

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**June 2, 1980**

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

**INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

**HON. G. MacMURCHY (Last Mountain-Touchwood):** — Mr. Speaker, through you and to all the members of the Legislative Assembly I want to introduce some 50 senior citizens from Last Mountain-Touchwood constituency from the communities of Nokomis, Govan, and Semans. They are on a tour of the legislature and a tour of facilities here in Regina. They are on a bit of a celebration. I'm sure that all members will want to welcome them, and hope they have a very enjoyable stay here in the legislature and likewise in the capital city. I am going to be joining them for tea and some pictures very shortly, and I look forward to seeing them. I extend on behalf of all members a very warm welcome here to the Assembly.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. R.G. LONG (Cut Knife-Lloydminster):** — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, I'd like to introduce to you and to this Assembly this afternoon, 31 Grade 8 students from Grosvenor Park School in Saskatoon. They are seated in the west gallery and I would like to welcome them to the Assembly this afternoon, wish them a good journey home and hope they'll enjoy themselves in the goings on in the Assembly this afternoon.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**Transportation Subsidy for Domestic Grains**

**MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, question to the Minister of Agriculture. In talking with officials of your department this morning, I'm told that the policy is now in place for your feed transportation subsidy in your drought program. I was wondering if the minister could explain why there will be a subsidy allowed for processed feed and hay, but no feed transportation subsidy allowed for transportation of domestic grains such as barley, feed oats, etc.?

**HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, I can't answer the hon. member. I'll have to check with the task force or the committee responsible for the program here in the province to give the hon. member an answer. I would assume that at this point in time it's felt that the stocks would be available in the country elevator system and, therefore, at least be close to the concerned farmers, but I would have to confirm my answer, and I'll be pleased to do so and respond to the hon. member.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In conversation with officials of your department it was indicated to me that the feed transportation subsidy was the only point of the program that had policy in place yet. They indicated to me that there's a

great deal of difficulty in formulating policy because it's all contingent upon federal funding. They also indicated to me that that federal funding has not yet been committed. Can you indicate to this House when we can expect that commitment, and in absence of that commitment can we expect a commitment from this government to go ahead with the program with or without federal funding?

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I've been attempting to respond to the hon. member and to the farmers of Saskatchewan that indeed we're convinced that a commitment is in place as a result of meetings as long as three weeks ago. I note very positive statements, press statements, coming from the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board. I report to the hon. member that I will be meeting with the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board tomorrow in Victoria. Part of the meeting will be to discuss what we are seeking to pursue (federal transportation policy). As I indicated to the hon. member, I will be pursuing the issue of drought with him. I note, Mr. Speaker, that there seems to be trouble with the federal government in getting itself together with respect to making an announcement as a government on the drought assistance program. I note that the Government of Manitoba has made some announcements with respect to transportation policy. I note that the committee here is getting those policies in place, and I note that also we made an announcement about a week ago about transportation.

I am not sure where the federal Minister of Agriculture is. I understand he is out of the country presently. He probably felt that he could pray for rain outside of the country as well as he has been praying for rain here in Canada.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister has finally admitted that, at least at the federal level, there is not yet a commitment. Will you now, instead of waffling around this issue, commit your government to this drought relief program with or without federal funding?

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, we are not waffling around the issue at all. I want to say to the hon. member that I take the word of the deputy minister of agriculture from Saskatchewan who was present when an agreement was achieved. I note the comments of the minister responsible for the wheat board. I am confident. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition isn't confident, but I am confident there will be federal cost sharing for the drought situation, not only here in Saskatchewan but right across western Canada if it is in fact necessary.

### **Low Hog Prices**

**MR. R.H. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Saskatchewan hog producers are voicing deep concern as it relates to their low priced produce on the market, resulting in their losing approximately \$40 per hog. Does your department have any immediate contingency plans to promise aid to the hog producers in this province at this time?

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, we have already made two announcements in the legislature here on the benefits accruing to hog producers in Saskatchewan as a result of SHARP (Saskatchewan Hog Assured Returns Program). We anticipate a further announcement effective the end of this month, the end of June and so on, under SHARP, and I think that the hog producers in Saskatchewan are pretty pleased with Saskatchewan's long-term approach to bringing stabilization to that particular industry.

**MR. PICKERING:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware that Alberta

recently announced a \$25 million emergency stock loss program for the hog producers in that province, which will ensure each producer \$28 to \$35 over and above his feed costs? Would the minister assure this Assembly that he will act immediately and place such a program in this province because of the fact that many of these producers are on FarmStart loans?

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't have the figures in front of me with respect to the comparison between the Alberta program and the Saskatchewan program. But my information is, as I recall it, that the benefits to Saskatchewan hog producers under SHARP far exceed the benefits coming forward in the Alberta program. I will point out to the hon. member that while all of the producers in Saskatchewan didn't join SHARP (Saskatchewan Hog Assured Returns Program) when it was introduced, I receive reports that they are now getting a new interest in SHARP and are very rapidly joining that program.

**MR. PICKERING:** — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister not agree that many of the hog producers do not belong to SHARP and many will be out of business because it takes a complete year to phase themselves in?

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, SHARP is a volunteer program. Now if the hon. member is suggesting that it should be a compulsory program, he should stand in his place and say so. If the hon. member is suggesting that SHARP is not a good program, then he should stand in his place and say so. I have indicated to all hon. members that it is a volunteer program; hog producers can join today or can join tomorrow and have in recent months been joining in very high numbers.

### **Royal Commission to Study Crowrate**

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. You have indicated that you're going to be meeting with the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board tomorrow and it's our understanding that there's going to be an announcement of an appointment of a royal commission to study the crowrate. Have you had any representation or have you made any recommendations to the minister as to whom that royal commission should be and who is he, etc.?

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I'll respond to the hon. member on his last question, etc. Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of a royal commission to be established by the federal government to look at the crowrate. I saw a press report which was, I anticipate, a rumor. The purpose of the meeting will be to try to seek the policies of the new federal government with respect to solving our transportation and grain handling difficulties and it may be that such an announcement will come forward. I would hope not. I would hope not, Mr. Speaker, because we have had a number of commissions and studies done with respect to the grain handling and transportation system and if the federal government (and I am sure the hon. member will join me in this position) would implement the Hall commission recommendations, they would have no need for any royal commission on the crowrate.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** — A supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture. The impending announcement of a royal commission on the crowrate and your lack of knowledge would indicate that you have not been advised; and the failure to get some consensus on whether or not we have a drought program would indicate there's a

complete breakdown of communications between you and the federal government on the drought program and the royal commission on crowrates.

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, there can't possibly be a breakdown on communications between the federal government and the western governments with respect to the policy of the federal government since this is the first opportunity we have had, as four western provinces, to meet with the federal government collectively. This meeting comes as a result of a request from the western ministers for such a meeting and its intent is to hear from the federal government what its policy intentions are with respect to grain handling and transportation.

### **Provincial Election in Quebec**

**MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current):** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, in light of the announcement by the Parti Quebecois House Leader that there are no immediate plans for the provincial general election in Quebec, at least not until after constitutional talks, indicated that the constitutional talks or the changes would be used as the basis for an election platform. Do you believe that this was just another example of Quebec blackmailing the rest of Canada?

**HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the announcement and accordingly I wouldn't be able to characterize it with any such description as is offered by the hon. member for Swift Current.

**MR. HAM:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, since the federal government has established the double standard in Canada — one for Quebec and one for the rest of Canada, especially the West — how do you intend to resist federal government pressure, with regard to oil prices as an example, while at the same time to accommodate Quebec?

**MR. LANE:** — Oh, ask me that.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, the erstwhile leader of the Conservative Party asked that the question be directed to him. I will, however, attempt to answer it. I believe that the federal government has policies which vary, clearly, from province to province, because the circumstances of each province vary. For example, they have a province with respect to offshore fishing rights which is an issue that does not particularly heavily impinge upon Saskatchewan. So there will always be differing approaches by any federal government to the problems of individual provinces. I do not think that it necessarily means that the federal government is favoring a particular province, or acting with less than appropriate sympathy to the problems of a particular province. We clearly feel that on the issue of resources the federal government is not sufficiently responsive to the desires of Saskatchewan. We continue to press our interests in that regard. No doubt other provinces feel that the federal government is insufficiently responsive to concerns which are uppermost in their minds.

**MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Unionest Party):** — Does the Premier agree with the Prime Minister of Canada that the entrenchment of French language in the constitution of Canada is non-negotiable?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, clearly he is giving the position of the federal government that it is non-negotiable on their part. I would anticipate that that was an

opening statement in the course of some proceedings at which he intends to negotiate a great deal on this point. I would be frankly surprised if in the course of the next number of months, when constitutional negotiations are discussed, the federal government did not put forward this proposal and attempt to recruit support for its particular proposal, as we obviously will with our proposals. That may be saying that it is non-negotiable but, in fact, is acting as if it were negotiable.

### **Ward System**

**MR. LANE:** — A question to the Minister of Education. The minister has announced that Dr. deVlieger is doing a study on the possible imposition of the ward system. A press report in the Regina Leader-Post indicated that when Dr. deVlieger was accused of having a pre-set position, i.e. in favor of the ward system, he denied it and then gave a vigorous defence of the advantages of the ward system. Would you not admit that your study is, in fact, weighted in favour of the ward system?

**HON. D.F. McARTHUR (Minister of Education):** — No, I would not, Mr. Speaker. I discussed this question with Professor deVlieger prior to his undertaking the study. I was satisfied that he wished to undertake a full and complete inquiry into this whole question with the objective of obtaining all possible sides to the argument. I don't think there is any evidence at all to support the suggestion that Professor deVlieger has made up his mind one way or another on this question.

**MR. LANE:** — Your news release – and concerns from school boards that have already opposed your position – indicates that the deVlieger committee is to study and communicate to the Saskatchewan Urban Law Review Committee a position on the ward system. Of course, if there is no ward system, no position need be communicated to the Saskatchewan Urban Law Review Committee. Would that not be further evidence that in fact your department and the government opposite are firmly committed to a ward system in the school boards and that the deVlieger's commission is a sham and a phoney thing to try to get the government's position out to the public?

**MR. McARTHUR:** — Mr. Speaker, if I already had a position on this subject I would not have commissioned Professor deVlieger to undertake this investigation; I would have simply made my feelings known directly to my colleagues. I have not done that. I have asked Professor deVlieger to undertake an investigation. I think this is an appropriate time to be doing so, given that the urban law review committee is looking into the whole question of urban election procedures, organization and so on. I think it is only right that we should have an open investigation into this question with some opportunity for people to make their views known. I know that Professor deVlieger will listen to those views and give us an objective accounting of the possibilities and so on with respect to the ward system.

### **Additional Highway Lanes**

**MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Highways I will address my question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, the Minister of Highways has expressed repeated concerns for the safety of the motorists in this province and is at present considering the reduction of speed limits on our highways. In light of the very tragic accident which happened last week at Webb, Mr. Premier, do you now realize that double-laning one of Saskatchewan's most travelled highways, the Trans-Canada Highway, would be a most positive step to ensure the

safety of many Saskatchewan residents and of visitors to this province?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that the double-laning of all highways might well be a positive step toward the safety of motorists both local and out of province. I believe the Department of Highways operates on the basis of a traffic count and where particular stretches of highway have high traffic counts they build into their plans potential four-laning. I believe that particular highway west of Swift Current has a traffic count which is somewhat lower than the standard now being applied by the Department of Highways.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Supplementary. Mr. Premier, I am talking about the complete Trans-Canada Highway and in view of your minister's map on traffic counts, it is one of the highest in the province.

Your government, Mr. Premier, continually boasts of the profits from potash and other resources. Would you explain to this Assembly and to the people of Saskatchewan why your government has seen fit, in these supposedly fine times Saskatchewan is in, to cut the capital budget for highway construction (which would be a great improvement) to that important transportation artery, right through the province, the Trans-Canada Highway and therefore safeguard the lives of many of the people of this province? Would you explain why you cut these in times when there is bounty in this province?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, there are of course other highways which have significantly higher traffic counts than the Trans-Canada Highway west of Swift Current or west of the intersection between the No. 1 Highway and the Leader Highway. There are, in fact, parts of the Yellowhead Highway which have significantly higher counts, which are still two-lane as opposed to four-lane. I know there is some support from my colleague, the member for Redberry, to having a four-lane between Saskatoon and North Battleford and no doubt support from my colleague, the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster, to four-laning a highway from North Battleford to Lloydminster and so on.

I go over to Alberta and see many, many two-lane highways in a province which has a very substantial income. I think any government must make judgments as to where money should be spent. It is never infinite in its supply and the Department of Highways has made a judgment as to the traffic count which justifies four-laning. I believe it is certainly one of the lower average yearly census figures in Canada justifying four-laning, and accordingly it will be seen that our standards are, in terms of promoting four-laning, among the highest in Canada.

**MR. BERTSON:** — Mr. Speaker, if the answer to this question is yes, I hope the Premier accepts our congratulations for truth in advertising on the Saskatchewan highways and transportation construction. The question is: is the 'slow' sign on the front of this pamphlet indicative of the policies and programs by the Department of Highways and Transportation?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I think the answer is yes, if by those policies you mean urging motorists to proceed slowly and with caution. We certainly do not doubt for one moment that motorists proceeding slowly and with caution on highways, whether two-lane or four-lane, is the best way to promote traffic safety and to lessen the number of injuries and deaths on the highway. I hope, therefore, that message conveyed by the Department of Highways will be taken to heart by all motorists.

### Oil Pricing Agreement

**MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley):** — A question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, we now have less than one month in which to arrive at a new oil pricing agreement before the present oil pricing agreement ends. It appears we are now in a situation of a Mexican stand-off between Ottawa on the one hand and the producing provinces on the other hand. Could the Premier advise this Assembly as to whether or not any behind the scenes negotiations with regard to oil prices would give any encouragement to the fact that perhaps the parties are coming closer to an agreement?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I have to answer the hon. member by saying, no, so far as I'm concerned, and I have recently consulted with my colleague, the Minister of Mineral Resources. I do not believe there are any negotiations to which we are privy or aware of, which would encourage one to believe there will be an early settlement on the matter of oil pricing.

**MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Premier, press reports would indicate that the confrontation could be coming, in particular between Alberta and Ottawa. Your government has always advocated a planned development of our resources, including the theory that perhaps the resources are better left in the ground. It would appear from press statements that Alberta has brought in legislation in the form of Bill 50 which could have the effect of curtailing production of crude oil in Alberta by as much as 20 per cent. Could you advise the Assembly as to whether or not your government is in support, in principle, of that type of procedure, or that type of legislation by the Government of Alberta?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, our government is in agreement in principle with provinces having the right to regulate the rate at which a resource is produced. It has been the position of our government that the provinces should have the right to regulate the rate of production or any particular resource, both with respect to conserving the resource and having it developed in an appropriate way, for maximizing the use of the resource, and with respect to being able to regulate, in part, the impact upon the provincial economy of producing the resource.

We have put forward this point of view with respect to potash; we have put forward this point of view with respect to uranium in a policy statement last year, saying we would attempt to promote a staged development of uranium. Accordingly, as a general proposition, we believe provinces ought to be able to regulate the rate of production of resources, to conserve their resource and to get the maximum beneficial impact upon the provincial economy.

### Payment to Unionest Party

**MR. LANE:** — A question to the Government House Leader. Last Wednesday I asked you a question about the payment to the Unionest Party. You made the statement and used the phrase that the public should not assume that any payment was being made. You indicated secondly that you were having the matter investigated by your officials. Press reports indicate that a payment was made to the Unionest Party. Would you now be prepared to table the report that you received and how it authorized the payment?

**HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Mr. Chairman, I would not be prepared to table it. The Department of Finance, whose department in the end result authorizes payments of financial sums, wanted to have a legal opinion from the Department of the

Attorney General as to whether or not the payment was obligatory given the fact that retroactive legislation is currently being debated by the House. That was the nature of the legal opinion. I have not seen the legal opinion myself and I don't know whether the payment has been made to the Unionest Party or not. I assume it has been made. It is not the policy of the government to outline the details of legal opinions which are tendered, obvious in a privileged basis, as between the Department of the Attorney General and other departments.

### **INTRODUCTION OF GUEST**

**HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Regina Centre):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to introduce to you and through you to the House, Mr. Simon de Jong, the member of parliament for Regina East. Mr. de Jong was first elected in 1979 in what must be regarded as an upset election. He was re-elected in 1980. We share not only a common calling and a common riding but also we share common responsibilities. Mr. de Jong is presently critic for science technology in the arts and in the last parliament was critic for multiculturalism as well.

In this crucial time in the cultural life of our nation, I know all members will feel relieved that we have in Ottawa a penetrating critic of the competence and energy of Mr. de Jong. I am sure all members will want to join with me in welcoming him.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** — I would like to join the hon. member in welcoming the member of parliament. I suppose the first question is, what's he doing here? And secondly, I would hope that as the NDP critic for science and technology he could make some representations on behalf of the people of Saskatoon to allow them to receive cable television through the cable operators and perhaps discourage Sask Tel from jamming the television signals in Saskatoon.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Unionest Party):** — Mr. Speaker, since we're all welcoming the member of parliament, Mr. de Jong, I would like to add my welcome to him. I would say that Ottawa's gain was Regina's loss; it seems we've lost one of the best restaurants in town.

### **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

#### **Additional Morning Sitting**

**HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — I would like to introduce, and I shall do so on the completion of a few very brief remarks, a motion for extended hours. The motion I think is self-explanatory. It would extend the hours of sitting by two more hours a week, involving private members' day, which of course is Tuesday. The extended hours would start tomorrow and every Tuesday thereafter. The legislature has completed virtually all of its work with the exception of one small matter on the private bills committee which, I think, can be adequately looked after by the House within half an hour or one hour at the most in advance of the 10 o'clock sitting and would permit the members to debate more fully the various matters which are still on the order paper. Mr. Speaker, I trust that members opposite will see fit to agree to this, Accordingly I move, seconded by the



member for Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman):

That notwithstanding Rule 3(1), this Assembly shall, commencing Tuesday, June 3, 1980, and each Tuesday thereafter, meet at 10 o'clock a.m. and there shall be a recess from 12 o'clock p.m. until 2 o'clock p.m.

**MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Unionest Party):** — No, Mr. Speaker, the Assembly is not ready for the question. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this motion for extended sitting hours is obvious and apparent to anyone. It is an attempt by the Government of Saskatchewan to drag out the hours in order to try to prevent the member for Swift Current and the member for Nipawin from extending their discussion of Bill No. 105 and attempting to convince other members of this Legislative Assembly of the necessity to re-examine their position in terms of Bill No. 105.

I was interested to note, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General appears to be the master of BS. I was looking the other day at the Regina Leader-Post and the headline said, Collver Loses Bid to End Debate. How in the world the Attorney General could convince a reporter that an adjourned debate was ending the debate is beyond my comprehension. Furthermore, outside the Assembly the Attorney General said to this reporter that it wasn't an NDP plan to prevent the adjournment of debate, but only because the members were tired of listening to the member for Nipawin. Now, if the members were tired of listening to the member for Nipawin they would have allowed the adjourned debate. And they could have gone on with the rest of the business of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the point is that this introduced motion, as I said, is nothing more than an attempt by the government to prevent that from happening and to ram its bill through. However, to prove to the people of Saskatchewan that this issue is extremely important, to prove to the people of Saskatchewan that this kind of move by the government is not going to stop us, I am going to support this motion. I am going to show the Attorney General and others this kind of extension of hours is not going to prevent us from fighting this bill as much as is humanly possible.

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** — There is a lengthy tradition usually followed when we have the extended hours motion at the end of the session. There is some negotiation and some understanding between the party whips that the government, at some point, indicates it is not bringing in further legislation. I see another bill today. There were further bills on Friday. We saw the move of the Government House Leader last Thursday to put Bill No. 13 prior to Bill No. 105, and in fact having a closure of Bill No. 13 to allow debate on Bill No. 105.

I would suggest to the Attorney General that given the House traditions there should be some indication from the Government House Leader as to whether there is going to be another packet of bills. Because if there is, it in fact means that you are trying to hurry them through the House. You are trying to put pressure on the opposition to get government business hurriedly through the House. I hope the Attorney General in his closing remarks will indicate that the government is at the end of bringing in legislation, except for The Statute Law Amendment Act.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I would make two very brief comments in rebuttal. First of all, with respect to the Leader of the Unionest Party, this is not an attempt to add additional hours in order to make it more difficult for him to extend the discussion (as he words it) on Bill 105. I think all members would agree that an additional two hours, given especially the fact that there is a two hour luncheon break and a two hour dinner

break, certainly would allow full discussion of all of the legislation that is involved. Indeed I must tell the hon. member that what I did indicate to the reporters outside is substantially correct, as outlined, and many members of this House are anxious to see some resolution to Bill 105. That is in fact the situation.

The second comment I would make, Mr. Speaker, relates to the member for Qu'Appelle. I cannot give him any commitment at this time that there will not be any further legislation. I don't believe that there is any more substantive legislation to come forward that has not made the blues or the whites, with the possible exception of the appropriations bill at the end. I don't think the hon. member was including that in his comments because that is a standard bill. The fact of the matter is the longer the House sits, members must appreciate, the longer the pressure exists on government, now that we're into June, to introduce legislation as required.

The thinking of the government was very simple. It is not an attempt to push the opposition along to deliberations. While I would very much like to see a speedy end to the session, I think it can be done without destroying the respective roles that we have. The fact is we sat on Tuesday for Crown corporations committee or public accounts committee, or private bills. None of these committees is any longer sitting and so it is a mere transference of work that we would have done in committee to work that we would do here in the Legislative Assembly. I think that's it for the bills. For the hon. member's edification, I think that's pretty well it; but I do not want this to be undertaken as a commitment in the eventuality that two, three, or four weeks from now some issue arises which would necessitate an introduction of another piece of legislation, the said legislation will not be introduced. I thank the hon. members for the co-operation and I look forward to passing this motion.

Motion agreed.

## **COMMITTEE OF FINANCE**

### **MOTION FOR INTERIM SUPPLY**

**HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Mr. Chairman, in the absence of the Minister of Finance, the Acting Minister of Finance, and the Acting, Acting Minister of Finance, this committee has the pleasure of being stuck with the Acting, Acting, Acting Minister of Finance. Not being one to give up an opportunity to act, I shall now put on my Minister of Finance garb.

Mr. Chairman, I move the following four traditional motions for interim supply:

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$163,959,070, being approximately one-twelfth of the amount of each of the several sums to be voted, as set forth in the estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981, laid before the Assembly at the present session, be granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the twelve months ending March 31, 1981.

**MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Unionest Party):** — This is one-twelfth, I presume, of the total budget. Is this money allocated for the month of April? Is this the one that applies to the month of April or has that already passed this House?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — That has already passed this House. This is related to the month of June, I believe . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I guess it goes back to May. April has

passed.

**MR. COLLVER:** — It's my understanding that a bill or a motion has passed the Assembly, the committee, to grant interim supply to the end of June. Is that correct? This is merely going through the committee of finance up until the end of the month of June?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — No. Mr. Chairman, this is the standard procedure which members of this House, unfortunately the longer the session drags out, have to follow. On a month by month basis we vote funds for the civil servants to be paid, for the government projects to be continued. This works for the month of May. This is to vote the funds for the month of May, I'm advised by the Minister of the Environment. If he's wrong, he's the one who is going to take the blame for it. I thought it was for the month of June. In any event, it doesn't matter whether it's past or present; it works on a month to month basis. So if we are still sitting in July – heaven forbid! – we will be coming about the same time again for another one-twelfth whether it's for June or for July.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, the point is that once again the Attorney General is attempting to flimflam both the members of this Assembly and the members of the press by getting interim supply prior to grievance rather than grievance prior to supply. The Attorney General knows that the budget could very simply be passed in this Assembly by merely calling the departments of finance – the various departments of finance. He could get that kind of motion to this Assembly. We could get through very quickly with all of the business of the House.

The Attorney General presents to us today a list of business to do. Today! And he has a list of adjourned debates a mile long, committee of the whole a mile long, and another page of second readings. But he sticks Bill No. 105, The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act, right at the top. It is the Attorney General's intention, through this flimflam method, to try to convince the people in the province of Saskatchewan that somehow it is the debate on Bill No. 105 that is holding up the business of the people in the province of Saskatchewan. That's the reason why he brings these kinds of things forward in this order. Why attempt to get interim supply at this point when, in fact, you can bring forward the necessary departments of finance and in very short order get them through this House? So the Attorney General is attempting to use this method and he says he had three or four of them. I don't think very many people in this Assembly would feel too badly about the interim supply for the month of May since the month of May has already passed.

I would also like to know under what legislative authority, if this is for the month of May, did the Attorney General issue cheques in the month of May? This is June 2.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Chairman, first of all the hon. member is in error with respect to his understanding, with all due respect, of the rules. I just finished mentioning to the member for Qu'Appelle that the traditional debate on the sums, the wrap-up debate, comes with the introduction of the appropriation bill (to meet your argument about the sufficient funds). That is, after we have dealt with the vote by vote consideration of the various departments we then introduce the appropriation bill; it is a two day debate (up to two days; it doesn't have to be two days). Traditionally we have about a 20 minute debate at the end of the session, because we are all talked out.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Does it have to be at the end?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — It doesn't have to be at the end. It is the tradition of the House to deal with the entire package of legislative spending. It would allow the opposition to get

an overview of the explanations or the lack of explanations which the government has or has not provided on all the departments. That's the way the appropriation bills have taken place.

The fact of the matter is, as much as I would like to see the Department of Agriculture and a few other departments yet to do in estimates get finished before Wednesday or Thursday, when the deadline for this appropriation bill is met, I don't think it's possible. I could be wrong but I don't think it is possible. If I am wrong, I will be the happiest man in this House. I don't want to take the chance as House Leader. We need to get the money out to the local governments and to the local school boards. We have to get the money out to our civil servants. We have to get the projects going. This is the traditional method of doing interim supply.

Mr. Chairman, I see no other option here but to proceed on this basis; otherwise nothing moves.

**MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley):** — I have just a couple of questions on the comments by the Attorney General. You indicate this is the payment for May for which you are getting the money. It seems strange to me. How did you make these payments if the money wasn't approved and if the people received their payments for May? Was the payment made before the money was approved (which seems a bad practice to me)? I remember last month during questioning in the House that civil servants were late in receiving their pay cheques. They were told the interim supply didn't come forward soon enough. If my memory serves me right, it was April 26 when it was brought in. I wonder why interim supply wasn't brought in last week so that the money could have been appropriated before the bills were paid, if they have been paid?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Chairman, I get advice from the man who undoubtedly would have to have the definitive word on this, the former minister of finance, the member for Biggar. He advises me that in his experience as minister of finance, the money comes about the beginning of the month. It works retroactively for payment of wages and the like for the month of May. There is a slop-over of some days and some functions into the next month. You have a grace period of three or four days from the time the end of the month strictly runs out. Accordingly, there would be sufficient funds for the processing of the cheques.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Following that, the answer given to the employees last month, when they phoned the Department of Finance to find out why their pay cheques were not there and it was said it was because the interim supply had not been passed, was then not true.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Chairman, again the situation is, with respect to the first month, that it was true because there was a drying up of funds. On that first interim supply we needed the injection of fuel, or the injection of money, into the system. Now the pump has water in it; it's running dry, but we are pumping more water into it. But the first interim supply had no water whatsoever; therefore there was no money from which to see it paid. It would be true that in due course, if we delayed this and passage was prevented of interim supply, then we would be facing the same problem which we did a few days ago.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Would it not seem logical, if the payments for the government are at the end of the month and there is this spill over which I understand you are talking about here, that you would ask for the money prior to the end of the month? It seems

strange to me that you would be coming in June wanting the money for May.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member tells me, and of course I know this of my own experience, that there used to be a time when we would come into the Legislative Assembly and introduce the interim supply for three-month periods. You would do it once every quarterly period. This was felt through some mechanism, rules committee or otherwise, not to be sufficiently responsive and therefore we changed over to the one-twelfth mechanism, which is what we use now. Accordingly, the introduction of interim supply is done on the advice of the officials of the Department of Finance given the supply of money and their obligations.

I am advised that we are now heading into the first of June, and it's the appropriate time to cover off May and to cover off those portions of June necessary in order to keep it going. If we are here until July, we will be following the same regular basis thereafter.

**MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South):** — Mr. Chairman, pursuant to that question from the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley, would it not follow then that April is actually a dry well all through the month until that appropriation is done at the end of the month? You are paying bills. For example, you would be paying salaries either on a weekly basis or bimonthly basis; so there would be some payments in the interim that would have to be made with a completely dry well since it's a new fiscal year.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I think the hon. member is basically right and (we have Mr. Costello here with us who is the acting deputy minister of finance) April would be a dry month in essence. You introduce the first interim supply in May. You pay off all the obligations retroactively for April and some ongoing obligations and then you come back in again in June.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Well, in that case, it would also be a reasonably dry well in the month of May because you are talking about one-twelfth of your budget which you are spending on a monthly basis. So, therefore, your weekly or bimonthly salaries being paid in the month of May would have to come from an overdraft at the bank or however else you generate those funds.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I would just like to check this for a moment but we think that the first interim supply was for two-twelfths, April and May, which should answer the problem.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — If I recall the motion last month, it was for the same amount of money, which brings me to another question while you are checking that one out. Would the Chairman mind repeating the amount of money involved please?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — \$163,959,070.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, that amount does not work out to one-twelfth of the budget, the cash outflow, and I am asking now why the variance? Your yearly cash outflow budget is \$2,019 million which works out to about a little better than \$168 million, not \$163 million. Why the discrepancy in those two amounts?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Chairman, I am advised by finance people that the figure, the number, is given on the basis of appropriation plus loans and advances. That is how the one-twelfth breaks down. It's one-twelfth of the combination of those figures and you are looking at the appropriation figure alone.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Would the Attorney General please give us the figure of appropriation – the total for the year?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Chairman, it's in the blue book. The hon. member has it as easily as anybody does. I don't know if I have my blue book here or not, but it's there. Here's the blue book; I'll have one of the officials check it out for me.

Mr. Chairman, I direct the hon. members to page 9. The estimated for 1980-81 to be voted is \$1.96 billion plus loans and advances.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Is your interim supply dry every month since you are making payments during every day of the month, right from the beginning?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Chairman, I am advised by the acting deputy, Mr. Costello, that we took interim supply early in April for one-twelfth. We then took another supply in early May for two-twelfths and these are not necessarily on a calendar month. They are proportions broken down into twelfths of the expenditures. This is the third interim supply which is an additional one-twelfth and essentially is required for the fire suppression and other matters related to this.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, the answers you've been giving all along, then, have been incorrect. Now we're finding out that this is four-twelfths. We're into our third month and you're paying the bills from behind, so you're two months ahead. Surely you're not looking at \$330 million for fire suppression?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Chairman, I wish that government could be so simplistic that it was simply a matter of paying cheques for the employees at the end of the month. The fact of the matter is that there are ongoing obligations. For example, fire suppression – there's a requirement for money to look after the payment for the expenses involved in the suppression of fires. Some of those may be ongoing; some of them may not be ongoing. They don't necessarily end up neatly at the end of months. What we are doing here is on a twelfth basis allocating funds, some of which may be on an ongoing basis, some of which may not.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, what I would like to know from the Attorney General is this. Having received already three months interim supply, for April, May and June, he's now asking for July interim supply. Now let's be honest about it. This motion is not specifically designed to pay May interim supply at all. He had the legislative authority through interim supply before to pay the May bills. I'm sorry that the Attorney General finds himself in this position of having to answer finance questions before the finance people were next to him and so I'm not trying to embarrass him. But we're actually talking about July interim supply.

Now the fact remains, Mr. Chairman, the only reason that we are not now finished the budget, that we are not now completed with the budget, is because of the Attorney General's own choice as House Leader for bringing in bills to this Assembly. He is now bringing in bills that normally his department would accumulate and bring into the fall session. That's a fact. What the Attorney General is trying to do is continue this sitting to ram through legislation because we're at the end of the session and to ram through legislation that is against the best interests of the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

This is absolute and utter nonsense to suggest that the Government of Saskatchewan

needs another one-twelfth interim supply when it has already received one entire quarter of the year interim supply. We are now talking about July. So what the Attorney General is trying to do is to blackmail every member of this legislature. I think that is what the Attorney General is trying to do, because he can finish the budget; it's the Attorney General who decides the order paper and the Attorney General decides what comes on in this House. He can call finance; he can develop finance and we can finish the budget. Why then, does the Attorney General need another interim supply at this stage when he's already received one-quarter of the entire year?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Chairman, I must say, with all due respect to the member for Nipawin, that he is not conversant with what interim supply is all about. I'm saying to the hon. member that as requirements arise for government to pay bills, some of which are foreseen, some of which are unforeseen (I use the fire suppression as a very good example of an unforeseen and expensive run on finances) a quarter of the functioning with respect to government . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Of course it isn't \$160 million, but there are other ongoing obligations. That's but one example. You have to continue the pay and rations of the civil service for one reason. You can continue to do that. And the fact of the matter is that this is not done on a monthly basis; it is generally thought of, or perceived of, for the month of May or for the month of June, but it is not compartmentalized into neat quarters. As I indicated to the hon. member for Regina South these are non-moneys which are in effect sliced straight across the budget and are used for the services of the government.

For example, we have voted social services money already. We can't use that money, already voted, for fire suppression. We have not yet voted Department of Northern Saskatchewan. We have not yet voted Department of the Environment for that matter . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Exactly, and therefore that comes now to your next argument which is wrong, and that is to say that somehow this bill isn't needed. This bill is needed because I don't know when the appropriation bill is going to be introduced and debated. I am saying the appropriation bill goes on the order paper after we introduce and pass the various estimates of the departments of the government. We are not doing any estimates for today because we have the very urgent and pressing matter of Bill 105 to deal with.

**MR. COLLVER:** — There you are. You see Mr. Chairman, what he's trying to say is that the urgent and pressing matter of Bill 105, the suppression of civil liberties of citizens of this province, is more important to the Government of Saskatchewan than paying its bills. What he's saying is that it's more important to suppress civil liberties than it is to go through and put the departments on here. It's more important to bring in this sly and dicey little interim supply, to get supply before grievance. I would merely ask the Attorney General, has he ever heard of that expression, grievance before supply? Does he believe that the function of a legislative chamber is to grieve before the government has money, not after?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, of course everybody would understand grievance before supply. That is one of the cornerstones in general terms of our parliamentary system. The fact of the matter is that this process now is melding the two by permitting grievance and supply on an interim basis. We are not here introducing twelve-twelfths of the budget . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . But listen, we are into June which is virtually unprecedented, I dare say unprecedented, in the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan right now. What are we trying to do here? We are trying to

accomplish the two objectives of making sure the government has enough funds around to be able to do its job and to do the business of the House. All I can say as House Leader is that I try to draw a balance between those bills which you think are important (you, meaning the opposition), and those that you think are unimportant, and those estimates which you think are important and those that you don't think are important, and the ones that we think are or are not important. Sometimes that balance works and sometimes it doesn't. Right now you don't happen to agree with the balance. Well, just call them the way you call them and act the best you can.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm going to say this and then I'm going to take my place. I'm prepared to accept the Attorney General's one-twelfth for the month of July. If the Attorney General, who said he has three or four of them to bring in today – of these motions for interim . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, standard. Oh, just one-twelfth, no more than one further twelfth, just pertaining to one-twelfth?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Right. I tell the hon. member what we do today is all pertaining to one-twelfth.

**MR. COLLVER:** — I'm saying to the Attorney General in my judgment, in my opinion, in my estimation, it is not necessary. If he brought forward the necessary departments to be discussed in this Chamber, he would find that it would go very, very quickly and the appropriation bill would go very, very quickly. He would get the budget and then he would have grievance before supply instead of supply before grievance. With one-twelfth I'm prepared to accept it. But let me assure the Attorney General of this one thing. If the Attorney General attempts by ramming through legislation, suppressive legislation, that he thinks is important, ahead of the budgetary requirements of the province of Saskatchewan, if there is another attempt to bring forward another one-twelfth, I can assure the Attorney General that I will tie that, in no uncertain terms, to Bill 105 and we will continue the fight in terms of not only Bill 105 but also interim supply.

Motion agreed to.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Chairman, I move:

Be it resolved that toward making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981 the sum of \$163,959,070 be granted out of the consolidated fund.

Motion agreed to.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Chairman, I move:

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$52,664,580, being approximately one-twelfth of the amount of each of the several sums to be voted, as set forth in the estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981, laid before the Assembly at the present session, be granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the twelve months ending March 31, 1981.

Motion agreed to.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Chairman, one final motion:



Resolved that toward making good the supply granted to Her Majesty, on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981, the sum or \$52,664,580 be granted out of the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund.

**MR. COLLVER:** — What fire suppression or other urgent matter has to be granted out of the heritage fund?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Chairman, the interim supply in the last number of years has involved passage of one-twelfth of consolidated and one-twelfth of that portion committed from heritage to consolidated. That is what this last motion is doing.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry the Attorney General doesn't accept what I said earlier. The point is the Attorney General said the \$168 million to be granted out of this committee was in order to meet the urgent needs of government, to carry government forward another little time and to meet the commitments they have already made such as fire suppression and such as other unknown expenditures — to meet the grants and that sort of thing that have already been met.

My question was quite reasonable. What urgent matters are being paid out of this fund? If this is the case, the government doesn't need this \$52 million until it passes the appropriate budgetary items and until it passes the appropriation bill. In other words, if there's no urgency for this money, why in the name of heaven should this Assembly grant interim supply?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Chairman, first of all, the policy of the Minister of Finance and the government has been, rightly or wrongly (and I think it's been a right policy), to come forward on interim supply for both consolidated and heritage on a one-twelfth basis for each, separately, in order to keep the two accounts, in effect, roughly up to date and current. If we were to bring them in concurrently, or blended (although the funds are used in a concurrent and blended way) it would make it more difficult for proper accounting.

Secondly, the point that I have just alluded to is the case. The funds, whether they come from the consolidated or from heritage, go to the administration of the province in its various needs, some of which may very well be ending up in fire suppression or in the other ordinary operations related to government.

It would be very difficult for the officials, perhaps not impossible, to determine with precision what funds from heritage are being directed specifically for what purposes, unless there was some particularly obvious or glaring need identified from the heritage fund. We don't have that identified in this one-twelfth call. What we are simply doing is identifying the one-twelfth, which is what we normally did in the other two interim supplies — the same way for the same no special circumstances, the same bookkeeping for the kind of an operation which we have identified. The same approach is being taken here. It, in effect for budgetary purposes, is cutting off the one-twelfth of the two sources of supply at the same time.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, I might not understand what the Attorney General is saying — one-twelfth of the heritage fund to the consolidated fund, as the payment made from one to the other. If that is the case, I'd say that motion should be for about \$32 million, not \$52 million. What I see here under the inflow for the consolidated fund is \$387 million coming from the heritage fund.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I find this process interesting. I find it interesting from the Conservative side; the Unionists I could almost understand because of their determination on Bill 105. I find it a little more difficult on the Conservative side, their now asking these questions on interim supply, this having been the third time this session it comes up on this standard procedure. All of a sudden the member for Regina South is asking these questions and seizing on every word that I raise.

I shall try here to explain to the hon. member. I said the consolidated fund. It's true I used that word. I should have more accurately, and not anticipating the extreme care by which the Conservative members are following this process, have said that that money of the heritage goes to consolidated and also to development programs (development funds as identified on page no. 121 of your estimates book) and thereafter and as voted on by department by department as we come to it, an example being Department of Culture and Youth, restoration of Saskatchewan House. The hon. member will remember that one, or the Northwest Territorial House, because of the overruns. It is marked right at the very bottom, Saskatchewan Heritage Fund budgetary expenditures. Those two into the consolidated and into what I will categorize as the developmental functions are what that one-twelfth from heritage is comprised of.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — What page are you on?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — What? I said I'd draw your attention to page no. 121, Saskatchewan Heritage Fund budgetary expenditures, resources division.

**MR. COLLVER:** — With deference to the Attorney General and I am not trying to embarrass him again, I will say that. But Mr. Attorney General, be embarrassed. On the one side, you are telling us that the Department of Finance requires one-twelfth of the total consolidated fund expenditures. So that is what you told us to divide by 12 and come up with this one-twelfth. Now you are telling us it needs another one-twelfth of the heritage fund that goes into the consolidated fund.

So what you are asking for is more than one-twelfth of the operating fund or consolidated fund in the province of Saskatchewan. That is what you are asking for. If you wanted interim supply, you would have interim supply based on one-twelfth of the consolidated fund expenditures plus one-twelfth of the difference between heritage fund expenditures and the amount which goes into the consolidated fund. Then you would get one-twelfth of the appropriation per annum . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, yes. If you would pass me your book, Mr. Member for Regina South (which I asked for earlier), I would be happy to show you the figures . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Why? Would you rather I borrow an NDP book? Is it red instead of blue? Goodness gracious sakes alive!

Total budgetary cash outflows, Mr. Chairman, in the province of Saskatchewan estimated for 1981 is \$2,019,345,400.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — What page are you on?

**MR. COLLVER:** — I am on page no. 9.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — That's including statutory. Take the appropriation.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Yes. Less this. Pardon?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Take the \$1.9 billion and something.

**MR. COLLVER:** — To be voted \$1.965 billion. Divide that by 12 and you come up with the amount the Attorney General had in his former motion. That is one-twelfth of the expenditures of the consolidated fund. Am I correct on that? So you took one-twelfth of \$1.965 billion and that is how you came up with that first motion.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Chairman, I explained to the hon. members that the first one-twelfth required for the consolidated fund is one-twelfth of two figures: (a) the figures on page no. 9 which you are citing, and (b) the figure related to loans and advances, etc. One-twelfth of that is the first set of motions. The first number is \$1.965 billion, page no. 9, to be voted. The second, on loans and advances — I say to the member for Nipawin so we don't take more time than we need to . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — I don't know what you are doing, Roy. I think you are getting away with something here.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — First of all, it is one-twelfth of the figure on page no. 9, \$1.965 billion, then one-twelfth of loans and advances, which figure is not summarized in the book.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — And that is the second one you are dealing with?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — No. That is one-twelfth of the first motion. It is comprised of two things, the \$1.965 billion plus loans and advances. That is out of the way.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could just pass this along to the Attorney General that \$1.965 billion divided by 12 is \$163 million. That is a portion of the expenditure. Now what the Attorney General is telling us is that over and above that he wants one-twelfth of the income of the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund, a portion of which goes into the consolidated fund. The member for Regina South doesn't understand the difference between income and expense. On this side is . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Chairman, I'll explain it once more and hopefully, even the members opposite will understand. What the Attorney General, in principle, has said to us today is that he wants one-twelfth of the consolidated fund plus one-twelfth of the ability to expend moneys from the heritage fund. But, Mr. Chairman, by including the moneys he is apportioning over to the consolidated fund, he is getting one-twelfth of that too much. Now surely anyone can understand that. A portion of the outgo of the consolidated fund is the moneys received from the heritage fund.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — You did this when you were the Leader of the Conservatives too. Remember that?

**MR. COLLVER:** — No. I didn't do that. On an interim supply, what I did when I was in another group was entirely different than this, Mr. Chairman . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, perhaps a little classroom study is in order here. Perhaps the Government of Saskatchewan had better realize the principle of grievance before supply, instead of the supply, and take what they will.

I'm going to try one more time to explain it to the member for Shellbrook. O.K.? The member for Shellbrook will agree that what the government wants is one-twelfth of the consolidated fund plus one-twelfth of the heritage fund expenditures. Is that correct? Let's have an answer.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Nipawin and the hon. member for Regina South don't have their acts together. The hon. member for Regina South got up in his very first series of questions and said, one-twelfth of \$1.9 billion doesn't work out. Why doesn't it? So I said to him, the first set of resolutions is one-twelfth of two things: (a) the \$1.96 billion on page 9 plus (b) one-twelfth of loans and advances equals one-twelfth. The Department of Finance people will go back to their calculators and just see whether or not it works out. They advise me it does. But that's what the first set of resolutions deals with.

The second set of resolutions deals with one-twelfth of the heritage fund, for those expenditures which are identified on page 121. But there are other expenditures laced throughout the field. I will give you an example on page 119, energy security division, grants and rebates to the petroleum and natural gas exploration and conservation development. These are expenditures which come out of the heritage fund, expenditures due and owing to the various companies which are involved.

So I say to the hon. members again lest they become further confused in this whole operation, what I've been trying to say now for the last hour, namely that we are voting here two sets of funds. They are two sources of revenue. One goes into consolidated, one-twelfth made up of those two figures I've mentioned. The other is one-twelfth heritage expenditures, example being the one I just gave you. We are passing four motions. The first two deal with consolidated based on that computation; the next two deal with one-twelfth of the heritage fund. That's the standard procedure which has been going on now for this the third interim supply operation.

Now how much plainer I can make it I don't know. If the hon. member for Regina South says, well, your figures don't calculate it out, I will ask the committee to sit for a minute or two until we get the Department of Finance to rush all the way back to check on their figures. It's possible they made a mistake but they tell me the computations and the figures are accurate. I am working on that assumption. I am surprised, quite frankly, that this committee has adopted itself into the position of being chartered accountants, in effect to work out one-twelfth amounts, rather than to look at the policy and principle of interim supply. I can only ask, why is this taking place?

**MR. COLLVER:** — I will go back one more time to try to explain to the Attorney General. In an appropriate explanation perhaps the Attorney General can end this entire discussion quickly and we can get right on with what the Attorney General considers to be the most important issue facing the people. We will get on with that as soon as we get an answer to this.

On page 8 of your blue book and I now have a blue book which doesn't belong to the members to my right, which says 1981 on it and I hope that is all right for the benefit of the member for Regina South; it didn't turn red in my hands — on that page the Attorney General will find the total budgetary cash inflow, expected by the Government of Saskatchewan for the year 1980-81, is \$2,019,345,000, of which \$387 million comes from the heritage fund. Now is that clear enough for the Attorney General? If you want one-twelfth of the total, you want one-twelfth of \$2,019,345,000 plus one-twelfth

of the difference between what the heritage fund puts into this fund and what it expends in other areas. If you take one-twelfth of \$2 billion, plus one-twelfth of all of the heritage fund, you are taking a double one-twelfth on the \$387 million. Now surely even the Attorney General can understand that. If what you are trying to say is that you need that money in total, then say so. But you haven't said that. What you have said was, we want one-twelfth allocation. Well if you want one-twelfth allocation, let's have one-twelfth allocation.

I ask the Attorney General, since he is doing this bill and trying to usher it through in a hurry, to take \$163 million and multiply it by 12; take the \$57 million in this motion and multiply it by 12. Is that the total budget of the heritage fund plus the consolidated fund? The answer is no. You are \$300 million high, which means that you are going to be \$25 million more in this interim supply than you should be.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wasn't here when the Attorney General mentioned two other interim supply motions this year or I would have brought this to his attention at that time.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Where were you a year ago or a couple of years ago?

**MR. COLLVER:** — The member for Shellbrook says I didn't two years ago. How much was the heritage fund two years ago? For the information of the member for Shellbrook the heritage fund was zippo two years ago. But \$387 million, one-twelfth of it is a very material sum of money. That's \$25 million. I have heard the member for Rosthern, for heaven's sake, question the government on expenditures of \$150. Here we are talking about granting the government \$25 million more than they would have otherwise received, if we were taking one-twelfth. Now would the Attorney General kindly, if my numbers are wrong, explain why they are wrong?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I will try one more time. I say to the hon. member, what we are doing (please without interruption), if you can sit tight and listen for a minute or two it might solve things a little bit. And this is also to the Conservative member for Regina South.

We are dealing here with approval for the government to expend one-twelfth of expenditures. I direct the hon. member's attention first of all to page 9, budgetary cash outflows, \$1.965 billion — one-twelfth of that. It does not quite come out to the exact figure in the resolutions because of loans and advances, but if you compute loans and advances in on the assumption that the boys have done their numbers, the first two resolutions should amount to that \$163 million. Forget about, for the time being, page 8, cash inflow. We're not dealing with that.

Now turn to page 119 of your blues. We're dealing with the heritage fund. You are computing one-twelfth on \$387 million — the top figure. I am computing one-twelfth on total budgetary expenditures to be voted — \$496,175,000, not \$645,529,000; one-twelfth of that should, if the boys have done their numbers, roughly amount to that \$56 million or \$57 million the figures show. And we are therefore passing four motions to cover off two sources of expenditures, or funds if you will: the consolidated, made up of that figure on page 9 plus loans and advances, and the heritage, made up on this page of 465. That's the way it was done in April; that's the way it was done in May; that's the way I hope it will be done in June.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, I'll just go through it one more time. I'll take the

numbers the Attorney General gave me and maybe, just maybe, some of those NDP backbenchers, especially the ones who used to be cabinet members and are now backbenchers, would pay attention; maybe they'd learn something and they could get back in the cabinet again. Here's the point, Mr. Chairman. How much, as a result of these motions, will the consolidated fund get as a result of interim supply? How much? I'll tell the Attorney General how much. The Attorney General will know . . . Well, he's not listening so . . . I listen to him with bated breath.

How much as a result of these motions will the consolidated fund receive? The consolidated fund will receive one-twelfth of the total expenditures, \$1.965 billion plus one-twelfth of \$387 million, which means that the consolidated fund receives more than one-twelfth of its expenditures. Now you see, Mr. Chairman, that's the point. One-twelfth of \$387 million is some 30 odd million dollars. The consolidated fund will receive \$163 million plus \$30 million; the consolidated fund will receive \$193 million, which means we are granting more than one-twelfth.

You can't because it's called in business, for the benefit of the member for Regina South (who has been shaking his head at what I am saying), an intercompany account or an interdepartmental account or an interagency account. Whatever you call it, when you consolidate a fund or when you consolidate accounting methods, you . . . (inaudible interjection . . .

Well, Mr. Chairman, the point is that the Attorney General is suggesting that somehow this is going to be acceptable to the people of Saskatchewan. He says it was done in May. He says it was done in April. Three-twelfths has already been done. So therefore I say to the Attorney General that he's already received \$90 million extra in the consolidated fund, \$90 million over and above what one-twelfth interim supply amounts to. Then why do we need this motion at all? He doesn't need this. It was too much in April; it was too much in May by double; it's too much again. It's more than one-twelfth of the annual expenditures. Now am I correct in that, Mr. Attorney General?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Chairman, speaking to the heritage fund – I'm checking with Mr. Costello to make sure that I fully understand this. I'm convinced that I do and the hon. member opposite does not so I don't want to say this in inflammatory terms but . . . What we are doing is voting (I repeat again) one-twelfth out of heritage as a dividend, if you will, to the consolidated. Included are two functions – a consolidated vote function as voted and a provincial development expenditure fund as voted. We need funds from heritage combined with funds from consolidated to meet the combination of those two as voted. For example, the one I gave was the \$49 million set aside and voted on, with respect to royalties and grants for exploration companies out of the heritage. There are other examples under the development. Now that's the function, the process and why we need it.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, I think it's time we had a question on this motion as I'm prepared to vote on it. I just want to tell the Attorney General that I do understand what he has been telling us with one exception which I'm sure is an error on your part – that is the one-twelfth of the budgetary cash outflow in the consolidated fund, not part of the loans, advances and investments. If you're talking loans, advances and investments of the Crown corporations, that's a totally separate amount. I don't know whether you're talking about that or not, because that is 400 and some million dollars. However, I do understand the other exercise the Attorney General has put us through and I think it's time for the question.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't think it's time for the question at all. Would the Attorney General ask his official if this session happens to drag on – and he already has (supposedly) four-twelfths of the total expenditures of government – and the Attorney General keeps ramming these bills in, in advance of the budget, would the Attorney General or his official agree that by the time you would attempt to get ten-twelfths of the expenditures of government, you would have overspent the budget of the province of Saskatchewan? Is that correct?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Chairman, I am advised by my officials that we would not have overspent the total budget.

**MR. COLLVER:** — That is very interesting, Mr. Chairman, because I would like to see how the Attorney General does this little mathematical game. You have \$55 million here from the heritage fund. Is that correct, \$52 million? Multiply that by 12, a very simple number, which comes to \$624 million, as I add it. Multiply 163 by 12 and that comes to \$1.965 billion for a total of \$2.589 billion altogether . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — They are two separate budgets.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Pardon?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — They are two separate budgets.

**MR. COLLVER:** — They are two separate budgets? Oh, I can understand that quite simply. Thank you very much, Mr. Member for Regina South. But if you have \$2.589 billion and you only have \$1.965 billion and you have only \$496 million altogether that comes to \$2.361 billion. Now how can you multiply your one-twelfth by twelve and come to \$200 million more than the total expenditures in your budget? Would you explain that to me, Mr. Attorney General?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member keeps confusing his figures. Then you keep reverting to the top figure of \$387 million . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, you said that in the preface of the question. Plus non-budgetary . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It is.

Well, Mr. Chairman, again I want to just comment to the members of the committee because I find this an interesting process. It's a fascinating political process to watch, Mr. Chairman. We are not here debating expenditures in the sense of policy expenditures and interim supply which is what we are approaching to do. We are, several of us, the member for Regina South, the member for Nipawin in particular, trying to play accountant. They are saying this figure is wrong, one-twelfth of that figure doesn't work out, send your officials out to figure that out. I suppose that's what this Chamber should be used for – that kind of accountancy – but for my part I would sooner trust the officials of the Department of Finance who computed these figures, than to trust, with all due respect, the hon. member for Nipawin or the member for Regina South, in their on the spot computations.

I am going to try one more time, Mr. Speaker, to explain, if I can, how the figures are arrived at; if I don't succeed then I am, frankly, burned out because you can take any other figure going from there, and give your interpolation of that and say the figures don't match. But here is how the process of government works in coming to this Legislative Assembly for interim supply. I repeat again, on basics. We are voting here; we are giving permission to the government to make expenditures for up to one-

twelfth. Expenditure is what we're voting on. We are voting out of two categories – two funds in effect. One is the consolidated. Here we have an appropriation of \$1.965 billion (that is indicated on page 9) plus approximately 1.8 of loans, advances, and investments other than the loans, advances and investments which are identified under specific special categories somewhere toward the back. Those are voted on every time we come to the committee of finance. You take those two figures (I'm still dealing with consolidated funds), \$1.965 billion and loans, advances, investment of 1.8. You come to a figure of \$1.967 billion. One-twelfth amounts to \$163,959,070. Now, it's taken one hour and fifteen minutes to get the hon. member for Nipawin to agree to that set of figures – exactly what I was telling him 20 minutes before and he didn't buy that.

Now I come to the heritage fund. The heritage fund is comprised of, or there are two kinds of expenditures. One is the appropriation, which is \$496,175,000 – that is on page 119, total budgetary expenditures to be voted, which I have explained – plus loans, advances and investments, which amounts to, in various places, \$135,800,000 additional. If you total those two up, it is \$631,975,000. The hon. member says the figure, taking 52 times 12, doesn't match with \$387 million. On \$631,975,000, we take one-twelfth which amounts to \$52,664,000. The boys have gone through their computers and calculators again, Mr. Chairman, and lo and behold (I hate to shock the hon. member for Nipawin and the hon. member for Regina South) the same figures come out the same way for the sums which are set out in the blue book. That is the procedure, and we are doing the one-twelfth for the two funds – the consolidated and the heritage – at the same time. But the funds are in effect blended. They are used for consolidated or specific developmental projects or specially identified on the one-twelfth basis. I have given the example of the \$49 million, which is heritage fund, out of the one-twelfth there. A portion of that may or may not be used, I don't know, for the satisfaction of outstanding obligations with respect to royalties and the like. It may even be the payment back of the Cigol case. I don't know, but that's an example.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that's what we are doing, simply put – one-twelfth. I don't know how many more times I can explain that to the hon. member opposite, but there it is.

**MR. COLLVER:** — I'm glad the hon. member for Regina South agrees; I do not agree.

Mr. Chairman, the point I am trying to make to the Attorney General and to his officials is quite simply this. I have made it before in this legislature many times. It is not incumbent upon the Government of Saskatchewan to expend moneys unless it is legislatively approved. Now the purpose for this interim supply is to await the legislative approval of the final and formal budget. When you take one-twelfth of expenses on the heritage fund, but you include in that an interbranch or interdepartment transfer between the heritage fund and the consolidated fund, you in fact are taking one-twelfth more than you need. Now when you add and compound that by suggesting you also need one-twelfth of borrowings, you are saying you need one-twelfth of borrowings plus expenditures. But you might borrow to pay expenditures. You might borrow to give appropriations.

So the point is you are trying to mix apples and oranges. I don't object to your mixing apples and oranges if that is what you say you are doing. If you say to this Assembly, we are not attempting to get one-twelfth of the budget, we are attempting to get this much cash money for the people of the province of Saskatchewan to work, then I will sit down, take my place and that's the end of it. But if you try to say to the people of Saskatchewan, we are trying to take one-twelfth of the total budget through these allocations, then you are misleading the people of Saskatchewan and misleading this Assembly.



I don't object to the Attorney General saying we need \$163 million. I don't object to him saying we need \$52 million out of the heritage fund. But I object to him saying this represents one-twelfth of the total, because it does not represent one-twelfth of the total for the information of the Attorney General and his officials. It cannot represent one-twelfth of the total, since you are double counting on heritage fund transfers into the consolidated fund. Fair enough, but that means we are not talking about moneys up to the end of July; we are talking about moneys on into August, in terms of the total budget and the budgetary expenditures which need to be voted on. I don't object to the Attorney General saying, as of today we need moneys going into August.

But I don't think it is fair to the people of the province of Saskatchewan, nor do I think it's fair to the members of this Assembly, for the Attorney General to say that this is one-twelfth and that it goes until the end of July. That's all. So if the Attorney General wants to end this debate, he should merely get up and say to the people of Saskatchewan, what we're looking for is this money on interim supply. It doesn't represent one-twelfth but this is what we need. Fair game.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I've said to the hon. member on many occasions that this is not an allocation of funds on a month compartmentalized by month basis. It is the voting of funds from heritage or consolidated on, if you will, a block basis as needed . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, you can continue all you want. I want to tell the hon. member that by so doing — well, he does whatever he wants to do; we'll make a conclusion on that.

I'm saying to the hon. member here that the one-twelfth of the heritage fund is, again, the slicing of the heritage fund (one-twelfth blended into consolidated and interdevelopmental) plus one-twelfth of the consolidated in order to allow this government to operate for this one-twelfth period — not in a compartmentalized way, but in a block way.

That's the way the process has worked for three years. The member has voted that in the past and has consented, with all due respect to the hon. member. Short of wanting to make this an issue because of Bill No. 105, he fully understands how the budgetary process operates and I say to him, he ought not to hold up interim supply and the very many worthwhile expenditures which are attached to that — not worthwhile, absolutely mandatory expenditures tied up with that — because of other motivations.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

### Yeas — 32

Blakeney	Kaeding	Lingenfelter
Pepper	Hammersmith	White
Bowerman	Feschuk	Larter
Romanow	Byers	Taylor
Messer	Vickar	Rousseau
Kramer	Cody	Swan
McArthur	Lusney	Pickering
Gross	Long	Muirhead
Shillington	Nelson	Katzman

MacMurchy  
Banda

Engel  
Poniatowski

Andrew

### Nays – 2

Collver

Ham

The committee reported resolutions.

Resolutions agreed to and read a first time on division and read a second time.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 135 – **An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981** be now introduced and read the first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first, second and third time.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Cowley (Provincial Secretary) that Bill No. 105 – **An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act** be now read a second time.

**MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Unionest Party):** — No, not quite yet, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I was going to make a few remarks today before I went on with this, but fortunately during the course of the discussion on the motion to extend the hours I was able to make those remarks. I don't want to extend this, drag out this discussion anymore than is at all possible. I know the gentlemen to my right and the gentlemen opposite will notice how we granted leave on two occasions prior to the introduction of interim supply. We certainly said it was acceptable this time, but next time we wouldn't permit it to go on quite so easily. But I know members will feel that spirit of warmth and will want to definitely get on with this lengthy list of business.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you will know, and all members of this Assembly will know, that the Attorney General and the House Leader provide a list of business to be conducted in terms of the Government of Saskatchewan – such important items as for the Attorney General, Court of Queen's Bench, district court, provincial court, defamation, unified family court, small claims court. I am sure the Attorney General wants to get on with that work, and of course through a simple manoeuvre of accepting a leave to adjourn debate, we can get right on with that business. Now, Mr. Shillington I am sure wants to get on with the heritage fund; Mr. Snyder with The Labour Standards Act, I am sure of that; Mr. Tchorzewski, the heritage fund and the corporation capital tax and income tax No. 2; Mr. Robbins with Queen's Printer and Department of Revenue; Mr. Bowerman with drainage control(I'm sure he wants to get on with that bill); Mr. Smishek with urban municipalities. And then on the list for today is committee of the whole, to get on with Mr. Smishek and the assessment of real property, capital works projects, planning and

development. There is the Department of Municipal Affairs and the Department of Urban Affairs. I'm sure we want to get on with the important business of the House. Because the members of this Assembly are so worn and because they saw that I granted leave to them to bring in interim supply today so they wouldn't have to wait for 48 hours and perhaps be late with some cheques, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The member has asked leave to adjourn debate. Is leave granted?

Motion to adjourn debate negatived.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Well, I didn't really expect it. I don't think there is any spirit of co-operation in these people. You see, Mr. Speaker, the point is that what they are attempting to do . . .

**MR. KATZMAN:** — On a point of order — am I correct or incorrect? I understand you ruled prior that no member who has asked for leave to adjourn debate once can ask for it again? Is this incorrect or correct?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — It was not granted; therefore he didn't get the adjournment of debate.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Yes, for the benefit of the member for Rosthern, I sincerely appreciate his interjection. During the course of today and perhaps later on this evening, and for as long as the member for Rosthern wants to interject on points of order on my remarks, I would be most happy to hear them. I am sure Mr. Speaker would be happy to rule on them and I'm sure the House Leader would also like to hear them.

I'm not going to repeat myself because I know there is only one person in this Assembly who fiddles with his drinking water, Mr. Member for the Battlefords and we all know who that is. I'm not going to go back over my review again because I know every member of this Assembly is anxious, no, in fact, eager.

I have had several members come to me wanting to find out the disposition of the Berger case as quickly as we can possibly get to it, in order that we can get on with the case of the five New York socialists, and see the kind of degradation into which the members of this Assembly are sinking by moving a bill which would attack a political party merely because of what it believes in.

This, of course, is unacceptable. If the political party were countenancing the violent overthrow of the country, or if in fact the political group were countenancing some kind of insurrection, or if the political group were countenancing that we act outside the laws, then of course such action might conceivably be taken. In fact, under the Criminal Code of Canada, there is a charge of treason which can be laid under those circumstances. That charge, of course, has not been laid nor will it be laid in this country. Anyone who is prepared to live within the laws should be allowed to think the way he wants to; he should be allowed to associate with others who also wish to think that way; and he should be allowed to react in accordance with the beliefs he may have, albeit unpopular.

I have been emphasizing, over the past little while, the unpopularity of the Unionest Party in the province of Saskatchewan. However, I might inform members opposite and members to my right, that I am going to have to very soon remove that stigma from our ranks. I am afraid we are becoming much more popular, not only in so far as the presentation of what we believe to be the best option for western Canadians is

concerned, but also because western Canadians are starting to recognize the truth of what we are saying – Canada is, in fact, breaking up; there is no hope for the future and therefore we must look to the best possible option in order to protect ourselves, our children and our grandchildren.

Now I want to emphasize this to you before I get on with the Berger case. I know all the members in this Chamber are anxious to hear what transpired in terms of the Berger case. But I want to emphasize to you that the kinds of actions Mr. Trudeau has taken recently, the kinds of statements that the Premier of Saskatchewan issued in this House today will not enable western Canadians to stand behind whatever happens in terms of the near future. The point is, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Trudeau has already promised the people of the province of Quebec that he would enshrine language rights in the constitution. Now, Mr. Speaker, what does that mean? What does that mean to western Canadians if language rights are enshrined in the constitution? What that means is that every Crown corporation in the province of Saskatchewan, because it is a government corporation, must be bilingual. That doesn't mean they have to have an interpreter available. It means that every person of French-speaking descent has a right from their government to be able to speak the language of their choice. That's what it means to enshrine a language right in a constitution.

The Prime Minister of this country has stated unequivocally that this is not negotiable in terms of the coming constitutional talks. The Premier of Saskatchewan said today in answer to a question that it was negotiable. Now how in the world can you negotiate a non-negotiable item? The Prime Minister says we're not going to put it on the agenda; it's non-negotiable. We have promised the people of Quebec it will be enshrined. When are the people of western Canada going to get the facts from their representatives?

Now here's the point, Mr. Speaker. The facts of this case are, in no uncertain terms, that enshrining language rights in the constitution will mean that all Crown corporations, all government operations, all government organizations in the province of Saskatchewan will have to be and must be bilingual – French and English. What does that do to the feelings of the people who are of other cultures and language backgrounds? I'll tell you what it does. It makes them feel like second-class citizens, that's what it does. We in western Canada have a multicultural heritage. No one could have attended Regina's mosaic recently without seeing that we have a multicultural heritage, and are proud of it. Those of us in western Canada are very proud of that heritage.

What about those in central Canada and Quebec? Well, my relatives (I've mentioned before in this debate) live in Simcoe. What do they think? They don't believe in the multicultural heritage, Mr. Speaker, at all. They believe in the English heritage. To them there is only one Canada, and that is English Canada. And the people of the province of Quebec? No one could have witnessed the debates which occurred in the province of Quebec recently during the referendum debate without knowing that the people of Quebec believe there is one Canada – a French Canada. So in order to try to bring those two views together the Liberal Party of Canada (and for a time the Conservative Party of Canada) decided that the only possible approach to it would be two founding cultures – two nations. So that was their policy – two founding cultures. Well, if we in the western part of Canada want to lose the very essence of western Canada, which is its multicultural heritage, we will accept the view that somehow, in some way, French and English are the only two important cultural heritages to enshrine in a constitution. That's what we'll believe. I don't think there's a living person – well there might be a few – but very, very few people in western Canada are prepared to accept that. I was talking

to a young man the day before yesterday and he said (as a matter of fact he was a member of the press corps) until I spoke to the Saskatchewan French community and recognized what it was that they wanted, I wasn't prepared to accept any other thought besides that of a united Canada with these language rights enshrined in the constitution. But, he said, I'm of Ukrainian heritage and when I spoke to them and realized what it was that they wanted, and realized what it was that Mr. Trudeau was trying to say to people, and realized what it was that Mr. Trudeau had promised the people of Quebec . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, Mr. Chairman, the member for Shellbrook asks me what this has to do with Bill No. 105. I'll tell you exactly what it has to do with Bill No. 105. Bill No. 105 is an attack on the rights of a political party in this legislative Chamber. That's what it is.

In order to properly and appropriately understand what Bill No. 105 is doing to the province and to this legislative Chamber, the members had better understand what the position of the Unionest Party really is. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to tell them what the position of the Unionest Party is and to explain to them why they are making such a mistake in passing this kind of retrogressive, repressive and wrong legislation. Now, language rights enshrined in the constitution won't work. That is going to attack the feelings of western Canadians. It is going to attack the feelings of western Canadians of anything but French and English heritage, and it is going to attack the feelings of those of us who happen to have had an English heritage but who believe that our multicultural society is the right approach and the correct approach to a country.

Do we want to develop the attitudes they have in Ontario? Do we want to develop the attitudes they have in Quebec? Because if we do, we will enshrine those language rights in the constitution and demand that all those inefficiencies be placed throughout our governmental system, our court system, and our Crown corporations. There was great debate in here, Mr. Speaker, about Sask Tel and the power therein. I wonder what Sask Tel will say when and if those language rights are enshrined in the constitution and the few (and I say few) people of French-speaking origin in the province of Saskatchewan demand that that corporation be bilingual in nature. Once it's in the constitution, if you believe in the rule of law, then you believe that law must prevail. The Prime Minister says it's non-negotiable.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to get to another aspect of Unionest Party policy in a moment. To start with I want to point out how ridiculous that approach is, how that cannot possibly work and how in the long run – and I don't mean by that, 10 years 15 years or 20 years – over the next four or five months that issue will become more and more prevalent in western Canada as it becomes more and more apparent that the people of the province of Quebec are demanding precisely that. That is precisely what they are requesting and I say it will take the very heart right out of western Canadians; the belief that we are a multicultural, multiracial society, that we can all get along together and that we don't have to enshrine one group or another in our constitution.

Now that having been said, Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a quick look at what the Government of Canada is doing today prior to any constitutional discussions and what others are doing today with reference to how this country is in fact going to break up. The Government of Canada is saying (because Mr. Trudeau and his people promised the people of Quebec), that the world oil price will never be in terms of western Canada. Now, he didn't say anything about world hydro-electric price; he didn't say anything about the world nickel price; he didn't say anything about any of the other things that are manufactured in Ontario. He didn't mention anything about the protective tariffs for

Ontario and Quebec industries; he didn't mention any of those things. What he said was that we have to, we must, support the energy needs of eastern Canadians at below world price because, Mr. Speaker, they need it. That's the point he's making.

When we needed it, when our young people had to leave western Canada to go looking for jobs in Toronto, Hamilton, Montreal and other parts of Canada, what did we have to say? Nothing! They just left and we pleaded with them; we said, this is unacceptable, we want to develop here in western Canada. No, no. That's where the jobs are. Do they get special favors down there so they'd prevent the outflow? No, no. Leave them as the hewers of wood and the drawers of water.

Mr. Speaker, there is a chance, an opportunity right now for western Canadians to develop economically, to develop a broad economic base that will enable us as western Canadians to finally offer our young people jobs and opportunities and the federal government says, you may not do it. We are going to see that petro-chemical centre remains in Sarnia even though it's in the most illogical place in the country. We're going to see that it stays in Sarnia and we are going to protect them to the detriment of any development of a petro-chemical industry in the province of Alberta. I don't need to just say that myself in terms of a belief, Mr. Speaker, that it's coming from the Unionest Party of Saskatchewan. Crosbie also accuses Ottawa of bullying western Canada.

There's an item in today's Regina Leader-Post. Every day it is something else. Every day there is something in the paper about some minister in Ottawa leaving a document around that says, don't do anything real for western Canadian farmers in the drought but make darn sure that you appear to do something. That's the document. That's the attitude. Those are the thought processes of those people in central Canada and there is no possible way that those thought processes can be brought to bear and brought together with the thought processes of the people of western Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned about the unpopularity of the Unionest Party; that's the reason the members opposite have introduced this bill and the reason of some of the members to my right, although I'm not so sure at the moment where they stand. They haven't bothered to say to anyone where they stand. Some of them, I understand, have informed some members of the press they haven't taken a position on it yet. That is a very interesting thing. After three and one-half or four weeks of this bill being before the legislature the Conservative Party has not bothered taking a position on a bill of this magnitude. But, however, that's for them to decide and I'm sure they'll play their tactical cards to the best of their ability, which may prove to be somewhat lacking in the long run.

But, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that western Canadians are not prepared to put up with, economically, a continued drain on western Canadian resources when what we're looking for is the development of jobs and opportunities here. Sure it's happening now, and I don't think western Canadians are prepared to accept the kinds of moves that Mr. Trudeau, Mr. Lalonde and others in that central Canadian government have said they are going to impose in the constitutional discussions.

Mr. Blakeney, the Premier of Saskatchewan, today said to this Legislative Assembly that he sees nothing – no negotiations anywhere are going on in terms of the oil-pricing agreement which is up in less than a month. He sees no place . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. I think the member for Nipawin would have to agree that I've

been fairly generous with him on keeping him to the topic. I've allowed him a fairly wide latitude. The topic before us is Bill No. 105, An Act to amend the Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act and I can understand the member relating that to certain aspects of the Unionest Party. But I cannot understand how the member can expect to be found in order when he's talking about the constitution of Canada or the petro-chemical centre of Canada being in Sarnia or about the philosophy of the Unionest Party. He can speak about the philosophy of the Unionest Party only as it may be affected by this bill. But quite simply this bill has to do with the mechanics of research money and other things with regard to a third party in this Chamber. And I would ask the member to try and keep his debate related directly to that.

A brief reference to the number of the bill or the name of the bill or what members on his right may or may not have done with regard to making up their minds. It doesn't necessarily make his debate in order if he's talking about the constitution of Canada.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Speaker, surely, if we believe this bill is an attack on the Unionest Party, which is the third party in this legislature, then we must try to explain the position of the Unionest Party. Now, you say, how can we possibly relate that to the constitution of Canada? Surely we must make in advance our comments in terms of the present situation in order to then say, this is why we believe what we do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have stated in my remarks so far on this debate that this bill runs contrary to every principle of natural justice and every principle . . . And I've gone through and told Mr. Speaker what the intent of our debate is going to be and what our amendment is going to be before I take my chair. And, Mr. Speaker, surely if this is an attack, as we believe it is, on the Unionest Party, then surely we must be allowed the latitude to explain what the position of the Unionest Party is.

We've said this is an attack on us, not because we're any other party; we've said, and we've been able to prove beyond any reasonable doubt, that if the member for Swift Current and the member for Nipawin had become Liberals in this Chamber, even after the bill passes — we would be eligible for those grants which are written in the bill. We would be immediately eligible, even if they pass the bill. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, it must be an attack on a party because of the views of that party. Well if it's an attack on the party because of the views of the party, surely we're entitled to explain what the views of the party are. And that's what I'm attempting to do, Mr. Speaker.

The mention of the constitution of Canada and the comments of the Premier today were just to indicate, Mr. Speaker, (and I hope Mr. Speaker will allow me to do that) to him why we found it necessary to create the Unionest Party; why we believe it was necessary to take this stand at this time; why we believe it's necessary that we should present this option to the people of western Canada. Surely Mr. Speaker will allow a person that latitude.

That's what this bill is — an attack on our views. Well, we're entitled surely to present our views, and we're right on topic. In order to present our views, we must say why we're not prepared to stand with the Conservatives or to stand with the NDP or, in fact, to stand with the Liberals. So I hope Mr. Speaker will allow me that amount of latitude. That's precisely why: we want to explain why we're not standing with those people who today believe that a constitutional change will occur.

After all, Mr. Speaker, what other reason has ever been given for the formation of the Unionest Party? We didn't give as our reason that we no longer wanted to be members

to our right because of their views on the governing of the province of Saskatchewan. As a matter of fact, we've said many times that we would certainly like to see them become the government of the province of Saskatchewan, given the current situation in Canada. We've said that many times.

We've said we couldn't possibly support the views of the NDP because they believe, as I said at one other point in my debate, Mr. Speaker, that of the four choices facing western Canadians they should take over the club, as the Attorney General suggested in an interjection the other day. So we couldn't join with them.

We couldn't join with the Liberals. How in the world could we support Pierre Elliott Trudeau in the present circumstances? In fact, it was our stated objective at the time we sat as independents that it was the re-election of Trudeau and his gang down in Ottawa that finally made us realize it wasn't the politicians at all. It is the people in central Canada who are making these decisions, who are re-electing people of the ilk of John Monroe and Francis Fox and others even though they have, in some cases, committed criminal offences and have used their positions to influence others (as in the judges' affair) and other things like that. That scandal-ridden government in Ottawa was re-elected in February. It made us believe that the people had decided that is the way it is going to stay in Canada – the club is going to stay in charge; it doesn't matter about these scandals; it doesn't make any difference about how badly they governed the country; it doesn't matter that the economy was and is on the verge of collapse. None of those things matter. The only thing that mattered was they keep the power in central Canada, and that is, Mr. Speaker, why we formed the Unionest Party.

That's why I made the comments on the constitution which I have, Mr. Speaker. From time to time I hope you will let me refer to those. I think they're important to this discussion, and important to figure out why the member for Swift Current and I have made the presentation we have, and why we are going to continue to do so, Mr. Speaker, whether or not this bill passes.

I mentioned the other day, Mr. Speaker, and I will again mention, the fact I'm very pleased the Government of Saskatchewan has made this decision to proceed on this bill. In no possible way could it be emphasized more strongly the need for a change in direction for the people of western Canada than for a government in western Canada to introduce a bill of this kind.

To suggest that you live in a free country, to suggest that you live in a free society, to suggest that you live in a society with parliamentary traditions, and free parliamentary traditions at that, and then to try to pass a retroactive bill to cancel out the rights of a legitimately created, legitimately organized party within that legislature, must I'm sure, make most members in this Assembly cringe at the thought of what could happen to them, when and if they ever have guts and courage enough, to stand on their own two feet and present something they believe in.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it would be interesting to find out if any of the members on the government side of the legislature would ever have the courage of a Victor Berger in the United States (the first socialist elected in the United States). I wonder if any of them from their cushy new cars, their cushy new offices, their cushy new positions with their cushy salaries, would ever have enough courage to stand up to be counted, and to talk about something they, in fact, believe in, knowing at the moment it might not be particularly a popular thing to do.



Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, with the attitude they are presently exhibiting, with the attitude that some of the members to my right are presently exhibiting, I honestly can't believe they would do that. I honestly believe what they would do is persist in taking the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland's position, and that is, the tradition of the NDP — when we object to anything, we abstain. That's how we object, by abstaining.

In most parliaments, in most governments, in most free societies, if you object to something you stand up to be counted, and you persist in standing up to be counted. I must say from time to time the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland at least shows some courage of conviction and is prepared to stand up to be counted even though it may not be a particularly popular thing to do. For that, I have to give him full credit, even though I don't for the life of me, agree with any stand he has taken. Oh yes, I do. There was one he took I agreed with. The vast majority of the things he says, I don't agree with, but I certainly admire him for at least having the courage to stand up and say them from time to time.

I thought it was interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the members like to say (on the government side) they had a lot of trouble in their caucus over this bill. There was some dissension in there. I sure haven't seen any of them step forward to say, yes, I don't think this is a very good thing to do. What they're doing, Mr. Speaker, is taking the tradition again, of the NDP and that is to abstain, or to sit back and allow these things to happen. But when is it going to happen that someone has enough courage to stand up and say what he believes?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is necessary in western Canada right now. I think we are at a crossroads . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Give us a chance.

**MR. COLLVER:** — The member responsible for education and testing in Saskatchewan speaks from his chair, to give us a chance. I want Mr. Speaker to understand that in this Assembly I called on every member (every one of them) to stand on this bill and speak on it. I look forward with enthusiasm to that day when they will do so. But Mr. Speaker will know, in due course . . . That is about when it is going to happen is in due course, a reasonable time from now depending on your outlook on what is reasonable.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this country is breaking up. There isn't any way to reconcile the views of those people in Quebec who believe they can enshrine those language rights and prevent the development of resources in western Canada. Again, Mr. Speaker, the Premier said today he had spoken to the Minister of Mineral Resources and he saw absolutely no hope at all in the negotiations which had been conducted so far. I believe I am stating his words quite accurately. The member for Kindersley asked him if he saw any hope in the negotiations. The answer to the member was no. Now, I don't know how you could interpret that 'no' as any more. He said he had spoken to the Minister of Mineral Resources and he didn't see any hope. It doesn't mean that perhaps, in the deepest recesses of his mind, he doesn't have hope. He merely said that so far (and I think that was correct) he doesn't see any hope in these negotiations, that they are going to be concluded by July 1 which is when the present oil-pricing agreement runs out. But I don't think these views can be reconciled. I think it is absolutely impossible. You know, we talk quite a bit in this country, Mr. Speaker, about compromise. We say, let's compromise our views. I say to you, the people of western Canada have been compromising their views for 100 years. It is time somebody else compromised theirs. It is time the people of this country recognized it is not compromise from us which is

going to work right now. What is going to work out right now is people trying to understand how you can best govern a country like Canada.

Now, I said there was no hope, Mr. Speaker. I do see a hope. I did see a hope, I should say. So I worked very, very hard at many constitutional conferences to attempt to bring that hope to fruition and to realization. What I said was this, Mr. Speaker: in a country as diverse as Canada, you allow governments at the local level (that is, provincial governments and municipal governments) to deal exclusively with those areas of concern which are personal in nature; for example, health care, welfare, education, those for which people have to deal directly with their government. Those items which are absolutely essential to the maintenance of a country should be in the hands of the federal government. I tried, Mr. Speaker, and I tried, but no one would listen to that. No one would say that family allowance is welfare, let the provinces have it, period. No one would say that. No one would say that the federal Department of Health is interfering with the rights of the departments of health, and with the medicare programs, in every province in Canada, although that must be a regional concern and the federal government should fold up in that area. No one is saying that. Not one party is saying that, Mr. Speaker, no one.

No one is saying that education is a right of local areas to conduct as they see fit. The federal government should get out of that field completely, and allow provinces to become involved in educating their children as they see fit at the regional level. No one is saying that, Mr. Speaker, no one. So the point is, if no one is saying it, then it is not going to happen and it is not going to work. The provincial governments, from time to time, try to interfere by opening up pseudo embassies in Europe. That is a federal concern. There is no question about that. That is the way it should be; the federal government should deal with foreign governments. The federal government should deal with interprovincial trade. The federal government should deal with the armed forces and defence.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order. I rise again to caution the member for Nipawin that I see absolutely nothing in this bill dealing with the matter that the member is saying to this House at this time. Therefore, I find the member's remarks out of order, and I ask the member to hasten to bring his remarks into order, in other words, to talk about the principle of this bill that is before us. And if the member does not do that, I will rise again.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm attempting to tell you what the policy of the Unionest Party is, and that's what's being attacked by this bill. So if that is unacceptable then I hope Mr. Speaker will tell me it's unacceptable.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I don't expect the member for Nipawin to get up after every time I've gotten up and made a ruling and argue my ruling, as he did last time. I expect him to deal with the principle of this bill. This bill has nothing to do with the Unionest Party. It has to do with a third party in this Assembly, period. And the member must deal with that principle. If he continues to stray off the point of the debate, or the principle of the debate, I will call him to order, and I don't expect him to argue my ruling every time after I sit down.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm not arguing with your ruling nor would I pretend to argue with your ruling. The third party in this legislature is what this bill deal with. The third party in this legislature is the Unionest Party of Saskatchewan, or the Unionest Party. That is the third party as of now, as of today, and that's the principle of this bill.

This is an attack on the third party in this legislature.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I'm going to warn the member for the last time that he does not have the privilege, nor does any member in this House, to argue with the Speaker after he's made a ruling. My ruling is that the principle of this bill is the third party in this House. The member does not rise then and twist my words to say that I am wrong and he is right, and that the principle of this bill is about the Unionest Party, because it is not in fact about the Unionest Party. It could be about any party of any name.

**MR. COLLVER:** — I'm not going to argue with your ruling, Mr. Speaker. We'll just return to the bill. The bill says Mr. Speaker, that only those parties which were registered at the time of the last election would be eligible to fit under this bill. I'm sure that Mr. Speaker will read that into the bill, and I'm sure he will find it says only those parties that were registered at the time of the last election. Now this doesn't only deal with the third party; it deals with only those parties that were registered at the last election. The Conservative Party was registered at the last election; the NDP was registered at the last election; the Liberals were registered at the last election. There is only one other party that is registered now, Mr. Speaker. This bill refers to registered parties. I'm not questioning your ruling. This bill deals with parties registered before the chief electoral officer. The chief electoral officer has now selected four parties — four. They are the Conservatives, the NDP, the Liberals, and the Unionests; therefore, Mr. Speaker, with deference and respect to your ruling because this bill refers to . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. I hesitate to interrupt the member again but clearly the member is saying, with deference to my ruling, with respect to my ruling, and he's arguing the point that I was making before. I don't know how I can put it more clearly than I put it before that the member must deal with the principle of the bill and not argue my rulings. While I have the member sitting down I wonder if he would permit an introduction? One of the members wishes to make an introduction, the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake.

### **WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**HON. J.A. HAMMERSMITH (Prince Albert-Duck Lake):** — Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Nipawin and I would like to introduce on behalf of myself and the member for Prince Albert, some 88 students from Holy Cross Junior High School in Prince Albert. I understand they are all Grade 8 students. They have journeyed today all the way from Prince Albert. They are accompanied by their teacher Marcel Levesque, as well as other chaperones and bus drivers. They will be staying tonight in Regina, visiting the natural history museum, the RCMP Museum tomorrow and returning to Prince Albert tomorrow.

We have had the opportunity to meet with the students for pictures, refreshments and questions. We wish to extend to them a hearty welcome to the legislature. I am sure all members will join with me in welcoming the students and we express the hope that their stay in the legislature is informative, that their visit to Regina is educational, interesting and memorable. We wish them a safe journey home tomorrow.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### **Adjourned Debates – Bill No. 105 (continued)**

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Speaker, I am not questioning a ruling, but I want to ask you for

one now. Clause 3(d) of printed bill, Bill No. 105, states:

‘Leader of the Third Party’ means the member who is the recognized leader of two or more members constituting the second largest group sitting in the Assembly in opposition to the government where that group is a political party registered under The Election Act on the day of the last general election

The amendment, which this bill is designed to correct, as Mr. Speaker will know, is to add the words, ‘where that group is a political party registered under The Election Act on the day of the last general election.’ The principle of that surely is to bring political parties into account. Is it not possible, in terms of making the presentation, that this bill, in suggesting that political parties be introduced, must of necessity refer to political parties in existence now, but not in existence at the time of the last general election? That is the purpose of the clause.

Now if that is the case, would you accept the fact that by defining political party in the new act, it is therefore the entitlement of any member to talk about the political parties and the beliefs of the various political parties in Saskatchewan? Is that not part of this bill?

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, am I correct in the assumption that they have brought the words, political party, into this bill? It is a new addition to the bill. Because of that, it surely must be part of the principle of the bill that the people who drafted this legislation wanted to bring in the words, political party. Now there are only four registered political parties. The bill specifically says, registered under The Election Act on the day of the last general election. That surely must be the intent of the people who drafted the bill, that the principle of the political parties and the beliefs of political parties must enter into this debate. Am I wrong in that assumption, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Well, I am going to resist the invitation of the member for Nipawin to get into the debate, since there is no opportunity for me to do that. Essentially, I have to rule on the basis of what I see before me. I see in section 3(d), ‘Leader of the Third Party.’ Part of the principle of this bill deals with the funds to the leader of the third party.

It doesn’t matter whether there are three parties in this province or whether there are 50 parties in this province. It would still read the same – the leader of the third party. This is dealing with the principle of funds to the leader of the third party in this Chamber. It doesn’t say a word about Unionest Party. I have allowed the member for Nipawin the latitude to suggest that, yes, that’s what it is talking about in his particular instance, the Unionest Party.

But when the member for Nipawin then extends that one step further to talk about the constitution of Canada, that is too far from the principle of the bill for me to allow the debate to continue. All I am doing is cautioning the member for Nipawin to get back closer to the subject before us and I am specifically saying that the subject before us is grants in part, grants to the leader of the third party.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Good, Mr. Speaker, and I will certainly accept your ruling. Mr. Speaker will know that the bill is about more than grants and I’m glad Mr. Speaker does not want to get into a debate on the bill. Nor, I am sure, does Mr. Speaker want to rule on something that a member sincerely believes is part of a debate on a legitimate bill. Therefore I will now at this point return to the exciting saga of Victor Berger who, Mr. Speaker will be well aware, was a legislator and was attacked. Mr. Speaker has certainly

not ruled it out of order to cite examples of legislators who have been attacked by other legislatures and governments in history.

Mr. Speaker will recall that I promised on my word of honor to mark this book with a pencil, so that he wouldn't suggest that I was repeating myself. And so I will. But I wonder if Mr. Speaker would allow me enough latitude just to briefly summarize what's happened to Mr. Berger up to this point in time. I wouldn't want Mr. Speaker to say that I was repeating myself. But I do want to alert everyone that Mr. Berger was a socialist in the United States, the first ever elected in the United States. When Mr. Berger was attacked he had what he believed were sincerely-held views on America's entry into the first great war. He was not only attacked, he was charged with treason because of five articles that he wrote in his own paper.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Telephones makes motions with his hands as though he thinks it's a pretty good idea that the member for Swift Current and the member for Nipawin be charged with treason. I tell the Minister of Telephones today and I tell everyone else today, I would welcome a charge of treason. I would welcome the Government of Canada's being as stupid as the Government of Saskatchewan in attempting to make this kind of charge stick, or in attempting to thwart the aims and ambitions of people who have sincerely-held thoughts in this country. I would welcome any government's attempting to make that kind of stupid ploy, including the Government of Canada. Because, Mr. Speaker, there isn't a court in the land (I'll just alert the members opposite to this one thing) that would allow a charge like that to be laid, let alone stick. There isn't a charge like this in the land that any court is going to allow to stand.

The NDP has introduced all kinds of legislation that have been tested in the courts. I want to tell the Premier of Saskatchewan and I want to tell other members of this Assembly that if they pass this bill, it's going to be another one tested in the courts – a jim dandy on retroactive legislation and whether it applies in terms of the bill of rights when it's specifically used to attack the right of free association of individuals in our society. And, Mr. Speaker, that's going to be a good law case. I've been involved in some law cases in the past . . . Yes, and I haven't lost one yet. I haven't lost one yet and I tell the members opposite that this is one that is just going to cheer me on. I think this is the kind of law case I would just dearly love to face in this country . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Well, the member says, let's get the bill through quickly. You take each step one at a time, Mr. Speaker. You know that. You don't bother jumping into things with both feet. History is a very long and involved process.

The process of history is very, very long and the member for Regina Wascana will know that better than most people. I keep giving him so much credit in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, for being such a fine historian. I haven't read any of his works though. Any time I've talked to him outside the Chamber, he's always been very pleasant, with some knowledge but I wouldn't say all the knowledge in the world. So maybe I shouldn't hold him up to be quite such an expert as I suggested because I don't have enough facts to go on in his case. In this case, Mr. Speaker, I've lots of facts to go on.

Anyway, you will recall Victor Berger, I'm sure, and his fight against what you might call totalitarianism in the United States. As a result of his fight, he protected the rights of others.

Mr. Speaker, it might interest the members opposite to know . . . they think I'm making a big joke of this and they think his is just sort of a sham victory. I happen to think I'm not particularly fussy about standing here, doing this day after day; I'm not particularly fussy about taking the kind of chaff that members opposite and others are giving. I know, however, that there is building, in the community and in other parts of Saskatchewan, a continuing and added feeling every day that although they don't agree with what I stand for they do agree with my right to say what I think. And they agree with my right to associate with anybody who happens to believe the same thing, and they believe in my right to free speech in this Assembly. And, Mr. Speaker, surprisingly enough they believe the NDP is dead wrong in bringing up a bill like this to retroactively attack members of this legislature. As a matter of fact this number is growing rapidly, not just in Regina but throughout the province of Saskatchewan; and the members opposite will find that out in due course.

For what it's worth, I also happen to believe in what I am doing, Mr. Speaker; as you know, I get nothing personal out of this. The community fund of Nipawin gets a lot out of this. It's going to be interesting to see, when and if they pass Bill No. 105, whether the members opposite in the NDP are going to attempt to collect back the moneys which were donated to the United Appeal Fund in the town of Nipawin. It's going to be interesting to see if they are going to try to attack the charity the money has gone to, to see if they can get that money back by passing retroactive legislation. Mr. Speaker will know that money has already been donated. From a personal point of view, I don't get anything out of this bill. I happen to believe that by doing this perhaps I'll make some contribution, however small, to the right of free men everywhere and to the right of people to associate as they see fit.

When I hear what has happened to other people in the course of attempting to protect and preserve those freedoms, when I hear what has happened to other people in Britain and other places over the centuries as they attempted to protect those freedoms, this is a very, very small contribution to make. So the members opposite can believe that this is somehow an insincere effort or designed to gain great public attention. All they have to do is withdraw the bill and the public attention will no longer be there. All they have to do is go on to other business in the House and they'll see that the other business in the House gets done relatively quickly. That's all they have to do. It's a very, very simple thing, a very simple move, a very simple manoeuvre by members on the government side. If they do that, fair enough. If they don't do that, then they're going to face whatever they face over the coming days, weeks, months and whatever.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I have not been known as a person in the past to give up on so-called lost causes. I don't intend to give up on this one. I've not been known as a person to be less than stubborn; and I am that. Mr. Speaker, I assure the members opposite and I assure you that I do not intend to give up easily on this bill, because I sincerely believe I am protecting rights for others in future. For me, at this point, it makes no difference; but for others in future, I sincerely believe it does.

Now, we'll get back to Victor Berger.

Otherwise, the great leaders of the confederacy might have been eligible before the fourteenth amendment or Brigham Young could have been elected and his forty wives have occupied the gallery to see him sworn in. Is a man to be brought from the felon's cell to the floor of the Senate? Could women be elected to Congress before they obtained the vote? In order to keep out an insane man, must the House resort to such subterfuges  
as

expelling him after he is seated or finding him physically incapable of taking the oath? Suppose a representative, just before he is sworn in, should create some outrageous disturbance in the House. If he cannot be disqualified, it will be necessary to go through the rigmarole of first swearing him in and then expelling him. The duty of the Senate and the House to preserve the nation and carry on business is said not to be sufficiently safeguarded if the constitution requirements are exclusive of all others. The arguments against both of the extreme views mentioned are so strong that the actual practice takes an intermediate ground. As to elected persons satisfying all the requirements in the constitution, we are not forced to choose between giving the House absolute power to unseat whomever it dislikes and giving the voters absolute power to seat whomever they elect.

A third alternative has been adopted fairly close to the second view. The constitutional qualifications ordinarily sufficed, but Congress has rather cautiously imposed some additional tests by statute, and the House of Representatives or the Senate has promptly added a very few more qualifications by established usage, a sort of legislative common law to cover certain obvious cases of unfitness.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here's a precise example in the United States of America which is right on the principle of this bill. We have in Saskatchewan established criteria by legislation for what constitutes a political party in so far as this Legislative Assembly is concerned. That's what we have established by law, as other legislatures have done. We did that, Mr. Speaker, not 50 or 100 years ago. We didn't do it 25 years ago. We didn't even have other members, elected under other governments, do it. We did it ourselves; this very same group did it less than one year ago. We established certain criteria for elected representatives by law to be a political party and recognized as such in this legislative Chamber.

Now, the NDP government wants to change that. But they don't want to change it for the future, they want to change it retroactively. They want to change it because two members following exactly those same rules, following exactly what we set out less than a year ago as the legal criteria, decided to do precisely what the legislation then envisaged. If two members or more of this Assembly became associated with a political party, one of them would be recognized as the leader.

Mr. Speaker, that has nothing to do with whether he was elected or otherwise, as is evidenced by the member for Souris-Cannington, now recognized as the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber. Another man was elected as leader of that party, but we recognize the member for Souris-Cannington, selected by his caucus, as the Leader of the Opposition. Why do we do that? Because, Mr. Speaker, that's the tradition and the precedent.

We established less than a year ago that two members of this elected body, or more, if they desired to belong to a political party . . . We didn't say that it wasn't a new party. Legislation didn't say it couldn't be a new party or an old party. That's the way it should have been written. It doesn't matter whether it's new or old. If two members decide to become members of a particular political party in this Assembly and present their views in concert, then in this Assembly they are entitled to do so. In order to do so, they are entitled to certain funds to pay for secretaries, research and other help. That's the law. That's the way it is today. That's the way we ourselves intended it less than one year ago.

All of a sudden, Mr. Speaker, the government decides that's not good enough; that's not reasonable enough; that's not realistic enough. Therefore that is an attack. The same group of people, who passed the same bill less than a year ago, has not decided to change the rules. Mr. Speaker, I say to you with all deference, and I mean that sincerely, it is an attack on the Unionest Party of Saskatchewan because of its views. That's what it's all about.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.