

## EVENING SITTING

## GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

## Time Allocation

**Mr. Goulet:** — Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the listeners who are just starting to listen to the debate, I'll do a recap then of the overview. We are this evening, we're debating the super-closure motion that the Tory government has introduced which will essentially limit the debate to two days. And it also limits each member to 20 minutes on the debate; regardless of how many amendments are brought in, each member is only allowed an allotted 20 minutes. And also, too, on third reading, a total of two hours is allocated.

I guess what I did mention at the beginning was that this whole issue was centred in around democracy and the freedom of speech and freedom of debate by individual MLAs in the House, and that this closure, this super-closure motion, which some members are calling time allocation, and historical documents will also call the guillotine, is basically a position that has been strongly opposed by leading parliamentarians, not only in Europe, but also in North America; and more particularly, I mentioned, the strong opposition that was brought forth by the late John Diefenbaker in the '56 pipeline debate, and also Mr. Coldwell and Stanley Knowles.

And I gave very strong quotes on their opposition, and basically their opposition was one where they stated: number one, the reason why these closure motions are introduced and the reason why they go against the democratic rights of debate and the freedom of speech in the House is because they stated that it's meant to silence the opposition. The right to oppose is, therefore, taken away by the motion of closure.

The other aspect to the closure motion which I have mentioned before is that it not only silences the individual members. It silences the people, it puts a muzzle on the people in the sense that their representative cannot put the people's views out in front in the legislative process.

I also mentioned that it was extremely important because of the poor written coverage that the potash debate has taken, that it was very important that a stronger debate and a longer debate take place in the legislature so that people can not only understand the historical overview of potash, but also the sociological and economic realms of potash development.

So basically I went also through the history where this was introduced. The first closure was introduced back in 1881, introduced in Canada in 1913. And one of the major debates I was getting into was the 1956 pipeline debate at the House of Commons, and that's where I made the quotes.

And I also mentioned that this closure has historic significance because it puts aside all roles of the House and puts at precedent the closure motions. And it's of historic significance because no leader in the history of Saskatchewan had ever used this closure motion. No

government, whether Conservative, Liberal, CCF (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation), or NDP has ever, ever, ever used the closure motion. Everybody has recognized, in the history of Saskatchewan, that the closure motion is something that goes against the grain of the democratic nature of our legislative institution, and it simply hasn't been part of the Saskatchewan heritage.

Before I get into the substance of the debate, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to also make a few more quotes from expertise in the field and their comments on the issue of closure. I will start out by a quote on Erskine May on the 17th Edition, page 474, and this one is quoted in an article called the *Allocation of Time: The Guillotine and Voluntary Timetabling* by John Palmer. This article is written in *Parliamentary Affairs*, Volume XXIII, 1969-1970, page 232-247. And I quote from page 232-233. It says:

The guillotine is the ultimate deterrent. The "extreme limit to which procedure goes in affirming the rights of the majority at the expense of the minorities in the House . . ."

And I mentioned that it did come from Erskine May, page 474, 17th edition.

Notice that one of the top experts, Mr. May, has suggested this the extreme of any procedure that can be used in the House. This is the extreme of the extremes.

As I talk with people, a lot of them have suggested that the government was moving more and more in certain particular realms in a more extreme direction. And the utilization of this particular motion to guillotine or to cut off debate is a sign that the hard-liners in the PC Party have taken control of the executive of the government; that indeed probably, I might state, that many of the front-bench hard-liners have had their way in finally coming out with one of the most undemocratic tools that even an expert such as Erskine May, which he happens to say, is the extreme.

This extreme view, of course, is not going to be taken lightly by the members of the opposition and by the people of Saskatchewan, because the democratic rights of people, the democratic right to speak, the democratic aspect of being heard, the fact that the government in the past six years have silenced a lot of people and have put a lot of fear into people's lives because of the fact that many had lost their jobs in '82 and even post-82, and the fact that this type of extreme thinking still exists with the PC Tory Party in the second decade . . . in their second term and towards the end of their second term, it shows very clearly that the implied threat that privatization would not only be in potash but in all of SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation) and many other areas, including health, is not something to be completely disregarded; that it indeed hides there by the simple fact in regards to this latest aspect where the democratic right to speak in the legislature is absolutely crushed by the government in power today. So the hard-liners have indeed taken over in regards to how this government is run.

I also looked at certain aspects of other parliamentarians, parliamentary experts, and I would look at the study by

Josef Redlich. The title of the book is *The Procedure of the House of Commons, a Study of its History and Present Form* and this is one of the historical books on parliamentary procedure that is always quoted from in many of the academic journals. What Redlich says in the development of procedure in regards to the issue of the majority position and the minority position in the party is as follows. On page 49, volume 1 of the 1908 edition, he writes:

The most important of these characteristics which must be dwelt on here rests upon the recognition of the perfect equality of all members of the House: it is the assertion of freedom of parliamentary action, for each individual member and for the House as a whole, within the limits laid down by custom and enactment. Hence has grown a principle which is especially distinctive of English parliamentary life — the principle of *the protection of the minority* as the fundamental basis of parliamentary government.

Mr. Speaker, implicit in the statement are two aspects: one is the individual rights of members of the legislature; and also the rights of the minority opposition. I think that the statement by Redlich in this case is a very important aspect of the debate that we're getting into, which is the aspect of the right to oppose and the right to speak and debate. And I fully agree with this important characteristic of our parliamentary history and parliamentary tradition.

Another aspect that I've always picked up on in the debates from the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that we have made lengthy speeches. I might add that these lengthy speeches have been full of sound historical information, and they have also been dealing with the various aspects of each debate that goes on. And I would like to state what Sir Erskine May has to say. And this one again is from the book by Redlich on page 81. He said:

(1915)

The development of freedom (this is on Erskine May), he says, has enormously increased the desire to speak in the House. Delays and even obstructions must not always be regarded as illegitimate parliamentary weapons, as they afforded the means of collecting the opinions of constituencies and the public. For the future, on important legislative proposals, long debate might always be reckoned on.

Two points on this particular quote by Erskine May. I think it's very important to recognize that the debate that is put forth by the individual members of the opposition and the fact that the government is muzzling the opposition is that a lot of the opinions of the people of Saskatchewan are put through the words of the individual MLA, and that the public at large is therefore being put down in a direct way by the utilization of the weapon of closure.

The other aspect is that it must be expected that when important issues are debated in this House, that when there are various changes in regards to various directions

in the House, and substantive philosophies and directions are changing, that proper debate has to take place. And there is no way that major shifts in governmental strategy, even if they don't have the mandate of the people, even if what was not stated before the election that this would be brought out, even if all of this has been there, the fact still remains that the public in the long run, the public that's out there in the long run can listen to the debates whether or not they are long, medium, or short.

The basis of any debate is whether or not it has qualitative significance. Some of the worst nonsense you can hear sometimes in the legislature are stated in two words, and some of the most qualitative gems could also be stated in two words. But the same also holds true in medium scale or long scale debate. So the question of the qualitative nature of debates is what is at issue, rather than the length.

As I also looked at another section, I also examined the 17th Edition of Erskine May which again is reprinted in the article by Palmer. He says:

. . . the allocation of limited amounts of time to the stages of bills, and occasionally other kinds of business, forms no part of the general procedure of the House, but is applied in each case . . . by a special order.

You'll notice that in the news release and, of course, in the last comment of the motion, it reads:

That consideration of Bill No. 20 pursuant to this motion be a special order of this Assembly to be called immediately and after orders of the day.

A mistake in regards to Erskine May's comments, that it forms no part of the general procedure of the House, is an important aspect because it does get away from the general rules of the House. It's very important for people who are listening to know that this particular rule is being introduced for the first time in the history of the Saskatchewan legislature.

I mentioned before, no leader or no government in the history of Saskatchewan had dared challenge the democratic rights of individual members to speak in this House. It's only taken a right-wing, hard-line government for the first time to introduce such an extreme measure in the House, where they said that they wanted us to be back in the House to debate, and yet they chose not to debate themselves. So this is an extreme measure in regards to parliamentary tradition.

I would also like to get into the area in Canadian parliamentary tradition in regards to statements made by Eugene Forsey. This article, of course, is under a book edited by J.A.G. Griffith, and the book was entitled *Public Law: the Constitutional and Administrative Law of the Commonwealth*, written in 1957. In it, Eugene Forsey had an article entitled the "Constitutional Aspects of the Canadian Pipe line Debate," and this debate formulated some of the more recent aspects of the issue of closure, which of course John Diefenbaker was vehemently against. He spoke at great lengths against the whole issue of the undemocratic nature of the closure motions and the

fact that it tries to get away from the truth, and it's simply a way of challenging people.

I will quote from the fact of . . . the aspect of speech which was related by Forsey in his article on page 12. He states:

Parliamentary government is not just a matter of counting heads instead of breaking them. It is also a matter of using them. It is a government by discussion, not just by majority vote . . . essentially, a talking place, a *parlement*.

These are very important words by one of the leading experts on Canadian parliamentary history. And Mr. Eugene Forsey says:

While voting is very important, the essence of a democracy of a democratic institution such as the parliament or legislature is a fact that people have to debate . . .

People have to speak, people have to bring forth the ideas of the public; people have to bring forth the ideas of farmers; people have to bring forth the ideas of small business, of workers, of women, of Indian and Metis people, of youth, of many others who live in the province. And the essence of a democracy is therefore the right to speak in the legislature.

And again, for those who are just listening, we are debating the closure motion where the right to speak of an individual member is going to be eliminated after two days debate.

The other aspect that has been raised by the members opposite has been the whole issue of obstruction. Many times they say we are obstructing the House because of the debates that are an important and integral part of the legislature. And this is a statement again by Eugene Forsey on page 18:

On a great issue of public policy, a Government defeated in Parliament is entitled to appeal from Parliament to the people, because it believes the existing Parliament has lost the confidence of the people. Equally, on a great issue of public policy, an Opposition facing certain defeat in Parliament is entitled first to try to rouse public opinion and so force the government to back down; and secondly, if that fails, to try to force an appeal from Parliament to the people, and for precisely the same reason which entitles a defeated Government to appeal: that it believes the existing Parliament has lost the confidence of the people.

In this case, in this particular quote, we are seeing that debates are a very important aspect of getting public opinion participating in the legislative process. Without the information, there is no debate; without the information, the public will not be able to formulate their opinions based upon the facts that are reproduced. They will only hear them on hearsay. In fact, dealing directly with the debates in the legislature can get the people on the first hand to develop a sounder public opinion on which various facts can be weighed from what is debated in the legislature.

Mr. Eugene Forsey furthermore states that:

A Government makes its appeal by dissolution. An opposition makes its appeal by trying to force dissolution, by obstruction . . . Used, as it should be, and almost always has been in Canada, only for the gravest reasons, it is a legitimate and indeed essential part of the parliamentary system; in the last resort, with the Government's power of dissolution, the only way of keeping Parliament responsible to the people.

So obstruction, when it comes down to debating issues at length, is an important part of parliamentary tradition; that indeed, that form of obstruction which the government calls simple obstruction is part and parcel of our parliamentary system.

And an expert such as Forsey agrees that it has its rightful place because no government can just go ahead and not be opposed by whatever it does, whether it means dismantling the dental plans, or prescription drug plans, or selling off Saskatchewan Power Corporation, or whatever. The right to oppose always has to be there, and the right to debate at length is an important part of the parliamentary aspect. And the members opposite simply call it obstruction, but it's also an important part of our parliamentary process.

The other thing that is stated by Mr. Forsey in relation to the pipe line debate, which was a debate on closure in Canada back in 1956, he also states in regards to majorities and their responsibility. It says, quote, page 25:

They had no understanding that parliamentary government rests on the rule of law: that the Government must not break the rules any more than any private member; that majorities are not enough; that they must be majorities acting within the rules.

When we look at this government in the past while, Mr. Speaker, they have simply not operated within the rules in many cases. Whether it was not following the law in regards to the auditor and the auditor's report and not giving out 50 per cent of the information required by the auditor, by hiding the facts on privatization, by hiding the facts on joint corporations, this has been one of the most serious mistakes that this government has made in the past while.

And we look at the fact that when SPC was put out and the energy aspect was going to be sold, they bypassed regulations and the Securities Commission so their whole process of privatization has been replete with the fact that they have not followed the law as stated out and laid out in the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan. As such, therefore, in many cases, a majority is not fit to govern. In many cases a majority, when it only uses brute force, the brute sum of majority to put forth an issue that is not acceptable to the people of the province of Saskatchewan, when a government can stoop that low, then we are in a serious mess. Some people have called this issue the gigamess of Saskatchewan history.

(1930)

The other aspect of the debate on closure by Forsey, and I quote on page 25. In regards to the people, he says that, in regards to the government of the day when they introduced closure he says this:

They had no understanding that parliamentary government rests on unwritten conventions of self-restraint and fair play; that if any one part of it uses all its legal power it can wreck the whole thing. All their conduct showed that.

The had no understanding of the sacredness of an Opposition, of the fact that the decisive difference between parliamentary democracy and "people's democracy" is the existence of a freely functioning Opposition, an Opposition with a means of becoming the Government peacefully, decently and in order.

I think it's very important to state, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Forsey recognizes the freedom of the opposition members to speak freely in the House and not be muzzled. Mr. Eugene Forsey recognizes the fact that the opposition has to have the right to oppose. Closing debate after a particular time simply because the government is in trouble is not a good enough excuse.

The fact that the government is low on the polls, and they know it from their own polling, the fact that the majority of the people in the province are very worried about the way they are operating, whether it's dealing with the gigamess or the fact of the high taxes, or whatever, people are becoming very, very disappointed and disillusioned with this government. And the only way to get around that disillusionment is sometimes to bring out the facts, that indeed the truth that is brought out in the legislature is an important part of people and their democracy, that a parliamentary democracy cannot function properly without the knowledge that the people can have in order to function on a daily basis. And I think as we go on in this debate, that will be stated time and again.

In regards to the aspect of a . . . he makes another comment on obstruction on page 26. He says that — and again I'm quoting Mr. Eugene Forsey:

. . . the Government and the presiding officers showed no understanding that obstruction is a necessary part of the parliamentary system. They were not even clear about the necessity of a device for ending obstruction when it has performed its function: they thought it was a device for preventing obstruction.

So whether you examine the words of Erskine May, who says this is the extreme of extremes in regards to procedures, or whether you listen to great parliamentarians, whether its M.J. Coldwell, or whether we look at the position put forth by Knowles, or by John Diefenbaker, one recognizes that all of these parliamentarians have had a strong disregard for the whole procedure of closure, whether it was different forms of time allocations or whether it was called the guillotine.

I must state also that guillotine is probably the proper word for this because not only was it used a couple of hundred years ago to cut off the necks and the heads of people, that indeed this closure is rightfully called a guillotine because it is cutting off the life-blood of the essence of parliamentary debate, and that's the right to speak in the legislature.

When I look at the rationale, Mr. Speaker, in regards to why a government would introduce such a piece of legislation, the first thing it shows is that the government is either very, very desperate because of poor public opinion or maybe it is arrogant. Maybe it feels, look, we can do whatever we want to do, and we'll get back in and win another election. We are so arrogant is maybe what they're thinking, that we will be able to do those things that the majority of the people of the province of Saskatchewan oppose.

And that's why, Mr. Speaker, they had done away with many important aspects of our Saskatchewan heritage. The fact that they did away . . . they said they would never touch medicare, they did away with an important part in the historical development of medicare, and that was the prescription drug plan. They completely did away with that and without absolutely any feeling in regards to the people.

The dental plan and 400 people and families and their lives were more or less destroyed by the action of the government when it unilaterally did what it did by knocking them right out. It shows, I think, Mr. Speaker, that this government is introducing this motion not because it is so desperate, but because it simply doesn't care any more. It's become too arrogant. It feels it's been elected twice and it can just walk right in again for the third time.

I think it's very important to recognize, Mr. Speaker, that the government in its arrogance has developed a very hard-line position. I was in Chile last year, and I know the hard-line position of a government that is controlled with extremities and extreme measures. Places such as that do not provide the freedom of debate. They go ahead and do whatever it is that they want to do. The military junta can just go ahead and go against the wishes of the people, not matter how strong the issue is and how devastating it is, and they don't even allow the people the right to speak. They silence the people. And there was tremendous fear over there when I went there last year.

I must state, as I watched international affairs as we were debating potash and I looked at a China and I looked at the youth trying to get the right to speak, the type of extremity wherein you deny the democratic right of speech if something that is abhorred by all the countries of the world except . . .

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

**Mr. Goulet:** — I must state, Mr. Speaker, that when I look at historical tradition in Europe and many of the issue of stoppage of the democratic rights came into play, most of the things were done not by the total government, by all the government members that usually exist; it's always

done by the hard-line extremists of a particular government. And while I might not say that we have extremists in the PC Party, I would say that they are indeed having a hard-line position. I would state that this type of attitude is something that is going to bring the government into great trouble as time goes on.

The other aspect in regards to the rationale as to why the closure on the debate. I think we were bringing the notion, Mr. Speaker, that we were producing the facts of mismanagement, that never in the history of this province have we ever seen such sheer, the worst and terrible management. We have seen not only \$4 billion, \$1 billion a day in taxes, \$1 million a day we have to spend in interest payments, that in fact we have to even pay bingo tax and gambling tax and gas tax. And the only thing that is a growth industry in this province has been bingo, economics, and gambling. That has been the only thing that has grown economically in this province.

I think it's very important to recognize that the mismanagement forces governments to gamble on people's lives, and now they are gambling on closure. They are gambling that they have the absolute authority. This is like back in the Middle Ages where the serf and the lord . . . where the lord reigns supreme. That indeed this is the type of situation where the opposition becomes completely muzzled by the government in power.

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

(1945)

**Mr. Goulet:** — The other rationale for the introduction of trying to get a quick exit out of this House — the fact that the government is scared to debate, that they simply did not stand up and debate the potash. They sat in their seats and — apart from two or three members, and I think to a maximum of five — whereas we debated the potash Bill 20 thoroughly, they did not dare speak up because they were afraid, afraid that what they had to say would be shown to be at odds with what the people thought in this province.

When I look at the aspect of rationale, I look also at those things that come on the edge of corruption; that indeed we have talked about the Securities Commission, the Pioneer case before, but we also looked at GigaText — \$5 million of taxpayers' money was used. So I use that as an example, wherein this government wants to run away from the debate, they know that the GigaText scandal brings them problems, so they want to get out of this House; so they want to get out of the debate; so they don't want to debate potash; they don't even want to debate the democratic procedure of the House, except on a very shallow basis.

All they say is that we make long speeches, all they say is that we're radicals. Well I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, for all the people who are out there listening: every time we speak for seniors in this province, they say we are radical; every time we speak for the youth in this province, they say we are radical; every time we speak on the protection of the drug prescription plan, they say we are radical. When we talk about protection of the dental workers, they say we are radical . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I've been listening to the hon. member for some time, and I would like to ask him to make his comments more relevant to the topic under discussion.

**Mr. Goulet:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was replying to the comments on their type of a debate on radical, but I think I've used enough examples for people to recognize the point that I was making, that indeed that's a false argument.

The real substance of the argument is that they are giving away potash to the foreign corporations. That's the substance of the argument. What the substance of the argument states is this, Mr. Speaker: that they are afraid of the people of Saskatchewan; they do not trust the people of the province of Saskatchewan to control their own economic destiny. That's what it means.

They know, they know very well that the basis of democracy, Mr. Speaker, is not only the question of procedures in the House, the fact that we are debating the closure motion. The fact of democracy is not only political democracy. We have known from the past history of Saskatchewan and in Canada that private control of schooling was only benefitting a few and the rich, that we had to move to buy public control of education. We now know, over a 100 years later, that that was the right way to go.

Many of the Conservatives and the *status quo* people of the day 100 years ago opposed the public control of education. And the same type of people today will even move towards the privatization of education if we allow them. Because little by little, that privatization will also occur.

No Conservative believed also in public control of health. They opposed it tooth and nail. And the fact that they opposed the prescription drug plan is an attack on medicare because the prescription drug plan was an important historical component of it. The dental plans, all of these things are in important part of our political democracy, but people recognize that democracy is not only educational democracy, it's not only political democracy; that democracy has to come to the foundation of what life is all about, and that is in the economics.

We also require economic democracy. And unless you have economic democracy and economic control, you will always have the foreign, outside control dealing and doing everything for you. You can never do things for yourself.

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

**Mr. Goulet:** — Mr. Speaker, as we debate the closure motion, the question of democracy, as I mentioned, is one where the economic basis, the mixed economy approach where we see the right of private corporations to work side by side with co-ops, to work side by side also with publicly controlled Crown corporations, an important part of Saskatchewan history.

This is the type of debate that is being closed by the members opposite. They want to muzzle these statements because they don't want to see the people not only control their institutions democratically, but to control the economic destiny of the future of their children. And that is the essence of this debate.

We are looking at very important aspects of Saskatchewan history. And for us to be muzzled in a couple of days, for us to be silenced by the simple majority is just not right.

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

**Mr. Goulet:** — I think it's very important, Mr. Speaker, that some of the other rationale are out front as we . . . the rationale and their impact is also an important part of the debate, as we deal with what closure is trying to hide. It's trying to hide that privatization is costing us money. That's what it's trying to hide. It's trying to hide the fact that big corporations, when they completely control everything, monopolize not only economic power, but political power as well. That indeed the wishes of the majority of ordinary people cannot be heard basically because the economic might of the large corporations and the large amounts of money that they give to the status-oriented people is a way of control. We don't only have to look at the Exxons or the fact that they don't even do anything about polluting our Canadian shores. They can go ahead and defy the law; they can defy the law any time because they are so big that none of the politicians dare go against them.

The challenging aspect of this debate is one where we put the control in the hands of Saskatchewan people. What the Tories are scared of is they're afraid that the people of Saskatchewan will run things better than the corporations. And of course the record shows very clearly, Mr. Speaker, in the potash debate, that when the NDP was running potash, when they were forced in the early '70s to get into, to establish the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, that indeed in a few short years when the Liberals and their private enterprise ideology was only able to get \$2 million a year from the big corporation — when that's all they were able to get, was two measly million dollars a year — when the NDP took over and PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan) came in, there was a total of \$985 million taken from the corporations, including the public corporations, to the public purse in a five-year period. Close to \$200 million a year came to the public purse.

And when we talk about the fact we can't build roads and we can't have anything for seniors or for health, no wonder — basically because the Tory ideology and the Liberal ideology preceding it was one of giving in to the big corporations.

Indeed when we look at the debate, when I examine the debates of the Liberal era and when I examine the fact that they were the ones who brought in prorationing, they were the ones who caved in to the U.S. potash industry . . . When they introduced those things and we challenged that aspect and weren't going to go, the big corporations came running and said, we want prorationing. And when the NDP introduced prorationing along with an increase

in royalty, they took the government to court.

The big corporations didn't even follow the law in the same way that the Tories don't even follow the laws of Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Goulet:** — They simply withheld 30 million and more and did not . . . They even took the Saskatchewan government to court. That is the controlling might of the corporations. In just a few short years, though, the competitive edge that was put in by the establishment of a public Crown corporation, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, competing side by side with the American giants, they were able to stand toe-to-toe with them and have the best record of any potash company in the history of Saskatchewan.

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

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the member for Moose Jaw North.

**Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Speaker, I seek leave of the Assembly to present an introduction.

Leave granted.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Speaker, we have a distinguished guest in the galleries this evening. Seated in your gallery is the president of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, Barb Byers.

As members of this Assembly will know, Ms. Byers is the democratically elected president of the federation of labour representing some 60,000 organized workers in the province of Saskatchewan. I'm pleased to see her taking an interest in the debate here this evening and I would ask all members of the Assembly to join in bidding a welcome to Ms. Byers.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

### Time Allocation (continued)

**Mr. Goulet:** — Mr. Speaker, in continuation of the debate on the closure motion, these are majority . . . This information that I presented in short summary form is the type of information that was going to the people of Saskatchewan in order to make their own decisions as to where they fit in on the debate.

It was important, these particular substantive issues at each level, whether it was in the profit margins or the production margins, or whether it was in regards to employment that these were presented to the people.

When I looked at the potash record and I looked at the close to \$1 billion that the NDP made during the five-year period after the PCS was established, I compared that record to the PCs following the next five years. What did I

find out? That they had sold approximately the same amount of production, 32 million tonnes a year; approximately the same amount of cost in regards to potash, \$109 for NDP years, \$106 for the PC years.

And when I examined the record in regards to return for the people of Saskatchewan, we saw that the PCs, in terms of royalties and taxes, had returned \$274 million. When I looked at that historic record, we know that the PCs were in bed with the big companies, that indeed we had made \$711 million more in the comparative five-year period at a time when the production rates were approximately the same and the price per tonne was approximately the same.

It shows very clearly in the record that these are the issues that the Tories don't want to debate. When we look at the issue of employment, we know that, in PCS alone, we lost 1,000 jobs. The Tories say you never lose anything in privatization. Well the dental workers, 400 of them, know that they lost. The highway workers know what they lost. When we look at potash, 1,000 jobs have been lost. We keep hearing from the Tories, privatization creates jobs, and that's one of the biggest myths and untruths of the government of the day, that indeed their attack on workers and their employment rights are a very basic aspect of this Tory government.

And as we debate this motion to shut down this debate, that's the type of information that they don't want the people to know. Because when it comes down to the next election they'll have all kinds of fancy ads paid by the big corporations that say, this has been the greatest diversification exercise in the history of Saskatchewan, and the greatest amounts of jobs were produced, and the facts remain that to this date 1,000 jobs have been lost.

(2000)

These and many others were the types of things that we were debating. When the Tories said they didn't want long speeches, those were the types of information that we were providing. And the whole idea of all of this is pretty simple. When we look at the fact that we can debate a gambling tax on moral grounds or economic grounds or whatever grounds, we debate the gas tax and we debate all of these taxes, the only reason why it's happening is because more money is being drained by the big corporations. They are simply not paying their fair share.

We know that the oil companies, if they had paid the same as '82, we would have an extra \$2 billion in the kitty; that's half of the deficit. In potash it would have been an extra billion dollars; that's three-quarters of the deficit. In other words, the people of the province of Saskatchewan would not be paying \$1 million a day in regards to interest payments to the banks and other financial institutions, basically because we know that they simply will not stand up to the big corporations.

Yes, they stand up: they will beat up on the ordinary people of Saskatchewan; they will beat up on Indian and Metis people; they will beat up on workers; they will beat up on welfare people; they will beat up on the people who need it. They will act pretty tough when it comes

down to the people in need.

But they never act tough when it comes down to the corporations. They kneel down and beg and say, how much do you want? What, where, how much, what royalty do you want now? Last year they gave them . . . When they were making \$700 million in uranium, they gave them an extra \$7 million, just like that, in royalties. And they have been doing the same thing with all the major resource industries in this province.

So when we debate closure and we look at potash in regards to closure, it's a lot more to it than meets the eye. There's many things to debate and a closure motion is not only something that muzzles an opposition individual member, it is also meant to crush any people's opposition because the people want to know the facts. This becomes a way of hiding the facts.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I debate this historic debate, I would again like to do . . . Before I get into a summary statement, I would like to say a few words in Cree to outline the basic aspects.

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

**Mr. Goulet:** —

(The hon. member spoke for a time in Cree.)

I guess, Mr. Speaker, in summation, I would like to state that I am in total opposition to the introduction of the closure motion, or what we have called the super-closure motion; other members have called it time allocation motion, and others we have called it the guillotine. I prefer to call it the super-closure or the guillotine basically because, like the guillotine that cuts off the head of the people, it cuts off the people's right to speak in the legislature. It cuts off the right of the member to speak in this legislature and it cuts off the voice of the people in the legislature, and that's what it does.

We are also very opposed to it because of the substantive nature of the debate. In many cases we have seen economic history of potash, we have social history of potash, we have seen the issue of profit margins, production margins, all of these things that are very important for knowledge building in a democracy. These types of things have been taken away.

As I debate the motion, I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that the reason why the government is doing it is debated. Whether or not they are very desperate, it's a sign of a desperate government. But other people just say, they are getting too arrogant.

It's a government who has been too long in power. They feel that they can do whatever they want to do at any whim and at any time. They feel they can do what they did to the prescription drug plan and dental plan, highways — name it, they can do anything. They will do things that they said they would never do; they said they would never, ever privatize SPC, and they proceeded to do so. They said they would never ever do the privatization utilities and they proceeded against their very word.

And the words are very important in regards to debate. Their words cannot be taken for granted; that indeed their words are very hollow in regards not only to this debate on closure, but because they didn't even have the courage to stand up and debate potash. They just sat there and whimpered away because they were scared to deal with the fact that the people out there are opposing them.

The only time that they will stand up and where they have the absolute power and control is on the debate on closure. When they have the fact of the majority, the brute force of majority to be able to force a closure so that they can shut and muzzle every opposition member, they can shut and muzzle the people's ideas of the province of Saskatchewan. That is a sign of hard-line government. It's a sign of a government that is out of touch. It's a sign of a government that's on its way out. It's a sign of a government that has just touch with the people.

They are simply out here trying to hide the facts. They're trying to hide the facts from the people, whether it is potash facts, whether it is GigaText facts. This has got to be the gigamess of government.

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

**Mr. Goulet:** — Mr. Speaker, we are debating this motion because we are standing up for the people's future. We are standing up and saying, enough is enough; that the privatization mania must stop; that it is costing us too much money in regards to royalties and taxes; it's costing us too much money in regards to livelihoods, in regards to jobs, in regards to everything. The fact that foreign control will be the basis of Saskatchewan history, rather than the people of Saskatchewan that we should be proud of, the Tories have no pride in the people of Saskatchewan. They are even ashamed of the people of Saskatchewan. When we control economic destiny, which is the basis of control, the Tories are ashamed of their own people and ashamed of their own institutions.

And that's the essence of the debate, the fact that the Tories do simply feel that the big corporations are the only ones, they're the only ones to control and monopolize everything.

And I must state that I am in total opposition with this closure motion and the attempt by the Tories to muzzle, not only the opposition members and their right to speak in this legislature, but also muzzling of the people of Saskatchewan in such an important decade in the history of Saskatchewan. And with that, I oppose the motion.

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

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to join in this debate, although I'm not as usually pleased as I would be in other circumstances. It's necessary to rebut some of the arguments that the members of the opposition have made, but it's unfortunate that it's necessary to get into this debate at all because the members of this Assembly have had many months to debate the merits of potash ownership and the type of business that is best for the people of Saskatchewan.

You've had many months, many days, and the members opposite have had many hours of opportunity to make their point, which they have done over and over again, I might say, Mr. Speaker, which they have done repeatedly. And it is unfair, Mr. Speaker, that they should ask for unlimited time to make the same points over and over again.

It becomes apparent after a period of time, Mr. Speaker, that the chief aim of the members of the opposition is to absolutely, completely stop the sale of any shares or bonds in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Whether this is good or bad, they intend to stop that procedure. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is essential that this legislation be passed, enabling legislation, so that given the appropriate time and the appropriate opportunity, the Government of Saskatchewan can do what's best in the potash industry, what's best for the people of Saskatchewan.

And, therefore, Mr. Speaker, you get to the fundamental principles as have been laid out today, the principles of do you elect a government to govern, or do you elect 64 members to make noise for four years and accomplish nothing. We have a duty, Mr. Speaker, to govern in a responsible manner. I have heard much, much discussion over the last few days about the rights of the opposition.

But let us talk about the rights of the people. The people have a right to stable, solid government. The opposition has a right to oppose. They have a right to point out errors, if we have any. They have a right to indicate things could be done a different way. In this case they have expressed that right. Unfortunately, what they have told us here is that their way is the only way and that no other way should be tried.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard many arguments here. One of the big arguments I have heard is that the potash companies would not have paid taxes if the members opposite did not purchase or expropriate all of the potash industry, and the remaining companies have continued to pay taxes on royalties ever since they first started production in this province. They have paid whatever the law has provided. Yes, they have taken their legal right to contest that law and they lost. And that is democracy because democracy also includes the judicial system and people have a right to use it.

But we have heard nothing but talk of rights of the opposition, Mr. Speaker, we also have to consider responsibility. The government has a responsibility; the opposition has a responsibility, and the people have a responsibility.

In this Assembly we need deal primarily with the responsibilities of the government and the responsibilities of the opposition. The government has a mandate to lead. The government has a mandate to innovate. The government has a mandate to do what we believe is best for the province of Saskatchewan and the people. The people then, whenever an election is called, have the right and the responsibility to decide whether this government or any other government has led properly.

Mr. Speaker, we do not at this time yet have the necessary



information to determine exactly whether the sale of shares in the potash corporation will be absolutely beneficial, partially beneficial, or, to believe the opposition, of no benefit whatsoever.

What we have here is a Bill enabling legislation. What we have here is a debate that the opposition raises on philosophical grounds; that they believe only in one form of ownership — ownership by the Government of Saskatchewan — which, Mr. Speaker, is not necessarily the same as ownership by the people of Saskatchewan. This government is prepared to give the people of Saskatchewan a chance to participate in the ownership of this corporation.

The question we have before us then is: can the opposition stall the government's duty to govern for ever? Yes, I will concede that they have a right to oppose for a reasonable period of time. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that reasonable period of time has now expired, that they will have a continued period of time under this legislation, another four days which is a possible 40 hours of debate. In 40 hours you can say a great deal, Mr. Speaker. A great deal can be said in 40 hours, on top of the 80 hours that have already taken place in this debate.

Mr. Speaker, the hours go on and on, and nothing new, no new points are made by the members opposite. We will have further points to make in this debate, but now is not the time, Mr. Speaker. Today we were discussing the principle of reasonable period of time for debate. And you can consult and confer with senators like Eugene Forsey who are knowledgeable, but who, Mr. Speaker, is an expert? Who is the ultimate authority in how a government should govern and how reasonable a government should be?

Mr. Speaker, the people have that ultimate decision, but in the meantime, this government has the responsibility to govern. There are estimates to be passed here. There are Bills to be passed here. And the opposition says, well go ahead and do all that work; we will pass anything that we agree with, but we absolutely, flatly refuse to pass anything that we disagree with.

Well the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, are beginning to say, why do we have elections? If we don't have elections to elect a government to lead, then why do we have elections in this province? It is certainly not to have the people govern who have been rejected, and the NDP can't face the fact that in the last two elections their theories and their policies have been rejected. They now have the responsibility to accept that decision of the people.

Mr. Speaker, we heard long, long speeches from the members opposite, and I do not intend to fall into that same trap and set that type of an example. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it being reasonably late on a long weekend, I move that this debate now be adjourned.

Debate adjourned.

#### NOTICE OF MOTION FOR CLOSURE

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr.

Speaker, I give notice, pursuant to rule 31:

That at the next sitting of the Assembly, immediately before the orders of the day is called for resuming debate on the motion moved by the member for Melfort for the allocation of time to the debate on Bill No. 20, an Act respecting the Reorganization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, and any amendments or subamendments proposed thereto, I will move that the said debate be not further adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 8:27 p.m.