

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**June 3, 1980**

**EVENING SESSION**

**ADJOURNED DEBATES**

**Bill 105 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act (continued)**

**MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Unionest Party):** — In my remarks this evening on Bill 105, I think I should draw a couple of items from Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms to the attention of every member of this Assembly and to the members of the Saskatchewan press corps. They are very, very brief sections. I would refer all members to section 299, page 98, of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms which reads as follows:

(1) Relevancy is not easy to define. In borderline cases the Member should be given the benefit of the doubt.

And on page 100 in Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, under section 304, item no. (9):

(9) After an amendment has been moved and seconded, the question on the amendment is proposed, and any Member who speaks after that question has been proposed speaks to it and not to the main question. When the amendment has been disposed of and the main question is again proposed, any Member may speak who has not already spoken on the main question, whether or not he spoke on the amendment. The mover and seconder of the amendment having spoken to the main question cannot speak again to it. The same rule applies, of course, to the case of an amendment to an amendment.

Now, here's the operative section of that clause from Beauchesne's Rules and Forms, chapter 7, page 100.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. The subject before this House is the principle of Bill 105 and anyone who is not discussing the principle of Bill 105 is out of order.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise then on a point of order, if I may, to draw to the attention of Mr. Speaker and the Assembly the operative section of item 9, page 100, the mover and seconder . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. That's not a point of order. The member is out of order.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Speaker, can I not on a point of order draw to the attention a rule of the House?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. There's no purpose at hand for drawing a certain rule to the attention of the House. Otherwise the member could read the whole book of rules to the House and that's not the purpose of this period of time we have before us now; it's to discuss the principle of the bill. If someone is out of order and the member wishes to raise a point of order, by all means raise the point of order. But if a member with no

provocation whatsoever rises and attempts to make a point of order, that's not in order.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Fine, Mr. Speaker, I will then return to the question before the Assembly which is Bill No. 105, An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act, to which we are going to propose at the conclusion of my remarks an amendment which I have already read to the members of this Assembly and to Mr. Speaker. I am sure Mr. Speaker will be aware of that amendment, and will be aware of the rulings in the various parliamentary books, most specifically Beauchesne's, page 100. So I will continue my remarks on this bill, retaining this particular section of Beauchesne's.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I left off at 5 o'clock I was bringing to all of the members' attention in this Chamber the fact that . . . I want to just summarize the history of The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act for the benefit of the members present. First of all, in 1976 The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act was after amended on or about May 6, 1976, after considerable discussion had ensued, both outside this Chamber and within, about the necessity to do two things: first, to change the act to bring three acts together and second, Mr. Speaker, to not only bring the three acts together but to bring into force some means by which third parties in the province of Saskatchewan could receive the same kind of research and secretarial help that other parties received, and also to increase the members' remuneration and expense allowances.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it's particularly significant that back in May of 1976, when this act was amended, being first of all introduced by the member for Biggar who is currently introducing Bill No. 105, the member for Biggar positively stated that the bill was worthy of support and was based on the Hughes committee.

The Hughes committee, as you know, for some considerable time had studied the members' remuneration, the make-up of the various benefits, perquisites if you like, secretarial help and research staff to be afforded to the members of the various caucuses as they existed in the Saskatchewan legislature.

The member for Biggar decided to go ahead with Mr. Justice Hughes' recommendations so he brought forward this bill in May of 1976.

Now I want, Mr. Speaker, to be especially aware, and the members to be especially aware of precisely what then happened, because I'm sure their memories are lax. Just before dinner I drew to their attention the remarks in May of 1976, of the member for Swift Current, even though, Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservatives at the time were in fact a third party in this legislature, and even though they had gone through five or six months of near-bankrupt conditions relative to the expenditure of their moneys for secretarial and research help, and even though it was almost impossible for the Progressive Conservative caucus to function in the same fashion as the then Liberal opposition and the NDP government; even though that happened, Mr. Ham, the member for Swift Current said that he would not support the bill out of a matter of principle.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might just go on in that debate which occurred in May of 1976, to remind the members of this Assembly what the member for Nipawin stated in May of 1976. I think it would be of some interest to all members.

Mr. Speaker, since last August I have attempted in every way that I know how

to convince the members opposite, but most specifically the cabinet opposite, that in this period of inflation it is absolutely essential that we as legislators show leadership in the fight against inflation.

Now you will recall, Mr. Speaker, back in '76, inflation was just beginning to become rampant in our society and rampant in the province of Saskatchewan. We were asking, at that time, for government to show some leadership. I went on to say at the time:

I know at this moment in time, I know no further step that I can possibly take to try to convince the members to show this leadership. I am very concerned that this bill was dropped on us at the very last moment when all of us are anxious to get out to our farms.

That, Mr. Speaker, happened as you know in 1976. It has happened frequently with reference to the NDP. Although these matters had been under discussion for some considerable time and brought about (as Mr. Speaker may recall) in 1976 the so-called budget stall that was perpetrated by the member for Nipawin.

At that time it was alleged by the Attorney General that some kind of an agreement had been reached where he had the written copy of the agreement and the agreement the others gave to him was verbal. The verbal agreement was pertaining to the allocation of sufficient resources to meet research and secretarial help for the Progressive Conservative caucus.

When that was not forthcoming from the Attorney General, when assistance was not received as agreed, it was apparent, at least to me at the time, that no agreement existed.

However, because he had it in writing and I had it verbally, it was unfortunate. It made it appear that we reneged on our side which was to say that we would allow the budget speech to proceed at that time.

Just as soon as we went back into the legislature, the Attorney General, the Premier of Saskatchewan and others contended that, because they had this written agreement, I had breached the agreement. Therefore it was my fault that the session didn't proceed as agreed and that we had to go through the statutory requirement for a throne speech debate.

As a result, during the entire throne speech debate every member of this Assembly who was not a Conservative proceeded to attack me and attack the Conservatives for supposedly delaying the legislature.

And quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, it was only because we lacked the necessary secretarial and research help at the time that we were unable to realize the box we had put ourselves into politically as a result of this so-called breached agreement. It was also as a result of our newness to the scene; we were tenderfoots.

And before the Leader of the Opposition leaves the House, Mr. Speaker, I sure hope he'll listen to one remark. I won't go through all my remarks. I would, however, like to remind the Leader of the Opposition and others about what appeared in Hansard on May 6, 1976, page no. 1542, relative to this bill which was amended at the time by Mr. Cowley.

I won't read all the ayes; I will only read the nays. These are the people who out of a

sense of principle, even though their own party was being attacked, even though their own party couldn't go forward in terms of having sufficient moneys to meet their needs, voted against the bill even though their own pockets were sore: Collver, Larter, Bailey, Berntson, Ham, Katzman and Birkbeck.

That's who voted against the bill in May of 1976, page no. 1542 in Hansard. It is interesting to note how one's principles can change. How can one say on the one hand that even though it affects my pocketbook, even though it affects me personally, I am prepared to vote against this bill in order to provide leadership to the people of Saskatchewan in the fight against inflation; and in the very next breath, when a government tries to attack the very principles established by those seven Conservatives who sat in here as third party in the legislature, say, let's attack the third party legislation as it was created in 1976, as it was created again in 1979 and is now to be amended by the member for Biggar and others in this Assembly in 1980?

But, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to return because I mentioned to you that I wanted the Leader of the Opposition to hear the vote. I am sure he recalls it. I am sure some others who were in this Assembly at the time recall it. I can say without any fear of retribution that the member for Qu'Appelle who was also in the House at the time, I must say, voted in favour of lining his pockets even though leadership was required to fight the battle of inflation. At that point in time, of course, the Conservatives seemed to have some kind of principles and seemed to be able to stand up for the principles that they believed in.

I'm afraid today, Mr. Speaker, that's not true and those principles of the member for Qu'Appelle have been adopted. I feel sorry for them for having that happen but nevertheless so be it; that's what they decided. I wouldn't want to bore the members of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, with the comments made by the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake and the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Steuart, when this bill was first introduced in May 1979. I also wouldn't want to bore the members with the comments of Mr. Wiebe at the time. They certainly sided with the government in the presentation of this bill and in tying in any benefits or, if you like, necessities for a third party in this legislature so as to provide the necessary opposition which it is every member's right to provide on a relatively equal footing. At that time, they thought that it was the best way to get their salaries raised. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that the seven Conservatives at that time who voted against that bill showed some courage and some forthrightness that perhaps is not being shown at the moment on this particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, back in 1976, in commenting on this bill, I said as follows:

We don't think the bill is providing the leadership necessary in the fight against inflation. We have said so since last August. I don't think that it does any good to stall or delay or discuss it any further; there is no further discussion needed between ourselves. I must say to the members of this Assembly that it has not been easy to take this stand in this House with all of the members. It has not been an easy position to take since many, and I think with some justification, believe that it is very difficult for members without means to go on at the present level of remuneration.

I must remind Mr. Speaker that some of the members who were in the Conservative caucus at the time (the member for Rosthern, the member for Rosetown, and the member for Swift Current) were not with particular means. They did not have the kind of outside income that perhaps the rest of us had, to be able to take the stand with some impunity. But I must say, Mr. Speaker, that at least at that time they exhibited enough

courage to be able to stand up on their own two feet even though it wasn't pleasant or easy for them.

However, we still think that the one choice, the leadership choice, is more important than perhaps our personal considerations. Therefore, I do not intend to support this bill.

That was my comment back in 1976. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to go back to what Mr. Cowley, the member for Biggar, said in concluding the debate on Bill No. 108 in 1976. Mr. Cowley, the member for Biggar, is the same member who is bringing this bill before this House today. This identical member in 1976 was following the Hughes commission report to adopt and bring together these various Legislative Assembly acts and to bring members' remuneration into line with the inflationary trends then facing the people at that time; this same member also shepherded through the bill in 1976 that set the guidelines for third parties in this House; this identical member brought in a bill that set the guidelines for the third party legislation in this Assembly. This is what he had to say in conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, I have a very few brief comments following up some of the comments from the members opposite.

Now keep in mind. Mr. Speaker, that at no time have we yet heard from the member for Biggar in 1976 except in his opening remarks relative to the third party legislation. I would just like to go back and say that he said:

With respect to one other section of the bill, I would like to make some comments, as I did with the press, and that is the provision with respect to the third party, and to the leader of the third party.

That's what he said in 1976 — 'I wish to make some comments with respect to the third party, and to the leader of the third party.' He made those comments not only in this House, but also to the press outside the House.

The legislation does not specify any amounts, as I have pointed out to the press this afternoon. There are no amounts specified to the Leader of the Opposition; these are contained in estimates. But it is our intention to follow, with respect to the third party, the recommendations outlined in the Hughes report.

Now, remember that's what he said. In concluding his remarks, Mr. Speaker, on the bill, he said:

I think I can say to this Assembly and to the people of this province, that the member for Morse has very adequately summed up the feelings of many members on our side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, in my constituency I discussed MLA remuneration with a great many constituents, and when I run into trouble it is usually because the majority of them think I'm getting the same amount as the members of the House of Commons in Ottawa, who are paid more than our Premier is presently.

Mr. Speaker, with those very few words and short remarks, I will sit down

(said the member for Biggar).

Not another single comment in this entire debate about the necessary legislation for funding third parties in this legislature – not one single comment in 1976. Now, Mr. Speaker, that was four years ago. In 1976, the member for Biggar introduced the bill; the Conservatives (then the third party in the legislature) rejected the bill because it was an inflationary bill. The other members (the Liberals and the NDP) decided to get together and they supported the bill and the bill passed. It passed not only with raises in pay to the members, but it also passed with the third party legislation, following the recommendations of the Hughes report.

Now, do you think that independent outsider, Mr. Justice Hughes, would have recommended the kind of legislation the province of Saskatchewan has at the moment, without Bill No. 105? Do you think he would have done that without thinking perhaps that members were free to select and elect a party of their choice within the House, that members were free, between elections, to select whatever party they shall sit with?

You see, Mr. Speaker, these amendments (and I'm sure you will be aware of them) say absolutely nothing about the Liberals, the Conservatives, and the NDP. Those are the three parties which were registered at the time of the last election. It says nothing about them. It means, Mr. Speaker, that any member may cross from the Conservatives to the government side; any member may cross from the government to the Conservative side; any member may cross from there to the Liberal side with impunity under this legislation. But any other choice, be it Social Credit, be it Marxist-Leninist, be it Unionest, be it any other choice members may wish to make, they may not do so because that party was not registered at the time of the last election. What nonsense! What absolute, utter nonsense!

This didn't come up one time, Mr. Speaker, at the time of Mr. Justice Hughes' suggestions. It didn't come up one time when the member for Qu'Appelle crossed from the Liberals over to the Conservatives. It didn't come up one time when the member for Thunder Creek crossed from the Liberals to the Conservatives – not one time, and that happened after 1976, Mr. Speaker. The member for Qu'Appelle crossed after 1976. The member for Thunder Creek crossed after 1976.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say to you the only reason that one can possibly discern for the introduction of this bill, by the same member for Biggar who introduced the amendments to the legislation in 1976, the only possible connotation that one can get from it, I suppose, would be that they don't like the Unionest Party or what it stands for.

The leader of the Conservative Party has already said that. He doesn't like what the Unionest Party stands for and therefore we should pass a bill in the legislature, preventing them from obtaining equivalent status to other members of this legislature. That's what he said. At least he was honest enough to say outright what everyone else on the NDP side of the House is thinking, but not saying.

Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid the inexperience of the present Conservative leader made him say that, because at least the NDP is smart. He's honest enough to say what's on everybody's mind, but the NDP is smart enough to know that if you say it that way, it becomes a direct attack, without any question, on the rights of members of the legislature. Now the NDP is smart enough to say in the Assembly, oh, they're just correcting a past oversight. That's what they say. And the Premier of Saskatchewan, when asked, says the bill speaks for itself. He doesn't say the Unionests shouldn't get

any money. He just says that the bill speaks for itself and it's just a correction of a past oversight.

At least the NDP is smart enough to say that; the NDPers aren't honest at all. At least the Conservative leader is honest enough to say what's on everybody's mind. This is why, I would presume, he and the member for Qu'Appelle have somehow coerced the Conservatives into supporting that kind of repressive legislation against their best interests, against the best interests of their constituents, and in the long run, against the best interests of this very institution in which they so sacredly believe they have a vested interest.

Mr. Speaker, now let's go on to the next stage in this development of the third party in the province of Saskatchewan. Since there was no third party prior to the election of 1975, I suppose that in speaking to that particular point of Bill No. 105, and that is the creation of the third party, it isn't worth raising anything prior to that. But since 1975 there has been a third party in this legislature, up until 1978. Between the election of 1978 and the spring of 1980, there wasn't a third party in this legislature. There were only two parties: the Conservative Party and the NDP. The Liberals were wiped out in the election of 1978; not one single member was left in this Chamber.

A person could give lots of reasons why the Liberal Party was wiped out at that time. They could say it was all Mr. Trudeau's fault; they could say it was any number of things that happened. But I'm inclined to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the reason the Liberal party was wiped out and has not become the third party in Saskatchewan (as I believe the NDP believed they might, after the 1978 election), was quite simply, Mr. Speaker, that they kept giving support, against what you might call the principles of the Liberal party, for example, to this kind of bill, which today the Conservatives are also expressing their support for, against the very principles for which they stand.

No matter how much they may hate me personally; no matter how much they may hate the cause for which I have announced that I am working; no matter how much they may hate that, the principles for which they stand should be, Mr. Speaker (and I say that sincerely), far more important to them than any hatred they may have of me or dislike they may have of the cause for which I stand. If they have some evidence which they wish to place before the people of the province of Saskatchewan which would indicate that the Unionest Party has broken a law of some kind or that members who subscribe to the Unionest Party are seditious in nature or have committed treason, then I suggest they bring those facts before the appropriate body of the Attorney General of Saskatchewan or the Attorney General for Canada. I am sure that will then be tried in a proper court of law. I believe that whatever happens as a result in the court of law, at least justice will prevail.

One doesn't object to facing the bar of justice on any matter one feels is reasonable, on any matter at all that the bar of justice happens to place before us. If you are brought before them under a charge and the charge is proven, then I am sure every member to my right and every government member could, would and should have no hesitation whatsoever in removing whatever rights the Unionest Party may have or whatever rights those individual members who have subscribed to the party must have.

But in the absence at any time of any intent to dismantle a country . . . I believe that there has been no occasion at all in which the Unionest Party or any member thereof has suggested dismantling a country which is intact. What we have said is the country is not remaining intact. And therefore, after it becomes not intact, we believe the people

should seek union with the United States.

In the meantime we will present that cause to people and let them present their views to the people, to the leaders in Ottawa, and to the club which runs Canada in Toronto and Ottawa. We will present those views to them now and they will make their choice known to all and sundry.

Now I would presume, Mr. Speaker, without any question that if the vast majority of people in the province of Saskatchewan, or in fact in western Canada, made the specific decision . . . Let's say 75 per cent of them decided to vote Unionest in the next provincial general election in their particular area. I would suggest that might indicate the country had already broken up. But I don't think anyone anticipates that, least of all the member for Swift Current or myself. We don't anticipate that kind of thing.

But unless these options are presented to the people by someone who is free of a national party, unless these options are presented to people by someone who has some sort of forum, some means by which those ideas can get out, some means by which people can find out what compulsory bilingualism and the like are going to mean to western Canadians, then we don't see how the people can be appropriately informed by politicians and political parties, which must of necessity retain their national flavour and therefore be very cautious about how they express those views.

Now I say that because I realize this is the situation which has created the third party in the province of Saskatchewan. Members to my right and members opposite realize and recognize this. Certainly the vast majority of the members of the Saskatchewan press corps who cover this legislature realize this. I wonder whether there isn't some other reason why the NDP members are bringing in this bill and why the member for Biggar is suggesting a change in the bill. The members to my right seem enthusiastic about pursuing this attempt to try to change the rules of the game in midstream.

Now what other possible reason could there be do you think, Mr. Speaker? I have been wracking my brain (what brain there is) for some considerable time attempting to decide and to determine what possible reason members to my right and the government members could have for bringing in this Bill No. 105 and for supporting Bill No. 105 as they did this afternoon.

About the only reason I could possibly conceive of, Mr. Speaker, was a dislike personally of the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current. Perhaps there has been a personal animosity that has developed between members of the NDP and members of the Unionest Party over the last number of years. Perhaps that's true because I can't imagine any possible reason why they would have brought this bill forward other than that, except perhaps for the reason that I stated earlier which the Leader of the Conservative Party has so succinctly put to his television audience and that is that we're not going to allow taxpayers' money to go to a party that is working toward the break-up of Canada, even though he has no evidence to support that; there is no proof of that whatsoever. That is merely an initial reaction just prior to the Quebec referendum of the people there who were perhaps not thinking at the time but were more emotional than they should have been and even now, Mr. Speaker, rational heads are starting to prevail.



I know the member for Qu'Appelle likes the cocktail circuit. I know that he will know even in the city of Regina that if he wanders around the cocktail circuit today he will find relatively little support for the cause of the Unionests but a tremendous amount of support for the principle that new members of the legislature should not be attacked for the views that they hold. Now whether or not that translates into a great number of votes — I know I never found the cocktail circuit to be particularly vote-getting or vote-catching. Quite frankly, what those on the cocktail circuit say today they retract tomorrow and they jump on the bandwagon the next day. And generally speaking that's not a very good barometer of the public's mood or the public's feelings. It's like trying to decide that the Saskatoon Club and the Assiniboia Club are going to determine elections for the city of Regina or the city of Saskatoon which is, of course, absolute and utter nonsense. The best possible means by which anybody can get elected in the city of Saskatoon, at any rate, is to have the Saskatoon Club come out for his opponent. That's the easiest way for him to get elected.

The member for Saskatoon Centre is nodding his head in agreement on that. I know that's true. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think that's true here in Regina. I know it pleases every member, even members like the member for Regina Victoria over the years, when members of the Assiniboia Club come out en masse with buttons saying I am for someone else. And it only happened of recent date in terms of his mayoralty campaign. I know that's off the topic, Mr. Speaker, but in terms of the mayoralty campaign, it was just a sudden anomaly and he'll be back in there fighting next time, I am sure.

Mr. Speaker, what then could the reason possibly be? What possible reason could there be? A reaction to public pressure? Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, if public pressure were strong in this area, I would think there would be a great many letters appearing in the columns of newspapers in Regina and Saskatoon, and other papers that accept letters to the editor, pertaining to the funding of the Unionest Party as third party in this legislature. Don't you think it's interesting, Mr. Speaker, that not one single letter has appeared in either Saskatoon or Regina pertaining to this matter? There have been a couple that have not been favorable towards the aims of the Unionest Party; that's a fact. But don't you think it's interesting that there have been very, very few letters, if any, to any newspaper anywhere in the province of Saskatchewan with reference to the funding of the Unionest Party as the third party here.

I think it's particularly interesting and makes me wonder what political pressures are being brought to bear on individual members who support an attack on their fellow members; it really does. Since there's no evidence of any public pressure, since there's no evidence of mounds of mail being delivered to individual members in this regard, since there has been no evidence of this kind of public pressure . . . Oh, the member for Meadow Lake holds his hand like that. Mr. Speaker, the entire Conservative Party, NDP and Liberals combined didn't receive that many letters on the potash debate so don't try to fool a man who has fooled the world. Is that an honest admission, Mr. Speaker? Never mess with a fool. You see, that's another way to put it. Never mess with a fool because you're liable to get some of his ideas back.

That's maybe what's happening right now in this legislature, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps these ideas of ours are foolish. Perhaps these ideas are wrong. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, as the Premier of Saskatchewan has suggested, they're even dangerous. I doubt that but perhaps they are. But, Mr. Speaker, that doesn't give members of this Assembly the right to decide whether or not they're foolish or to decide whether or not they're

dangerous or to decide whether . . . As long as we are complying with the laws, as long as we are presenting our case in a reasonable and realistic fashion, it is not up to the members of this Assembly to make that decision for us. It is up to the people to decide at the next election.

Whether or not the Premier of Saskatchewan suggests that he's afraid of us or whether the Leader of the Conservative Party suggests he's afraid of us really shouldn't make any difference whatsoever on the progress of Bill No. 105 through this House. What should happen, Mr. Speaker, to be quite frank, is that Bill No. 105 should not even have to be here. It shouldn't be here in the first place. Mr. Justice Hughes, during his remarks, didn't suggest it should be here. The NDP member for Biggar, when he introduced the bill in '76 didn't suggest Bill No. 105 should be here. The Attorney General in '79 when he changed the bill again, didn't suggest it should be here and there was a third party in the legislature, or presumed to be so, from 1976 onward. So why would it be introduced? Well, perhaps they don't like us personally.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have lots of very unfortunate personal traits; I admit that. I have from time to time been insulting. I from time to time am not the most intelligent man in the world; I accept that. I even, Mr. Speaker, with all deference, sometimes do foolish things. You see, the members say now I'm starting to make some sense. I even have made many mistakes in my life. But the one mistake I don't make, Mr. Speaker, is to presume because I make mistakes, that everyone else is perfect, or conversely, because I make very few mistakes that everyone else doesn't make them as well.

What's going to happen, Mr. Speaker, in this legislation, in terms of how the members are setting themselves up as judge, jury, and prosecutor in this particular instance? What is going to happen to them personally is that they're going to recognize, perhaps too late, that the only reason they did it was because they didn't like me personally. Because there can't be any other possible reason for introducing this kind of onerous legislation – none whatsoever! Now is that reason enough, do you think?

Even Mr. Eisler of the Regina Leader-Post commented in his column about the member for Swift Current and no one dislikes the member for Swift Current. Everybody likes him. So why in the world would you attack the member for Swift Current? I can't imagine why you'd want to attack him. If there's some kind of personality clash involved between me and other members, I can accept that. I don't think it's reason enough to bring in this bill; but nobody has a personality clash with the member for Swift Current. No one. He is probably the nicest member of this entire Assembly. Certainly he's one of the most pleasant and most well-spoken, and recognized as such by almost all members of this House. There might be one or two members to my right who don't like what he's doing . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Well, there's a question asked from the chair of the member for Saskatoon Centre: how come he's there? Exactly, Mr. Speaker. You see all the good guys belong to the NDP and all the bad guys belong to the Unionist Party. Agreed, agreed, agreed coming over; yet making fun like the member for Saskatoon Centre is, is very unusual and untoward.

The member for Saskatoon Centre (I've mentioned others but not him) comes from a minority group which in the province of Saskatchewan over the years has not been particularly well looked upon, has been stepped on and has worked very hard to build a community that gained respect through the hard work and effort of everyone. That's how they ended up gaining the respect.

They fought very hard through a great many administrations for rights of association and rights to have the kind of ethnic background that they can be proud of . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, Mr. Speaker, not only did they come to Canada, but I can tell the member for Saskatoon Centre, a much larger majority of the Ukrainian people in every single Ukrainian migration went to the United States than came to Canada. Many more of them went to the United States than came to Canada, for the information of the member for Saskatoon Centre. So to make the suggestion from his chair, that somehow Canada was the only protector of minority rights, is just quite simply not true.

I am amazed for example, that the member for Melfort can possibly approve legislation which attacks a minority. That is beyond my comprehension. It is beyond my comprehension, Mr. Speaker, because not only is the member for Melfort a member of a minority group that has worked extremely hard to protect and preserve those rights over the years in Canada, but the member for Melfort happens to be a member of another, if you like, oppressed minority in the province of Saskatchewan and that is the small businessmen.

We have heard for some considerable length of time the oppressions that have existed, or that are perpetrated upon small businessmen by the NDP government. I must say in the last couple of years I've seen some change in the right direction since the advent of the member for Melfort's sojourn as the minister responsible for small business in the province. I must say he has gained a considerable respect from small businessmen, but he will remember that they are a minority and have been stepped upon for some time by governments and by the majority.

Mr. Speaker will be aware that the minority group to which I refer not only is business oriented and economically oriented, it can also be racially oriented. Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that it can equally be true that it be thought oriented.

A minority opinion can be small, it can be medium and it can be large, just like a box of soap flakes. You can buy it in the large economy size, and that kind of opinion might be respect for Her Majesty the Queen in English-speaking North America, which is extremely high. That, Mr. Speaker, would be the large economy-size opinion. Then you might have the regular size of opinion in the province of Saskatchewan which you might say would be the socialist or NDP form of government. In the last few years it seems that the majority of the people in the province seem to support that. I don't know why, but obviously I was never able to figure that out. Either that or we were never quite able to pin on the NDP what in fact they were doing; that was taking over all the economic power they could, to the detriment of any kind of private sector. And now they are turning their attention, turning their focus on members of the Legislative Assembly. Don't you think that's interesting, Mr. Speaker? Suddenly, they're turning their attention on individual members of this Assembly. Why they're doing so, one can only speculate. I certainly haven't heard any yet put forward by any member of this Chamber, either inside or outside this House, that would suggest that they had any reasonable or rational reasons for bringing forward this bill.

The spokesman for the Conservative Party has already said his comment and he hasn't said anything since. Some of the members in the corridors have said, we're not going to support the bill. Others have said to the press in the corridors, well, we haven't made up our minds yet. Obviously, they made up their minds . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, Mr. Speaker, the member for Assiniboia suggests that somehow this legislature is the only place to say anything to the people of Saskatchewan. I might suggest to you, Mr.

Speaker, that the legislature is perhaps, certainly in the month of June, the worst place in Saskatchewan to say anything to the people. I am convinced, I am totally confident, Mr. Speaker, that the remarks or stands taken from May 15 onward in this province, quite simply are ignored by the people because they're too busy with the nice weather. They're too busy with their crops, they're too busy with their farms; they're too busy with their weekends with their children. They aren't listening to whatever goes on in here anyway. So this is the worst place to say anything.

That doesn't mean, however, Mr. Speaker, that those of us who believe that a very fundamental right of this legislature is being taken away by a bill, shouldn't attempt in every way to try to convince individual members of this legislature that they should change their minds. I know, Mr. Speaker, that I'm not in any way attempting to convince the people because nobody is listening anyway. But you will know, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps I might, over the course of a reasonable time in debate, be able to convince the odd member of this legislature . . . (inaudible interjection . . . That was sure a fast cut across there.

I admit to being odd, Mr. Speaker. I not only admit to being odd, I'm proud of being odd. You see great gales of laughter. The point is, Mr. Speaker, that's what makes the world go round – people who are different. I would even respect the views of the member for Assiniboia to think the way he wants religiously. I think that's his business. He may think that way if he likes. He may act that way if he likes. That's his total business. As a matter of fact, I not only respect him, I admire him for his views. They're not my views. But I respect him for his views.

I even respect, most times, the views of the Minister of Health, and the Minister of Health, I can assure you, has some of the oddest and strangest views, with reference to his department, of any minister of health in the history of the province of Saskatchewan. I even respect his right to have those views. I may not agree with them but I respect his right to have them.

You see, Mr. Speaker, I am proud of being odd. I think that every person should be proud of being odd at some time in his life. I'm afraid to say that to those members of the legislature who want to fall into line and goose-step with everybody else, or if they happen to disagree say (as one member of the NDP did), the way to disagree in this caucus is to sit on one's chair; that's how we disagree here; we abstain. That's in Hansard as the member will well know. Members to my right may be prepared to allow the NDP to forget that great comment by the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland; but I can assure the members that as long as I'm a member of this legislature, I'm not going to let them forget that great and glorious comment by the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland who stated in Hansard, in the tradition of the NDP: 'I am going to abstain on this vote because I disagree with it totally.' That's an interesting concept.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, that's what this bill does, it penalizes people because they're odd. It penalizes people because they think differently. Is that what freedom is all about? No. To them what freedom is all about is goose-stepping in time to the leader. Goose-step in time to whatever the consensus is at the moment. We'll all get together and goose-step.

Now if you disagree with us partially, we'll let you stay in opposition over here and we'll let you make your remarks as you will. And if you disagree with us partially and stupidly, that is even better. If you can disagree with us partially and disagree with us stupidly, we just love you in opposition.

What they are afraid of, what members are afraid of on the NDP side is anyone who disagrees with them totally, whether it's stupidly or otherwise. What they want is conformity. That's what they want. Let's conform; let's all conform to the same views they have.

I'll tell you why they think that so strongly. They think that so strongly because at one time they thought differently. At one time they were the minority. At one time and as a matter of fact in some places (I've brought several examples of it into this record) the socialists were a minority even in Saskatchewan. The reason they are so anxious to have everyone goose-step to their tune is because at one time nobody goose-stepped to their tune. And it's interesting to know that.

I think it is only because of that that they want everyone in the province to link arms and goose-step right along with them . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Paranoia, paranoia, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister of Health has even looked at Bill No. 105? I wish he had . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, he helped draft it you say? It is a change in The Legislative Assembly Act and The Executive Council Act to redefine what the leader of the third party is and to redefine what a third party is in so far as this legislature is concerned. Retroactively enforced, it will make lawbreakers out of sitting MLAs who haven't broken any laws, but by the passage of this act will have broken laws.

The member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg nods and says, gee that's good, we don't like what the person thinks so we'll retroactively pass a law that will make him into a lawbreaker and then we can attack him as a lawbreaker. Isn't that terrific? I know the principle comes right straight from the Lord's word. I know that, Mr. Speaker. That principles comes right straight out of the Bible somewhere.

Where it comes from, I don't know, but for the benefit of the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, I'm sure it must, because he so completely, totally devotes his life to biblical causes . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, perhaps you'd better get a Bible out and read some sections of it.

It would be interesting except it doesn't contribute to this debate too much. But it would be interesting to cite one or two quotations from the Bible for the member. I suppose the leading quotation I would cite for him is the one that is perhaps most famous in terms of Christianity and that is: Do unto others as you would have them do unto you. If that's what you think you're doing with this bill, as you would have others do unto you, then you're certainly interpreting the Bible a lot differently than I'd interpret the Bible. I want you to think about what happens when you're sitting in a minority position. I want you to think about what happened when you were in a minority position, and the speeches which were brought forward by Mr. Douglas and Mr. . . . Oh, yes. And what did they say, Mr. Speaker. They said things that were so different and so radical that no one around them believed in them, until the Depression pointed out that in fact the society and the economy as it was then known – the laissez-faire society of the time – quite simply wouldn't meet the needs of people. The socialists came along (most of their policies were adopted by the Liberals or Conservatives over the years, surprisingly enough) to meet the needs they saw back in the '30s.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if it might be possible for members to just consider for a moment the thought that maybe, just maybe (there's no reason to think this at this point; but mind you there was no reason to think the socialist ideas were right in the '20s either) . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh no, you weren't even born in the '20s; Mr. Minister

of Health — you might have been. Most people didn't believe the thoughts of the socialists were right in the '20s, but it has come about that most of the socialist philosophy has been adopted by the major parties in the United States and Canada and in Britain as well — I would say the social benefit programs more than the socialist programs of nationalization of means of production. Nevertheless, a great many of those programs have been adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I'll bet my bottom dollar right now there isn't a member opposite (except maybe the member for Regina Wascana) who could rise in his chair and tell this Assembly what a Chartist is.

**MR. BOWERMAN:** — A what?

**MR. COLLVER:** — You see. The Minister of the Environment yells from the floor, what's that, what's that? And I don't speak softly, Mr. Speaker, I speak very loudly. I asked what a Chartist was. For the information of most members opposite, Chartists were the foundation of the socialist movement. That was the foundation from Britain. Those were a group of people who presented socialist goals in Britain. Mr. Speaker, not only do they not know anything about the history and traditions of parliament and legislators; they don't know anything about the history and traditions of their very own movement. How in the name of heaven can they be expected to act on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan in this legislature, and present to their constituents a responsible position pertaining to third party legislation, if they don't even know what their own roots are, if they don't even know what their own foundations are? Not one member across there even bothered to say anything. I know the member from Regina Wascana was busy writing, and I'm sure he could have stood up and said what a Chartist was. Even the Minister of the Environment, that eminent socialist from Shellbrook, didn't bother.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I just want to quote from one small book which has a few remarks about Chartists, not only a few remarks about Chartists but . . . That's the wrong book. Goodness gracious! I don't want to lose that because that's an important . . . Oh there it is, a nice, thin little fellow. Mr. Speaker, this is a very brief quotation. I wouldn't want you to think I was quoting at any length. This is a very brief quotation from a very brief book which relates directly to my remarks so far.

#### The Essence of Democracy

Many years ago Abraham Lincoln expressed the essence of democracy in his famous phrase: 'Government of the People, by the People, for the People.'

Right now, Mr. Speaker, I know the members opposite are going to say, look at that diddle-do; he's reading another excerpt from a book on American democracy. I bet you'd think that, wouldn't you? But you see, Mr. Speaker, this is taken from a text written by Reginald Lennard, published by Cambridge and in fact it's about English democracy; it's about British traditions and British democracy.

You see, Mr. Speaker, even the mother of parliament, even people in Britain, can look to the United States for some examples, for some means by which they can determine a reasonable course of events for democracy. Even some people in Britain can respect America for what it is — a free society, a free country that is doing its best to survive in a totalitarian world.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in our judgment, this country on its present course is not going to survive this totalitarian world.

The phrase is now hackneyed and its significance is commonly overlooked. But there's a depth of meaning in its simple terms and their force and relevance to current problems seem greater, the more one reflects upon their implications.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize here and I want to emphasize strongly, that Bill No. 105, in my judgment, and in the judgment of the member for Swift Current, is an attack on the very essence of democracy. I am going to move an amendment subsequently, that states exactly that.

The principle of the bill is an attack on democracy and before one can possibly understand why it's an attack on democracy, one had better understand what democracy's all about. And therefore I propose to read a very brief quotation from this text, *The Threatened Foundations of Democracy*, and basically a very short chapter entitled *The Essence of Democracy*. I will interject, as Mr. Speaker has suggested before, from time to time, my comments about what the man is trying to say. Perhaps I may have to interpret it for some of the slower minds in this Assembly.

Government of the People, by the People, obviously implies that a People must be free to govern themselves — free from the interference of other Peoples — free from aggression and the fear of aggression.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that you wouldn't want me to go off the topic tonight. I know that you wouldn't want me to be off the principle of Bill No. 105. But I must ask, how can political parties in this legislature be free, as it is suggested here in *The Essence of Democracy* by Reginald Lennard? How in the world can they be free to believe that they can come into this legislature as a free people and as a free member of this legislature if the majority can attack the minority with retroactive legislation which is against the very principles for which we stand?

Free from aggression, it says; free from a fear of aggression, it says. How can any member of this Chamber be free from aggression if the majority can dominate the minority? How? It's just not possible, and every member will suffer when an attack is made by the majority on the minority — every member. Every member will have a fear of aggression; every member will know that tomorrow (politics is a very changeable business) you may find yourself on this side. As a matter of fact you may find yourself, as the Liberals did, nowhere near here.

Would anyone ever have thought in 1977 or early 1978, that there wouldn't be one single Liberal elected to this House? Nobody over there thought it and certainly none of the Liberals thought it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, come on, I watched the Liberals walk around this province saying, we're going to win the next election; I heard them. I didn't realize they were going to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If it hadn't been for the Liberals, we wouldn't have.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! I'd like to get some decorum back in the Chamber. If I could ask members to co-operate with me I'd like to get the member for Nipawin back onto the subject. I think it is important that we stick to the subject so we can all clearly get in our minds our arguments pro and con.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Speaker, I hope you were ruling me not on topic because of my repartee with the members opposite and not because I was quoting from this text on the

Essence of Democracy.

I would like to go back to this:

. . . but further these words imply that the governed and I say that is really one people and should be treated as such. There can be no government of the people by the people if any class among the governed is excluded from full citizenship.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that's this gentleman, Reginald Lennard's comments:

There can be no government of the people by the people if any class among the governed is excluded from full citizenship.

You will recall in Britain that the class system is very existent and has been a great factor in the development of democracy in Britain. But in western Canada we have never ever had the class system. Are we now to introduce it? Are there going to be first-class members of the legislature, second-class members of the legislature and no-class members of the legislature. Now there are lots in this Chamber, I am sure, who believe I'm no-class, but I don't think that we should be no-class members of the legislature and I don't think you should pass legislation trying to make us such.

It follows, of course, that slavery is incompatible with democracy. Well what, Mr. Speaker, do you think happens to a people and to the feeling of a people when its legislators are no longer free in the legislature to think their own thoughts? What do you think happens to their thoughts and their ideas? I believe and the member for Swift Current believes that they think they are in slavery, they are in bondage. Because what else can they think? If a government has taken over all of the means of production of society, if a government has taken over many, many of the private sector corporations in the province as the NDP has done . . . I would like to know just for my own information (because I've never been able to quite count them because there are new ones so often) how many Crown corporations and agencies there are in the province of Saskatchewan . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I still haven't heard how many . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, 23 is quite incorrect. I said Crown corporations and agencies.

For example, the liquor control board is now a Crown corporation; it's an agency, but it deals with many millions of dollars of the people of the province of Saskatchewan. It's well in excess of 140 but I don't know the exact number because there seem to be new agencies in old agencies developing all the time. But if the people's lives are being directed by government in that way, the people honestly believe their legislature is the one means by which that power can be kept in check. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, a government or a majority can dictate its own wishes on individual members who have broken no laws, who have done nothing wrong but merely expressed their views. If they can pass legislation that retroactively affects those members then there really is no hope for the people and the people will believe that they are in slavery and they are in bondage.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to get a very brief comment from a book called Corry and Abraham on the Elements of Democratic Government and I'm going to quote from that shortly with reference to the role of the opposition. But basically what it says is this:



The role of the opposition is to oppose.

That's fundamentally what it says; the function of the opposition is built in the word and that is to oppose. For the Progressive Conservatives to back the NDP in an attack on personal liberties certainly is beyond the scope of their responsibility as an opposition. They should oppose just to support their own principles. But they should certainly oppose because that's their role in opposition, to oppose, and to perhaps present alternatives if there are any. But to do as they've done, Mr. Speaker, is to give the people no hope. If the opposition isn't going to oppose and the government is going to attack members of the legislature, where's the hope for anyone if the government's taking over all the means of production? But I'm sure members will use their own conscience. We certainly saw how they will vote today. I suppose that's the way it goes.

It follows too that all persecution of minorities and all class war is undemocratic.

Did you hear that, Mr. Speaker? Here's another author. As I said before this afternoon, I don't know how many different authorities I have to bring into this legislature to point out that an attack on minorities is not a democratic thing to do, that the group you see sitting in this legislature is a minority, that retroactive legislation is an attack (I don't know why you can't see that) on minorities. Does anyone suggest that retroactive legislation in terms of the oil industry in Saskatchewan wasn't an attack? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I heard that no from somewhere, I don't quite know where it came from; but no reasonable person would suggest it wasn't an attack.

I think when the bill was introduced, it was introduced with an attack. I recall, Mr. Speaker, that bit of retroactive legislation being introduced into this very same Assembly and being introduced in this way. The NDP government said the Supreme Court of Canada had made a mistake. That's what they said: the Supreme Court of Canada has made a mistake. Their decision is wrong and (I'd be happy to get the speeches and read them into the record if the members are interested) it's going to cost the people of Saskatchewan \$500 million; therefore, we are going to pass retroactive legislation. Is that an attack? Of course, it's an attack. It was an attack at that time on the Supreme Court of Canada. Every member of the Liberal Party, when it was introduced, said so; so did most members of the Conservative Party; so did most writers, most observers. Of course it was an attack!

That particular instance showed the stupidity of the NDP in passing that bill in the first place in the way they did. Right next door the province of Alberta passed a different kind of bill and didn't have any trouble in the courts – none whatsoever! – and got the same taxation except for a tiny, small percentage. We supported the NDP; we said that attack is correct. Because of your stupidity, the people of Saskatchewan shouldn't have to suffer and shouldn't have to pay. I think we were right in taking that approach. But it was an attack, Mr. Speaker. That's what it was. It was an attack. Retroactive legislation can never be anything but an attack, because it's retroactive. Surely, there can't be anyone in this Assembly who doesn't understand that. If you're passing legislation for the future, you are saying that everyone from now on will know what the law is. Everyone from now on will accept the law. Whatever happened before doesn't count.

You know, Mr. Speaker, there hasn't been a single act pertaining to a professional association passed in this legislature to my knowledge which hasn't got what's known as a grandfather clause. Now why do they have grandfather clauses? The reason is that you don't change the rules in midstream. For people who've worked all their lives to become accountants or doctors or lawyers or whatever, and suddenly say you have a

new set of rules under which you will have to practise your profession and you have to adopt the new set of rules – you don't do that. What you do is, say from now on everyone entering the profession is going to have to abide by this set of rules passed today. Up until this point in time if you've accepted the professional standard, you can go on practising until the day you die. That's called a grandfather clause in legislation, and that's reasonable and that's what that kind of legislation is designed to protect against. It's designed to prevent an attack on those people who, prior to the introduction of the legislation and through no fault of their own, are practising their profession and living their lives as the law should allow them to do. You want to change and improve the situation so you say, O.K., we're not uprooting your lives because we want to upgrade the profession; what we are going to do is pass a law today and from now on that's the way it's going to be. But we're not going to uproot your lives as a result. That's called a grandfather clause. That's why retroactive legislation is so onerous.

What you are really doing when you pass retroactive legislation is attacking the principles under which people live. You're saying in retroactive legislation, O.K., you live within the law. Go ahead Mr. Folk, Mr. Person, Mr. Member of the Legislature, Mr. Whoever, you live within the law and as long as you live within the law, you're going to be O.K. But then when you pass retroactive legislation you're saying, even though you live within the law we're going to attack what you stood for before and we're going to make you into lawbreakers. Well, that's an attack. There can't be any doubt about that. This man, Reginald Lennard says and I quote:

It follows too that all persecution of minorities and all class war is undemocratic. It follows whether the minority is large or small and whether its numbers are rich or poor; democracy requires that they shall be treated as fellow citizens, not merely tolerated but made to feel that indeed they are a part of the people.

That's what democracy is all about. There are others in the world who call themselves socialists and don't believe in democracy. There are others in the world who call themselves socialists and do believe in democracy. Why don't you tell people what kind of socialists you're going to be? If you're going to be democratic socialists and believe in democracy, then you can't possibly want to persecute the minorities or attack minority interests. Retroactive legislation is an attack. And what is the Unionest Party in Saskatchewan, in the Saskatchewan legislature? It's a minority. So by passing retroactive legislation you are attacking minorities. That's a fact.

The member for Regina Lakeview says precisely that from his chair but he's not at his chair. But he says that's right. Retroactive legislation is an attack on minorities and the Unionest Party is a minority, therefore you are attacking minorities. I'm glad we finally have that settled, that you understand that you are attacking minorities. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will qualify what I just said.

If that minority group is jeopardizing the lives of the majority then that attack is justified. If the minority group is going out with guns and shooting people, if the minority group is presenting a means by which the entire break-up of the society will occur and they are committing that with overt acts, then you must attack the minority. If a person decides to break the Ten Commandments, then the law attacks the minority. So there are lots of attacks on minorities that are justified. But can you justify an attack on a minority when the minorities have not broken the law? Can you attack the minorities and justify democracy when that minority is merely presenting a different view from

yours? We have agreed, Mr. Speaker; at least the member for Regina Lakeview agrees. You cannot pass retroactive legislation without attacking. You cannot doubt that the Unionest Party in this legislature is a minority, and therefore this retroactive legislation is attacking a minority. Is there any justification for the attack on that minority? That is the question that must enter every member's mind. Is there justification for it?

Now if you want to change the bill for the future, you want the principles of this bill to be applied to the future, and you said to the people of the province of Saskatchewan that this bill makes it necessary for a political party to be registered under The Election Act on the day of the last general election, and if you said that that principle was merely an oversight in the bill due to the mistake of this legislature, then, Mr. Speaker, you must pass it from today on. No one, least of all me, would object to that change, except I would. I would object to the change but not for the same reasons.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, the change in itself is wrong. I believe it represents a misunderstanding of the role of members of the legislature. But at least if it was from today on, it would not be an attack on a minority. If it was from today on, it would state that anyone in future who decides to cross the floor and form another party, or if they want to join a new party, must, Mr. Speaker, be registered at the time of the last general election. That's fair game. I don't agree with it. I think it's wrong, and I would object to it, but I certainly wouldn't be standing here talking for the, I believe, 16th straight hour about the evils of that legislation.

I would present the case against that legislation and allow the members to continue with the debate. I would not be so adamant in my opposition to that kind of legislation, although I would oppose it, because it is not an attack on a minority. And that's the essence you see, Mr. Speaker.

If, for example, the members had brought in a bill that said from now on we are not going to pay the third party anything, I would object to it. I would say that it's wrong. I would present my arguments to the people and object to the government's trying to repeal that.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in between the coughs I am sure I will be able to conclude my remarks tonight. If they had brought in a bill like that, that said from now on third parties will no longer be funded in the Saskatchewan legislature, I would object to it. I would say it was wrong, but I wouldn't be half as adamant, because it's not an attack on the minority. I am sure that may be lost on some members, but it's true. I would oppose but not be as adamantly opposed.

Why, Mr. Speaker? Because that wouldn't attack the fundamental nature of democracy. If for example they came in with a bill that says from now on third parties receive no money in the Saskatchewan legislature; good grief, third parties had no money in the Saskatchewan legislature up until 1975. It has only been law since 1976 that third parties received anything in the Saskatchewan legislature. Now, admittedly, it has only been since 1975 that there was a third party here. But nevertheless there wasn't any legislation up to that point in time rewarding third parties.

That kind of bill would not attack the very fundamental essence of this legislature. That kind of a bill would remove the payment to the Unionest Party all right, but wouldn't reward the Liberals, or any other members who decide to cross to the Liberals. It wouldn't reward the Conservatives if they became the third party. It wouldn't reward those individuals in the Conservative Party if, as I suspected or suggested here in

previous remarks I made in this legislature, 12 or 13 NDPs decide to cross over here to the Unionest Party side. We would become the opposition and the Conservatives become a third party, and if you rule out the third party legislation, then they don't get the third party grants. That's it; they don't get any — period, zero, end of report.

If you bring that in, I'm going to object; I'm going to say it's wrong. I'm going to say it's not in keeping with the traditions you established in this Assembly, but that's it; it's finished. That's not an attack on the minorities, but this bill is an attack on minorities. This bill is retroactively attacking two members because of what they believe. That's the difference. You want to stop payment to the Unionests in Saskatchewan? Well bring in a bill that doesn't attack the very institution in which you live. Bring in the kind of bill which is fair to people and says, this is the way it is. You could find all kinds of excuses for that.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure a member of this legislature from the NDP side could stand up and say, the people of the province of Saskatchewan, the government, is facing a period of economic down turn, which we all are. We're facing a period of recession and we have to cut back as much as possible. Therefore, we are no longer going to fund a third party in the province because the opposition has the major job (the major role) in opposing legislation. If you had come up with a bill like that, Mr. Speaker, which didn't apply specifically to one particular party in this particular legislature, which wasn't retroactive in nature, and which makes members of the Legislative Assembly lawbreakers, certainly I would oppose. Certainly I would say you're wrong, and that's it. I would make my case; you would make your case, and it would go to the people. That's fair enough. That's a decision that's fine, but why do you bring in a bill which attacks the very essence of this institution?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — It doesn't.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Well, the member says it doesn't, but Mr. Speaker, I know I have proven already (certainly to the satisfaction of independent observers) that it does . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, you had better talk to some independent observers who have been sitting in here, and you will find out we have shown it does attack because we have already stated so in very simple words, Mr. Speaker.

I don't want to be out of order because I'm answering the Minister of the Environment's questions, but I want him to appreciate that retroactive legislation is an attack, whether it's an attack against the oil industry, whether it's an attack against anyone else, it is an attack. It must be defined as an attack. No one could doubt that the Unionest Party is a minority in this legislature. We are two against 58, therefore retroactive legislation affecting the Unionest Party is an attack on the minorities. That's a fact, whether or not the minister likes to think it.

He could bring in legislation from now on stating this principle was reasonable, and then it wouldn't be an attack. He could bring in legislation to stop payment as from today on, to any third party in this House, and then it isn't an attack. But, Mr. Speaker, it is an attack when he brings it in this way.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Because your actions are retroactive, that's why. You didn't go to the people.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Neither did the member for Qu'Appelle, Mr. Lane, neither did the member for Thunder Creek, neither did anyone else who has crossed go to the people.

Why wasn't the Minister of the Environment on his feet at the time the member for Thunder Creek crossed to the Conservatives and made them equal, when the member knew full well that what was going to happen was that the money was now going to be divided in two. The Conservatives of that day were rewarded by an extra kick at the can because the member for Thunder Creek crossed to the Conservatives. And the member sits there shaking . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's not baloney; that is the exact truth.

I see even the member for Rosthern sits there nodding his head and saying, yes that's true. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that was a fact. Why wasn't the member for Shellbrook on his feet at the time, saying the Conservatives did not have the member for Thunder Creek running in a previous election. Because he didn't run in the previous election, this legislature shouldn't recognize him as a Conservative and therefore make equal representation in this very House and therefore divide up the opposition in the third party and add it together and multiply by two.

Ah, you see, that's his position. But he didn't say it then. Oh no, neither did any member in the government benches say it then; not a one said it then.

So how can anyone sit in their chairs or stand on their feet and say to anybody anywhere, well, it's because you didn't run in the previous election that we have decided to add this to the bill at this time? What nonsense!

Precedent means something in law. I suppose it doesn't mean anything to legislators, but it sure as heck means something in law. There's a precedent in this very legislature for exactly the same situation, as it refers to research moneys and money for the office of the third party and leader of the third party. It refers to exactly that. There's an exact precedent in this legislature so why in the world would they introduce the bill except to attack the minorities?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know it's difficult for some members of the NDP to let facts interfere with their arguments, but I invite every member of this legislature to take a trip to the Clerk's office and ask the Clerk what happened the day after the member for Thunder Creek crossed to the Conservatives in the last legislature. What happened to the grant moneys? What happened to the research money? What happened to the money for secretaries? What happened to the leader's money and what happened to the leader's office? This was the day after the member for Thunder Creek crossed to the Conservatives. He didn't run in the previous election as a Conservative; he ran as a Liberal. That is an exact analogy . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Well, if that is the issue, then pass a bill to that effect. The member for Shellbrook says that if a member crosses the floor, he must go back for a by-election. And I say, then don't pass a bill here in this way; don't retroactively charge the minorities; don't attack the minorities. Pass a bill for what you mean.

I know I wouldn't support the member for Shellbrook if he introduced a bill like that, but I know I wouldn't be as adamant in my opposition to that bill as I would be to this kind of bill. If he wants to bring in an amendment to a bill which says that any member who runs under one party banner must stay with that party until the next election or face a by-election of the people, then bring in the bill. That's not this bill. Bring that one to the people, if that's what you believe. But don't go out saying, as the member for Shellbrook is trying to, that the reason I support this bill is because I support that concept . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I happen to think he's a good guy too, but good guys

sometimes finish last.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the trouble is I'm not known as a good guy, so I shouldn't be over here . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You didn't say that to start with; you're twisting words again.

Oh, I'm out of order, Mr. Speaker. I won't respond, but it's hard to resist the temptation sometimes when some of these members flash their brilliant lights from their seats. It's difficult to resist the brilliance with which the repartee comes across the floor.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to return to the comments of Mr. Reginald Lennard pertaining to democracy because it is our contention that this bill threatens democracy. If this bill threatens democracy then the members must be aware of what democracy is all about . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry for one more interjection; the Minister of Health said he can't take it any more. I suggest that tomorrow when Bill No. 105 is first on the order paper again, when we beg leave to adjourn debate, if he can't take it any more, he has a simple alternative: let us adjourn debate and go on with the business of the people. It's as easy as pie you see, Mr. Speaker, that's a very, very easy thing. If he doesn't like it, he has the perfect option.

Well, just another hour and 25 minutes to go Mr. Speaker and then the Minister of Health could be flying away to whatever island of solace he has been looking for all of his life . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I've often wondered what a socialist paradise looked like, Mr. Speaker. When the Minister returns I sincerely hope he'll describe it to me, but I'm sure it's the world's most giant co-op . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The creator of the co-ops? Well, actually Mr. Speaker, Milton created the paradise; mind you he created paradise lost and paradise regained. Fortunately, the minister will never quite regain what he's already lost.

'If class war is a contradiction' . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Ah, Mr. Speaker . . . I'm really trying with all these great interjections – and not even from his own chair.

That rules out religious tests for public offices or for employment in the state schools, and the toleration which admits the Catholic, the Jew and the agnostic must not strain at the Communist or the conscientious objector.

Did you hear that, Mr. Speaker, if a school system or a legislator or a legislature admits a Catholic, a Jew or an agnostic, this man believes you shouldn't strain if it is a communist or a conscientious objector or even a Unionest. You shouldn't strain yourself if there is a view that doesn't quite coincide with yours. Because if your view is so good and so perfect, then the view of that person who is different will fall by the wayside. If your view is not so perfect, then you should have enough of an open mind to accept the other person's point of view. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that doesn't seem to be prevalent in this Assembly today. Mr. Speaker, this gentleman says:

The principle carries us further still. If it implies that all minorities should be treated as part of the people, it implies also that it is their duty to behave as such and not cling to privileges which mark them off from their fellows nor let clannishness grow stronger than good citizenship.

Now what this is saying, Mr. Speaker, is that if the Unionest Party allowed itself to fall outside the law, or we decided not to participate in the various events of this legislature, or we decided to clannishly get together and be a minority all by ourselves without

being full citizens, then we deserve to be chastised by the legislature and have our rights removed, which is exactly what this bill is designed to do. But no, we're not doing that. We're not only not doing that, Mr. Speaker, we are participating fully in the business of the people of Saskatchewan. We brought to the attention of the people the necessity to legislate the dairy workers back to work. We brought to the attention of the Minister of Telephones the kind of amendment which would allow the telephone bill to go through. We have participated fully in this Assembly by asking questions as often as Mr. Speaker would allow us to do on the fifth, sixth or seventh attempt at getting those questions asked. We are participating fully in the business of the people of Saskatchewan. We are not sitting back and being clannish, being minorities and only talking about the one issue.

I admit Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, at the start of the creation of the Unionest Party I thought it would be a wise tactic to perhaps only participate in the presentation of our cause. I thought it would be a wise tactic in only participating and presenting our cause to the people in order that every opportunity we had in terms of the media and the press that at least our cause was getting out to the people. I then discovered that was a particularly poor tactic. In other words, I took what this gentleman, Mr. Reginald Lennard, suggests is the essence of democracy and what the minority's responsibilities are.

As a minority group we must not only present our views and stick together as best we can, but we must also participate fully in the business at hand. So we decided consciously and above board to participate fully in this legislature. The members, I think, will agree with that and will agree (although they may not agree with our stand) that our participation, for the number of members we have, has been at least as good, as effective as any other member in this Chamber. At least I believe so. I don't think anyone would suggest the reverse. This man goes on:

If class war is a contradiction of Democracy it is none the less true that Democracy is favorable to the social progress which leads towards a classless society and is affronted by the spirit of exclusiveness wherever it appears, whether it is based on pride of birth or pride of wealth or the pride of self-conscious intellectuals.

Now, I wouldn't say anyone in this Chamber, other than maybe the member for Thunder Creek, has a whole heck of a lot of pride of birth. I don't suppose there are many people in this Assembly besides the member for Wilkie and maybe the member for Rosthern who have a pride of wealth. But, Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting to you that everyone in this very same Chamber has the pride of self-conscious intellectuals because every member of this Chamber (and I include myself in this number) is an egotist – every one. Every member is an egotist, and every member thinks his ideas are the best. What makes a good member, what makes a good solid citizen of the country is someone who realizes that although he believes his ideas are the best, other ideas are also prevalent. Other people can have ideas and they can present them and they don't do a bad job from time to time, you see. That's what makes a complete human being. But when, Mr. Speaker, your pride of self-conscious intellectuals overcomes your sense, your understanding for your fellow human beings . . . Mr. Speaker, I'd like to proceed when the conversation . . . I know you can hear me just fine but right here with this particular dialogue it's hard to keep up the pace and try to pay attention to their scintillating conversation and also attempt to provide you with appropriate remarks.

Pride of self-conscious intellectuals – here is a bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which

purports to change only the grants and allowances to the leader of the third party and to the leader's office. That's what it purports to change, plus a few other minor changes which change the wording of the act passed in 1979, if you like, housekeeping changes . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I know that. Why is it awful?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member for Rosetown-Elrose suggests the press has gone home. Most of the time they've been home all day, so I wouldn't worry about it. Even when they're there, we don't get much out to the people anyway, so all your work since May 15 has been for nought because there isn't enough past page 96 to blow in your eye at any rate. And so I wouldn't worry at all about what you've done since May 15. There were some who were trying to tell you that over the last number of days, but you may not believe that. I know and it gets worse every day in June. We'll get less and less and eventually there'll be nothing. I can well imagine that. I don't think it really matters. When you're talking about something which is of deep and abiding concern to the future of every member of this legislature, I think it's necessary to convince as many of those members of the legislature as you can. And, unfortunately, it has not been possible so far to convince them of anything . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I noticed the member for Wilkie wasn't here today to vote on the amendment on the adjourned debate, which is too bad. It would have been nice to have seen where he stood on this issue in relation to his own caucus . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Everybody wants to get into debate. It's easy to get into the debate. All you have to do is allow adjourned debate. Let the business of the people proceed, and the next time it's called get right back in and jump into the debate. We'd be happy to let you do it. I just want to tell you something about the rules of the Assembly. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm going to be right on topic here. There are only two members in our caucus. Those two members of the caucus form the third party in this Assembly. When there are only two members of a caucus, when it's the third party in the Assembly, the member for Rosthern and others will know it is impossible for the first speaker to do more than say his bit to the topic and to any amendment he might make, and it's only possible for the other member of that caucus to second the motion. Now, the only way you can ever get back into the debate again (you can't conclude on the motion, everyone knows that) is to adjourn debate and let other people speak and then you get a chance to come back in and rebut. That's the only possible way to do it, when there are only two members in your caucus.

It has been interesting to me to note the reactions of the NDP for example, who say, let us get into debate. And I say, terrific. Let me adjourn debate and get on with the business of the people. Next time it comes back in, you get in and it's terrific. Members to my right are saying, we'll get right on with the business of the people. As soon as that bill comes up again, you guys stand up and speak. It gives me an opportunity to get back in and rebut what you might say. Now, you see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's the problem. That's the problem we face, and you want the member for Wilkie to get into this debate. Fair enough. Try to understand the rules from everybody's point of view. You know, that's really what I'm trying to say on Bill 105. Why not, Mr. Deputy Speaker and Mr. Speaker, whoever is in the Chair . . . It's hard to tell at the moment . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . O.K. It doesn't matter. I beg your pardon?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — You always address him as Mr. Speaker, never Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Is that true? I didn't know that. I thought when the Speaker's hat was



on the table you had to refer to the person in the Chair as Deputy Speaker. Now, isn't that something? Thank you very much, Mr. Member for Kelvington-Wadena. I have taken some of your advice before. I can even recall when you were campaigning in Nipawin, you gave me a bit of advice from here, there and everywhere, and I even listened to it (some of it, not all of it, mind you, but some of it).

Mr. Speaker, I would like to return to the remarks of Reginald Lennard because I don't think the members are paying enough attention to these sterling remarks on democracy. Pride of self-conscious intellectuals is where I left off. I think there was rather unanimous agreement here, Mr. Speaker, while you were taking a breather. There was rather unanimous agreement that every member of this legislature had the pride of self-conscious intellectuals, which means a very large ego. It would be nice though if members in relation to Bill No. 105 would be a little less egotistical and a little more understanding. That's what makes a complete person.

It is worthy of note that Lincoln spoke of 'Government by the People', not of 'Government by the Majority.' (I must emphasize that point.) If we were to disfranchise a small section of the community . . .

Now this directly relates to the bill, Mr. Speaker. It would be a disfranchising, if you like, through lack of allowing members of this session to participate fully in the activities of the House and through lack of funding for secretarial and research staff to do their jobs as members of this House.

And that's how you are disfranchising certain members of the House. It's easy. That's how you are doing it.

If we were to disfranchise a small section of the community – if for example we should lay it down that no hairdressers or dentists or millionaires might have a vote to take part in politics – we might still have 'Government by the Majority,' but it would not be a Democracy.

That's what this man says. And he's right. Democracy is not government by the majority. Democracy is a special unique kind of institution which has evolved mostly in the English-speaking world over the last 600 years or 700 years. It was first put forward in ancient Greece but real democracy, even the regulations and rules that Plato suggested in his republic with his slaves, and so on, did not have too much democracy involved in it. It is something that has evolved if you like over thousands of years. That's what democracy is.

And democracy, as this man says, is not government by the majority. Democracy is something else.

In a democracy the will of the majority must prevail; but more than that is implicit in the democratic ideal of 'Government by the People.' There is a world of difference.

Mr. Speaker, I'm off the topic, but the member for Saskatoon Buena Vista, the minister responsible for The Education and Health Tax Act, has just brought something extremely important to my attention. I think all members of this Assembly should thank the person responsible for it. The member suggested to me that I brought the rain. Apparently it's pouring cats and dogs outside. All I can say is that I want, as one member of the Assembly, to thank the person responsible for ending the drought in this part of

Saskatchewan.

Now if it starts to leak in here we could have a problem, Mr. Speaker. It might be thought that I was in fact bringing the rain upon the people of Saskatchewan.

There's a world of difference between the majority decision taken after the opinions of minorities have been heard and considered, and one reached in ignorance of what can be said on the other side.

Now everyone is falling asleep, Mr. Speaker, and these words are so closely on topic:

It is essential to democracy that all should be able to make their wishes known, that every minority should have the right of trying to convert the majority to their way of thinking. Every minority should have that right and they should not be treated differently. They should not be treated, one minority one way, and one minority another.

That, Mr. Speaker, is precisely why the people of western Canada will not accept the concept of two nations or the concept of compulsory bilingualism in western Canada. That is why. That is the precise reason – there is no special minority group. There's not even a special majority group. The greatest thing about western Canada is the fact that all of us together make up the society with a great many different ethnic backgrounds. There are a great many minorities, and they make up that society; and no one group should superimpose its will or its wishes on the will of others if it is to the detriment of that minority group.

And that's why the people will refuse to accept compulsory bilingualism when Mr. Trudeau tries to make it stick in forthcoming talks. The people are in no uncertain terms going to let their politicians and everybody in this Assembly know that it is unacceptable to western Canadians. But we can go beyond that.

Government by the people is an idea which takes us beyond the mere principle that minorities shall be heard and that every citizen shall have a right to express his views. Rights without the capacity to use them are of little value. And though it may not be necessary that every citizen should be able to make a political speech, it is necessary that each and all should at least be able to form a reasonable judgment upon the arguments which political leaders employ. In other words, education is necessary as well as free speech.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with reference to Bill No. 105 I must tell you in no uncertain terms that education in this Assembly is necessary in order to preserve free speech. That's what Reginald Lennard said and that's what I say.

I'm going to get to the Chartists later in this small, very short quotation so that the members can find out about their own heritage and what Chartists are all about. But unless they are educated on democracy, unless they are educated on what free speech is about, unless they are educated about this legislative Chamber, how in the world can they pass a reasonable judgment on Bill No. 105? How can they, unless they are educated to the point where they understand that if you pass retroactive legislation it's an attack; if two members of the Assembly fall under the scope of that retroactive legislation and there are 60 members in the Assembly, you are attempting retroactive legislation to attack minorities.

Now, unless they are educated to understand that, Mr. Speaker, they are going to persist in trying to pass this bill. Why wouldn't they, for example, if they really wanted to eliminate the Unionest Party in Saskatchewan (and they didn't want taxpayers' money to be used to support that party) just say with the bill, we won't fund third parties any more in Saskatchewan. That is pretty simple.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Don, you have the answer — scramble it.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — He is going to jam you, watch out.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, I notice the member for Wilkie from his chair is making quite a number of comments and remarks. I hope the member for Wilkie will appreciate the fact that some of us don't have the kind of researchers who can write out filibusters for us. We have to make up filibusters as we go along. The more he yells out from his seat like that, the more helpful he is going to be to me. So I hope he will continue screaming out from his seat. I hope he makes enough noise that Mr. Speaker calls order. All of these things help someone who is attempting to extend the debate to teach the people in the Assembly a certain lesson. I know the member for Wilkie, as intelligent as he is, will have some tremendous comments to make from his chair. Given his requirement to go home to rest, after spending a couple of days on his feet, spending time with his family whom he misses terribly, and now he is back in this legislature . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! Not only is the member for Wilkie out of order when he is interrupting a debate or any other member for that matter (and I want to keep all members in order in this debate), but also the member for Nipawin is equally out of order if he is responding to things which aren't in order. Because he is then off the topic before us which is the principle of this bill.

**MR. COLLVER:** — That's fine, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your comments. I knew I was out of order that time. I certainly will watch myself as time goes on.

And what of the third clause in the Gettysburg motto? What of the bold assumption that 'Government by the People' will be, or at least may be, identical with 'Government for the People'? 'Government for the People' must mean government in the interest of the whole people, and not in the interest of any privileged class or section. But that is not as simple as it sounds. We cannot suppose that every act of government must directly benefit everybody. Governments would find very little to do, if it were restricted to such actions. For example, such an interpretation of the principle would make it impossible to levy taxes to pay for old age pensions, for old are only a section of the people and we can scarcely pretend that taxpayers are directly benefited by the demands of the tax collector. It seems to me that what 'Government for the People' really implies is that the government in all its actions should consider the interests of the people as a whole. It is often necessary to do things which are contrary to individual or sectional interests; but the interest which all share must always be respected, especially the vital interest which all have in that maintenance of that spirit of unity without which Democracy would become impossible and government by discussion give way either to anarchy or to government by coercion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to just comment briefly on what this man is saying. What this man is saying is that unity is not necessarily a patriotic feeling for one country or for

what that country stands. Unity is in the spirit or the essence of that society in which we live. If we are unified in spirit and purpose for the preservation of freedom and a free society, if that unity prevails across the country, then any country will survive, any area will survive. Whether we join with the United States or not, that spirit will unify the people of Canada. But if we lose that unity of purpose, this man is saying that we will have anarchy at the best or government by coercion (which is what Bill No. 105 is all about). Then there will nothing left for any free-thinking person, nothing. Anarchy or government by coercion – that is what this man says and I agree. The unity which democracy requires is not unanimity. Thinking alike and feeling alike is not a democratic ideal. It is not necessary, Mr. Speaker, for me to think like a Conservative to maintain democracy. It is not necessary for a Conservative to think like me to maintain democracy. It is not necessary for me to think like the NDP to maintain democracy. It is not necessary for them to think like me to maintain democracy.

It is, however, necessary (this man goes on to say), that in the ideal of totalitarianism, an idea strikingly exemplified in the Gadarene swine when the whole herd of them, ran violently down a steep place into the sea and perished in the waters . . .

You recall earlier, Mr. Speaker, before I got to the remarks of Mr. Lennard, I talked about people wanting to goose-step together. I don't think it's necessary that they goose-step together to preserve democracy. That's what every totalitarian state in the history of the world has suggested. It has suggested that it's necessary for every citizen to think alike and to be alike and to look alike, in order for that society to be unitized. And you will recall the kinds of actions that were required, for example, in Germany – the raising of the salute, the marching parade, the millions of people massed in the squares, the speeches that sounded sometimes like the ones I give but never saying the same things. You will recall then at the top of these, millions of people and everybody sieging their heels. In a democracy that's not necessary. There was unity in Germany but there was no democracy. They were united but they were not free. They had a unity of purpose but they had no unity of spirit. They caused some of the greatest hardship and damage that this world has ever known or seen.

In contrast to such unanimity, it is the mark of Democracy that under it people, as we say, agree to differ.

Isn't that the essence of Bill No. 105, a bill that's brought into this Assembly attempting to attack minorities, retroactively attack a party? The essence of that bill, the essence of Bill No. 105 is to attack minorities. Why? Because two members of the Assembly refuse to accept the prevailing thought processes and are suggesting something new, something different. The essence of this legislative Chamber should be to agree to differ, not to attack. The essence of a democracy should be to agree to differ.

That trite and well-worn phrase is rich in meaning. It helps us to penetrate more deeply into the significance of the terms, 'Government by the People' and 'Government for the People'. In a Democracy, when we differ we settle our differences peacefully by, 'counting heads instead of breaking them'. The majority decides. But the very word 'majority' not only implies the use of this peaceful and orderly method of counting: . . .

Now, get this, Mr. Speaker, and this is what every socialist has been saying in Saskatchewan for decades, the way that people get their say is by counting noses, by voting for people. But this man says, of course we

must count noses and of course we must account for people but democracy also

. . . implies that the majority and the minority together form a whole, that they are in fact one People. We may say that the inhabitants of Rutland (and now it will exhibit, Mr. Speaker, the English views of this particular writer) are a minority and that English men who do not dwell in Rutland are a majority, but we could not use these terms in comparing the population of Rutland with the population of China. An underlying unity is presupposed by the conceptions, 'majority' and 'minority'. And whatever else we may infer from the nature of 'Government for the people', there can surely be no doubt about the conclusion that it must be compatible with the maintenance of that unity, not merely as a formal and legal thing, but as a fundamental harmony of feeling.

What in the world is Bill No. 105 going to do on behalf of the harmony of feeling between minority and majority in the province of Saskatchewan? A retroactive law is an attack. Two members of the legislature are a minority – attack minorities. What are other minorities going to think? How are they going to feel? How are they going to accept that harmony of feeling which is so essential to a democracy?

Now I know, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, not many messages are going out from this Chamber in the month of June. The antennae of the people are not tuned to political animals in the month of June. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, whether the antennae of people are attuned to political animals for much of the year, including the month of June, but they are perhaps less tuned in in June than in January or February.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps the people won't hear about this. That is, I'm sure, what the members are counting on. I haven't heard the news because I've been slightly busy today. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that when they asked Mr. Blakeney if he would accept Mr. Romanow's challenge to run in the constituency of Nipawin against me and the Leader of the Conservative Party, he accepted and tomorrow will be turning his resignation in. I will do the same when he does – turn in my resignation – and we'll all have a good, old-fashioned, hard-fought, proper debate in the constituency of Nipawin. That was the Attorney General's challenge.

Failing that challenge, I hope the Premier and the Leader of the Conservative Party agree to my challenge to debate this very important issue before the people of the province. The only way we can possibly get the debate before the people is to have the Leader of the Conservative Party, who seems to have some kind of a ring through the nose of most of the people here to my right and is able to lead them right along . . . He's not in this House, so he can't come down here and debate. I could debate the Premier but I couldn't debate the members here. The only possible way we could have a proper debate is to have the Premier and myself and the Leader of the Conservative Party debate this important issue.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — You'd better find out who he is.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Oh no, we all know who he is. He's not in this House and therefore I hope he accepted the opportunity to get some press exposure which I gave him today. I hope he accepts that opportunity to debate this important bill. I doubt that the Premier will, but he may. I hope he will, because I think it would be an exciting debate; I think it would point out to the people exactly what the Premier of Saskatchewan believes in and

exactly what the new Leader of the Conservative Party believes in. I certainly would welcome such a debate outside this Chamber because the people aren't really interested in what goes on inside the Chamber in June. It would be nice to have them find out what's going on, to find out what the government is proposing and to ask people who are members or minority groups in Saskatchewan if they think a retroactive attack on any minority is a good thing. Then just see what they have to say.

I don't think they would give you much support if they knew what the issue was. But let's get a debate which the people will see, instead of a debate here between only two of the participants, with one of them having to sit in whatever cloud he may possibly be desirous of sitting in.

Mr. Lennard goes on to say:

All must recognize the duties which are correlative to their rights.

I mentioned that earlier, about duties and rights. We recognize that we have obligations to participate in this legislature and we've done so; we've participated in the business of the people, which you might say is the major plank in the beliefs of our party.

Minorities must always remember that the right to have their views heard and their interests considered carries with it a far-reaching if not wholly unlimited duty of loyally accepting the decisions of the majority.

You see, Mr. Speaker, that's precisely correct. Finally, even in taking away the rights of the minorities, we, as citizens of this country, of this province, must accept in the final analysis the decision of the majority.

However, we must accept that decision when it comes. Mr. Speaker, we'll know and we'll realize that it is important to present to the people of the province of Saskatchewan, if you are a minority group, your belief that your minority opinion is being attacked. Because if the people believe that your minority opinion is being attacked, only the people can bring enough pressure to bear on the majority to make them change their minds.

That's the reason, if you wish, for my challenge to the Premier and the Leader of the Conservative Party. Only the people can bring enough pressure to bear on the majority to change their minds away from attacking the minority. Because as a minority group, if we believe in a free society, we must accept the final decision, the final arbitration of the majority.

But, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lennard goes on to give some very good advice to the majority as well. He says this:

And the majority, in reaching its decisions, must always remember that the minority are also a part of the people. It must treat them with consideration. It must not press its own views to the point of outraging the minority. In short the majority must exercise the faculty which we call 'political sense'; that is to say, it must do nothing which will destroy or even seriously impair the will of the minority to remain fellow-citizens of the majority.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Speaker, that's precisely what we believe Mr. Trudeau and his group in Ottawa have been doing for some years. The minority, if you like, are western

Canadians; the majority are Ontario and Quebec. And what he's been doing is ignoring totally the wishes of the minority in western Canada, while overemphasizing the wishes of the majority in central Canada, and he has created an alienation the likes of which this country has never seen.

There's a chance that the minority may come back from that alienation but I predict it won't happen. I predict that so-called momentum which I heard members of this Chamber talk about has already disappeared. I didn't think it was there to begin with. And I predict the kinds of views that are presently being put forward by Ottawa will be so soundly rejected by western Canadians that they will be looking for the opportunity for other options. Any politician who doesn't present those other options to them will be soundly defeated and will be recognized as – and I'm going to use the word now, Mr. Speaker – a traitor to the cause of western Canada, to the interest of the citizens of western Canada. Any politician who tries to suggest that compulsory bilingualism can work, who sells out our oil resources, who says that our other resources in the province of Saskatchewan don't belong here in the province of Saskatchewan and sells them out to the eastern Canadian interests in the so-called spirit of compromise, once again capitulating to the will of the majority, will be rejected. So we find ourselves having to follow that will of the majority. I say the people of western Canada won't accept him and they will look to other alternatives and other reasonable options and any politician who doesn't provide them is not going to last very long as a political animal under those circumstances.

I should go back, Mr. Speaker and say:

It is in such ways that in a Democracy men 'agree to differ'. In place of the blatant unison of Totalitarianism, Democracy sets the ideal of a harmony which is really rich and full because it is made up of many different notes.

Do you hear what I say, Mr. Member for Assiniboia? I say I'm proud of being odd. This man says the essence of democracy is that it's a harmony with many different notes. Just because we are different and think differently from you doesn't mean we can't be harmonious and that we can't present our views as strongly as you do. But this Bill No. 105 says we can't. This Bill No. 105 says retroactively that the Unionist Party members in this Legislative Assembly will not have the same opportunity to present their views as you do. We don't have the researchers; we won't have the secretary. You can present yours; the Conservatives can present theirs; we can't present ours. There are certain rules of the House; we can't respond to ministerial statements, because we are not recognized as a party. That's what this bill says. The NDP can; the Conservatives can; the Unionists can't. You add these things together and it means that we become second-class MLAs in this very Chamber, which is what the third party legislation was designed to correct. Bill No. 105 is attempting to retroactively end the opportunity for two members of this legislature (as the bill formerly saw the opportunity) to do their jobs properly. It doesn't have to do with personal money; it has to do with doing your job properly. That's what this bill would prevent, and, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that's what this bill is designed to prevent. We're afraid of that man; we're afraid of that group. Good heavens! Hold them back as much as we possibly can; as much as we can get away with, hold them back. That's what this bill is all about; and that's what this man says is not the essence of democracy.

When the nature of 'Government for the People' is described in these general terms, it sounds 'too good to be true' and one is tempted to doubt the possibility of 'Government by the People' being actually exercised with the

wisdom and forbearance which 'Government for the People' demands. Yet the operations of politics in England do in fact commonly display the democratic qualities of forbearance and political sense in a remarkable degree – so much so indeed that many adherents of the democratic faith, especially the young and inexperienced, are offended because of these things and doubt the reality of a Democracy in which reforms are introduced so slowly and no political party appears to 'mean business.' In any case, Democracy is more than a form of government, it is a social ideal; and the difficulty of the ideal is commensurate with its nobility. Like all the best ideals of men, it reveals, not something to be easily and finally attained, but a vista of possible progress which seems to have no limit. The service of such an ideal calls for high qualities of head and heart; and among those qualities not the least important are the intellectual realism which frankly recognizes the existence of difficulties and the faith which refuses to be discouraged by their magnitude but sees in them a call to effort. Two practical conclusions seem to follow. First, we find once more that the case of Democracy is closely bound up with the cause of Education. 'Government by the People' cannot be really 'Government for the People' unless the People understand what will really contribute to the general welfare . . .

Surely, Mr. Speaker, that applies to this legislative Chamber as well. Surely that's the purpose of debate. Surely that's the purpose of providing the necessary research and secretarial help and opportunities in this legislature: to ensure that every member presents his views to the best of his ability, that he is not tied back, that his hands are not tied, that every single member presents those views in the best way he possibly can so that every other member is educated to views which are different from his own. Think of the benefits which can be gained, Mr. Speaker, from such a system. Think of the benefits which can be gained within this very House. I want to give the members opposite (those who are listening – which isn't many) some idea of the benefit which can be gained by allowing individual members in this Chamber to be equal and to present their views with equal facility, because of the research funds which are available to them.

I suggest to the members of this Assembly that the NDP and the Conservative opposition in five straight days of questioning before Crown corporations, in six days of debate in this Assembly, couldn't make each other understand what they were saying. The Conservative opposition was presenting its views about computers and the problems they're having; and the NDP was standing against it. Suddenly, Mr. Speaker, at the eleventh hour a member was able to bring the two sides at least partially together and come up with a solution that was not only possible but one that worked. He brought the two sides partially together and put the bill through second reading. Isn't that what different ideas and ideals are all about? And isn't that what Bill No. 105 is designed to thwart?

I said earlier that I couldn't understand why members of this legislative Chamber could possibly have decided to support this piece of onerous legislation which attacks minorities. I couldn't for the life of me understand it. On the part of the NDP it is probably two-fold. One thing is arrogance – they can do anything they want, get away with it and nobody else cares. The second one is probably personal dislike for me.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I can certainly ascribe the second one to members on my right. They have a personal dislike for me but if they are becoming as arrogant as the members on the government side, thinking that they can do anything and get away with it, they have



another think coming.

Why would they support this bill? It's against everything they have ever stood for. Why would they support this bill as they did this morning? It's hard to say, Mr. Speaker, it's hard to say.

Since it is based on a belief in reason and in confidence in the results of free discussions, but at the same time fully recognizes the existence of the difficulties, Democracy is far from having a uniform programme for all nations at every stage of social development. Uniformity belongs to it as little as unanimity.

Uniformity and unanimity do not belong in democracy says Mr. Lennard. I don't believe it belongs there either. I don't believe it is necessary for anyone to believe the same as the majority in order to get equal status in the legislature or equal status in society or equal status in the country.

For example, we hear a lot about minority rights. We hear a lot about gay rights. We hear a lot about women's rights. But how are all of those people who are concerned about their rights going to feel when even in the Saskatchewan legislature the majority is attacking the minority? How are they ever going to cope with that other majority – the majority of citizens?

I mentioned before that in the constituency in which I live, for example, there are some very, very strongly held feelings of alienation and upset with native Indians. A man attempting to take hold of this kind of emotional action could get the spirit of the majority against the minority almost overnight. But no responsible legislator, and I must say no responsible person seeking the seat in Nipawin has ever attempted to do that despicable thing, ever. That's because they understand the essence of democracy, Mr. Speaker. Now how in the world can members of this legislative Chamber forget it so quickly? Retroactive means attack; two out of 60 means minority; this bill attacks minority. How could they forget so soon?

Of government we may certainly say that, if the People are to be governed by the People, they must enjoy political independence: they must be free to govern themselves. But we are not compelled to limit Democracy to any one form or mode of government: within wide limits variety is admissible. There is nothing at all in Lincoln's phrase to suggest that Democracy favors either a federal state or a unitary state, or that it necessarily is promoted by any particular electoral method, such as proportional representation or the second ballot. We are surely justified in inferring that what Democracy requires is that in all such matters we should aim at the particular arrangements which in the given conditions of a particular society or particular time are most likely to make 'Government by the People' operate as 'Government for the People'.

It is the same with the scope of government action. Democracy is not as such identified with any pre-determined degree of 'state interference'.

See, Mr. Speaker, you can't argue that it's undemocratic for the NDP to nationalize industry. In this Chamber I have never said it was undemocratic. I merely said that they were withdrawing the rights of free people. There is a difference. Is it from Switzerland, Paul?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — No, those wires went dead.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Oh, did they go dead? No more calls from Switzerland? From Wickenburg perhaps – something's happened to my horses. I'll have to run there quick.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — No, Bessenbach.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Oh, Bessenbach. I don't know that place . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, well, that place I have no further interest in, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure that Mr. member for . . . I don't even stay there when I go there, Mr. Speaker. Bessenbach, it's a terrible place, and I wouldn't want to comment on it.

It's inappropriate for members to talk about small states in western Germany when we are talking about Bill No. 105 and the important and urgent and compelling reason for members to withdraw this horrible bill from this Chamber and get on with the people's business, or at the very least adjourn debate and get on with the people's business and stop this nonsense of trying to test an individual member for his physical or mental or emotional strength.

Now I recognize that the member for Saskatoon Buena-Vista wants to get into this debate, Mr. Speaker. There is always a kick at the end for the mile runner, and I think there should be a kick at the end for the marathon speaker or marathon speech, or whatever you want to call it. Mr. Speaker, it's an unfair tactic, on a point of order, for members who know that a man has a smoker's cough to make him laugh in the middle of his speech. It is totally unfair and unreasonable for members to try to do that. So I'm not paying attention to them anymore.

I'll go back to the comments at hand and the importance of Bill No. 105.

Like the word 'Government', the word 'People' too is significantly vague. Lincoln left the 'People' undefined. He said nothing about their belonging to a particular race, nothing about their being inhabitants of a particular territory, nothing even about their historic identity. It would appear therefore that these things, so obviously important, are yet not essential. The essential thing without which 'Government of the People, by the People, for the People' is impossible, is just that those subjected to a particular Government shall be in fact one People, able to live in loyal fellow-citizenship one with another.

That's the essence of democracy. Is it possible, Mr. Speaker, under Bill 105, to believe that a minority can survive the truncheons of a majority? No. How can fellow citizens live in peace and harmony with others if they believe that even their legislators can be subjected to minority attack? Mr. Speaker, how can one part of the country survive when another part of the country believes that they must impose their language on everyone else, even though no one else wants it? How can a country survive like that? I don't know, Mr. Speaker, and neither does anyone else at this stage.

But if true Democracy implies this deep harmony – if it postulates a sense of unity so firmly rooted that men can, as we say, ‘agree to differ’ without the fundamental unity of the People being impaired – then it follows that Democracy does not require the continuance of political unions on grounds of geography, or race, or history, if the harmony and sense of unity are in reality, wanting.

Mr. Speaker, I don’t believe that you just nodded your head at these three Conservatives who were attempting to interrupt the person on his feet in this legislative Chamber, who then turned from Mr. Speaker’s nod to try to put me out of order. I don’t believe you would participate in such a charade and such an attempt to draw me out of order. I don’t believe it and I won’t believe it, Mr. Speaker, and I wouldn’t believe it, Mr. Speaker, if I stood here for a thousand years. I wouldn’t believe that Mr. Speaker would participate in attempting to draw me out of order which is what the members to my right are doing and I’m not going to let them do it. I’m not going to let them do it, Mr. Speaker, not for one second. They seem to be having fun tonight. I don’t know whether it’s liquid refreshments or what . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Oh, you’re not serious. Oh, perhaps he’ll join us in this debate. Mr. Speaker, I hope so. I think what he did was he peeked in and saw that I was still on my feet so decided not to stick around for the debate. Perhaps that means he’s decided to debate me outside the Chamber. Since he won’t come into the Chamber, he’s decided to debate me outside the Chamber. I hope that the press has found this out. I’m looking for them to nod that he’s agreed to . . . Oh, they’re shaking their heads; he hasn’t agreed yet to debate me and the Conservative Party leader, in this very important matter. Well, Mr. Speaker, that’s too bad. I think everyone has to feel saddened by this loss the Premier has placed upon the people of Saskatchewan, the loss of probably the most exciting election ever held in the history of the province, with the Premier of Saskatchewan, the Leader of the Conservative Party and the Leader of the Unionist Party all in the same constituency. I’ll bet you something else, Mr. Speaker, right now; I’ll bet you if we got in there, Mr. Ted Malone, the Leader of the Liberal Party would jump right in with both feet because he likes elections and he’ll run anywhere. No matter how few votes he gets, he’ll jump right in and run anywhere. So I would predict that if that race comes about, Mr. Ted Malone will be right in there with both feet and then it would be the most exciting election – exciting debate, first-class drama for the people in the province. It would be probably the most interesting and hard-fought by-election, I won’t say in the history of the province, but certainly, since Pelly, and the cleanest since Pelly. I remember how clean the Pelly election was but I’m sure Mr. Speaker will say that didn’t have anything to do with Bill 105. Except, Mr. Speaker, if we had been able to win that Pelly by-election before the 1978 election, we could have relegated the Liberal Party to third party status, and then they too could have tasted what being a third party in this legislature is really all about. It was unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberals never had that opportunity. I tried everything I knew to give the Liberals that brief, ever so brief, glimpse of what it was like to be third party in the Saskatchewan legislature but, unfortunately, the 1978 election intervened and the Liberals were no longer in this Assembly. And I think that is so sad, as I said the other day.

If you pass Bill No. 105, which would only recognize Liberals as Liberals in this Assembly, perhaps it’s time the Liberals did in fact taste what it’s like to have

third party status in the legislature; perhaps we should see what we can do to make sure that the Liberals do taste – at least for the balance of this legislature – what it's like to have third party status in the Saskatchewan Legislative Assembly. To show the people of Saskatchewan how straightforward this bill is, to show them how reasonable it is, to show them how fair it is, perhaps it would be best if the Liberals became actively involved in this Assembly once again as a third party — which I was unfortunately unable to make them do. But if we had won that Pelly by-election, Mr. Speaker, you remember, that's precisely what would have happened; and the Liberal Party could have tasted what it felt like in this Assembly to just get right in there as a third party and understand what this is all about.

And wouldn't it be nice, since it was Mr. Ted Malone, the erstwhile Leader of the Liberal Party, who first suggested that this bill is no good — what you want to do is kick them out of the legislature. That was his first reaction to our suggestion of the formation of the Unionest Party – kick them right out of the legislature. Matter of fact, he even said it before the. He said it when I decided to sit as an independent. He said kick them right out of the legislature. That's the kind of democrats they are – Mr. Ted Malone and the Liberal Party.

Doesn't it scare you just a little that that same thought, that same feeling, that same thought process exists in Ottawa with Mr. Trudeau and his group? Doesn't that just frighten you a shade, just a hair, that kind of common sense, libertarian approach Mr. Ted Malone expressed when I first announced as an independent in this legislature? Doesn't it make you just thrilled that our country is governed by a group of people who believe exactly that?

Why do you think Canada's failing? That's why Canada's failing, because there's a group in this country which seems to think it can get away with absolutely anything. Mr. Speaker, that government – I watched them out there fighting against Liberals. I watched them fighting against autocracy and the removal of freedoms which Liberals have been known to perpetrate on the people of Saskatchewan and the people of Canada for some considerable time. And I watched them stand out there in the rain and the sleet and the snow, and say this is wrong. You know why they said it was wrong, Mr. Speaker? It was because they wanted to step right into the boots of that same autocracy. They wanted to step right into the boots of that same dictator. They wanted to stand there and see what it was like to have his cushy chair and his cushy car and his cushy office. As a matter of fact, they wanted to make it even cushier. They wanted to go out there and build all kinds of cushy offices, tons and tons and tons of cushy offices all over the province and all over the city of Regina. They wanted to experience that same kind of feeling the Liberals have been perpetrating on the country for years.

I don't understand how people can forget their heritage so easily. How can the NDP forget its CCF heritage; how can the Conservatives in this House forget what happened just four or five short years ago when we were the third party in this House is beyond my comprehension. I'm sure they'll be able to justify it somehow, but I await their justification with eager enthusiasm.

One would think, in the light of the way this debate is proceeding, that there might be some justification forthcoming, both from the NDP and from the Progressive Conservatives, as to why they are in support of this legislation. I think that's only reasonable for the people of Saskatchewan to suggest. I have already explained tonight why the rules prohibit me from sitting down and letting anyone else speak. I don't get any chance to rebut.

At 9:45 p.m., I say to the members that tomorrow if this bill comes up first again, I would

suggest you give me an opportunity to adjourn the debate. And then you will have every chance in the world to jump right in and have the expression of your thought known to all the people of Saskatchewan.

Let me adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker. I'll promise you right now, if you let me adjourn the debate tomorrow that the next time it comes up, I will let everyone else in until they're all finished so that I have a chance to rebut. I would like to then rise and rebut. I don't get that opportunity at this point in speaking on this bill, and every member knows it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right. The member for Rosthern says only the mover gets that opportunity.

Since this bill so materially affects our party and so little affects the member for Biggar, then I would suggest to you that it's only fair and reasonable to allow us an opportunity to get back into the debate once again, after hearing all sides. Now if you didn't want to do that, the least you could do as a party is whip outside and tell the press why you're supporting the bill. That would be fair and reasonable as well. In that way one could at least see where you stood; one could see what you believe and why you were in favor of a bill that is so totally against any principles your party . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes, you'll tell us when you get up to speak on the bill.

Like I say, be fair and rational, or sit there and be silly; that's your business. But I also say to the members on the government side, you will have an opportunity again tomorrow to get on with the people's business, if this is brought on first. Perhaps the House Leader may not bring it on first tomorrow.

But if he brings it on first again, you'll have another opportunity not only to proceed with the people's business, but also to have all you want to say about this bill. Just give the opportunity to the Leader of the Unionist Party to come back in the debate if he so desires, at some future point, to rebut some of the arguments you may have put forward. I think in any court, in any legislature in the land, that is a reasonable request.

In so far as this legislature is concerned, in this particular session there has been only one adjourned debate not allowed and that is the adjourned debate requested by me on Bill No. 105.

On the bill the Progressive Conservatives stated they wanted to delay and to bring about changes in the bill pertaining to Sask Tel; they adjourned debate many times. On the government side, they adjourned debate many, many times.

The fact is . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member for Wilkie adjourned it only once, but several people stood it from their chairs when he wasn't in the House. Oh, yes, there were. Don't tell me there weren't, because I was here when it happened. So the point is, Mr. Speaker, the only time adjourned debate has not been allowed has been pertaining to Bill No. 105 every day since last Thursday.

So I say to the members of the Assembly, I am sure that they would love to speak on this bill and I think they'll go right at it.

Now let's get back to the principles of democracy that Mr. Lennard has been suggesting. I would like to get to the point he makes on the spirit of English democracy and that's a very short excerpt. Perhaps I'll jump to that, Mr. Speaker, because we have very little time this evening and I do want to get to the part about Chartist, because they

are certainly an important and essential part of English history and democracy and are the foundation group for the socialists in Britain who in turn are the foundation group for the socialists all over the world. So for that matter I think it's important. Let me just start out here with a very short excerpt:

Much that is puzzling in English Democracy and liable to produce misunderstanding of its nature is a direct consequence of the manner of its growth.

Mr. Speaker, you will say what does that have to do with Bill No. 105? We have said that this bill is against the principles of democracy. I believe we have proven that the bill is against the essence of democracy, the spirit of the minority-majority relationship. What we're trying to ask is, how you can possibly appreciate how much this bill is against democracy if you don't understand just a short bit about how democracy was rooted in England? After all, the English democracy is the basis for all of the democracies in reality. Even the American revolution which was a revolutionary form of government has its roots in English democratic institutions and has its roots in the English system of jurisprudence. Until we can understand what democracy is all about, the members may not understand why Bill No. 105 is against democracy. This man says:

It was Maitland, I think, who once said that we English 'never clean our slates'. And undoubtedly the institutions and conventions of English society are a curious hotch-potch. Scarcely anything is wholly new. In scarcely anything do we find principles carried out to their logical conclusions. Old things are fitted to new ones and anachronisms which seem to have no use at all, and are not always picturesque, abound. As a result it is easy to be deceived as to the character of the whole. In the reign of Charles II a French ambassador, with a discernment which is still characteristic of the diplomats of France, reported to his master that the Government of England 'has a monarchical appearance, because there is a King, but at bottom it is very far from being a monarchy.'

Mr. Speaker, there was a commentary by one historian, by one observer that said here was one country which appeared to have a king but at rock bottom was no monarchy at all. It depended on his perspective because even in Canada we believe we have a monarchy when there's no appearance of the monarch at all. And in India which is a republic and a member of the Commonwealth there is even less appearance of the monarch at all, and yet they subscribe to the monarch as the head of their state. The appearances, you see, can sometimes be deceiving.

Appearances in this legislature can sometimes be deceiving. Some members have suggested there was a great difficulty in attempting to get this bill through the NDP caucus. Some members have even said that publicly, certainly not in this Chamber. They have expressed their views to members of the press from time to time and have said there was difficulty in ramming this bill through the NDP caucus. Well, they finally were able to ram the bill through the NDP caucus and now they're trying to ram the bill through this House. And they persist in bringing it up first every day, even though there's a mile-long list of business. They persist in doing that. The reason they do that, Mr. Speaker, is because of appearances. They want to make it appear that it is the member for Nipawin's fault that the legislature is dragging on. They want to make it appear that it is the member for Nipawin's fault that urgent public business is not being attended to.

But you see, Mr. Speaker, that won't wash. That appearance belies the facts. It is not the member for Nipawin who determines the order for speaking in this Chamber. It is the House Leader on the NDP side. It is not the member for Nipawin who has refused adjourned debates in this Chamber. It is the Conservative and NDP combination which has refused an adjourned debate on Bill No. 105. So appearances belie the truth. The truth is that it is not the member for Nipawin who is responsible for delaying or holding back this House or for not getting on with the urgent business of the people. It is in fact the House Leader and others of his ilk who are attempting to ram this bill through the legislature, to the detriment of every citizen of the province of Saskatchewan, and to the detriment of every member now or in future who may belong to this House.

Why? It's too bad the Attorney General wasn't here earlier, Mr. Speaker, when I drew the analogy of attacking minorities. Retroactive, as the Attorney General will know, means attack. There is no question that two out of 60 is a minority. So when you draw retroactive legislation, which is an attack by definition – an attack on two out of 60 — you are attacking the minority, and no one can possibly deny that's what Bill No. 105 is all about, an attack on minorities.

The words alone mean that it is an attack on minorities. The feeling, the sense of the bill is an attack on minorities. Mr. Speaker, I say to you that even though the appearances – as this man suggested at the time of Charles I – even though the appearances may be that it's a monarchy, to this man's perspective it wasn't a monarchy. Now in his time, I suppose, that was because in the monarchy he lived in the common folk really had nothing whatsoever to say. It was a particularly harsh kind of monarchy in France prior to the revolution, compared to the monarchy in Britain. But nevertheless, it was a monarchy and still is a monarchy.

That judgment is still true; but today we might say, with greater truth, that England is at bottom a Democracy, but is far from having a very democratic appearance. Observers in the New Worlds overseas, and also those among ourselves whose youthful omniscience is the happy and natural product of hasty and wide-ranging glances . . .

Was omniscience right? That's pretty good for an uneducated jerk at almost 10 o'clock at night; that's pretty darned close to being accurate. I might repeat that words, Mr. Speaker.

. . . omniscience is the happy and natural product of hasty and wide-ranging glances, are very liable to be misled by the appearances, for the anachronisms and the oddities, just because they are out of keeping with the general structure, obtrude themselves upon the attention and seem more important than they are.

Mr. Speaker, I'm skipping over again because I have very little time and I don't want to bore you with lengthy quotations from books . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We talked about that earlier. This is the only book in the Legislative Library and to provide it, prior to any conclusion of Bill No. 105, to every single member to read would take an interminable amount of time. Therefore, I'm trying to save the members' time by drawing these quotations to their attention during the course of the debate. That would save members a great amount of time; I couldn't possibly read you the whole part prior to 10 o'clock.

As a matter of fact, I would think, Mr. Speaker, it is very near 10 o'clock. I wonder if Mr.

June 3, 1980

---

Speaker also notices that it's 10 o'clock.

The Assembly adjourned at 10 p.m.