

Mr. Hawkes: —and we create better quality jobs and more jobs. There are now 14 privatization proposals on the table. We have completed a number of those, and this happens in every single case. Every single time we get the same stupid, foolish argument.

It is common sense and it is logical that if we take two smaller units in the same business, we reduce the input costs in part in terms of administration, research and development—

Mr. Benjamin: Baloney! That is not true.

Mr. Hawkes: It happens every single time. That is why there are so many mergers of private sector companies. They want to reduce their overhead costs. They become more aggressive as marketers because they have people out in more centres trying to sell their goods and products. We have mergers all the time because they end up with a healthier corporation which does a better job, with happier employees when there is employer ownership, and that is part of this proposal. All these positive things happen.

We have a lot of important issues coming up in this country such as free trade, abortion, and so on, but the NDP, for some set of silly, bloody reasons, has decided to drive us into a fourth day of debate with two mouths. The Leader of the Party stands in the House and says this should go to committee soon, and the back-benchers of the NDP Party stand up and filibuster and move silly motions to try to kill a piece of legislation. What is this country coming to? Is the NDP Party going to stand in this Chamber and do what is right and it is best for the Canadian people or is it going to continue to behave in a nonsensical, ideologically nonsensical way?

Mr. Waddell: Call an election, then.

Mr. Hawkes: Which are they going to do?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is that the question?

Mr. Hawkes: That is the question. What are they going to do?

Mr. McCurdy: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think the Hon. Member in his fit of apoplexy must have lost track of the English language and the appropriate way to refer to Parties in this House. It is the New Democratic Party. We are not having a party. It is a political Party.

An Hon. Member: Come on, sit down!

An Hon. Member: Order!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I will allow the Hon. Member a minute to answer the question.

Mr. Althouse: Mr. Speaker, I think that if the Hon. Member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes) had been paying full attention to my speech he would have noted that I did not take very much time at all on ideological arguments. I was dealing with economic arguments. I am a person from Saskatchewan,

a person who pays taxes there and who is an owner of SMDC through the Government of Saskatchewan. As such, I cannot see the economic advantages for me as a Saskatchewan taxpayer of taking over part of the debt of this company. As a Canadian taxpayer, I cannot see the advantages of being saddled with the balance of the debt.

● (1140)

Saskatchewan already has the advantage of having most of the good concentrates and good ores in the uranium field. We do not particularly need this deal. The deal that is being offered apparently permits SMDC to have some options on facilities Eldorado Nuclear had that SMDC might buy for a very low price. The point I was making is that this low price is in fact a problem for me as a Canadian taxpayer and also as a Saskatchewan taxpayer, because I am concerned about why we need this deal.

Saskatchewan has all the advantages in the uranium industry. If we want to develop it, we can develop it at our own speed. We are sitting on several hundred years of the best uranium mines anywhere in the world. We are in charge of them. I do not think that there is any advantage to me either as a Canadian taxpayer or a Saskatchewan taxpayer to go through with this deal.

I have not seen any data presented by the government side to convince me or my colleagues or my neighbours that it is a good deal. Although this debate may have gone on for a short time on three or four different days, that data is still lacking. Through the motion of my hon. friend from Regina West, we are trying to give the Government an opportunity to present that information to us. What will be the advantage to the Canadian taxpayer and to the Saskatchewan taxpayer?

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to have this opportunity to participate in a debate which, in the view of my Party and of my House Leader, is one which should be pursued. If there is anything silly about the motion that was introduced by my hon. colleague, it is that it has elicited a silly, obscene response from the Hon. Member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes).

The Hon. Member alleges that this debate is based on some ideological imperative. Let us make it clear that the question of privatization is not subject to ideological imperatives. That is a fact and a consideration that I wish the government Party would take into account.

Mr. Hawkes: That's what you say every time. No common sense—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): There will be an opportunity for questions and comments later.

Mr. McCurdy: What I said is like a worm that drew a fish to speak. It is not this Party which has raised the issue of the ideological content of privatization, it is the Government.