

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, I have the great pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the House today, guests of my family from Sweden. I'd like to introduce Mr. Rune and Birgith Larsson and their son Goran, who are in the company today of my wife's mother, Bertha Stolson, and her aunt, Marie Spate. And I'd like the House to welcome these guests from Sweden.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to all members of the legislature, Barry Turner, who is in the Speaker's gallery. Barry is a former MP for the riding of Ottawa-Carleton, now with the Department of External Affairs. I had a chance to meet with him just before question period today to discuss international students and this whole business of global education and the global village of the future.

Mr. Speaker, I would like all members of the legislature to join with me in welcoming Mr. Turner to the proceedings.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to all members of the legislature, a group of nine dancers. They are in grades 3 to 8. They're the Northern Lights Square Dancers, seated in your gallery, Mr. Speaker. They are accompanied by their teacher, Leonard McCallum; mayor Greg Ross; Ed Dunfield, representative of Northern Affairs Secretariat; and Jim Marsh, alderman.

I would like as well, Mr. Speaker, to read each of these distinguished dancers' names. We have: Clinton Sanderson, Charmane McCallum, Rubin Natomagan, Shannon Natomagan, Neil Natomagan, Roxanne McCallum, Desmond Natomagan, Rita Natomagan and Sharman Natomagan. And I hope I pronounced that correctly.

I'd ask all members to join with me in welcoming these northern dancers.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — I too, Mr. Speaker, would like to welcome the dancers from northern Saskatchewan, more particularly from Pinehouse.

(The member greeted the dancers in Cree.)

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tusa: — It's my pleasure and privilege to introduce to this Assembly some distinguished visitors from Iceland who are seated behind the bar. I would like

first to introduce to the Assembly, Her Excellency, Vigdis Finnbogadottir, president of Iceland.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tusa: — Her Excellency is visiting Canada to mark the 100th anniversary of Icelandic immigration to our country.

Seated with the president is His Excellency, Svavar Gestsson, Minister of Culture.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tusa: — In the Speaker's gallery we have more distinguished guests, Mrs. Jonina Benediktsdottir, spouse of the Minister of Culture, His Excellency, Svavar Gestsson.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tusa: — His excellency, Sveinn Bjornsson, ambassador, Minister for Foreign Affairs, and Mrs. Bjornsson.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tusa: — His Excellency, Ingvi Ingvarsson, ambassador of Iceland to Canada, and Mrs. Ingvarsson.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tusa: — Mr. Graham Mitchell, ambassador of Canada to Iceland.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tusa: — As well, I wish to welcome all delegation members to this Assembly. It is my pleasure to introduce some members of the Saskatchewan Icelandic community seated in the government and opposition galleries. This delegation represents a substantial Icelandic community in Saskatchewan from the Wynyard, Elfros, Foam Lake, and surrounding Saskatoon and Regina areas. Colleagues, let us once more give all these people, and especially the president of Iceland, a warm welcome.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Construction of Fertilizer Plants

Mr. Romanow: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to, I guess, the Minister of economic trade and development, or perhaps the Minister of Finance, and it pertains to the announced decision by the Canadian energy "88" people that in fact they are not going to proceed with their plant at Rosetown and the possible next phases in the Melfort area and in the Yorkton area. It deals with the government's decision, rather, to spend almost \$300 million in financial support for one of the largest world conglomerates from the United States, Cargill, with respect to the proposed Belle

Plaine fertilizer plant.

Now, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, this represents lost opportunity, obviously, for Rosetown and for Melfort and for Yorkton areas, lost opportunity because your government wants to get into bed with one of the largest multinational corporations in the world, Cargill, and not to work with the local folks in Rosetown and area.

Mr. Minister, my question to you is this: how in the world can you justify this?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I think the first thing the hon. member should be aware of, and perhaps he is not, but the largest part of energy “88” is in fact an American multinational corporation, and that American multinational corporation is far larger than the Cargill corporation. So for the hon. member to somehow suggest this is a little wee fellow versus a great big large multinational corporation, I don’t think he’s being fair to the issue and to the question, Mr. Speaker.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, I think what is important is this, is that the province of Saskatchewan for ever has been a large consumer of nitrogen fertilizer. That nitrogen fertilizer has, for the most part, been supplied by plants in the province of Alberta. There has never been a fertilizer plant in the province of Saskatchewan.

Previous governments, along with our government, have attempted in some way to attract to our province a fertilizer plant that stands the test of being viable and being economical. And that’s exactly what this particular proposal does.

Now we would also like to see other proposals as well, Mr. Speaker, but when we sat down and did a proper analysis of both of these two plants, the reality is the Cargill plant was far superior, had a better chance of surviving, made more economic sense and far more economically viable.

So that was the decision that we took, Mr. Speaker, I think a proper decision, to use our natural gas produced here in Saskatchewan, converted into fertilizer for the farmers of Saskatchewan at a lower price. And I think that’s what the people of Saskatchewan would want their government to do.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the minister of economic trade and development. The minister in his answer indicated that the Cargill operation is a viable one. It’s a much more viable one, he indicates, than the Canadian energy “88” at Rosetown. When I say working with Rosetown people, I mean that’s exactly what would have taken place, working with Rosetown people and the other communities of Melfort and Yorkton.

But the minister says that this project in Belle Plaine with this largest, probably, grain trading multinational corporation in the world in Cargill, this operation is

supposedly going to be viable and self-sufficient, and it’s a doggone good deal for the province of Saskatchewan.

My question to you, sir, is this: if it’s such a good deal, why in the world are we on the hook for nearly \$300 million; why doesn’t Cargill build it itself?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, with regards to the various other communities, about, oh I guess a month ago, three weeks to a month ago, the Premier, along with a number of members of this side of the House, met with the mayors of Rosetown, of Yorkton, of Melville, of Melfort, of Tisdale, etc., and along with officials went through the proposals — the proposed Cargill plant and the proposed Melfort plant.

I think the hon. member saw out of that meeting came the mayor, certainly the mayor of Yorkton as a spokesman for the group, indicating that they were convinced that the Cargill plant made more sense, was more viable, and that they took at heart the decision and the facts. They simply said that they would have preferred that these . . . and that information had been advanced to them earlier and this whole issue wouldn’t have come up. And certainly we can take some of the criticism for doing that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the Minister of Economic Development, and if I may say with the greatest of respect to the minister, his answers are becoming less convincing on this as he proceeds, because in his last answer he said that the mayors are convinced.

And I have here in front of me an article from *The Rosetown Eagle*, the headline says “Mayors unconvinced”, and if you listened to the CBC Radio this morning — I’m not sure that many of you on that side do; I’m not so sure that many on this side do — but we know for sure that the CBC reported today that the mayor of Melfort said that come the next election the PC government will find out exactly how unfavourably the voters in Melfort viewed your decision.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Now my question to you, sir, is this. You’ve met with the mayors; they remain unconvinced. The mayor from Melfort says that you’re going to get punished politically because of this hopping into bed with Cargill. You say you’ve met with them and you’ve given them all the facts. How about tabling all of the documentation in this legislature so that we and the public at large in Saskatchewan can be satisfied that this isn’t a rip-off to the advantage of Cargill? How about tabling the documents?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — The hon. member is . . . virtually every other question he asks he talks about tabling documents, and I think that tabling of documents works both ways, and the Minister of Finance asked for some of

tabling of documents yesterday; I didn't notice those coming forward.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, let me say this . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. The Minister of Finance, order. Let us allow the Minister of Justice to continue.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Number two, Mr. Speaker, I did not listen to CBC Radio and the hon. member is right — I seldom do. I don't usually listen to the radio all that much of any radio station, Mr. Speaker. But if in fact, what the hon. member indicates as being true in the sense that the mayor of Melfort says that come the next election Melfort is going to do harm to this party, Mr. Speaker, I would simply say this. I, along with everybody on this side of the House, have a great deal of support for the member from Melfort.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — And I don't care whether it's the mayor or whoever in Melfort, I'd put my money on that young fellow there.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the Minister of Economic Development. I want to tell him that that assurance that he and his front-bench colleagues are supporting the hon. member from Melfort, that does it — the hon. member from Melfort, he's done, come the next election, I'll tell you that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — But my question to you, sir, is simply this. Here you have a project of nearly \$300 million and you have this project for \$300 million that you're backing, of Cargill, this large multinational — world's largest, probably — grain trading company, \$300 million. You have that project on the one hand — which by the way I find very interesting in the face of the fact that you're a free enterprise government and supposedly are going to allow these corporations to come in on their own — 300 million for them, and you had a chance to work out a deal where there could be community developments on three separate locations in the province of Saskatchewan. Now you talk a great game about rural economic development; how in the world does that decision square with your policy of rural economic development? Why don't you admit it, you have no rural economic development policy. You're lock, stock, and barrel owned by the large multinational corporations in this country.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member talks about support of various rural members. I simply say to the hon. member: you've had one opportunity since you became leader of showing your stuff in rural Saskatchewan, and for that we have another excellent member on this side of the House. He's a very excellent member on this side of the House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member I've indicated is that the Cargill operation is an economically viable, it's a good project and it's going to produce fertilizer for the people of Saskatchewan.

Now the hon. member would have us believe that there would be three fertilizer plants should energy "88" go forward, Mr. Speaker. If energy "88" was to build three plants, they would have five times more fertilizer than they'd have ability to sell in the province of Saskatchewan. Now that doesn't make a lot of sense, Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, and they have not the capacity to sell into the U.S. market. That's number one, Mr. Speaker. If they wanted to build three plants, and now they're not going to build any plants, what's that say about their plans, Mr. Speaker?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question for the Minister of Economic Development. What it says to the Hon. Minister of Economic Development and to every thinking Saskatchewan person is that you people pulled the rug from underneath that proposal by putting your money into the Cargill operation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — How in the world is it, Mr. Speaker, that the minister can stand up in this question period and say that they've got so much extra capacity in the Rosetown project, and yet the Cargill project, it is estimated, will add at least 30 per cent or more productive capacity. Why isn't that sauce also for them? How is that you support, and more importantly, why do you put at risk, given the huge debt that you and your colleague, the Minister of Finance, have racked up in the province of Saskatchewan, why are we exposed yet an additional \$300 million for this multimillionaire company, this multibillion corporation? Why are we putting our money there?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member, and I will try to explain this to him. In the area of fertilizer there are different types of fertilizer that are used by farmers, Mr. Speaker. One type of fertilizer in more and more use is a fertilizer referred to as urea. All right? That is what is going to be produced by the Cargill plant, or the proposed Cargill plant.

Now the fertilizer that was proposed to be produced in Rosetown and the other so-called plants was not to be urea; it was to be a solution fertilizer. Now for the hon. member, a goodly part of that solution fertilizer is water. And when you have to transport water from point A to point B, the farther you transport it the more it costs, because the largest bulk of this is water. Now that is a fact that the hon. member should look into before you go casting questions on all this stuff, Mr. Speaker.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, is this. If the hon. member thinks it is so easy to have attracted to the province of

Saskatchewan a fertilizer plant, he was in government for 11 years and I ask him, how many fertilizer plants did they produce or build in the province of Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

RCMP Report on GigaText

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the Deputy Premier and the absence of the minister in charge of SEDCO, I address it to the Minister of Justice. This morning your department indicated that there will be no criminal charges as a result of the RCMP investigation in respect to the GigaText scandal.

And I want to say, as a result of that decision, as a result of the fact that there's no criminal charges going to be laid, that the ultimate responsibility lies with the government and the front benches opposite for the squandering of \$5 million of taxpayers' money.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, who . . . Somebody's head has to roll in respect to the squandering of \$5 million of taxpayers' money — gross mismanagement of taxpayers' money. I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, who in fact is going to take the responsibility for the gross incompetence?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I first of all say to the hon. member, I acknowledge his statement, inferred or otherwise, that the investigation has been completed, and I think that was fair and properly done.

With regard to the second question, I think, and that becomes, was the investment in GigaText a proper investment? And I guess that remains to be seen, Mr. Speaker.

I think the Deputy Premier has said on previous occasions in this Assembly that he takes responsibility for that particular venture by the Government of Saskatchewan, and I guess that he would take that responsibility. I suppose it is very much the same as the member from Regina North East would take the responsibility for the investment in Nabu which was some 5 or \$6 million dollars, \$8 million that basically was lost. Those things have a long history, Mr. Speaker, a long history of government action over the years in a province of Saskatchewan that requires, very often, some government help or assistance in order to get something going.

So clearly the Deputy Premier has indicated in this House before that he takes responsibility for that, and I would assume he would act according to the way that the member from Regina North East has acted in the past.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — New question to the Minister of Justice. Mr. Minister of Justice, your government can no longer hide behind the RCMP investigation. There is a waste and

a mismanagement of over \$5 million of taxpayers' money; there's a precedent in Alberta in respect to the Principal Group where the minister showed gross negligence and resigned as a result of it. There has been gross negligence here. I ask you, whose head is going to roll as a result of the squandering of \$5 million of taxpayers' money?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member indicates that this government was hiding behind the RCMP investigation. The members opposite some two months ago were making allegations in question period, Mr. Speaker, of criminality. I indicated to this House on many occasions that when these reports came out of Montreal in the newspapers that we caused that investigation to be done. That investigation was done in accordance with the proper procedure of any allegations of criminality. It was done in a proper way, Mr. Speaker, and I would argue, even, we went beyond what was normal or required in these type of situations.

I don't think it's fair for the hon. member, who has some of his colleagues alleging that there was violations of the criminal law involved here, to then turn around and say, well you guys were simply hiding behind this in some way trying to stall this off. This was thrown in; it was put into the hands of the RCMP; they conducted it in a proper way, Mr. Speaker, and now they have reported today, and I think that was all done proper, above board and the way it should have been.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I just want to remind the hon. members that I know there's a great deal of information to dispose of, but the answers are getting a little long at times, and I must say the questions at times are probably a little longer than they should be too. And so let us tighten up both sides and everybody will be pleased.

Mr. Koskie: — A further question to the Minister of Justice. Mr. Minister, we were not making from the outset allegations of criminality. You commenced the investigation. I want to indicate that gross mismanagement and incompetence has from the outset been the issue. I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, will you be prepared now to file a report of all the expenditures . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Now I have to interrupt the member, but we're having a great deal of difficulty hearing what he's saying. And I think the hon. member should allow him to put his question without being interrupted.

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. They're very uneasy in respect to this, and well they should be. Mr. Minister, as I indicate, you can no longer hide behind the RCMP investigation. The issue has been the gross mismanagement of the front benches opposite and, in particular, the Deputy Premier and also perhaps the minister of SEDCO. I want to ask you: in light of the gross negligence and the waste of 5 million, over \$5 million of taxpayers' money, I indicate to you that calls for the resignation of the minister responsible and/or ministers responsible, and what are you going to do about it?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, for the hon. member now to suggest somehow that that side of the House did not make allegations of criminal activity, Mr. Speaker, I would have the hon. member from Quill Lakes read the *Hansard*, Mr. Speaker, and the statements made by the member from The Battlefords. Read *Hansard*, Mr. Speaker. That is the record, and it clearly states in *Hansard* what is contrary to what the hon. member has just said.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the second part of his question was simply the same as the first. I responded to that. I don't think it's in the value of the House to simply repeat the answer, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — Yes, my final question to the Minister of Justice. In light of this extravagant waste of taxpayers' money which has been disclosed, I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, will you in fact file all of the expenditures as it relates to the \$4 million that was initially advanced? Will you today file a list of the expenditures and how it was abused, the taxpayers' money?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I understand that that question, and I'm going from memory here, Mr. Speaker, but I understand, if I recall from memory, that the hon. member had posed that question to the Deputy Premier. The Deputy Premier had indicated to the hon. member and to this House that that in fact would be done in due course, Mr. Speaker, and I would take the Deputy Premier at his word on that issue.

Late Submissions to Barber Commission

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, yesterday I took notice for a question from the member, I believe Saskatoon Nutana, with regard to her allegation that the Barber Commission was accepting submissions from Tories and changing the rules to allow late applications.

I'm advised that the policy of the Barber Commission is as follows; that a number of interested parties had indicated to the commission that they would be late and requested an extension; an extension was granted if they could give a reasonable estimate of when the brief could be submitted.

A number of people had not handed their briefs over to the commission by the 14th deadline and had not requested an extension. The commission will still accept the written brief, however, if it is handed in before the oral presentation.

Thirdly, if anyone still wants to appear or submit a brief and contact the commission, they are still accepting them.

I might indicate, Mr. Speaker, that among the late submissions accepted by the Barber were the following: the NDP executive of Shellbrook-Torch River; the SGEU

(Saskatchewan Government Employees' Union); citizens against privatization; and the United Church of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

And I hope, in fairness, Mr. Speaker, that the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* corrects its editorial and manages, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP are trying to get submissions before Barber, Mr. Speaker . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Working Conditions of Interns

Ms. Simard: — My question is to the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, as you know, the Professional Association of Interns and Residents of Saskatchewan have taken drastic steps in their battle to improve their working conditions. As you know, they have sent a letter across Canada that blacklists Saskatchewan because of your government's failure to provide decent working conditions for our future doctors.

Mr. Minister, when is your government going to take action to address the long-standing concerns of our future doctors, and when is your government going to improve their working conditions?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member well knows, or should well know, the negotiations are under way between the residents and interns and the health care association. Those are negotiations which operate in a matter of course as other negotiations do with other groups within the health care sector. Negotiations, as I understand them, are under way during this week.

The member says that it's because of a lack of funding by the government, which is what she said about nurses, and which is what she said about the CUPE (Canadian Union of Public Employees) arrangements, which was what she said about physicians, which is what she said about every sector in the health care sector.

But I want to remind her and remind you and all members of the House, Mr. Speaker, there is a settlement, a long-term settlement with physicians, there's a long-term settlement with nurses, a long-term settlement with CUPE and all of the hospitals, a long-term settlement with all of the sectors that work in the hospital sector, in the health care sector.

This one is not settled yet, but, Mr. Speaker, I have every confidence and the people of Saskatchewan should have every confidence that that settlement will be reached.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — New question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, this organization has been bargaining in good faith for some two years, and their efforts have been thwarted, Mr. Minister. And it's directly related to underfunding by your government.

We've seen it in many, many areas. We have a shortage of specialists, a shortage of the therapists, and health care

professionals are leaving this province because of the working conditions in the health care sector directly related to your mismanagement of the health care sector.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — Now, Mr. Minister, are you going to intervene and get these negotiations under way and this matter settled immediately?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, the member says, are you going to get negotiations under way? Mr. Speaker, just as I said, the negotiations are under way. They're under way in a manner in which they should be under way between the two parties, the health care association and the group termed PAIRS (Professional Association of Interns and Residents of Saskatchewan).

Mr. Speaker, the dispute between these two groups is not, I repeat, is not related to a lack of funding by the government, as the member says. It is absolutely not the fact that she said out here today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

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

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As I had indicated earlier, we have developed an economic analysis which the press in this province has seen fit to ignore, but at least the people of Saskatchewan have had the ability over the last several hours to see a detailed bit by bit discussion of the economics of the privatization or the public participation of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

And it is clear from those who with respect of the academic community such as Dr. Nancy Olewiler who was writing for the Economic Council of Canada, who has done a bit by bit by bit analysis of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, that it is a bad deal for the people of Saskatchewan to allow this Conservative government to sell off our resources in our heritage, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — But, Mr. Speaker, I had indicated earlier that I was going to take some time to devote to an analysis of the impact that the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan had on communities throughout Saskatchewan in terms of the wages and the living

conditions and the effect it had on off-farm income.

But because of the Draconian actions of this government in an attempt to gag the opposition, in an attempt to gag the people of Saskatchewan in expressing their opposition to selling off the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, I am going to today limit my remarks and make a summation and sum up what I've said over this last few hours, so that other members on this side of the House will have the opportunity to put forward their viewpoint to this economic folly and economic madness that your government has entered into.

Mr. Speaker, the issues have been defined well by members on this side of the Legislative Assembly. The issues are this, Mr. Speaker: one, does it make economic sense, and did it make economic sense to invest in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan when the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan was created in the middle 1970s.

The answer, which is irrefutable by any objective economic observer, Mr. Speaker, is this, that first of all, the investment in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan had positive economic benefits not just for the few, not just for a small group with the ability to buy shares in a private corporation, but to each and every man, woman, and child in the province of Saskatchewan; each and every man, woman, and child in this province who benefitted from the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan equally — equally, Mr. Speaker, not in the elitist fashion in which members of the Progressive Conservative Party would like to see the economy structured, where there is a small and wealthy and powerful elite who can back the Tory Party on the one hand, and the rest of us on the other hand watching our resource revenues and our dividends and the profits from those resources going out to foreign investors, to foreign countries, and to those who've got the money to be able to buy large hunks of shares in a private potash corporation.

Mr. Speaker, that is not our vision, and that is not the vision of Saskatchewan people in the mid-1970s when time after time after time they returned to power a government which ran openly, honestly on the question of public ownership of the potash industry, were elected before they provincialized the potash industry, and were elected after they provincialized the potash industry.

And I may say, Mr. Speaker, that will be in sharp contrast to the fate of each and every Tory in this Legislative Assembly when the people of Saskatchewan finally get the opportunity to pronounce on your agenda which was hidden from them, hidden from them, tucked away in the back pockets prior to the 1986 general election.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Speaker, it is clear, as I said earlier on, it is clear that any competent economic analysis of the performance of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan can reach only one conclusion, can reach one conclusion, supported, I suggest, by the evidence that I've presented here in the debate in this legislature, and that is that the performance of the Potash Corporation of

Saskatchewan even as to compared with the performance of the private potash producers in Saskatchewan was superior.

And, Mr. Speaker, was superior not only in raw, economic performance terms in the amount of money which they generated internally for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan; not only in the profitability ratios which we presented to the legislature last evening; not only in the facts and figures and statistics which showed that the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan was able to produce and produce in many ways more cheaply than the private potash producers, but was superior, Mr. Speaker, in its performance in regards to things which affect people all across Saskatchewan, and in particular those communities affected directly by the existence of the potash industries in Saskatchewan.

Superior in maintaining employment levels over the slumps, over the hollows which affect the economy, which affect the markets for potash. Superior in maintaining the standard of living of the potash workers, or the part-time farmers that work in the potash industry, or those people in the local communities which benefit through the introduction of the pay cheques on main street, in the local businesses.

Mr. Speaker, that is an irrefutable economic fact shown by competent economic analysis. But do we see that fact challenged by members of the Progressive Conservative caucus? Do we see someone on that side of the House trying to stand up, trying to refute what is real? No, Mr. Speaker, we don't. And we don't see that because they refuse to deal with the real economics of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, the real life of the people who work for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Do we see, when we make the statement and when we provide the proof, that the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan performed in a superior manner to the private sector companies when it came to worker health and safety? Do we see anybody on that side of the House trying to stand up and refute that fact? No, Mr. Speaker, we don't.

We don't see that type of argument from the Progressive Conservative caucus, Mr. Speaker, because it's kind of hard to argue with fact. It's hard to argue with reality. It's easier, it's much easier to sit there, to employ and to utilize tactics which show nothing but political cowardice, such as the motion to end the debate over the sell-off of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

It's much easier to try to use an artificial majority than it is to deal with reality, Mr. Speaker, because not one speaker from the Progressive Conservative side has stood and tried to refute the superior performance economically of this Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan when it came to dealing with matters of environmental safety.

(1445)

Because the performance of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan was superior in regards to environmental concerns, and here's the proof. There's the proof that we presented to the legislature in that matter that it's better for

the environment to own a publicly held mining corporation in the potash industry in Saskatchewan than it is to sell them off to foreign investors. It's better for the environment. The proof is there.

But do we see, Mr. Speaker, the members from the Progressive Conservative caucus standing up to try to deal with that fact? No we don't, Mr. Speaker. We don't see the members of the Progressive Conservative caucus trying to defend this jackboot approach to dealing with important economic issues, an approach which is the antithesis, which is the exact opposite of democracy in this province.

No, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative members of this legislature would rather sit and hide than deal with the real world; would rather sit and hide than deal with what are the facts in regards to Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan; would rather sit there and let their front benches lead them into their Waterloo, their Alamo, their big mud hole in which the people of Saskatchewan will pull on the traces and bring them to a grinding halt.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Speaker, do the Conservative members stand up in this Legislative Assembly and attempt to refute the evidence that we've presented, that in the long term that the investment by the people of Saskatchewan through their government was a better investment than, as the members on the other side would suggest, than keeping your money in the bank.

Last night in this legislature, Mr. Speaker, we presented a document by a reputed economic analyst in the potash industry who addressed that question directly, who addressed the question that the Conservative members tried to put forward, that it was better to put the money in the bank.

And what happened, Mr. Speaker? When that economist addressed that very question, did it support the contention put forward by members of the Progressive Conservative caucus in this legislature? No, Mr. Speaker, it did not.

No, it did not, Mr. Speaker, because that economist who has dealt year in and year out with the activities of the potash industry in Saskatchewan clearly stated, clearly stated that in the long run, and I quote:

It was not better to keep your money in the bank . . .

That it was better for the people of Saskatchewan to invest their future in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan; that it was better for the economic diversification of Saskatchewan to invest their money in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan; that it was better to build this province's and diversify this province's economy by putting the money in the future of potash rather than selling off the future to multinational, foreign corporations which have the Progressive Conservative Party members in this legislature in their back pocket.

Mr. Speaker, reality, facts, figures, the truth will not sway

— will not sway — the Progressive Conservative members of this caucus. But let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, the facts, the truth, and the reality also will not sway the people of this province. They will not sway the people of this province, I suggest, sir, from the continuing support they have given to members of the New Democratic Party and the members of the New Democratic caucus who, to each and every one of them, have made it perfectly clear that they will stand with the people of Saskatchewan to protect the people of Saskatchewan's heritage, its future, and its resources, by maintaining the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan against those foreign interests, those foreign potash corporations, those foreign companies that want to come in and steal the future from us.

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, where we stand on this issue. But it is also clear, Mr. Speaker, and it is also becoming painfully evident to everybody across Saskatchewan, that this government which refused to put forward its privatization agenda prior to the 1986 election, in fact who went from town to town to town denying that the plans of the PC government were to sell off Saskatchewan, who for example . . . who like for example the member . . . the Minister for Justice in Moose Jaw talked about privatization as yesterday's theory, who said in Moose Jaw, no, we're not going to sell off any of our assets; no, we're not going to give Saskatchewan's future away; no, heavens to Betsy, we're not going to do that because that's yesterday's theory — that's what he said prior to the election.

Much the same way that the present Minister of Finance, the member from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden, in Regina said prior to the 1986 election: heavens, no, we're not going to touch any of the Crown corporations; heavens, no, we're not going to touch SaskTel; we wouldn't dream of selling off any portion of the Saskatchewan Telecommunications Corporation; heavens, no, we wouldn't dare deal with any of those Crown corporations because we know that the people of Saskatchewan, we know the people of Saskatchewan want those things protected.

That's what he said in Regina; that's what he said in Regina one week, one week prior to the 1986 election. But, Mr. Speaker, we know and the people of Saskatchewan know, finally, because of the activities of that particular member since the 1986 election, that you could not trust the PC government any farther than you could throw this Legislative Building, because it has been nothing but a record of betrayal, has been nothing but a record of betrayal when it comes to the resource history, the resource future of our province.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, prior to the 1986 election what did we see the Premier of the province saying? The crown jewels, the crowns of the Crown corporations, the utilities, they're not for sale. Heaven's sake! We're not going to touch Saskatchewan power; we're not going to touch the power corporation at all. Goodness gracious me! No, sir, we're not going to see any privatization of the power corporation. That's the record; that's what they said prior to the 1986 election.

They hid the privatization agenda from the people of Saskatchewan. The people of Saskatchewan know they

did it. The people of Saskatchewan know that they weren't honest prior to the 1986 election. And when the members attempted to introduce their privatization agenda into this legislature in this session, including the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, including Saskatchewan Power, what happened politically, Mr. Speaker, I suggest is this: is that there was a rupture, there was an irreparable rupture between the government on the one hand, and the people of Saskatchewan on the other. That the people of Saskatchewan said to themselves and are saying to themselves: you can't believe them; you can't believe a word they say; you can't believe a thing they're doing. It's nothing more than cynical manipulation — like the Barber Commission, as we presented here in this legislature recently.

The same thing applies to the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. They set up a front group, the Institute for Saskatchewan Free Enterprise, and it should be called the institute for Saskatchewan free-loaders, because all those so-called free-enterprisers, if you look at them on the board of directors, each and every one of them — the Bob Bundons, the Gordon Wicijowskis, the Gunnar Pedersens, the Roger Phillippses — have they been out there making it as real entrepreneurs in the real world? Not a bit, Mr. Speaker. Each and every member of the Saskatchewan institute for free-loaders has been living well off the public trough for years and years and years.

And you look at the biographies and you look at the history of those individuals who support the privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, because they've been able to rip off enough money out of the public purse, where they're going to out and buy a whole pile of shares. You can bet your bottom dollar on that, Mr. Speaker.

You can bet your bottom dollar that all those bigwigs in the institute for Saskatchewan free-loaders, that Tory front group that puts out supposed neutral economic analysis, which does nothing more than peddle the Tory line that it's okay, it'll be okay to have the quick fix of privatizing the potash corporation . . .

You can bet your bottom dollars that they'll be loading up their wallets with the real profits that will be made from the privatization of Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan; profits that should be going to all the people in this province; profits that should be going to every man, woman and child in the form of increased and better services for health care, in the form of increased and better services in education, in the form of increased and better services throughout — a whole series of public programs that the people of this province have fought for and have paid for, and are being destroyed in this privatization mania.

Because that's the reality. That's what this is all about, Mr. Speaker. Ultimately it is reduced to nothing more than a simple case of greed, a simple case of greed on the one hand, by the foreign potash corporations who've come to take their revenge on the people of Saskatchewan for having the temerity to stand up to them in 1974, in 1975, and taking control over their potash resources.

It's the revenge of the foreign potash corporations on the

one hand; and secondly, it's the revenge of a small group of would-be big shots and would-be big wheelers and dealers on the international scale; of people who can't make it out as entrepreneurs out in the real world, but take their money through co-operatives like a Gunnar Pedersen, or take their money through a corporation that deals solely with the government and is paid by funds that are derived directly from the revenues of the taxpayers of the province of Saskatchewan. Right?

An Hon. Member: — First in line at the trough.

Mr. Lyons: — Those who are first in line at the trough are right with you, shoulder to shoulder, Mr. Speaker, in selling off the assets of the people of Saskatchewan.

But where do the great majority of the people of this province stand, sir, when it comes to the question of whether or not the potash resources of this province belong to them? Do they stand shoulder to shoulder with the member from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden? No. Do they stand shoulder to shoulder with the member from Indian Head-Wolseley? No. Not on this issue, not on the issue of SaskEnergy and SaskPower. Not on any issue since this government broke faith, broke faith and broke the trust and then turned around and rubbed the nose of the people of Saskatchewan in their own political cynicism, exhibited by, first and foremost, the attempt to gag the opposition, the attempt to shut down and limit debate, as we stand here day after day trying to convince this arrogant, out-of-touch government, this incompetent bunch of economic bumblerers that are selling off the heritage of us all.

And that's my son's heritage that I'm talking about, Mr. Speaker. That's my son's heritage, and it's the heritage of the sons and daughters of all families in Saskatchewan. The potash that's in the ground in this province does not belong to the Norandas, does not belong to the AMAXs, or U.S. Borax Corporation, or Pennzoil — it belongs to all of us here in Saskatchewan. Because it belongs to all of us it forms the economic basis for a great part of the future prosperity of this province.

And these people, Mr. Speaker, because they have been bought and paid for over and over again, none more so than the member for Qu'Appelle-Lumsden by the foreign potash corporations, have turned a deaf ear to what the people of Saskatchewan are saying, and are going about with this privatization mania come heck or high water. That's what the agenda of today is here in this legislature, Mr. Speaker.

(1500)

But their agenda is not the agenda of the people of this province. The agenda of the people of Saskatchewan is not to sell off the resource history. The agenda of the people of Saskatchewan is this: they want the ability so that their sons and their daughters can have jobs so that they can stay here and live here and work here in Saskatchewan, and that opportunity will flow out of this province just like the dividends, just like the profits; just like the revenue from the Potash Corporation will flow out of this province somewhere else, whether it's China, whether it's India, whether it's Chicago, who knows

where?

Because who knows what kind of deal that the members, the little clique that sits on the front benches of the Conservative party, have cooked up with goodness gracious knows what group of enterprising entrepreneurs who are dealing with them in the back rooms, who are making the kind of financial arrangements that ensure them whatever happens, whatever happens, whatever judgement is cast upon them by the people of Saskatchewan for selling off the Potash Corporation, that some of them will be very secure. Some of them will be very secure after their political career is over. Because that's what it's about, Mr. Speaker. It's called greed. It's called greed.

And I can tell you right now that the Potash Corporation of America or the U.S. Borax Corporation or Pennzoil, or any one of the large multinational conglomerates which comes with a job offer to any one of the front benches offer, that after the election, boys, provided you give us the potash in Saskatchewan, we will make sure that you're well looked after. Perhaps they can offer them a greater financial reward than serving the people of this province, because that's what it's about. That's what it's about for the members of the Conservative caucus.

Because if it wasn't, Mr. Speaker, if it wasn't about individual personal greed, they would look at the economic facts, the realities that we have presented in this legislature day after day; the realities that say, as does Dr. Nancy Olewiler for example, that it is to the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan that the potash corporation of this province be maintained for the benefit of all the people and not for that select group, the cronies, the political bagmen, the wheelers and dealers, the back-room boys that are so cozy with the front benches of the Progressive Conservative caucus.

Mr. Speaker, there was a notion at one time, there was a notion at one time in the province of Saskatchewan that to be a government was to be a steward of the resources of the people of the province. And that wasn't a notion that was peculiar or particular to the New Democratic Party of the province of Saskatchewan, I suggest. As we proved in developing the history of why it was there came about a Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, it became clear, Mr. Speaker, that the policies of the former Liberal government of Ross Thatcher, and prior to that the policies of Tommy Douglas, were to develop the potash industry in Saskatchewan for the benefit, for the benefit of Saskatchewan.

We had differences, of course, with the way in which the Thatcher government did it. But at least at that point in time no one was suggesting that the Government of Saskatchewan was not interested in expanding and developing the industry. The same, Mr. Speaker, cannot be said of this present group which occupies temporarily the front benches of the government of the province of Saskatchewan.

Not only have they broken irreparably with the trust of the people of this province over this issue of privatization, they have also broken with the tradition of how one goes about building a province. They have got themselves

locked into some weird, right-wing, ideological roller coaster that's bound for goodness knows where, but because they're all having a good ride at our expense you can bet your bottom dollar that they're not going to hop off, until somebody derails him.

Mr. Speaker, it's evident to each and every member of the New Democratic Party on this side that facts and reality will not derail this government. It doesn't matter how good the case you make, it doesn't matter how much common sense is contained in your argument, it doesn't matter what people independent of this legislature say, it's evident, it's evident that they don't care.

Now some members have indicated that they're bailing out of the ship, that they're getting off the roller-coaster ride, and some not for anything more than personal reasons, particularly valid, personal reasons, like the member from Rosetown, perfectly valid reasons. We know his personal situation and that's fine. Right?

Or like the member from Pelly. Again, personally valid reasons to leave the government — right? — and to leave government service. And he, personally, is a fine individual. I will say so here. I happen to like that individual on a personal basis. But you watch, Mr. Speaker, what happens, because as those in the front bench, that little clique that has made the decision to sell off the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to foreign interests, as that little clique looks closer and closer at the deadline, at the judgement of the people of Saskatchewan, you watch those people jump. You watch those people get off that roller-coaster. You watch those people get off and land somewhere where it's nice and cushy.

You watch where they go, Mr. Speaker, because you can bet your bottom dollar that the big golden parachute has certainly been put together with the silver and the thread provided by the potash corporations of the United States and by those wheeler-dealers from offshore who are putting together the little deal to sell out our interests. Because that's what's going to happen. That's the political reality of greed in terms of taking away our future by selling off the potash corporation to foreign interests.

Mr. Speaker, I have stood in this legislature and put forward my case. I have tried to limit the partisan political rhetoric until my summation this afternoon, and I think all members here would agree with that. I've tried to show, by means of a Conservative economist, someone that adheres to the philosophy of the Progressive Conservative Party, that it doesn't make any kind of economic sense to sell off the potash corporation. I've tried to use the arguments and take seriously the arguments that the members put opposite, like the argument put forward by the member from Regina South or the member from Melville, that it was better to keep the money in the bank.

That's a valid argument if it were true, but we have presented evidence directly contrary to what those members have said. We have presented evidence that suggests in fact that there were two years, '82 to '83, it may have been true, but in terms of the long-run development of the potash industry in Saskatchewan, it was better for the . . . more beneficial, more positive for

the people of Saskatchewan to put their money into the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan it was to keep it in the bank. I just use that as an example of the kind of issue.

But you know what's going to happen, Mr. Speaker? You know what's going to happen? Instead of dealing with that economic fact and that economic reality, we're going to have somebody from the Progressive Conservative caucus get up, particularly after they invoke their closure motion to shut down the debate in the legislature — the first time in the history of this province — engaging in pushing through their privatization mania, the privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, engaging in an act of political cowardice unsurpassed, unsurpassed in the history of this legislature, the first time, the first time that an opposition has been refused its right to speak, and in this case to speak out against the privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Because, Mr. Speaker, they know they're losing the argument. They know that on the basis of facts, they know that on the basis of rational decision making, they know that on the basis of the long-term interests of the people of Saskatchewan that what they're doing is fundamentally wrong.

And instead of facing up to that fact, instead of saying, you know, we got on this privatization roller-coaster and it was the wrong track, instead of admitting it, what you see is the Premier sending those letters to people saying, oh well, we're going to look after Saskatchewan families by privatizing SaskEnergy and by privatizing potash. And we'll make sure that those foreign potash producers look after you real well, because Chantal and I really like families in Saskatchewan, and maybe there's an election coming up and we'd sure like your vote.

I mean, that's the kind of political cynicism that people have seen through. They understand what's going on. People in this province aren't stupid. People in any province, I don't believe, are stupid, but in Saskatchewan in particular, the most politicized province in this Dominion of Canada, they certainly aren't. And they can see that kind of petty political manipulation and cynicism.

I mean, it's simple. You have to look at how people are laughing at the Barber Commission, just as an example. They know it's whitewash, because they're not stupid, because they know that the sell-off of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is the same type of manoeuvre. They know that the sell-off of the assets of the people of Saskatchewan are not in their best interests. And it's almost like this government doesn't believe that the people existed in this province prior to 1982.

You know . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. Unparliamentary language will not be tolerated, and I'd ask the member from Saskatoon Eastview to restrain himself from using unparliamentary language in the House.

Mr. Pringle: — I apologize, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, the people of Saskatchewan weren't born yesterday, and they certainly weren't born post-1982. Some of them were, some were obviously. But the people of Saskatchewan that lived through the tumultuous debates of the provincialization control of a provincial resource, remember the debates. They remembered and they passed judgement on the government of the member for Qu'Appelle-Lumsden who opposed in the first place bringing the potash corporation under public control.

You know, it's not as if that they weren't here. I mean I don't understand how a government can be so arrogant as to think that the people didn't exist prior to their coming into being as a government, prior to their election. Because the people in this province passed judgement on whether or not they wanted a publicly controlled, a publicly owned, a public potash corporation whose benefits went to them all.

They passed the judgement in 1975; they passed that judgement again in 1978 and thought the issue was settled. And they thought the issue was settled because of the incredible profitability of that corporation, a profitability which has produced greater revenues for the people of Saskatchewan than for, as the member from Melville would suggest for example, putting the money in the bank. It was better than putting money in the bank, and every reputable economist in Canada will tell them so.

Except, the member for Melville, as other members on that side of the House, have something wrong either with their faculties of reasoning, or their political judgement, or their ears, or all three, because they can't accept the fact that the people of this province say no to privatization.

(1515)

They're saying no to the sell-off of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to foreign interests. They're saying no to an agenda that was hidden from them prior to the 1986 election. They're saying no to a government which broke faith with us as exhibited by the government's attempt to sell off the potash industry of Saskatchewan. And saying no, Mr. Speaker, in a way that's loud and clear, at least to the members on this side of the House.

You know, Mr. Speaker, earlier on I said that the issue of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is an issue that I will be proud to go to the electorate of this, my constituency of Regina Rosemont, because having the opportunity to live in Regina and being probably more in touch with my constituents than some of the other members who live outside the city of Regina, I have not received one call, not one letter, not one door knock, not one chance acquaintance on the street, not one tap on the shoulder of anybody, including the Progressive Conservative members in Rosemont, concerning our stand opposing the sell-off of the privatization, the privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Because in Rosemont even the Conservatives know that

this is nothing more than economic folly. Even the Conservatives understand that you don't sell off one of your greatest potential assets, because some of the Conservative business people in Rosemont are saying: this does not make any kind of economic sense whatsoever, and we may not agree with you, Bob, we may not agree with what you have to say all the time in all places; but I'll tell you this, on this issue we do agree with you, so you guys are doing a good job; keep up the fight. That's what the Conservatives say.

And you know, my other caucus colleagues who have been around and have been to their home constituencies, they report the same thing to us. They're saying the same thing. You know, they're saying the same thing, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: — Ring the bells.

Mr. Lyons: — Now the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster says, well why don't you walk, why don't you ring the bells? Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. I would ask that members don't carry on a debate between themselves across the floor, so I do ask the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster to allow the member from Regina Rosemont to make his comments, and I would ask the member for Regina Rosemont not to respond to him.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I was going to get to that particular question just in a few minutes, so I will wait for a few minutes.

As I said, even the Progressive Conservative members in Rosemont aren't backing the government in this one. So you guys have got the polls. The members of the government, particularly the little group, the inner group in the cabinet, have got the real polls which show what the people of this province are saying about privatizing the potash industry of Saskatchewan, the potash corporation. And you know very well what the polls are saying. They know very well what the polls are saying.

Now maybe they're not telling the people, maybe they're not telling the back-benchers over there what the polls are saying, but they had better understand this, that this caucus hasn't stood here day after day after day in this legislature, taking the position we have on this issue, without the knowledge and full knowledge and support of a tremendous majority of the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker — a tremendous majority of the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — Including members of the Conservative Party who say to me: hey, Bob, you guys are doing a good job; keep up the debate.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. I allowed you to make reference to yourself and let it go by once, but you're not supposed to make reference to anyone in the legislature by name. So I'd ask the member not to refer to himself again.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry, I just didn't realize that. They're saying: hey, member from Regina Rosemont, you guys are doing a good job on this one; keep up the good debate. And then they'll go on and they'll tell me about what they've been doing for the summer, and they'll make a few cracks about the next election and that kind of banter that occurs in Saskatchewan, few words about GigaText and maybe a word about the Barber Commission, or this or that or the other thing. I mean, that's what people say to a political person when they know that the person's political, like their MLA.

So I don't understand, I mean I don't understand, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, that despite the fact that we have shown black and white and the bottom line for the people of Saskatchewan is that it's more beneficial to keep the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan as a public entity than to sell it off, I can't understand why, just in terms of rational economic analysis, that that wouldn't sway you. I can't understand that even on the basis of political opportunity, and any chance of forming the next provincial government in this province, why the members opposite haven't backed off potash; haven't said, well maybe we did make a mistake, and look, let's find some way out of this that is not going to leave us at the bottom of the barrel in terms of public opinion, in terms of what people think about us, and people going around with the notion that we don't tell them the truth, and don't show them what the real agenda is, because as I said the inner clique over there, they've got the real poll results.

So I don't understand on the political level; there has to be some explanation, and if it's not rational debate and discourse, and rational economic understanding, and if it's not just a question of politics, then there's got to be something else.

And the only thing else, Mr. Speaker, that one can think of is the question of human greed. So we have to ask ourselves: which of the private potash producers have bought and paid for those little members of the inner circle of the Progressive Conservative caucus so that they can get their hands on our Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Because ultimately that's what this issue reduces itself to.

That's what it reduces itself to. There can't be any other rational explanation I suggest, Mr. Speaker. And I'm not trying to impute the reputations of any member over there. But someone over there has got to stand up in this legislature when I'm finished, which I shall be in a very few short minutes, someone from that side of the House has got to stand up and tell this legislature, because it doesn't make economic sense and because it doesn't make political sense, why are they going about doing what they're doing?

I mean, that's the question. Why are they doing what they're doing when it doesn't make any kind of sense? And I guess, Mr. Speaker, if they don't want to tell the real story, they've got enough practice in telling another story that they can present to the legislature that doesn't reflect reality, that doesn't reflect the honesty in terms of economic analysis. But for goodness sakes, if you're not concerned, you know, if you're not concerned about

particularly I say this to the older members of the front bench, including the minister for privatization — if you're not concerned about your own fading political futures, you know, think about, a little bit about maybe somebody else that wants to move up to the front bench, that wants to occupy the position that you occupy. Now I don't happen to think they're going to occupy the front bench after the next election, but, you know, in politics things change.

And one of the things that's got to change, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, in regards to the whole debate around the privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is that the government's got to change its attitude. And that attitude is: we can't fool all the people all the time. They'd better change that, because that's what basically is going on. They think somehow that the people of Saskatchewan didn't exist prior to '82, that they can pull the wool over the eyes of the people. But I guess, Mr. Speaker, it's free advice and that's what it's worth, I say to the members opposite.

But I say this, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion. I say this to the people of Saskatchewan. We on this side of the Legislative Assembly believe that the natural resources of the province of Saskatchewan belong to all the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — Not to just a few, not to just the rich, not to just the powerful, and not to just those of the so-called corporate elite who are salivating at the mouth waiting to get their chance to buy the potash shares, because they know such a good deal it is. They know that it's going to be just a great deal. They know that the potential in potash is an extremely rich potential, and they can't wait to fill their pockets with that rich potential.

But I would caution those who think that they're going to make a fast buck at the expense of the people of Saskatchewan, I would caution them as to how they operate vis-à-vis operate with in relation to the natural resources that belong to all the people of this province.

Times change, government changes, the tide goes in and the tide goes out, and if you can't stand solid as a rock no matter what happens with the tide, you end up as a bit of flotsam. And that, Mr. Speaker, I suggest is precisely what is going to happen to the members opposite and their rich and powerful friends who are waiting to enrich themselves at our expense.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a privilege and it's been an honour to take part in this historic debate. I think that rarely in political life does any member of the Legislative Assembly get to sit through and take part in such a crucial and historic times in the affairs of any one province. And I tell you, I feel particularly privileged that the people of Regina Rosemont sent me here to take part in these affairs.

I hope that in this debate, and I know that in this debate I have represented their wishes and desires, the great majority of the people in the constituency — not them all, that's true — but the great majority of the people in the constituency I represent. And I'm going to try to continue

to do that, whatever happens over the next few days, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to try to continue to represent them in the best manner possible in order to ensure that their future is secure and that the futures of their families are secure and that their children have an opportunity to grow and develop here in this province. And I'm going to, like every other member of our caucus, work as hard as we can to ensure that that takes place. That's the commitment that we make, Mr. Speaker, all of us in this debate, at least speaking for myself.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — And finally, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to thank yourself and the Speaker, and I want to thank the members on the other side of the Legislative Assembly for providing the decorum necessary to carry out the kind of debate and analysis and the presentation of a viewpoint that I've attempted to do here over these last 13 hours. So I know that this is an emotional, and I know that this is a tremendously crucial debate for both sides of the legislature. And I leave you with these words. There are times in the affairs of human history when that which is in principle must stand above that which is easy. In this debate I have tried to express that particular sentiment, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1530)

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's with pleasure that I enter into this, what everyone is calling an historic debate, and I do not deny those terms. I think it is history in the making for the province of Saskatchewan. However, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to say that what I have experienced in the last few days in the House causes me some dismay and some concern as a steward of the taxpayers' dollar of the province of Saskatchewan.

I've sat in this House and listened to opposition members speak on for periods — as the last member just said — 13 hours, others for 10 hours, some for eight hours, and seven hours, and so on. I say that the member opposite brought forth some argument from his perspective that probably he feels are quite valid. I think the member took from his case by extending it into 13 hours, which any rational individual could have said in one or two hours.

And as I've talked to people across this province — and I've been taking it upon myself to phone a lot of them over the last few nights to get an opinion of what they feel should be taking place in this rather historic debate today — and there isn't a man, woman or child in Saskatchewan who can say that they justify anyone standing for a period of 13 hours to repeat, to repeat, and repeat the same thing over and over again.

If we all remember back in our days in high school when we studied English literature, and remember Polonius giving advice to Laertes, and what did he tell his son? He said, my son, brevity is the soul of wit.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — And I would hope that the member

for Riversdale take his caucus tomorrow and says to them, remember the words of old Polonius, that brevity is the soul of wit. Because if you talk to people from Stewart Valley to Carievale to Meadow Lake to Wynyard, no one can justify why person after person should stand at a cost of \$3,500 an hour, to use the taxpayers' money, as did the member from Moose Jaw North to the tune of \$35,000, to have continual repetition of his point of view.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that that is a gross misuse of the funds of the province of Saskatchewan. I believe, and I give the opportunity to the opposition to put forth its . . .

An Hon. Member: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: — What is the member's point of order?

Mr. Koskie: — Point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The issue that we are debating is Bill 21 . . . Bill 20 and the position of the government, not an allegation of how long we spoke. That's the issue and he has not addressed it and none of the other members are prepared to address and put their position forward. I would ask you to call him to attention.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. I've listened to the member's point of order and I believe that all members will agree and admit that in this debate, which is a very significant debate in this province, that all members have used some of their earlier comments to lead into the debate. And I will allow the member from Indian Head-Wolseley to continue his debate and I will bring to his attention relevance and repetition as he gets into the debate and further discusses Bill 20.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Thank you very much for your ruling, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It shows how much the member from Quill Lakes is paying attention.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order, order. I would just bring to the attention of all members that when the Speaker has made a ruling, that no other comment be made regarding the ruling, but just continue the debate regarding the question before the House.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It would seem logical to me that in a debate on a Bill, it would be quite in order to talk about the length of debate by members. That would seem logical to me . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right, I've used about 5 or 10 minutes to outline that I believe that taxpayers' money is being wasted in this Assembly because of filibustering. And I hear the House member from the opposition, yesterday saying in his . . . (inaudible) . . . that they will do anything to string it out. And I just want to draw to the attention of the taxpayers of this province that that's what's been going on in this House.

However, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is certainly not my intent to do that. And I believe, as I said earlier, that any member who has done his homework can certainly, within the constraints of a half an hour or one hour, put forward his position or the position of his party or to government as regards Bill 20 and the public participation in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

And with that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I as Minister of Public Participation in the province of Saskatchewan, am proud to rise before this House and before the people of our province to enter into debate on Bill 20. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this debate specifically focuses on our intent to provide public participation opportunities in the potash corporation.

To truly understand the intent of Bill 20, I believe the members opposite must be given a chance to gain insight into the public participation program. Only then will they understand why public participation is right for the potash corporation. And only then will they understand how public participation will help the potash corporation grow to its fullest potential.

Here in this Chamber we have the power and the obligation to free the potash corporation from political and bureaucratic constraint and help it evolve into a progressive Saskatchewan company. Mr. Speaker, my opening remarks are focused on public participation. This program is the common thread that weaves the social and economic future of our people together with the needs and potential of companies like the potash corporation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will demonstrate by example, and beyond any doubt, why public participation is crucial for the potash corporation. I will also speak about the true history of the potash industry and of PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan). Through this history I will demonstrate the monumental mistakes made by the Leader of the Opposition and the former government in nationalizing potash and other resource industries. I will clearly answer the question why we need public participation in the potash corporation. And finally I will address the legislative features of Bill 20.

The topics of public participation and potash cannot be debated in isolation of each other. We cannot make a case for Bill 20 without also making a case for public participation. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask that you trust my line of reasoning. Although Bill 20 and the potash corporation are not reflected in every thought, my remarks are intended to lay before the House a convincing and irrefutable case for public participation in the potash corporation.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite have clearly demonstrated that they don't understand our public participation program. And I'd like to set the record straight about the history of our province and its people, about the basic principles of public participation, about Bill 20 and the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, and most of all, Mr. Speaker, about this government's commitment to the people and to the future of Saskatchewan.

This debate reaches beyond the narrow boundaries of potash. It is a question of pride in our province. It is a question of opportunity to build and to grow and to diversify. And it is a question of rights — the right to choose, the right to participate, and the right to become true partners with this government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — It is a question of embracing our past and of knowing that we as a people are guided by fundamental principles of commitment, of compassion, of determination, of drive, experience, and common sense. It is a question of recognizing the needs to manage change and the question of moving forward with strength and conviction to meet the challenges of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, it is a question of believing — believing in our people and in our province and in ourselves, believing in our integrity and our sense of purpose, and believing that we can work together; believing that we can build and diversify and create a dynamic economic base to support our social foundations in the century ahead. And I believe, my colleagues, that we can do that. By passing Bill 20 and other Bills that create public participation opportunities, we can realize our full potential as a people and as a province.

Ours is a history of challenge and change. Saskatchewan was built by enterprising men and women, people who invested time and energy and commitment and compassion, competitive skill and entrepreneurial spirit to bring prosperity to this province.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order, order. I ask the members of the Assembly to allow the member from Indian Head-Wolseley to continue his debate without continuous interruption. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The men and women who brought us to the threshold of the 21st century took the need for change seriously. They believed in freedom and in progressive government and in the rights of individuals, and they worked hand in hand to build our province and our future.

The co-operative movement was born in this environment. It was, and is, a good movement. It proved that Saskatchewan people had the good sense and tenacity to address the needs of our society. We created credit unions, a universal health care program, and Crown corporations like PCS in the resource sector and like SaskTel in the utility sector. With this movement we laid the foundation for Saskatchewan's entry into the 21st century.

The co-operative movement had its place in our history. It gave our Crown corporations the start they needed to take root in our province and to begin to grow. Co-operative development will continue to play a dominant role in our future. You see, Mr. Speaker, public participation is not unlike the co-operative movement. In fact, the basic principles are nearly identical — Saskatchewan people working together to build Saskatchewan.

To understand the essence of public participation and why public participation is critical to our potash corporation, we must appreciate our history as a province. Our history is related to that of other nations and our trading partners throughout the world. While Saskatchewan was building on the strength of the co-operative movement, others were also building their government sectors. After World War II, industrialized governments mushroomed in size. The number of

government employees grew. The number of services provided to the public by the government grew, and the cost of these services and the government deficit climbed.

For decades we followed this world-wide trend in government ownership and control. Our government pursued an interventionist public policy, one where politicians and bureaucrats held the decision making power and control with little input from ordinary people. And the enormous size and complexity of government distanced politicians who made government policy and the public servants who implemented them for the people they serve.

In Saskatchewan our small resource-based economy depends on unpredictable variables — such things as market demand for products, fluctuations in price, the value of the dollar, the weather, and transportation bottle-necks. The potash corporation was affected by all these variables.

An economy dominated by government ownership of key industries in the Crown sector leaves little room for diversification and growth. Social priorities must always come first, and the cost of providing these services left little capital for reinvestment in our Crowns. Lack of capital has stunted the growth of PCS and our other resource Crowns. The need for a new economic direction, a new public policy, was evident.

(1545)

Mr. Speaker, the challenges of today are no different than those of yesterday. We must recognize those challenges and work together to reinforce our foundations. We must build tomorrow on the strength of yesterday. And while they may not understand why the potash corporation needs public participation, the Leader of the Opposition admits that this program signals the immersion of a new global trend. And here in Saskatchewan we have demonstrated beyond any doubt that public participation is a trend which brings concrete results. It brings new jobs. It brings new investment and ownership opportunities for everyday people, and diversification of our industrial base.

As my colleague, the Minister of Education, pointed out only a few days ago, these program initiatives stretch across the economic activities of many countries, many peoples, and many governments. In no less than 110 countries around the world, there are countless examples of public participation at work, and these numbers are growing every day. Public participation is a proven success, and I believe that public participation will be very successful in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Saskatchewan is a vital link in a progressive nation, and part of the global economy. We are taking a lead role in public participation, and we stand on the threshold of a new decade and a new century. We face a challenge of singular importance. That challenge is to provide the means for our province and our people to face the future with confidence in their economic and social systems. And as in the past, we must work together to build a better tomorrow.

Through public participation, we will build and diversify here in Saskatchewan. With the help of Saskatchewan people, we will invest in our province to reinforce our economic and social foundations. To do this we must create wealth inside our borders through economic diversification. Only then can we support our social programs and care for those in need.

Saskatchewan has suffered from the boom or bust reality of agriculture and resource-based economy. We must find new ways to ensure more stable growth. The potash corporation and our other Crown corporations need freedom to grow. They need flexibility, new funds to expand their operation. And most of all, Mr. Speaker, our Saskatchewan Crowns need the help of Saskatchewan people if they hope to evolve beyond the restrictions of government ownership. Only then will there be maximum advantage, maximum economic and social security, job protection and job growth, and industrial growth and diversification.

That is our commitment, that is our vision and that is our destiny.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker, are the most saving people in the world. While we're saving our money in various accounts and other secured investments, PCS and other Crown corporations must go elsewhere.

In the major markets of eastern Canada and the United States and Europe, they borrow against our heritage just to stay in business. We must put an end to this practice of out-of-province borrowing at the highest interest rates. We can and we will through public participation.

The members opposite constantly refer to this program as privatization. Their lack of understanding results in the miscommunication of our goals and principles. Public participation is more than privatization. It goes well beyond the narrow activity of selling government assets. It is a people-based, employee-based, community-based economic development program, one that involves every person in our province in making decisions that will keep us on the leading edge. It is a new approach to public policy, one that recognizes the right of Saskatchewan people to participate in developing our province. It is a partnership for economic development and diversification.

Through public participation we have offered bonds and shares to Saskatchewan people, affordable opportunities to invest and save at home, and a way to provide much needed capital for Crown corporations.

Mr. Speaker, by passing Bill 20 we can provide much needed capital for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Investment dollars work for us to build our economic and social programs, our province, and our future. With public participation we can raise the investment capital we need to expand our economic base and maintain our standards of living without increasing taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to highlight some examples of how public participation is working for Saskatchewan people right now. These examples, Mr. Speaker, will demonstrate the potential growth . . .

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

Mr. Solomon: — Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the minister could answer a question about the debt. He mentioned in his speech that privatization had a successful . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I don't believe you have an opportunity to give a . . . make any remarks except to ask if the minister will take a question, and I will relay that question to the minister.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, you well know, so does the minister opposite . . . the member opposite, that certainly in this House that we have a question period every day in which the minister responsible for the potash corporation will be more than pleased to entertain a question. I should say at this time I haven't heard a question to the minister regarding the potash corporation for quite some time — not one question.

Mr. Speaker, these examples will demonstrate the potential growth of the potash corporation through public participation. We've sold guaranteed government bonds through SaskPower and SaskTel. Through these sales we've guaranteed more than 824 million in revenue and kept more than 80 million in interest in Saskatchewan to reinvest into major projects. And that's public participation.

With the story of Saskoil, we can draw another parallel to the potential benefits for PCS. Saskoil is a graphic illustration of the success behind the public participation program. Like the potash corporation, Saskoil was a government-owned, government-operated oil company. It was restrained by the bureaucracy and by politics and by the priority demands of our treasury for social programs.

In short, Saskoil was costing us more to run than it was making. It needed to be expanded, to diversify, and to grow. We considered this situation, weighed the pros and cons. We decided to offer investors an opportunity to sell shares and participate in bonds in Saskoil.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to inform the members of this House that we have sold over 50 million in Saskoil bonds and over 110 million in shares, and we have protected over 1,000 jobs.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Saskoil, Mr. Speaker, has been transformed from a constrained Crown corporation to an expanding and diversifying company. Since this offering, the company has made one of the most dramatic transitions any company in our history has ever seen. It has moved from a passive role in the market-place to a company with a national and international scope and

influence.

In four years, Saskoil has propelled itself to a position of one of Canada's 10th largest publicly traded energy companies. In 1988 it acquired SaskPower's gas reserves, and this year in acquiring ICG resources and Metro gas marketing.

Now Saskoil, Mr. Speaker, moves forward with an expanded base of operations to become the eighth ranked company of its kind in Canada. In a few short months Saskoil has become our largest natural gas producer. It employs over 400 people. Its assets have tripled. Its value has grown from \$300 million to over 1 billion. Its Saskatchewan payroll is worth over 1 million a month, and that's just the beginning.

Saskoil is positioned to continue this explosive growth and pattern. The new 7.6 million Horsham gas plant near Richmond is in production. Saskoil drilled 41 wells costing some 4.3 million. Over its life span the Horsham plant will cost 11 million in operation and maintenance fees, money that will stay in Saskatchewan for Saskatchewan people.

Through the Horsham projects, Saskoil will pay 4 million in royalties, 7 million in provincial taxes, and 10 million in federal taxes. That's direct benefit for Saskatchewan and Saskatchewan people. There will be more acquisitions and more diversifications to come.

Last year, and I'm using Saskoil as an example of what Sask potash can become, last year Saskoil contributed over \$89 million to the Saskatchewan economy, and the projections for this year are even better. Mr. Speaker, that's public participation, and that's just a fraction of the potential that Bill 20 will give the potash corporation.

Public participation means the development and diversification of public assets. It means a new partnership. Saskatchewan people, companies and non-profit corporations can own business and property owned by the government. Ownership, management, and assets stay here right at home. Share offerings are accessible and affordable, and head offices stay in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Let us look at the WESTBRIDGE Computer Corporation as another example of public participation, which I relate to the potash corporation when it will have public participation.

Another prime example, I say, of public participation at work in Saskatchewan is the WESTBRIDGE Computer company. And as it has grown, I believe the potash corporation will grow after we pass Bill 20. In light of WESTBRIDGE, we bought four small but strong companies together, some from the private sector and some from the government. And each company built on the strength of the others to establish a dynamic national corporation.

WESTBRIDGE is a company with annual revenues of over \$125 million. The firm's employee base has grown from

496 people immediately following the merger, to over 1,000 people today. The Saskatchewan payroll is over \$1.5 million a month. The corporation has contributed over 500,000 to worthwhile Saskatchewan projects. Last month they announced plans to build a \$90 million state of the art computer centre here at the University of Regina.

WESTBRIDGE is a powerful player in the national computer business. It is the fastest-growing company in our province, catapulting from 43rd to eighth largest in one year, and in Saskatchewan zone areas, headquartered right here in Regina.

In March WESTBRIDGE bought Management Systems Limited to gain valuable expertise and additional revenues of 7.5 million. Last month the company purchased Superior business machines, a firm with IBM PC (personal computer) dealerships in 10 major cities across Canada. Through this acquisition, WESTBRIDGE gained 200 more employees and annual sales of \$420 million.

WESTBRIDGE has 10,000 terminals on line to its computers. In perspective, Mr. Speaker, and you'll find this startling, that's more terminals than Air Canada has in its national reservation system.

Listen to this, Mr. Speaker. The WESTBRIDGE company prints high-tech boarding passes for airlines, and tickets for the NFL (National Football League), the CFL (Canadian Football League), the NHL (National Hockey League), the NBA (National Basketball Association), the American college football teams, and major league baseball teams. They provide automated leasing system for an automobile industry. And that's being done here in Saskatchewan and servicing the North American continent.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's real high-tech diversification, the kind of diversification that can only result when we allow our Saskatchewan Crown corporations to develop into Saskatchewan public companies. And you know, that's just the beginning. This year WESTBRIDGE will sign contracts to provide computer service to international airlines.

Over 83 per cent of the company is held by Saskatchewan people; over 98 per cent of the employees hold shares. We have a profitable computer company right here in our own back yard. We have access to a national and international markets and permanent jobs for Saskatchewan people. We have computer expertise like this province has never seen before, expertise that will stay here to be part of an expanding and growing company. And we did it here, and we did it with the help of Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Speaker, that's what public participation can do and that's why Bill 20 makes so much sense.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Now let's look at another example

again of public participation and see how it can help when Bill 20 will be passed to help the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Witness the evolution of the Prince Albert pulp and paper company. It was costing our taxpayers over \$91,000 a day in interest charges alone. So we took that company and we sold it to Weyerhaeuser, an international firm with an American base. They know the business and they have access to the market. They were prepared to run that pulp mill as a competitive business in the private sector. The benefits are unquestionable. We have a profitable company doing business in Saskatchewan. We have a brand-new \$250 million world-class paper mill and 150 permanent jobs for our Saskatchewan people.

(1600)

Weyerhaeuser is making paper to ship from Prince Albert to markets all over the world, and they're already diversifying their operations. In a few short months Weyerhaeuser will have a paper cutter and they'll ship finished paper, a value added product, to their customers.

The people of Prince Albert, I believe, are happy. They have a stable industry that benefits the community. There are spin-off jobs in payrolls of some \$500,000 a month being spent to boast the local economy. And there are people putting down roots in Prince Albert. Mr. Speaker, that's public participation, and that's another reason why I have faith in public participation for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. We've given government employees a chance to become entrepreneurs by creating new companies and offering preferred investment opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, the employees want the opportunity and the challenge. They like the fact that they're responsible to themselves and they have room to grow and room to build. With Bill 20, PCS employees, Mr. Speaker, will have an opportunity to own part of the company they work for. And I'd like to illustrate the benefits of employee ownership as it will affect the employees of PCS.

I could use, for example, the Saskatchewan Government Printing Company which is now called Printco Graphics. Mr. Speaker . . .

An Hon. Member: — Point of order.

The Speaker: — Order, order.

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, I remember many times during the course of debate you've made rulings on relevancy, and I've listened to the speaker that's on his feet now for quite some time. He's not talking about the potash corporation, about Bill 20, or the principle of the Bill. He's blowing his own horn about the Department of Public Participation. And I'd like you to make a ruling on relevancy of his speech. I think that all members should be relevant in their comments, and in this particular case where there's a minister of the Crown, we've had very few ministers of the Crown speak, that should be relevant and to the point of the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — Order, order. As hon. members know in the area of relevancy, a considerable latitude has been

given. And I have allowed members to use examples to buttress their opinion. I have listened to the hon. member from Indian Head-Wolsley and he has used several examples and significant detail to indicate to the benefits of public participation, and he must make his comments relevant, of course, and there should be some limit on how many examples one can use.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Thank you for your ruling, but I think it is very important that I use an example to show how the employees of the potash corporation, as I prefaced my remarks just a minute or two ago. That's what I was wanting to do. And I will use some examples of employees of the Government of Saskatchewan who have formed their own company to illustrate what can happen with the employees of the potash corporation, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — And as some examples I'd like to say, at the Saskatchewan Government Printing Company, which is now Printco Graphics, all 21 employees purchased \$1.5 million of government assets. They've been guaranteed a declining amount of government work over the next six years, and they have opportunities that they've only dreamed about.

Another example: 88 employees of SaskTel's marketing division, the yellow pages, have pooled their resources and their expertise to form a labour-sponsored venture capital corporation. They have joined with Brigdens to create DirectWEST, a new Saskatchewan company with offices outside of our borders, and there's potential for diversification and gain new markets and no job loss or income loss or loss of benefits.

We've handed over our tape duplication work to Media House Productions, another employee-owned company. Bruce Solilo, the man who put together the employee proposal, says all temporary jobs are now pertinent, and they have been able to cut the cost of tape duplication for government by 50 per cent — 50 per cent, Mr. Speaker, better service, and new economic developments.

And I can say to you, Mr. Speaker, if by employee ownership in the potash corporation, provided through Bill 20 and public participation, we can cut the cost of production at the potash mines of Saskatchewan so that the employees can benefit from that, I say right on, and that's what we're attempting to do.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — and let us take another example of this because this is part and parcel of Saskatchewan and the benefitting of Saskatchewan people.

The Speaker: — Order, order. I have allowed the hon. members to use examples, and certainly the hon. member up to this point has used quite a few examples, and I realize there are many more that he may feel exist. However, that particular debate in full can take place under Bill 1, and I'd like to ask the hon. member to make his points more relevant to Bill 20. And I realize what he's trying to do, but like I said, there is a limit on the number

of examples that can be used to make your point relevant.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, I'm not challenging your ruling in any way, shape, or form, but let me just use a little explanation for your benefit and for the benefit of the legislature.

A big portion of Bill 20 is public participation. And an important part of public participation is employee ownership, employee shares, and so on. And I think it is only fair, I've used up about half an hour of the time of the Assembly and given example after example, and I think it's only fair that I should be allowed to do that when we look at other people sitting for 13 hours in here . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I don't think we need to get into the length of speeches. Really the rule is, and it applies to everybody, and I've been quite lenient with you as well, I've allowed four or five or six examples, I don't know how many exactly, but quite a few examples to make your point, and that's fine, but it must be related to Bill 20, as I said before.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well I believe in every case, Mr. Speaker, where we see employee buy-ins, employee buy-ins, and buy-ins by the people of Saskatchewan, is a significant and one of the fundamental parts of public participation. I feel that I'm in my right to cite for hours on end where employees in the province of Saskatchewan have bought into government services, as they will with the potash corporation after the passing of Bill 20. And I think this is just a continued example, and I would ask your indulgence to allow me continue with more examples.

I was going to talk about the Meadow Lake saw mill. Now it may be ruled that we shouldn't talk about employees there being owners. We maybe shouldn't talk about the 10 bands, Indian bands being owners as part of public participation, but I question that. I think that's an important part of public participation. And with that type of example I'd like to continue on, Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence.

So let us look at the Meadow Lake saw mill. We tried to run that saw mill from Regina and it didn't work. So the employees and the 10 Indian bands that I mentioned previously in the area bought it, and they're making a valuable business. We wanted to build it here, and they can.

Mr. Speaker, these initiatives, ignored too often, are also public participation. Honest, hard-working, everyday Saskatchewan people such as the Meadow Lake people, are benefitting from public participation, and, Mr. Speaker, after the passing of Bill 20 so will the potash workers throughout the various mines of PCS in the province of Saskatchewan. Honest, hard-working, everyday Saskatchewan people will be benefitting from public participation in PCS.

And there's more examples. We've encouraged the Saskatchewan people to put their government assets to work. Witness the White Track ski . . . and this is an example of volunteerism, again I think a very important part of the future and the destiny of this province. A group

of volunteers got together and convinced us that they could provide a community service and make a good business out of an underused facility. They worked hard and they cleared the land and they made snow.

This year thousands of people skied at the White Track ski hill and used their skating rink and toboggan runs and cross-country trails. Local students learned to ski without having to go to Fort Qu'Appelle to do it. In spite of the fact that the resort opened late in the season and there were equipment difficulties, the club made a modest profit. And that is public participation of a volunteer type.

The Speaker: — Order, order. I'm listening very closely to the hon. member's remarks because as with other members' remarks they're important. Unfortunately the hon. member keeps talking about public participation, and Bill No. 20 is, you know, can be construed as being an example; however, I'd just like you to make it more relevant from time to time as you go on with this speech.

You're concentrating on public participation, and it should be Bill No. 20 we're concentrating on as perhaps part of that.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, Mr. Speaker, it would be far from my intent to dispute your rule. I think I've given some examples, and I hope you and the members realize those, to see how public participation in various aspects will help employees and help Saskatchewan people. And to that now, Mr. Speaker, as I said in my preamble, I would give some examples which I have done.

Now I'll turn more specifically, Mr. Speaker, to Bill 20 that is before this legislature. Saskatchewan is a major player in the world agricultural markets. It's time we diversified from potash into fertilizer. Restructuring PCS debt, inviting local equity participation, and helping the company to grow will bring benefits to all Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that this share offering will provide major and direct benefits for PCS employees and the Saskatchewan people. We all benefit when PCS grows and diversifies.

Before I discuss the details of the legislation, I'd like to talk about the history of the potash corporation and potash in our province. The pink potash of Saskatchewan is a mineral used as a fertilizer to boost crop production. But, Mr. Speaker, as you well know, our own Saskatchewan domestic market is too small. We must rely on primary outside markets outside our province and outside of our country — in the mid-west United States, in China, in Japan, and in India.

The potash corporation controls 49 per cent of all productive capacity in Saskatchewan. It is the largest producer of potash in the world. For many years governments of the CCF, the Liberals and the NDP recognized the importance of potash to our province. It is resource that offers entry to the world agricultural markets, a base for diversification into fertilizer, and an opportunity to develop our transportation infrastructure.

Tommy Douglas knew that Saskatchewan people did not

have the capital to develop or support potash mines, neither did they have the expertise. From the book — and I'd like to quote from the book — *Tommy Douglas*, by Doris French Shackleton, born and raised in Saskatchewan, a writer, a political columnist, and an assistant to the federal NDP caucus. Ms. Shackleton writes, and I quote:

Attracting private investment was essential to Saskatchewan. The province was obviously unable to raise local capital to develop mineral and oil resources. Douglas had hoped for complete public ownership of the potash find near Unity, which in 1946 opened up immense prospects. But the potash called not only for more capital but the cultivation of export markets.

Douglas tried to get the federal government participation, but Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent turned it down, so private investors were invited in.

And the Liberal government knew it too. A precedent based on fact and sound judgement had been set by Douglas, and that's why the Liberal government invited private investors — the Americans, the French, the Germans, to further develop Saskatchewan potash resource.

He knew that we don't have to own the mines to manage the resource and gain the best possible benefit for our people. The nationalization of the potash industry in the mid-1970s stood in defiance, Mr. Speaker, of the judgement of Tommy Douglas. The Blakeney NDPs bought the potash mines from the Americans and the Europeans who developed them.

(1615)

In 1975 they took — and listen to these figures, Mr. Speaker — in 1975 they took 413 million from Saskatchewan's Heritage Fund and they bought potash mines with money that rightly belonged to the people of Saskatchewan for important and essential services such as health and education. And that wasn't the end. Then they went outside of our borders and they borrowed \$106 million from foreign bankers to finish the deal.

And that isn't all. And again in 1978 they went outside our borders to borrow 550 million from foreign bankers for an expansion that was by all counts unwise and unnecessary — \$550 million for unnecessary expansion.

There was an oversupply of potash on the world market and we were stockpiling our reserves — 413 million, Mr. Speaker, in heritage money, and 656 million in foreign debt, Mr. Speaker. Saskatchewan people are still paying for that debt.

And when the NDP, Mr. Speaker, nationalized potash, they said they wanted all Saskatchewan people to be shareholders in the potash corporation, to benefit from the direct ownership of the company. Well, Mr. Speaker, when you're a shareholder, I believe you have certain rights. I believe you have the right to attend shareholders' meetings, the right to cast a vote, the right to share in

profits by receiving a dividend, the right to gift or sell or bequeath shares. In fact, as a shareholder you have the right to use your shares however you see fit.

And I ask you, Mr. Speaker, do ordinary Saskatchewan people own the potash corporation? Ordinary Saskatchewan people cannot use their so-called shares in the potash corporation at will. They cannot alter the corporation in any way; they cannot lend their shares to a friend; they cannot give their shares to a charity; they cannot sell their shares to pay for a daughter's wedding or to buy a house or a car or any other thing they may wish; they cannot bequeath their shares to their families; and they cannot receive a dividend from profits the company might make. In short, they cannot participate in the company in any way.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, we hear time after time, hour after hour, 13 hours for example, 10 hours, eight hours, seven hours, we hear the opposition insist that potash and our other Crown corporations are owned by the people of Saskatchewan. And that statement simply doesn't ring true. In fact, the Crown corporations are not owned by the people of Saskatchewan; they're owned by the government, and government ownership is quite a different matter than full participatory public ownership. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the only right Saskatchewan people receive as shareholders in the potash corporation is the right and the obligation to share the debt.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I'd like to focus on the overall debt of our Crown corporations and specifically on the debt of the potash corporation. I'd like to clearly define what this debt means to the taxpayers of our province. And in doing so I refer to the 1982 report of the Crown investments review commission. The commission's report covers the years from 1975 to 1982, years in which the NDP formed the Government of Saskatchewan. And I quote from that report:

Although the Crown sector reported more than \$650 million in profits during the seven years ended March 31, 1982, cash dividends paid to the provincial treasury amounted to 145 million, of which 95 million was channelled into the Consolidated Fund. As the members opposite are no doubt aware, the Consolidated Fund is the fund which is used to provide government programs and services.

I find it hard to believe that over half a billion dollars in known profits from Crown corporations is unaccounted for — half a billion dollars, Mr. Speaker. Where could the NDP have frittered away half a billion dollars that rightfully belonged to the people of Saskatchewan?

Well, I'll tell you. We know it didn't go to the seniors because in 1975 the NDP placed a moratorium on the construction and the expansion of special care homes for the elderly, a moratorium that wasn't lifted until this government took office in 1982. They didn't recognize the need for hospital expansions or medical specialists or country doctors or rehabilitative centres or services for young people with drug and alcohol abuse.

And they didn't improve social programs or education or the small-business sector. They didn't lower automobile insurance rates; in fact, auto insurance rates clearing by 54 per cent. They didn't lower fuel prices; in fact, they placed a sliding tax on every gas pump in the province. And they didn't lower taxes or provide a mortgage protection program for home owners; mortgage rates were at 22 per cent, and the NDP stood by and watched while families lost their homes.

There was little help for the farmer. In fact, they tried to grab prime Saskatchewan land through the land bank program. And we all know the money didn't . . . where the money didn't go. In fact, not even 15 per cent of the profit from Saskatchewan Crown corporations was given back to the Saskatchewan people — not even 15 per cent.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I quote from the report of the Wolff commission:

The pattern indicates that steadily increasing cash contributions from provincial revenues amounting to more than \$1 billion were required to finance the acquisition and the expansion of natural resource investments.

Natural resource investments, Mr. Speaker, like oil, like uranium, like pulp and paper, and sodium sulphate and coal. And like potash, Mr. Speaker.

Let's look at this monumental investment, this money that the NDP tied up in the resource sector, this money that could have been working to build Saskatchewan and benefit Saskatchewan people. And let us look at the figures, figures that confirm all Crown corporations, of which PCS was only one, generated profits of \$650 million in seven years, figures that confirm only 95 million was channelled to the Consolidated Fund to pay for Saskatchewan's universal programs — 95 million in seven years. That's not even \$14 million a year. In 1982 the health care system alone cost 880 million a year to run. What an insult, Mr. Speaker. What a dreadful insult.

So where did the money go then, Mr. Speaker?

An Hon. Member: — Good question.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues say, good question. And it is a good question. It is a question that Saskatchewan people should be asking the NDP every time they see one of them on the doorstep.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the NDP were busy nationalizing everything in sight, and Saskatchewan people were suffering. Those modern-day Neros were fiddling away valuable dollars to entrench the government and the people of Saskatchewan in resource Crowns. They were taking unnecessary risks by investing in cyclical commodities like potash. They did not make any attempt to diversify our economy or protect our social programs or provide a safety net for Saskatchewan people.

They frittered money away on elaborate buildings — and just look downtown in Saskatoon and Regina and you'll see the proof — on elaborate boardrooms, on elaborate

furniture, on elaborate salaries for their friends, and yes, as my colleague behind me says, on liquor stores throughout the province of Saskatchewan.

In fact I could tell you, in the seat of Kelvington-Wadena, there are five monumental liquor stores. And when I was minister of Health, they were crying out for nursing homes. And what did the NDP give them but liquor stores.

I invite any of the members in this Chamber to see the NDP waste first-hand. Take a tour through the Saskatoon headquarters of the potash corporation, you'll see what I mean with your own eyes. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it took three cabinet ministers — three — to manage the potash corporation, and the Leader of the Opposition was one of them.

Let's look at the return on the investment in the potash corporation between acquisitions and expansions. Well over half a billion dollars was invested in the company. Since 1985, the NDP has borrowed 656 million from foreign bankers to finance PCS. We pay interest on the debt at 11.3 per cent. The simple interest on the money is 867 million. Over the years, we have received 3.7 per cent return on our investment. Simple mathematics will show you we're nearly 8 per cent in the hole.

The PCS debt cost Saskatchewan taxpayers, Mr. Speaker, the PCS debt costs the Saskatchewan taxpayers \$220,000 a day in interest charges alone. To put it another way, we pay \$9,200 an hour, every hour of the day, every day of the year, to finance the NDP ideology — \$9,000 an hour — and then you add the 3,000 while they blather around in here, that really puts the price up.

Let's get on with passing Bill 20 and addressing these serious economic problems. Saskatchewan money, Mr. Speaker, that leaves this province and never comes back — money that can't be used to lower taxes or auto insurance rates. That's not good business, Mr. Speaker, and anyone who tries to tell Saskatchewan people otherwise had better brush up on their basic economics.

If the 413 million the NDP took from the Heritage Fund had been invested in a savings account that pays 10 per cent in interest, it would be worth over 1.5 billion today. Saskatchewan money lost, money that couldn't be used for health care or education or agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, not one single job, not one, was created at a PCS mine site by the nationalization of the potash industry. The jobs were already there.

But one final point on this topic. Crown corporations — and I don't think many people have thought of this, Mr. Speaker — Crown corporations don't pay taxes. How much money has been lost to the people of Saskatchewan by forgoing taxes that PCS and others would have paid in the last 12 years if they were in the private sector?

Well, Mr. Speaker, when this government took office in 1982, we inherited a Crown sector that was taking but giving precious little back to the Saskatchewan people.

In potash we were locked into an expansion contract at

the Lanigan mine. If we'd have cancelled those contracts, the 233 million already invested by the NDP in cash and . . . (inaudible) . . . commitments would literally have been thrown out the window.

The world's agricultural economy hit a downturn. There was no market for potash, and as a Crown corporation, PCS had no opportunity to diversify. The potash corporation lost money. Mr. Speaker, our Crown corporations cannot be expected to grow and diversify on debt financing. In spite of the oppressed markets in the past two years, our potash corporation has made an extraordinary turnaround and recovery.

In 1987 we hired new management for PCS. We haven't looked back since. The changes implemented brought our production costs in line with other potash producers. The potash corporation is a world leader. We have a highly trained and productive work-force. We believe they're the best in the business. Our production facilities are state of the art. Our warehouse and distribution system is one of the best in the business. And our new marketing programs have set the standards for the industry.

Our potash reserves are virtually limitless. There is enough potash in the ground beneath our soil to supply our customers for well over 100 years. In our present position, and with our ability to bring production on stream when needed, Saskatchewan is indeed a powerful force in the world of potash.

We can build a multinational company, headquartered in Saskatchewan, managed by Saskatchewan people to benefit Saskatchewan people. Through diversification and acquisitions we can broaden our base and become even stronger. We can diversify our holdings and become a primary world-class fertilizer corporation, serving Saskatchewan and the world.

And through public participation we'll have the partnership in the potash corporation with its employees, with the people of Saskatchewan, and with private investors. Public participation is the next logical step for the transformation of debt burdened Crown corporations into an expanding multinational Saskatchewan public company based here in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I believe the potential of the PCS to become a diversified world-class corporation reaches beyond the wildest dreams of our pioneers. And that's why we've introduced Bill 20, to invite public participation in the company.

The potash corporation needs freedom to grow and build and diversify, away from dependence on the product, into other areas and other markets and other means of self-sufficiency. We can open an opportunity for Saskatchewan people to be part of a vibrant and diversified corporation.

(1630)

Mr. Speaker, Bill 20 is an economic development Bill. It is

a Bill that will take the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to the next logical step in its development. Bill 20 will allow public participation in the potash corporation. It will create a partnership between PCS employees, the government, Saskatchewan people, and others who have faith in economic development of our province.

Bill 20 will lay the foundation for the international fertilizer company that we all want to see grow and expand and diversify with Saskatchewan as its headquarters.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — By passing Bill 20 we can permanently deliver Saskatchewan's portion of the international market by inviting a less than controlling interest from investors outside our borders.

I use the term investors and not owners, Mr. Speaker, and that is no slip of the tongue. There is a difference. The potash resource and our other resources are already owned by the people of Saskatchewan. It is ours. No one can take it away or exploit it or use it in any other way than to bring benefit and growth to this province. It is ours and it will always be ours.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — But we don't have to own the mines and the equipment to develop the resource to gain maximum benefit for our people. We have other ways to benefit the people of Saskatchewan from the potash resource — such things as taxation, royalties, special agreements, and legislation like the Bill that is before this House today. We can gain maximum benefit for our people without risking tax dollars that are earmarked for those social services of those who need them.

Mr. Speaker, our potash legislation is fair for the PCS employees, for the people of the province, and for our country. And it is fair for investors and trading partners in nations outside our borders.

Mr. Speaker, the intention of Bill 20 is clear. The Bill will facilitate the reorganization of the potash corporation into a company that can be publicly traded. As with Cameco (Canadian Mining Energy Company), all Crown assets and management operations will be transferred. Bill 20 is designed to cement the partnership between PCS employees, Saskatchewan residents, government and private investors. Past experience has taught us that employees are more productive if they can actually participate in the ownership of their company.

And we want Saskatchewan people to take pride in their province and its resources and its potential to grow and diversify. Therefore, we have set in law our commitment to promote a special share offering for PCS employees and Saskatchewan people. The potash corporation must remain a Saskatchewan company with its head office in this province. Current operations and holdings will be maintained and all future endeavours must be directed to build and diversify for the benefits of Saskatchewan.

Following the share offering, majority ownership of PCS will stay in Saskatchewan through government holdings combined with widespread participation of PCS employees and Saskatchewan residents — 55 per cent of the shareholders will be Canadian and at least three directors will reside in Saskatchewan. Individual ownership by one person or a group of related people is limited to 5 per cent.

We recognize the need to balance investment provisions to offer maximum opportunity for our domestic and foreign markets, and therefore foreign investors may collectively hold no more, no more than 45 per cent of the shares, or vote 25 per cent on any decision made by the shareholders. This provision is consistent with our other public participation initiatives.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Bill 20 reflects the vision of this government for the future of PCS, a company with the potential to dominate the world's markets through a new and diversified business base.

Mr. Speaker, I've carefully examined the provisions in this Bill. I believe it is a responsible treatment of the interests of Saskatchewan people, drawn in such a way that the interests of all concerned are protected. Unlike the members opposite, I believe we are a forward-looking government, committed to this government's vision of building and diversifying through public participation — a government with determination, a government with drive.

Mr. Speaker, where others see problems, we see opportunity. Where others stifle creativity, we're prepared to accept the challenge to the best that we can. Where others practise selfish control, we extend our hand in friendship and in partnership.

Mr. Speaker, public participation of the potash corporation and throughout the government sector will open unique opportunities for Saskatchewan people, call on their ingenuity and entrepreneurial skills, their ability to work together and meet the challenges of the next decade in confidence and with pride.

We are moving with energy and purpose to create a favourable atmosphere for all potential investors in a company that holds unequalled promise for future growth and diversification. That company is the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

These are indeed, Mr. Speaker, exciting times in Saskatchewan. There's a new attitude, there's a new freedom, one that recognizes the right of people to actively participate in their economy. Mr. Speaker, outside our borders the eyes of the nation and the eyes of the world are on our province as we build and grow with the strength of Saskatchewan people behind us.

Let me conclude by inviting all those here today and all Saskatchewan people to be part of the public participation in the potash corporation. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very

much, Mr. Speaker. I have noticed that a great deal of leniency has been extended to the member from Indian Head-Wolseley, and I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I believe in this historic debate that that is the right approach for the Speaker to be taking. He has cited a number of examples of privatization and I will be dealing with those examples later on in my speech, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the same leniency will be extended to myself.

I do want to point out a couple of things immediately with respect to the minister's speech that have stood out. He talked about the need to . . . one of the justifications for selling the potash corporation was to get the debt down. Well, Mr. Speaker, it's well known in this province that the provincial debt by Crown corporations has increased by some 7 billion since the Tories have been in power, and we have a \$4 billion deficit in general revenues, Mr. Speaker. So I think that if they want to get the debt down, it is because of their mismanagement and incompetence with respect to the administration of the Crown corporations in the province that has created this substantial debt.

They talk about the cost of the interest payments to Saskatchewan people on the investment in the potash corporation. Well on this \$11 billion Tory debt that we had in Saskatchewan today, this would be a debt of some \$11,000 for every man, woman, and child in this province. Families in my constituency of four would have a debt of \$44,000 as a result of Tory incompetence and mismanagement because of their debt that they have created.

The interest on this debt alone would be approximately \$1.3 billion a year, Mr. Speaker — \$1.3 billion a year or \$1,300 a year for every man, woman, and child — the interest alone on the Tory debt, Mr. Speaker. I do not think it behooves them to talk about debt at this point, particularly when their record in this area is so atrocious.

The member from Indian Head-Wolseley, Mr. Speaker, had also indicated that the lengthy speeches that have been made by some of my colleagues on this side of the House are a misuse of the public purse and an abuse of the public moneys. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that this government has engaged in waste and mismanagement to such an extent that we now have the \$4 billion deficit plus the increase in the Crown corporation debt of 7 billion, Mr. Speaker. That is as a result of their mismanagement, their waste, their incompetence. And the privatization of the potash corporation is not going to reduce the provincial debt, as they will have us know, because the long-term benefits that we are now receiving from the potash corporation will not be there in the future, Mr. Speaker, they will not be there.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — So if there is a misuse or an abuse of the public purse, it's not the New Democratic opposition fighting to maintain an asset that has been profitable and will bring us future revenues. It's the gross mismanagement and waste by the Tory government. It's their patronage appointments. It's their misuse of

government funds that is a misuse of the public purse, not the New Democratic opposition fighting for the rights of the people in Saskatchewan, fighting privatization as the vast majority of people want us to do. That's not a misuse of the public purse, and that argument doesn't sell out there. Nobody buys it; nobody believes it. They want to see us in here fighting this sell-off of our future, fighting the sell-off of our children's heritage; that's what the people of Saskatchewan want us to do, Mr. Speaker.

And there is no way that the minister from Indian Head-Wolseley is going to receive any mileage by suggesting that fighting the battle of the people of the province of Saskatchewan in this legislature is a misuse of the public purse.

There were a number of arguments raised that I'm going to deal with much more specifically later on in my speech, Mr. Speaker. But one of the things that I first noted in the course of the member from Indian Head-Wolseley's comments was his comments that the new privatized potash corporation or privatized public corporations will be free from political constraint so they can expand and grow.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is just utter nonsense. This is completely a question of perception. Public corporations can expand and grow if the government of the day has the will to do it. And Saskatchewan people in this province have had in the past, and I believe they still do, the will to create Crown corporations that expand and grow and generate revenues for the use of the people in programs such as health and education.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — If there have been political constraints on Crown corporations, it is because the government has put those political constraints on the Crown corporations, of their own volition. And I suggest that that is precisely what they've done with respect to the potash corporation. And the minister of Indian Head-Wolseley has in effect admitted that today by using that as an argument for privatizing it. He is saying that the potash corporation was under political constraints and that has been our argument all along. That has been our argument and he has admitted it today, that they put the potash corporation under political constraints, refused to expand the potash corporation and aggressively market potash on the international markets. That's what they've done. And they feel they have to now privatize it in order to free it of political constraints. We say that they have the right as a government to go ahead and expand that corporation and to make it grow and to get the market on the international markets and aggressively market potash around the world, that a Crown corporation such as the potash corporation in Saskatchewan does not have to be tied to political constraints as the member from Indian Head-Wolseley has admitted that the potash corporation has been tied to such political constraints.

(1645)

He talked about believing in our people, Mr. Minister, believing in our people. He wants to privatize the corporation because he believes in the Saskatchewan

people. He wants to take ownership of this corporation out of the hands of Saskatchewan people and put it in the hands of foreign investors because he believes in the Saskatchewan people. That's in effect what he's saying, Mr. Speaker, and that's the fallacy in his argument.

This corporation will be owned by . . . 45 per cent of the shares can be owned by out-of-province investors, Mr. Speaker. The control of this corporation will ultimately be taken out of the hands of Saskatchewan people. And I say, Mr. Speaker, I say, Mr. Speaker, the fact that 55 per cent of the shareholders have to be Canadian does not make them Saskatchewan.

The fact that only three, three board members are Saskatchewan residents — out of how many, Mr. Speaker? out of 24, out of 30, out of 15, out of 50, how many? — that doesn't guarantee any control. And the people of Saskatchewan are not going to be bamboozled by that argument either, Mr. Speaker.

No, the PC government does not believe in Saskatchewan people. They believe in privatization resulting in ownership by large out-of-province corporations, by multinational corporations with control being down in Toronto or Chicago. That's their belief. They do not believe in Saskatchewan people. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that New Democrats in this province believe in Saskatchewan people.

We believe that working together, Mr. Speaker; working together we can build strong corporations and we can compete on the national and international markets. We don't need foreigners from Chicago or foreigners from Toronto telling us how to run our province and our corporations because we can do it for ourselves. And we've done it in the past and the record of PCS substantiates that. We've done it in the past, and I tell you, Mr. Speaker, after the next election, we will do it again.

What I want to do, Mr. Speaker, in my remarks, what I want to do is to deal with the events leading up to 1975 from my point of view, my own personal analysis of these events and the results of these events. I want to talk about why I believe the potash corporation was established in the face of a very uncooperative potash industry. I want to talk about why it should be retained and not privatized; and in that regard, I want to deal with some of the accomplishments from 1975 to 1982.

I want to talk about why the potash corporation was growing prior to 1982, and I want to talk about the PC strategy with respect to the potash corporation subsequent to 1982. I want to talk about how the direction that was being set by the New Democratic government to expand on the potash corporation was changed as the minister from Indian Head-Wolseley has admitted here this afternoon, was changed by the Tory government.

I want to deal with the Progressive Conservative record from 1982 to 1988 with respect to potash, the mining of potash and the marketing of potash in Saskatchewan.

I think it is pertinent for us to examine the 1988 annual report, Mr. Speaker, that illustrates that despite an attempt

to reduce the potash corporation's role by the Tory government, despite an attempt to minimize its profits, it still shows to be a strong and efficient Saskatchewan company, which is an argument, Mr. Speaker, against privatization.

I want to deal with the arguments that have been put forward by the members of the government who have stood up and spoken here today. I have dealt a little bit with the argument by the member from Indian Head-Wolseley that privatized Crowns grow but public Crowns don't, and the fact that that is a question of perception, that is a question of leadership. It's a question of leadership and direction, Mr. Speaker, and if a government chooses not to expand them, of course they will not grow.

If a government takes aggressive initiatives and decides to expand and properly manage a corporation, it will compete as effectively and as efficiently, and probably more so in many cases than many privatized Crowns. And I want to deal with that argument in some detail in my speech.

I want to talk about the fact that the members opposite are saying there are more opportunities for employees, which is simply hog-wash. And I can demonstrate that, Mr. Speaker, by talking about some of the privatizations that the member from Indian Head-Wolseley himself has raised, and some of the lost jobs that have resulted as a result of PC privatization in this province.

The members opposite have talked about employee participation and the fact that employee participation is necessary, and privatization ensures employee participation. That as well, Mr. Speaker, is a question of political will. Employee participation can exist just as much under a public Crown corporation as under a privatized corporation. That is not a reason for privatizing; that is a goal that we should be striving for as a province — participation by people and employees. It is not a reason for privatization because these goals can be achieved under publicly owned corporations as well as privately owned corporations.

And under a publicly owned corporation, Mr. Speaker, I believe that it can be very easily demonstrated that the profits that accrue to the province are much more substantial than the profits that accrue from taxing of a private corporation.

The member from Indian Head-Wolseley said something about interest payments on money borrowed and foreigners benefitting from these interest payments. Well it's very interesting that the member from Indian Head-Wolseley, Mr. Speaker, is willing to let foreigners take profits and dividends from our resources, but objects to foreigners receiving any interest moneys.

I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, that we deal with the Arthur Anderson report in the Institute for Saskatchewan Enterprise study which simply does not deal with the reality of the situation but is a very sterile report, to say the least — a sterile analysis that overlooks and fails to address many salient points, Mr. Speaker, not to mention the fact that it is quite obvious that the Institute for

Saskatchewan Enterprise is a Tory front group, Mr. Speaker, and therefore their analysis of the situation is highly suspect and should be indicated as such.

I think it is also important, Mr. Speaker, to deal with our vision, our vision for PCS, and I want to get into that later on in my remarks as we continue throughout this debate. But I do want to say that I appreciate the opportunity to be standing before this Assembly and speaking on behalf of the constituents of Regina Lakeview, many of whom I have spoken to at length in the last few weeks about this issue of privatization and about the privatization of the potash corporation; all of whom I have spoken to have advised me that they want us to fight privatization, that they do not believe in the privatization of the potash corporation or in the privatization of SaskEnergy, in effect SaskPower.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — All of whom have urged me to continue in this debate . . .

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

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, I would like to introduce some guests.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you, and through you to other members of this Assembly, some friends of mine from my own home town of Hague — Mr. and Mrs. Ed and Lorraine Harms and family. They're just coming back from a visit to the Black Hills of North Dakota, and by all accounts have had a wonderful time and are enjoying a full day in the fair city of Regina.

I would like all members to join with me in wishing them many good holidays left and a good trip home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 20 (continued)

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would also like to welcome the guests in the gallery on behalf of the New Democratic opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I was saying that I have spoken to many of my constituents, and although I recognize that there may very well be people in Regina Lakeview who support the privatization initiatives of the Saskatchewan government, the fact of the matter is, is the people to whom I have spoken to have been in favour of our fighting the privatization and who have strongly supported us in this battle against the sell-off of our heritage.

Many of them have expressed to me that they are opposed

to privatization that results in the loss of control to foreigners, that results in lost jobs to the people of Saskatchewan, that results in lost revenues and higher costs to the province, and they oppose privatization on those grounds. They oppose the privatization of the potash Bill.

And many of them, Mr. Speaker, are very much aware of what is going on and what the government is attempting to do. And they want us to fight this vigorously. And they want us to speak out on their behalf in this Assembly.

And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to put forward the arguments that many of my constituents have discussed with me, to put forward the arguments that support their point of view. As I said earlier, I know there may be some people who have differing views and I respect their point of view, but the fact of the matter is that by far the majority of people with whom I have had any contact whatsoever have been opposed to privatization, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Bill 20 lays the foundation to sell off one of our most important resources, Bill 20. That's The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan reorganization Act. This resource was discovered, Mr. Speaker, in 1942 in Saskatchewan as a result of an oil exploration project. Prior to that, potash had been discovered in Europe and in Germany, I believe, back in 1839 and later near Carlsbad, New Mexico, in 1925. But not until 1942 was it discovered in Saskatchewan.

And the size of the reserves in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, are very important. And let me just illustrate the importance of that. The area of distribution extends across the province from North Battleford to Saskatoon and Yorkton on the northern edge, and from Moose Jaw and Weyburn into Montana on the southern boundary. The reserves are expansive, Mr. Speaker. There are huge amounts of reserves.

This is an extremely important resource because of the quantity of reserves that we have in this province. In fact, these reserves are adequate to supply the entire world's needs for hundreds and even thousands of years, Mr. Speaker. These are substantial reserves, and when we start selling off our heritage to these resources, we must be aware, Mr. Speaker, at how huge and large these reserves are, and what we are selling off.

We are not just selling off a Crown corporation. We're selling off the future of this province. We're selling off our ability to control and influence the international market in potash. We're selling off our ability to control these reserves which I have described as being huge and expansive in the province. That's what we're selling off, Mr. Speaker, with Bill 20.

Even more importantly, we must note that if these deposits are managed properly, Mr. Speaker, they have the potential of supplying an increasing proportion of world demand as we note that ore bodies in other places such as France and the U.S. are declining; that we can continue to grow, continue to expand, and continue to capture world markets, Mr. Speaker, because ore bodies in other countries are declining. And I think that aspect of

the debate is extremely important to consider.

We must consider that when we talk about selling off to foreign ownership, what are we really selling off here, Mr. Speaker? What are we really selling off? And I say, Mr. Speaker, we're selling off a huge resource where there are reserves to supply the world for hundreds if not thousands of years. We are selling off our right to be world leaders, to influence the international markets. We are selling off our right to control a major resource.

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

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.