

The Assembly met at 8 a.m.

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

Prayers

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SPECIAL ORDER

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 20 — An Act respecting the reorganization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan

Clause 1 (continued)

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, the manner in which these privatizations proceed I think has become something of a scandal. And let me begin by describing, Mr. Minister, why I think that's the case. The Bible on privatizations, as has been scripted by the folks from England, is that you sell these assets for less than what they're worth so that those who buy the shares will realize an immediate appreciation in the value of what they buy.

I think that's despicable, Mr. Speaker, because what it overlooks is another group of people, the taxpayers, the people of this province who do not get full value for the value of their assets. You forget, Mr. Minister, that you are a steward of these public assets. These are not yours to fritter away as you may feel appropriate. They're not yours to squander for your own re-election purposes. You are a steward of these assets for the public, and it's high time that you and other members of the treasury benches started to remember that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, you're going to have to forgive us then if we scrutinize with the utmost care the details respecting the sale of these shares. We have every expectation, Mr. Minister, that you'll attempt to sell these for a lot less than what they're worth, and that they be useful for the 50,000 or so — I'd be surprised if there were that many — the 50,000 or so well-heeled people who purchase these shares. But it's a raw deal for the rest of the public of Saskatchewan, who also have an interest in these assets, who are ultimately going to wind up paying the debt, the mountainous debt that you've accumulated, and the debt which you could go some distance toward paying off if you got full value for the assets.

It is the taxpayers, your constituents and mine, who are getting the raw deal, who are going to have to pick up the debt that you people leave behind when you give these assets away to your friends for a lot less than what they're worth.

With that as a background, Mr. Minister, my first question is when you expect the shares to be issued, the date when you expect these shares to go on sale to the public.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Well no date has been set, as I've

indicated to the press. What will happen after the legislation is passed, assuming it does, then the investment advisers, syndicate managers, whatever, will prepare the prospectus. I would see that in all likelihood, but it depends on market, that perhaps late September or October would be a selling period for a fertilizer issue.

But again, if the market were to turn, it would not be done then. That is an advice as to when you can go to market. So that I would believe to be the next window where a public issue could be done, but there's no assurance or guarantee that it is in fact going to happen then.

Mr. Shillington: — So I gather, Mr. Minister, what you're saying is that your target date for selling these shares is approximately a month to six weeks.

An Hon. Member: — I don't have a target date. I did not say that.

Mr. Shillington: — Well the minister says he doesn't have a target date. Mr. Minister, you're not dealing with a group of children. I know your opinion of us may not be what we wished it were, but you're not dealing with a group of children, Mr. Minister.

If you're going to sell these shares in the fall, you must have a target date by this time. This is not something that you wake up . . . you don't wake up some morning and stretch and yawn and say, sounds like a good day to sell Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, I think I'll go ahead and do it. This requires a great deal of advanced planning, and if you're going to sell them this fall, you must have a target date.

I don't even believe, Mr. Minister, that you would operate in such a fashion, certainly not with a company that's worth a couple of billion dollars. This, Mr. Minister, will be one of the largest sale of shares on the market in 1989 in Canada. Since this is a major sale of shares, it's not something that can be done in a haphazardous fashion.

Now I say, Mr. Minister, is the middle of September your target date? And please don't give me all the pedantic nonsense about it may be later, it may be earlier depending on when the market falls out of bed or whatever. We understand that target dates are just that — target dates. But will you confirm if it is your target to sell these shares in the early fall, late September or early October?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Again, there is no such target date. What I have indicated to you is that based on the advice of when a fertilizer issue would be . . . not better received but more awareness, perhaps, in the market place, you tend to look at the fall and the spring . . . probably a lot to do with the agricultural seasons in the United States.

But having said that, there is no fixed target. I have indicated to you in fairness that after the passage of the legislation, the work will be done, the work will be done. I would think that that would take six weeks. But at the end of the time when the work is done, if the advice on the market is no public issues, unwise to do a public issue or unwise to do a fertilizer issue, then you don't go to market. Okay? That's all I'm saying to you. I mean, I

would like to have it done; I'd like to be able to say that it's going to be done by October 1, September 15, or whatever the date, but that's not the way you assess the market.

There may be a change in market come early fall, after the summer. I can't tell you whether there is or is not going to be one. I do say this, that there has been a change in the market over the last six months in terms of public issues. Recently in Canada there have been several major public issues that the market is now looking for or accepting new public issues — Air Canada being one, CAE being another in Canada. But that is something that the investment managers ultimately will give you the decision on that, or give you the advice to make the decision.

So I'm not trying to be imprecise. I'm telling you when the window is; I tell you when I would like to see it done, but it will be decided by the investment managers as to when the appropriate time is to go to market. I fit's not appropriate, it will not happen that soon.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I'm just going to have to absolutely insist that you stop playing games with us. You're sitting in the legislature of Saskatchewan; this is not some sort of a play school you're in, and you owe us some answers.

Mr. Minister, it is patently obvious to anyone with the remotest interest in the subject that the investment houses have already given you this advice. They've already told you when you the appropriate time to go is, and you already have that.

Mr. Minister, you haven't come this far without getting a good deal of advice from whoever is going to handle it. And I ask you to stop playing games with us, Mr. Minister. You owe the public of Saskatchewan, who've elected you, something a little more than that.

(0815)

Mr. Minister, I want to be . . . I want to try to get you back on track again. And let me just set aside the nonsense about selling these shares I the spring of the fall when the farmers are taking off their crops or seeding. This has nothing to do with the agricultural cycles. Farmers are relatively small buyers of equities. These will not, by and large, not be sold to rural people at all, but to people who wouldn't know a hoe handle from a cow's tail. These are sold basically to urban people who have nothing to do with the agricultural cycles.

Now I ask now . . . Mr. Minister, I take it you are planning on selling them in September. You said that — late September. That gives you about six weeks. That being the case, much of the preliminary work must already have been done. It is true that there have been other issues of new shares in this country, but nothing of this magnitude. Assuming this company's worth a couple of billion dollars, that will make it a major issue, a very major issue, particularly on a market as small as Canada's.

Mr. Minister, the next question I have is: if you're planning on selling these in late September, if that's your

target, what investment firm will be the lead investment firm in handling this issue?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — The lead is Woody Gundy; the U.S. tranche is Merrill Lynch; European tranche is Credit Suisse; the Saskatchewan tranche will be Richardson . . . I'm sorry, RBC Dominion Securities. Those are the heads of the various tranches.

The full syndicates have not been finalized. But each of those except in the cases of Merrill Lynch are the lead province of Saskatchewan managers or co-leads in our various syndicates. The exception with Merrill Lynch is because Merrill Lynch has done, I believe, two of the three large potash issues in the United States for IMC (International Mineral and Chemical Corporation) and have some expertise or experience in the fertilizer issues.

Mr. Shillington: — Okay, Mr. Minister, I take it that Wood Gundy, then is the lead firm with the other operating in concert. Mr. Minister, is that the full list? You've no Asian — Japanese or Hong Kong — firms?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — No, one of the questions to be decided ultimately, or several questions, obviously size of the issue, because if the market would only accept say a smaller issue of say 2 to 300 to 400 million, we would suspect that Saskatchewan would obviously take up some, Canada would take up some, United States would take up some, and less for Europe. There would not be enough left, depending on the size of the issue, for a nation market issue.

So in all likelihood there won't be an Asian issue, or an Asian tranche, is the word. I am not ruling it out, but at this stage we don't think it's likely.

Mr. Shillington: — Okay, I gather then that is the, at least in a preliminary way, that is the full list of firms which will be involved under the general leadership of Wood Gundy.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I've indicated the leads and the co-leads. In each case the Canadian firm Wood Gundy will be a co with the U.S. or with Europe.

Mr. Shillington: — Can we have the full list then, Mr. Speaker, if that's the case. May we have the full list then, if that's the case?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I'm saying that we haven't put the full syndicates together. These are the people that are doing the lead work. I'm more than pleased at the time that the syndicates are finally decided, to supply you with that. I mean, it'll be a matter of public record anyway.

But the determinations, we will lean — let me put it this way — we will very much lean first to the investment syndicates that the province of Saskatchewan uses, particularly if on an international tranche we think that there is some advantage to using the firms that have a knowledge of the province and have an interest in terms of being part of the syndicates that the province has used.

But I'm more than prepared when those are done, to supply them, but again they'll be a matter of public

record.

Mr. Shillington: — I gather that one of the reasons why Wood Gundy was chosen because they're trying to recoup some of the losses they took on a sale of issues for this province, I think last year at this time. They took a real bath on a somewhat overly imaginative sale of issues last year.

Mr. Minister, that brings me to the next question. What is the fee that the investment house takes?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Let me come at it this way. The standard fee overall, and this is for all the syndicates and the participants of the syndicates, is 5 per cent. We expect . . . That's for all of them, okay? That's not for each one. That's the total. We expect to do better than that when the full syndicates are put together because the issue will be larger, but I'm prepared for discussion purposes to have that accepted.

What will happen then, so that the hon. member understands, what will happen then, as your syndicates are established, you will have to negotiate the percentage of that 5 per cent in total. So that will be negotiated down as the syndicates are established. But I think for debating or discussion purposes, I'm better prepared to indicate, although I think we'll do better than 5 per cent which is very much, I gather, accepted on the initial public offerings.

Mr. Shillington: — I may say that is quite a sum of money, Mr. Minister. We're now starting to get into, I suppose, some of the cost of your ideological obsession with disposing of provincial assets. On, say, 400 million — that's exercising every doubt in your favour — on a sale of 400 million, that's \$20 million this costs, \$20 million in fees. This at a time, Mr. Minister, when the roads are a disgrace, when any number of groups of people cry out for some sort of assistance. You, Mr. Minister, are spending \$20 million on a pipe-dream that nobody wants, that the public of this province has said clearly they do not want.

I think it's apparent, Mr. Minister, to use and apparent to anyone but the members opposite that there are far better places to spend \$20 million than on this bit of privatization which, as I said, everybody in the province says they don't want.

Mr. Minister, is 5 per cent the full cost to the province of Saskatchewan of this sale? Is that everything in? If not, what are the additional costs of this extravaganza of yours?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — There will be additional costs for the promotion of the issue, obviously the province's own legal fees, and the preparation of that activity. Understand what happens with the syndicates. The syndicates buy the shares and then have to place them. There is some risk. Well . . . but I mean, I don't think there's anything out of the ordinary in terms of the amount. I've said it is likely going to be on the low side.

However, having said that, you've got that fee plus the promotional costs. I can't tell you what those will be. I

know that whatever they may be, the opposition will say that they're too high and that the material is too glitzy and the usual arguments, but having said that, there are those costs.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I'm even more upset than I was at 8 o'clock when I started to find out that we are spending \$20 million on a privatization that nobody wants. Mr. Minister . . .

An Hon. Member: — To another friend.

Mr. Shillington: — Yes, to another . . . I might add, \$20 million to, by and large, yet another friend of the Conservative Party.

Mr. Minister, it's not secret that Woody Gundy, and in particular, John Ritchie of that firm has worked very, very closely with this government. Seems to me it was John Ritchie of Wood Gundy in Regina who made the prediction that whatever housing problems may occur elsewhere in Canada, thanks to the magnificent management of this government, there'd be no dropping off here for the house sales. Of course the opposite's been the truth; we have the highest vacancy rate in Canada. Such is the balance and independence of the firm of Wood Gundy here in Regina.

Mr. Minister, I want to try to put \$20 million in perspective. Mr. Minister, you're spending more on this bit of foolishness, and that's as accurately as I can phrase this within a legislative Chamber. There is far more accurate language but language that would not be permitted here to describe this. Mr. Minister . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, one may think this is perhaps empty-headed. Seems to be a phrase to which you can relate.

Mr. Minister, \$20 million is more than is spent by the Department of Economic Development and Tourism. Just think about that for a minute. You're giving more to your friends in the investment firms than you're spending on Economic Development and Tourism in this province. That, as a matter of interest, is more than we are spending on Energy and Mines. You're spending more for this sale, which the public of Saskatchewan don't want, than you're spending on the entire management of our natural resources.

Mr. Minister, you're spending more on this sale than you spend in the Department of Environment and Public Safety at a time when environmental problems have this government absolutely at bay. You're spending more on this privatization, which the public of Saskatchewan don't want, have said so in every conceivable way, than you're spending on the environment.

This sounds hard to believe, given the fashion in which the ministers opposite travel, but you're spending twice as much on this as you are on Executive Council. As I say, given the royal trappings in Executive Council, that's hard to believe, but that is the case. It simply puts all this into perspective.

Mr. Minister, in addition the \$20 million, Mr. Minister, I wonder if you would tell us what you're going to be

spending on the promotion of this. Will this be another \$20 million that you'll be spending on advertising? What figure do you have budgeted for promotion?

(0830)

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Well, the NDP are critical of the 5 per cent, which I've indicated is a standard. You pay 7 per cent if you're selling your house. That's a commission that most people can relate to.

But let me put things in perspective, and I'm going to give you some figures. In 19, I believe about 74, 1974, a company called AMAX bought Esterhazy, and they paid IMC about \$12 million. In 1976 in your wisdom, and you were a vital part of that decisions, you then paid to IMC some \$85 million for the same . . . or to AMAX, I mean, for what two years before was \$12 million. So the expenditures on the sale of the potash corporation are going to pale before some of the costs of acquiring.

So having said that, we will do a budget are we, one, assess the Saskatchewan market — and I indicated last night we'll have to assess the effect of the debate on the willingness of Saskatchewan people to buy the shares. I have said, and I have said it quite pointedly, that we will be taking the steps that we believe to be necessary to encourage Saskatchewan people to buy the shares, and that will requires some promotion. As well, as in the case of any such share issue, there will be the costs to meet with the potential investors and the various . . . well the investment community, after the prospectus is filed and the issue is decided upon.

So yes, there'll be promotion costs. No, we do not yet have an estimate.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, that's just not believable. That is not accurate. And I have the greatest difficulty being charitable enough to believe that you thought that answer was accurate when you gave it, Mr. Minister. I just have the greatest difficulty being that charitable.

Mr. Minister, you're spending \$20 million on this bit of foolishness, this bit of empty-headedness, at a time when hunger stalks the streets of our cities; at a time, Mr. Minister, when people on welfare have not had any increases in the last . . . and in fact have experienced cuts, that's right, as one members says; at a time, Mr. Minister, when agriculture is yet again sliding into a crisis with a harvest that is deteriorating and alarmingly low prices. What's your priority? Your priority is giving \$20 million to your friends, the vast majority of whom could, quite frankly, are less about this province, could quite frankly care less about this province. The people, Mr. Minister, who you are benefitting by this, by and large, could just care less about this province. They have a very different agenda. Mr. Minister, they operate by the law of greed.

Mr. Minister, I asked you about the cost of promotion. I well recognize that you're going to have one obscene extravaganza when it comes to advertising. I can imagine, Mr. Minister, that you have every single moment of television time and air time, as much print space as you can muster, not to sell the shares — that's not how this is

done. What you'll be doing is to try to justify the disaster, which you've unfolded over the last few weeks.

Mr. Minister, you know full well that these shares aren't sold by advertisements; they're sold in a different fashion. When Air Canada, as much as I disagreed with it, was privatized, I didn't have to watch wall to wall advertising telling me what a great deal a privatized Air Canada would be. It was simply sold in the normal fashion. You're going to be advertising, Mr. Minister, not to sell the shares but to try to redeem your own political fortunes, what I think is a thoroughly hopeless venture. But that's going to be the effort.

I want to know, Mr. Minister, how much you're going to be spending trying to save your political hides when this issue goes on sale. How much are you going to be spending on advertising and promotion? Give me the figure, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I've already answered the hon. member, and I will put the Air Canada issue in response. There was, as a matter fact, promotion on the Air Canada issue. But remember this as well, that the Air Canada issue was primarily designed for the sophisticated investor, the person who would normally buy. Now certainly they had a hope that it would be broader than that. I gather there are indications that it was broader than that, but I would suspect only marginally so. I don't know that, but I would suspect that beyond the traditional sophisticated investor that Air Canada did not expand much of the market.

That's a different type of activity than what we want to do in the province of Saskatchewan, and we do want to encourage. I think it fair to say that if the public believes that the advertising is overdone, that they will react, and quite properly. You know that; you know what happened to the family of Crown corporations ad. It turned out to be a mistake in terms of the objective that it was set out to meet. All governments, all advertisers run that risk. You're right; it can be overdone. But if it's overdone, then the government will be criticized.

So we have to make those decisions and operate on the basis of . . . we're trying to certainly expand the number of the people, encourage more and more Saskatchewan people to invest in their own province. You disagree with that, that's your choice. That's one of the fundamental differences that we have, as stated by the Leader of the Opposition and myself yesterday, where he very pointedly left out the involvement of people themselves in the economic development of the province.

So yes, there will be advertising and promotion. I have said that. The extent and the effectiveness, well I mean that will obviously be decided. You may want to prejudge; that's obviously your political right. You want to prejudge it. That's fair enough. Ultimately the public will say whether it's too much, too little, not enough. But one of the things that has been made clear to us is that if there was to be a public issue of PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan), a great number of people of this province wanted the opportunity to buy shares, and we will give them that opportunity.

Mr. Shillington: — I'm sure, Mr. Minister, farmers who are looking at a crop which is wilting in the heat and

working people who haven't had an increase in minimum wage for many years, I'm sure they'll be deeply appreciative of an advertising program running into many millions of dollars which tells them why they should buy shares with money that they don't have. I'm sure they'll be deeply appreciative of this information.

Mr. Minister, I asked you for your budgeted figure. If you're going to be selling these in six weeks, you must have a budgeted figure. I ask you for that, Mr. Minister. It's your responsibility to give us information, not the nonsense which you've attempted to pass off on us this morning.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I've already indicated to the hon. member that the figure has not been budgeted. We will do an assessment after as to the effect of this very debate on the Saskatchewan market. I think that's only fair and you would expect us to do that.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, I've been listening to the minister try to tell us that he has no budget for the sell-off of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, which we believe the government is going to do as soon as the legislation is passed. And it's simply hard to believe, in fact, we don't believe that the minister doesn't have a budget laid out that would include the fee that the brokers will get — and he's given us that, 5 per cent — and we know that 5 per cent of 400 million will cost the taxpayers about \$20 million. We got that number.

Now in advertising, surely, Mr. Minister, you're not telling us that you don't have a budget item. Give it to the nearest million. I mean is it 500,000, is it 1.5 million, is it 2 million? Certainly you must have in your mind, in a budget somewhere what the cost of advertising the share offering is going to be.

You've done a budget up. You've given us what you're going to give to the brokers, to Wood Gundy, your friends in the brokerage firms. That's going to be \$20 million. How much is the advertising? You must have the firm that's going to advertise lined up and ready to go, just as you have the firm that going to be doing the brokerage for you.

Can you tell us who that firm will be in the province of Saskatchewan, who — or other places — who will be doing the advertising of the share offering?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — We will be using Dome — may be familiar to some of you

I would just like to correct something, and I find it very, very interesting that the member, and member that preceded him, critical of Wood Gundy and friends of the government, etc., etc. The investment syndicates that we have used as province are very little different from the investment managers that the New Democratic Party used. And the two leads under the New Democratic Party were Wood Gundy, Dominion Securities, for a long time, for a long time.

Now we've certainly expanded the number of managers because companies change, some improve their experience, others have better distributive powers

because of the change. But to be up and slamming the investment managers, I suggest is exactly what you did to the management of the potash corporation. The management of the potash corporation, judged by the potash industry is probably the best managed potash company now in the free world.

So you can make those allegations, and you can in your mind relate them. But let me tell you, if these companies are friends of the present government, then by your convoluted, paranoid logic, they were obviously friends of yours because you used them.

The fact is that the investment community in Canada, provinces of all political stripes have their investment syndicates and their investment managers, and they choose them for their abilities, they choose them for their abilities to distribute, they choose them for the financial advice that they give the province. That's no different, that's no different . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's simply not true and you go and check your syndicates. You know that's not true So that's no different and provinces can't operate any other way, I think in fairness.

So you can make the allegation. You are surprising a great number of the business community, as you continue to do, but in fact we get investment advice from syndicates, different syndicates in the United States, different syndicates in Europe, different syndicates in the Asian markets. So having said all of that, I think the reason that you put out for the use is not a valid one.

I have indicated to you in terms of promotion, we will do an assessment after the Bill is passed to determine the state of the Saskatchewan market. On the one hand you stand up and say everybody's against it. If you're right, then obviously we're going to have to promote. We don't happen to accept that and we don't happen to believe it to be in the case, and we don't think that . . . we happen to know that there's far more support for the privatization of potash than you believe, let me put it that way, and I'm putting it very mildly.

So we will do an assessment of that market; we will do an assessment after the debate, and then decide on what requires to increase and to get the greatest number of Saskatchewan people to invest in the potash corporation.

(0845)

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, Mr. Minister, that was one of the silliest arguments I've ever seen given in this House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — If you expect anyone in the province, outside of a few of your back-benchers — maybe the member from Cut Knife-Lloyd would believe what you're saying here — some of the back-benchers who seem to believe everything that the front benches say to them, they may believe that you don't have a budget for advertising.

But obviously, Mr. Minister, when we talk about the 20 million you're going to pay to Wood Gundy, that's not an allegation, that's your fact that you gave to us. You gave

us the figure of 20 million. On a share offering of \$400 million, you have told us that Wood Gundy will get \$20 million of that 400 million.

An Hon. Member: — I did not.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Yes you did. You said they would get the money and then it would be distributed to other people who would be selling for them. That's the indication. You indicated that \$20 million would go to the brokerage houses to sell the shares.

An Hon. Member: — In total.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well in total. That's what I'm saying. But they're the main brokerage house and they will distribute, where they need parts of the \$20 million. That's one item. That's one item. There's other major items of cost in this sell-off. There's advertising. There's the legal fees, and what we're trying to do here, Mr. Minister, is establish what the cost of the sell-off is. That's a perfectly legitimate question to ask. Perfectly legitimate.

What isn't legitimate is you, Mr. Minister, and your cowardly government cutting off the debate and then avoiding answering questions. That is not acceptable, and that is not a principled way for you to be acting.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — If you're saying you don't have all the answers — and I'm not saying about the very detailed answers — if you don't have the answers on the legal fee estimate that you're going to pay and on the advertising and the prospectus, then what are we doing here? Why is there a bill here if we don't know any of the details?

I say to you, when we did Saskoil — and I'll give credit to the member of Saskatoon, Mr. Schoenhals — he came here with a prospectus; we looked at the detail; we knew how much the brokerage fee; we didn't have to ask. I say to you that when you're using closure, it's incumbent on you to have the answers.

Does it make any sense for you to say: look, we don't want any more debate on this potash issue; the public knows all the detail of privatization, they know all the detail; we shouldn't be debating any more because it's costing too much money; the few extra hundreds of thousands of dollars that a week of debate would cost is unnecessary. That's what you said. That's what the Premier has told the people of the province. But now what we're saying is we're going to be advertising the sell-off — we're going to advertise the sell-off.

Now I say to you and I say to the press who were involved in that debate in their editorial, saying the debate had gone on too long that it wasn't wasting too much money, I question whether or not you have the right, the right to now advertise the potash sell-off.

And I really question the media, who will benefit from the sell-off in terms of the advertising the sell-off, whether or not the debate should go on at taxpayers' expense outside of the Assembly? That's the point I want to make to you, Mr. Minister. Because if the public already knows about

the sell-off, if they already are tired of the repetition, then how does it make sense that you will now take tax dollars and advertise the share offering?

Like, either the people know about it or they don't. You can't say in here that it's costing too much money when there's a debate going on and both sides are being presented, and cut off that debate using closure, then come here and give us no answers, and then go outside the House and use taxpayers' money to sell one side of the argument. That's unprincipled and unneeded, and you have to be able to recognize that.

And the press have to recognize that, that it's undemocratic to cut off the debate in this House on the potash sell-off, then get out of the House and use taxpayers' money to pay the press in advertising to sell one side of the argument. That is neither fair or democratic.

Now I want to ask you again" what is the budget for this one-sided argument, this debate on privatization that you will be putting on TV, on radio, and in newspapers, following the closure of this bill?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I will address the press, too, the same as the hon. member. There's no need for you to sit and sulk and be . . . because you got cracked by the public as saying you overplayed your hand on the potash debate. The fact that you had no public support out there for you protracted filibuster is no reason to take it out on the press. That was the public speaking that felt you overplayed your hand and you went too far . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh sure it is.

So you're sitting here smarting and you're still angry and you're still upset over that. But I mean there's a case of kicking the messenger. You sit and accuse us of doing it every day, but here you are sitting, kicking the messenger that told you that you'd overplayed your hand, which everybody knew — which everybody knew.

But I want the public to see the inconsistency of the NDP argument. On the one hand they say, we're only selling to our rich friends — and a couple of heads nod up and down. On the other they say, don't advertise to get other people to buy. That's precisely what they're saying here today, precisely what they're saying. You can't have it both ways.

Do you know what their great fear is here? Is that there's going to be a successful advertising campaign and some little New Democratic Party members is going to surreptitiously walk down to a brokerage house or his credit union or the Bank of Nova Scotia or wherever, and take a little bit of money out of his pocket and say, can I buy some of those potash shares? I know my leader doesn't want me to do it, but can I busy some, because I saw that advertising campaign and it looked pretty good. That's what their fear is.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — That's what their fear is. It's got nothing to do with the amount. It's got nothing to do with the advertising campaign. It's got nothing to do with who's

been doing it.

It is this fundamental fear, fundamental fear in the New Democratic Party that some member . . . I mean, did it work in the past? Did the advertising work? I think you'll find it interesting that Allan Blakeney, Allan Blakeney familiar to many of you, has got some Saskoil issues. Maybe it just may be that my logic and persuasive powers and the minister of the time convinced him in the legislature to do it. I don't know. I doubt it. I think maybe the advertising campaign had a little bit to do with it.

So having said all of that, you can complain because you overplayed your hand. That's your choice. And you can be critical because we're going to advertise. And you've got the contradiction where you say, you're only selling to your rich friends — don't let anybody else buy.

What I have indicated to you, and I've now repeated it — I don't think anyone will deny but that the potash debate, protracted as it was, will have some effect on the Saskatchewan market. I think positive, but others think it may be a negative. So what I am saying is that we will encourage as many Saskatchewan people to buy shares in the potash industry, and we will also make sure that Saskatchewan people have, as they have requested of us, the opportunity to buy the shares.

So having said all of that, we will do the assessment of the Saskatchewan market once the debate's finished. I think that's quite proper. That's what any company would do before it goes into the market-place.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, Mr. Minister, your logic totally escapes all the people in the province just as it did when you did your budget in 1986. What is clearly happening here is a minister who was involved in invoking closure, stonewalling in the House on a very important issue, and that is the cost of the advertising that he will at this point know full well. He knows exactly, within a few thousand dollars, what the advertising campaign is. He will also know what the legal fees, the legal charges will be for the share offering.

What I want to know, Mr. Minister — first of all, I want to go back to the question of advertising. I want to ask you again, what is the estimated cost of the advertising that will be done outside of the legislature at taxpayers' expense for the share offering?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Well I've already answered the question on three occasions that we will do an assessment . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, we will do an assessment after the debate is finished and the Bill's passed on the Saskatchewan market and determine what is necessary.

I don't think anyone will deny that the debate will have had some effect, will have some effect, and at that time we will do an estimate and see what the market is and what is necessary to ensure that the greatest number of Saskatchewan people have both the opportunity or the ability to buy the shares.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, I asked you yesterday the percentage of ownership of Saskatchewan people in

the corporation. It took a good 10 minutes for you to get the answer. I wonder if you would take the time to turn to your staff, who will have done the budgets. I mean, obviously, I believe that you know the answer, but if you're saying you don't know, will you turn to one of your staff and ask them what budget they have done for advertising, because it simply is not believable that you haven't done a budget, that there's no budget done. Will you just take a moment and ask your staff what your staff what budget they have done for advertising of the sell-off of the potash corporation, because it's important to the people of the province.

Mr. Minister, what you're doing here is stonewalling. You have moved closure because now there are only two days allowed for asking these questions; you know that. You know that if you stall for another 14 hours, you'll be scot-free, and what you expect to be able to do here today is stonewall, I believe, on the prospectus, when the share offering will start, the advertising, and the legal fees.

And you're not obviously wanting to tell us. But that simply isn't acceptable; you know that. And I want to ask again whether any of your staff know what the budget is for advertising.

(0900)

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Well I took the member's suggestion that I take some time, and I simply indicate to the hon. member exactly what I said before.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, Mr. Minister, that was a useful use of five minutes of the time of the Assembly consulting with your staff. If you didn't have an answer, it would not have taken five minutes. If there was no answer, what you were doing is deciding whether or not to give the information. That's what you were doing. And you decided to deceive the House and not give the information, and I find that unacceptable.

Mr. Minister, just for a moment I want to go back to the issue of the 20 million that will be going to Wood Gundy and to other brokerage firms. Mr. Minister, the reason we're concerned about the choice of Wood Gundy is not because of other government's having used them but because of political donations that have gone directly from Wood Gundy to your party.

I have here information of donations that have gone to your political party in the province and federally. In 1982 a thousand dollars, this was at the time of the previous election, 1982 when you were first elected, a thousand dollars. In 1988, \$500. To the federal party in 1984 — you remember that election — 13,216. And in 1987, prior to the last election, 29,864. Now there's a direct relationship I think, Mr. Minister, federally, to the use of this company in the privatization in the federal government and the donations to the political party.

This is the issue we're raising here, Mr. Minister, that a company that gives \$30,000 before the last federal election to your political friends in Ottawa, now is getting a major share of the money that is coming out of the privatization — \$20 million, or their share of it. And I say to you, Mr. Minister, that these are the kinds of answers

the public want.

Like we know in GigaText, you stated out in the same fashion, there are no answers — stonewalling. And then as the weeks went on, it was exposed. This is why closure is a devious move by this government because I believe if we could spend several weeks asking these kind of pointed questions, we would find the major scandal that is actually involved in this sell-off. That's the point.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Now the debate on things like GigaText may be boring and unpleasant for the government, but that is not reason to cut off the debate, and at 11 o'clock tonight you will effectively cut off the debate. And if you can stonewall on the cost of advertising until then, you believe that people will simply forget about it. But I say to you that these questions are important.

Now I want to ask you one more time for the advertising costs. You have the budget; you consulted with your staff; they have a budget done up. What will be the cost of advertising the sell-off of the potash corporation?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I just want the press to know, because the hon. member has just made some allegations that Wood Gundy, for example, a statement Wood Gundy has made political contributions to the Progressive Conservative party. He doesn't say that Wood Gundy has also made political donations to the New Democratic Party.

An Hon. Member: — We're not selling off the potash corporation.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Oh, so they're friends because they make a donation to us, but they're enemies if they make a donation. So understand the kind of perverse logic of the members opposite. And also note that he didn't deny it; also note that he didn't deny it — and, I suspect, other brokerage houses, as they do to all political parties.

So the argument is a rather spurious one, and I indicate to the hon. member that I've answered the question now three or four times today. And I have indicated to the hon. member that I have little doubt that this debate, protracted as it was, had some effect on the Saskatchewan market and whether people will buy shares or not. I happen to think it's positive. Like I say, others think that less people would buy. And I have made the statement that after the legislation is passed, we will do an assessment of the Saskatchewan market with the objectives of getting as many Saskatchewan people to buy shares, and the second objective, to be able to respond appropriately to the message that we get from the people of this province, is that they want an opportunity to buy.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, you say you gave me the answer, and many people would call it a non-answer. You haven't given anything. You've been stonewalling for the last hour. That's what you intend to do for the balance of the day.

And the unfortunate part of this is that when the corporation was being set up back in 1976, you will remember when you had a least five or six days in committee to ask questions of the then deputy premier. You'll remember that. And the debate wasn't cut off. You were allowed as many days as you wanted, and in checking *Hansard* I find your name on each of the days, asking questions, that it was in committee. You knew the problem that would cause for you, and you argued with the cabinet to move closure to protect yourself so that you wouldn't have to be here day after day answering questions. You told them clearly that, I can stonewall for two days, but you've got to have closure in place to protect me. That's why you're not answering any questions.

And I say again that, in not answering the question, you tell the people one thing clearly, that the number is too embarrassing for you to give out. That's all you're saying. If it were a small number of no advertising, you would quickly tell us. But what you are telling us clearly, very directly, that it will be millions of dollars. And we will put our number in that blank because you won't give it to us. So we've got 20 million for the brokerage houses. We have millions for advertising. Everyone will accept that now because you refuse to answer.

I want to ask you now on legal fees, what is the estimated amount of legal fees, for example, for drafting the Bill, which went to one of your friends again in Saskatoon, one of the law firms, I understand? Maybe you could give me the name of that law firm that prepared the Bill for you and gave you assistance, and then the total cost of legal fees.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Now we will obviously, as in the normal course, get at the end of the time, the law firms are paid in the usual manner for the work done.

But I would like to just put the debate on the time, because the hon. member very pointedly ignores, when he makes the argument that there were some five days in committee, I think the total debate was some 21 days.

An Hon. Member: — Nineteen.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Nineteen days. All in — all in. So now they say they're being muzzled. The fact is, they went on for days.

And let me tell you, after five days in 1976 . . . Because the hon. member is right. The hon. member is right; we did ask questions. Do you know what questions we asked? How much are you going to pay for the mines? Do you know what answer we got? We don't know; we've got to start negotiating. Hundreds of millions of dollars, hundreds of millions of dollars that you would not give to the people of this province.

Don't stand up and tell me, don't stand up and tell me that you were forthright on the potash — hundreds of millions of dollars. Do you know what they said? Well we don't even know if we have to expropriate. We don't know what those mines . . . we've got to do the valuation after. Do you have estimates? Well we've got people looking at them yet, but wait until we decide which mines

— which mines. They didn't even know which mines they were going to buy.

An Hon. Member: — But we had a mandate.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Oh you had a mandate. Oh, they had a mandate. They had a mandate. Now let me tell you, because I wish Dale Eisler was here, I really wish Dale Eisler was here, because Dale Eisler — with the greatest respect that I have for the individual — has missed the inconsistency of the New Democratic argument and it is this. On the one hand their critic for potash says that the reason they nationalized the industry was to protect it from the big, bad federal government, and it was the only way to do it. Okay? That's what he says.

Then some of their other members said oh no, we had a mandate in '75, which pre-dates the threat, pre-dates the threat from the federal government — pre-dates the threat. It wasn't even an issue . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . There's no doubt that it was philosophical, and I thank the hon. member from Saskatoon for her interjection.

So for you to say that we're more or less not giving you the information . . . Let's put that back, because you made reference to it, I didn't, the debate of 1976. And I have publicly given full credit to the Leader of the Opposition in the skilful manner in which he handled that debate — skilful manner.

Other than asking him what constituency he represented, he never told us anything else. He never told us the number of mines, he never told us what mines, he never told us how much they're prepared to spend, he never told us how much time was spent up to date, how much time was spent on studies, how much time was spent on evaluations — all of those because they could not begin to take the action until such time as the legislation was passed.

And I have now said on numerous occasions today that after the Bill passes, we will do an assessment of the Saskatchewan market and take the appropriate measures to make sure that all Saskatchewan people have the opportunity to buy.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well this is a perfect example, Mr. Chairman, of stonewalling, trying to burn up the two days time by not giving any answers. But I asked you, Mr. Minister, about legal fees. Gary, you'll know I asked about legal fees. I want to know, what is the estimate of the total legal fees that will be paid out during the privatization of Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I've indicated that the professional advice will be paid in the usual manner, and when the work's done they will get the bill.

An Hon. Member: — How much?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Well I mean, obviously the work's not completed. Now the hon. member knows full well that when that work is completed — she is a lawyer — that when that work is completed the appropriate firms, the accounting firms or be it legal firms, will submit their accounts for payment. That's the normal way it works.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, this idea that you can stonewall your debate here and get yourself through the day, it may work. but I say to you that I would like to know that to date, what is the amount of money that has been paid out in legal fees or that has been received in bills in your department, in terms of the privatization of the potash corporation? You will know that the firms that have been drafting the Bill for you will have sent in a bill, and you'll know that; preparation of documents. Can you tell us what has been billed to date? At least let's get a little start on this.

(0915)

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Well we will certainly have to pull that information as to all professional fees, and I think at the end of the day what will happen as will happen in the normal course, that the appropriate forum will be there for answering those questions.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I want to ask you again, Mr. Minister, because we didn't get anything out of the questions on advertising, but what would the budget be? Like, I'm not asking for the numbers, but what is the budget for legal fees? You can't tell us that you go into a billion dollar deal and don't have a budget done up. I mean there isn't a farmer in the province, there isn't a small-business person that wouldn't, when they're planning to expand or contract, do up an analysis of what the cost and expenses are going to be. It simply isn't acceptable.

Now I want to know what you have planned for legal fees in this billion dollar sell-off. You can't tell me that we'll just have to wait and see. That simply isn't good enough. What is the budget time for legal fees?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Well, I've already answered the hon. member that legal and the professional fees will be paid in the normal manner as the work is done. And I suggest to the hon. member, as in 1976, there were different types of work being done at various stages of the operation, either being tax consideration, being structure of the share, which has not yet been determined, and a great deal of the work to be done yet. And those accounts will be submitted, I suspect, in the usual manner.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, Mr. Minister, I want to go back to advertising just for a moment because there's been some expenditure and I'm sure that some bills have been paid on advertising as well.

The workers out at the potash mines had the privilege and opportunity of watching a videotape a while ago showing Mr. Childers selling potash. and this was an example of the ability of the individual . . . and I say again, contrary to your explanation of my opinion, I hold him in high regard. I think he's an excellent manager for the private sector, and that is why you have got him to help you privatize the potash corporation. I'm not being critical here. I am saying that he is probably the best you could get to sell off the potash corporation.

My problem is, is the idea of selling off the potash corporation. What I want to know is what is the cost of advertising that has been carried out to date?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I will try and get for the hon. member the information on the videotape and the communication with the employees that was prepared, and I said I would get that for the hon. member and get it back to you.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, the tape that I refer to you, I'm glad that you are aware of it. I wondered if, for the benefit of the members of the Assembly and others who are interested, whether you could get me a copy of that tape when you're getting the cost of it.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — We're not able to . . . well we'll try and get it down from Saskatoon today, but I'll be happy to supply the hon. member with a copy of the tape.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have sat here for some time and I have listened to the discussion on this sell-off of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, and I really must say, Mr. Chairman, that I am shocked by the performance of the minister. That performance, Mr. Chairman, is making a mockery of this whole process to a level, to an extent that has never been witnessed in this House before. Here we have a case of deception by a minister of a Crown that has reached new heights. There is no doubt about that.

We have seen today, without any doubt, a very clear indication of why closure was used. It was used because the government wanted to spend no more than two days in this House to answer the questions in the committee because the government had decided some time before this that it was not going to provide the answers. This is the biggest cover-up since Watergate, Mr. Chairman.

And the minister laughs. Well he might laugh but the public of Saskatchewan, who are the shareholders, who are the owners of this corporation and this resource, don't find it very funny. How in Heaven's name can a minister of the Crown stand up in this House and say to the people of Saskatchewan who own this company, you don't have a right to know? That's indefensible.

Now maybe on the part of this minister it's expected, because here is the minister who misled the public of Saskatchewan in 1986 . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. I don't believe that members are to refer to other members in the particular vernacular of misleading in the Assembly, and I ask the member to withdraw that remark and continue his speech.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — If that's unparliamentary, I will withdraw it, Mr. Chairman, but I will say this, that this is the minister who in 1986 did not tell the truth to the people of Saskatchewan about his deficit in his budget and made an error of some \$800 million.

Let me qualify that. It wasn't an error; it was intentionally said to the people of Saskatchewan that the number on the deficit was something which it was not, in order to try to get by an election. Today we are seeing the same kind of deception, which you say I can't call misleading, on the part of this minister once again. That's the history of this man, and I suppose that's why he's piloting this Bill

through the House rather the minister of mineral resources.

Now what have we seen here today and yesterday? We have seen the minister come to this House, when he is asked what are you plans, oh he comes and he makes glowing statement about how there's going to be diversification, that the potash corporation is going to do major things. But when he's asked what is it intending to do he says there are no plans.

Today when he is asked, what is the budget for advertising for the promotion of this whole thing, he says there is no budget. This is August 11. The minister has made it clear that this whole thing is going to be in place by the end of September. Anyone who even knows a small amount about what it takes to put together this kind of a major proposition knows you can't do it in that period of time. Therefore that whole process is done, and he knows it and we know and the people know it. And he's hiding the facts from this House and he's hiding the facts from the people of Saskatchewan.

The minister was asked today, what have been the legal fees. He can't tell us. Well all of those things, Mr. Chairman, it's not a question of the minister can't tell us; it's really a matter of the fact that the minister refuses to tell us. And because he had determined and this government had determined some time ago that they weren't going to provide these answers, they put closure in so that then over time they could not be forced to provide those answers by public pressure as the debate continued.

There is all the evidence that anyone could possibly need including the editorial writers in our press, that the people of Saskatchewan don't want this Bill to proceed. The other reason why closure was imposed — because opposition has been growing and the minister knew that as long as he stood up in this House and stonewalled and refused to provide the answer, the longer it took, the more that opposition would grow.

I ask the question then. Let us assume that the minister is right. Let us assume that none of these things have been done. Let us assume that there have been no plans. Let us assume there have been no evaluations. Let us assume there is no plan for an advertising. If that's the case, then this whole Bill being before this House cannot be justified.

No one could make such a major decision with such major implications as to sell off a \$2 billion asset, or whatever that valuation is, without having done some considerable study. We know that the government has done that, and yet they refuse to provide that information to owners of the resource and the company, the public of Saskatchewan.

So the closure is here because the government did not want to give the answers. Earlier in this debate it was suggested that there is a sweetheart deal. And I say it again. I think that there is a deal. I think the minister is involved in that deal. I think this minister has been involved in selling us out, along with the Premier.

Oh, he says, well we can't do any of this work because we need the legislation first. Well if that argument holds true, how does he defend the Premier going to Korea and India and China and Japan and trying to wheel and deal and sell off the potash corporation. You've got to apply the same argument in that respect as well.

Mr. Minister, I want to ask you then, as soon as your colleague moves away, in light of all of this, Mr. Minister, and in light of the fact that his company is owned by the people of Saskatchewan, why are you not prepared to stand up in this House as their representative and provide the answers which they as owners have right to know? How can you justify hiding this information from the owners, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Sometimes, not intentionally, the hon. member is humorous. And for the hon. member from Regina North East to talk about cover-up, he's an expert. he was prepared to risk the very lives of people in Regina to cover up a PCP (polychlorinated biphenyl) spill — 10 feet of concrete, 10 feet of concrete on Federal Pioneer. He covered it up. He covered it up. PCBs could be seeping into the aquifers in Regina, but he covered it up; prepared to put lives at stake — covered it up. Do you know how they got the information? They got the freedom of information legislation in the United States. That's where the press in Regina were able to get the information that you had covered up for some 18 months, I believe, 18 months.

But I want to put the information on privatization in perspective. This government tabled the information on Weyerhaeuser. We perhaps made a mistake because it had a lot of big words in it and the NDP didn't understand a lot of it, but we stacked big books and piles of information in this Assembly. You know that the NDP did with it? Who read it?

An Hon. Member: — I read it.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Okay, one read it, one read it all . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well I believe that hon. member did. I believe the hon. member did. Well it's interesting, if you did read it; there were no questions about it after. Very interesting that way.

And then, Sask Minerals, information tabled, information tabled on the privatization, tabled and tabled and tabled. So the public does get the information. To say that they don't is simply not accurate. And to say, and we can agree to disagree, that doing an assessment after this bill is passed as to the market and what promotional activities are needed to get the greatest number of Saskatchewan people buying shares but also giving comfort to the Saskatchewan people, even those that choose not to buy, that at least they had an opportunity. So having said all of that, I happen to believe that a fair position.

So it's fair, and you and I can get into a debate. I have given the documents here about how far are we out — \$12 billion on oil on \$50 a barrel, and potash at several hundred dollars a tonne. But I'm prepared to get that information again because the member from Quill Lakes has an extremely short memory. So we can get into the personal debate, you and I, as to who does what to whom.

The fact is, and you can debate it all you want, when potash was nationalized, you stood up in this Assembly and said you didn't have information. You didn't have the information on how much you were going to promote; you never told us. Never did find out how much you spend on the family of Crown corporations' ads. Never did. Never did.

So it's all right, I gather, for you but not for anybody else, I gather. That's the argument you're making.

You never knew the number of mines; you never knew how much you were going to spend; you never knew how much of the taxpayers' money you were going to put out; you didn't know what your legal fees were going to be because, if I recall the answers . . . as a matter of fact, we couldn't even get all the firms, if I recall . . .

(0930)

An Hon. Member: — You haven't read the transcript.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Oh yes I did.

An Hon. Member: — Do you think we're going to tell you publicly what we're going to offer to buy a company in advance of the sale?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Do you think I'm going to tell you what the advertising costs, when people know what the advertising costs are? And a lot of times they have an objection to when the costs are out. So you know that as well as I do. You know that as well as I do. So be wise about it. Be wise in it. And as I've indicated on numerous occasions today, we will do the assessment of the market after — after the legislation is passed.

To say that the public will not have the information, based on the track record of this government as opposed to your track record, the public gets the information.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, in that non-answer you admitted on a very significant thing which I took note of. You admitted that you do have an advertising budget and you . . .

An Hon. Member: — No, I did not.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes, you did. And that you have a plan in place. Now, Mr. Minister, how can you justify, therefore, not providing the answer to this House? Well here's what you said. You said, "Do you think that I will give you the advertising costs?" What can one conclude from that except for the fact that you do have the advertising costs, that you do have a budget, and that you're hiding it from this House, and you're hiding it from the people of Saskatchewan who are going to foot the bill.

Now, Mr. Minister, in light of that, will you now undertake to do what any responsible minister would do and provide to this House the budget for the advertising for your political promotion, and what that advertising process is going to be?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — There's a difference between saying

that if I had it, I would not give it to you for certain reasons, and saying that I don't have it and what we will do after. And I've stated that position I think, seven or eight times this morning.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask the minister some questions regarding the advertising cost of this promotion for the sale of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. In this House yesterday, Mr. Minister, you indicated that you were targeting 50,000 Saskatchewan investors, so you must have done some kind of an analysis, you must have made some kind of decision as to what the economics and the economy of this province would allow in terms of Saskatchewan people who might be able to afford to invest in this province.

So if you've done an assessment in terms of how many investors you would expect, clearly, given the millions and millions of dollars that you've spent on advertising over the years that you've been government, you must have some ideas of what it would cost to target the Saskatchewan people to sell these assets of this Crown corporation.

You've indicated that your agent will be Dome Advertising of Saskatchewan, and I'm going to ask you again, Mr. Minister, to check with your officials as to how much they have budgeted in terms of targeting the Saskatchewan investors.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Let me correct the hon. member. I did not say that. I said I hoped. That was my person view. I'd like to see more of them than 50,000. I hope that the number are people that have not invested before in any way, shape or form, be it bonds, shares, or whatever. That was my hope. It was not a target. I think to be fair, it's not a target that I set.

We will meet, try to meet the following objectives, as I've said several times. One, we will try and get as many Saskatchewan people . . . One of the message that we get is that if there is to be an issue, a vast majority of the people of this want the opportunity to buy shares. So we're going to try and meet that objective. But secondly, we have to meet the objective of even those who choose not to buy, that they have the comfort of having had the opportunity. Those are the two objectives.

The number was my hope; it was not the target. I mean, we have to meet two more broad objectives than that specific number, but it was not the target that I set with respect.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Minister, it may not be your target, but it was figure that you used. And if we can use your figure, what it means is no matter how many millions of dollars that you're going to spend in this province to advertise this foolish move, if we can use your figure, it means that you've got 950,000 Saskatchewan people excluded from this privatization move.

Now what I want to ask, Mr. Minister, and I will ask you again. As Minister of Finance, surely, given the amount of money that you've spent on advertising in the past years, having the knowledge of what it cost on your extravagant

advertising of the privatization of Saskoil, having knowledge of all you've spent on WESTBRIDGE, having knowledge of all of this, if your officials haven't prepared a budget, which I don't believe and members on this side don't believe and the people of this province don't believe, and if your move has been so ill-planned and ill-conceived that you don't have these budgetary figures or a proposed budget, can you tell us what you would expect to be spending, through Dome, to sell the people of this province of the privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I get, I must say, a bit of a kick out of the ratio of the figure that is said I had hoped and what that is to the population and that we now have 950-some thousand people excluded.

I must admit that I hadn't given consideration to advertising on your favourite program, *Romper Room*, for the two- and three- and four-year-olds, so that they could go out and buy shares that are included in the million people. And I have not considered whether we should be advertising on the *Flintstones* for a rather particular market, at least of one Regina alderman familiar to many of you opposite.

So when we take a look at the total numbers in the province, I think in fairness we're probably dealing with the adult population — in fairness. I think ultimately if Saskatchewan shareholders were in the 15 to 25 per cent of the adult population, we would be higher by quite a ways than the national average. And I think that would be a big change in the province, and I think it would indicate a willingness and perhaps a desire of many people in this province to in fact participate.

And there would be reasons for not buying. Certainly, I've never denied affordability. I have never denied that some people choose not to, some people do not want to invest in shares. Others make other decisions. So to include, say 950,000 would be excluded, taking the figure — and I said it was my hope as opposed to a target.

I have restated several times what our objectives are, and they're twofold, and they're important. People tell us that they want the opportunity. But the second thing is, even if they choose not to buy, they have to have, the people of this province have to have the comfort that they had an opportunity. Those are the objectives we're going to meet. We'll do that market assessment after the legislation. I have no doubt that the debate had an effect on market, and I was through that earlier this morning.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Minister, that response is simply disgusting. But I tell you what did come out of the response was that you indicated that those who choose not to buy are going to be blasted with a barrage of government advertising, government advertising at their own expense to sell a corporation that they can't afford to share in.

And as my colleague says, what you're continuing to do is force closure on this legislature, where this debate would be taking place, so that you can continue to debate outside of this Assembly, so that you can continue to spend millions and millions of taxpayers' dollars on

advertising to sell them something they can't afford to participate in. And that, Mr. Minister, is why this debate should be happening in here.

Because rather than funnelling tens of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money through your friends in Dome, you should be standing in this House and providing answers to the people of this province so that they can make their decision based on the facts surrounding this issue. But instead of that, Mr. Minister, you chose to introduce closure to this House, to close this debate so that one side of this issue can be heard, and one side only — and that's your side.

And I want to say, Mr. Minister, that the 950,000, using your own figures, the 950,000 people who can't be a part of this move of your government, will not forget you, nor will they forget the fact that you limited the debate on a \$2 billion deal, one of the biggest financial deals that this country will see in this year or maybe in this decade. That's the issue. The issue, Mr. Minister, is that you've chosen not to participate in any debate on one of the biggest financial moves that this province will ever see.

I ask you one more time, Mr. Minister, will you allow the people of this province, the 950,000 people who won't be able to be involved in purchasing the shares of the potash corporation — I believe it may be more — but will you allow those people to know how much this political advertising that you're about to embark on is going to cost them. Will you at least tell them that, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I want the public to recognize that the NDP are saying that a great number of people will not have the opportunity and that many people are going to be upset with closure. I'll tell you, the two-year-olds that are going to be upset with closure and the two-year-olds that are going to be upset that they can't buy a share are the same two year-olds that signed your petitions. They're the ones that are going to be upset. And the two-year-olds that signed your petitions, you haven't stood up and commended the Minister of Education for the advances we've made in our educational system that we got two-year-olds that can run around and sign petitions.

So be realistic in your argument when you state that everybody, including babies and children are being excluded from buying shares. It's silly. It's a silly argument that you're making. The hon. member happens to be backing the member from Prince Albert and saying that babies and two-year-olds . . . like I say, you want us to advertise on *Romper Room* because it's the favourite program of one of your members. So let's not get extreme in your statements.

The fact is you look at the, by and large, the adult population, perhaps some of the teenagers that may be interested. Certainly some parents will buy for their children. But to say that that's part of the market that you would go out and promote and they're excluded, I think, is silly.

I have stated on several occasions this morning, quite properly in my view, that this debate has been a protracted one. The public are aware of it, the public are

tired of it, but the public were aware of it, and that it will have some impact on how Saskatchewan people assess the issue of shares in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. And we will do that assessment after the debate, and I think quite properly. I think quite properly that is the proper way to assess the market and what is necessary to meet the two objectives that I have set out, which is the opportunity to buy; and secondly, if choose not to buy, a comfort that the opportunity was fairly given.

So having said that, I've not restated that several times today and I believe the hon. member from Regina Wascana would like to introduce some guests.

(0945)

Mr. Chairman: — Why is the member on his feet?

Mr. Martin: — Mr. Chairman, I beg leave to . . . would you mind if I introduce our friends from Quebec?

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Martin: — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to take a moment of our time, with the blessings of the members opposite, to introduce some friends from Quebec who are attending the bilingual school at the University of Regina. What we have here today is — I understand you're not allowed to speak French, so I won't endeavour to try and speak French either — however what you see here today is a debate on the potash privatization. Potash, as you know, is a mineral that we have lots of in this province. It's used for fertilizer . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. I would ask the member just to introduce the guests and not to go into debate.

Mr. Martin: — And the members opposite are asking questions of the Minister of Finance. So, Mr. Chairman, would the member opposite and the members here please welcome our guests from Quebec.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

SPECIAL ORDER

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill 20 (continued)

Clause 1 (continued)

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I join with the member to welcome the guests in the gallery.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a number of question to the minister who has been stonewalling this legislature this morning, virtually giving no information whatsoever. I want to deal, Mr. Minister, with the financial position of this province, a contrast of the financial position of when you took over, and the state of the financial position of this province under your stewardship.

Today we sit with a debt, Mr. Minister, of \$3.9 billion in

the Consolidated Fund. We have an additional \$10 billion in Crown corporations. This province has a debt of \$13 billion, and you say you have been building. You say you have been helping the people of Saskatchewan. You say there's so much more we can be.

When you took office this province had the lowest per capita debt in all of Canada. Today we have the highest per capita debt in all of Canada. Today we are offering a sell-off of a valuable resource corporation, and at the same time we have 90,000 people who are part-time workers. We have unemployment, we have people fleeing from this province — 13,000 left this province, out-migration over in-migration, in the first five months.

We are paying on an annual basis, just to service that debt which you created, \$390 million annually. Every man, woman, and child has to contribute more than a dollar each, every day, every day of every week of every month just to service debt. And you say, we are building. Oh boy, building for whom, the people of Saskatchewan ask.

Mr. Minister, this is not the first privatization that your government has introduced. There has been a series of privatizations. And I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, and certainly you should know this as Minister of Finance and certainly as minister of privatization of the potash corporation — you say it's a great thrust for the province to privatize. I'm going to ask you, Mr. Speaker, can you indicate to this House the total amount of revenue that this province has received to date from the sell-off of assets up until the privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan?

We have sold off Saskoil; we've made hundreds of millions of dollars on that. We've sold off SaskCOMP. We sold off Sask Minerals. We sold off PAPCO (Prince Albert Pulp Company). And what has been the consequences for the people of Saskatchewan here? Their debt has mounted — astronomical — to where we have the highest per capita debt in the nation. And when you took over we had the lowest per capita debt anywhere in Canada.

The poverty rate — Saskatchewan is the second highest poverty rate in all of Canada, second only to Newfoundland. You say privatization is working. Those are the bare facts. What about so far as the provincial government? The credit rating has gone down substantially under your administration. But you say we're building.

I want to say, Mr. Minister, can you give a ballpark figure at least, as to the amount of revenue that has been taken in to date in respect to privatization, and the allocation and what it was done. Was that debt retirement or was it not?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Well I have to remind the hon. member, not surprisingly, that we are debating the details of the potash Bill. That information as to the moneys that have come in from the efforts, the privatization efforts to date, is quite properly directed to the Crown Management Board in the Crown Corporations Committee.

Now what I am prepared to do is go and find out what is

the total of those sales to date. But the hon. member has been around long enough — why, I don't know — but he's been around long enough to know what the rules are. That information is readily obtainable that way. Secondly, we have indicated from at the time of the sales what those amounts were. So again, they're all public record.

Now you want us, when we're dealing with potash, to go and get the information dealing with a whole bunch of other departments. You know that that's not the practice, but we'll . . .

An Hon. Member: — Well sit down. If you aren't going to give it, sit down.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — No, I'll finish my answer. You took long enough in your question; I'll finish my answer. So I'll tell you that that's where that information is attainable, it's readily attainable, and it's in the public information, so . . .

An Hon. Member: — On a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. What is the member's point of order?

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, the point of order is the minister gets up time and time again, stonewalling, saying he has no answer, and then speaks and wasters the time of the committee saying he has no answer, and then goes on talking, stonewalling — and we have closure. We know the debate is over at 11 o'clock tonight, and he is spending all the time filibustering in order not to give any answers.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. I've listened to the point of order and I believe that in clause 1 in debate that there is wide-ranging debate allowed on all bill and all motions. But I also — order — I also believe that the minister is allowed to respond as he would see fit. And review of *Hansard* over the years has indicated that all ministers have taken that rule. But I would also ask members to allow the minister to respond with the same courtesy that the members are allowed in placing their questions.

Mr. Koskie: — The point that I want to make, and I know you're embarrassed in respect to it, but what has happened is our debt has risen astronomically. The benefit to the people—there have been cuts, there have been tax increases, debt has increased, interest payments have increased, and you say you are building. You've had privatization going since 1982.'

And I'll tell you, you have sold off a lot of assets. Saskoil, over \$100 million; PAPCO, over 248 million — at least you said. You didn't receive anything — you gave it to them, but you said you sold it for 248 million. You sold off Sask Minerals for 15 million; you sold off highway equipment; you sold off and sold off and sold off. And what has been the consequences for the people of Saskatchewan? Increased debt, increased taxes, cut in services, and more poverty

because we are second highest rate of poverty of any province in Canada other than Newfoundland.

That's the point I was making. I thought you would be proud to stand up here and say, well, we have privatized and this is the amount that we took in. and I thought you would stand up in this legislature and say this is what we did with it. But you're not proud of it because you're trying to pull the wool over the people of Saskatchewan's eyes. That's what you're trying to do. But it's not working, and the polls indicate that, Mr. Minister.

And you couldn't come into this legislature and debate Committee of the Whole normal time. You had to use closure. And you had to come in here and stonewall and deceive the people of Saskatchewan with non-facts.

I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, you can give no answers in respect to the privatization of the potash corporation, but you're going to obviously receive some money I want to ask you, what is the intentions of the government once they sell off the potash corporation, what are they going to do with the money? Are they going to retire the debt which you have burdened the people of Saskatchewan? Or are you going to blow it on some more extravagant electioneering campaign?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Well the hon. member has restated the NDP rhetoric that has been on for four months, and that the public have made it abundantly clear that they no longer believe you.

And let me just respond because it's a statistic that I find one that the NDP tend to put the province in a bad light, and that's the so-called poverty statistic. And it's interesting the way the poverty statistics work, that if someone has zero income they've obviously below the poverty level. And so when our farm net income drops below, up with go that statistical number.

So to put it in perspective, if you're saying every farmer is poor, I don't think that's right. I freely acknowledge some are having serious difficulty. But to extrapolate that is a distortion of the statistical information.

Now what we have said, what we have said and what the Premier has said publicly certainly we expect at least some of the moneys to go into further diversification, and that is the objective of trying to get the potash corporation, which is now a single commodity company, into a more balanced company to offset the cycles.

Secondly, we will be taking the people of this province the question, what should in fact be done with the moneys? And we will be, after the sale . . . well you laugh at it. I don't know what's wrong with going out and consulting with the people of this province. We will go out and ask the people where they the money should in fact be spent. And I think that's proper. And we will consult with the people of this province. The Premier has said that, and we will do that after the issue.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Minister, what are the possible uses for the money? What are the options that you're going to be giving to the people of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I mean I've already indicated one. Further economic diversification is one; whether there are special projects or items that the public feels are worthwhile. The options are limited only by the imagination of the Saskatchewan people, and I happen to hold that in high regard I thin its quite fair and proper for the government to go back and consult with the people of this province as to where in fact this money should go.

Mr. Koskie: — Well just let me get it clear. You're selling off the potash corporation which made \$106 million — you're going to privatize it — turn that over to the private sector, and then you're going to get the proceeds from the sale of the potash corporation, and they you say the potential is to go into other risk ventures?

Is that the interpretation that you're looking at, some of the areas of diversification and risk areas, after what you have already and the people own is a potash corporation with an outstanding future under proper management? But what are you saying? Is that your intentions to sell of the potash and then to use this money that comes in into new forms of investment? Is that what you're saying?

(1000)

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I have said we will — and I believe it's quite proper — that we will consult with the people of this province as to where the money . . .

Mr. Koskie: — I want to be specific here. You have . . . selling off a valuable asset. The debt that you have run upon the people of this province is astronomical. Generations will be paying for the mismanagement and incompetence and corruption of this government. There's no doubt about it. For generations will be paying for the sins and the corruption of that government and incompetence of the government.

And I want to ask you, you've been selling off assets, and further and further is the debt piling up on the backs of ordinary Saskatchewan citizens, and what I want to ask you, that debt that this government has is on the backs of the people of this province — \$390 million annually in interest, over a million dollars a day. I want to ask you, out of the millions of dollars that you've done by selling, selling, selling, this is the consequences; millions of dollars you've taken in sell-off assets. Now you're going to sell off yet another assets, and I ask you, is debt reduction one of the options?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I don't know how I can express it more clearly, what we said we would do. And I've indicated now three times to the hon. member that we are going to consult with the people of this province as to where the proceeds should go. And I've given one. I believe economic diversification will be one that the people of this province will choose.

Now I understand why you don't like to hear the answer that the government's going out to consult as to what we're going to do with the proceeds, but we intend to do it.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Minister, I think what you should have done is consulted with the people of Saskatchewan before you went into this here privatization; then you would have been on. But you're going to dispose of the asset and then you're going to say, well here's what we're going to do — we're going to build some more for you, and you're going to squander the money just like you have done in the past.

And, Mr. Minister, there is no doubt, Mr. Minister, there are some winners. There are some winners in your privatization. There is no doubt about it. There will be an undervaluation of the assets that are sold. And buying Saskoil shares, you had to be blindfolded or have no knowledge not to know that you could make money, a good potential for making money in buying Saskoil shares. And there are winners then.

And the Premier stood up and he talked about some of the winners when he addressed this legislature. And do you know what he said? There are winners with Saskoil. He said, the effective price was 5.34, and that stock is now trading at 11 and that stock is paying dividends. And there are winners, he said.

But I'll ask you, Mr. Minister, how many are participating in Saskatchewan in that? Twenty-five per cent of the shares of Saskoil, and 75 per cent down in eastern Canada. That's where it is. They're participating in our assets.

And I congratulate the government in respect to the issuing of bonds. But just take a look at what the winners get. If you have some money to purchase SaskPower bonds you are a winner. But you know, there were only 40,000 people that were able to purchase SaskPower bonds, somewhere in that neighbourhood.

And the Premier stood up in this House and you know what he said? Everybody's a winner in privatization, public participation, SaskPower bonds. And he said, SaskPower bonds were issues at a hundred dollars, the bonds traded as high as \$118. The \$18 capital gain, he said, is tax free. You'd have to receive \$36 per cent return, he said, in order to get that \$18. And he said, besides there's another 10 per cent on top of that. He said, do you realize that there's 46 per cent in one year — 46 per cent in one year is what the Premier brags about.

I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, that's what's happening — 40,000 participated. They could have, I agree, gave them a good, reasonable rate, but 46 per cent. Who was paying for it? That is borrowed money by the Government of Saskatchewan. That interest has to be paid, and who's paying for it? All of the users across the province.

That's what's happening — 46 per cent — nice return. Participation, you call it. But how many? Forty thousand. How did the Joe on the street who didn't participate, what did he get out of it? Well he helped to pay for the advertising, he helped to pay for the bond share issuing, and that is helping to pay a massive amount in return to those who are privileged in order to be able to participate in the tax break and in the interest rates that you're paying.

Now there's nothing wrong . . . don't get me wrong and don't get up screaming and saying we're against people of Saskatchewan participating in bonds. The federal government has been doing it for years. But just take a look at it and say, how many people have the opportunity to participate? Fifty thousand . . . 40,000, and you say it's a massive success. Saskoil — 25 per cent only. How do those that are outside of it benefit?

Today we own this potash corporation. For better or for worse — God help us, under your management it's for worse. But we own a great asset, a great mining and development we had at the university. We had a funding for it. We were leading in the potash world. And that's all going to be squandered, Mr. Minister, to the multinational corporations and the tycoons from down East, and the people of Saskatchewan pick up the wreckage that is left behind. And the wreckage that is left behind is the astronomical debt that has been laid on the backs of this people.

I'll tell you, under our administration, Mr. Minister, there was some different economic times, I agree, but I'll tell you that there was administration under Alan Blakeney working for the people of this province. You may not have agreed with the ideology, but I'll tell you, he ran this province on a business-like basis for the people of this province. We didn't have the accumulated debt.

And how is the ordinary citizen that is not able to buy shares in this potash corporation, are they going to contribute to the advertising and to the legal fees? Taxpayers' money, of course it is. Are they going to, when the shares jump up because you undervalue the asset, are they going to get a gain? Of course not.

And so I ask you, Mr. Minister, who are the winners and who are the losers? And I think that the losers are the people of Saskatchewan, because throughout the world, if you look at the Japanese economy, they have virtually no resources of their own, and they go around the world and they purchase assets and they take them back and they manufacture, and they're one of the leading industrial countries of the world, buying assets.

Farmers want to own their land; business men want to own their business; Saskatchewan people like to be able to control their economic destiny. And what happens is if you give it into the hands of the few, Mr. Minister, we don't have control of our own economic destiny. And if you don't have control of your own economic destiny, you don't have control of your political destiny. That's because he who pays the piper and has control will dictate the government of the day. That's a known fact across this world.

And what I say to you, Mr. Minister, I'm shocked, I'm really shocked at this government, proceeding as it is with the massive sell-off of assets. Maybe there can be some realignment. Why didn't we, if we're going to privatize, do it over a series of years even, and allow Saskatchewan people, as they could raise the money, to be owners? Why do you have to go to Bay Street? And the Premier stands in this House and attacks eastern Canada for having all the privileges. And here he comes and he offers to eastern Canada one of the great resources, control of

one of the great resources of this province.

And so I just simply say, Mr. Minister, there will be some winners, but boy there's going to be a lot of losers because you'll squander this money like you've squandered the rest. And the people of this province, do you know what they'll be left with is an astronomical debt of \$13 billion with a \$390 million just to pay the interest annually. With the highest per capita debt in the nation, how can you stand in this legislature and say that your economic philosophy is working?

Mr. Minister, that's the problem you have. The people of this province is saying, we gave them a chance; they're going too far. And on this deal, Mr. Minister, you are going too far.

I want to ask you: how does the ordinary fellow on the street who can't participate, how is he a winner when he loses? Now it's owned by the government on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan. Foreign owned — is he better off? Maybe. You'll say, oh there'll be some more jobs and diversification. But you say you have no plans.

So I say, Mr. Minister, could you address the question of who are the winners in this, the big winners, because I don't think we agree.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — We've agreed to disagree through this debate, and the hon. member added absolutely nothing to what was debated yesterday afternoon between the Leader of the Opposition and myself, and the member from Saskatoon Fairview and myself. I think to their credit they articulated it much more rationally.

Let me take a look at the Japan argument. The Japan argument is one of the strangest ones that the hon. member could make, because what he says is absolutely right that Japan is going out and acquiring assets doesn't have the resources. But where does Japan fundamentally get its money? From the people, from the people of Japan that are loaning their money and their pension moneys at 2 and 3 per cent to the large financial institutions in Japan, and that has been the fundamental source, has been the fundamental source. Now their ethic and their culture is such that the people are comfortable doing that and want to do that. That's not realistic in Canada, in my view, North America, different society.

But that is where, I think, one of the largest investors in the world is the post office pension plan in Japan with, I believe 100 and nearly \$200 billion U.S. The railroad pensions, one of the largest companies, huge, huge pools of investment capital from the Japanese people that put their money in these savings accounts at 2 and 3 perhaps 4 per cent, I know is very high. So the people of Japan have in fact put their money into the economic development of their own country.

Secondly, the question of management, and we've now had the third or fourth New Democratic Party members be critical of the management of the potash corporation. The management of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan today is recognize in the industry as perhaps the finest management team of any potash company in the world. And I don't think that the people . . . I know that the

people of this province do not have to in any way apologize for the management of the potash corporation.

And I actually think, I actually think, from the people I've talked to in Saskatoon, some of the union people in the potash corporation, that they believe that the management that we have today in this potash corporation is the best management of any of the potash companies. And I've had that from union leaders within the potash corporation who believe that this management is extremely good.

(1015)

So I tell the hon. member that you sit and criticize the management; in fact, the management team that is in the potash corporation today is recognized in the industry, it's recognized by those that purchase our potash as perhaps the finest team, most credible team in this industry. And that that management, because of its credibility, has put the potash corporation in a position that it was not before; that is the price leader and the leader in the industry.

Before, with the greatest respect, we had size but IMC was the price leader, and it was until 1986. And you can't dispute that. The leadership role has now moved to the potash . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right. And the present president came over . . .

An Hon. Member: — From IMC.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Yes, he came from IMC. And when he came over his skills were such and his abilities are such that that role of leading the industry moved rather quickly, moved within a matter of months to the potash corporation. I think it's a credit to the individual and the team that he has put together.

So then we've talked about the matter of control. And we went through the debate yesterday, nothing new. The NDP believe and equate control and ownership. and we went through that debate. And the hon. member from Saskatoon says, rightly so. And that is their equation.

And I think that that's a dangerous, dangerous equation and a dangerous concept. Because it leads you logically that if you want to control the oil industry, you have to own it. If you want to control a gas industry, the government has to own it. If you want to control a forest industry, the government has to own it. If you want to control all of the mining industry, the government has to own it. If you want to control agriculture, the government has to own it. Those are logical extensions of the fundamental premise put forward by the New Democratic Party that control only comes about through ownership.

We don't ascribe to that. And that is one of the competing differences. In fairness, and we agreed to disagree I think yesterday, unless the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is reconsidering my remarks today, which I doubt — but control equalling ownership has been restated, restated, restated by the New Democratic Party, and if there's been one consistent theme through the whole debate for four months from the New Democratic Party, is that in order to

control, the government must own. And we reject that as a necessary premise. We reject that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — We control, Saskatchewan controls the oil industry, not by ownership, by legislation and regulation and the taxing powers. And the same for the forest. We sign forest management licensing agreements. We don't own the forest industry; we sign licensing agreements — not even legislation, just agreements — and we have the power to do it by legislation.

And I go through the gas industry. Again, we can control and regulate through regulation . . .

An Hon. Member: — You're just stonewalling.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I am not, I am not. I'm responding to the matter raised by the hon. member opposite, and I think in fairness I should be allowed to do it. It may be repetitive but his arguments were repetitive with respect.

So we've talked about that. We've talked about the fundamental difference of control, and I say that your premise and your position is an inherently dangerous one and also one that is not accepted by the vast majority of the people of this province.

So you ask me who benefits. I say that the employees of WESTBRIDGE benefit — 97 per cent have bought shares. I say that the people of Prince Albert, and I say that the employees of Weyerhaeuser, and the new employees as a result of a paper mill, have benefitted. And I say that the people in Saskoil have benefitted. And I say that the province is better off having a much, much stronger company.

So I can go on and on and on as to who benefits. And I suggest that the people of Meadow Lake will benefit. And I suggest that Indian people will benefit in Meadow Lake. You may not like that but I believe that they will benefit. You say they won't; we say they will. They will be the judges and they will be the ones that ultimately determine the issue.

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, the minister has just given us another example of stonewalling in this legislature, taking up time for the purpose of avoiding answering the questions of the opposition.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — After closure was invoked by this government, after they limited the debate, they are attempting to limit further through stonewalling. The minister's response to the member from Quill Lakes completely ignores the history of the potash corporation and the history of the potash industry in Saskatchewan, as was pointed out very aptly by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday, which I'm not going to go into in detail at this point. But when he makes his point about ownership and control, he ignores the facts, he ignores the history, and he ignores the fact that he doesn't have

the powers that he claims he does for regulation of the industry.

The minister had indicated that with respect to the money that he receives from the sell-off of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, that he will consult with the people as to how it is to be spent. I would like the minister to tell us whether or not this money will be going into a special fund, or whether it'll be going into the consolidated revenue, or in what manner he intends . . . or in what way he intends to use this money or dispose of it.

Now I just want to point out, and I think it's important to point out that when the minister talks about consulting with the people, it's very interesting that he has refused to consult and listen to the people about privatization in general, and about privatization of the potash corporation specifically, because the minister knows full well that the majority of people in this province, a very substantial majority, somewhere between 60 to 70 per cent or more, are opposed to his privatization measures, and are opposed to the privatization of the potash corporation. He's not consulting, Mr. Chair, he's not listening, Mr. Chair, but not he's going to consult with the people on the issue of how the money is to be spent.

Mr. Minister, then my question to you is how are you going to deal with this money? Are you going to put it into a special fund, or will it be going into general revenues and then you will ask the people how they want it disbursed?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — The hon. member understood the Crown corporation's report are handled by a holding company, Crown Management Board. Proceeds obviously go there.

Now it may well be that the people say establish a trust. It may well be that the people say that some money should go to native economic development, It may well be that the people say that money should go to economic diversification. I mean, that's why we're going to consult on it. And you have your views as to whether people are opposed. We happen to totally disagree and we're very comfortable with our position.

But even if I were to take your position that we should govern by polls, a position that you've been highly critical of us before, let me tell you what the people of Saskatchewan said when you nationalized the industry. The hon. member freely acknowledges that it was not popular; you did not have the polls on your side. And I'm just responding to your argument. You accuse me of stonewalling when I respond to the arguments that you raise. Am I supposed to sit here and take it and not respond?. No, course not.

So I've indicated what we propose to do, what we propose to do. And you know, you may not like that, but I have stated what the government policy and position is.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, you've said that you're going to consult with the people. We see a situation in Saskatchewan right now with the privatization of the potash corporation where you are selling off — and from

all the reports that I have heard, you will be selling off at a substantially reduced value — a major, major asset in Saskatchewan, owned by the people of Saskatchewan; an asset that has a lifetime of hundreds, if not thousands of years, Mr. Minister, that will bring in substantial revenues to the people of Saskatchewan.

But instead you are in such a rush to sell it off and give it away, Mr. Minister, that you have introduced closure on this legislature without being prepared or coming forth with all the information that is necessary for the people of Saskatchewan to fully judge whether or not this venture of yours is a good venture from the point of view of the people, Mr. Minister.

You have introduced closure, and now you're attempting to stonewall this morning.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — You're selling away the heritage of the people of Saskatchewan, you're selling away the heritage, Mr. Minister, and you're doing it in a rush. And I submit, Mr. Minister, the reason for the rush is that you wish to create a slush fund in a pre-election year, and that that money is going to be used for the re-election for the PC Party, and that's your game plan, Mr. Minister.

In other words, your game plan is short-term gain for the PC Party and its friends, and you do not have at heart the interests of the people of Saskatchewan. We have asked you repeatedly today for information on how much this is costing the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, and you don't know. You don't have any plans for diversifying; you don't know how much the legal fees are going to be; you don't know how much the advertising, advertising your ideological approach and your game plan for a slush fund in a pre-election year, Mr. Minister. You don't have any of the answers. You don't know what you're doing, except that you're bent and determined to sell off the heritage of the people of the province of Saskatchewan for your short-term gain. That is clear, Mr. Minister. That is clear.

With respect to legal fees, you said you didn't know what they were, for example, Mr. Minister. You said you would come forward with whatever information you could, as I understand, as soon as it was available. Well, Mr. Minister, I believe sitting around you there today is a member from one of the law firms who has been probably sending you bills on a monthly basis. Perhaps that member could now tell . . . perhaps that person could now tell you, Mr. Minister, what the extent of the legal fees from the Saskatoon law firm have been to date, Mr. Minister. Could you get me that information?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I have responded to that on numerous questions. You accuse me of stonewalling. I have had to answer questions six, seven, and eight times — same question over and over and over again. I think the stonewalling, quite frankly, is the opposition trying to get this to 11 o'clock tonight.

That's all they're doing. They're filibustering today because they know full well that the questions asked by the hon. member from Riversdale and the member from Fairview yesterday were the insightful questions on

the whole debate, were the legitimate questions on the whole debate, which were the questions which were germane to the debate. We disagree, but they were the two that articulated their party's position, their concerns, the issues as they saw them, in a very rational and very strong and very forthright manner. So we went through that that debate yesterday.

And now we get people seven, eight, and nine times, same question all over. And I know the hon. member from Saskatoon back there will ask the same questions all over and I know the press are just sitting waiting — same questions already, and I've answered them. I've answered them.

So now the hon. member says there's a slush fund. Maybe that's the worry. Maybe that's the worry of the New Democratic Party that they stalled this debate and went through a four-month filibuster, stating that it was going to go on for another . . . indefinitely, not because of the principle, but because of an election timetable. And I think that's a fair accusation that I can make to you.

So what I suggest to the hon. member, fundamentally we believe that you do not have to own to control. We've been through that debate. We've gone through the reasons, and I have now told what the government intends to do with regard to the proceeds from the sale. You may not agree with it. You may not agree with it.

(1030)

You may not like the fact that there are proceeds and the government is going to consult with the people of this province. That's your right. I've stated the position now several times today — several times today — of what we're going to do with it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, what we've seen today is the fact that what you're prepared to do is engage in short-term policies, short-term policies that may have an immediate short-term gain, but do nothing for the people of Saskatchewan on a long-term basis.

And we've seen that in the area of health. No long-term strategic planning by this government whatsoever, just *ad hoc* decisions done on an *ad hoc* basis. And we've seen that prevail throughout your entire government, decisions being made on an *ad hoc* basis, on a short-term basis, with no long-term planning. And that's why, Mr. Minister, your policies aren't working, and that's why we have a \$4 billion deficit in this province, because of your lack of long-term planning for the people of Saskatchewan.

My question to you, Mr. Minister, was: how much has the Saskatoon law firm billed to date? Ask the lawyer; he'll know. It's a simple question, and a simple answer is all that's required.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Now we went again through the debate yesterday with the Leader of the Opposition, and we talked about competing visions. And I indicated what the strategy was. Now, I'm quite happy to repeat that. We

believe that we must use every economic lever that we possibly can to create economic diversification.

The difference, the fundamental differences between the NDP and us, is that, with the greatest respect, you are ideologically hidebound and only believe that the government had to buy assets. And your record was clear. Your record is irrefutable. The first thing you did was cancel the Meadow Lake pulp mill; the second thing you did was Intercon; the third thing you did was buy potash; the fourth thing you did was buy PAPCO. That's the choice that you made in economic development.

An Hon. Member: — And farm land.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I never . . . no, I disagree with my colleagues on this side when they say farm land, the purchase was a matter of economic development. I believe it was an ideology and a philosophy as to dealing with agriculture that the NDP had, and I don't attribute land back to economic development.

So I have said, we have taken every lever. We've had government involvement; we've had private sector involvement; we've worked with the co-op movement — we've done all of those, and we'll continue to do so. But we took two new courses that the NDP rejected. The first one is the people themselves as individuals, they are getting the vehicles and the opportunities to invest in the economic development of this province. We believe that to be right, we believe it to be vital, and we believe that the people of this province believe it is a good idea

And the other area that the NDP very pointedly missed and excluded, and that is the employees themselves of the various corporations having an ability and an option and a right to go out and take an ownership position in the very companies that they're working for.

So there is a difference. The Leader of the Opposition and I went through this debate yesterday. I've laid out the strategy. I've laid out the long-term strategy that we are going to have to use, every vehicle and every lever that we have, and that's what we're doing. I didn't ask the repeating questions. Don't accuse me of stonewalling. You've asked the same question that the leader of the Opposition asked yesterday.

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Mr. Minister, I've had the last two days, I guess, day and a half, to listen to some of the arguments that have taken place between yourself and members on our side of the House with regard to this privatization of PCS. And I want to remind you, Mr. Minister, that in March of 1988, your privatization minister, Graham Taylor, the member from Wolseley, published what he called the objectives . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. I just bring to the members' attention that we're not to refer to members by their name but by their seat.

Ms. Atkinson: — Your minister of privatization published what he called the objectives and guide-lines of the PC privatization strategy. And I just wanted to repeat for the members opposite personal knowledge, some of those objectives. And there were three of them. The first

objective was that privatization would lead to full benefit for the use of public assets to increase employment and create economic and investment opportunity.

And if you look at what's happened to date under your leadership, Mr. Minister, we have seen 200 workers at Cory get the heave ho under your privatization objective. It has not meant increased employment for the workers at PCS. Under your leadership, Mr. Minister, as you've prepared to have this corporation privatized, the number of workers have fallen by 1,000 at PCS under your leadership. If you look at what's happened in this province in terms of economic and investment opportunity, all of the economic indicators show us that the economy of our province is not thriving, and in fact, investments in this province are down substantially under your leadership.

The second objective of your privatization strategy was to ensure that there would be increased opportunities for personal and employee ownership. And you've admitted it in this House in the last couple of days that you don't anticipate that many Saskatchewan citizens having the opportunity to have shares or will have shares in this privatized PCS. Forty-five per cent of the shares will be owned by foreign investors. Most of the shares will go to people outside of Saskatchewan. You hope you're hoping and hoping and praying that maybe 50,000 people in Saskatchewan will take the opportunity to invest in this privatized PCS. So it won't mean improved or increased personal ownership.

And then the third objective of your privatization strategy is to ensure a more effective and efficient public services at good value for money and since you've gotten on this wavelength, we've seen what's happened in this province in terms of public service. We have a horrendous crisis in the Department of Health. People in this province no longer have faith in that department or in the Minister of Health. We have horrendous line-ups waiting to get into hospital. We have people waiting to get home care. We have children waiting to get rehabilitative services through occupational therapy and physical therapy. The health services in this province have never been so poor.

All we have to do is look at other services like the Department of Highways, and we see those services deteriorating.

So you've had three objectives and guide-lines, according to your minister of privatization, that we could judge privatization on. And in my view, Mr. Minister, you have failed, failed, failed through your sell, sell, sell mentality. You have absolutely failed on all counts, all counts.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — Now it's interesting, you say that this privatization will lead to diversification in our province, but you don't have any plans. You say that the privatization of PCS will mean an expansion in this province, but you don't have any plans — you can't give us any details.

You say that this will mean more personal investment in the potash industry in Saskatchewan by Saskatchewan people, but when you look at your own figures and if you look at what's happened in other privatization deals, that's simply not been the case. Saskatchewan people have not come out in droves and bought up these shares.

We know who has come out in droves. They've been people outside of Saskatchewan and they've been a few wealthy friends of the Tory Party.

Then we ask you some questions that are simple and only require simple answers about what this is going to cost us: what's it going to cost us in terms of advertising; what's it going to cost us in terms of legal fees; what has it cost us in terms of accounting fees; because we know Pemberton Houston Willoughby has worked on this deal for the last year; we know that Robert Stromberg in Saskatoon has worked on this deal for the last several months, night and day; we know that — but you don't have the courage to tell us what the figures are because, Mr. Minister, you want to stonewall the process.

You've had the opportunity in this House to provide us with some answers I the last couple of days and you've failed to do that. You've failed to do that. And you've simply failed to provide the answers because you want to muzzle the opposition through closure, and then you want to sit twiddling your thumbs for the next few days until you get it over with, and you can go on to bigger and better things, and that's rewarding your friends in the private sector.

Now what I find extremely interesting, Mr. Minister, this morning is that you said up until 1986, IMC was the leader in the industry, and in 1986, PCS became the leader in the industry. And what I find so interesting, Mr. Minister, is that is the time that Mr. Chuck Childers, your president of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, came over to PCS. That's when he came over. And so the question that one has to ask themselves is now why would that be? Why would it be that Chuck Childers is at IMC up until 1986 and they're leading the industry, Chuck Childers comes over to PCS in 1986 and all of sudden PCS is leading the industry, and you say somehow this is good? This is due to miraculous management; that it's due to good management.

Well I would suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that this is a possible scenario. There is no question, there is no question that the private potash industry in this country and in North America has never liked the idea of a publicly owned potash company in the province of Saskatchewan. They've simply not liked that idea. They've simply not liked it, and they have been waiting, they have been waiting for some time to get a minister of Finance like yourself to come along, and a government like yourself to come along so that they could go in there and get rid of it. And you know, Mr. Minister, you have provided them with the opportunity.

And my colleague, the member from Elphinstone said early today that Mr. Childers is a smart man, and you're right and he's right. He's a smart man. He knows a sucker when he sees him. This industry has been waiting for some time, Mr. Minister of finance, been waiting for

some time to come in here and do in public enterprise.

And I see Mr. Childers is kind of smiling and laughing, and I appreciate that, because, Mr. Minister, he knows a sucker when he sees him. He knows a sucker when he sees him, and you've been fooled. You've been fooled, and so what we will see, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan turned over to the large multinational corporations through the foreign ownership content — through the foreign ownership content, Mr. Minister.

And I would ask you, Mr. Minister, why it is, why is it that PCS all of a sudden turned around in 1986 when Mr. Childers came over from IMC, and up until 1986 IMC led the industry? Why would that be? And, Mr. Minister, were you taken in by a guy that had a lot of brains and knew a good deal when he saw it?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Well I'll quickly correct, and it was my error, it was '87 not '86. It's okay, but that's not germane to the debate or to the attack.

But we have gone through a long dissertation repeating . . . and again, I'm the one being accused of stonewalling. Right? And yet the hon. member from Quill Lakes, the member from Prince Albert; we know we'll get them from the member at the back. I'll make a wager that we'll get the same arguments. We'll get them from the hon. member in Saskatoon Sutherland. I'll predict, I got a little more confidence as I watched the development of the member from Regina Victoria that he won't be totally repetitive, but he's the only one over there. I know the hon. member from Saskatoon University will be quite repetitive, will be quite repetitive, and a few that I'm sure will join the debate.

But in fact the hon. member's made allegations in health care. The fact is that the public doesn't buy your argument. The public knows full well that waiting lists are dropping and dropping dramatically in Saskatoon. The number of surgeries are up since 1982, some 65 per cent. The number of more in-patient beds and patient care staff in Saskatoon, additional surgical procedures in Saskatoon, constructed special care home beds — and I think the hon. member in fairness will be there for the official opening of the new St. Paul's Hospital, and I'm sure she will be, I'm sure she will be — new day surgery, new day surgery in Saskatoon; expanded day surgery at St. Paul's Hospital; automated information system on waiting lists.

(1045)

An Hon. Member: — This is the best stonewall I've ever seen here.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Look, I'm responding to the attacks made by the hon. member opposite, and I think that that's fair, that's fair. What we saw is a restatement, and I am a bit surprised, a bit surprised of the ideologically hidebound ideology of the NDP from the hon. member. I'm somewhat disappointed; I'm somewhat disappointed.

But I'm going to tell you why — and I had said this

yesterday to the Leader of the Opposition — why someone of Mr. Childers' talents and abilities is able to have an influence on the potash industry by virtue of his accession to the presidency of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. And it didn't happen before; it didn't happen before Mr. Childers' arrival.

And I said before and I said yesterday that the potash industry, notwithstanding the size of the capital investment or the amount of potash that's sold, the potash industry worldwide is very small in number of the people that make decisions — very small. I would suspect when the fertilizer institute meets that they may have 2 or 300 people. We have cartels in Europe; we have Russia a major producer; Dead Sea producers tonne by countries — very few; great amount of tonnage, but very few influential decision-makers involved.

Then we have the buyers. Major buyers tend to be countries except in the United States, and in the United States we have major farm organizations that will buy on behalf of farmers. So when we look at the size of the industry in terms of either sales or production or capital investment, it doesn't reflect the fact that the number of decision-makers and influencers are relatively few.

And so individuals within that number, that have personal integrity or influence, are influential and are respected, and so you have to recognize that. And that's why, when someone of Mr. Childers' abilities and talents becomes the president of the potash corporation — he has those skills, he has that credibility, as well as being president of the largest producer in the free world — so very quickly, and I say it's a matter of months, that the potash corporation went from a position of having size on its side and that was it — the leader, the price influencer was IMC — then that changed over to the potash corporation, where it should be, in my opinion. But understand the reasons why it happened. It happened because it's a very small number of people that make decisions in that industry. So they are related. I said it earlier, they are related.

But I also say, and I don't think I'm being unfair, if you want to make broad allegations, I think you expect me to reply. And that's precisely what I'm doing. And I had a very short reply to the number of allegations made by the member opposite.

Ms. Atkinson: — Now, Mr. Minister, as you said, there's a very small number of people in the industry, and it is possible — because it seems somewhat strange that PCS could make such a dramatic recovery and switch-over in a matter of month — and it is possible, because of Mr. Childers' connections to IMC, and IMC had been the leader, that it is possible that IMC gave it to Mr. Childers for a while, in preparation for the privatization of PCS.

Now, Mr. Minister, my colleague from the Quill Lakes asked you who the winners and loser are in privatization, and it seems to me that we know some of the winners will be the lawyers, some of the winners will be the accountants, the brokers, the advertisers, many foreign interests, perhaps some of the large multinationals. Who else will be the winners in this, Mr. Minister?

We know who the losers have been in the past. We know who the losers have been — the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, the 400 highways workers that lost their jobs, the 25 per cent of the labour force over at Saskoil that lost their jobs, the 70 workers at SED Systems that lost their jobs, the 400 dental workers that lost their jobs when the dental plan was privatized — we know that.

We know that the losers in the privatization of PAPCO were the people of Saskatchewan because we, in essence, gave our forests to Weyerhaeuser of Tacoma, Washington. We lost ownership. We know that the losers in the Sask Minerals privatization were the taxpayers of Saskatchewan because this company was undervalued and sold to Premier Cdn of Quebec and Kam-Kotia of Ontario for a song. We know that the losers when Manalta Coal, or when the coal-mine was sold to Manalta Coal from SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation) were the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. And we know who the losers have been.

But I want to know who the winners are going to be in this particular privatization. Will the winners be IMC or will the winners be the People's Republic of China, or will the winners be some people in Tokyo or Japan or Korea or the United States? Who are the winners?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Well the hon. member is having a rather superficial look at the issue. And I'm going to remind the hon. member, and I will acknowledge that she did not participate in the decisions, but certainly the member from Regina Centre was a vital cog in the machinery of government of the day, and let me tell you who a big loser was, and I think people will be quite interested.

One of the companies bought out by the New Democratic Party under the then deputy premier was Alwingsal, a mine here in Saskatchewan. The moneys were paid to the French and German interests. Do you know what the French and German interests did with Saskatchewan taxpayers' money? You know what they did? They took the money from the Saskatchewan people, given to them by the New Democratic Party, took their money, went down to New Brunswick, build a new mine in New Brunswick to compete with Saskatchewan potash — to compete with Saskatchewan potash. You talk about losing. You compounded the losses, you compounded the losses. Not only did you take Saskatchewan money from the people; you turned it over and you gave it to the multinationals; the multinationals came back and built a new mine that took away market share from the very workers and the people of this province. That's precisely what you did. And you have to admit, you have to admit that that decision was wrong. That decision was terribly, terribly wrong.

And I believe that some of the people involved in making that decision did not anticipate that Alwingsal would take its money or the interest and build in New Brunswick. I think, if they had of thought that through, that they wouldn't have bought that. I really believe that. But they didn't think it through and it turned out to be a tragic mistake.

So I've gone back through who would be the winners. The NDP say that the people of Prince Albert are losers because this government sold PAPCO to Weyerhaeuser. They believe that. The NDP believe that the new employees, 200-and-some more at Prince Albert in the paper mill, are losers. I don't have to subscribe to that, but that's your position.

The NDP say that the employees of WESTBRIDGE — and we now are up to another, I think they're up to 1,300 employees. When SaskCOMP was around, it was 200-and-some, certainly not all in Saskatchewan, but a large percentage of them here. I don't think that the employees of WESTBRIDGE are losers as the NDP say they are. I think that they're benefitting by the privatization

Your argument is no longer correct on Saskoil, wasn't 25 per cent, first of all. But secondly, if you've been reading the papers over the last year, Saskoil in its expansion has moved its offices from Calgary back there. There, they were in Calgary under the NDP. They've been moved back here.

Secondly, Saskoil with its expansion has been hiring more and more people, so that the numbers, I'm informed, are now higher . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, no, they did not. I will grant you, I will grant you this, that the potash corporation has had a substantial reduction in the number of employees, not due to privatization, although you can make your tie, but dealing with the state of the industry, the productive capacity, and the fact that Lanigan came on stream, which is a much more, as I think acknowledged by the member from Fairview, a much more technologically efficient shaft. So those factors did come into play. So they did come into play.

And in fairness, the production of the corporation still maintained, the efficiency of the corporation's been very much maintained, and some difficult decisions. And we've taken our criticism from the opposition, in many cases the employees, the unions, and those affected, we took those. We made difficult decisions.

The argument that the NDP have made today that in the case, for example, of SED Systems, that the government should, in fact, subsidize to keep people working. There's tremendous changes in technology. To blame that on privatization, again is not a fair argument.

An Hon. Member: — Oh, stop trying to run out the clock.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I'm just responding to the hon. member. I'm just responding. She talked about SED Systems, so I'm responding to her. She talked about hospitals, so I'm responding to her. She talked about potash employees; I'm responding to her. She talked about Weyerhaeuser; I'm responding to her. She talked about WESTBRIDGE; I'm responding to her.

So you want to repeat the same questions? I'm going to respond to them. You're the ones repeating. I'm not going beyond the bounds of the matters that you're raising. So it's your choice; don't repeat the questions if you don't want the same answers back.

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I thank the ministry of truth for giving me three minutes at the end of the morning to ask a question.

Mr. Minister, we began the day by asking you what the amount of the commissions were. We heard it was \$20 million. You've been embarrassed by the information and you've been stonewalling us ever since on every other subject. You won't tell us how much you're spending on advertising and promotion. We suspect it's a very larger figure. You won't tell us what you're spending on legal fees. We also suspect that is also a very larger figure, and we suspect that many of the people of Saskatchewan think there's a better use for such money than on advertising and legal fees.

Mr. Minister, let me ask a question which perhaps might not embarrass you. There seems to be little about this subject which doesn't embarrass you but let me try one area which might not. Is there, Mr. Minister, an intention that when the shares go on sale, small orders will be filled first? That was what was done, I believe, with some previous issues. Is there an intention, Mr. Minister, that small shares, say lots of 100, will be filled first in case there's any over-subscription?

And given the fact that you are selling these shares at a fraction of what they're worth, it's quite obvious, Mr. Minister . . . I shouldn't say it's quite obvious, but it's quite possible that it will be over-subscribed. So I ask you, Mr. Minister, do you intend to repeat that? Will there be any restrictions . . . The question is: will there be any restrictions on the filling of orders? Are they to be filled on a first come, first service basis or is there some other intention here?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I'm going to assume that you're referring to the Saskatchewan market when you ask that question. Well the objective will be to have as many people buy shares as possible. I can't give you exactly how that will be done, but obviously we will try and get the greatest number of Saskatchewan people investing.

So whether there will be an allocation or not, I can't say, because there may well be, depending on take-up, that everybody will be fully satisfied in Saskatchewan as to the number of shares that they can get. But our objective, as I said yesterday, was Saskatchewan people and workers first. We will try and make sure that they are satisfied and will get the shares that they are offering to purchase.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly recessed until 1 p.m.