

August 9, 1989

August 9, 1989

EVENING SITTING

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

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

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If it wasn't that the government had introduced closure, that question wouldn't be ready to be called for a long, long time yet, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — But as I was saying prior to 5 o'clock, there are a number of points that I wanted to make in this debate, and I will reiterate them for the benefit of the members of the House and the viewing public because I think it's important that they be emphasized.

As I said, the people of Regina North East constituency sent me here to speak on their behalf; the people of Saskatchewan sent the members of the New Democratic Party official opposition to speak on their behalf. And we have attempted to do that during the debate on this very major piece of legislation which is going to have some very dramatic impact on the future of the province of Saskatchewan. And I intend to show in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, that what I have just said is correct.

Now we don't always speak for those constituencies which we represent, but we speak for the vast majority of Saskatchewan citizens who have said to us on this side of the House, and I know have said to members on the other side of the House, that this legislation is wrong, it is not favoured, and it ought not to pass through this House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, and in doing that I want to make a number of points. I want to make the point that this government, this Premier's government, is selling off a major, profitable Saskatchewan asset and it's selling it off for a song to foreign corporations, foreign governments who will reap the benefits and reap the profits which now go to the people of Saskatchewan.

I want to make the point that this Premier's privatization of Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is going to benefit big business and wealthy outside investors and not Saskatchewan people.

And I want to make the point that by selling off this profitable Saskatchewan asset, the Progressive Conservatives are betraying Saskatchewan's future, a future which could be as . . . better than even in the past by using the revenues and the wealth that can be generated by our resources to pay for the services, the

services that the people need and want, the essential services. We're going to lose this possibility with this Bill, with the selling of the potash corporation, and the profits that could be going to the future generations, who will live and grow and raise families in this province are going to be gone and they're going to be going outside of this province and indeed, Mr. Speaker, outside of this country, as they used to before the potash corporation was established.

And I also want to make the point that the Progressive Conservative privatization has not helped ordinary Saskatchewan people and has been rejected by the people. And whether it's the privatization of the children's dental program, or the privatization of SaskPower, or the privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, the people of Saskatchewan have opposed it. And in fact the level of the opposition which I am going to show in just a moment, Mr. Speaker, has been growing very dramatically, and in the face of that, the members opposite will not allow this debate to continue. And I find that objectionable.

And I submit to you, sir, that in the future whenever this government calls an election, the people are going to show this Premier and this government that they too find it objectionable and will not trust such a government to be re-elected again.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I have said a number of times, and I will say again now and I will continue to say, that the people of this province oppose Bill 20; they oppose the sell-off of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan; and therefore this bill should not proceed. And the government knows that. Yet, with the introduction of closure under which restriction we are now operating in this debate, this government conceded, in fact it conceded that it is losing the public debate over the privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, and admits that it doesn't have the courage to defend its actions in the most public of all forums, the legislature of Saskatchewan.

The people who live in homes in small town Saskatchewan, and on farms, and in the cities, they aren't able to get up and speak about what they think to the government. That's what they elect us for. They elect us to stand in this House to represent them and make the point. So when members of this House are restricted in what they say, it is in fact the people of the province who are restricted in what they say, Mr. Speaker.

And so rather than show that public opinion is on its side, which is what the government ought to be doing, or attempt to change public opinion with the power of reasoned argument, the government has taken what it can only be described as the coward's way out — to use its majority to stifle debate and to force this privatization through, Mr. Speaker. That's what happened here in this debate.

And I say that if the government really, truly believed that the people of Saskatchewan supported its plan to sell 45

per cent of the potash corporation to foreign interests, then it would have allowed the opposition to debate this Bill as long as was necessary to debate it so that the people could be heard. If the government really believed that, why would it not have allowed that, is the question that has to be asked. It would know that the public — and I'm talking about the opposition — would know that the public would eventually pressure the opposition to allow a vote and let the government proceed.

Instead, this Premier's government, this Premier's PC government, introduced closure for the first time in Saskatchewan history, on a holiday, on a Monday, on a Monday, on the Monday morning, hoping that most of the people would be out on vacation or out at the campsites and would not be aware about what's going on. Well I say . . .

An Hon. Member: — Saskatchewan Day — what an irony.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes. My colleague says, Saskatchewan Day, and I say yes, what an irony. Yet on Saskatchewan Day, when we ought to be appreciating the kinds of freedoms that we have in this province, instead we have a government that takes away a freedom, a freedom of expression and the freedom of speech and the freedom of people to be able to tell their government what they think.

This government knows that Saskatchewan people don't want 45 per cent of their potash company sold to foreign investors. They know that. It knows that Saskatchewan people don't support the idea that the economic decisions which affect their lives should be made in Hong Kong or New Delhi or Beijing or Japan or wherever the Premier has been out selling 125 per cent of the potash corporation in recent months, Mr. Speaker.

Saskatchewan people want to own and they want to control the potash corporation and to benefit from the profits which provide tax revenue to build schools and hospitals and highways and other vital services, because they believe that this world-class company can be an important economic development tool for our province and can help Saskatchewan expand its trading links around the globe in the 1990s, in the interests of Saskatchewan and not in the interest of some foreign owners who may be residing on the Pacific side of the world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this debate has now been restricted, this debate on Bill 20. Closure was a desperate act by a desperate government which has lost the public's confidence and doesn't know how to win it back. Or worse, I think it just doesn't care. That's even worse.

The government has not provided an adequate justification for its decision to sell PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan), and rather than explain, it has simply to move to muzzle the legislature and to muzzle the people of Saskatchewan.

What I think this does, Mr. Speaker, is it exposes a government whose privatization program is in absolute tatters and falling apart, a government in disarray, a government that is desperate. It is that overwhelming

rejection by public opinion and that political desperation which has driven this PC government to this cowardly, unwarranted, and undemocratic act.

Now what I find especially worrisome, Mr. Speaker, is I don't think that this Bill alone tells the whole story. And what I then worry about even more is that now that the government has used this Draconian measure, this muzzling measure of a closure, they will now be comfortable with it and will be prepared to use it at every step of the way when they privatize other kinds of services that the people of Saskatchewan enjoy.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Oh the members opposite will stand up and say no, they don't have any intention to do that. But I might remind the House, and the public will know, that back in 1976 the member from Kindersley made speeches that were reported in the city of Moose Jaw in the newspaper — in 1986. He made the speech in which he said that privatization is yesterday's agenda.

Now that was a promise he made, and guess what we got? We got privatization all over the place. And is it any wonder that the public rejects it? But just in case, just in case the people of Saskatchewan might be tempted to believe what the members opposite say, let me just put on the record what some of their comments have been.

This potash corporation privatization is only part of a much bigger picture. It's not just a potash corporation, although that's bad enough, but it will be more. And closure, with these people if they are re-elected, will be used again. Let me read you a quote, Mr. Speaker. This is a quote, word for word:

Our hospital system today is dominated by large government owned institutions with inevitable bureaucratic tendencies. The potential for efficiency and better service through privately owned hospitals not requiring a change in ownership could have a dramatic impact on this high user of society's wealth, a situation that will worsen as our population ages.

And it goes on further. It says:

More and more will you hear leaders decrying our standards of education. We currently have a system that is without effective competition, sufficient private initiative, or reward for superior performance by educators. Why not consider a role for privatization in improving our education system in Canada?

Now that source of that quote doesn't come just from anybody, Mr. Speaker. It comes from one of the most prominent of prominent Tories, a man that this government has used to do very important things from them. That quote was said by Mr. Herb Pinder, as recent, Mr. Speaker, as February 6 of 1989.

I say without any hesitation that this government would be prepared to use this kind of closure motion in order to implement a privatization of health care, a privatization

of our education system, a sell-off of SaskEnergy and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

And what's the benefit? There is no benefit. The only benefit that comes from that, Mr. Speaker, is a benefit that goes to the corporate sector, for whom the Premier has now become the chief spokesman.

Now I want to go back now, Mr. Speaker, and just recall something that's happened recently. You know we have been told by the media, the public has been told by the media that we need a poll to support our case, we need a poll to support our arguments. Well I want to first of all emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that I don't agree with that. I think that's the easy way out. I don't agree that it's our job to simply use polls in order to support our arguments; it's our job to represent the people who elected us here. I want to make that point, Mr. Speaker. This fight began a long time before polls began to report on these kinds of issues. It's important to me to be able to say what the people of Saskatchewan want to be said, and it should be important that those things be reported by our media because they are what the people are saying.

But having said that, Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate that I'm prepared, if that's what's required, to talk about a poll, to talk about what polls are saying to confirm what we have been saying for over 80 days, or over 80 hours, and throughout this whole session. I'm prepared to be able to use those arguments and we'll see whether that becomes a big news story or not.

So let me begin, Mr. Speaker, with the most recent evidence of why this debate is important and why this debate ought to be able to continue, why closure and muzzling is unwarranted and unnecessary and dangerous. I want to do that.

(1915)

You know, on August 5 of 1989, in the *Leader-Post*, there was an article by one Ron Petrie. It was a good article, and he argued that there is no evidence that the public opposed government actions in Bill 20. And that's fair enough. I know that it was probably a defence against suggestions that the debate on Bill 20 was ignored by the press, but I won't get into that again. I don't think it's necessary nor is it that important. That point has been made.

But the point I want to make here this evening, Mr. Speaker, is that there is a new source of evidence which proves that the New Democratic Party members have spoken on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan while the Premier of Saskatchewan has been representing somebody else — the vested interests, the corporate sector, the big corporations, the financial institutions, and foreign interests who want to move in and take over and control our resources here in Saskatchewan.

So let me just point out, Mr. Speaker, what I'm talking about. There was today a poll released — you may be familiar with it — not a poll that was produced by the New Democratic Party, because we had done that, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure there would have been stories and the members opposite would have accused it as being a

political poll. So that's not what this poll clearly shows, why the government opposite did what they did. It clearly shows why the government used closure to stop the public from being heard, because, Mr. Speaker, the public opposition to the sell-out of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, as Bill 20 proposes, was growing day by day by day as the debate continued, and the government couldn't afford to let that happen. Opposition to privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, of Saskatchewan Government Insurance, of SaskTel, SaskPower, SaskEnergy, and the Saskatchewan Transportation Company hasn't declined over the summer as some would have suggested and maybe some would have thought. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it has hardened over the summer; it has increased. In every case there has been a substantial shift of opposition to strong opposition in people's attitudes towards privatization. That's what the poll was indicated, the one that was released today.

There were questions that were asked, questions related to the privatization debate, which was designed to test the government's credibility on the issue and get an impression of how it is affecting the public mood. That's what the questions were. The responses indicate that if the . . . Sorry. No, I'm reading it so I guess I can quote. It goes on again, that:

If the Devine government is not just out of step with Saskatchewan people, it has turned its back and headed in the opposite direction.

Well that's a strong statement, but it's supported. It doesn't come out of the blue. It is not just being said for the sake of saying it. It's a fact. Seventy per cent of the respondents agreed that the government is out of touch and not acting in the best interests of Saskatchewan people by pushing ahead with its privatization plans. Sixty-six per cent agreed that the Barber Commission is little more than an expensive public relations exercise. Now isn't that interesting? That's important to know, because as they see their political problem growing, one shouldn't be too surprised if they establish yet another commission of some kind to provide them a cover.

Well this clearly shows, Mr. Speaker, that the commission, which they have now to try to get them out of the political jackpot of their betrayal on selling off the power corporation and SaskEnergy, is not working.

It went on further, Mr. Speaker, and it said that 66 per cent believe that foreign investors will get most of the benefits from potash corporation privatization. This is what the people of Saskatchewan believe, and they're not wrong. That's a fact. They know that that's going to happen because they remember the time before the potash corporation when that was a fact, and they're afraid it will be a fact again.

Now 72 per cent said that privatized health services would be worse, and 57 per cent said that they will be less inclined to support the Devine government, as is stated in the statement here, in the next election because of its privatization program. Now there we are.

This isn't the only polls that are taken, Mr. Speaker. This

isn't the only poll that's been taken. It is well-known that that government spends unlimited amounts of taxpayers' dollars to poll weekly, and this is what they know is happening, and that's why this debate has been muzzled. That's why this government hasn't had the courage to stand up and debate, and instead has brought in closure so that the people of Saskatchewan would not be heard and so that the opposition, in their opinion, might somehow be slowed down.

Well I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, it's not going to be slowed down, because the people of Saskatchewan have decided that this is wrong, that it's bad for them and they don't want to have any part of it.

Now the interesting thing in all of this, Mr. Speaker, is that one can compare two polls, for the benefit of those who might be interested in writing an article or interested in the public. Back in . . . Some time ago, in May 3 of 1989 there was another poll released, asking the same questions. There was an Angus Reid . . . another, certainly not a political poll commissioned by any political party. But in that poll by Mr. Reid in May, by Angus Reid Associates, the question was asked, what about the privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan? Did you support or oppose the policy decision?

Well at that time, Mr. Speaker, 50 per cent of the population opposed it in Saskatchewan and 28 per cent supported it. Double oppose it; twice as much. Well I suppose if those numbers had changed since May to . . . now we are in August, that would be significant. But what is more significant, Mr. Speaker, is that in fact the opposition has grown from May, when it was 50 per cent, until August when the most recent poll was taken. It has increased from 50 per cent to 66 per cent. Now is there any more need to explain or discuss why this government chose to use closure and stop this debate? That's what it's all about. It's right here. Not done by the New Democratic Party, but done by pollsters for other people.

This government is in disarray. This government is afraid of the people of Saskatchewan. This government sees the opposition to the privatization policies growing dramatically day by day and it could not afford to have a debate. It had nothing to do with the workings of the legislature, Mr. Speaker. That's why I said earlier that it has become clear in this debate that the Premier of this province does not represent the people of Saskatchewan. It has become clear in this debate that the Premier of this province does not represent the people of Saskatchewan. It has become clear in this debate that the Premier of this province is a spokesman for vested interest.

He is the Premier who speaks for the big corporations which are going to benefit from this. He is the Premier who speaks for the financial institutions who are going to benefit from this. He is the Premier who speaks for foreign corporations and foreign governments who are going to benefit from this. Does he speak for the people of Saskatchewan? Of course he doesn't speak for the people of Saskatchewan.

The poll confirms that as well, Mr. Speaker, because when it asks if the people felt that the responsibility of the provincial government is to provide first-rate post-secondary educational facilities such as technical institutes, community colleges, and universities, whether

it was the response of the provincial government, 78 per cent yes. They don't agree with this government's privatization of our education system. That is what the people are talking about and that is what the members of the official opposition have been talking about, about the issues of the people. We represent them in this debate and the Premier can only represent the corporate interest.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Now it went on. The poll went on. It said, do you feel that health care services in Saskatchewan would get better or worse if services like hospitals and nursing homes were privatized? Seventy-two per cent of the people said, worse. Now who's been talking about health care in this legislature? The Premier? Of course not. The official opposition, the New Democratic party members? Of course they have. The Premier's been too busy talking about privatization. He's been too busy talking about selling off the potash corporation to China and India and Korea and Japan, to the corporate interests who are going to invest in this private company and then make the decisions for us.

The corporate interests are going to invest in this corporation, and that \$106 million which it made in 1987, they will then be able to have that profit. And it's going to go out of the country once again and not stay here to benefit the children of this province who need an education, who need a children's dental plan. Because we won't be able to afford it if we can't use the benefit of the profits from our resources but choose, as this government opposite has decided, to turn it over to foreign ownership — 45 per cent to foreign ownership and another big chunk to the big corporations.

Is it any wonder that the Premier has chosen to be the spokesman of vested interest, the spokesman for the big corporations, spokesman for the financial institutions, when they are the ones who are funding his very existence and the very survival of the Conservative Party as it falls to pieces in the public mind?

Is it any wonder then, Mr. Speaker, in light of this evidence provided by this poll, the poll that we heard about, which the Progressive Conservative Party had taken . . . They were asking a question about, who do you think would make a good replacement for the existing Premier — just in case, Mr. Speaker. Is it any wonder?

Mr. Speaker, I said in the debate on closure the other day that it was the act of a government that was afraid, a government running away from debating the Bill because opposition was growing. That's what I said then and so did many of my colleagues.

Well the evidence is now here. The debate carried on by the members of this opposition, of this New Democratic Party, has worked. We have done our job. And the people of Saskatchewan have reinforced it by showing that in growing numbers they oppose what this government is doing. And the government has said, we don't care. We don't care what the people are saying, is what the Premier says. We only care what the big corporations are saying. Because the New Democratic Party members were speaking for the people, Mr. Speaker. And the people

know that the Premier has abandoned them and is speaking on behalf of the big foreign corporations.

That's why this debate has taken a long time, because the people wanted it to take a long time. They wanted their explanations and their arguments to be made. And that's why the Premier imposed closure on this debate. He wanted to muzzle growing public opinion against PC privatization and growing opposition against the sell-off of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — It's not a complaint that we make because we're elected members here, Mr. Speaker. Sure, we've been muzzled, but the real tragedy here is that the people of Saskatchewan have been muzzled by what the government has done, the vast majority of the people of Saskatchewan.

And so what do we have? We have here a debate which has drawn a clear line between who speaks for whom in this province, and a very clear and distinct line. This Premier and this PC government has been the spokesman, as I said earlier, for vested interests, the big corporations. They're the spokesman for Cargill grain, a United States, very wealthy corporation.

The member of Souris-Cannington spoke about Cargill grain and fertilizer when he spoke in the debate. I want to speak to that. The fact that they spoke to that, Mr. Speaker, shows that Bill 20 is similar to what they have done with their give-away to Cargill grain. And Bill 20 is just legitimizing what they want to do with our potash resource; they want to give it away in the same way.

Here we have one of the wealthiest corporations in North American, indeed the world, and a government which says that it's strapped for money, says that it's prepared to provide it, and guarantees for it, half of some \$350 million so that they would build a plant in Saskatchewan. They want to sell off the potash corporation and take that money and give it to Cargill grain, instead of having the potash corporation make, 1987, \$106 million, so that the people of Saskatchewan could benefit. And at the rate of the growth of the potash market and all the projections, we should indicate that the potash corporation could make between 2 and \$400 million a year. Why in Heaven's name would we want to give that away to some foreign owners outside of this province, outside of this country, indeed outside of this continent? That is a strange philosophy over there, which people of Saskatchewan do not accept and do not want, and have been shut out from being able to say so.

(1930)

Now let me give you another example of how the Premier speaks for vested interest and corporations. Here we had the case of the Weyerhaeuser corporations. Now the Premier said — and I've got the article here, it was in the paper today — the Premier said . . . And this is a new argument from him, a very new argument. He said that even if Saskatchewan residents don't want to buy shares in PCS, he will still benefit.

Well do you remember, Mr. Speaker, not so long ago the argument was, everybody's going to be able to have a share? I mean, how it's going to be wonderful, public participation. Now he's admitting in the *Leader-Post* article, he said it in his speech yesterday, that it's okay if Saskatchewan people don't have a share. Somehow they're going to benefit. They shouldn't have to take the risk, he said. They shouldn't have to take the risk of having us invest in our own resource. Somebody else should take the risk.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if that's the case, why didn't that apply to the Weyerhaeuser corporation? If we're not supposed to take the risk, why did the Premier make a sweetheart deal for this big multinational corporation from the United States of America, Washington, in which . . . You know what happened here, by this Premier who said the people shouldn't take the risk? What we had here is that Weyerhaeuser bought off, was given, the Prince Albert Pulp Company, the pulp mill. The people of Saskatchewan guaranteed 248 million of debenture for that purchase. Who took the risk, Weyerhaeuser or the people of Saskatchewan? The taxpayers took the risk. And then another 83 million was a loan guarantee in order for the pulp mill to be built. Who took the risk, Mr. Speaker: the corporation, somebody else, the private sector, or the taxpayers of Saskatchewan? The Premier is not even being consistent in his own arguments. In the true form and tradition of this Premier, he never is able to say what the facts are.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if they make some money, the Weyerhaeuser corporation, who do you think gets the profit? The people of Saskatchewan? Of course not. They only took the risk. Now what we are saying, Mr. Speaker, is in the investment of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, the people owned it. They put some of our resources, our finances in it, and they got the reward and they got the profit and they got the dividends and they got the taxes. What Bill 20 does is says, with Weyerhaeuser for example, the people of Saskatchewan will still take the risk but don't get any of those benefits. Is it any wonder that more and more people are concluding that this Premier speaks for vested interest, for the big corporations, and not for the people of Saskatchewan?

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I say that this Premier speaks for vested interest, it is clear that he does not speak for the people of Saskatchewan. Here we have Bill 20 to privatize the potash corporation. Why? Because the corporate sector, the private sector in the potash industry, found that the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan was too competitive for them, it was too efficient for them. They need it out of the way.

So what do we have in this Bill? We have 45 per cent sell-off to foreign interests and foreign governments. Now here is a government that says, government should not be involved in anything. They said, governments should not be involved in resources; it should not be involved in the power corporation; they're saying it should not be involved in SaskTel, eventually. Here is a government that says, the free market is the way to go, but then can turn around and say, well it's only our government, it's only the government that the people of Saskatchewan elect. But if it's a government in China or a government in

Korea or a government in India, that's okay; we'll let them buy shares in the potash corporation. We'll let them make the decisions. We'll let them set the prices. And how do you think they'll set the prices? They're going to set them as low as possible because they don't want expensive potash for their farmers; they want cheap potash.

Now it may be, Mr. Speaker, that the potash corporation, in spite of that, may make some profit, but we won't even have that any more because it's going to go off somewhere else. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the taxes that the potash corporation used to pay to the province of Saskatchewan and the taxpayers of Saskatchewan are going to be reduced dramatically, because as soon as the potash corporation becomes a private company it's going to have to start paying massive taxes to the federal government, which it doesn't do now. I don't know . . . I would not go so far as to say that there's also some sweetheart deal between the Premier and the Prime Minister in order to get him this extra revenue, but the fact is that that's what's going to happen. I don't hear members opposite saying anything about that.

Now this Bill, Mr. Speaker, provides no guarantee of Saskatchewan ownership. It's selling off a major profitable asset for the future. It's selling off opportunity for prosperity. It's an unpopular measure that has been rammed through by closure because the government is afraid of the people. It's a sweetheart deal. It's a corporate give-away.

If it was not, why would the government not have indicated what kind of an evaluation it's done of the assets and of the economic things about the potash corporation? Why would the government not have done that? Why would the government not have said who did the evaluation? Why would the government not have made this evaluation available to the opposition so that we could ask the questions tomorrow in committee that need to be asked? Why closure at this time, on a holiday weekend?

Well, Mr. Speaker, so I say to the member opposite, to the Minister of Finance who's in the House, I say to him that it is incumbent upon him, because of this closure situation which will not provide the kind of time that's necessary to be able to grill that minister who's hiding behind closure because he doesn't want to stand here day after day and answer the questions . . . In order to be able to do all of that, the government ought to make available before the committee all of the information that is necessary in order to be able to review the Bill.

Who the Government of Saskatchewan has hired to undertake the evaluation of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, how much the valuation work will cost — that should be made public. Whether that evaluation takes account of PCS's potential market share as opposed to its current market share; the full valuation report on PCS plus all supporting documents; all the agreements, memorandums, or understandings of commitments signed between the Government of Saskatchewan and any foreign investor or investors and the dates and the places where the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan sale was discussed with foreign countries, or their agencies and corporations: this material is the very least

under these circumstances — and it should do it anyway — but under these circumstances especially, that the government should be prepared to make public in advance of committee review of this legislation. If it does not, Mr. Speaker, if it does not, it will only confirm what everybody knows, and that is that this government has something to hide, that there is a cushy deal, there is a secret arrangement, there is a secret arrangement to sell off this corporation to friends of the government in the big corporate sector.

And so clearly, I said before and I say again, this debate has clearly showed the Premier for what he is. He is a spokesman for vested interest, a spokesman for the big corporations and financial institutions, and he has betrayed the people of Saskatchewan and does not speak for them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Now he's been preaching, this Premier has been preaching a me-first society, where he and his cabinet ministers, along with the big corporate sector, are always the ones who are first. They have embraced a society of unfettered competition where the big corporations and the wealthy and those in positions of power will survive and thrive while the less fortunate are left with the economic crumbs. That's what Bill 20 does.

Those who are wealthy, those who are big corporations — most of them foreign-owned — are going to be able to thrive and do well and we're going to be left with the economic crumbs that come out of the potash corporation. Day after day this government brought forward on Bill 45 in the corporation's interest. Because the interests of Saskatchewan people weren't that, Mr. Speaker.

If the government had been interested in the interests of Saskatchewan people, they would have addressed the deficit. They would have addressed the cut-backs to education and health care. They would have allowed a discussion on the massive patronage that this government lives under. They haven't addressed the waste. Every day there are more sweetheart deals without tender, costing twice and three times as much as contracts with tender would cost the taxpayers of Saskatchewan because they're paying off their friends. Those are the issues of the people which the members of this side have been talking about.

We've been talking about the farm crisis, about the drought payment which is one year late, which is inadequate and confusing, and in which there's no real appeal process. We've been talking about farm closures by the government, by this very same Premier who's in charge of the agencies doing a large number of the foreclosures. We've been talking about the crop insurance premiums being doubled this year over the year before, about the high interest rates where the government refused to allow a debate on a resolution on high interest rates in the interests of the big banks, of the Royal Bank.

Those are the issues of the people which the opposition has talked about and which the government has ignored

in the interests of the big corporations with Bill 20 because that's all that they have been interested in this session.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken some time. I wish I could take more because this debate is so important. I would like to take a lot more, Mr. Speaker, but I'm not allowed to do that. I'm not allowed to do that because the government has put in closure. I want other members of my side of the House and the opposition to be able to have their chance to speak.

I have things, Mr. Speaker, that I wanted to say, which were important to be said, which the people of my constituency have said to me are important to be said. But I've been foreclosed. I've been muzzled. I've been told by this Premier that he is so afraid of what the people of Saskatchewan have to say that he has to stop them from having their views expressed. And so I'm not going to take a great deal more time, Mr. Speaker, because of what this government has done.

I simply want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, as I began, that the privatization and the sell-off of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is going to cost us dearly. It is going to cost the Saskatchewan people — the families of Saskatchewan, the farmers of Saskatchewan, people who work in our stores in Saskatchewan — a lot. It's going to cost them the ability to control and direct the development of one of our, if not our most important resource other than our agricultural sector. We're going to lose control. We're going to lose the ability to determine how it should develop. It's going to cost us the profits that the potash industry has been making and that the potash corporation has been making because those profits are now going to go somewhere else.

It's going to cost us the ability to determine how we are going to develop wider markets, because now we're going to let the private sector, we're going to let people who buy the potash from us be owners, and they're going to make those decisions.

Those are very major implications. It's going to cost us the opportunity to keep the taxes of people of Saskatchewan, who are now hard pressed with taxation, from going up even further, because once these revenues are lost, the government has only one place to go — to the pocket of the taxpayer of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, as I began, I want to conclude. This Bill has been important, has been an important discussion, for all the reasons that I've said, but it's also important because it has shown the Premier for what he is — not the Premier who should be representing the people who live in this province, because he doesn't speak for them, but the Premier who speaks for vested interests and foreign corporations, the Premier who speaks for the financial institutions and the banks at the expense of the people of Saskatchewan.

And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, come the next election, the people are going to remember that and they're going to elect a government that's finally once again going to

speak for them. And it's not going to be that Premier and that government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1945)

Mr. Tchorzewski: — That's why, Mr. Speaker, we don't need this Bill. What we need is an election which should be called so that the people could make the decision. And for all of those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this Bill. I'm going to support the amendment because that amendment would give the people an opportunity to address this thing and give them an opportunity to be heard.

I will support the amendment; I will oppose the Bill, Mr. Speaker. And although I am not allowed to speak at length in this House, I can tell you and I can tell the people of Regina North East and the people of Saskatchewan that I will continue to speak on this Bill and this issue of give-away and privatization wherever I go in Saskatchewan, for as long as I can, until finally an election is provided and this government can be voted out of power, so that our future once again can be steered in the right direction instead of steered away from the determination of what it should be by the people who should determine it, and that is the people who elect us this Assembly, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make a few observations with regard to Bill No. 20 and the arguments around Bill No. 20. It has been described by a variety of people as the great potash debate; take it as you wish. But I think I suspect that if one looks back in history 10, 15 years from now, this session will in fact be remembered as the potash session. The reality, Mr. Speaker, is the . . . Bill No. 20 is going to be passed in this legislature, and the potash corporation is going to be put out to the people to invest into that corporation.

And it will be remembered as the session of the filibuster, the filibuster on potash, the longest debate in the history of this province; debate that moved on for, in terms of some speakers, 13 — 12, 13 hours.

And the population and the people, Mr. Speaker . . . And I just simply ask anyone to go out on to the streets or to the farms or to the farms or the main streets of towns and villages across this province, and ask people what their view is with regards to the length of this session, and is it time to bring it to an end and for duly elected people to do what they were elected to do, and that is to vote. And I think overwhelmingly you will find that's exactly what people will say.

History will also show, Mr. Speaker, I think, and certainly I hope is in the interests of the parliamentary system, that perhaps this is the last filibuster, not only that we will experience in this province but perhaps in all of Canada, Mr. Speaker. The rules clearly, Mr. Speaker, have to be reformed in this House as they have been reformed in all parliamentary jurisdiction around the Commonwealth;

reformed, Mr. Speaker, to bring it up to modern times. And I think people are saying that.

If you listen to the some 100 hours of debate that we've had now, I think you can break down the arguments made by the NDP, and there's been a few and they've been repeated over and over. But I think the ones that are salient points advanced by them that I think is worthy of addressing, one is the whole question of Canpotex and the concept of international marketing. Clearly there's a difference between the two sides, and let me try to address that.

The second question, Mr. Speaker, is the whole issue of investment, whether it's investment here, investment by the Canadians, investments from outside of Canada. And there has been a dispute with regards to that whole question. And there's been a dispute with regards to the expansion of the Lanigan potash mine.

Now if you were to go back over the past 30, 35 days, when this Bill has been called in the legislature, and review the media, the print media, you will find probably that's the only three or four points that have been covered in the media, and therefore that's all the media saw as being important with regard to this debate.

I would like to then close by basically advancing the difference between the two models as to how we expand our economy — the model of the government ownership or the Crown corporation by the members opposite and the model that we have deployed by the government — and argue why we believe our model makes more sense as we lead into the next decade and the next century, Mr. Speaker.

So let me then deal with the international markets, as that's an area in which my department takes me and I therefore have done some study in that field. As I say, the two points made were, one, Canpotex, and we must leave Canpotex; and number two, the whole question of should we participate with international markets. Those are the two points basically made by the members opposite or some of their more forceful speakers or more informed speakers as they have joined into this debate.

Let's look then at Canpotex. First of all, what is Canpotex? Canpotex is a market arrangement — some people call it a cartel — of the Saskatchewan potash producers, where they are given, not unlike the Canadian Wheat Board, a share of whatever they sell according to what they can produce, just like a farmer is given a percentage of what he can produce out of the Canadian Wheat Board pool. That institution sells in the markets other than in the United States market and the Canadian market.

It doesn't sell into the U.S. Market, Mr. Speaker, because of American law that basically says it would violate the antitrust provisions of the United States law involving various American companies involved in the industry in Saskatchewan. It would also be seen by American law as violating even if it was Canadian companies. So about half, give or take of the product — the minister said 60 per cent — is sold in the United States, and is sold individually by each company. The balance is sold to offshore markets and is sold through the marketing cartel,

or the marketing model or arrangement of Canpotex.

Now if you look at Canpotex and the success of Canpotex, it has been that the market share that Canpotex has in our primary market, where Canpotex functions is in the Pacific Rim. And Canpotex's share of the market is in fact very significant. In many countries it's as high as 80 per cent, I believe, that we sell.

And the reason that it has been very successful, Mr. Speaker, is we have good product delivered, Mr. Speaker, at a proper price. Most of those countries will not buy 100 per cent of their product from any one market, because they don't want to put all their eggs in one basket, and that's true with wheat as it is true with potash.

Now the members opposite have always mouthed how they are champions for the Canadian Wheat Board, who sells into the Chinese market, or sell into the Indian market, or sell into the Korean market, exactly the same as Canpotex. Now it makes sense if you have the group all together, then they only have to have one salesman, not five or six. They only have to have one office, not five or six. They only have to pay one airplane flight, instead of five or six. Well that makes some sense in the sense of being able to save money. And that's fairly reasonable; that basis is in the whole concept of co-operating together for the benefit of all. And I always thought the members opposite subscribed to that.

But let's say they put that aside, even, Mr. Speaker. Then you go to look at Canpotex and say, well, they say, let's get rid of Canpotex. Why? Well, who is the competition to Saskatchewan potash in the international market? Who is the opposition in Canpotex? Well you've got the Soviets and you've got the East Germans and you've got the Israelis and the Jordanians; those are the main ones. Each one of those competitors, Mr. Speaker, sell from a single selling desk — sell from a single government selling agent. And therefore they sell that way and have the ability to bargain that way. And that was the rationale of Canpotex. So the competition is out there and the competition is very fierce, particularly when you get a supply-demand curve that the Premier talked about yesterday.

Now the logic of the NDP is to say, well if you have a surplus of potash in the world and the price goes down, what should our strategy be, Mr. Speaker? Well our strategy should be: let's create some further competition within the Saskatchewan mines. So what would happen? Drive the price down further. Now that's Economics 101, Mr. Speaker. So for that reason — the second reasons why Canpotex makes a great deal of sense.

Now the NDP, in their glory days, when the potash price went way, way high, believed somehow they could create their own great marketing arm that could get out there and sell potash and create themselves some kind of an international expertise in that whole field. What I say, Mr. Speaker, to the members opposite, and I say it to the people and to the journalists that don't watch, is that if it makes sense to sell wheat that way by the Canadian Wheat Board, why does it equally not make sense to sell potash that way through Canpotex? Why? Why would it be any different, Mr. Speaker? Same rationale, same market forces, same markets. Why does it make more

sense . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Member from Regina Centre is attempting to give his own remarks at the same time the Minister of Justice is, I believe he's had ample opportunity, and now let us allow the Minister of Justice to make his remarks.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, the Canpotex argument is tied into the next argument and the whole question about foreign investment — foreign investment in Saskatchewan, foreign investment in Canada, or having the countries of India or China buy a very, very small part of this particular issue.

Now where did that whole concept come from? It came from . . . When we came to office in 1982, Jack Messer, David Dombowsky, got out into their own private sector world. So they went to work for the Government of Manitoba. They had an NDP government in Manitoba who had announced the building of a potash mine just across the border three or four times. They used it in at least two or three elections.

So they employed Messrs. Dombowsky and Messer to go ahead and put this mine together for them. They'd been promising it for what, two to three elections, and now the people were starting to say hey, just a minute, you've been promising that now for two to three elections. When are you going to deliver it?

So what did they do? They went over to China, and they went over to India to find partners. And what partners did they seek? They sought the partnership of the Government of China and the Government of India. And who were they going to mix this with? They were going to mix it with AMAX which is a large U.S. corporation, and the Government of Manitoba, and build a mine, Mr. Speaker.

Now in so doing their argument went, well if we do that, Mr. Speaker, if we do that, then we've got a better chance of selling into that Chinese market, into that India market that is now monopolized — by who? By the Saskatchewan producer. So who are they going to compete against? Obviously they're going to compete against us.

The members opposite stand up and say, this is all bad. But it was their brothers and sisters in Manitoba of the NDP government that were doing the exact thing, the people that were the people that came up with the idea. And in order to try and make it happen, they came to some defeated NDP from Saskatchewan to deploy that in the province of Manitoba.

That wasn't good enough, Mr. Speaker. They didn't stop there, these two people. They also, over the last two years, those individuals, led by Mr. Dombowsky, have been attempting to purchase PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan) Cory in Saskatoon from the Government of Saskatchewan for the last two years. They want to put a syndicate together to buy it. So we sat down through the potash people and talked to them, because they were fairly aggressive in wanting to see if they could talk a deal and their condition, of course, was they had to get out of

Canpotex.

(2000)

Boy! Get out of Canpotex, and who would be coming to invest? I don't think they have enough money to buy the mine. I wouldn't think they do. Maybe they do; I doubt it. The people that were coming in is exactly the people from India or from China to do the exact same thing, Mr. Speaker, that the members speak so sacredly, that we are violating some sacred rule in doing — the very people that are running the debate on this potash question for the NDP. That's exactly what they are doing.

Now do you hear the members opposite make any mention of that when they're speaking? Never, Mr. Speaker. Do you hear the members opposite stand up, even the member from Saskatoon Fairview, and argue the value of getting out of Canpotex? Never said it, never said it in his speech — and I listened intently four hours to his speech. Never got that, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what the debate really should be about, and what the purpose that we are attempting to do here, is how do we build and expand the economy of the province of Saskatchewan? That's what it's about. If you expand the economy, you create more jobs. If you expand the economy, you create more economic activity, and economic activity, of course, goes around the piece. And so that's really what the debate is about.

The question, Mr. Speaker, and the fundamental question, is: is that best accomplished by nationalized industries, by Crown corporations, by government ownership of everything, or is it best accomplished by the private sector with the government giving the private sector some encouragement, maybe being a joint venture partner, maybe giving it some assistance, or whatever? And our philosophy and our belief is that the latter is the better way to go.

Let's go back and compare, as the members opposite are so wanting to do in a repetitive way through this debate. You have to look two things, Mr. Speaker. From 1971 through to 1981 you had a period of very high commodity prices. If we're not prepared to admit that, then we're not prepared to get into reasonable debate. The price of oil went high, the price of potash went high, the price of forest products went high, the price of grain went high, inflation went high, interest rates went high — fact. And it all went high enough that it came down in a recession in 1981 — fact. And that recession has been sluggish in a resource-based economy as we have for a fair period of time, Mr. Speaker. That's another fact, and it's a fact you must sew into and weave into the equation of this particular debate.

But let's look at the time of those high commodity prices and high demand and observe, Mr. Speaker, what was built in the period 1971 to 1982 by the NDP. Let's look first of all at the resource sector, Mr. Speaker. Break down the resource sector, Mr. Speaker. Break down the resource sector; start off with the largest resource sector we have in our province, its oil and gas industry. The gas industry, the NDP had the following economic model.

One, leave the natural gas in the ground in Saskatchewan and buy your natural gas from Alberta at a higher price so that we could preserve this resource of natural gas for future generations, and let the folks pay the higher price for Alberta gas. That was their theory. Now didn't it force up the cost of natural gas? It did not pay royalties, obviously, because the royalties were being paid to Alberta. It didn't create any jobs in the western part of Saskatchewan where natural gas is because it was being done in Alberta.

And who gained? Who gained, Mr. Deputy Speaker? Did the employees of Saskatchewan gain by that theory? Not likely. Did the province of Alberta gain? You bet — got higher royalties. Developed by Alberta companies, Alberta energy corporation found lots of natural gas, sold it to Saskatchewan on that basic theory. So that didn't do very much, it seems to me.

The second thing we had was large reserves of heavy oil. Now during that time of ever increasing oil prices, did the NDP ever develop heavy oil or build a heavy oil upgrader? No. They promised one. They promised one to virtually every town in western Saskatchewan — Moose Jaw, Lloydminster, North Battleford, Kerrobert, Kindersley, Rosetown. They all were into the game. And when we came into power in 1982, there was nothing there, Mr. Speaker, nothing. There was no proposal. There was nothing. Nothing was done, Mr. Speaker, other than the promise.

Now since we came to government, government has become involved with two companies to build upgraders — the Co-op and Husky. And there, Co-op is built, experiencing some problems now, but it's built and we'll overcome those and they will overcome those. But it's built. It's something that's there now that was never there before, creating jobs that are there now that never were before nor could be before, because that plant was not there. And the same will be true in Lloydminster.

Now let's go to the next resource, pulp and paper. Did the NDP build any new pulp mills or paper mills during that 10- or 11-year period? No, they did not. First thing they did, as the Minister of Finance indicated, one of their first acts of government in 1971 was to cancel the Meadow Lake saw mill, Meadow Lake pulp mill. And it's taken till now to be able to put together a group that can rebuild and look at once again giving some hope to that area and building a pulp mill that will be a quality piece of work, creating jobs for the people of Meadow Lake that were never there before that will be now, creating economic activity for north-western Saskatchewan that was not there before but will be there now. And that seems to us to make eminent sense.

Then we shift to the third item, which is uranium. And in that I have to concede to the NDP that they in fact did build something, because there was mines that were not there before that they in fact built. And I have no problem with the way they did it. Quite frankly, they put together a joint venture of government, of the private sector, and they built a uranium mine, creating jobs in the North that were not there before, creating economic activity in the North that was not there before, paying royalties to the government and to the people of Saskatchewan that were

not there before.

And I agree with that, and I agree with that model. The problem is, Mr. Speaker, we on this side agree with what the NDP government did '1 to '82 in the uranium industry; the members opposite don't, other than the member from Athabasca and a couple of other members . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, you do too. He does. You. You. No. All right, half-and-half. But what they did there was right — proper model, proper strategy, Mr. Speaker.

Now let's go to potash. In 1972 to 1982, did they build potash mines? No they did not. They bought them, just like they bought the pulp mill in Prince Albert. They bought it; it was there; they bought the mines that were there. Did they expand the mines? Well it's the same thing that they did in Manitoba.

In Manitoba they promised a potash mine for three elections, the NDP. Well that's what you did here too. If you go back to '5, '8 and '82, what was the promise of the NDP to the people? We will build you a mine at Bredenbury. You probably promised it in 1971 but I don't recall because I was too young in those days.

But they promised it every election to build a new mine at Bredenbury. Hey, now did they build it? No, they didn't build it. They deployed their money to buy the ones that were there. Now should they or should not they have built it, I suppose, is a moot question depending on the supply-demand situation, etc., arguable point. What I'm saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that they didn't build anything; they bought what was there.

Now had they built an upgrader and a paper mill and a pulp mill, they would have got the similar type of spin that they got from building Key Lake mining company, the same economic spin. And it makes sense, but that does not make sense, Mr. Speaker, simply to build . . . to buy up the potash mines.

So then the debate moves on to say, oh, about Lanigan. You guys say that it's the NDP's fault that Lanigan was built, and it really was your fault. Well let's look at the facts of Lanigan, Mr. Speaker. We came to office in 1982, and Lanigan expansion is half done, so what do we have the option of doing? They say, oh you guys should have cancelled it. The Lanigan potash expansion was half done. They would have us say, well let's just moth-ball that. It's half done, well over \$200 million, and they say, oh, you guys should have cancelled that. Silliness, Mr. Speaker. That is the only expansion that these people had done in the field of potash; the only expansion, the only building that these people had done in potash.

And then they say, well it's half done; you should have cancelled it.

It doesn't stop there, Mr. Speaker. Go to the area of food processing. And I don't want to branch off the topic too much, but I do want to tie it to potash, in fairness.

If you look at red meat processing, did they build a new plant or expand a plant in North Battleford or in Moose Jaw or in Saskatoon or at Melfort? No, they didn't. They

didn't expand that. What did they do? They bought one. They bought one that was already there. To process more meat? No. Just wanted to own it.

And how many new jobs did they create at Intercontinental Packers? None. And did they get any return on their investment? No. They lost money, Mr. Speaker.

It makes more sense for government, whether they lose it or whether they get the good return — they have to analyse that — but you have to deploy your money, Mr. Speaker, to try to create something new, to create more economic activity, to create more jobs. And that's what you should be doing.

And if you go to the Cargill plant . . . And these guys are great at saying, don't do Cargill; no truck or trade with Cargill. Those guys have been in this province for a long time, buying grain, paying wages, delivering farm chemicals, paying taxes to lots of small towns across this province. And what do these guys say? No truck or trade with Cargill. They go further. Cargill is not welcome in Saskatchewan. Cargill is not welcome in our province.

Mr. Speaker, and they clap for that and they cheer for that. Cargill, Mr. Speaker, creates jobs in the Regina and Moose Jaw area. It's going to create jobs — lots of them. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, it's going to deliver cheaper fertilizer to our farmers so that we can be more competitive in the international markets of the world. And that seems to me to make eminent sense.

It becomes a market for our natural gas producers, and they can create more jobs and pay more royalties in Saskatchewan — not Alberta natural gas; Saskatchewan natural gas. And that grows, Mr. Speaker. And that creates jobs, and that creates economic activity, and that pays taxes. That makes sense, Mr. Speaker, and that's the direction we want to go.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(2015)

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — The NDP then go on and say, but if you go through with Bill No. 20, who's going to buy all the shares? Well it's going to be foreign governments, big business, and big investors. Now who has bought shares in the issues that we've issued to date? People of Saskatchewan, 50, 60,000 of them, Saskatchewan people. My grandmother, my mother, your parents, everybody's families that they now have bought shares because the people of Saskatchewan have for a long time been savers of money.

So instead of putting your money into a bank account that goes off to invest in property in Toronto or Vancouver, why not put it into something that can be used in Saskatchewan? And they agree with that, Mr. Speaker. So that can be in terms of a bond or it can be in terms of a share.

Now Alberta Energy corporation was built on that model. It was Alberta people buying shares in that company. Now those people are holding the shares, many of them,

that they bought 20 and 25 years ago, because they have that sense of pride in Alberta, that we own a bit of Alberta, that we help the province of Alberta. Why can't the people of Saskatchewan be given that same opportunity?

There's people out there with savings. They don't have to spend a million dollars. They can spend 500; they can spend 1,000 or 10,000. Those people can invest, Mr. Speaker, into this particular corporation. The second group that's going to invest in this corporation, Mr. Speaker, and has already invested in corporations, is what is called the institutional investor, the pension plans. And the NDP in their proposal back pre-'82 election refers to that as well.

Let me explain to you, Mr. Speaker, what the pension plan investment is. The members of this legislature contribute through their monthly pay cheque to a pension fund. They take a certain amount out of our pension fund. That pension fund is then pooled with the pension fund of all government employees, school teachers, municipal employees, into a pension fund. And that pension fund, our money, everyone in this House money, what do they use that for? They bought shares in Saskoil; they bought shares in Ipsco; they got shares in real estate development in Vancouver and Toronto. They probably have investments in all the great evil people that the members opposite talk about.

It's okay for us as elected members to take our savings in that form and invest, but oh, don't let the folks do it. That's evil — that's evil, Mr. Speaker. The institutional investors are some of the largest investors you see today.

And who are those people, Mr. Speaker? They're small people, they're not big people. They're the school teacher and the nurse, Mr. Speaker, and the municipal employees and the government employees. It's their money that goes into those funds. Those funds have already bought private assets in the province of Saskatchewan, in the province of Alberta, in the province of Ontario, in the province of B.C. We're investing it now. Why don't the members opposite speak of that? And what is wrong with that, Mr. Speaker? Nothing is wrong with it.

The Premier yesterday talked about this proposal put forward by the NDP. Here it is here. I thought the member from Regina North East would at least try to meet the argument advanced by the Premier and some others that have spoken. He was part of it. The members opposite have not even acknowledged that this document exists, and there's the names. And it's the minutes of a meeting of the Crown investments corporation, pre-1982.

And they there proposed to allow the people of Saskatchewan to invest in the Crown corporations. And they estimate 50 to 60,000 of them would take it up, at between 4 and \$6,000 each, not 500 that we allow — 4 to 6,000 bucks each, and there's 60,000 of them there. They proposed this and it makes a good deal of sense, Mr. Speaker.

Now either they justify it and say, well that was in our dying days an these people were wrong and we're against what they said . . . Say that if they want, but at least talk about it, acknowledge it. And there's nothing wrong

with this, Mr. Speaker.

Now the NDP are going to wrap up tonight, Mr. Speaker, another speaker or two. And I would challenge them, whether it's the critic, member from Regina Elphinstone . . . Now he wasn't part of this. He wasn't on the board, but the member from Regina North East was. I challenge him.

They've got it; we've sent copies over to them. I challenge them in this time tonight speaking to get up and explain this, to get up and explain it. Because if he does not, Mr. Speaker, we can only take one assumption from it — they are ashamed of this or it doesn't fit their rhetoric of the last 110 hours of debate on this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, as I said in the beginning and I will say now, and that is this, and that is this, Mr. Speaker: what this debate is about primarily is two models of dealing with the economy, two models of dealing with the economy.

I've advanced ours, Mr. Speaker. It is us, as government, participating with the private sector, and that private sector, government co-operation building something new, versus the members opposite's view of you buy until you have control of the industry, and when you take over the industry, you as government can manage it better than the private sector. You as government are better than any private sector company. That's what you're saying. That's exactly what you're saying.

The Leader of the Opposition said two important things. One, he says, Mr. Speaker, that the take-over of the potash mine was his greatest moment, the greatest moment that he's experienced in politics in some 25 years. That's what he said. The members opposite, when you get the big boys talking, you know . . . The fellows at the back, it doesn't matter, but you take the member from Fairview, he's a big boy, member from Regina Centre, member from Regina Elphinstone, North East, the Leader of the Opposition, that takes care of it. You know, when they stand up, Mr. Speaker, when they stand up, they always beat their chests hard about saying, oh they're going to win the next election, but they stop short, Mr. Speaker, of saying, we're going to take these over again if we ever get back into power.

Have you ever heard them say that? But they will. Rosemont does or the Regina Centre, or Saskatoon Centre, some of the fringe members say that, but not the big boys. Now do the big boys mean it? The leader of the Opposition says, that's my finest hour. Is that what he's saying, Mr. Speaker? Give us power and I'll tell you what we'll do, because here's what the Leader of the Opposition said in *Hansard*, page 901:

I want to tell you something else, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Saskatchewan people know that there are some enterprises which are so important to all of us that the public sector simply can't be eliminated. The public sector simply should lead the way. I say to you, sir, potash is one such enterprise.

Now potash corporation is going to be sold to the people of this province and the people of this country, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — The members opposite say they were going to have this great election victory. Well they said that in '82, and they said that prior to '86. When the election comes, Mr. Speaker, the debate in this next election is going to be about their vision, their model, Crown corporations, and our model, a chance to build, Mr. Speaker, a chance to expand, Mr. Speaker.

And I say to the members opposite, some of the new ones that are here, they haven't been here before, ask your people in the front rows if they've ever wondered and thought or analysed why they lost in 1982. Why did you lose the election in 1982? Well they come up and say, well boy, the Conservatives got a good advertising agent and we didn't. Mr. Speaker, advertising agents don't win 56 seats for you in the province of Saskatchewan. The NDP were out of touch, and now they want to get back out of touch because they want as their centre-piece, they want as their centre-piece the reincarnation of the family of Crown corporations.

Well I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the members opposite, the people rejected that model in '82; they rejected that model in '86; and when the next election is called, they're going to reject it again, because they're wrong and it doesn't work, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrews: — It's wrong and it's yesterday, Mr. Speaker, it's yesterday's economics. You see the people in the countries, and we've listed them, that moved from this: India, China, the Soviet Union, Australia — labour government, New Zealand — labour government. I even hear tell that Fidel Castro, Mr. Speaker, is starting to have second thoughts about this model. Mr. Speaker, the world is moving away from that. The members opposite want to go back to yesterday. They go back to yesterday at their own peril, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I must say again that I'm . . . Thank you for your warm response. I must say, Mr. Speaker, again that I am not happy about having to stand in my place today and defend the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan from a government who is trying to destroy instead of build, all the while they talk about building.

And I am not, Mr. Speaker, going to rebut the words of the member opposite, the Minister of Justice, but for one thing. Mr. Speaker, prior to 1986, the man you just heard speaking in this House stood in the public, documented in the press, and said, privatization is yesterday's theory. And now tonight we hear him 180 degrees and reversed, talking about the thing called privatization that he, before the last election, called yesterday's theory. So the question I ask you, and everybody who watched his speech, is: can you believe him? I think his credibility is

gone.

So, Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to spend a few moments talking about potash, talking about why I think the potash corporation should not be privatized, talking about how this government is operating, talking about why this government is hypocritical, talking about why this government does not have a mandate, and some other point.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to begin by saying we would not be in this debate, we would not be in this debate — and I've said this before — if it had not been for a government prior to this government who built assets in this province for the good of these people. The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan would not have been there for this government to sell had we not built it, had we not build it to serve the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to go through several privatizations because I think we have to look at the history behind the privatization in Saskatchewan that led us up to the potash corporation privatization. And I want to look at several privatizations, just to explore whether or not it's a good idea to continue in this vein.

And keep in mind all the while that these are corporations that were built in Saskatchewan, for Saskatchewan, by Saskatchewan, to benefit everyone in this province. And they paid rewards; they paid dividends. And I'll just go through it.

(2030)

You will remember that, in 1982, the Tories privatized the SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation) assets, sold them to Manalta Coal of Alberta. In order to make the purchase, Manalta had to borrow enough money and the Government of Saskatchewan guaranteed Manalta's loans.

In November of '84, the PC government privatized the Poplar River coal-mine at Coronach, once again to Manalta Coal. The province had \$129 million investment. The sale price was \$102 million, and we lent them \$89 million to make the deal. And what was the result of that? Well, I just want to add one more thing. Then the government also, at the same time, entered into a 30-year coal purchase agreement to purchase coal supplied from Manalta to power the Poplar River power station at Coronach. They justified this by saying that they are selling them off to out-of-province operation on the grounds that it was improving SPC's financial position.

In 1982, they privatized the drag-line, and the electric utility lost \$30 million. In 1984, they privatized the Poplar River coal-mine, and that year the electrical utility lost \$22 million, and lost a further \$22 million in 1985.

So, Mr. Speaker, as you see, this is one of the first privatizations that took place. And in 1982, the power rates increased, as I said, and the deficit became larger. They said they were going to build, but the power rates increased and the deficit became larger.

Then they continued. They privatized Highways and the highways equipment. In April 1983, Jim Garner, the Highways minister then, fired 157 highway workers. And he said he was going to . . . They will now have the opportunity to work in the private sector.

Then in March 1984, this Tory minister privatized another 237 workers, and he said he was giving them freedom of choice. He fired them and he said he is giving them freedom of choice. He was going to let them have the opportunity to be transferred to the private sector.

And then the crunch came in 1984, when they privatized more than 400 pieces of highway equipment, the replacement value of which was \$40 million. They sold this highway equipment, much of it to people outside of Saskatchewan. And you can just imagine the people going to the auction, just lining themselves up a little bit before, and say, yes, I can use this piece and I can use that piece. And they got out of that sale of \$40 million worth of assets, \$6 million. Another example of PC privatization — lost jobs, the taxes went up, and the deficit increased. And as my colleague said, the roads went to pieces. So that's one of the earlier privatizations.

And then in 1986, they thought they were going to be real smart and privatize the parks. At Duck Mountain, the developer increased condominium rates by 25 per cent. This is privatization — the rates went up 25 per cent. At Mount Blackstrap, the price for a season ticket doubled — 100 per cent increase. At Moose Mountain, golf park green fees went up 40 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, it has also meant that by the PC government, they're saying they're providing more services. But what they did was, when all these other things increased, they increased their rates too, what they had left. The park entry fees went up 30 per cent, camping fees went up 80 per cent, and swimming lessons went up 150 per cent. So this is privatization.

In Blackstrap, when they privatized it, 15 people lost their jobs. Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park, they kept two out of 11 people when it was privatized.

So, Mr. Speaker, we see what's happening. The trend is beginning to develop — lost jobs, higher taxes, and a larger deficit, and fewer services. So we can see that the trend's starting to build. Now you would think maybe that the PC government at this time would just have to stop and question what they were doing. Or maybe they wouldn't; maybe they were thinking, well maybe we should give it a chance to go on further.

So then they went for a little bigger game. In 1986, they were privatizing Weyerhaeuser. They sold the P.A. pulp mill to a multinational corporation based in the United States. And they said the sale price was going to be \$248 million. But when we found out the terms of the deal, we found out that they paid no money down, they had 30 years to pay, they had a preferential interest rate, they could make no payment in years when Weyerhaeuser's profits were less than 12 per cent, and the province was to each year build 32 kilometres of road in the forest. Those were just some of the terms of the agreement.

Mr. Speaker, in 1985, the whole Canadian industry had a bad year, but there were reports around saying that this trend was going to change. In fact, an independent forest consultant in Vancouver published a report stating that the industry had its best two years in '86 and '87, and the forecast further said that the pulp prices would increase by another 15 per cent. So this Tory government, this smart Tory government gave away the P.A. pulp mill at a time when the industry was going to rebound to great heights. You have to ask yourself why they would do that.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, when you look at Weyerhaeuser's annual reports, you will see that in 1986, before the privatization, they had profits of \$221 million. And in 1987, after privatization — remember that's the years when things were turned around and the prices of pulp started going up — they had profits of \$522 million or double their profits from the year before they acquired the P.A. pulp mill to the year after. You have to ask yourself if half of the money could have been kept in Saskatchewan for Saskatchewan people and not given to Weyerhaeuser of Tacoma, Washington.

So an increase of profit of 100 per cent in those two years and that is privatization, Tory style. We lose the money, our taxes increase, and our deficit increases. Now, Mr. Speaker, after that you would think that this Tory government might say, well just a minute; maybe something's wrong here. But no, they carried on.

They privatized Saskoil in 1986. From the time that the PC government took office, Saskoil was making money until the first year it was privatized. Then you have to look at the reasoning for that. And then in 1987, it made money again. The preferred shares were sold to the private investors, and even in 1986, when the company lost money, the preferred shareholders were paid a dividend. They were paid when the company lost money. And the common shares owned by the government receive no dividends. Even in 1987, when the corporation made a profit, nothing came back to the Government of Saskatchewan.

In 1984, before privatization, Saskoil made a profit of \$4 million, all of which was kept by the people of Saskatchewan, kept to keep their taxes down, kept to keep the deficit down just as the previous examples of corporations owned by the government did.

And what has happened? Within six month of being privatized, Saskoil laid off 25 per cent of its workers. Within one year of the privatization — and get this! — Mr. Speaker, within one year, three-quarters of the shares were owned outside Saskatchewan. Within 15 months of privatization, Saskoil paid \$66 million to purchase an Alberta oil company, and the result of that was that at the end of '87, 12 per cent of the reserves were in Saskatchewan and 70 per cent were in Alberta. No dividends to Saskatchewan, but dividends to people outside of Saskatchewan and exploring in Alberta. That is privatization, Tory style.

So what do we have again? We have jobs that were lost for Saskatchewan residents. That year our taxes went up again, and that year the deficit went up again. I'm a

farmer, and if I'm selling off an asset . . . And many farmers do. Let's just take the example of someone who is in financial difficulty and they sell off assets for one purpose — to lower their debt load. And that makes sense in some cases where you just have to do that.

But what the Tories are doing is they're selling off assets, and you would think it would be to reduce a debt load if they were going to do something with the money. But all these years, privatization after privatization, we see this government selling off assets, all the while our taxes are increasing and all the while the deficit increases.

So the question you have to ask is, where is the money going? And I think if we had somebody in this government who would have asked, where is the money going, back in 1986 and '85 and before, we may not be in the deficit position we are now with over \$13 billion owed by the people of this province to banks.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they carried on. They privatized the SED Systems. In January 1987, the PC government allowed SED to be taken over by Fleet Aerospace of Ontario. The member who just spoke before me, the Minister of Justice, claimed that it would preserve 350 jobs in Saskatoon and keep the management of the company in Saskatoon. The province sold \$2 million in SED shares to Fleet in exchange for Fleet shares worth only \$1.3 million.

These are the people who tell us that they're the free enterprise, sharp, private operators who are going to make this place work. They sell \$2 million for \$1.3 million worth of shares. I mean, that's really clever.

You might ask yourself, as an aside, if there was any benefit received from doing that. And you might ask yourself if the Premier or the front benches received any benefits from selling \$2 million worth of shares for \$1.3 million. I simply ask the question I don't have the answer, but the question had to be asked.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, by early 1988, Fleet had forced SED to lay off 70 workers — 70 workers laid off, when the Minister of Justice had before that, the current Minister of Justice had said before that that he was going to preserve the jobs in Saskatoon. And they threatened — get this! — they threatened to fire more staff and even pull out of the province if the government didn't fork some money over to buoy them up.

That's the kind of deals, privatization deals, this government gets itself trapped into time and time again. You would think they would have learned from this deal to scrutinize these operations a little closer and they may have not gotten themselves into a gigamess and spending \$5 million of taxpayers' money because nobody was looking into and researching and finding out if these operators they're dealing with are straight up or if they're going to take them for a ride.

In late February, Mr. Speaker, of '88, Fleet's chairman in Ontario stated very bluntly and publicly, and I quote:

The message to the government is, we'd better get some financial help and some help quick. If we don't have help, we'll cut it right back again and even may have to move.

So he threatened the government. This is the kind of people here they're dealing with in their privatization.

In 1988, they laid off more workers. And then they said, well they'd buckled under. So the government agreed that SEDCO would purchase SED's new building for \$10 million and would lease the building to SED for 20 years. So they've knuckled under to the pressure. Instead of saying, look, we have a deal . . . Or maybe they didn't have a deal — even worse. Maybe they didn't have a deal.

But here's the result again — lost jobs, our taxes went up, and our deficit went up. And they say privatization is working? I think not. And it continues.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to talk now about Sask Minerals. The same thing happened. Sask Minerals made a profit in every year but one since 1946. Every year they made a profit. And they sold it in 1988. They sold part of it to Dickenson Mines of Ontario, and they sold the peat moss operation to Premier Cdn Enterprises out of Quebec. The announced sale price was \$15.9 million, and that is less than Saskatchewan Minerals' profits in the previous six years. So they sold it for less than what the profit was out of that corporation in six years.

Is that how the people of Saskatchewan benefit when they have an asset that they own, making money for them, generating income to keep their taxes down, to keep the debt down? The people of the province don't deserve that kind of treatment. And again I say, if it had not been for governments before this government, none of these things would have been in place to sell. And it wouldn't be so bad if, when they were selling these things, they were reducing the deficit or they were reducing the tax loads, but no, they're selling them and the taxes go up and the debt goes up.

(2045)

I ask again, where is the money going? That is the question that we don't have the answer to. We know, we think it goes to patronage, goes to blunders like GigaText, it goes to people like Cargill — and I'll get into Cargill in a little while. But it goes to advertising and lining Tory pockets. That's what we think and I think we're right, and I think the people of this province believe we're right, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

So then, Mr. Speaker, 1988, they continued. And as I said before, you'd think by now they would be asking themselves, what's happening? You'd think one member on that back bench would say, what's happening? You'd think they would be listening to the phone calls from their constituents, saying, where's the money going; maybe you should stop this. But no, they continued.

In 1988, they privatized SaskCOMP, part of SaskTel, to WESTBRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, over the past five years, SaskTel made a profit in every year, and its total profits

over those five years has been \$171 million — \$171 million, a very profitable operation. In '87 alone, SaskTel made a profit of \$50 million, a 21 per cent return on investment. And these guys want to get rid of that? Twenty-one percent on investment.

Over the past five years, SaskCOMP has made a profit in every year. In 1987, SaskCOMP made a profit of \$3.4 million or 37 per cent return on investment for the people of Saskatchewan, and these guys gave it away — 37 per cent.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — And, Mr. Speaker, not only that, but they refused to make any documents about the privatization deal public. They refused. They kept it secret. And you have to ask yourself why, but I guess it's pretty obvious after we see the litany of blunders that they've gone through in their privatization.

And again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in 1988 what happened? Our taxes went up again, and believe it or not, our deficit went up again when they were selling off profits worth \$171 million. I don't understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't understand that kind of logic, but I think they must have an ulterior motive. And I think that ulterior motive is self-preservation of the people in this government and their friends, financially. I think that's what the motive is.

Mr. Speaker, they privatized SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation). And over the past five years, SMDC made a profit of \$126 million for the people of Saskatchewan; 1987, \$60.3 million, or a 19 per cent return on investment.

And it goes on. Taxes up, deficit up, and services dwindling to almost nothing; our roads going to pieces; hidden taxes coming in everywhere; service fees and all the other little charges that they're taking out of the pockets of the people of Saskatchewan. And they didn't stop. They tried to privatize the natural gas, SaskPower's natural gas portion. And now they're trying to privatize the Sask potash corporation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we, meaning NDP leaders before me and before them, built these corporations to benefit Saskatchewan people. It wasn't simply to buy up something just to have it. It wasn't simply for control of the assets around the province. It was because the people before this government thought that there had to be a different way, there had to be a way to finance the activities of the province that would keep the taxes down and all the while keep the deficit down. And it worked right up until 1982; it worked perfectly. There was no deficit in the Consolidated Fund, and there was a relatively small debt compared to now in the Crowns, about \$3 billion in the Crowns which was self-liquidating debt, exactly. And what we have now, after the privatization, after the Tory economic agenda, what we have now, they privatized, they're selling off all these assets that our forefathers built for the benefit of the people.

But is this economic plan working? Well let's take a look: 1982, no debt in the Consolidated Fund; about a \$3

billion debt in the Crowns, self-liquidating. What about today? After the privatization, after the Tory agenda of how to run a province, \$4 billion of debt in the Consolidated Fund and \$9 billion debt in the Crowns. Isn't that a great statement from a government who told the people of this province that there is a better way, there is so much more we can be. What they didn't say is what they mean is, there is so much more in debt we can be if run by a Tory government, Mr. Speaker, that is the difference between what we saw in the past and what we have now.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you will just indulge me for a moment I want to read a little poem here, and I want to make a point after I read this poem. This poem is called *The Road Not Taken* and it's by Robert Frost. It goes like this:

Two roads diverged in a yellow wood,
And sorry I could not travel both
And be one traveller,
Long I stood
And looked down one as far as I could
To where it bent in the undergrowth;

Then took the other, as just as fair,
And having perhaps the better claim,
Because it was grassy and wanted wear;
Though as for that the passing there
Had worn them really about the same,

And both that morning equally lay
In leaves no step a trodden black.
Oh, I kept the first for another day!
Yet knowing how way leads on to way,
I doubted if I should ever come back.

I shall be telling this with a sigh
Somewhere ages and ages hence:
Two roads diverged in a wood, and I —
I took the one less travelled by,
And that has made all the difference.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is what this is all about. We in Saskatchewan had people with vision, people who looked around this province and saw what we had, the distance, the population, the sparse population. And they could see what was going on around the world because they all came from different parts of the world and they knew what was happening in their respective parts of the world, and that was one of the reasons they came to Saskatchewan.

And what did they do? Did they bring with them what was happening around the world? No, they put their heads together and they created something unique in Saskatchewan that they thought would be to the benefit of all those in this province. So they built. They built SaskPower and a power grid system throughout this province. The government built it. They built SaskTel. The government built it for the people. They built SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance). The government and the people, working together, built SGI to help the people of the province to keep the cost down. And they built dental plans and highways and a grid road system throughout Saskatchewan that was so sorely needed.

And I've talked to many of the old-timers in this province, and they say there are two or three things in this province that they can vividly remember as being so different after they had achieved them. And one was the power grid and the other was the grid road system in this province.

And they built Saskoil. And yes — I'll go back — and they built a socialized medicare system. Socialized medicine, and if I could speak parenthetically for a minute, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Premier, this man over here, somehow thinks that he is the saviour or the inventor or the father or the person who is going to save medicare. Socialized medicine was brought in to this province by people before him, by people who knew there was a better way, who knew there was another road to follow, and they have succeeded.

And don't let anyone tell you, especially this government or the Premier here, that they have any respect for anything that is anything to do with a social program or socialized medicine, because they are the people who are absolutely doing the reverse in privatizing everything and anything they can in Saskatchewan and achieving nothing but a higher debt and higher taxes.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, that was the vision of the forefathers, and that is why we want to carry on that strong tradition of building and growth and a reasonable tax level and no debt. Can you imagine the government who is talking about privatization, who say privatization in the private sector is the only way to go? Our forefathers knew better than that years and years ago because they not only built . . . With the government and the people together, they built the co-operative system.

They knew there was a better way because when you were a farmer and you had to haul your grain in the fall because you needed the money, and the prices were low, you got very little money for your grain. But if you were somebody who had capital and wealth that you could carry your grain over till spring when there was a bit of demand for it, well you got top dollar for your grain. And that's the kind of a system these guys are going back to, and that's the reason our forefathers said, no, that is not right; there's a better way; there's a co-operative way; there's a wheat pool system way; and there's a credit union way.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I tell you that there is a better way and it's been proven — been proven because there's no deficit; been proven because the taxes were reasonable; been proven because there wasn't unemployment; and been proven because all the people in this province were benefitting, benefitting from the minds of those people who came before them who were so intelligent to build and not destroy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd just like to read the last paragraph again:

I shall be telling (this) with a sigh
Somewhere ages and ages hence;
Two roads diverged into a wood, and I —

I took the one less travelled by,
And that has made all the difference.

That's one side. And now we see the other side. We see the other side where this Premier and this government are saying, but this is the way of the world; we have to do it to keep up with the times; everybody's doing it, even Castro. Well that is the very reason why we should take a second look at it, and that's the very reason our forefathers and foremothers took a look at it, and that's why they built a better system than what this government is promoting.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — But this government continues on. It continues on with its privatization. But why? If they look at what's happened in this province over history, if they would stop for a minute and see the difference, except for their ideological blinkers on, they could see that, because it's the way of the world, it doesn't mean it's the way of Saskatchewan. And that was proven 50 and 100 years ago in this province. So why do we want to go back? Why do we want to go back to a system that failed once, is in the process of failing again with all the privatizations? And they saying they're building, but we're losing jobs.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would just like to say that there's some people who aren't losing their jobs. There's some people in this province who are benefitting, just like they benefitted . . . just like the prosperous people years ago benefitted because they could take advantage of the system. And that's happening again. And I have heard the stories and read the books, and we know what happened.

But the Tory friends are well paid. The Tory friends are well paid in many areas. One of them is advertising, or polling, or patronage. But what about the people of this province who are on welfare? What about the people of this province who are working for \$4.50 an hour? What about the people of this province who are on unemployment insurance? What about the people of this province who just don't have any hope?

And I tell you, when I talk about hope, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have to ask, if this is the way, if this new neo-conservative agenda is the way in Saskatchewan for Saskatchewan, then why haven't they conveyed that to the thousands and thousands of people who are leaving this province?

And the potash corporation, if it was the right thing to do to privatize the potash corporation, if it was going to give people optimism, if it was going to . . . If they could convey that to the people, then we should have people coming here if it was going to be so good. But we don't; we have people leaving this province because they don't have any hope. They're fed up. And you would think even that would make this government stop and think for a minute, but no. They continue on their merry way.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, waste and mismanagement are a legacy that this government will leave behind, and I think it's such a legacy that the people of this province will not forget it for a long, long time. They made a mistake when they brought forward the privatization of the natural gas portion of SaskPower — they made a mistake.

(2100)

We allowed the democratic process to work by giving the people the opportunity. We went to the people and said, you have seen what privatization has done to date; now they want to privatize SaskPower, the natural gas portion; what do you say? And they said no; a hundred thousand people signed petitions and said no . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . in 10 days, that's right. In 10 days, a hundred thousand people signed petitions and they said, no, we don't want it to be privatized because that is something that, as I said earlier, was built for the purpose of every individual in this province to take advantage of, to keep the system in place.

But no, they said we went on strike. Well I'll tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when you allow the democratic process to work and when you give it an opportunity to work and when you give it an opportunity to work beyond this legislature, then I think you're being responsible. And it did work, and that is one of the thorns in the side of this government, because they continue to harp about us going out on strike. It really bugs them, democracy bugs them, because they want to do everything in secret behind closed doors for Tories.

And they were complaining about us walking out, saying that they wanted us . . . this is the forum, they said this is the forum, come and debate us. So we came back in, and it wasn't very long afterwards, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they said, well we don't want any more debate; when we got onto potash, we don't want any more debate. So they invoke closure. You see it's inconsistent; it's whatever's right at the time in their minds, and that doesn't work because the people understand inconsistencies. The people understand what is meant when this government says one thing and does another Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government is drunk with power. They're anti-democratic.

So then they thought, well if this didn't work with SaskEnergy, then we'll put it on the back burner; so they did. And they thought, well potash is probably a better step to take, a better thing to privatize; maybe we'll have a little more support on potash. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they thought they might have a little more support on potash so they come ahead with it. They say, first come and debate. And then they say no, you can't debate; we're going to put closure on.

And what do the people think? What do the people think?

An Hon. Member: : — Read us another poll.

Mr. Upshall: — Yes, I'm going to read you another poll, because I believe what people are saying is very important. What people are saying should be important to this legislature and how we govern our affairs here, because after all, we're elected to respond to the needs and wishes of the people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — Well there was a poll that came out today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and it goes something like this. One of the questions was: please tell me whether

you strongly oppose, oppose, favour, or strongly favour the sale of the following to the private sector. And there's seven. They asked the question on seven.

The first one was SGI — 68 per cent of the people oppose . . . 68 per cent of the people oppose the sale of SGI to the private sector. I mean, these are ordinary farmers and working people and doctors and lawyers and everybody around the province. This is random. At 68 per cent, they oppose privatization of SGI.

Sixty-eight per cent also said they opposed the privatization of SaskTel . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And one of the members opposite says, well he doesn't believe it. Well that's his prerogative. That's his prerogative.

An Hon. Member: : — That's his problem.

Mr. Upshall: — And that's his problem — exactly. Because they got the . . . You know what happens, Mr. Speaker, when you get a horse that gets a bit in his teeth and keeps running away on your? You take it out and you shoot it and you ship to the fox farm and you get a new horse. And I'll tell you, that's what's going to happen to the government. They'll be out of here.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — And they asked a question, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They asked a question, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about Sask Power Corporation. Sask Power Corporation privatization — 71 per cent of the people said they did not want SaskPower to be privatized — 71 per cent, over two to one.

And what about SaskEnergy? Well 61 per cent of the people said they didn't want . . . or 71 per cent of the people said they didn't want SaskEnergy privatized either — 71 per cent again.

And what about the Sask auto fund? Well 67 per cent of the people said they didn't want Sask auto fund. So you're running an average there of 66 to 70 per cent.

And what about the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan? Here again, falls right in line — 66 per cent of the people in Saskatchewan do not want the potash corporation to be privatized.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — So there, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have it.

Why would this government continue, why would this government continue to go on with their privatization when the people are standing up there? I mean, if they wanted to keep themselves in government, why wouldn't they be responding to the people, if only for their own interests? But maybe their interests in privatization are more, because maybe they'll get more out of privatization personally than they would if they kept on listening to the people of the province. Maybe that's the thing. Maybe there are rewards.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, they are not listening to the people

of Saskatchewan. In fact, here's one more question, and I will just read one more question on the poll, and it says:

Some people say the provincial government is out of touch with the people of Saskatchewan and is not acting in the best interests of the people by pushing ahead with its privatization plans. Do you agree or disagree?

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, do you realize that 70 per cent of the people in Saskatchewan say that this government is out of touch and is not listening — 70 per cent.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, other than the fact that there may be more personal gain in privatizing and giving things, assets in this province away than there is by listening to the people of the province, other than that, I don't understand why they continue in their ways.

And 70 per cent of the people are saying no, and they're continuing to do it. So who are they governing for? Who are they governing for? They are governing for the large, foreign corporations of this world who are dictating to them because they can say, we can make you a good deal, my friends. But what they don't know is what they really mean is, you pays your money and you takes your chances.

And the problem is that the people of Saskatchewan have to fall along with them. And not only fall along with them, they have to pay for every mistake this government makes. And the taxes go up when the deficit goes up. So why do they continue?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this reminds me of a little story, and this was a story about a group of hunters who went out to hunt moose. And there was about 38 of them, just like there's 38 members — I don't know if there's any comparison here — but just like there's 38 members here. And they went out to hunt moose. They were going to slay this animal. Just like these guys went out to capture the people of the province when they got elected.

So anyway, these hunters went and they shot this moose and they had a little discussion with what they were going to do with it. Well first they said, we got to get out of here, some place where we can manage it. Just like those people, you know, they talk about what they had to do after they took over and captured this province.

Anyway, they tied a rope around each foot and they all had it over their shoulders and they were dragging it out of the bush by the feet. And every hair, in fact, there were probably 70 per cent of the hairs were disagreeing with this, because they were digging in the snow, and they were trying to hold back because they knew there something wrong. And they were dragging this moose along for about, oh seven years maybe. But no, for a little while they were dragging it along and they come across another hunter, and the hunter said, well why don't you drag the moose by the horns? It would make much more sense. All the hair would be going; everything would be smooth. And you know what the reply from the chorus of 38 voices said? They said, because we're not going that

way.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — There is a comparison here — when 70 per cent of the people in Saskatchewan say, don't do it; we disagree with you. But they're not going that way. And that is why we have a government in this province who is so low in the polls, who the people don't believe any more. They don't believe them because of what's happened all the while.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government does not have the support of the people of Saskatchewan. This government does not have a vision. This government does not have a mandate. This government does not have respect from the people of Saskatchewan. And that is why, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government will be history after they get the courage to call the next election — they will be history.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to touch on some other topics now. I want to talk about how this government is hypocritical in a couple of its positions. And this government said that the Premier went on a little mission over to Asia and he was going to sell the potash corporation. Well he makes the argument in Saskatchewan that the government shouldn't be running these things because they can't do a good job, they're inefficient, the private sector could do it much better. That's his argument.

And then he goes over to India and China and . . . five countries altogether I think, and he was going to sell 25 per cent to each of them. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I ask you, how can you make the argument the province of Saskatchewan can't run it but the government of some foreign country can run it? And I don't think you can make that argument except for one thing as an aside, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they could probably run it better than these guys could run it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — But that doesn't make it right. That doesn't make it right.

And there's no wonder he had such a response. And I don't doubt that he could have sold 25 per cent five times of the potash corporation, because the trend around in these other countries of the world are to acquire assets, because they know that's what they have to do. They're going all around the world acquiring assets. And this government is getting rid of assets.

I mean, these other countries around the world are enlarging upon the model we had in Saskatchewan. They're going out around the world getting assets, but this genius crew over here are getting rid of assets.

And just take it one more step. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if we sold a portion of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to foreign interests, who are our consumers for the most part, whether it be the U.S. or India or China or wherever, if we sell a portion — up to 45 per cent can be sold out of province — why would they want it to make it a profit

because they're buying it?

Wouldn't they be lobbying, saying, well, we got 45 per cent control of this company now, and we're the guys who buy the potash, so maybe we should just use our influence and control to keep the price down as low as possible because in the end run that helps us, that helps the government that they're selling it to? I don't know if the Premier ever thought of that, but why wouldn't they do that? If somebody buys into a corporation and they're receiving a benefit at the other end, it works automatically. And that's what works.

An Hon. Member: : — Just like a co-op.

Mr. Upshall: — Oh the Premier says, just like a co-op. Well, I'll tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a co-op runs in Saskatchewan, controlled one member, one vote by every person that's involved in that co-op, and he says selling part of the 45 per cent of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to foreign interests is like a co-op — no wonder this province is in so much trouble.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the other hypocrisy is this, and this is where I get back to Cargill. Now I've got nothing against Cargill building a fertilizer plant near Moose Jaw, nothing at all, and I've said that before. But Cargill, at the same time we're getting out of the business of corporations in Saskatchewan in the business of public ownership, we are seeing this government give a corporation who, believe it or not, had sales of \$38 billion last year, giving a corporation who had sales of \$38 billion, \$290 million to build a \$350 million fertilizer plant. So we're giving them, were going to put up \$60,000 cash and guarantee them the rest and they're going to put up . . . or 60 million rather, and they're going to put up 60 million, or that's what we understand. So what we're doing is we're guaranteeing them 85 per cent roughly, 85 per cent ownership or equity. We're getting 15 per cent equity and we're putting up 85 per cent of the cash for 15 per cent equity.

(2115)

And now this government . . . this is so hypocritical because how can you have it both ways? You can't be saying we're getting out of public ownership on one hand, but getting in to public ownership by giving Cargill \$290 million, by giving Pocklington tens of millions of dollars, by giving Weyerhaeuser a sweetheart deal, by giving many of the other privatizations by co-signing or guaranteeing their interest rates. I mean, you can't have it both ways.

And that is why, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the people of this province do not believe this government when they hear them because they can only believe what they've done, what they've seen with their own eyes. And they know that they can't be trusted.

And that is why they're so far down in the polls, that is why they have to put closure on potash so they can try to bail out to get something, to get it passed again. That is why they have to . . . that is why they sat there before this

debate was closed upon, foreclosed . . . I was going to say foreclosed upon — and that's something just as another aside. Now we have a government of foreclosure on the farmers and closure on the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — Closure is a favourite word. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we see this government going in the pocket of Cargill, going in the pocket of Weyerhaeuser.

An Hon. Member: : — Say it again for Mike.

Mr. Upshall: — He wouldn't understand it if I said it again anyway so it doesn't matter.

But we got the hypocrisy, and the people don't believe them and that's why they're down. And that's why, as I was going to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, before they put closure on this debate, this government opposite, the members opposite virtually sat on their hands. Oh there was one or two or three, about a half dozen got up, six, I think, got up and spoke for . . . well the Deputy Premier spoke, for I think, six minutes and they spoke very shortly.

And we got up one after another in our places and we spoke from our hearts, pushed on by the people of Saskatchewan saying — 70 per cent of them at least saying — no, don't privatize this corporation.

And what do they do? Do they defend? Do the members back there stand up and give their reasons why they want? No. Only after closure because then they know there's a limited time on debate. So they'll all get up and they'll read their 15 minute speech, if somebody turns them on when it's their turn, flicks the switch to on. And that's what's happening. They're trying to consume time, but they don't have it in their heart, because they know . . . I think they know it's wrong, but they're driven on by something else. They're driven on.

And I ask, with relation to the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, in 1987 or '86, I believe it was, this government wrote off \$500 million worth of debt from the corporation. They took it out of the potash corporation and put it on to the backs of the people of Saskatchewan. In the potash corporation, it should have been self-liquidating. At least that's the way it's supposed to work.

That is another long story, and if I have time I'll get into it — about how this government took money out of potash corporation when it was losing money, so potash corporation had to borrow more money, so the debt kept going up. And they got it up so high they thought, well our plans are to privatize, so we'd better write off some of this debt. So we'll give it to the backs of the people of Saskatchewan, and so that's whoever's buying it doesn't have such a large debt to handle, we won't be able to unload this thing.

So, Mr. Speaker, I wonder. I have to ask myself, do you think it will go unnoticed by whoever buys the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan? Do you think it will go unnoticed that this government took away \$500 million worth of debt from that corporation before they bought it?

Do you think that'll go unnoticed? I don't think it will.

And I think that's why these back-benchers aren't standing up there. It's not in their heart. It's not in their heart, and they sat on their hands before the closure; they wouldn't say anything. Because I think it wouldn't go unnoticed that \$500 million was taken out of the potash corporation. It wouldn't go unnoticed by those people who were buying into it because I think they'd be very appreciative. And I think that members opposite would be well rewarded; they could be well rewarded because they took \$500 million off of this.

And that is so wrong, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That is not how governments work. That is how mafia works. Ask yourself the question, is there a difference?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the back-benchers didn't get up, nor did the Premier — the person who goes around this province day after day saying privatization is the way we're going to go because it's going to be so great for Saskatchewan. Did he lead the charge? Did he have such a strong feeling about privatizing, strong feeling that privatization would work for the people of Saskatchewan that he bounced out of his chair at every opportunity and gave his long oration about why they had to privatize the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan? No, he did not. He did not get up and lead the charge because he was afraid he might get muddled, because this is the . . . the new angle of the Tories is to try to hide the Premier. Put a Premier in your closet, keep him clean.

An Hon. Member: : — A chicken in a mud hole.

Mr. Upshall: — Mr. Deputy Speaker . . . a chicken in a mud hole, yes, that's right. I think that's pretty close. Put the Premier in the closet and keep him clean. That's what they're trying to do. But if he had it so strong in his heart that he thought it was right that the potash corporation be privatized, if he thought it would create jobs, if he thought it would create employment, if he thought it would create wealth, if he thought it would create a better atmosphere in Saskatchewan, I ask you, why was he not leading the charge on this? He was not leading the charge because he's trying to keep clean, because he doesn't have it in his heart.

An Hon. Member: : — I think he's stuck in a mud hole.

Mr. Upshall: — As my colleague says, I think he is stuck in a mud hole. Seventy per cent of the people saying he's not listening. People saying that this government is not in touch. People saying that this government, you can't trust them. People saying that they're power hungry; they're anti-democratic. And those aren't my words, that's the words that are out in the province of Saskatchewan, coming from the people, the people saying that this government has gone too far; there is a point. And they say that because they know their history. They know the path that Saskatchewan took in years gone by. And they know that this government has gone too far. They've pushed the people of Saskatchewan over the brink because the people of Saskatchewan . . . they know . . . These guys think they're dumb.

These guys think that they don't realize when their taxes

are going up, when your debt is going up, when your assets are going down, that something's wrong. That's why this government's in trouble, Mr. Deputy Speaker, ideological blinkers, out of touch, anti-democratic, gone too far, and it goes on and on.

Well I'll tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Premier didn't get up after the closure motion. After we're into closure, of course, then he gets up on his feet and he takes up some time because he knows that there's only so much time left anyway and he'd better get in because there are some rumblings around of asking where the Premier was. So he got up and he made a great passionate appeal to the people of Saskatchewan — ha, ha.

It was the coldest speech I've heard in my life. Oh it was pretty folksy; there's no doubt about that. He was trying the old 1982 line with a straw sticking out of his tooth and his cowboy hat on, saying, well folks, I think we're going to do it for you; there's so much more we can be and if it's doable, it's doable, and we're going to do it — all those kinds of things. You can just hear him saying it, because I've heard him say it time and time again around the province because he's got nothing else to say. But he continues, he continues on.

And he didn't have his heart in it. He didn't believe that this is working. If he believed it was working, we would have seen a compassionate, vehement appeal to the people of Saskatchewan to say no, let me just go and do this because I think this one will work — even though the last 15 didn't, I think this one will work. But we didn't see that appeal from the Premier. No, he just got up and did his thing to take up some time just like the other members did.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is not the role of the Premier of this province. And I hope he doesn't take it personally because I don't mean it personally, but he has a role to fulfil. He's a leader; he's supposed to lead this province, lead this province by the wishes of the people to create prosperity, to create jobs, and to create an atmosphere of security and services for the people of Saskatchewan. He's supposed to be the leader, but he does not lead. He does not lead because they want to keep him clean.

How many times in this legislature, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have we got up and asked the Premier a question and he refuses to answer? The Minister of Finance will take it, or the Minister of Justice will take it . . . Deputy Premier. Oh once in a while when one has a question on agriculture, he's almost forced to getting up and answering it — and doesn't provide a very good answer at that, but leave that aside.

You can run, Mr. Premier, but you can't hide, because you are the focus of this government, because you're the leader of this government. And you have to show the people, you have to show the people that you can lead them on. You have to show them that you can lead them through our tough economic times. You have to show them that you have a vision for recovery of this province. You have to show them that there is a way that they can stay in this province and not leave, that there's a way that they can live a better life-style in this province. But you're not doing that.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I say to the Premier, he can run but he can't hide because the focus is on him. But they try to closet him anyway to keep him clean, because he'll come out at election time and he'll think he's been untarnished by all the scandals, by the GigaText; untarnished by the privatization give-aways that we've seen in this province, and the debt going up and the taxes going up; untarnished by the GigaText deals where the money is squandered; untarnished by the patronage from defeated Tory cabinet ministers; untarnished by all the corruption involved in this government that we know today. But it won't work because he is painted with the same brush that every Tory on that side of the House is painted.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — Mr. Speaker, I think that we have to look at Saskatchewan, and I've gone over some of the enterprises that we've built and that the people of Saskatchewan and the government built up — the co-operatives, and the two visions, the two ways of doing things; the world situation and how some people say we have to lead, or we have to fall in line with the piper, the multinational pipers who are playing the tune, we have to march right along behind them.

But the people of Saskatchewan know that's wrong because they've been through it before. And our grandfathers and grandmothers have told stories. And I really enjoy talking to the senior citizens of this province because when they talk about when Tommy Douglas and Woodrow Lloyd and Allan Blakeney, when they came through that era, when they brought in socialized medicine, they talk about how beneficial it was to have socialized medicine, because they tell stories about their mother or somebody being . . .

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

Mr. Hopfner: — Mr. Speaker, I've been listening, and a point of order, please. First of all, I've been listening now for the last five to 10 minutes, and if you go back in *Hansard* and read the record, you will note that this member has not tied any one of his statements, and even mentioned the word potash during his debate in this legislature. And I just ask you to ask the member to get back onto the topic please.

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to make the obvious point that the member from Humboldt's speech is no more nor no less wide-ranging than the speech of the member from Kindersley which we listened to this evening with a fair degree of politeness. And I would suggest to members opposite that they do the same. His speech is fairly wide-ranging but so was the speech of the member from Kindersley — and no more and no less.

The Speaker: — I've listened to the hon. member's point of order and response. I would like to indicate that the members have been given wide latitude, more or less. The hon. member, if he has been speaking and has not been speaking to the topic, then I ask him to have his remarks relevant, otherwise he may continue with it.

Mr. Upshall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I don't want to get personal, but the point I was trying to make and the member missed, the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster missed, that you do have options in this province. Privatizing the potash corporation is a decision that has to be made, but we have options. And that's what I've geared my whole speech around. And I don't know where he's been, but we have the option of doing it the way it's been done in the past in Saskatchewan where we had prosperity, where we had services, and where we had an environment, a society of people that could live in a province.

Or we can do it the other way — privately. There is a difference, and that's the point I'm trying to make. And that's what we have to look at when we're deciding whether or not potash corporation should be privatized or not.

So the member, if he missed it, I'm sorry he did. I could repeat my speech if he wanted to, but they have closure involved here, so I can't do that.

(2130)

I want to make one more point, Mr. Deputy Speaker, before I close. We in this province have options, as I've said. We have resources and we have people and we have industries and co-operatives, and they all work together. We have to ask ourselves: with a \$4 billion debt in the Consolidated Fund and \$13 billion in the Crowns . . . \$13 billion debt total, rather, we have to ask ourselves and the people of this province have to ask themselves: if we're to get out of a \$4 billion debt — just let's just look at the Consolidated Fund — if we're to get out of a \$4 billion debt, how are we to do it? We have options.

You have to ask yourself, can I afford to pay more taxes? And I think the answer is probably no, because most people say I just can't afford to pay any more, and this government continues to go on by placing lottery taxes and other taxes. Anyway, or you can say, well where are we going to get the money from? Well obviously we get the money from the . . . There's many things in this province that create wealth, but there's one thing in this province that creates new wealth. And I don't know if I explained that right, but I'm talking about natural resources — whether it's the grain from the land or mines or potash or uranium or whatever — but that is money that goes from the ground and the people of this province, through their hands, exported, and it's new money coming in to Saskatchewan. Every time we take a mineral or any natural resource out of this province and sell it to somebody else, that's new money. And there's millions and millions of dollars in the ground, there's million and millions of dollars being processed and going out. And that's the people's money.

And we can do that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we can capture that wealth in two ways. We can capture that wealth in two ways. We can have the private sector running it and tax them. That's one argument. And that's okay because that's part of business. Or we can have the people of Saskatchewan control that resource, and you can do it together.

But the problem is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I'm trying not to be biased here, but I have to use Saskoil as an example. If we're the government, I don't worry about that if it's in the private hands because we tax it fairly so that people of the province can get on and have the money. But when these guys come in, they give it away.

Saskoil, 1982 to 1986, the price of oil, the value of oil that came out of the ground in Saskatchewan doubled, but the dollars to Saskatchewan people reduced by 25 per cent. And that's the problem. If there was a government that would tax fairly for the people of the province, we can do it that way. But this government won't do it, and the people pay dearly for it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by saying I read an article in the paper the other day about one of the journalists, and I can't remember exactly which one it was, but he was talking about the new era in government where everything has to be worked around the one-line length or 30-second clips or 10-second clips. I just forget which journalist it was. It's like a gaggle of geese; when they're all yakking away, it's hard to identify one from the other. But I want to end up by giving some one-liners for the media.

This is what the people of Saskatchewan are saying. The Devine government is selling off a major profitable Saskatchewan asset, selling it off for a song to outside interests. Devine's privatization of PCS is going to benefit big business and wealthy outside investors, not the people of Saskatchewan — fact. By selling off this profitable Saskatchewan investment, the Tories are betraying the future of Saskatchewan — that's a fact.

The Devine PC government is closely tied to big business and working in the interests of big business — fact. This government has worked out some secret deal with foreign interest, that's why they had to ram through potash privatization.

The Tory government's privatization has not helped the ordinary people of Saskatchewan and therefore has been rejected by the people of Saskatchewan.

Whether it is the privatization of the children's dental program or the privatization of SaskPower or the privatization of PCS, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan are opposed. And that is why we stood in this legislature for so long — and we'll stand here as long as we can, but the foreclosure action is going to cut us off — defending the people of Saskatchewan from the government that they elected, because they know now that this government is not working in their interests. Seventy per cent say they're not listening; 70 per cent say that they shouldn't privatize; 70 per cent say they're out of touch.

Mr. Speaker, I will be voting for the amendment, and I will definitely be opposing the sell-off of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan for the reason that the people of Saskatchewan can't afford to have this government doing this any longer. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me a great deal of pleasure this evening to rise and speak in the debate on the change of venue of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

I want to make some comments tonight, Mr. Speaker, about different aspects of things that have gone on before. I will do my best not to be repetitive because there have been many arguments advanced in this debate. And when one comes up near the end of the night, there has much been said that made a lot of sense. And I will talk about some of it and hope that I don't get repetitive in my arguments, as some other members in this particular House have done in the past.

I want to talk, Mr. Speaker, about how our economy in the province of Saskatchewan will work in the future. I want to talk about some of the tools that I believe will work in the future, tools which can be applied to the potash corporation once it goes through privatization. I'd like to talk about where the money will go that will accrue to the province of Saskatchewan and the people of Saskatchewan after that privatization takes place.

I'd like to say in offset, Mr. Speaker, that during the course of this entire debate, I have noticed a total lack of courage by members of the opposition to talk about some really salient points which have come out in the debate. And I think about the speech from the member from Swift Current who gave a very detailed analysis of the workings of the potash corporation and its role in international markets.

I think about the speech given by the member from Kindersley this evening who went into some details that I think were very, very salient to the argument that's been put forward by this government. Details about Canpotex, details about the initiatives of this government in building and diversifying, things that simply should not be ignored by an opposition that truly had its heart in a debate of this nature.

And then I think about the remarks made by the Premier of our province, Mr. Speaker, as he talked about that large picture which is our province, as he talked about the leadership that is necessary to make our province move into the future, and about how the privatization of PCS works into that fabric. And I believe the vision which he presented to this House indeed showed that PCS can be a part of a much larger picture which can only benefit the people of this province.

And I wonder at some of the statements which we've heard, Mr. Speaker, in this House about polls and mandates by members opposite. And I remember well the 1975 election because my father stood for election in that particular year, as you did, Mr. Speaker.

And I remember well going through that particular campaign and listening to the points put forward by the New Democratic Party, point put forward by the Liberal Party, and I honestly can't remember, Mr. Speaker, during that campaign, and as a family member you have a very heartfelt interest in the outcome of such a 30-day event, and I remember a lot of talk about nationalization of the

potash industry. And I think it's something that you have been aware of being in the position that I was as a family member of someone running in that campaign.

And as I pointed out the other day, Mr. Speaker, in the previous debate, the results of that particular election campaign. And they clearly pointed out that 61 per cent of the people in this province did not vote New Democrat; 39 per cent did. And I guess, Mr. Speaker, in the business that we're in that is the ultimate poll which the people pass upon politicians in this province every four to five years. And they passed that upon the New Democratic Party in 1975, reduced their majority, reduced their popularity from 1971 by almost 16 points, and they sent a message to the New Democratic Party that all was not well in the province of Saskatchewan.

And yet after that election campaign, Mr. Speaker, we saw the New Democratic Party move into the nationalization of the potash industry. And they have advanced many reasons in this debate why that took place. Some of them, I suppose, valid; some of them I don't believe so valid. But clearly, opinions polls, and I can think of the Gallup poll which was taken a year later in 1976 after the nationalization debate took place, after a full year that people had had the opportunity to see what the government of the day was doing, well over 50 per cent of the population of Saskatchewan did not believe in the nationalization of the potash industry. And those figures are there for you and anyone else in this province to check.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we have listened to the members opposite talk about polls and their interpretation of polls, obviously the credibility with which they placed on them in 1975, in 1976 shows us that they weren't entirely serious in the debate which we've heard over the past hundred hours as they talk about polls and their application to this province.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, that during the course of this debate, when anyone from this side of the House has come forward with points, salient points in this debate, the members opposite simply refuse to acknowledge that there were other thoughts occurring in our province. They are like Alice who fell into the rabbit burrow. Every time one of them popped up, it was back to fantasy land.

And it went on for 11 and 12 hours, that fantasy land, from some of the members opposite, because they would not address the documents produced by the former NDP government in 1981 and '82. They would not address the issue of Canpotex as laid forward by the member from Kindersley this evening. They would not address the level of production and the downturn in the potash market as addressed by the member from Swift Current. Instead, the members simply dropped off the edge into the rhetoric of socialism and despair which we hear so often when members opposite are put in a corner.

Now what is different, Mr. Speaker, in 1989 from 1975, that makes what is happening in this Chamber over the last hundred hours different from what happened in 1975-76?

Another point that the members opposite have refused to

address in this whole issue has been the fact that constitutional change has occurred in the country of Canada, and the way that provinces manage their resources has changed in the province of Saskatchewan.

And as the member from Swift Current mentioned in her address, the Hon. Peter Lougheed, the Hon. Allan Blakeney, did battle with the prime minister of the day at that time, Pierre Elliott Trudeau, to secure the right of provinces to manage their resources and the destiny thereof.

(2145)

And I remember well, watching the television set, as many western Canadians did in those years of confrontation, seeing the first ministers of this country gathered around the table with Pierre Elliott Trudeau, and the monumental battles that occurred at that time to give our province and other provinces that control of their destiny and their resources. And at no time in this debate, Mr. Speaker, have members opposite addressed that.

And the reason that they have not addressed it, Mr. Speaker, is because the outcome of those debates gives credence to these documents which have been referred to by member after member on the government side of the House. Because the legitimacy to do what is in these documents was obtained in those conferences by those western Premiers. And that legitimacy was well documented in here, well thought out by the power structure of the former NDP government.

And they knew the very arguments which had occurred in 1975 were no longer valid after those changes took place. And yet it has been deny, deny, deny from the members opposite and fall back on their ideology rather than address those points. And it was their own revered premier and leader for so many years who helped achieve it, and yet they have denied the very existence of those changes and the work which he did on behalf of western Canadians. And no time, and no time in this debate has one of those members stood and talked about those changes.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Another change, Mr. Speaker, which has occurred and has never been implemented by this government was The Potash Resources Act, in 1987. And even though it has never been used, the changes which occurred earlier in the decade mean that by order in council that particular piece of legislation can be enacted by a government in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if it ever will be, but I do know that in the management of our resources as a provincial government, we have those rights, and we would certainly have those rights, and we would certainly have those duties and responsibilities to enact that on behalf of our citizens, if the situation ever occurred.

I want to digress for a minute, Mr. Speaker, to another area. And I feel that I should as a member who represents a riding in which a potash mine occurs. I am lucky to have

as a corporate citizen in my riding, Kalium Chemicals. And I am not saying that in the 1971 to '9 period that Kalium Chemicals were not lumped together with other potash corporations in this province. And there were things occurred, there were court cases, there were battles over royalties and taxation, but I know for a fact, Mr. Speaker, that today in my riding, Kalium Chemicals is a very good corporate citizen.

Ask anyone who lives in the R.M. of Pense about the benefits that have occurred to that R. M. since Kalium Chemicals started up business almost 20 years ago. Talk to the Thunder Creek school board about the benefits of Kalium Chemicals. And I think if you asked any of the employees — and I lived next door to one for some eight years in Moose Jaw who was a labourer in that potash mine — what they feel about Kalium Chemicals, and you will find an intense amount of loyalty from people in the surrounding towns and cities who have worked at Kalium over the years.

They are a good corporate citizen today, Mr. Speaker. And I understand in the last year they have now instituted profit-sharing for the employees of that potash mine. And I think that when we have a good corporate citizen like that who has been in the potash mining business in this province for so many years, it would be remiss of us as members of this legislature to not stand in our place in a debate like this and bring that to the attention of the citizens of Saskatchewan.

These are not ogres. These are not people who steal and plunder our province because we as government give them a framework within which to operate. We give them laws that the employees operate under. And they have been a very good corporate citizen working within that framework, Mr. Speaker. And I certainly hope that they continue on for many, many years and that they provide the needed employment in Moose Jaw and area, and that they provide the taxes and royalties which this province needs for schools and health care and all the things which we have grown accustomed to in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to my opening and talk about some of the tools that will work in the economy of our province. And I've already mentioned this document which was produced by members of the then NDP government in 1981 and '82, and they clearly identified that it was beneficial for individuals in our province to be stakeholders in this great a province of ours. They identified that 50 to 60,000 people in this province would be willing to put up to \$4,000 apiece into the resources and corporations of this province. And I don't dispute those figures, Mr. Speaker.

Saskatchewan people are tremendous savers; they probably have the highest rate of savings of anyone in Canada. And the fact that the former NDP government identified 60,000 of them of having the kind of money that they would put into investments in our province, I think is positive for the people in this province.

And we have the same feeling. Maybe there are 100,000 people in this province now who are willing to put up that kind of money. And maybe there are many more who are

willing to get into bonds and support the endeavours, the resources of this provinces in making them grow and diversify.

And it is just too bad, Mr. Speaker, that members opposite want to deny that reality, clearly identified by them and identified by us, and don't want to talk about it. And, Mr. Speaker, it has been clearly pointed out in this debate in this legislature that former members of that NDP government, the former president of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and the former minister who had authority over the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, since 1982 have been out in the market-place actively soliciting offshore investment for a potash mine in Manitoba.

And, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to go into the details that were brought to this Chamber by the member from Kindersley, but I say if it is good enough for Jack Messer and it is good enough for David Domboswky to visit with people in other countries about investing up to 50 per cent in a potash mine in Manitoba, then there is nothing wrong with the Premier of this province visiting with some of the best customers that we have in the world to come into this province . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — . . . and talk about investing in 5 per cent of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

And for members opposite to stand and ridicule that, shows that members opposite are truly stuck in a rut and are not willing to look around the world today.

And I guess finally on this point, Mr. Speaker, finally on this point I refer back to the statements made by the member from Nutana, who I will say gave one of the shorter, more succinct speeches in this Chamber on behalf of the opposition. But the member from Nutana said in this Chamber, you do whatever works to make the people in this province move ahead. And I believe whatever works is privatization of the potash corporation and allowing the people of this province to take a direct stake as shareholders in that corporation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Now, Mr. Speaker, where will the money go? Well I think if anyone had taken the time in the opposition benches to listen to the words of the Premier as he addressed this issue in the Chamber, they would have known where the money will go. And I'm not going to repeat, Mr. Speaker, the arguments made by the Premier as he went across the spectrum of our province, or the arguments made by the member of Kindersley, but definitely that money which will replace debt in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan will be used for further diversification projects in this province to provide jobs and opportunity.

And it may well be used to help diversify the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, to give it the ability to be an integrated fertilizer company, to give it the ability to move into other value added products, to give it the ability to market its products in a wider range across the

world. Maybe that's where some of that money will go, Mr. Speaker.

And maybe it will go into joint ventures with people who want to come to this province to do business, to do value added. And maybe it'll be meat packing plants. And maybe it'll be an alfalfa plant tied to the irrigation on Lake Diefenbaker. And maybe it will be a fertilizer plant producing urea for the farmers of this province and for us to export to other farmers in North America. Maybe that, Mr. Speaker, is where some of that money will go.

But I guarantee you one thing, Mr. Speaker, that money will be used to the benefit of the people of this province and it will be used to create jobs.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — And it will be used to create opportunities that have not been here before.

And this province should not have to, Mr. Speaker, go through the ups and downs, the humps and the valleys of international commodity prices. This province should not have to go through a weak economy that was prophesied by the former agriculture minister in the NDP government where he told every farmer in this province to sow this province wall to wall to wheat in the face of 22 per cent interest rates. A monoculture, that was the NDP idea of diversification. I guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, that no one in this government will be sending that kind of a message to the farmers of this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — It'll be diversification and joint venture and growth and building. That is where the money will go.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I listened intently, and believe me, it was difficult, to the member from Humboldt. I mean, it was very difficult to sit in one's place and allow the member his due, because I'm sure that he's sorely tested the ability of members on this side to sit quietly and take that dissertation.

The one thing I did pick up, Mr. Speaker, was when he talked about the people who built this province. And I can relate to that because I have a grandmother who is 90 years old and still functioning quite well and who came and homesteaded and lived in a sod house in this province. And I have the opportunity to visit her, and I've spoke about this before, Mr. Speaker, in this Assembly. Those people created, and the member from Humboldt said that, he said they created.

But you know something those people didn't do, Mr. Speaker, is they never attempted to buy something that was already there to create their prosperity. That was totally foreign to those people, because they came here and they lived in a sod shack and they suffered through the heat in the summer and they suffered through the cold in the winter, but they always built. They took whatever they garnered from the soil in this province and they built with it. They didn't try and buy their way to prosperity.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — And that is where this government differs with the members opposite who are stuck in that ideological rut.

(2200)

The other thing they didn't do, Mr. Speaker, is they did not draw a fence around themselves. They did not try to wall themselves into this new part of the world which was being opened up and when they went from horsepower to tractors, they took technology which was developed in other parts of the world and applied it to the soil in this province to provide prosperity for they and their children and their grandchildren. They didn't say no, we're going to stay with horses because that's the way we started out. They took technology and applied it, they changed, they moved on; as today they are using the computer to move on, to put themselves in touch with people all around the world, to garner in information which can be applied to their lives, their businesses, and their endeavours in this province.

And they don't attempt to close others out. They don't try to draw a wall around themselves and say, we in Saskatchewan cannot function with the rest of the world. We in Saskatchewan have to be afraid of Americans, afraid of Chinese, afraid of anyone who would come to this province and invest in things which can provide prosperity and growth here.

And, Mr. Speaker, at no point in the dissertation from the member from Humboldt did he touch on any of that. No, he simply fell back into his rut of fear, fearmongering to people in this province, and I find that inexcusable in a debate of this magnitude in this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the role of government, the role of managing all the pieces that make up this province, that make up our economy? It's a provider of tools, a provider of rules, a provider of ideas. That is the role of government. It is not to be the master, Mr. Speaker; it is to be the servant of people in providing those things. How possibly can a government be the owner of a potash mine and still give to people the full benefit perhaps of environmental protection? And the record set by members opposite isn't very good in that aspect, Mr. Speaker.

When we bury our sins under 10 feet of concrete to hide from the people of this province, it really makes me wonder how those people opposite can nationalize an industry in this province and guarantee to the citizens here that as the owner, as the manipulator, they will also look after the environmental concerns. I believe that government has a role that is different than that, Mr. Speaker; they are there to look after the concerns of all people and certainly not to bury PCBs (polychlorinated biphenyl) under 10 feet of concrete.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — As you can see, Mr. Speaker, there are

many opportunities in this province which can accrue to us if we have the courage and the will-power to go out and seek new venues; if we have the fortitude and the insight to design legislation which will allow us to manage, as government, those who wish to come in and participate with us.

And I believe in this particular Bill, Bill 20, you see those tools — the ability for others to come and be a participant; the ability for people in this province to have a direct stake in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan; and the ability for us as government to manage our resources to manage our environment, and make the whole of the picture fit for the province of Saskatchewan.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would just hope that as this debate winds down, that members opposite take a good, hard look in their souls at some of the arguments that have been put forward in this legislature in that they, when they talk to the people as they will, try and answer some of these questions. Because I'm sure that people who have watched this debate will have questions for members opposite, and I would hope that truth and common sense will prevail from members opposite, and not some simple socialist diatribe which is in the past and will never, never get this province into the future, Mr. Speaker.

And that is why I will be supporting this Bill on the privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In the dying moments of this debate, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to take my place to address this issue, this Bill 20, the privatization Bill of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I believe it to be a sad day for the people of Saskatchewan, but as well, I think in retrospect, members on that side, when they're looking back at this day, will understand it's a black day for this PC government as well, because what I believe is it's going to mean the defeat of this government.

As I listened to the Justice minister address this House a little earlier, he spoke about building and diversifying, the same key phrases that we've heard since 1982 from this government. And I would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps junior members of that government wouldn't be carrying on the legacy and the litany of that kind of diatribe knowing full well that it hasn't happened in this province.

But when I see the member from Thunder Creek stand up and address this Bill it tells me that there's just more of the same coming and that's all we can expect from members on that side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, relating to the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and this government's intention to sell the assets of that corporation to foreigners, to people outside of this province, I thought back to what a unique opportunity we in Saskatchewan have in order to build on that valuable asset that we have under our ground.

I thought of the chance to take the revenue from that particular resource, Mr. Speaker, what was done with those resource revenues in the 1970s under the former administration, and what could be done in the 1990s under decent management that would create profits once again for that corporation.

I thought, Mr. Speaker, of my children who are . . . one of my daughters is just ready to leave high school in the next couple of years, and what kind of a future that the revenue from the potash resource could create for her and for her schoolmates. But I thought then, Mr. Speaker, of where this government has put their priorities. They've prioritized the large multinational corporations over the children of Saskatchewan.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that young people out there that are watching, that may be watching this evening — ones that will be voting for the first time in 1990, 1991, whenever the election is called — that they will remember the words of members on that side of the House; that they will remember that government members on that side of the House chose the multinational corporations and outside interests, outside of Saskatchewan, over their future.

Because I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the young people of this province who are going to have the opportunity to vote for the first time in 1990 or 1991 will be delivering a message, and I think a strong and a severe message to this government. They're going to be telling them that they're tired of seeing their friends' families move out of this province because their parents can't find employment — and the statistics are there and they're clear. They're going to tell government members on that side, and they're going to tell new candidates to replace those that won't run again, that they're upset seeing their schoolmates come to school, their parents living on 4.50 an hour and unable to feed them.

Those are the kinds of messages, Mr. Speaker, that are going to be delivered to members on that side of the House. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I'm anxiously awaiting that day where we can replace this uncaring, callous government, this government of mismanagement and corruption, with a government that cares once again in this province

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, these giants of business, these moguls of free enterprise on that side of the House have literally destroyed this province economically. There isn't one economic indicator that can be put forth in this House or any other place that would show any kind of reasonable management by that side.

My colleague from Humboldt went through the list of Crown corporations, revenue-generating Crown corporations that this government has given to their friends — some of them friends of the PC Party in Saskatchewan, a lot of them to friends of the PC Party outside of this province. But that's not enough, Mr. Speaker. This government want to move one step further. They want to take one of the most valuable tools,

one of the most valuable assets that this province will ever see and sell it to multinational corporations.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the end of where this will be, nobody knows right now; you can only speculate. There's no way of knowing whether foreign countries are going to own the potash corporation in totality. There's no way of knowing that right now. And why I say that is because you certainly can't trust what members on this side of the House say. Government members clearly cannot be trusted. They tell one story prior to an election, they tell one story when they go half-way on a move, which is what they're doing, I think, in the potash Bill. But it's not the end, Mr. Speaker, because clearly their agenda is to destroy every asset that the people of this province have ever created through Crown corporations. That's what they're about, and I think that's the end result of what Bill 20 is going to mean. It's going to mean the end of the potash corporation — foreign control, foreign ownership.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan saw a unique economic opportunity in the '70s and they grasped that opportunity. They invested some \$418 million and turned that into education for our children. They turned that investment into a decent road system, a decent highway system. They turned it into one of the finest post-secondary education system anywhere in North America. And, Mr. Speaker, they turned it into jobs for Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Speaker, the economic indicators and the figures that can be displayed in this House and other places that show clearly what happened with the potash corporation, the history of it, how the government became involved and why they became involved, Mr. Speaker, are very clear. And they can't be misrepresented, and I want to say that they are clear. As my colleague from Humboldt indicated, seven out of 10 people understand what that potash corporation has meant to this province and what it can mean in the 1990s.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, when members on that side of the House are out canvassing in the next election, I know who they'll be looking for. They're not going to be looking for the seven out of 10 people that oppose this sell-off to multinationals and foreign companies. That's not who they'll be looking for. They're going to be looking for a few friends, the three of the 10 who support what they're doing.

But I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that by the time an election comes, ever more of those 10 will understand just what a negative effect this is going to have on our province. And I would suggest that if a poll will be taken in six months from now, that the results will be even worse for the government members than what they display right now.

(2215)

Mr. Speaker, I said that the government of the '70s moved to be involved in potash development in Saskatchewan, and it was because the government of that day had some

faith in Saskatchewan people. They had some faith in the people of Saskatchewan in that we would be able to develop the expertise to build that potash corporation into a profitable venture. They had the faith that the people of Saskatchewan had the expertise to develop that industry. And they had the faith, Mr. Speaker, that if that industry was expanded into other areas, that Saskatchewan people could do it here in Saskatchewan, and that we didn't need the Chuck Childers' of the world to come in from International Minerals to tell us how to handle our resources.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, the government of the 1970s saw an opportunity, they seized on it. They saw that opportunity and they made it work. It wasn't just lip-service, as members of the other side of the House have been doing since '82. People of this province are so sick of hearing building and diversifying, and at the same time seeing their farms foreclosed on, and at the same time seeing their small businesses in their towns fold in record numbers and growing every year. They're so sick of seeing the kind of administration that would create a \$4 billion debt in general revenue and a \$14 billion total provincial debt. That's not the kind of building and diversifying that they're looking for.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that people of this province are not happy with five millions of dollars put into the hands of a French Canadian business man, Guy Montpetit, through the GigaText affair. Those are the kinds of things that they expect their government to avoid, and those are the kinds of problems that they expect government to create a solution for. They don't want to hear building and diversifying when it excludes them; they want to be part of building this province. But, Mr. Speaker, this government has disallowed that, and now they're disallowing them to share in the benefits of the profits of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan delivered over \$100 million worth of profits. I mean, can you imagine that? The Guy Montpetit scandal only cost one-twentieth of that. I mean, even you could mismanage . . . This government could mismanage small corporations and throw \$5 million and do it 20 times in order to squander the amount of money that the potash corporation made last year, and that's what they'd have to do.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have a government that no longer listens to the people of this province. And I was sifting through some newspaper clippings just the other day and I happened to come across one from January 16 of 1988. And in the middle of it was a rather large picture of the Minister of Public Participation just as he took over the new portfolio — the privatization portfolio. And I looked at one little part of it, and the minister indicates his willingness to listen to the people of the province. And he said, "It will be Taylor's job . . . " it says:

It will be Taylor's job to use his skill as a populist-style politician to carry the message and build support for privatization of government enterprises and services.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, he's failed in that. Clearly, when seven out of 10 people in this province will not accept the privatization that they're trying to ram down the throats of this legislature, that he hasn't done his job. And it goes on and it uses a quote from that same minister, the Minister of Public Participation, or privatization. And he says:

If it's not going to be of benefit to the people, then I will not take it up for consideration. And I don't plan to have any surprises (the minister goes on). We will be out to talk to the people.

An Hon. Member: : — Yes, ask them at Chaplin.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Well, Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Moose Jaw South said, you want to ask them at Chaplin whether you've consulted with them and whether they were in favour of what you've done. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the answer is no. Did you go out and consult when the SaskPower Bill was put before this House. A hundred thousand people in this province, Mr. Minister, you didn't have a chance to talk to because those were the hundred thousand that willingly and quickly signed petitions in order to stop that stupid privatization move of the Sask Power Corporation. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that this particular piece of privatization is as bad, if not worse, as the move to privatize SaskPower.

Mr. Minister, I'm going to put this aside because when as I finish my remarks I'm going to ask you to do a few things for the people of this province. And I'd hope you'd be in the House when that happens because I think this is such a serious matter that it shouldn't be taken lightly, and I think there's still time in order to back off of this closure move, this closure that will allow the sale of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

As I looked through the history of the potash corporation and looked at the massive amount of revenue that was generated in the 1970s under good management, and I looked at how quickly that shifted when this government took power in 1982, Mr. Speaker, it told me something of why we're having problems balancing budgets in Saskatchewan. It told me something of the make-up of people, members on that side of the House, and it told me that their political philosophy just doesn't work in Saskatchewan.

It's not just a matter, sir, of mismanagement; it's not just matter of patronage, a matter of corruption. It's a matter of a lack of understand of what it takes to make the economy in Saskatchewan tick. We've been able to use the private sector and the public sector and the co-operative sector all working together to develop a buoyant economy, but that's not where this government's at.

It's taken one of those tools, the public sector, and it systematically destroyed it piece by piece. My colleague read through the list of Crown corporations that this government had done away with, and all of them were revenue generating, Mr. Speaker.

And where are they now? They're in the hands of friends

of the PC Party. They're in the hands of corporations outside this province, and I say shame on this government. I say shame on this government for having no faith in the people of this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — I read a little brochure that was put out at a cost of I wouldn't know how many hundreds of dollars or thousands of dollars, because this government refuses to answer any of those kinds of trivia before this House. They can blow millions of dollars on advertising, but no answers.

And as I looked through this little brochure from the Minister of Public Participation, I was really quite surprised when I related one statement back to my home community of Prince Albert. It goes on to say, "Why sell what the public already owns?" under one heading. And under that, Mr. Speaker, it says:

By purchasing shares, Saskatchewan people will become genuine owners with the right to attend annual shareholders' meetings, to vote on company policies, and participate directly in profits by receiving dividends. Ownership will provide the Saskatchewan citizens with the right to trade, sell, give, or bequeath shares when the shareholders choose to do so. These rights of ownerships of Crowns corporations don't exist.

Well I thought back, Mr. Speaker, to the privatization of PAPCO, the Prince Albert Pulp Company, and I had to ask myself a few questions. Do the people of Prince Albert and the rest of Saskatchewan have the right to attend a shareholders' meeting? I think not, because, sir, those shareholders' meetings are probably held in Tacoma, Washington, and none of the people of this province own any shares in the Weyerhaeuser pulp mill.

And I thought, did they have a chance to vote on company policies? And again the answer to me was fairly clear. Of course they don't, because you see, sir, they weren't part of this public participation move, because it wasn't public participation. What it was was a give-away to a multinational company, and that's exactly what it was. It was nothing more and it was nothing less.

No people in Prince Albert had shares, no people in Regina had shares, or in Quill Lakes or in Watson or in Wadena; no shares for those folks, but shares for the Weyerhaeuser Corporation of Tacoma, Washington. And I looked through who benefitted and who didn't, and again it was pretty clear, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this province were the big losers, and the big winners were another multinational corporation.

I look at what possibly will happen with the potash corporation privatization, and I've got no reason to believe that it'll be any different. There's nothing in this Bill that will encourage me, that will tell me that a million people in Saskatchewan will be able to attend a shareholders' meeting. And even if they all could, there'll be less of them every year because of the out-migration from this province. I can't say that those people have the

opportunity to vote because nothing in this Bill shows me that.

But what it does show me is that almost half of this corporation is going to end up in the hands of multinational corporations and foreign countries, and they will be the shareholders that will be attending the meetings. They'll be the people that will be participating in the dividends when there's profits; they'll be the people that will benefit from our resource in this province; and that's the problem.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — There's nothing, Mr. Speaker, in this Bill, that encourages me to be at all positive about it. There's nothing in the actions of this, the undemocratic actions of this government in the last months, that create any kind of a feeling of positiveness within me this evening. What I do feel though, sir, is a feeling of anger — anger that 38 men and women would sit on the government side of the House and destroy an asset that the people of this province value so dearly.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the calls that I get from my riding, and have been getting in the last few days, are not ones that would be encouraging that government to continue with their privatization move of the power corporation of Saskatchewan — and there's nothing, sir, that leads me to believe that people in their ridings feel any differently regarding their actions, regarding their undemocratic actions on closure, regarding this foolish move to privatize this valuable tool that we could be using to enhance the future of our children. I can't believe that it would be any different in their ridings, sir, and I don't think at this point they believe it either.

But I think what they do believe is that they can take another bucket of public funds out and deal them out to Dome Petroleum and their media people . . . or Dome Advertising and their media people, and to the television networks and the radio stations and the newspapers and try and sell this ill-conceived plan that they've embarked upon. That's what I believe they believe.

I think that they know full well, sir, that the people of this province no longer support their moves towards privatization, whether it be the potash corporation, whether it be SaskPower, or whether it be SGI. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that members of this House would be well advised to be working in their ridings to try and explain this ill-conceived deal before an election is called, because I believe if an election were called on this issue, they would be defeated and defeated severely in every corner of this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I alluded to the privatization in Prince Albert that people didn't have the opportunity to participate in, and now I want to talk a little bit about the economics of that particular deal. And I want to quote from a newspaper clipping that was in *The Globe and Mail* in Toronto a few months back, as a matter of fact in February of '87. And a John Duncanson, a paper analyst for Wood Gundy, said the purchase was a smart

move for Weyerhaeuser; they're definitely going to make money from it. And that's been clear, Mr. Speaker, but that's the kind of economic diversification this government is so proud of. That's the flagship that they use to flaunt their privatization.

And I want to go on, Mr. Speaker, because there's some very interesting information in here. And if any people in this province feel that this government is going to cut a better deal with any of the other multinational corporations than they did with Weyerhaeuser of Tacoma, Washington, then I think they would want to reassess their position.

(2230)

It says in here — and I'm just going to paraphrase, for brevity's sake — I'm quite sure that they sold PAPCO for at least \$100 million less than what its worth was. Can you imagine that, Mr. Speaker? Can you imagine a government that would be so irresponsible as to devalue a Crown corporation, an asset of the people of this province, by \$100 million in order to sell it quickly? Can you believe the magnitude of the incompetence? Mr. Speaker, if you go through the list of privatization moves, I think it becomes clear that it's not an isolated incident.

This goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, that within two years PAPCO could have retired its debt, built a new mill . . . But he also goes on to indicate that . . . and he says, but two years later down the line is no good for a political party facing an election. And, Mr. Speaker, that's what this is all about, and that's what this government is all about. This privatization of the potash corporation isn't about economic sense or a positive economic move for the people of this province. The privatization of Weyerhaeuser wasn't in economic terms a good move, and I think members on that side know it. I believe, sir, that these are all timed for a political end, and I think the political end in terms of the sell-off of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is that this government is so cash starved that they can't go out and borrow another billion dollars to buy another election, so what they're going to do is liquidate the assets of the people of this province to try and buy their votes again in the next round.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, not only did they undervalue this asset in Prince Albert — that wasn't enough — they gave repayment terms that will make it unnecessary for that corporation to pay for the assets that this government gave them.

Why would we believe that the assets of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan would be sold any differently? Why would we believe that they would all of a sudden find some new-found economic common sense and be able to cut a reasonable deal if they're going to privatize the assets?

Nothing that they've done since 1982, sir, would indicate that that's going to change. And they make no apologies for it. Instead of hiding their faces in shame, they brag about and use it as a flagship as to how great it's been to

diversify this economy by giving away \$100 million or by giving away \$350 million worth of assets. That's what you hear from government members on that side.

And if you look at the ties between the big players and the potash corporation and the big American multinationals, when you look at the ties between what they've done, what this government has done since 1982 and who they put in place in order to oversee this sell-off of our assets, it gives you little reason to wonder if they're going to be cutting a deal.

They brought in from IMC (International Minerals and Chemical Corporation (Canada) Ltd.) one Chuck Childers to run the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Well what would make us think that that this American who ran International Minerals and Chemical Corporation and was vice-president of IMC's expansion and development prior to joining PCS in 1987, what would make you think or what would make anyone in this House think that his loyalties have changed? Would this new-found loyalty be to Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, or would it be to IMC?

That's my question, and that's the question I ask the Minister of Finance — the \$800 million man who couldn't balance a budget since he was put into the spot.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — If there's one shameful display that's ever been perpetrated in this House, it's that Finance minister misleading the people of this province by \$800 million. That's what the problem is. The \$800 million dollar man who has . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I think all hon. members should come to order. Order, order. Getting to the end of the debate, and I think it would be in the best interests of the House if all hon. members, member for Regina Elphinstone, and North East, the member from Meadow Lake, would the hon. members come to order.

We have a few more minutes of the formal part of the debate. It's in the best interest of the House that everybody contain themselves and we conclude this debate in a reasonable manner.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the member from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden's a coward.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order, order. I'm going to ask the hon. member to rise and withdraw that remark. Order, order. This issue has been brought to the House once before — the use of this word — and at that time the hon. member was required to withdraw the remark. I had just asked the hon. members to contain themselves so that we can get through this debate in a reasonable manner, and immediately a member rose with a provocative remark, and I'm going to ask him to withdraw that remark.

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

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

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, on page 111 of *Beauchesne's*, it clearly indicates that since . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. First of all I would like to point out . . . Order, member from Regina Elphinstone. First of all I would like to point out to hon. members that this . . . Now I'm going to ask the member from Regina Elphinstone once more to just calm down. This book, first of all, is not the gospel. It depends on the situation involved. Let me quote the following, rule 325:

When the Speaker takes notice of any expression as personal and disorderly, and tending to introduce heat and confusion, and calls upon the offending Member to explain, it is . . . (his duty to do so).

Would the hon. member rise and withdraw that remark. I deem that that remark has introduced heat and confusion after I asked the hon. members not to do so. I ask you to withdraw that remark.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that remark.

The Speaker: — Thank you.

Mr. Lautermilch: — And what I'll say again is the sensitivity of the Minister of Justice tells me that there may . . . or Finance, tells me that there may be a deal cooked with IMC, and I tell you the people of this province better be aware that it possibly could have happened already.

Some Hon. Members: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I said at the outset of my remarks as I referred to a column featuring the minister of privatization where he indicates he was going to be consulting with the people of this province before making any moves on privatization, on privatization, that he has failed in that. This government has failed in delivering sound economic policies to this province just as they failed the people of this province through their privatization moves. They failed democracy by invoking a closure motion in this House.

They failed democracy by invoking a closure motion in this House. They failed the young people of this province who they've chased out to find employment in other jurisdictions. And I want to say they've failed themselves as individuals, and I don't believe they deserve to govern any longer.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, in this debate, in this debate on second reading, there are but seven minutes left because of the undemocratic actions of members on that side of the House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — And I want to say, and I'll repeat this anywhere: if they have any courage, they should stand up, they should go out of this legislature, ask the

Lieutenant Governor to dissolve this parliament, call an election, and face the people on this issue.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I would dearly love to see members on that side of the House out campaigning in Wolseley and in Qu'Appelle. And I'd like to see them campaigning in Assiniboia and try and explain to the people of this province how selling off this valuable asset, that's delivered so much to the people of this province, makes any sense.

I'd like to see and hear some of those kinds of explanations because, Mr. Speaker, we haven't heard one legitimate explanation of the privatization of the potash corporation from any member on that side of the House since this debate started.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — The Premier got up in this House the other day and did his little farm boy act, but he didn't give any reasonable explanations as to how this makes good sense for the people of Saskatchewan. He couldn't make those arguments, Mr. Speaker, because they don't exist, and you can't argue on logic that isn't there.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — And I say, Mr. Speaker, they should call an election because I'm willing to face the members on that side of the House on the hustings. And I'm willing to explain to the people of this province why we've been defending to the bitter end this potash corporation. And I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it's a sad day, it's a sad day when you see a government who hasn't even yet finished its second term, who refuses to listen to the people that so graciously put them in power. They are so far out of touch, Mr. Speaker, and I say it's a sad day for the people of this province.

I want the members on that side to know, Mr. Speaker, that members on this side of the House haven't given up this fight. You can limit the time on our debates in here; you can do that, but I tell you what you can't limit. You can't limit the feelings in the hearts of the people of Saskatchewan who've totally opposed the privatization of this corporation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — You can't limit the hearts and the minds of Saskatchewan people because they won't be stymied. And this government may have succeeded in closing this debate down, and they may feel that they've won the battle, but I tell you, Mr. Speaker, they're going to lose the war.

They're going to lose the war in towns like Assiniboia and in Gravelbourg where that member has already, from my understanding, lost the war. And I tell you that there's going to be, when this election comes, some disappointed people after it's over, and they're going to be members that formerly sat on that side of the House because they're not going to be back here.

The people of this province won't stand the destruction of their Crown corporations and the assets that they've built over the years. Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan know better. And I want to tell you that the people of Saskatchewan, as well, know better than ever to re-elect that man as Premier because he's run his course. He's in the wrong direction. He's headed away from the people of this province. And I would suggest to you that they can barely wait until they have the opportunity to put that check mark on a ballot and put it in the ballot box and explain to him just how disappointed they are in his actions.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, you'll not tear the hearts and the minds and the souls out of the people of this province. That'll not happen because they're a spirited lot, Saskatchewan people.

They've watched you destroy asset after asset; they've watched this Premier misrepresent the facts prior to an election; they've listened to the ministers on that side of the House indicate to them that their utilities were sacred and that they wouldn't be privatized. And they've seen what's happened shortly after an election — they've seen a deceitful group of men and women, Mr. Speaker; they've seen a group of men and women who have lost the right to govern in this province.

And I want to say, whether it be the battle on the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, or whether it be a reoccurrence of the battle on SaskEnergy, that the New Democrats on this side of the House will join with the people of Saskatchewan to ensure that we get the best deal possible for them, and to ensure that we get the best deal possible for them, and to ensure as well that this government's defeated when the next election comes.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(2245)

Mr. Lautermilch: — I can't say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a happy day for the people of this province. It's a tragic day for the people of Saskatchewan, and I think that they'll hold the prime minister of this province, his Executive Council, and everyone of his back-benchers accountable.

I don't believe, sir, that they'll accept any more of the slaying of their assets. I think they've seen enough with the sell-off of the highways equipment. I think they've seen enough with the sell-off of Saskoil. I think they've seen enough with the scrapping of the dental plan. I think they've seen enough with the sell-off of Sask Minerals, and I think, sir, that they've seen enough deceit from members on that side of the House.

Within seven short years, Mr. Speaker, they have almost ruined this province economically. That, we can rebuild; it will take a long time. But I'll tell you one thing that they can't break, and that's the spirit of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — It is my duty now to interrupt the debate.

In order that all members be cognizant of the procedure we are following, I'd just like to briefly read from the *Votes and Proceedings* of August 7, 1989, which reads as follows:

Pursuant to rule 31, the Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Hodgins:

That following the adoption of this motion, when the order is called resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill No. 20 — *An Act respecting the Reorganization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan*, not more than two sitting days shall be allocated to debate on such order and that at fifteen minutes before the set time of adjournment on the second sitting day, unless sooner concluded . . .

The division bells rang from 10:47 p.m. until 10:56 p.m.

Amendment negated on the following recorded division.

Yeas

Romanow	Kowalsky
Prebble	Atkinson
Rolfes	Anguish
Shillington	Goulet
Lingenfelter	Hagel
Tchorzewski	Calvert
Koskie	Lautermilch
Thompson	Trew
Brockelbank	Smart
Mitchell	Van Mulligan
Upshall	Koenker
Simard	

— 23

Nays

Devine	Meiklejohn
Muller	Pickering
Duncan	Martin
McLeod	Toth
Andrew	Johnson
Berntson	McLaren
Lane	Hopfner
Taylor	Petersen
Smith	Swenson
Swan	Martens
Muirhead	Baker
Maxwell	Wolfe
Schmidt	Gleim
Hodgins	Neudorf
Gerich	Saxinger
Hepworth	Britton
Hardy	

— 33

The division bells rang from 10:59 p.m. to 11:13 p.m.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yeas

Romanow	Kowalsky
Prebble	Atkinson
Rolfes	Anguish
Shillington	Goulet
Lingenfelter	Hagel
Tchorzewski	Calvert
Koskie	Lautermilch
Thompson	Trew
Brockelbank	Smart
Mitchell	Van Mulligan
Upshall	Koenker
Simard	

— 23

Nays

Devine	Meiklejohn
Muller	Pickering
Duncan	Martin
McLeod	Toth
Andrew	Johnson
Berntson	McLaren
Lane	Hopfner
Taylor	Petersen
Smith	Swenson
Swan	Martens
Muirhead	Baker
Maxwell	Wolfe
Schmidt	Gleim
Hodgins	Neudorf
Gerich	Saxinger
Hepworth	Britton
Hardy	

— 33

The Bill read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

The Assembly adjourned at 11:15 p.m.