatchewan.

That's what he's saying now, but that's so contradictory, Mr. Speaker, as I've tried to point out; it's so contradictory to their own statements when describing the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan through its own annual report. It's just so contradictory.

As late as this most recent annual report, the 1988 annual report, we find phrases in that report telling us that this corporation last year alone made \$108 million — well over a million dollars of net income in one year. That's from this year's annual report, and the now Premier tries to paint it as an albatross around the people's necks. How can that be true? I just simply do not understand.

We have reports, annual reports, including the latest annual report, that describe the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan's holdings, its mines, as the most efficient in the world, as the most productive in the world, as

offering the highest quality of potash in the world, Mr. Speaker. Those are statements made by this government. How then their leader, the Premier, can go about saying that the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is an albatross around the necks of the Saskatchewan people is beyond me.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know where this change of heart has come from unless it is — and I submit it is — just an effort to convince the people of Saskatchewan that it somehow should be sold, that it somehow should be sold. Mr. Speaker, this change of heart has not gone unnoticed by the people of Saskatchewan because they know, as we know, the Potash Corporation Saskatchewan is anything but an albatross, anything but an albatross around the necks of Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Speaker, I thought it was important in this debate to talk about the resource, to talk about this resource that we call potash, this resource which is buried in Saskatchewan soil in such abundance, this God-given resource for which we, the people of the province, are stewards. And as elected members of the Government of Saskatchewan, this government in opposition, we bear a very special responsibility for the stewardship of this resource.

The decisions that we make in this House will influence the course of this resource and the use of this resource, the control and benefit of this resource, not just for the next year or two years but perhaps for generations, Mr. Speaker.

We are here talking about the most valuable mineral resource in our province, bar none, far more valuable than oil, far more valuable than uranium, far more valuable than any gold we have now discovered or might discover, far more valuable than any diamond finds we now have found or may in future find. This is a resource that far surpasses any other mineral resource in the province of Saskatchewan, the supplies that will last a prediction of 4,000 years.

We in this House are charged with the responsibility, the special responsibility for the stewardship of this resource, surely because the resource belongs to all of the people of Saskatchewan, a right that we fought for, Mr. Speaker, a right that we fought for and won. But because this resource belongs to all the people of Saskatchewan, we as a people, as a province, have the responsibility for the stewardship of the resource. But that responsibility is vested primarily, primarily in this House, in this legislature, among we who have been elected.

Mr. Speaker, the government opposite — the government opposite — would intend to take this resource that is now publicly owned and turn it over to foreign interests. Mr. Speaker, I challenge that as very poor stewardship of the resource, of potash, in Saskatchewan. I think that's a tragic stewardship of the resource. And not only our generation but generations, if they accomplish their goal, not only our generation but generations yet to come will suffer because of what they are doing in this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, this resource is a resource whose primary use, whose first and primary use is in the production of

fertilizer and therefore directly related to the production of food to feed the people of this globe. I've tried to point out in my remarks that the population of this world, currently at 5.4 billion people, is expected by the United Nations to double. In the year 2025 the United Nations expects that the population of the globe will be 10 billion people, 10 billion people who must be fed.

Mr. Speaker, we have a resource here for which we are the stewards that can play a key role in feeding that world population. The United Nations at the same time talks about the population of the world almost tripling by the end of the next century to 14 billion figure. That resource will become more and more valuable, more and more in demand. There will be a demand for this resource so long as the resource is in the ground beneath Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, this resource will never become obsolete. It will never become obsolete.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we are here dealing, as I said initially, in a very historic debate, because decisions that are made today, decisions that are made in this legislature in this session, can well affect the course of this resource for years and years, generations and generations to come. Mr. Speaker, we are the stewards of a very valuable resource, and let us as legislators not forget that.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried in the course of my remarks to postulate where in the world the idea comes from that we should somehow sell off everything that we own, including the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. That is not, Mr. Speaker, in my view a made-in-Saskatchewan policy. That is not a made-in-Saskatchewan idea.

In my view, that idea is foreign to this province, foreign to our history, foreign to our traditions. Many of us in this House have had parents and grandparents and perhaps great-grandparents who pioneered in this province, who built this province with a vision of co-operation, of working together, of striving together, of building together for the common good, for the common good. Not this mentality that says profit above all else; greed is the great motivator. Not that, Mr. Speaker. We are a province who have developed with co-operation.

And a great symbol of that co-operation and a great outgrowth of that spirit of co-operation and working towards the common good has been the development of public enterprise in our province. It's been our tradition, it's been our history, and it can be, Mr. Speaker, I submit, our strength to meet the 21st century.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, the notion that everything should be in private hands, that the only people that somehow survive and achieve in our economy are the private entrepreneurs, that notion is simply foreign, Mr. Speaker. And I asked in the course of my remarks to this debate, where does that idea come from? Because it is foreign to Saskatchewan; it's not a made-in-Saskatchewan policy.

It's been delivered here to us by this government, and I've argued in my remarks that they have imported this privatization ideology from their friends in Great Britain

and from their friends out in the Fraser Institute, and I tried to illustrate that, Mr. Speaker.

We've looked, in the course of my remarks I've tried to look at the accomplishments of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan under a New Democratic Party administration, under New Democratic Party management, and under Progressive Conservative Party administration and Progressive Conservative Party management. And the contrast is startling, Mr. Speaker, the contrast is startling.

Up until 1982 when this group of men and women took over the management of that corporation, the success of that corporation was simply . . . could only be described as phenomenal; in those few, short, early years of its existence having returned to the people of Saskatchewan hundreds of millions of dollars of royalties and taxes, having returned to the people of Saskatchewan \$100 million in dividends. And then the new managers came aboard and things have gone bad, Mr. Speaker.

Well the point I make is that if I am a shareholder in a business and I have employed managers who have so dismally failed me, my response is not to sell the company, my response is to get rid of the management.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, because I anticipate the comments of other members, I have tried in the course of my remarks to pose a number of questions, questions that are being asked by the people of Saskatchewan in regard to the sell-off of their potash corporation, our potash corporation.

I want members opposite to explain to the people of Saskatchewan where indeed they intend to find these revenues that will no longer be available to the people of Saskatchewan, where they intend to find the hundred millions of dollars that now have come to the province and to the treasury, and through the treasury to the people of the province from dividends paid by the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Where do they intend to replace that money with? Where do they intend to replace it from?

Mr. Speaker, I've asked a number of questions that people are asking in coffee shops and in work places and in kitchens all over the province. They're asking, I mean, if privatization is so good, if the potash privatization is so good, then how come . . . why is our deficit still climbing, why are taxes still going up, and why are our services disappearing if privatization is so good?

Mr. Speaker, they want to know, if this government is so bent on selling everything off, and they've sold a fair bit off, they want to know where's the money gone? Where has it gone? It hasn't gone into services; it hasn't gone into lowering taxes; it certainly hasn't gone into lowering the debt of the province. Mr. Speaker, people want to know that, and they have a right to know it.

(1345)

Mr. Speaker, people across Saskatchewan, when

considering the sell-off of the potash corporation, want to know where will this money go. We are not talking here about a small amount of money. We're talking about hundreds of millions of dollars. Where will the money go, Mr. Speaker? Members opposite will want to address those questions.

I've tried to point out in the course of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, what people are saying, what people are saying about this privatization and about the government opposite. They're saying regularly and in all corners of the province, they are saying this government has gone too far. Mr. Speaker, this government has simply gone too far, and it's time for a change. It's time for a change in the province of Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, there are many areas that I have not touched in my remarks that I might have. I might have easily spoken in regard to . . . I might easily have spoken about the relationship of the free trade agreement to this Bill. I might well have spent some time on the Lanigan expansion and the consequences of that, and the government's decision in that regard, the consequences of this government's decision to cut our market share, pulling us out of international markets and marketing.

But, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that at the bottom line the most important tests of this legislation or any other piece of legislation that we might look at is simply this: does this piece of legislation do what it intends to do? Does the sell-off of our potash corporation benefit those who already have much, or does it add to those who have little? Does it provide to those who have little, or does it benefit those who already have much?

And the answer to that question when applied to this legislation is obvious, sir, is obvious. It intends to take that asset, that resource, which is owned by the many and put it into the hands of a few, the few who are now already wealthy, the few who are able to participate in share-buys, those who are able as foreign governments to buy large chunks of our assets and resource . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Perhaps the minister from Cut Knife-Lloyd would like to speak? Would he like to get into the debate?

**An Hon. Member:** — Yes.

**Mr. Calvert:** — He would like to get into debate. Would he like to ask leave to get into the debate? Well if the member from Cut Knife-Lloyd would like to speak, I am more than happy . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Perhaps if we refrain from across the board debates the debate itself will run more smoothly.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the member from Cut Knife-Lloyd sits in his seat and says he wants to speak in the debate; in fact, he does speak in the debate, but from his seat. I've offered him an opportunity. If he wants to stand up and speak, then let him do so, or please, please refrain from comments from the seat.

Mr. Speaker, I'm wanting to say . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well the member from Wolseley describes my question as drivell. And I want to remind the member what my question is. Does this legislation benefit those, does it add to the wealth of those who have much, or does it . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I'm going to ask the hon. members to simply contain themselves, and I'll ask the member from Moose Jaw South simply to stick to the text of his speech. And if we don't have any diversions, the debate will proceed in a more orderly fashion.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, why I apply my test, my test being: does this legislation add more to those who already have in abundance, whether it be an abundance of wealth or power or privilege, or does it add to those who have much need? My conclusion is that it is a failure. It is a failure because what it does, it takes the assets now held by the many and puts them into the hands of a few. And on that basis alone, Mr. Speaker, on that basis alone, I will be opposing this piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, I will be opposing this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, given that the member from Cut Knife-Lloyd has on several occasions this afternoon requested to participate in the debate — I know that he already has once — so to facilitate that, I will now ask the leave of the Assembly to allow the member from Cut Knife-Lloyd to participate in this debate.

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

**The Speaker:** — Order, order.

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

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to enter this debate on Bill 20 this afternoon. I'd like to discuss three areas, Mr. Speaker, in my remarks today. Firstly a few remarks about the significance of this debate, Mr. Speaker, then a few remarks about change that the world is undergoing, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan is not insulated from, and our ability as a Saskatchewan people to adapt to and adopt a new economic blueprint for our province and our people.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, a few words about why we see potash privatization as part of that new economic blueprint, and why we face the future with all of its challenges with enthusiasm and with confidence and with determination with our friends and our family and our children, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, about the significance of this debate, Mr. Speaker, I think it's already been referred to in this House on more than one occasion about the historical nature of this debate. It's been compared to that other great event some 10, 11, 12 years ago when the potash industry was significantly nationalized in this province, Mr. Speaker, and certainly privatization of same potash industry is seen as very historical by those inside and outside this legislature.

I'm not going to talk in any detail today, Mr. Speaker, about the details or the what, if you like, relative to the



potash reorganization, or how it's going to be done, although the legislation obviously details that. And I suspect in Committee of the Whole it would be addressed, and as well the Minister of Finance in his opening remarks talked about the structure, about the how and the what.

What I would like to concentrate my remarks on today, Mr. Speaker, is why. Why do we have Bill 20 before this House? Why are we looking at, indeed, doing the privatization of the potash industry, Mr. Speaker?

Is it, as the NDP have suggested, is it because we are somehow ideologically driven, blinded right-wingers, merely agents for Margaret Thatcher, merely driven by the advice of the Madsen Piries, as the NDP opposition have suggested in their speeches? Is that the reason, Mr. Speaker? I mean, that was what the NDP would have us believe. I would like to suggest that that's not the reason, Mr. Speaker, and I'm going to make the case for that in my remarks today.

What I really believe, Mr. Speaker, is that why we're doing this is because we are at a hinge point in history, as some people have sometimes described events like this, a break point in history, if you like. It really boils down to two different visions, Mr. Speaker, of how this province should unfold — the NDP vision on one hands, Mr. Speaker, and the PC vision on the other hand. They see one course, Mr. Speaker, for the future; we see another.

We are not ideologically blinded, Mr. Speaker, but I would suggest to you that the position they are taking, this position of clinging to the past, this blind ideology and dedication to an economy of the past really does have very deep ideological basis in the NDP Party.

But first, to answer my own question. Are we ideologically driven? Is that the reason we are doing this, Mr. Speaker? Well the answer is no, and I'll tell you why. First of all, if this privatization agenda was merely a Tory agenda, merely an agenda of our Premier or of this Progressive Conservative Party, if that's the case, then, Mr. Speaker, why is it that 100 countries all across the world, of all political stripes, are engaged in privatization to some degree or other?

Certainly we are only one of a hundred. Yes, we happen to be a Progressive Conservative administration, Mr. Speaker, certainly we are a Progressive Conservative administration, but I think one would hardly accuse the government in Spain of being a Progressive Conservative administration, or in Portugal or in Sweden or in Cuba.

And these countries, Mr. Speaker, are just a few of the hundred that are into privatization across the world. They are not driven by Madsen Pirie or Margaret Thatcher or our Premier or this administration or our view. They are doing it for quite different reasons, Mr. Speaker — for the same kinds of reasons, I would submit, that we are.

In Spain's socialist government they've sold auto manufacturers, truck and bus manufacturers, large government textile manufacturers. In Portugal, after having a state domination of the economy that kept living standards behind that of most European countries, their

prime minister recently committed his government to a major privatization program. Sweden's government, a socialist government, Mr. Speaker, has sold a bank, a minority interest in their very major government holding company, and a ship port. In Cuba, certainly one . . . Who would ever have guessed 10 or 20 years ago that Cuba would be into a privatization agenda, Mr. Speaker?

So the first point I would make in terms of, are we driven by ideology, the answer is no, Mr. Speaker. And the answer is no because we're only one of several dozens of countries around the world that are engaging in this new economic era, Mr. Speaker, that of less emphasis on Keynesian economics, less emphasis on the Crown corporation as the model for economic existence and government domination in the economy, Mr. Speaker.

The second point that I would lay before the legislature, Mr. Speaker, is would a government, if it was so ideologically hidebound and so ideologically right-wingish in its tendencies and so against Crowns, would that government then set up Crowns?

I mean, obviously if the NDP make the observation that the reason that we're destroying, in their minds, this potash corporation is that we're against Crown corporations or against government intervention, then the illogical mirror image of that argument would be that then certainly that same administration wouldn't start up a Crown corporation, wouldn't embrace a Crown as perhaps a useful model for anything.

Well what is the truth, Mr. Speaker? Has the progressive administration under this Premier been blinded and just ruthlessly destroyed Crowns, or have they in fact set up some Crowns where they thought it was useful?

Well I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that one of the very first initiatives that this Premier undertook after the 1982 election was the setting up of the Saskatchewan Water Corporation, a Crown corporation. Does that sound like somebody who's guided by blind ideology, Mr. Speaker, when he saw as part of his government's agenda and mandate for the people to provide them quality of life and some rationalization with water in four or five or six different departments, I think, as the hon. member for Morse one time pointed out — 38 or 39 different pieces of legislation that somehow mandated water management in this province?

No, Mr. Speaker, we are not blinded. We saw that a Crown corporation route might be a useful way to deal with irrigation and diversification and water management in this province, and so we set up a Crown corporation. Not anathema to this party or this administration; we set up that Crown — a major Crown, Mr. Speaker, right up there with SaskTel, Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, SaskTel, not blinded by any ideology. If it makes sense, Crowns have a role.

And I could talk about SaskExpo, I could talk about the Future Corporation. You compare that to the, what I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, the opposite approach, that of the NDP when they were in government. I mean, can we come up with any examples where they nurtured the private industry?

I can think of none. I can think of tremendous government intervention. I can think of a string of the family of Crown corporations. I can think of land bank. I think back to 1981-82 when there was some jokes and stories going around in my constituency, Mr. Speaker. Because the NDP were so bent on nationalizing everything, there was a little cartoon going around — zap, you're a Crown corporation.

They were blinded by that, Mr. Speaker. They saw as the economic models strictly that of the Crown corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I think then I have made the argument in opposition to the points made by the NDP that we are not driven by ideology when we look to privatize the potash corporation. Other countries are doing it. Socialist countries around the world are doing it, Mr. Speaker. And quite frankly in this case, yes, we're privatizing a Crown corporation, but in other instances we have indeed set up Crown corporations.

Another point I would like to pick up in terms of the observations made by the opposition, Mr. Speaker, is they've made a great to-do, and the NDP have made a great to-do about pre- and post-management, pre- and post-1982 management of this Crown corporation. They've painted the picture on the one hand that during the NDP years this Crown corporation did very, very well, was well managed, was nothing but sunshine and roses, Mr. Speaker. Then somehow, somehow magically in 1982 when the Progressive Conservative administration took over, that somehow it's been nothing but mismanagement and anything but sunshine and roses.

(1400)

And, Mr. Speaker, those points I suppose can be made for pure political and ideological reasons. But let's stand back and look at the issue, and I will engage in that as well as anyone, and you know that in this House, Mr. Speaker. But let's stand back and look at the potash industry for what it is.

Would it really have mattered, Mr. Speaker, who was managing it, whether it was PCs or NDPs or Social Credits or Créditistes, independents? What was the world situation in which we sell this potash? What was going on in the world, Mr. Speaker, that might have accounted for a change in the well-being of any potash company, Mr. Speaker, in 1982? What was going on?

Was it simply an isolated incident that we had a change of government in Saskatchewan and things, at least in the NDP's mind, fell apart? I would suggest not, Mr. Speaker. And why I would suggest that is because you have to ask the question, which you'll never hear the NDP ask, what do you use potash for? What do people in China buy potash for? Well farmers buy potash, Mr. Speaker, because it's a fertilizer. Now the NDP really have never acknowledged what you use potash for.

**An Hon. Member:** — They don't know what a farmer's for.

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Well somebody says they don't

know what a farmer's for . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Why is the hon. member from Moosomin on his feet?

**Mr. Toth:** — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the House to introduce some guests.

Leave granted.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Toth:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce some very special people in my life, my aunt and uncle from Oregon. My uncle's a pastor of the Methodist Church, and they're here in our province . . . Actually, Mr. Speaker, they came to visit my grandmother who passed away recently, and they're just on their way home. And I would like to ask members of the Assembly to bid them a warm welcome to the province of Saskatchewan.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### SECOND READINGS

#### Bill No. 20 (continued)

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Speaker, so as I said, what potash is used for, and our farms in Saskatchewan here for certain are not deficient in potash in our soils, but in many countries, particularly China, they are, and so that's what potash is used for is to make fertilizer.

Now if you put yourself in the position of a Chinese farmer, for that matter a U.S. corn farmer, which in that area they also are very . . . the soils are very deficient in potash, what would determine whether you're going to buy a lot of potash or not very much potash, Mr. Speaker? Well, you yourself are a farmer. You know that when things are good and you can afford it and you can see the market potential for your crop, you're going to buy all the inputs you can to put yourself in a position of growing the best possible crop.

And that's true of any farmer in the world, I think. They love to grow. And the more and the better quality they can grow, that gives them a certain pride and satisfaction right there. Well somehow in all of this debate, this political namby-pamby, Mr. Speaker, the NDP ignore this large fundamental global happening that in 1982, as you well remember, when we first came to office in this government, the world agriculture economy was undergoing a fundamental restructuring. We've seen the commodity price collapse. We've seen trade wars. We've seen farmers, because of burdensome debt, withdraw from the fertilizer market. They're buying less chemicals, less herbicides, less fertilizer.

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder — you know farmers' thinking. I know farmers' thinking — is it any wonder that there was a change in purchases of potash fertilizer by farmers across the world? And, Mr. Speaker, any realistic person would look at the market-place and read that into it. They wouldn't get into this picayune sort of suggestion

that some manage better than others or worse or whatever, Mr. Speaker.

There was this larger cyclical fundamental agriculture issue overhanging the market, Mr. Speaker. It led to drop in price; it led to stockpiles in the industry. And nobody likes that. Nobody likes to see people in the potash mines go without jobs. But if farmers aren't buying, they don't need it, what do you do? Just keep stockpiling it and stockpiling it and stockpiling it? Pretty soon, Mr. Speaker, there's a diminishing return in terms of how you can use that approach for an economic stabilizer.

I think that point has to be made, Mr. Speaker, because otherwise we can get into this debate . . . And I know the Leader of the Opposition in his opening remarks tried to suggest that under the Tory years — he never talked about fertilizer and world agriculture and what was happening there — he just suggested that when we got in in 1982 we just tried to wreck the company, just tried to wreck the company, starve it so we'd have a reason to sell it off.

But yet later in his same speech, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Finance was on the verge of tabling the latest Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan annual report that I think showed one of the largest profits in the history of the corporation — something over a hundred million — which obviously spoke to the fact, to use his argument, there must be some pretty good management there that they've done that well; then he switched his argument from one of; well you're starving the company so you can sell it off to your big corporate friends — to all of a sudden: oh you're just fattening it up.

Well which way is it, Mr. Speaker? You can't have it either way. And quite frankly, if you stand back and look at the larger question, neither is probably true, Mr. Speaker, or neither is probably true.

The other point that they have raised in debate, Mr. Speaker, is they say we will control, that we will lose our say, that there are no safeguards in the legislation for Saskatchewan and Saskatchewan people. Well I'm not going to get into this in detail, but certainly the Minister of Finance has laid out about head offices and directors and maximum shareholdings and who can vote what and those kinds of things, Mr. Speaker, because our interests are the same as the Saskatchewan people, and the safeguards are there, Mr. Speaker.

But I would ask the opposition NDP members, I would ask the members of this side of the legislature: under the Crown corporation structure, under this magnanimous family of Crown corporation structure that the NDP put in place in this province over the years, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, I ask any member in this legislature, did you ever get invited to the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan board meeting? Did you ever get a vote at the board table, Mr. Speaker? Did you ever get a say, did you ever get a dividend cheque from the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker? I would suggest not, Mr. Speaker.

And I could contrast that quite frankly with what's happening at Saskoil, with the changes that have taken place there since we privatized Saskoil, and I'll do so later

in my speech, Mr. Speaker. So what we're talking about is really, Mr. Speaker, who has ownership as opposed to perceptibly who has ownership and control.

One of the attempts, Mr. Speaker, to sort out all the mumbo-jumbo about the economics of owning or not owning, or nationalization versus privatization of the potash industry, was one of the groups that tried to sort this out for the average public. And I picked this out of today's *Leader-Post*, a full page ad, sponsored by the Institute for Saskatchewan Enterprise. At the top of it it has pictures of and reference to four members of the editorial committee who put this together, and those people are: Dr. John Brennan, dean of commerce, U of S, Saskatoon; Dr. Ralph Cheesman, manager of Saskatchewan Mining Association; Ted Renner, president of Saskoil; and Gordon Wicijowski, managing partner of Clarkson Gordon, chartered accountants, Regina.

Arthur Andersen & Co., Mr. Speaker, did a study for the institute, and I'll just read the last four sentences that they've highlighted as a result of their study, Mr. Speaker. And I read those names into the record as to who was on the editorial committee, because I think no one would question the credentials, if you like, of Dr. John Brennan, dean of commerce, and Dr. Ralph Cheesman, manager of the Sask Mining Association — very reputable individuals, Mr. Speaker, dean of commerce, for example.

And their sort of four highlighted conclusions are: number one, Saskatchewan's potash investment has lost \$950 million, minimum. Secondly, Saskatchewan received no net returns from PCS. Instead PCS, Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, cost \$1.950 billion, Mr. Speaker. The most the potash corporation is worth is 1 billion. And their final point is, and I quote: "It's up to you to decide if the \$950 you've lost so far was a good deal."

Mr. Speaker, what they are saying here is that unlike the opposition's rhetoric about this world of sunshine and roses that comes with owning a Crown corporation, in this place a resource Crown corporation, that subject to cyclical agricultural global trends, instead of its paying a dividend and us collecting our dividends or having a shot at the board table, what we've got and what we've had, Mr. Speaker, is a bill for \$950 for every man, woman, and child in this province, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I've outlined why we are not embarking on this for ideological reasons, why we see this in that larger global context that's . . . I want to make the point clear in answer to the opposition who have suggested we're just a bunch of right-wingers engaged blindly on a privatization agenda. I've made those points. Now I want to examine why the NDP are for nationalization and blindly, I might add, Mr. Speaker, against privatization.

I say to you and all members of this legislature, Mr. Speaker, that they are blinded by their ideology. And I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, they are not here to save the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, they are here to save their own political hides. It's got nothing to do, Mr. Speaker, with the corporation; they want to save their own political party and their own political hides and

their seats. It's purely a personal gain that they're looking for, Mr. Speaker.

I would suggest to you that they continue to pursue this "big government is good government" agenda. I would suggest to you that while a hundred countries around the world are prepared to cope with change, investigate the potential of a new economic blueprint, the NDP are not, Mr. Speaker, and they are not because they are dinosaurs and they have their heads stuck in the sand, the sands of time of decades past, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — And, Mr. Speaker, I will now in the second part of my speech make the case for this blind ideology and show how the NDP is clinging to the economic models of the past when it comes to nationalization and privatization.

Why do I say that, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP are interested only in the old economic theories — old economic theories? I quote, Mr. Speaker, from the *Leader-Post*, July 19, I think it's '89, although I can't quite see it. The headline of the article is: "The state of the NDP and its search for the magic elixir" and it's by Ish Theilheimer, who is president of the provincial New Democrats in Ontario Renfrew North. And in her article here she talks about how an NDP Party strategist, Robin Sears is keenly aware of the NDP's problem. I'll quote:

Sears says that, instead of formulating new policies for changing times, the party (talking about the NDP Party) has "taken refuge" in earlier successes, like government pensions and health insurance, labor laws and Crown corporations.

Worse, some of yesterday's successes have become major turn-offs. Who loves Ontario Hydro or Canada Post? Sears is aware of "big negatives associated with the collective delivery of goods" and the notion that governments are inefficient.

The party's establishment has failed to confront . . .

And by party's, Mr. Speaker — I interject there in the middle of my quoting — party being once again the NDP.

The party's establishment has failed to confront gritty truths for several reasons: fear of alienating labor (and I want to touch on that a little further, Mr. Speaker) and other traditional supporters, dread of repeating the Waffle debate which split the party in the early 1970s and general complacency . . .

It went on further to say in this article:

The NDP has come to rely on a tried and true message: that "ordinary Canadians" need the NDP to "fight for you". But people don't want to be thought of as "ordinary".

And that's exactly it, Mr. Speaker. The NDP cannot confront the new realities. And I'll tell you, the

constituents in my riding are not ordinary, Mr. Speaker; they're very wise, intelligent, dedicated, committed people of this province, and they resent being sort of viewed as somehow ordinary, and big government, this big NDP Party will look after them, let along fight for them.

That's what I call part of clinging to the past. And even their own strategists and own presidents of their own parties, in some regions perhaps more progressive than the one here in Saskatchewan, have recognized that, Mr. Speaker. They've recognized that.

But one of the reasons that is pointed out by this president of an NDP association is that the NDP is not prepared to formulate new policies because they don't want to alienate labour unions and cling to Crown corporations. They don't want to confront, they're afraid of fear of alienating labour and traditional supporters. I'm going to examine that in a few minutes, Mr. Speaker.

I could go on to talk about other articles that have been written along to the same line. Here's one out of Alberta report, March 20, 1989. The headline on this one was, "Toward a newer Jerusalem" — the New Democrats' search for a new leader and a sensible economic policy. They're really saying the same thing.

And the gist of the article is, you know, I mean this has been the most spectacular non-race in the history of political parties in this country, Mr. Speaker, this NDP race. And it makes the point in here that countries like France and New Zealand and Australia, where nominally socialist parties that are in power, privatization and deregulation are in.

Veteran NDP strategist . . .

I'll just quote briefly from it:

Veteran NDP strategist and former national party director Gerald Kaplan was one of the founders of the . . . Waffle faction.

He says — this is quoting Kaplan's political views:

I'm pretty much persuaded that the field of public ownership . . .

And he would be referring to things there, Mr. Speaker, like public ownership of potash mines and resource companies, Saskoil, oil companies, those kinds of things. He says:

I'm pretty much persuaded that the field of public ownership and nationalization is outdated.

(1415)

Now this is Mr. Kaplan, a well-known NDP, Mr. Speaker:

In places where it's been tried it hasn't worked with the success that we thought it would. It also seems to me that national Keynesian policies, pumping big bucks into one's economy, doesn't make as much as sense as we used to think it did.

Now there is the key, Mr. Speaker: Keynesian economics is the wealth creation version of NDP economic policy. It's outdated; it's outmoded. It has a place in down times, in downturns, Mr. Speaker. They were using it in the halcyon days of the '70s, pumping public money into Crown corporations. Yes, they have a place, but it has to be used at the right time in the history of a country, Mr. Speaker.

Well anyway, a president of . . . or a well-known NDP strategist making a similar point there, Mr. Speaker.

Another article, and I won't get into it, the headline was "Along the red brick road to nowhere land," referred to the same thing. The NDP are adrift, have no economic blueprint, no idea of what a wealth creation policy should look like, Mr. Speaker.

And just to make the case, Mr. Speaker, about how they are dug in on this privatization, one has only to look at some remarks that were made in an anti-privatization meeting on April 19, 1989 at Martin Collegiate where the hon. member from Regina Elphinstone . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. While the previous speakers have also dealt with the issue of privatization, I think you must tie in your remarks to Bill 20, rather than dealing with it in isolation.

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The question is: what is the stand of the NDP Party in this province as opposed to in other provinces and as some of their strategists would see them in terms of the nationalization on the one hand, versus privatization and deregulation on the other hand?

At a rally in this very city, Mr. Speaker, an anti-privatization rally, the member for Regina Elphinstone stood on the platform, and when the president of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, Barb Byers, said, we must fight privatization with all means — that includes making the province ungovernable — the member from Elphinstone was there clapping and cheering with the rest of them, Mr. Speaker. And in fact he said, if fighting privatization means we are out of step, then I am with your cause.

Why I introduce that, Mr. Speaker, is even NDP people across the country, across the world, editorial writers across the world recognize that they cannot cling to the old ways; they must make change. But here they say, we want to stay out of step with the rest of the world, Mr. Speaker. We want to stay out of step with the rest of the world.

And that led, Mr. Speaker, that led to this commentary in the *Regina horizon* a couple of years ago, shortly after the new Leader of the Opposition took his place. I quote:

Thus far Romanow has not demonstrated a propensity to make clear and meaningful stands on major issues. In time he may, and find a new direction for the NDP, one that gives people a better idea of where the party and the leader stands.

And certainly, Mr. Speaker, that's got to be true on this historic issue of privatization and deregulation when the whole world, 100 countries across the world, are into it.

The article went on to say:

If Romanow hopes merely to swing into office on the current backlash against the provincial government, he should take note of history. Hoping the past is good enough to convince people to vote for you just does not seem to work in this province . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I must once more call the hon. member to order, that he must relate his remarks to Bill 20. He seems to be dealing with the issue of privatization in only a very peripheral manner or in isolation of Bill 20. I'd ask you to relate your remarks to Bill 20, then it will be relevant.

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I will shift gears here a little bit.

I want now to . . . As I said earlier, I wanted to make the case that, in rebut to the opposition observation, that we are not driven by ideology. Many countries are pursuing this. There are some larger global trends and realities that are impacting on why we would pursue this course here in Saskatchewan and Canada, why Cuba would pursue it, etc., etc.

Now I want to make the point as to why . . . Who was against it, and why are they against it? Why are some . . . and I know there's concern; that's natural in a debate of this sort. But why are some people against privatization, and who is against it when you come to privatization of the potash, Mr. Speaker?

Well what we have seen, Mr. Speaker, is, as you will know, rallies across the province. We've had petitions presented in this House relative to privatization, and certainly much debate in this House on this very issue — potash. In fact, it wasn't all that long ago, Mr. Speaker, that we had a rally on the steps of the legislature, an anti-privatization rally. And it was estimated by the media at the time that attendance there was 2 to 4,000 people. Now that's a significant number of people. I think a lot of people in the NDP, and certainly in the media, and certainly in our party here in the legislature wouldn't have been surprised if it had been 7, 8, 9, even 10,000 people out because of the emotionalism of this issue. But as it is, there's somewhere between 2 to 4,000 people, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker. And the Leader of the Opposition spoke there. The president of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, Barb Byers, spoke there, and other spokespersons from the Coalition for Social Justice, Mr. Speaker.

And what did the protesters want, Mr. Speaker? And this was probably put by a writer for the *Leader-Post* better than I could put it, and I'll just read two brief sentences into the record, Mr. Speaker.

Ron Petrie commented on the event, in the *Leader-Post*

this would be, and I don't have the exact date. I think it was May 17. And I quote — commenting on this rally, Mr. Speaker, with 2 to 4,000 people. He starts off, and I quote:

And what did the protesters want? Change? No. A new economic blueprint? Hardly. The highly partisan group actually marched down Albert Street in favour of the *status quo*, namely an economic system designed by the innovators from decades past and highly dependent on public ownership to succeed.

Devine is bang on when he insists, as he so often does, that it is his democratic right to proceed with privatization and face either the wrath or gratitude of the electorate. In the process, one can only hope that notion of Saskatchewan as somehow being on the leading edge of political and economic experimentation will be quietly laid to rest.

Now you contrast this rally, Mr. Speaker, you contrast this rally that the NDP coalition and the SFL (Saskatchewan Federation of Labour) coalition and all the to-do that they made about that rally — you contrast that rally, Mr. Speaker, with another privatization rally in this province that we heard virtually nothing about in Regina.

And where was this one held, Mr. Speaker? Well it was held in Meadow Lake, Saskatchewan. Now what's the population of Meadow Lake compared to Regina? One-tenth, maybe? Meadow Lake is a very prosperous and thriving community, but it certainly doesn't have 160,000 people in it, Mr. Speaker.

But in Meadow Lake, Mr. Speaker, as part of this larger and new economic blueprint, the 10 bands in the Meadow Lake Tribal Council — we've had debate on this very point in the legislature before — through their investment company, own 50 per cent of a new company, Norsask. The other 50 per cent is owned by mill employees and management through Techfor Services Ltd.

Well they made this announcement, Mr. Speaker, and this announcement will result in the injection of about \$100,000 into the economy and the creation of more than 150 jobs. Now they made this announcement, Mr. Speaker, and they invited the people of the area to come out and to share in this new news, this privatization with the Indian bands, Mr. Speaker.

And how many people turned up, Mr. Speaker? Three thousand. Three thousand people turned up to that rally. Now you contrast that with the rally, the NDP, Saskatchewan Federation of Labour coalition rally here in the legislature. I would like to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP, the reason that they are having trouble with this potash privatization is because they cannot make the change from the old economy to the new economy. They want to cling to their radical past. And as was pointed out in that one article, they do not want to alienate traditional supporters.

They are, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you, putting the union hierarchy, not the real workers, the rank and file

who I count as my friends, and everyone in this building counts as their friends, who work hard and are dedicated and great community people — all of those people that work as part of the union structure in this province. But I would suggest to you that the NDP opposite are putting the union hierarchy ahead of the people of this province. And I'm going to make that point, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to make that point, Mr. Speaker.

My first piece of evidence, Mr. Speaker, for that would be this. Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, NDP Coalition for Social Justice rally — all there together. Should it surprise us, Mr. Speaker, then when we see headlines like this: "CUPE vows to stop Devine privatization." Should it surprise us when we see this one: "CUPE solidly behind NDP fight against privatization." Or this one which is in a letter, a newsletter to the civic employees union. One of the lines goes like this:

To do this we obviously have to inform the voters that things like privatization and tax reductions are not in their best interest. Planning an extensive media campaign . . . (and those sorts of things) The way to deal with them (that is to say the Progressive Conservative Government), is to throw them out of power.

And here's the line, Mr. Speaker:

We have suggested to the members, and are sending out a question to every member requesting an affiliation to the New Democratic Party.

It speaks for itself. That's from a newsletter to the civic employees union.

**The Speaker:** — I'm going to have to once more call the hon. member's attention to the topic which reads, Bill No. 20, An Act respecting the reorganization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Now, sir, you've been talking about privatization almost exclusively, and while certainly the reorganization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is a strong element of that, I would ask that you direct your remarks more directly to the Bill under discussion.

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your ruling. The issue that we're dealing here with in potash privatization, as I've talked about earlier, is part of a global phenomena, a change, a fundamental change, if you like, that's part of a new economy to create quality of life for citizenry, no matter what the country.

The NDP continue, whether it's potash or any other issue, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, continue to be obsessed with the old economic models, obsessed with the view that Crown corporations are the only answer, obsessed to the point where they would put the family of Crown corporations ahead of us, ahead of us as ordinary citizens, Mr. Speaker. And why are they doing that? They're doing that because, Mr. Speaker, it's more important for them personally and as a political party to maintain their ties to the big union leadership, whether it be Bob White or Shirley Carr or Barb Byers, or anybody else.

We see headline after headline to make that point. The potash privatization is being worked at hard on by all groups out there as part of the NDP union leadership coalition, Mr. Speaker, to do just that. And we're not restricted to it in this province, we see it in other provinces.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Speaker, interestingly enough and sadly, Mr. Speaker, one of the saddest kinds of tactics when it came to this whole privatization debate, the potash privatization debate, part of this campaign by the NDP-Saskatchewan Federation of Labour coalition to stop potash privatization and to stop privatization, Mr. Speaker, was they published a colouring book, a children's colouring book. And it talks about the good family going on holidays, and how these big, rotten capitalists that run the park now are charging a hundred dollars a night for camping, and 2 or \$3 at outlets, and boat rent for \$10 a minute, and all those kinds of things.

Well I'm not going to bore members with that colouring book. But others, Mr. Speaker, including myself, took umbrage at that because it was simplistic, it was nonsensical, it was probably an attempt to be a manipulative advice. But I want to quote what one writer had to say. It was Dale Eisler on the 30th of July, Mr. Speaker. And he's quoting, and he's talking about this comic book on privatization, and potash privatization is obviously part of that.

In fact this kind of mindless propaganda aimed at politicizing young children does a disservice to the privatization issue and adds nothing of substance or value to the debate. At the same time it undermines SGEU as being a credible voice on the subject.

He went on to say further:

A good place to begin would be conceding that at least in some cases what's good for SGEU might not necessarily be in the best interests of the majority of Saskatchewan taxpayers.

What I'm trying to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is this is what the NDP have got to separate out in their minds. They must not just pay blind homage to the SGEU (Saskatchewan Government Employees Union) leadership or the CLC (Canadian Labour Congress) leadership, or the SFL leadership, or the CWC (Communications Workers of Canada) leadership, and the list goes on and on, as the stories I've referred to earlier have said, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

What they've got to do, Mr. Speaker, is put the real people of the province ahead of their traditional structures and traditional supporters. They've got to now start concentrating on what it is that rank and file union member wants. That ordinary, or in my mind, not so ordinary — that extraordinary person who works and toils, whether it be a farmer or somebody in Ipsco or elsewhere in this province, Mr. Speaker.

(1430)

It's time to cast off this blind ideology of Crown

corporations as simply and only the only economic engine to fuel economies and indeed to create wealth. And this is the big issue that the NDP face, Mr. Speaker, and really this is what this debate is about, this potash debate: will we have a new economic blueprint or will we cling to the old?

Well let's look at what the new one, the one that the Progressive Conservatives subscribe to looks like, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We are not going to cling blindly to any given model. If we need a Crown corporation, we'll set one up. If privatization, more privatization is the answer, that's the way we'll go, Mr. Speaker.

And now I want to tell you why. I want to tell you why, Mr. Speaker, I received on my desk in late May, Mr. Speaker, a copy of a paper entitled "Privatization in Saskatchewan" by a young student named Heather Rodine from my riding. And she had written this formal essay for an Economics 30 class in the middle of May, and I might say she received fourteen and one-half out of 15. She's a top student; in fact, at their graduation last month was the senior pin. And a fine young Christian lady who has, in my mind, a very bright future ahead of her, and a fine writer.

I read through this paper because this is this potash privatization debate through the eyes of our young people, Mr. Speaker. And what did she have to say in her essay? I'm just going to read some very selected parts because it speaks to exactly why are we privatizing the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

The issue of public participation is one of the most current and timely economic topics facing Saskatchewan at the present time. This program is basically "widespread public involvement through bond offerings, delivery of services to the private sector, non-profit organizations, and through employee-owned and operated companies."

This is far different than simple privatization which is simply selling off government assets. Public participation is a modification and improvement on this.

She went on to say:

It has been acknowledged that spending the amounts of money necessary to support these sorts of programs in Crown corporations cannot be afforded in less than affluent times. Competition is fierce, and governments as well as business must become as efficient as possible to meet the challenge.

Of course, a major turn-about in policy and practice is bound to be met with some concerns and resistance.

And we've seen that, Mr. Speaker. We've seen that. But the point that she makes here in this second paragraph is that we are kidding ourselves. And she recognizes, as a young person, if we think that to expand, for example, the potash corporation and make it into a mega-international

company, a mega-international fertilizer company for example, where they do additional formulating, but to come to the people of Saskatchewan, to come to the young people of Saskatchewan, to come to the students of Saskatchewan and ask them for a half a billion dollars, or \$500 from every man, woman, and child, so that the potash corporation can expand, they are going to say, no, the money just isn't there. And if there is a half a billion, then we would like to see more spent in health and in education and roads, those kinds of things. Very sensible young people.

And she makes that point, Mr. Speaker. She makes that point. And she went on to say:

The exciting part of this policy, (and she's referring to privatization, potash privatization, those kinds of things) is the possibility of economic employment and investment opportunities that are expected for the people of Saskatchewan.

She then asks:

One of the first questions that come to the minds of people about privatization is why sell; we already own. The answer to this has to do with how realistically we can say that we can feel control of our own ownership.

Mr. Speaker, this is the point that I made earlier, with the potash corporation over the last 10 years, did you get a dividend? Did you get a vote? Did you get a say at the board table? She makes the same observation, Mr. Speaker, the same observation.

And finally, one other reason that she lays out as to why we must look at privatization of the potash industry or public participation in the broader context, and I quote:

... to take advantage of opportunities for large industrial projects in an era in which capital rationing for Crown investments has become a reality.

You know where she got that statement, Mr. Speaker? She got that statement — it's appendix by number four — I suspect that statement, Mr. Speaker, came from the NDP proposal, the share proposal that was in place when the NDP opposition secretly examined privatization, unbeknownst to the public, Mr. Speaker.

She finally concludes by saying:

It offers true ownership of business and an opening up of government to the people of the province. Less political interference and greater efficiency are spin-offs that will benefit the corporations and, in turn, help strengthen the economy on the whole. A new capital investment pool of resources will open. The financial resources, talents, and competitive advantage of the private sector will be more open to develop. Employees and communities will have more incentive to support and develop companies they have a direct influence over or gain direct rewards from, depending on the company's performance.

Her final sentence, Mr. Deputy Speaker:

It seems that public participation may well be an important step in the economic development of our province.

And this is from a young student, a high school grade 12 student, and I can see why she received 14 and a half out of 15 on that paper, Mr. Speaker, because that young person looks ... and why I found it particularly useful, Mr. Speaker, is there is somebody looking at it from a young person's perspective, because they are the ones that really are going to reap the benefits of this privatization, Mr. Speaker.

The final point that I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, is — and I would like to use the Saskoil analogy here — somehow the opposition have suggested that if we privatize the potash corporation, the world will come to an end. Well we privatized Saskoil, Mr. Speaker. I think the government's ownership there is something below 50 per cent, maybe even below 35 per cent at this time.

**An Hon. Member:** — Allan Blakeney bought shares.

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Former members of this legislature — NDP members of this legislature — have shares in there.

Well if we could expect ... if we went through the model, Mr. Speaker, and said, well here's what happened to Saskoil after it privatized, and here's what potentially could happen to the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, this speaks directly to the points that that young lady made in her essay about building and growing and developing and diversifying our resources and our Crown corporation companies.

Well Saskoil stock is currently trading at \$11. That means for the individual person, the former leader of the opposition, the hon. Allan Blakeney, who's now retired from this House, his investment that he bought — presuming first issue — the investment has doubled in two years.

SaskPower V bonds, Mr. Speaker, were issued at \$100 a bond. They trade as high as \$118. The accrued interest amounts to 10 per cent on those bonds over and above their capital gain, giving an effective rate of return of 46 per cent in one year. That's not too bad, Mr. Speaker. And that's privatization, public participation in the economy of Saskatchewan.

Well let's look at this application of this model to the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan a little closer. Value of PCS — since 1985 the estimated value of Saskoil has grown 3.8 times from \$265 million to over \$1 billion. And that is exactly the point we have been making about why we privatized the potash corporation, is to make this company grow from a small company that can't get funds to expand from the Saskatchewan taxpayer, to go and access the equity markets. That's exactly what Saskoil has done, gone from 265 million to \$1 billion, Mr. Speaker — a 3.8 ratio, I'm led to believe.



Employees have gone up, Mr. Speaker, and if we were to look at that same ratio for Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, it would go from 800 million to 3 billion, Mr. Speaker. The work-force would go up 1,300 to 1,820. Production in Saskoil went up some 2.42 times, Mr. Speaker.

So on the contrary, on the contrary of companies, Mr. Speaker, these companies, when they're privatized with the view to expanding and diversifying do exactly that, and Saskoil provides us with an excellent model.

Production has gone up. The value of the company has gone up. The company that we still as a province, if you like, still own in terms of our shares that we hold there. They've diversified into natural gas, and 65 per cent of the employees own shares in Saskoil, Mr. Speaker. That's the kinds of good things that have happened when we unleashed another commodity — oil — from merely the government's constraints, management. That's what's happened there.

I believe that's what can happen at the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. So I would just say, Mr. Speaker, that we do not pursue this for blind ideological reasons, we pursue this because it's part of and makes sense in this new economic era, in this new era of globalism. I know these are competing visions of the future. We have one vision and the NDP want to cling to the past. That is not our view.

We know that the NDP/SFL coalition is a very strong and powerful one. But I say, Mr. Speaker, we are doing this not for the NDP/SFL coalition. We're not doing it for the NDP/Bob White coalition. We're not doing it for the NDP Coalition for Social Justice coalition.

We're doing it for the farmers and the home owners and the workers across this province and the young people and the children, because we want to see them have good jobs and improved quality of life. We're doing it for that 123,000 bondholders who already exist in Saskatchewan. We're doing it for those 425 employees, Mr. Speaker, at Saskoil that have already seen what privatization can do. We're doing it for that 1,000 people who, because of Weyerhaeuser, Mr. Speaker, have jobs directly and indirectly across this province. We're doing it for the Indian bands, Mr. Speaker, in Meadow Lake who like that, because we're prepared to put those kind of people ahead of the NDP federation of labour union hierarchy coalition, Mr. Speaker, and we won't apologize for it.

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

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — They can be a toady, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they can be a toady for the SGEU; they can be a toady for every union hierarchy alike. We're going to stand behind the rank and file union worker. That's who we stand for, Mr. Speaker.

And it doesn't matter whether it's in the North, South, East, or West, whether it's in the resource commodities or the service industry. It doesn't matter, Mr. Speaker, we put people ahead of coalitions, and that is a plain and simple fact, Mr. Speaker.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, is we approach the future, as I said in my opening; we approach it with confidence, we approach it with hope, determination — yes, because there's challenges there, but we see the opportunities. And we will not, Mr. Speaker, we will not allow ourselves to slip into the fearmongering and the change resister mode that the NDP opposite are. Because I believe that that young lady who wrote the essay epitomizes, Mr. Speaker, the kind of hope and confidence and challenge just that she espoused there, that all the citizenry of this province espouse, Mr. Speaker.

And so I will be supporting item 2, Bill 20, with all the support I can muster, Mr. Speaker, and I would urge members opposite to join the new age and come inside, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Trew:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to begin my remarks by congratulating the member for Weyburn for his involvement here today. I sincerely, and my colleagues on this side of the House sincerely welcomed your speech, welcomed your presentation. We certainly disagree with it fundamentally, disagree with most of it factually, but we welcome your standing on your feet rather than heckling. I ask you, sir, to notice that for the roughly 45 minutes you were on your feet, not once did anyone from this side of the House heckle . . .

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order. I don't see how those remarks are relevant to Bill 20. I would ask the member to . . .

**Mr. Trew:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I was going to mention that the member for Weyburn spoke about the Ontario New Democratic Party, about the New Democratic Party leadership race, about the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, about the Meadow Lake Sawmill. He spoke about a constituent of his who wrote an essay, and I congratulate her for what was a fairly interesting essay to those of us on this side of the House.

I simply point out that was certainly, most assuredly, far ranging debate as it should be. And I congratulate you, sir, for allowing such far-reaching debate on this important issue.

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

(1445)

**Mr. Trew:** — Mr. Speaker, I of course will appreciate the same consideration.

The potash debate started in April of this year, and I want to quote from a *Leader-Post* article — I'm not going to quote terribly extensively, but simply to set up the opening remarks of my presentation today. The article says, "Historic potash debate begins at the legislature", and the first paragraph reads:

The resource the good Lord granted Saskatchewan

people to last 4,000 years will be for ever lost to foreigners and eastern Canadians once the government completes its privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, NDP Leader . . . (the member for Riversdale) charged Wednesday.

I guess I can use his name in a quote, but I excluded it. A little further in the article it points out that the Leader of the Opposition was threatening, according to this article, to enter a personal filibuster of this Bill 20 until the 1988 potash annual report was tabled. And indeed the government took it seriously enough that by the time he was on his feet the next time, they had tabled the report.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is purely indicative of the lengths this government will go through to keep the facts from the people. There's late filing of reports. Yesterday we received a report from 1985-86 tabled in this legislature. We received a report from 1987, and lo and behold! We actually got one from 1988. Here we are day what? You do the math, but it's certainly been a long time this legislature has been in session. Most legislative sessions would have been over by now, and the government is still tabling reports . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . day 86, the member from Saskatoon University tells me, and thank you for that.

But here we are getting reports from '85 and '86, and I think that's a shame that the people of Saskatchewan can't depend on the government to come through with timely reports to try and keep certainly the opposition as aware as we can be of the business of the government, therefore the business of the people of Saskatchewan, but it's a shame that they introduced the major Bill of this session without having had the courtesy to table the annual report.

Those are some of the concerns we have. A further concern I have, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is still in the first column of this article in the *Leader-Post*, and this is a short paragraph. It says:

But Lane, who has said the NDP can have as much time to debate the Bill as they want, told the Assembly the government has every intention to march on with what is the natural course for PCS.

Well we are pointing out, my colleague from Moose Jaw South has pointed out a polling done, not at the request of either the government or the opposition, but independent polling, a survey of more than 800 households geographically spread throughout the province of Saskatchewan, and that poll showed that less than one-third of the people thought that the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan should be privatized. Fewer than one in three agree with the so-called natural course that this government is taking. You have to wonder why and how a government could possibly get so far out of touch, so far removed from reality, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that they would proceed against the wishes of two-thirds of the people of the province of Saskatchewan. It's an astounding disgrace, and nothing short of that.

Nearing the end of this article, Mr. Speaker, and I'm of course tying this to the potash debate as an historic

debate, and they quote Dr. John Archer, who is the author of a great many books, but the latest, or the one they're talking about here is *Saskatchewan A History*. And Dr. Archer says:

I don't think anyone dared foretell how important it (the potash debate) would be in 1975.

Many debates have been very important milestones. Maybe this will be one. Dr. Norman Ward, a political science professor at the University of Saskatchewan for more than 30 years, said:

The current debate is likely "at least as important" as the '75-76 debate that created Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. There's no doubt (the article goes on) that the issue will further polarize the two sides of the Assembly, Archer said. It will be the first time we will see clearly where everyone is coming from.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I could not agree more with Dr. Archer and Dr. Norman Ward that this debate focuses the difference between the Conservative government and the New Democratic current opposition. This debate is about control, it is about ownership, and the fundamental question, as my colleague pointed out earlier today, the fundamental question is: does, at the end of the day, does this Bill enhance ownership, enhance control, enhance the privilege of those who have little, or does it enhance the ownership, control, and privilege of those who have much? And of course the answer is as obvious as the nose on my face, and for my friends and relatives, they know that's fairly obvious.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill enhances the control, the ownership of the privileged. It is not going to be the people working for minimum wage, the single mothers, single fathers, the single people starting out in life, struggling to buy their first stereo, making payments all too often on a stereo. They're not the folks that are going to be buying shares in any potash company. Indeed, as the member for Regina North West, my colleague, has pointed out, 14 per cent of adult Saskatchewan residents own any shares — 14 per cent, 14 people out of a hundred. That's a pretty low number.

And the point I am making, of course, Mr. Speaker, is that the government is telling us this potash privatization is going to enhance our ability to participate in the potash industry. I wish to point out, there are a half a dozen private potash corporations currently operating in this very province. There is absolutely no shortage of opportunities for any and all of those 14 per cent who will own shares or other people to invest in any one of those half a dozen companies. There is ample and all kinds of opportunity for those people to invest in the potash industry. They can hopefully make some money in the current half dozen privately owned potash companies in Saskatchewan.

But why should those wealthy people, those out-of-Saskatchewan, out-of-Canada corporations and wealthy individuals, why should they benefit at the expense of Saskatchewan people? Why is it that we would want to look after the wealthy around the world

who are quite capable of looking after themselves without our help? Why would any government be looking out first and foremost for those big corporations? It's a real interesting question. We've talked about that in various times.

There is all sorts of forms of pay-offs. Some of them are legal. There are certainly corporate donations to political parties. There are over and under the table deals that are made. There are interest-free loans given to individuals. Indeed if you look at the Canadian government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's getting almost to the point where the reason the Prime Minister built a penitentiary in his own riding was so he could have his cabinet meetings there. And it's a sad, sad commentary on the state of Canadian affairs. It's a sad commentary to realize that all too often our lives have stooped to that.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Weyburn talked about a 123,000 Saskatchewan people participating in the purchase of bonds, and he was saying how this is tied into privatization — it's somehow part and parcel of privatization. I fail to see how a bond issue in any way, shape or form has any connotations of privatization. Certainly share offerings, shares are directly the issue. Bonds are not. Bonds are simply a promissory note. There is no ownership at all given up with bonds — none whatever. Never is there ownership changing because of bonds.

On the contrary, with shares there certainly is. Because you buy a share you become an owner of that portion of shares that you have purchased. What the member is suggesting is that those of use who have ever purchased Canada Savings Bonds have somehow participated in the privatization of Canada. And boy, you've got to draw one awfully long bow to tell anybody and convince anybody in the world how the purchase of a Canada Savings Bond somehow is privatization of our great, beautiful country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to bring a little historical context into this debate. Earth has been here for somewhere between 10 and 15 million years which, let's say, represents this much time. But that's an awful long time; that's an awful long time. So let's take just a tiny little bit at the end and make that a line. That would represent the maybe 3 million years that man has been alive on earth, but that line is too long. So let's take just this little bit at the end and stretch that out to form a new time line. And we have there perhaps 10,000 years, the amount of time that there has been civilizations on earth. And those of you that are better at history, please forgive me if I have missed by a few thousand years, but I think not significantly.

But this 10,000-year time line is too long, so let's chop it off a bit. Let's take just the time of Christianity, 2,000 years, and so we've got yet another time line. Well 2,000 years at the time of Christ, I don't believe potash was used as a fertilizer, so it's obviously not germane to this debate for us to be talking about this time line. Let's take this little portion at the end again. We'll talk about the twentieth century when potash was discovered as a useful fertilizer.

And so we've got this century time line, but in the history of Saskatchewan and potash development of Saskatchewan even a century is too long, so we'll only

take about a third of that. Then we get into the potash debate; then we get into the development of potash right here in Saskatchewan.

The expansion of world-wide markets for potash — we see in the initial stages, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we find that nobody had the knowledge about how to get deep enough into the ground to get that potash. There are a number of technical reasons, not the least of which I understand there's a certain lake over it that caused no end of water problems. So finally a couple of companies decided they could freeze the lake and then pour the cement for the shaft and then thus get through that particular lake, which the name of the lake escapes me at the moment. That happened under the Liberals, the government led by the late Ross Thatcher. There was interest in potash in Saskatchewan prior to that, but it was while he was premier that they made the breakthrough and actually got the first potash mine operating.

The late, right-wing premier, Premier Thatcher, felt that these companies should be rewarded, and he rewarded them royally. He set a royalty rate of two and one-half per cent on the potash that was mined, and then he extended that to all companies for a period of 20 or 30 years which resulted in — want to get the figure right, Mr. Speaker — it resulted in 14 or \$16 million. I've got it right here — in \$15.7 million collected in royalties and taxes by that Liberal administration in the five-year period, 1965 to '71, 15.7 years.

(1500)

So there was some jobs. There was some spin-offs that way. Certainly I have a brother who worked at the Allan potash mine, worked as a lab technician there, played hockey with the Allan potash team. So there was certainly some benefits. That was a good start for the potash industry, but it was sadly lacking in any return to the people of Saskatchewan.

What we had was a multiplicity of private corporations coming here for one reason and one reason only, and that was because they knew, it was proven by then, that Saskatchewan had the best, highest-grade, largest resources, largest reserves of potash in the free world — the largest reserves. Couple that with a stable democratic government. So not much danger of a war shutting down the potash mines. Add all of those things together, add a highly-trained, highly-educated work-force, add to that the ability of Saskatchewan people to tackle any job and excel at it because of the hardships we have had to overcome since Saskatchewan was settled.

Saskatchewan people, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as you are well aware, being a farmer yourself, Saskatchewan people are very innovative. I bet you that I would be hard-pressed to find a challenge on your farm, sir, that you could not overcome one way or another. And the same can be said for virtually farmer in this province. That's a real credit to Saskatchewan people.

But the potash industry, the potash companies knew that if they set up mines in Saskatchewan that they were going to have a work-force that could make almost anything work. They would have a work-force second to none, so

they were quite happy to come in.

The problem was the mines developed faster than the markets. And indeed the late Liberal premier Thatcher . . . I'm not going to pretend to use an exact quote, but it was something to do the effect that never has he seen so many reasonable and good business people in so much trouble before. That was the gist of what he was saying. And so he set up potash prorationing, which of course history shows was challenged in the courts and ultimately found to be lacking, to be wanting, to not being the method that could be used to control the potash industry. So he was really at a dilemma.

But along came the hon. Al Blakeney and the crew of New Democrats, and they formed the government in 1971, thereby taking away that major worry from the late Ross Thatcher, the late hon. Ross Thatcher.

But it was no accident that Al Blakeney and the New Democrats came along, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and it was no accident that they had a commitment to the resource industry in this province. They had had from 1964 to '71, or roughly seven years, to formulate their ideas, their policies, what it was they were going to do for the people of Saskatchewan.

And I have before me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a copy of the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan program for progress titled New Deal for People, this being the blueprint for the 1971 election; this, as you will recall, being the blueprint that was sent to everyone in the province even before the election was called, not waiting until the day that writ was dropped. It was in the hands of Saskatchewan voters before the premier called the election — very much up front, as has been pointed out to me by my colleague.

This booklet — and I'll call it a booklet because indeed it's at least 21 pages long and they're not exactly tiny pages, I can assure you — dealt with agriculture, it dealt with values of rural life, labour, employment, resource and economic development, small business, taxation, education, health, social security, and welfare. It dealt with senior citizens, it dealt with pollution, it dealt with housing, consumer affairs, Indian and Metis, human rights, and electoral reform, amongst some other things.

But those were the issues that New Democrats of the day fought the election in 1971 on, and they won it with a resounding victory, largely because the people appreciated that finally here was a government that put their program up front.

You didn't have to agree with everything in the program, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That's asking too much of everybody. But if you agree with the basic tenets of it, if you agree that at least you've got a government that doesn't simply say: elect us, we're the best-looking crew; or, trust us, with no reason for you to trust them, once you realize that you've got to have some . . . governments have to be responsible for their actions, is what I'm saying. And I haven't said it terribly well, but that's what I'm trying to get at.

And on the resource and development section which

took a full page, I just want to read a few excerpts from that 1971 booklet, New Deal for People, and it said:

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

Towards these ends, a New Democratic government will:

3. Oppose any further sellout of our resources. With respect to new development, the NDP will give first priority to public ownership through crown corporations. Co-operative ownership will be encouraged. Partnership arrangements between government and co-operatives or private developers will be undertaken when appropriate. Limits will be established with respect to foreign equity capital, and every effort will be made to limit foreign investment in resource development to non-equity capital.

Non-equity capital. Next point:

5. Review existing royalty, and other arrangements with a view to renegotiating, where necessary, those not in the interests of Saskatchewan people. Where feasible, we will reclaim ownership and control of foreign-owned resources.

And next point:

6. Spare no effort in renewing those resources that are renewable, such as fish and forests, while conserving non-renewable resources, such as oil and other minerals.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the key of this very extensive New Deal for People put out by the New Democratic Party is:

Review existing royalty and other arrangements with a view to renegotiating, where necessary, those not in the interests of Saskatchewan people. Where feasible, we will reclaim ownership and control of foreign-owned resources.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, contrary to what the Conservative government would have you believe, New Democrats campaign on what we believe in. We always have and I hope we always will. We tell the people before, during, and after an election what it is we are standing for. We are rewarded with the loyalty and faith of a good and growing number of people because over the years they have come to realize NDP is truth. We are honest.

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

**Mr. Trew:** — Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you may argue that, well that was 1971 and the potash was not privatized until some time after the next election. Well if we were true to the Tory view, we'd have just shut up about it,

because it was a hard and bitter battle fought in 1975-76. It was a battle that took in excess of 120 hours of the legislature of Saskatchewan's time — in excess of 120 hours. Here we are in this historic debate somewhere around hour 45. I may be a few hours out, but I'm not very far. Somewhere around hour 45, compared to 120 hours allowed in 1975-76.

Here we are, hour 45; there's been talk of closure for over a month now; talk of the government using closure for the first time in Saskatchewan history. I hope it just remains talk because this issue is fundamentally important to my constituents, it's important to me, it's important to my children, and I hope it's important to their children and their children's children.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are talking about a God-given resource that should never be in the control of foreign multinational corporations. It should remain as it currently is now, as we've . . . (inaudible) . . . It must remain in the control of the people of Saskatchewan so that we, the people of Saskatchewan, can keep the benefits of our potash right here.

I was talking, Mr. Speaker, about the 1981 New Deal for People. And I want to come back, not to the '71 New Deal for People, but I want to point out that in 1975, in the election then, in the New Deal '75 put out by the Saskatchewan New Democratic Party — this being even a lengthier document by some three pages, this one being 24 pages long — it dealt with a number of issues.

But this time, instead of resources being on page 7 and 8, it was bumped up to being on page 4. So we've heightened the stakes — if anything, been trying to highlight the New Democratic Party's position with respect to our natural resources by putting it right behind the most important industry to the people of Saskatchewan, which was and is agriculture.

The index of the New Deal '75 consists of the following titles: agriculture, natural resources, northern Saskatchewan, rural Saskatchewan, transportation, small business, co-operatives, housing, urban and community development, labour, education, health, social services and security, senior citizens, rights of people, consumer affairs, environment, parks and leisure activities.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in this matter of resources — and I'll quote fairly briefly from this New Deal '75 that was put to the people of Saskatchewan before the election in 1975 so that they would know what they were or were not voting for; so that they would have a better idea, better understanding of what it is that New Democrats stand for, what it is we believe in. That's why this was put out.

Under resources, it says, Mr. Deputy Speaker:

In 1971, the New Democrats promised to act decisively to see that Saskatchewan resources are developed to benefit Saskatchewan people. Under the Blakeney government, that has been done. Direct revenue to the provincial government from minerals alone in 1974 was more than four times what it was in 1970. These

revenues will be still higher in 1975.

(1515)

When re-elected, New Democrats will continue to act to see that Saskatchewan people get the greatest possible benefit from our resources in the decades ahead.

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

And, Mr. Speaker, it is very clear. I'm not going to take the time of the Legislative Assembly to read all 24 pages of New Deal '75, although I would dearly love to, as I'm sure you can appreciate. And the reason I would dearly love to is because if I were to read the New Deal '75, all 24 pages, the people of Saskatchewan — those who have been around long enough and were voting then — would know that the Blakeney NDP kept its promises — kept its promises, took them sincerely.

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

**Mr. Trew:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, my grandmother was a CCF MLA in this very Legislative Assembly. She had the good fortune of being part of the very first Tommy Douglas government here. My grandparents . . . I should rephrase that. My grandmother lived all her life in Saskatchewan. It looks like my grandfather, who is now 94, will likely live all his life right here in Saskatchewan. Their children, with the exception of one, lives right here in Saskatchewan. That one lives in the province right next door to the west.

The point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that we New Democrats are not here for a good time, we're here because we believe in Saskatchewan. We're here for the present, we're here for the future. I want my great-grandchildren to be able to look back at this debate and say, yeah, great-gramps is a fuddy-duddy, but by gosh, he had his day; he stood up when it was counted. I don't understand everything grandpa believes in, or great-grandpa believes in, but by gosh, he stood up for the people of this province when it counted.

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

**Mr. Trew:** — That's of course, Mr. Deputy Speaker, assuming I should be so fortunate to live that long.

**An Hon. Member:** — Well even if you don't live that long, they'll still say it.

**Mr. Trew:** — I hope so.

**An Hon. Member:** — You're on the right side of the

debate — standing up for the people.

**Mr. Trew:** — I hope so, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think we can never go wrong when we are standing up for the people of Saskatchewan, the people in our constituencies.

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

**Mr. Trew:** — I think as long as we are true to ourselves, true to our constituents, true to our province, people will be most accepting of the odd blunder, of the odd mistake made in good faith, as long as we're doing our utmost to stand up for them, for what we believe in, what they perceive they elected when they elected me. And I hope I can survive the tests of time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the potash debate we see that the latest thing to have happen is the Institute of Saskatchewan Enterprise, which, as you are well aware, is a pure right-wing Tory front — one of the directors is Dr. Barber. I could go through the whole list of directors, pure right . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Who are they?

**Mr. Trew:** — Roger Phillips of Ipsco.

**An Hon. Member:** — Who else?

**Mr. Trew:** — My colleagues are saying, who else, so we'll go through some of who else. We have here Dr. John Brennan, dean of commerce, U of S; Dr. Ralph Cheesman, manager of Saskatchewan Mining Association; we have Ted Renner, the president of Saskoil, hardly a New Democrat; we have Gordon Wicijowski, managing partner of Clarkson Gordon, chartered accountants. I do hope I pronounced his name properly, and I extend my apologies to that gentleman if I mispronounced it. But the fact is that gentleman is not a New Democrat, is a Tory in a right-wing group that take out . . . I mean, took out a full-page ad in today's *Leader-Post*. I shouldn't be giving them this kind of advertising, but can you imagine the expense, more than \$2,000 for this newspaper alone.

There's another one in the *Star-Phoenix*, I'm told. There's another 2,000 — we're up to \$4,000. Well all the weeklies, there's news . . . they've been in the news ever since they released their report that misleads the people. Talk about a group.

Can you imagine, Mr. Deputy Speaker, ordinary Saskatchewan people coming up with the \$10,000 or more to mount a full-page ad campaign in the dailies and weeklies throughout the province? And that's just right now. This is going to go on, I suspect, as long as we are debating this Bill 20, this potash Bill, here in the Legislative Assembly.

Now we can have all the money, the Tories and their various front groups can spend all the money they want on full-page ads; they're welcome to it. They're welcome to it, but . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'll come to that in a second. They can spend all the money they want, but the difference, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the fundamental

difference is the people of the province have made up their minds — very, very many of them have already made up their minds.

They've said so in a number of ways. They've said so in a privatization poll that asked them a question about potash; are you in favour of selling PCS? Fewer than one-third of them said yes, they agree with the government privatizing, selling it off.

We have a situation where 45,000 Saskatchewan citizens have voted with their feet in the last four and a half years. That's an average of more than 10,000 people per year.

**An Hon. Member:** — You're talking net.

**Mr. Trew:** — Net. Thank you, member for Moose Jaw North. That's the net loss, that's not just the people who are leaving. That's the people who are leaving, minus those who come in, and we're still 45,000 people short. Now, 45,000 people. You can understand if it's a few thousand. Sometimes there is some tough times. Sometimes there is. But you never get 45,000 people over a four and a half year time frame. You don't get that number of people, Mr. Speaker; you don't get that number of people leaving without that there is significant big and growing problems in the province of Saskatchewan, problems that those 45,000 people have decided are not going to be resolved in the very near future — not going to be resolved. So that's a very sad statement.

So we've got, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have got the people of Saskatchewan on our side. Doesn't matter how many full-page ads the Institute for Saskatchewan Enterprise puts out, doesn't matter how much advertising they do, the people know who it is that's standing up for them. They know, and I will be coming to it in, I hope, a reasonably short time in my presentation, the financial reasons why we feel so strongly about this. And there are some very good financial reasons why the people of Saskatchewan should benefit by keeping control of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

But I want to point out one thing that has happened in this Institute for Saskatchewan Enterprise ad. They missed one of the board of directors. Now I wonder why there would be four pictures when the fifth director happens to reside right here in Regina, but they couldn't get a picture of this fifth member of the board of directors of this Institute for Saskatchewan Enterprise despite the fact that I can absolutely guarantee that every daily newspaper in this province has that person's picture.

**An Hon. Member:** — Who is it?

**Mr. Trew:** — Who is it, I am asked. The fifth and conspicuous by his absence director of this right-wing radical group happens to be none other than Lloyd Barber, president of the U of R. That's the same Lloyd Barber who is currently chairing the SaskPower hearings, the privatization hearings. That's the same Dr. Barber who has this same Tory front making a presentation to his own commission. He's writing a letter to himself in effect, writing a letter to himself, and of course he's able to read it — Dr. Barber being a very well-educated individual.

But with clear, right-wing ideology, Dr. Barber, by being one of the five on the board of directors of the Institute for Saskatchewan Enterprise, and all of the garbage that they put out, by the very fact that he is one of the very lead players, Mr. Deputy Speaker, shows that he has no credibility when it comes to the SaskPower hearings. And indeed because of that and the fact that he tried to sell off the university's library last year, things like that — because of that, Dr. Barber has, and the Institute of Saskatchewan Enterprise have, no credibility when it comes to discussing whether something should be under Crown ownership or privatized — no credibility at all. He has got his ideological blinkers on and he is going that way. It's simple as that.

**An Hon. Member:** — Going right.

**Mr. Trew:** — Always to the right. But you know, Mr. Speaker, speaking of always going to the right, you know, we've referred to government members as being right-wing all the time. And the interesting thing about being right-wing is that if you stop and think about it, you take your left wing off and you start flapping around, you're always turning to the left. So things are going to turn around.

Things are turning to the New Democratic Party. Things are turning left, and the right-wingers are driving people to us. The right-wingers are sealing their fate, and they're sealing it by coming with the ill-fated SaskPower Bill that we won. The people of Saskatchewan won that. It's put off for now. They're sealing their fate by day after day after day coming at us with this Bill 20, this potash privatization Bill.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that fate is sealed. It is astounding, the number of people that I meet throughout this province who don't even care if they talk, don't even care if they talk about politics, because they've made up their minds. They know how they're going to vote, they look me right in the eye and say, not to worry, New Democrats are going to get my vote. That's before we even have a nominated candidate anywhere, and they're saying, not to worry.

They believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the old Confucius saying, "Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me." And they're not going to be fooled twice.

Mr. Speaker, I have talked about, why would we privatize the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Why would we issue shares? And there's a number of observations I have, but a number of questions that are very much unresolved, and I have not heard the answer in any of the interventions, the very few brief interventions from government members.

(1530)

Why would you privatize? Why would you offer shares in a potash corporation that is owned by all of us? Why would you ask people to buy shares in something they already own? It absolutely baffles me. Second question, we've got a half a dozen currently privately held, privately owned potash companies. Most or all of them

sell shares on the stock-market. There is no shortage of potash mines in Saskatchewan for Saskatchewan people or outside of Saskatchewan, other Canadians or Americans or Europeans or Japanese or people from anywhere in the world, they can invest in those half dozen mines.

So we have no shortage of share offerings. Why would we try to use the argument that, well, we've got to give people the opportunity to purchase shares in a potash mine, especially when you realize they already own the mine. Mr. Speaker, it's got to be a harder sell than selling ice cubes to the Eskimos. It's got to be a harder sell than that.

I own . . . My good car, which is sitting out front — my 1981 Plymouth with 181,000 kilometres on it — I own it outright. I'm not sure any lending institution would give me a loan on it because, as you can appreciate, it doesn't have a huge amount of value. But I'll be darned if any government or somebody can come along and tell me I have to buy the car I already own.

They're going to sell me shares in my car? No, they're not. I own that car — outright. You're not going to sell me some piece of paper telling me I own that car. I know I own it. I drive it every day.

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

**Mr. Trew:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, there's a couple of observations I have regarding potash and what has happened since we formed the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan in that previous historic debate, 1975-76. And in the time leading up to the formation of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, we had up to . . . starting with one, and then it got up to 12 potash companies operating in Saskatchewan. Twelve potash companies operating in Saskatchewan.

And you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there was not one head office in Saskatchewan — not one — until the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, and then we now have a head office for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan in Saskatchewan. Stationed in Saskatoon, that head office is providing many jobs that would have gone to New York or Switzerland or Tokyo, but primarily New York.

Those head office jobs that would have been in New York are now in Saskatoon. There are sons and daughters of Saskatchewan farmers and Saskatchewan business men and women who are working in that head office in Saskatoon. That means that the wages and salaries that they are earning for doing a job stays in Saskatchewan, is not paid out to New York, New York, to people living in New York. It is to the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan.

There have been occasions, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the potash corporation has hired somebody from outside of Saskatchewan to work in its head office. And that's fair enough. You need a little mix, local grown. You can't expect everybody to come off of a farm or out of a small business to be able to run a huge corporation such as the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, or you can't expect

everybody to be able to do all of the jobs.

So occasionally you bring in an expert, but in every case they've become Saskatchewan citizens. They have been living in Saskatchewan. They've been earning their salary here, and they've been spending their salary here. They're buying their new vehicles here. They're purchasing their residences right here in Saskatchewan. They buy their groceries here. Some of them go to market gardens. That enhances market gardening opportunities for the many co-operative market gardeners that there are throughout this province.

So you see there's a great spin-off from the hundred-odd jobs that are created by the head office of Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. There's a great spin-off that Saskatchewan people have developed for ourselves since Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan moved to Saskatchewan. Now I know that the government promises that a head office will remain in Saskatchewan under a privatized Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, but there is no shortage of post office boxes right here — post office boxes.

How many people have seen something advertised — and I'm not trying to slam T.V. advertising — but seen some fly-by-night thing advertised at 2 in the morning, dashed off their money, and then not ever received the goods, and also not ever known who to contact. All they have is a post office box in Minnedosa, or some other equally — with apologies to Minnedosans — some other equally obscure place.

The point I'm making, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is we can have a head office here in Saskatchewan . . .

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

**Mr. Trew:** — Thank you. We can have a head office right here in Saskatchewan that can be a real head office like we have now, with roughly 100 people employed, or we can have a post office box: Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, Head Office, Post Office Box 4, Saskatoon. Well, some head office!

The assurances of this government don't wash. The people of Saskatchewan know that they don't wash. They're fed up with it. They wish that instead of us being here and debating this incredibly important Bill, instead of us being here . . . I was going to say giving up our summer holidays, but that would sound like I'm somehow bitter about it or disappointed about it. On the contrary, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm excited about the opportunity to participate in this historic event.

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

**Mr. Trew:** — Mr. Speaker, thank you. I'm excited to participate in this event, as obviously are my colleagues. We're proud as punch to be able to be here, and we will be here.

But the point I was getting to, the people of Saskatchewan wish that instead of us debating this, they would sooner see us out on the hustings with an election having been called. That's what they'd really like. Never mind that it's

the dead of summer. I'm sure that New Democrats take vacations, as do Conservatives. I think it would balance out, kind of. Call the election; people will get home in time to vote. Call the election and let the people who really will decide ultimately the fate of PCS and the fate of SaskPower and the fate of Saskatchewan Transportation Company and the fate of what remains of Saskatchewan Telecommunications Company, let the people make the decision now.

Not once in your previous elections have you ever had the courage to put out a statement saying: we're going to privatize the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, not once — not once — because you wouldn't get elected and you knew you wouldn't get elected. You speak no evil; you speak no good either, that's the problem. People don't know what they're electing. You promised to eliminate the gas tax. Well, the gas tax is higher than it was when you came into office. There's more gas tax collected now than there ever was, through this scheme now, than there ever was under the New Democratic . . .

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

**An Hon. Member:** — I suppose you're going to say he's off the subject.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — I would ask the member for Regina Centre not to address the Chair when the Speaker's on his feet. I would ask the member from Regina North to relate his remarks to Bill 20. I've allowed a pretty far-ranging debate and he's drawing a pretty long bow. And I would ask him to get back on the subject that is before the Assembly, Bill No. 20, the reorganization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Trew:** — I thank you for your guidance, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I will endeavour to stay germane to the potash debate. And it is very germane that the people of Saskatchewan know what it is that a government, any government, whether it's New Democrat, Conservative, Liberal or something else, it is very important that the people of Saskatchewan know before the election what it is that that party, that potential government stands for. I think that's a fundamental thing in a democracy; it's the way democracy works the best.

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

**Mr. Trew:** — I appreciate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the fact this is a historic debate. We appreciated the member for Weyburn telling us about his constituent having written a letter or an essay and the fact that she got 14 and a half out of 15 potential marks. That's not bad for any student.

I'll tell you I'd be proud if that was either of my sons or my daughter. I'd be proud if they did that well. I can assure you just for the record that my sons and daughter have done that well on some of their exams, but they certainly don't on all of them. I can also assure you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that my sons and daughter do not support that position.

Another observation I have about the whole Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, and indeed the potash industry, any royalties, any revenues that are collected



from potash, every single dollar, Mr. Deputy Speaker, comes from where? In Saskatchewan? No, it comes from out of Saskatchewan. Every single dollar that the potash corporations, whether it be PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan) or the private corporations, all the market is out of province.

And I hope nobody's going to jump on me and say, yes but we sell 50 tonnes a year in Saskatchewan. I realize there's a minute quantity of potash sold here in Saskatchewan. I'm told that quantity is growing, but everybody knows that that quantity is not enough to keep one single mine — any single mine in production for a single day. That's how small the Saskatchewan purchase of this great fertilizer is.

So all of the money that comes from potash comes from American, Indian, Brazilian, Chinese, south-east Asia — did I mention Japan? — Europe, certainly out of province.

So it's, if you like, a very, very valuable export. Of course it is a non-renewable resource, but as has been pointed out, Mr. Deputy Speaker, potash reserves, there's enough potash to last for four to five millennium. I like the word millennium; it reminds me of *Star Wars* and the opening credits when they talked about whatever millennium it was. But a millennium of course is a thousand years.

So we've got 4 to 5,000 years of being able to sell Saskatchewan potash at current rates of production — 4 to 5,000 years of proven resources. And all of that money, all of those resources will be sold outside of Saskatchewan with, as I pointed out, a very minute amount being sold right here.

Another observation I have, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that in the first five years of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, total revenues from potash, total revenues collected by the Government of Saskatchewan amounted to \$985 million — \$15 million shy of 1 billion. That's in five years, from 1976 to '82.

(1545)

I think that's not a bad record especially, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when you compare it to the immediate five years subsequent, when in the immediate five years subsequent to that in the total potash industry, total royalties and revenue and income taxes totalled \$274 million over a like five-year period. Not bad, not bad when you see what having a government that's committed to — as we pointed out in the New Deal '75 — we have a government that's committed to extracting the greatest possible benefit from the natural resources for the people of Saskatchewan.

I mean, it's not much wonder that you see such a great divergence between what New Democrats did and what Conservatives are doing. You might say, oh yes, but you know the potash industry's really gone through some tough, tough times.

**An Hon. Member:** — Tory times.

**Mr. Trew:** — As my colleague from Moose Jaw North points out, gone through Tory times. And Tory times are

tough times. I don't disagree with that at all. So I guess the potash industry has.

But let's look at the record of the potash industry in Saskatchewan. In the five years since, from the time that Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan was set up until the government changed in 1982, that five-year period, there was 32 million tonnes of potash mined in Saskatchewan.

Compare that to 31 million tonnes in the next five-year period since the Conservatives took office. So you're comparing 32 million tonnes to 31 million tonnes — a drop in production of 1 million tonnes, or one thirty-second. That would be almost like taking an inch out of a yard, or for today's metric children, it would be like taking a centimetre out of a metre . . . pardon me, three centimetres out of a metre. I'll get it right yet — three centimetres out of a metre is the correct amount. So not a significant change in the production.

And what was the situation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with regards to the average price of the product that was sold, of the fertilizer that was sold? Well we see that in the great years, the boom years under the NDP, under the New Democrats, the average price was one hundred and — I just want to check it, I think it was \$109, almost certain — \$109.50, but we'll call it \$109, that being while the New Democrats were the government and while the people of Saskatchewan owned the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

In the subsequent five years, the Conservative five years, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the average price of fertilizer dropped, and it dropped by less than \$3 a tonne, less than \$3 a tonne. It dropped to \$106.69, average price. Let's call it \$106.

Well how do you explain that minimal drop in production and that minimal drop in price? We see the difference in revenue being some \$711 million, revenues from potash, total revenues from potash dropping from \$985 million all the way to \$274 million, in each case taking a five-year period. That's to take some of the peaks and valleys out of it, but in each case, taking a similar five-year period.

Well some people might question me still. They might say well, don't quite trust what the member is saying. I'm going to put it in a slightly different context, and this makes it crystal clear. If you take 1 million tonnes, the drop in production, remember from 32 to 31 million tonnes, the difference is 1 million tonnes. You multiply 1 million tonnes by the difference in the average price, so you multiply it by \$3, and you've got \$3 million.

Mr. Speaker, I'm missing a little bit, and I will ask my colleague from Moose Jaw North to give me the right figure on that because I would not want to mislead anyone. But there's a drop in production of 1 million tonnes, and a difference in price of \$3 a tonne — \$3 million. Flat on, \$3 million, by gosh. Well how about that!

It's amazing when you look at a \$3 million difference, and yet the reality is under the Conservatives we had a \$711 million drop in royalties and income taxes. If you

took the total difference, the total difference, every penny of it, not just the royalties and taxes, but every penny of that difference, it totals only 3 million.

Yet they parlayed it for their big-business friends, the half dozen still-remaining private corporations, potash corporations, they parlayed that into a \$711 million tax savings for those big-business friends of the government members opposite.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, some people are still wondering, still saying, well who do I believe? Should I trust the New Democrats or should I trust the Tories? Many of these people have become cynical because we have a government that wants them that way. We have a government that goes around saying, oh, well all politicians are the same; they're all alike. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they're not all alike, because in 11 years, 11 New Democratic Party years headed by Al Blakeney, not one time was there a cabinet minister or an MLA before the courts and convicted of anything — not one time, not once.

Not one time in those 11 years did we ever have a deficit budget . . .

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

**Mr. Trew:** — The people of Saskatchewan enjoyed 11 successive surplus budgets, 11 out of 11. You can't do a whole lot better than that, Mr. Deputy Speaker. What we have seen since is seven out of seven deficits, seven out of seven. We see the Minister of Finance introduces a budget that missed by a mere \$800 million.

**An Hon. Member:** — Whoops!

**Mr. Trew:** — Whoops is right. And I will get back to potash because I appreciate why you're getting a little fidgety, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I confess I strayed a little bit there. I hadn't intended on focusing on that fiscal mismanagement of everything else for so long.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there's a huge number of us who have decided to stay in Saskatchewan rather than to join the 45,000 people who have left in the last . . . net loss, in the last four and a half years. But many of us have consciously decided to stay — many of us have consciously decided to stay. But some have unconsciously decided, look, Saskatchewan is my province, I love it. I have my family here. Saskatchewan has been pretty good to me. I remember my first girl-friend or my first boy-friend from . . .

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order. I've been allowing the member a lot of leeway in the debate. And I've certainly been taking some notes down, and he's been repeating himself and he's certainly been irrelevant . . . Order, order.

I'd ask the member for Regina Centre and the member from Moose Jaw North not to address the Chair from their seat. When the Speaker is on his feet there's supposed to be silence in the House, and I'd ask the members to adhere to that — and the member for Humboldt.

The member from Regina North is going on and on, irrelevance, and I would ask him to relate his debate to the potash Bill that's before the Assembly.

Why is the member on his feet?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Point of order, Mr. Speaker, on your ruling. I think if you go back, as I have done this afternoon, and attempt — boring as it might be — to read the *Hansard* of July 4, 5, and 6 when this hon. member spoke, and what he said on each of those days of July 4, 5, and 6 is exactly the same, and it's exactly the same as he's been saying today. Now that's a sign of . . . if there's a filibuster, Mr. Speaker, a filibuster has to take a bit of talent. It's not just simply stand up there and let words dribble out of your mouth. It says the same thing for four days now in a row.

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

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to address the comments made by the member from Kindersley, and it's a key point in this matter. It is true that a member may not repeat himself over and over again. That falls within the definition of tedious repetition. But if the member from Kindersley's suggesting today, as he's suggesting yesterday, that members may not use the same arguments, that I think is clearly inaccurate.

Each member is allowed to state why he does not wish to vote for the Bill or why they wish to vote for it. Inevitably some arguments are going to be repeated. The member from Kindersley cannot point to an argument yesterday and say the same argument's being made today. It's being made by a different member . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . He wasn't. He just started today.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order, order. The member's point of order is well taken. Members cannot repeat at length what they have said before or what other members have said. And I have been keeping notes just this afternoon. The member has been repeating himself in the debate this afternoon and certainly has been repeating himself as I have listened to the other debates that have been going on, and he has repeated himself on other members' debate.

And I will read rule 25(2) to the members again.

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

So the point is very well taken that members cannot repeat their own statements or statements of other members.

Order, order. The member may continue to speak if he has something new to add to the debate.

(1600)

**Mr. Trew:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Perhaps if my girl-friend's name, my first girl-friend's name had been potash, it would have been more relevant. But it was not. I will endeavour to follow your ruling, sir.

We in Saskatchewan are unique. In Saskatchewan we have a vast population unlike many provinces such as Ontario where they've got 8 million people in not much bigger land mass than what we have. Indeed they've got some 4 to 5 million people within 100 miles of the centre of Toronto. So they've got some problems certainly because of that. They've also got some opportunities because of that. They've got some industrial opportunities because of the great consumption.

The member asks what that has to do with potash. And I will tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and for the member from, I believe it was Saltcoats, exactly what it has to do. We don't have a population base that will allow for a huge manufacturing industry here in Saskatchewan. It is not natural. It is natural for us to have a potash industry here. We have the greatest reserves in quantity, in quality. We have the world's most productive mines. The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is the most efficient potash producer in the world. We refine our potash here in Saskatchewan.

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

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I refer, Mr. Speaker, to July 4, 1989, *Hansard*, page 2375, and ask the Chair to review that and determine whether or not the hon. member is once again engaging in repetition.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member for Kindersley suggested the member's repeating himself, is being repetitious. The rule 25(2) that the member refers to says quite clearly it must be tedious repetition. For the member to repeat . . . it may be tedious for the member opposite because he doesn't agree with it. But for the member to repeat one or two times some subject, is not tedious repetition, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order, order. I find that the point of order is well taken. It's the decision of the Chair when repetition becomes tedious repetition . . . Order. And if the member from Regina North has something new to add to the debate, certainly he can continue to debate, or else he can discontinue his debate.

**Mr. Trew:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly have something brand-new to this debate that I did not bring in before, nor has any of my colleagues.

What this is is out of the *Star-Phoenix*, Thursday, July 27, which was yesterday, and it's an editorial that says, "Debate should run its course." And I quote from that article:

The legislative debate over the privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan (PCS) should be allowed to run its course. This is not the time for government to invoke the closure rule and curb the discussion.

That closure has never yet been invoked in the

Saskatchewan legislature is a positive testimony to the democratic process. Sometimes its wheels grind more slowly than the government would like, but that's not necessarily a shortcoming. If the legislation the government has introduced is good for the province, it should be demonstrated as such through the debate.

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

**Mr. Trew:** —

And the argument over privatization of a Crown corporation like PCS, one of the province's major industrial players, is hardly a trifling affair (the editorial says.)

As has been aptly pointed out, it took 120 hours of debate on both sides of the house to nationalize the industry in 1975. Why attempt to limit the privatization debate after only 40 hours? And why has the debate so far been (and the article goes on) and why has the debate so far been so one-sided? Shouldn't government members be rallying to support a policy they claim to believe in? (the article says.)

If the Tories do resort to invoking closure, the measure promises to create more problems than a protracted debate would ever cause for the government. The NDP has vowed to pull all possible tricks out of the bag to thwart the measure. As a result, the public would perceive the legislature as even more petty and discordant, although it's hard to imagine possible.

The final paragraph says:

It's better to let the debate go on. If MLAs want to take their time debating privatization and pay their own expenses while they're at it (their daily expense allowances ran out July 5), then let them do it.

Mr. Speaker, welcome back to the Chair. The natural resources in the ground and the benefits from those natural resources should belong to the people of Saskatchewan, should go to the people.

I was talking with a friend of mine earlier today and she described the multinational corporations as being something like a bloodsucker, were her words. They would provide some short-term jobs, but their bottom line is purely and only their interest in pursuing profits, dollar profits. That's the only reason they have for existing.

This friend of mine was wondering, is this sell-off of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, is that a quick fix to allow the government to funnel hundreds of million dollars to their other multinational friend, Cargill? Is it to allow those sorts of things to go on? Is that why the potash corporation is being privatized, or is attempted to being privatized? And this friend of mine pointed out something that I have truly not heard in this debate before and it is a very good point.

If the government gets its way and the shares are offered in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, there will be an investment tax credit for investors, costing the treasury of Saskatchewan more millions of dollars. In other words, for the treasury to get some money in it's going to give some money out to the wealthy investors. So we're faced with a double whammy. The wealthy gain control of our resource potash; the poor lose control. The people of Saskatchewan lose control, collectively, of that potash corporation, and as if to add insult to injury, only those wealthy investors get the tax credit.

So the poor get hit with a double whammy and they've lost everything. The wealthy come up with the shares in the potash industry. In the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, and the treasury of the people, the treasury of Saskatchewan pays them to take ownership, to take control of our resources.

Mr. Speaker, that is Tory economics at its worst, and that is why we are so vehemently opposed to this potash privatization Bill. We have seen the results of privatization here in Saskatchewan. I spoke . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, please. Let us allow the hon. member to continue his remarks in an orderly fashion, and continuous interruptions of course are not acceptable. I know hon. members realize that and I'm sure they will want to co-operate.

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

**Mr. Trew:** — And I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for that ruling. We've got a situation here in Saskatchewan that has been a long time in the growing. Even prior to the 1982 election we had potash companies lobbying vociferously against the government, lobbying vociferously because they realized that they were paying their share of royalties and taxes.

Now they would of course grudgingly follow the laws of the land, but they didn't like it so they lobbied, because if you look at it, lobbying is a very, very inexpensive way to get results. A thousand dollar donation to someone's political campaign can indeed put that politician in the hip pocket of that corporation. A mere thousand dollars goes a long, long ways.

(1615)

A lunch bought in a seemingly very innocent way bonds some friendships, and whether it is intentional or not, all too often that lunch winds up costing the taxpayers of Saskatchewan many, many, many, many thousands of times whatever the price of that lunch was.

Mr. Speaker, the potash corporation had a total debt of \$88 million when the present government took over. They ran it up, and now we're looking for a way out. Well we've offered them the way out. The way out is just let this Bill sit, get on with bringing forward needed legislation, get on with bringing forward legislation that would allow for things such as the inflationary increase for retired civil servants and Crown corporation employees, even Crowns such as the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

We promised to pass the Bill the same day it's introduced. The government controls the agenda.

Their ideological blinders are on, and so we're into a situation where we're debating potash, potash, potash from 8 o'clock in the morning until 11 o'clock at night starting Monday morning until Friday night. Tonight at 11 o'clock, I and my colleagues will still be here, and we'll still be debating potash, the Premier points out, and so will they, and good for them. And I'm pleased to see that today for the first time in a good long time we're also getting some input from government members. It will be most interesting to hear what the Premier has to say about it, if he ever dares to speak.

Mr. Speaker, I pointed out that in over a five-year period in potash, it had cost the people of Saskatchewan \$711 million in lost taxes and royalties. The situation is . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Now the hon. members are making some noise, but the member from Regina Centre, I would just suggest to him that he be very careful in how he refers to other members in this House. I'm not going to call him to order, make him apologize on this occasion, but I'm just warning him that those kinds of phrases are not acceptable, and you can be sure that next time you'll be required to apologize for remarks of that nature.

**Mr. Trew:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I pointed out the loss in income to the people of Saskatchewan — \$711 million. I merely do that to set up . . . the resource sector has been blessed under the present government with royalty tax holidays, with all sorts of tax breaks, lowering of the corporate tax rate. The situation in potash is a loss of what we estimate \$711 million. The loss from oil is more than double that.

And so it's small wonder we wind up with a \$4 billion deficit here in Saskatchewan. It's small wonder we wind up with debt in Crown corporation after Crown corporation. It is really incredible that these wonderful fiscal managers, this great business people opposite who come from the likes of Peter Pocklington and those sorts of enterprises, it's amazing that these fiscal managers have run us into a \$4 billion debt. And it's just . . . it astounds me that they still have the audacity to stand up and say that they are great fiscal managers.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, I believe, wants to introduce some guests.

**Mr. Upshall:** — Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I'd like to introduce some guests.

Leave granted.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Upshall:** — Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the Assembly today, some guests seated in your gallery. In your gallery are Mr. and Mrs. Homer Burke from Watrous and their son, Donald, and accompanying Mr. and Mrs. Burke is a young man from France, Jean-Laurent Hugues, and he is from Beziers, France — I hope I pronounced that right — which is along the Mediterranean coast. Jean-Laurent is

over on a Rotary exchange where he'll be spending a month in Canada in the Watrous area, and in return Donald Burke will be going back to France to spend a month there. And I think these are very useful exchanges.

And they are here today taking in the proceedings. They've had a tour of the legislature and will be visiting around Regina before returning back to Watrous. So I'd ask all members of the House to give them a warm welcome.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### SECOND READINGS

#### Bill No. 20 (continued)

**Mr. Trew:** — I thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I indeed I wish to join my colleague from Humboldt in extending a welcome to our guests in your gallery, Mr. Speaker. I hope you're enjoying this historic debate on the ownership of potash, the biggest resource in Saskatchewan, and the one that should last for 4,000 years.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to hear the Premier now talking from his seat, and we look forward to his entry into this debate. It would be a refreshing change if he would come clean and tell us what it is he stands for.

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

**Mr. Trew:** — Mr. Speaker, I am, as you can appreciate, I am much nearer the end of my debate than I am the beginning. My recollection is I spoke for between three and four hours earlier in this month, and I've been at it for a while today. I don't know — hour and a half, two hours. So I can assure you that I'm certainly within five or six hours of concluding my remarks. Actually I'm much closer than that.

In 1975-76 when the people of Saskatchewan became owners of the new Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, we became masters in our own house. We started for the first time ever to truly control our destiny with regards to the ownership and the benefits and the jobs that come with such a bountiful resource such as potash. We set up the marketing arm of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan which, by the time we set up the marketing arm, PCS was the largest single potash corporation in the world, in the free world.

And I recall vividly the 1982 election. It was about some mythical golden bathtub, sunken golden bathtub that doesn't exist. It was about tax breaks, a 10 per cent cut in personal income taxes that nobody has even close to seen — certainly the big corporations have. It's about those sorts of things, and I don't want to expand on them simply because I want to maintain some focus on potash, Mr. Speaker.

But one of the issues in that election campaign was this idea, this statement that the Premier made. He said, we will disband the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan

marketing arm. Elect a Tory government and we'll disband that.

And I have to ask, why? Why would you disband the marketing arm that could potentially develop new markets in countries such as Brazil, countries such as India, such as Japan and China at the time? Why would you disband a marketing arm? Why would you even promise that before you were ever elected into the Legislative Assembly? Why would you promise such a thing? Why the haste? Why not say, we'll look at it and if it's feasible it's gone. But instead, they gave up the whole year's sales by promising it during the election and not delivering until the very end of the potash sale season, June 27 or 28, 1982, when the final announcement was made.

Why the big hurry? A government elected in April, why would they be in such a hurry to disband that marketing arm? And of course, Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan paid a dear price for that; they paid a dear price in that at the end of that year they had to go cap in hand to Canpotex, the marketing arm of all Saskatchewan potash, and say, sorry we were such bad people and we said such nasty things about you, but will you share some of your sales that you've made? Not a very tenable position.

And as a result, the production records — I've got them here somewhere — but they show that the production records in the year immediately after the government, present government took office were about two-thirds of the level they were the year before. And again, I'm not very far wrong when I say that, Mr. Speaker.

So now here we are some seven years later, debating not simply the shutting down of the marketing arm of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, but we are being told that the government has every intention to sell off the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan in total. And they further intend to sell an asset that is worth, estimated, about \$2 billion, and they plan to sell it for somewhere between 5 to \$900 million. In other words, less than half price.

Why the hurry? Why on earth would you want to give away such a valuable commodity, such a hard-earned gain for the people of Saskatchewan? Why would you have such a haste to give it away? I'm wondering if the Premier believes in Saskatchewan's long term? I wonder if the Premier thinks that Saskatchewan is a province worthy of looking to the next decade, to the next century. I wonder.

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

**Mr. Trew:** — And I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier believes he's going to get elected next time, because . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — A point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I apologize for not rising a couple of minutes earlier. But I want to refer the Speaker to page 2449 of *Hansard*, July 6, and page 2451, the second paragraph of that page, and refer the Speaker to July 5, 1989, 2400 and 2401. If the Chair would take the time to read those two pages, two

and a half pages roughly, one would find that the last five minutes what the hon. member has said he repeated almost verbatim from what he said back July 5 and 6.

If I can read to you, Mr. Chairman, and we will recall this:

After the markets closed . . . PCS had to go to Canpotex, cap in hand.

Do you remember him saying that just a few minutes ago? You can go through that time after time after time on those four pages and you'll find exactly the same thing.

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

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have also made a point of doing so when the member first raised the point. I've made a point of reviewing the member's comments made before, comparing with the comments he made now, and they are different. I'm not going to go through the entire routine and outline what he said before and what he's saying now, but they're different comments and he's making a different argument.

The member from Kindersley may be able to find a phrase that has reappeared. That doesn't mean he's making the same argument; he's not. They are different arguments, albeit on the same subject, and some of the same phrases are going to arise. So I suggest here is no repetition, Mr. Speaker.

(1630)

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Member for Regina Elphinstone. Without having the opportunity to go through the pages as the Minister of Justice indicated, I would say this, that no doubt the hon. member is having some problem. He has indicated a little earlier that he has spoken for quite some time. And I have been watching the monitor, and he has been having trouble with repetition earlier on. So I simply am drawing this to the attention of the hon. member for Regina North, that while you may be finding it somewhat difficult now not to repeat yourself, you're going to have to pay a little closer attention and make every attempt not to.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Speaker in the chair on two occasions, not more than 15 minutes ago when I raised the question — I want to bring it to your attention because you were not here — and at that point in time the Deputy Speaker addressed to the hon. member rule 25(2) . . . the Deputy Speaker raised to — and the Clerks were up at the Speaker's — raised to the hon. member rule 25(2) and cautioned that member that if he repeated, if he repeated that they would have to take the necessary step and ask him to discontinue.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to say that earlier this day when the member from Weyburn was speaking, I listened closely while the member . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — You weren't in here.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — I was in here and I listened to him talk a great deal about the NDP federal leadership and

many other issues, a very broad-ranging debate, Mr. Speaker . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I believe that hon. members have had their . . . Having listened to the arguments . . . I'm just going to once more caution the member for Quill Lake. I'm just going to once more repeat my ruling, that the hon. member will have to be very, very cautious and careful that he doesn't repeat himself.

**An Hon. Member:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

**The Speaker:** — What is your point of order?

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — The member for Kindersley raised a point of order about repetition. You ruled on it. Before the member could even speak again, he made another point of order which was exactly the same. If that's going to be allowed, we could get up and make points of order for the next six hours and never get the speech completed . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I believe what we'll do now is proceed with the hon. member's debate.

**Mr. Trew:** — I thank you for your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I believe I was having a little difficulty a little earlier on in my speech, but I think I'm on track now.

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

**Mr. Trew:** — As *Hansard* will show, as the record, even for the member for Kindersley, will show, I was speaking of something I had not, nor had any one of my colleagues mentioned earlier in this debate. I resent being harassed and continually interrupted. When I moved on . . .

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

**Mr. Trew:** — When I had moved on, and my intention is to continue moving on a little further, but I was asking whether the Premier had faith in Saskatchewan, whether the Premier of this province thinks that the citizens are worthy of his attention, are worthy and able to control our future.

Because if he is, I also asked if he was expecting to be the Premier after the next election. I'm not coming from, well call an election right now, but if he is convinced he can pull this rabbit out of the hat, if he's convinced he'll become Premier, then I ask him simply to table this legislation, just set it aside because they have never once campaigned on the privatization of Saskatchewan Potash Corporation.

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

**Mr. Trew:** — So my argument is, set this legislation aside, run the next election with that being one of the issues — and I assure the Premier we would make it a dominant issue — make that one of the next election issues. And then, I don't care, you could wait until your term is up, but call the election and run on the privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, run on the privatization of the power corporation of Saskatchewan, and then you might as well just keep on running because you'll be so badly rejected by the people that you won't want to show

your face here.

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

**Mr. Trew:** — Mr. Speaker, the government have, I believe, used the argument about return on equity. If not the government, then certainly the Institute for Saskatchewan Enterprise have used the argument revolving around return equity, their argument being that in recent years the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan has not had a satisfactory return on equity.

That may well be, but there are two points I wish to make. One was made by my colleague for Moose Jaw South, so I won't belabour it, but that point is the recent years mismanagement should be laid where that mismanagement belongs, and that's at the feet of the present government. They keep . . . seven, more than seven years after they were elected, they keep saying: oh, it's the NDP's fault. Well it doesn't wash any more, if it ever did — long since doesn't wash.

The second point I wish to make on the point of return of equity is that if you were to use the guide-lines that the Institute for Saskatchewan Enterprise and the Conservative government use, I think you would be very, very hard-pressed to find even a handful of farmers in Saskatchewan who should still be operating their family farms because the return on equity is inadequate. The return on equity . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Tell the truth.

**Mr. Trew:** — The member for Cut Knife-Lloyd says, tell the truth. We've got farm foreclosures going on at a record rate in this province — record rate — by the thousands, and he says, tell the truth. We have farm legislation that New Democrats forced the government to bring forward, and we passed it the same day. And now they just want to deal with potash. Now they just want to deal with potash.

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Speaker, I fail to see under rule 25(2) how farm legislation has any relevance to the potash debate, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, on that point of order I think he was responding to the member from Cut Knife-Lloyd who was yelling from his seat. Also I find it interesting, the minister from Weyburn who talked at great length about the NDP federal leadership, would be now the one to be critical about staying on top on potash.

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

**The Speaker:** — Order. Having listened to the hon. member's point of order and notwithstanding the arguments of the member from Regina Elphinstone, the point of order is well taken.

**Mr. Trew:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** — The member from Quill Lakes, if he has any comments to make relative to the role of Chair, I advise him to do it in the proper manner. What is your

point of order?

**Mr. Koskie:** — The point of order is the consistency and respect to have the member from Weyburn stand in this House to call points of order, when this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, we never interfered with him. You called him to order once. His entire . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. The hon. member is debating the ruling of the Chair. That is . . . Order. That is not a valid point of order and it is out of order.

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

**The Speaker:** — Order. I'm going to also remind the member for Regina Elphinstone that he restrain himself. Remarks directed towards the Chair are not going to be tolerated, and if you have a problem, you know the proper route to follow.

**Mr. Trew:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Using the same arguments that the Institute for Saskatchewan Enterprise uses and the government uses, farmers and PCS should both be sold. That's the tie-in, using the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to the comments briefly that the member for Weyburn made with one minute of 2 o'clock. At that time, the member for Weyburn said the New Democratic opposition doesn't even realize that this debate is about fertilizer. It's not a direct quote, but that's the gist of what he was saying. This debate is about fertilizer, and very close to 2 o'clock today he said . . . and none of them over there know it.

Well I just want to take a moment to point out that on my first intervention, July 4, I said, and I quote:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to join the great fertilizer debate tonight.

First sentence — fertilizer. My second entrance, the very next day, July 5, my first sentence:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, colleagues. It's again my pleasure to join the great fertilizer debate . . .

I've only one more and it won't take long. Then on July 6, again my first sentence, Mr. Speaker, I said, and I quote:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's again my pleasure to join in this great fertilizer debate yet another time.

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

**Mr. Trew:** — If we seem to be a tad repetitious at times, it's because we don't seem to be getting through. We have had numerous speakers on my side of the legislature talking about fertilizer, talking about potash, and yet we have government cabinet ministers not realizing that what we are talking about is fertilizer, potash, and the control of that potash — who will ultimately have control; who will benefit from the ownership of that largest resource, natural resource, this province has.

Mr. Speaker, this is my, I believe, my last new point and I

will be very brief because this takes a bit of a bow, but it's an article that I found in *Grainews*, and the headline, and I know this is going to seem strange, "What to do if your tenant damages your property." And of course it's talking about farm land and it talks about voluntary waste and permissive waste.

Now the government of the day is merely like a tenant; you have temporary custody of the province. When we form the government after the next election, the premier, the member for Riversdale, will have but temporary custody. Whether he is premier for 4 years, 8, 12, 16, 20, or 28 years or longer, it is but a temporary tenure, a very temporary tenure.

And so what we're faced with, Mr. Speaker, is a situation where the government wants to fundamentally change a vehicle that we can use to finance goods and services for the people of Saskatchewan. We can use the . . . for example, last year the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan had a \$106 million profit. Well we can use some of those profits to pay for things such as the children's dental program and the prescription drug plan, and I could go on and on, but that sets the drift, and I'm not hereby trying to waste a bunch of time.

I'm simply pointing out that's one of the major vehicles that a New Democratic government will have to fund the things that we will be wanting to provide to and for the people of our great province.

So, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, yes, in conclusion, the question I guess is why is it that the next premier and those of us on his team are so adamantly opposed to this potash privatization?

(1645)

Why is it? And it can best be summed up with the fact we want to maintain that control and ownership and the benefits of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan for all the people of Saskatchewan, not for the multinationals, not for out-of-province and out-of-country rich, wealthy investors, but for all of the people of Saskatchewan.

We want the revenue opportunities to be here. We want for the next government, whether it's a New Democrat administration, a Liberal administration, or something else—we know it's not going to be a Conservative one—but whatever, whoever takes over this badly in debt province will, of necessity, have to have as many tools, as many levers to the economy at its disposal as it possibly can, because we see after seven years, we see a deficit, and a gross redeficit, if you like, of \$4 billion, and we see an ever growing debt on the Crown corporation side.

So we're looking for where can we extract money other than by jacking up liquor, cigarette and personal income taxes. Where would a New Democratic government get its funding from? And the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is one of the major players in that financing.

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

**Mr. Trew:** — We want, Mr. Speaker, to protect the Potash

Corporation of Saskatchewan because of the jobs that will continue to stay right here in Saskatchewan. We want to have the ability to expand minds, not at the whim of some corporation owned somewhere else, not at their whim, but we want to be able to expand it for the reasons of economics for Saskatchewan, not for a corporation based in New York — for Saskatchewan.

And because of that ability to expand with decisions made right here in good old Saskatchewan, we can create jobs in the construction or expansion of existing mines, construction of new mines, expansion of existing mines. We can create jobs so that people like my neighbour would no longer have to travel to Ontario for work. He's an ironworker, and I was talking to him when he was home not so long ago. He tries to get home for one weekend of the month, and it must truly be a depressing thing to have his family here while he is in Ontario, but simply so he can keep a roof. That neighbour doesn't want to leave Saskatchewan though, for some of the reasons I talked about earlier.

Anyway we need to have the ability to expand potash mines with decisions made here so that we can put people like my neighbour across the street . . .

**The Speaker:** — I'm going to once more have to draw the hon. member's attention to repetition. He indicated himself that he has spoken at considerable length, and that would make it difficult for most people. However, it is the hon. member's responsibility that if he chooses to speak for that long, it's his responsibility then to be able to speak in such a manner as to stay within the bounds of the rules. And now he's getting quite repetitious and I want to bring that to his attention, that he must watch how he advances his arguments. That's your responsibility.

**Mr. Trew:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm in no way trying to challenge you, but I would like to ask a question. If you choose not to respond to it, that of course is your right. But I was talking of jobs and the ability of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to create jobs with Saskatchewan decisions, and I truly, sir, do not recollect having broached the subject of Saskatchewan decision making with regards to the potash corporation and job creation before. Have I, sir?

**The Speaker:** — I would just like to say that in the last few minutes, your arguments have tended to be repetitious notwithstanding that perhaps one isolated point might not have been. I'm drawing your attention to the fact, as I said earlier, that you're becoming quite repetitious, and to be careful of that.

**Mr. Trew:** — Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought I was moving along at a reasonable clip, but I will try and be more careful. I guess it boils down to things like revenue sharing and the ability of Saskatchewan to share, of the province to revenue share with urban and rural municipalities. And where does the money come from? Potash again is a big one.

It boils down to us keeping a head office with roughly a hundred people in it. It involves research and development which will be naturally stationed at the University of Saskatchewan based right here in



Saskatchewan, in our province. It makes all kinds of sense, Mr. Speaker, for those farm kids to have the opportunities to be involved in research and development and perhaps to find a future in some arm of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Martin:** — Mr. Speaker, I've been listening to the member speak all this afternoon, all this afternoon . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order.

**Mr. Martin:** — I've been listening to the member from Regina North speak about this all afternoon. He has raised the same issues that he's raised earlier this day, and I would like to ask the Speaker to deal with it in the proper fashion.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Speaker, I say by way of general background that some of these points of order really approach being vexatious, and that is, not put forward for the point of raising a point of order but for the point of harassing someone. The member from Regina North spoke, it is true, about the general subject of the head office, but he was talking about jobs, the good jobs that are lost. He's now talking about something very different, and that is research and development, which are always associated with a head office, bring to the province. The two are quite separate, the jobs and the technical research and development. He did not talk about research and development. The hon. members opposite, from their vehemence with which their views have been put forward, they perhaps are being sincere. So maybe I should withdraw the comment about these things being vexatious. But the member from Regina North is now on a subject which I have not heard this afternoon.

The Speaker: — I've listened to the point of order, and in response to the point of order I would only say this, I would only say this. There might be some argument about a particular job mentioned or not mentioned. I would say that I know the hon. member is having some difficulty, and I'm going to give him another opportunity because I wish him to have the opportunity to speak. But once more, I draw to his attention that in his remarks it's his responsibility now to take extra care that he doesn't repeat himself, because that has been drawn to his attention several times.

**Mr. Trew:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've not spoken about the potash equipment that has been sold and then leased back, and I don't recall any of my colleagues. They may have, and if they have I apologize to you, sir, but I am truly unaware of this point having been raised previously.

**Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Speaker, point of order.

**The Speaker:** — What's the point of order.

**Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Speaker, I believe yesterday the question was . . . was it earlier today? Earlier today the question was brought to your attention regarding the use of telephones, as well as lap-top computers in the Legislative Assembly. I believe at that time, as well, Mr. Speaker, if I remember correctly, you will, I am sure, confirm what you ruled, that my recollection is that you

ruled in the absence of a specific reference in the rules for the members of this Legislative Assembly, that until that was specifically addressed that you would not permit the use of those telephones or lap-top computers or have them present within the Legislative Assembly Chambers.

Mr. Speaker, just following the point of order raised by the member from Morse, as the member from Regina North stood to his feet and began to speak, he was interrupted by the Minister of Finance's telephone call which was ringing in this Legislative Assembly. The Minister of Finance jumped up with his telephone in hand and dashed out of the Legislative Assembly.

And I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that in light of your ruling which was made just earlier this day, within the last small number of hours as a matter of fact, that you would address this and make a ruling regarding the conduct of the Minister of Finance.

My concerns as well, Mr. Speaker, is that the Minister of Finance clearly understood your ruling and is defying a ruling made by yourself, sir.

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, this shows you how frivolous the NDP are, and how little respect they have, that not only do they wish to waste their time but all of the government members' time.

It also shows you their disregard for modern technology, how far back in the past they are, and I submit that the point of order is frivolous. There is no rule against electronic devices . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I have listened to the point of order, and quite frankly I was so intent on watching the member for Regina North and listening to him that I certainly wasn't watching what's going on there.

However, having . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Oh no, you don't watch them. He broke the rules.

**The Speaker:** — The member for Quill Lakes, he is once more challenging the Chair, for the second time this afternoon. Now before I deal with the point of order, I'm going to ask you to rise and apologize in the proper manner.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry.

**The Speaker:** — Now, to deal with the point of order, I was intent on listening to the member's speech; I did not see it.

However, having said that, I ruled this morning that those devices or any other similar devices, in the absence of rule, a specific rule, are not to be used in this House.

And I am once more reaffirming that rule, that members should co-operate and not bring those devices into the House. And I'm reaffirming the rule this morning that was made. And I expect members to abide by that.

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

**Mr. Trew:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying before I was so . . . well, interrupted by the sound of the phone call, I was talking about potash equipment. And I was wondering why it is that when a corporation such as the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan owns equipment to mine potash, owns it outright, how in the world it could possibly make sense to sell that to an investor from Ontario and then lease that same equipment back, the equipment that was down 3,000-or-so feet below the surface of Saskatchewan. The equipment in the mine never even had to be shut off, and yet the ownership changes.

How is that in any way, shape, or form anything other than Tory wizardry of finances? Small wonder that PCS could make money every year under the Blakeney New Democrats and lose money most years under the Tories.

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

**Mr. Trew:** — Small wonder, Mr. Speaker . . .

**The Speaker:** — It being 5 o'clock, the House stands recessed until 7 p.m.

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

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.