

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Nineteenth Legislature

Tuesday, June 10, 1980.

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.
On the Orders of the Day

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): — We have three guests just coming into the gallery now from the opposition of Manitoba – the New Democratic opposition. We have Mr. Howard Pawley, the leader, Wilson Parasiuk and Bill Uruski who are here in Saskatchewan to meet with various ministers of the government and perhaps the caucus of the Government of Saskatchewan, no doubt preparing themselves to again form the government in the province of Manitoba. I wish all members to welcome our guests today.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): — I would like to join with the Minister of Mineral Resources in inviting our opposition colleagues from Manitoba to this legislature. I freely concede that they are either a very effective opposition, or they have a very responsive government. I see they've had their drought program in place for about one month now, and we're still fighting for ours.

QUESTIONS

Drought Relief Program

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): — Question to the Minister of Agriculture, and this may sound familiar to you; it has been about a month since you in this House announced your drought relief program and the drought is still going on. The details of this program are scant indeed. Every department that you phone, whether it's for a transportation subsidy or a water well subsidy, or whatever, gives no details. The problem is critical. People are trying to get feed into place, get water wells drilled. They can't get the information. They are selling stock.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think the member is giving information. He is supposed to be seeking it now.

MR. BERNTSON: — The question Mr. Speaker is, when can we expect the details of this program to be in place and available to the farmers of Saskatchewan? It is a critical situation.

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that the situation is indeed very, very critical. There have been announcements with respect to the drought. I think they have been scattered announcements, and I would agree with the hon. member that there is some confusion.

I have asked the department to provide for me a complete update on the drought situation – the situation and the programs that are in place and the programs that we are seeking to put into place – so that I can provide the information when I speak tomorrow morning in Moose Jaw at the Saskatchewan Stock Growers' Association. I

hope to have a detailed report to provide to them. I will provide it to the hon. member. I will be in the House tomorrow morning, and I will provide it to the hon. member before I leave for Moose Jaw.

MR. BERNTSON: — Supplementary to the Minister of Urban Affairs. When the Minister of Agriculture announced his drought relief program in this House, the final paragraph of that announcement said that the Minister of Urban Affairs would be announcing the urban or community water assistance program in due course. When is due course? Are we going to hear about it soon? I've talked to your department as late as last Friday and again yesterday and they still say the policy is not in place. We can't put it in place until we see what participation is coming from the federal government. Why can we not make the commitment and get the programs in place? It's a critical situation.

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Municipal Affairs (Urban)): — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member must have missed the announcement, because I announced in his constituency in Redvers a few days ago that the Government of Saskatchewan is prepared to put in \$1 million (the press carried it) for deep well drilling, in the event there is need in particular communities, plus \$25,000 for water conveyance. We also announced that we are negotiating with the federal government with the intent of doubling the amount to \$2 million for deep well drilling and \$50,000 for conveyance.

Mr. Speaker, may I also say that at that time, and I repeat it here, we also advised the people in the community that we are monitoring the situation very closely. Two students have been hired to work with the communities to keep us advised and posted on their water situation, and at the present time there are no serious problems anywhere throughout the province. In some cases there may not be a shortage of water but rather the filtration plants are not able to keep up with the consumption. That does not mean there's a shortage; it's a matter of the filtration plants not being able to keep up with the usage.

MR. BERNTSON: — A supplementary to the Minister of Urban Affairs. The Minister of Urban Affairs is talking about a policy that has been in place for some time, the community well program. I concede it has been around for a long time and that you announced it again in Redvers is really no big thing as far as I am concerned. But I wonder if the minister would consider, in his community well program, expanding the policy to cover wells that could service three or four or five households in the rural areas where they have to drill for deep water? This would spread out or average the expense of getting the well into production.

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, we have, under my jurisdiction, the urban water program, and what we have announced in Redvers is not the same program; it's an additional program. Under the municipal water assistance board program \$2 million is provided for water and sewer programs for communities. This year, under the community services program, that money has doubled to \$4 million, and the \$1 million announced in Redvers is over and above the standing program we have. So I pass that on to the hon. member. Our responsibility lies in urban communities, not on the farms. The farm situation is handled by the Department of Agriculture and the family farm improvement branch.

Release of Drought Relief Program Information

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — A question to the Minister of Agriculture. After many phone calls on Friday to various people in your department, I finally was

informed that the programs could not be released to me because the minister hadn't given the final approval. Yesterday we were unable to question you in question period, and seeing that you have a program in place and you have these statements ready that you indicated a few minutes ago you would announce tomorrow morning, and given the severity of the drought in southeastern Saskatchewan, why don't you provide us with that information today, rather than waiting around, and engaging in political posturing by announcing it to the stock growers tomorrow? The need is right now. Will you announce it today?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I'm not like the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley. I do not do any political posturing. Mr. Speaker, he shouldn't look at other people as he looks at himself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that I would be making an announcement to the Saskatchewan Stock Growers' Association tomorrow morning. I indicated to him that I had asked the department for a full update on the situation and the programs to be put in effect to attempt to meet the situation. I do not have that available to me this morning. I will have it available before I go to Moose Jaw and I will provide it to the hon. member before question period tomorrow, so if he wishes to question me on the program, he will be able to do so at tomorrow morning's question period.

MR. BERNTSON: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture would indicate to this House whether this program is subject to federal participation or whether it is a commitment to the people of Saskatchewan, with or without federal participation.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I report to the hon. member, at our meeting one week ago today in Victoria, involving the western transportation ministers, agriculture ministers and the minister responsible for the wheat board and the minister responsible for transportation federally, there was a commitment by the federal government that it would be involved in the drought assistance program.

So what we've been saying to the hon. members opposite, that the federal government will be involved in the program, was in fact confirmed by the two cabinet ministers in Victoria.

Purchase of Cows and Calves by Department of Agriculture

MR. G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I should like to ask the minister, in light of reports that his department is purchasing cows with calves and putting them in community pastures, would the minister confirm or deny these reports?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I can neither confirm or deny the reports. I have no knowledge of the Department of Agriculture purchasing cows and calves and placing them in community pastures. I am aware that there is a program, part of which I will be announcing, for the movement of cattle to community pastures and to wildlife lands. This is being undertaken now, but I am simply not aware of any purchase of cows and calves. I would have to check with the department and I will let the hon. member know specifically what is going on.

CPR's Cancellation of Construction Project

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Unionest Party): — Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. This morning he mentioned the meeting in Victoria with the federal authorities. In this Chamber some time ago, he said that the number one item on the agenda would be discussions pertaining to the CPR's cancellation of construction in central British Columbia. Would the minister please report to this Assembly what decisions he has come up with, in consultation with the other ministers and in consultation with the federal authorities, as to what steps should be taken to insist that the CPR live up to its responsibilities.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Part of the discussion was in fact relating to CPR's position on upgrading through the Rockies and its withdrawal of upgrading. Rather than discuss the item singly, we discussed it in the broader sense, Mr. Speaker, of solutions to the overall grain handling and transportation problem facing Canada. I report to the hon. member that in an attempt to resolve that problem, the Government of Saskatchewan put forward the request to the federal government to implement the Hall commission's recommendations, which have very strong support here in Saskatchewan. Unfortunately, we found that did not have strong support with other provinces and neither had support with the federal government.

The issue of resolution is an issue which was not resolved at the meeting in Victoria; it remains an outstanding issue. We will be putting forward, in writing, to the federal government once again our position on resolution of grain handling and transportation; in fact, resolution of the moves made by Canadian Pacific, along with our position on the review of branch lines as put forward by the previous federal government (by order in council), and which is now under review by the present government. So, we will be submitting to Ottawa our position on a solution of grain handling with respect to branch lines.

MR. COLLVER: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister will be aware that the Government of Saskatchewan has committed many millions of dollars to the purchase of hopper cars to assist the western Canadian farmer. He will also be aware that without this upgrading in central British Columbia, in very short order and time those hopper cars will have some difficulty in traversing that line. Will the minister announce to this Assembly, because he didn't receive support for his position, any unilateral actions by the Government of Saskatchewan to prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway from blackmailing the western Canadian farmer into accepting the revision of the Crow Rate?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to dealing specifically with the issue of the hopper cars and in light of the position taken by Canadian Pacific, I report to the hon. member for Nipawin that my staff yesterday met with former chief justice Emmett Hall here in Regina to discuss and put finishing touches on a proposal, which we will be submitting to the federal government, which will in fact add to the powers of the grain transportation authority to make sure that the cars move on the railways and that there are no roadblocks to the movement of the Government of Saskatchewan cars, or in fact any car purchased by the taxpayers and producers.

MR. COLLVER: — The minister has not answered the supplementary question. The minister will be aware that he has not received support from other western Canadian governments with reference to the Hall commission, not can he expect any reasonable

support from the federal government for any new proposals which might be made by Mr. Justice Emmett Hall, I think, in light of past refusals to accept the Hall commission report. I therefore ask the Minister of Agriculture, if this report or proposal by Emmett Hall is refused by the federal government, will he now consider unilateral action by the Government of Saskatchewan to prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway from using its position in the central Rockies to upgrade the track to try to blackmail western Canadian farmers into accepting something they don't otherwise want to accept?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, our objective as a government (in responding to the hon. member) is to put forward positive proposals and take positive action. I report to the hon. member that we are still hopeful the federal government will reconsider its position on the Hall Report. In fact it was their commission, as a Liberal government. It has wide support and therefore we will be encouraging them to reconsider that report.

Mr. Speaker, we will also be putting forward, as an alternative, a continuation of the approach which has been taken over the last two years, which in fact has been a very, very positive approach to improvements in the grain handling and transportation system. It is a co-operative effort by all of those involved, including the railways, the grain companies, the federal and provincial governments. We will be putting forward additional steps because if we are going to provide those kinds of public funds, there should be control over those funds so we won't run into roadblocks as put forward by Canadian Pacific. I referred to that in the answer to the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is unfortunate that members opposite seek to undermine the crow instead of finding . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I will take the member for Bengough-Milestone.

SHARP Benefits

MR. R.H. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I hope his answer isn't quite as long on this one. In light of your response to a question I asked on June 2 with regard to SHARP, in which the minister responded, and I quote,

My information is, as I recall it, that the benefits to the Saskatchewan hog producers under SHARP far exceed the benefits coming forward in the Alberta program.

Would the minister be specific and tell this Assembly exactly how SHARP has better benefits than the Alberta Emergency Stop Loss Program for Hogs?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I indeed apologize to the hon. member. I did have the figures, and they are in my office. I don't have them with me. I don't want to respond to the hon. member on the basis of figures in my mind, because that's not very accurate. I will in fact, Mr. Speaker, get the information as provided to me by the department and I will forward it to the hon. member.

I want to say to the hon. member for Bengough-Milestone that I spent a good part of yesterday (and I am sorry I missed question period; I understand from the Leader of the Opposition, it was a very good question period) at the Prairie Swine Research Centre with hog producers. They were very complimentary about SHARP.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PICKERING: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In the Western Producer on Thursday, May 29, it says that hog assistance makes Saskatchewan and Manitoba jealous.

Would the minister not agree that the Alberta Stop Loss Program far exceeds SHARP? Can he now implement such a program in Saskatchewan to stop all the hog producers from going broke?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I have no feeling of jealousy, nor have I had any indication of such in my discussions with hog producers. I indicated that to the hon. member in my previous answer. I was with a large number of hog producers yesterday at the Prairie Swine Research Centre and I would suggest hon. members visit that centre. The questions with respect to SHARP were not that it was not a good program; the questions relating to SHARP were, what is the future of SHARP going into 1980-81-82? They want this program to continue, Mr. Speaker.

Forest Fire – Woody Lake Area

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. Mr. Minister, there has been a fire burning in the Woody Lake area near Hudson Bay, and approximately 270,000 acres are involved in this fire. Can you tell me why it took approximately eight days to get any appreciable number of aircraft and technical equipment into that fire?

HON. J.A. HAMMERSMITH (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — Mr. Speaker, I am not certain of the source of the hon. member's information, but my information is that there was a considerable number of equipment, aircraft and personnel committed to that fire from the outset. The 270,000 acres to which he refers is not entirely within the province of Saskatchewan, although a substantial acreage is. My information, as of yesterday, is that the fire was in a holding pattern. There was a temporary breakout on Sunday across the fire line near the Manitoba border; immediately extra equipment was positioned in the area and the fire was again brought into a holding situation.

MR. LARTER: — Supplementary, Mr. Minister. Does the minister realize there were 75,000 acres of merchantable timber in there. This represents about half the timber that is in the riding of the member for Kelsey-Tisdale. This shortens the life of Simpson Timber Co. to about five years and Sask Forest Products would follow almost immediately. Can you tell us why a fire of that magnitude with that much merchantable timber would not receive a big priority as far as fighting fires in northern Saskatchewan?

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — The hon. member would do well to assign his researchers again to their homework with regard to the size of the fire, the amount of the merchantable timber and the effects on the various users. He will also be aware that particular area is in the intensive fire protection zone, and any fire in that zone receives immediate high priority. Under the conditions in the forest area during much of the time that fire was burning, the people responsible did an excellent job in being able to contain it and to reduce the amount of territory burned. Of course we realize there is merchantable timber and that it burned. We committed all the equipment and men possible in the context of fighting, at the time that fire broke out, in the neighborhood of 60 to 70 fires throughout the forested area, many others of which were also in the

intensive protection zone.

MR. LARTER: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister not agree that it would be far more feasible and sensible to have the equipment in this area where there is much more merchantable timber? It is my understanding that you were in an area with many of your helicopters and water bombers where there were approximately 5,000 acres of merchantable timber.

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Mr. Speaker, the understanding that the hon. member has, regardless of where he may have acquired that understanding, is inaccurate. The point he makes is that equipment for forest fire-fighting should be positioned in one corner of the province in anticipation of a fire. I suggest to the hon. member that it is not possible to predict where fires will break out, and where the equipment should be committed. The equipment is mobile. The fire control headquarters in Prince Albert — under the very capable direction of Red Taylor who is certainly recognized as one of the best forest fire protection people in Canada, if not in North America — is in a position on the information they receive to very quickly reassign equipment, whether that be helicopters or water bombers or ground equipment, and to very quickly reassign men. I repeat, that area is in the intensive fire protection zone and would automatically receive very high priority.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Initiatives for Training Nurses

HON. D.F. McARTHUR (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to this Assembly several initiatives which are being taken by this government to increase the number of nurses trained and available for employment in this province.

At the outset, I should point out that the Department of Health and the Department of Continuing Education work together closely to ensure that the output of nursing graduates meets requirements in the province. Over the past few years, a very fine balance has existed between the supply of and demand for nurses. However, several factors now point to a potential imbalance unless new initiatives are taken. These factors include a general tightening of nurse supply across Canada; the recent increase in the number of nursing positions in hospitals, resulting from the very generous 1980-81 budget for hospitals; and reduced hours of work in the recently negotiated nursing contract. In view of these factors, the following initiatives are being taken:

1. An increase of 30 students in the two year diploma program at Kelsey Institute beginning this fall. The enrolment capacity will increase by 15 per cent, from 200 to 230. Instructional staff will be increased by three this year, with additional increases likely in subsequent years.
2. An increase of 20 students in the advanced placement program for certified nursing assistants at Kelsey Institute beginning in February 1981. This advanced placement program allows a certified nursing assistant to become a registered nurse with 15 months of additional training. The enrolment capacity here is being increased from 10 to 30 because of the expressed interest of certified nursing assistants in terms of taking this program. Instructional staff for this program will also be increased by three.
3. Increased offering of refresher courses on a subsidized cost basis. These courses

enable inactive nurses to regain their registration status. The courses will be offered over a 10 week period with part-time study for the first 10 weeks, followed by a 4 week full-time clinical placement.

4. The Department of Continuing Education has been co-operating with the Department of Health, the Saskatchewan Registered Nurses' Association, and the Saskatchewan Health Care Association, in a recruitment campaign to attract more potential students into nursing. I am pleased to note that the applications for nursing are already up considerably, as compared with this time last year.

In closing, I look forward to continued collaboration between the employers, the nursing profession, and our institutes in order to ensure our provincial nursing needs are fully met.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek): — I would just like to make a few brief comments on the statement by the Minister of Education. I do agree with him that we are faced with a critical nursing shortage in Saskatchewan at present, and perhaps the program just announced will alleviate the situation several years down the road, but it does little to alleviate the situation right now. Perhaps while he is encouraging girls to go into nursing, he should speak to the Minister of Health about increasing moneys to hospitals so that their budgets are not stretched to the limit, and so they can meet wage parity with B.C. and Ontario. We train many nurses who go elsewhere. Once they receive their training they go to provinces which pay a lot better; perhaps this is the area we should attack.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

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

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, it is most interesting to see how keen the members of this Assembly are to get on with the business of the House and the business of the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, at the time the member for Nipawin was debating the issue of Bill No. 105, members on both sides of the House were calling for entrance into the debate on this bill. I determined last night during my debate that members were very anxious (there were very similar and numerous calls coming from members opposite who appear to be leaving the Chamber at the moment) to become involved in the debate on Bill No. 105. Many of them, Mr. Speaker, asked the member for Swift Current to sit down so they could get involved. In order to give these people an opportunity, I now beg leave to adjourn debate.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 2

Collver

Ham

NAYS — 44

Pepper

Allen

Bowerman

Smishek

Messer

Baker

Skoberg

McArthur

Shillington

MacMurchy

Mostoway

Banda

Kaeding

Hammersmith

Kowalchuk

Dyck

MacAuley

Feschuk

Byers

Vickar

Rolfes

Tchorzewski

Cody

Koskie

Matsalla

Lusney

Long

Johnson

Nelson

Thompson

Engel

Poniatowski

Lingenfelter

White

Solomon

Larter

Taylor

Rousseau

Pickering

Muirhead

Katzman

Duncan

Andrew

McLeod

MR. HAM: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess the results of today's vote respecting Bill No. 105 are indicative of the attitude of the government and members of the opposition. As I said before I attempted to adjourn debate, last night we had innumerable calls from members opposite and members to my right to get involved in the debate. I guess it's just more political chatter.

Mr. Speaker, I began last night by bringing into focus the reasons that Bill No. 105 was an attack on a minority. Just because they happen to espouse a view that the majority of this legislature doesn't support, they're attempting to eliminate this minority by retroactive legislation.

For the benefit of our guests from Manitoba, I apologize for the boredom which I may create in this House over the next several hours. It would be most interesting, Mr. Speaker, to see how the NDP opposition in Manitoba would react to a similar bill brought in by the government in power in Manitoba, to eliminate minority views in Manitoba.

It has been referred to by the member for Nipawin as to what the hue and cry would be if the Government of Alberta decided to eliminate the party status and funding for the lone NDP member in the Alberta legislature, Mr. Grant Notley, who is entitled to some \$75,000 and other benefits.

Mr. Speaker, it's most interesting to me that Bill No. 105 is an attack on the very roots of our democracy and the very foundation on which our institution is based. I have some quotes from Hansard, from members of this legislature from previous debate, which I think are relevant to Bill No. 105 and the attitude of members opposite, in particular, respecting their belief in our democratic system; I guess it's safe to say, their

hypocritical view of belief in our democratic system. During debate on a bill to send the dairy producers back to work in a cooling-off period, the Hon. Minister of Culture and Youth brought forward some comments which I find most interesting, Mr. Speaker, which I would like to read into the record, and I quote:

My constituent, who is a person of, shall we say, fairly vigorous views, suggested to me that we should kick them out of the legislature because they were somehow or other un-Canadian.

Mr. Speaker, responding to the agreed calls, I question members of this legislature, who are suggesting that the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current are un-Canadian, as to how often they have stood up for their principles and brought to the attention of the public of this nation that there are troubles. This nation is failing, and we have to consider options. At this point in history, Mr. Speaker, this nation is failing because people have failed to stand up and bring to the attention of the public the fact that we do have problems and they should be looked at seriously. And I continue with the Minister of Culture and Youth's statement:

And I said to him what we were talking about was not whether or not we believe that union with the U.S. was desirable or possible (on that, I think, he and I were in agreement), what we were talking about is freedom of speech . . .

Mr. Speaker, Bill 105 is not particularly an issue of freedom of speech obviously. We've spoken some 40 hours approximately in this House on this bill now. However, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated last night, on so many occasions, what Bill 105 is doing and is going to do is to take that next step closer to control those in this province and this Chamber with whom the government in power, the majority, disagrees or has thoughts that are contrary to.

. . . the right of someone who is elected to the legislature to be wrong (he went on to say). That's what I think they're doing. I think the issue of \$60,000 (I say that just in passing) makes an entirely different issue. That was an issue put, I think, very, very correctly by the member for Biggar. But I think the issue of this strike is on the same issue. It's a question of freedom.

The Minister of Culture and Youth said it was a question of freedom.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Don't you think it was interesting Dennis, that he could make those comments on that bill?

MR. HAM: — Yes, that's very true, Mr. Speaker — a comment from the member for Nipawin that the minister would make those comments on a bill sending the dairy producers back to temporary work. Yet the members of this House are obviously supporting a bill that, in every way, shape or form, runs contrary to freedom.

The member went on to say:

Just before I stood up I was reading a report from Time magazine (you'll have to pardon my sources) on the Cubans going to the U.S. And if the report can be believed, what they want is not a better economic life. What they want is economic freedom . . .

Mr. Speaker, economic freedom! Let's forget economics for a moment – just on the word freedom. I believe the member for Regina Centre to be a sincere person. I believe, and strongly believe, that he has convictions with respect to freedom or he wouldn't have made these statements.

Bill 105, Mr. Speaker, is a bill that, as I mentioned earlier, for all intents and purposes deals specifically with liberty, freedom and one's ability to support a cause, although unpopular at the time. These are attacked by a majority retroactively. To continue:

... and the right to make the best deal they can to do the best they can by themselves. That is, in a sense, what we're denying to those involved in this dispute (most interesting, Mr. Speaker) when we take away their right to bargain collectively. (The member may recall that bill was a bill of temporary conditions.) But I think even with the philosophy of someone like myself who as I say is a member with reasonably close ties to the trade union movement, there are circumstances under which we can and must intervene. I think we are very close to having met those conditions. I think the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, under which we should intervene, should include two conditions. I think, Mr. Speaker, we must be able to say to ourselves that there is no hope of resolution.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is no hope of resolution with Bill No. 105. There have been statements emphatically made by the Attorney General that Bill No. 105 will pass with a majority. The Premier of Saskatchewan stated in Lethbridge, at the western premiers' conference, that the bill was brought in on the premise that some day we may have only two Liberals in this House. That in itself is an indication that this government only chooses to deal with an opposition that they think should be here. It is very, very serious and indicative of what Bill No. 105 is all about.

All too often, I think, governments are precipitous in that regard. They intervene, when in fact the collective bargaining process might well have led to settlement. I have made my point with the Hon. Minister of Culture and Youth, Mr. Speaker, that I think he knows, without going any further, that he speaks with a forked tongue. Further, Mr. Speaker, a quote from the Attorney General on the same day (which I thought was most interesting) in relation to Bill No. 105; the Attorney General said, I still believe the average working man and woman (whether they agree or disagree with the law; and that's important) does respect the law and this Assembly, and will obey it, the level of fines notwithstanding.

Mr. Speaker, I can't comprehend how the Attorney General or members of this government can make statements about the public respecting an institution and wishing to obey laws which this institution passes over a period of time, and then justify bringing in a retroactive bill (I don't believe this) to correct the mistake they think they made when they passed The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act, fully realizing that there might be two members of this legislature or more who decided to constitute a party.

The sad thing is, Mr. Speaker, that there are many citizens in our society today (an ever-increasing number of citizens) who are losing respect for not only the law, but also for the lawmakers and the institutions. The examples of this that I brought forward last night, Mr. Speaker, were at the time most disturbing to me, and are indicative of the attitude of many people. At the opening of our fall session you may recall, Mr. Speaker, the entrance of the Conservative opposition, and the response by the striking members

of the SGEA in the hallways of this building, followed by the members of the government who were also heckled and catcalled . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member calling from his seat is the same one who wanted to get into debate and had the opportunity today but refused again.

Mr. Speaker, what was disturbing at that opening last fall, and the resulting show by those members who were on strike, was not so much that they took issue with members of the government or the opposition. What disturbed me, Mr. Speaker, is that the Lieutenant-Governor of this province, while entering under the music of the royal anthem, God Save the Queen, was booed and heckled just as much as the opposition or the government. That is indicative of the lack of respect and the attitude so many people outside this Chamber, so many citizens of our nation, are beginning to have.

Further, Mr. Speaker, you were here to witness the atmosphere when supporters of the anti-nuclear society decided, for whatever reason (obviously they thought it was an important reason), to make a circus out of our legislature. I don't recall in my five years (and as I said last night there are members who have been here longer than I have) to have ever witnessed that kind of action in this Chamber. It's just another small indication or perhaps a large indication of the lack of respect or kind of attitude people are beginning to take toward the legislators within our nation and particularly this Chamber.

Inasmuch as there are many people on the streets of our province who today or tomorrow may not be affected by Bill No. 105, eventually the chickens come home to roost. If it can be done to two members of one caucus, surely it can be done to 15 members of another caucus. I fear for the future knowing full well that the bill will pass; knowing full well (and members of this Chamber are fully aware) that the question of grants to a third party and grants to the leader of the third party are not an issue. Members of this Chamber are, I am sure, sympathetic toward all members with respect to research grants, and the ability to act in a proper and fair fashion as a member of the opposition, able to do research work and to represent their constituents to the best of their abilities.

Mr. Speaker, there was a further incident of hypocrisy and it is significant that the hon. member for Moose Jaw North made these statements in this House. I think it also points out hypocrisy with respect to his attitude; he personally supports incidents and then he changes like the wind when it comes to what may be considered a popular political stand to take. I don't suggest for a moment that to take a stand today against Bill No. 105 is as popular as it was the day the Unionest Party was announced. As I pointed out to the hon. member last night, even his own radio station within hours of our announcement had a 50-50 split. I venture a guess that today it would be a 70-30 split in favour of the Unionest Party being recognized as a third party in this legislature.

Mr. Speaker, the members who have been suggesting and making statements about my constituents and the standing of the member for Swift Current within the Swift Current constituency, perhaps should take a visit to my constituency. They may be somewhat shocked to know there are far more people supporting the member for Swift Current, not necessarily because he's taking a stand within the Unionest Party, but because he is taking a stand on something which he believes; he is respected for those views and respected for his principles. At least the member for Swift Current at no time in this legislature has said one thing today and something else tomorrow; nor has he spoken with a forked tongue.

I would like now to allude to some of the comments made by the member for Moose Jaw North about freedom and democracy. On May 8, during debate, he said:

... what I am really saying, Mr. Speaker, is the motion we have before us at this particular time really means those people are not prepared to let the normal and democratic process proceed. I think most of them opposite truly believe there is a democracy in this country . . .

Well, Mr. Speaker, I did too. I truly believed there was a democracy in Saskatchewan. I honestly can't believe that the member for Moose Jaw North can sit there now and say there is a democracy in Saskatchewan when the rights of minorities, which are the bases on which our democratic process has been laid down, are under attack. The member knows full well that I will not have the same rights as he does once this bill is passed; I will not be entitled to the same research staff as he is; I will not be entitled to sit on committees in this House; I will not be entitled to respond to ministerial statements.

Anyway, the member for Moose Jaw North went on to say:

... truly believe there are responsible people on both sides; things are not dictated to that person or that person.

Things aren't dictated, Mr. Speaker. If any piece of legislation has been brought into this legislature that a word such as dictate could be parallel with, it has to be Bill No. 105.

Mr. Speaker, these are just three small examples from members in this legislature who have stood up and espoused their belief in the democratic process in Saskatchewan. I honestly can't believe these gentlemen don't (although they obviously don't) have difficulty facing themselves in the mirror in the morning . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's the problem, Mr. Speaker, they don't. To me it's a classic example of twisted principles. I think it is only fair that members hear about . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, I should probably respond to that statement because Bill No. 105 does affect the member for Swift Current and the member for Nipawin in respect to their constituents.

There are many members in this Chamber who take particular care in dealing with constituency problems and have the obvious advantage over the members of this Chamber who don't have access to research staff and party status. But I can tell you sincerely that I would suggest I am one of the top 50 per cent or even 25 per cent of members in this Chamber who does take care of his constituents with respect to answering their inquiries, answering their letters and encouraging their involvement with their MLA to the point where it sometimes may even be considered overkill.

But it may be important for the members of the Saskatchewan Legislative Assembly to realize some of the history behind political parties in the world, so they will better understand why Bill No. 105 is an attack upon not only those political parties but also an attack on the history of democracy as we know it. The way in which political parties have inserted themselves between the electorate and the legislature has been pointed out. The member for Nipawin has pointed it out on several occasions and if the members had been awake or listening, they would have heard.

Some indication of political parties' influence over legislative proceedings and

decisions has been given. I have given some and the member for Nipawin has given many. Even if there were no evidence of their central importance, we already have enough to show that a study of liberal-democratic government that ignores them would be quite unreal. If an institution or a group of political figures from all provinces and all levels of government was called together to discuss Bill No. 105 non-partisanly, I would venture to guess that 98 per cent of the politicians involved would say it was a bad bill. It was a mistake and it is wrong. I believe that the Premier of this province is embarrassed because of two members of this Chamber opting for what they believe to be a serious option because of very serious problems within our nation. It was stated by the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current on several occasions that we desire, and would be extremely happy, if this nation of Canada is able to survive the problems it is facing and will be facing over a period of time. We happen to believe that they will not be solved and that the people, our constituents and everyone in western Canada, should be given an option to choose a system that does work.

Mr. Speaker, relative to the formation of political parties, there is other evidence. The growing democratization of government in the nineteenth century was everywhere accompanied by the rapid development and intensive organization of nation-wide political parties. At that time, I guess, it was fair game for individuals or groups to get together to form political parties without fear of persecution or retroactive bills such as Bill No. 105.

Wherever democratic government has flourished, two or more political parties have been active participants in government. These are not recent events, Mr. Speaker. They go back centuries in western Europe and North America. Invariably the first step of dictators in destroying democratic government has been to forbid all political parties but one. I think that's very significant. The first step, as I pointed out earlier, as a result of Bill 105, is to eliminate the Unionest Party in Saskatchewan.

AN HON. MEMBER: — All but three; there are only three recognized.

MR. HAM: — Well, even at that, there are only three parties recognized in the province, and I say, it's because the first door has been opened; even though it may be opened only a crack, the next step is a small push and it is opened all the way. I would like to repeat (in case some of the members were asleep) that invariably the first step of dictators in destroying democratic government has been to forbid all political parties but one.

Bill No. 105 is not unparalleled to that, Mr. Speaker. The Government of Saskatchewan wants the kind of opposition in here that they know how to respond to. Obviously they have controlled the Progressive Conservative Party well. I have witnessed this since I left the Conservative Party. I was here when the Liberal Party was here and they had no problem with the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party is not here any longer so obviously they handled them quite well.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are times when some of us who take our principles seriously have no dispute with the people we happen to associate with who take our principles seriously. We believe other things have to happen. Some of us are not particularly concerned about our political future.

There is ample reason for suspecting that political parties are somehow essential to the working of democratic government. It is far too important to be left in the realm of reasonable conjecture, particularly because many people of genuinely democratic

instinct are deeply hostile to the party system.

I think it's fairly obvious that there are people genuinely hostile to the Unionest Party and as a result the Government of Saskatchewan introduced Bill No. 105. Had they not been hostile toward us – either the government and/or some of their constituents – we would not have seen such a bill as Bill No. 105.

Some are convinced that most of the troubles of democratic countries are caused by the spirit of faction which competing parties foster and promote.

Well, that is not a problem in this legislature at this particular juncture. By the Conservatives voting with the government on adjournment, they have decided not to become hostile to each other and not to compete. At least with Bill No. 105 they have decided to stand together to squash the rights of the minority.

An attempt must be made to lay bare the connection between liberal-democratic governments and political parties. That is a statement which has to be taken extremely seriously. This government has decided to connect the two. When you start to eliminate those who espouse causes you don't believe in, you are attacking the very rights, the very foundation, on which our democratic system is based. This requires some fairly abstract analysis based on certain assumptions about the prevailing condition of the electorate.

Mr. Speaker, I am not convinced that the Government of Saskatchewan brought in Bill No. 105 because there was reaction from the public. I believed for some time that was the reason, until I heard about the article to which the member for Nipawin referred yesterday. It was the one from the western premiers' conference in which the Premier for Saskatchewan made other statements respecting Bill 105 and their reasons for attempting to eliminate retroactively the two members of the Unionest Party. It does not require, at this stage, any further description of the organization and general behavior of political parties.

And I will allow that to go for the moment, Mr. Speaker, because we have alluded (and I'm sure all members are aware) to why the Unionest Party exists.

Such descriptions will be much more meaningful once the essential functions of parties are made clear. The analysis, we will assume exists on two political parties, partly for the sake of simplicity and partly because most democratic governments have, until very recently, had two party systems. It is ironic, Mr. Speaker, that a government that espouses (as I alluded to earlier) a belief in democracy and freedom is attempting, through Bill No. 105, to eliminate one of four parties, or to encourage (if you like it the other way, on the other side of the coin) invitations to those people whom they think they can best handle politically in this Chamber and outside this Chamber.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I know there are members of the Government of Saskatchewan who have on occasion said to others (and it has been repeated to me) that if the member for Swift Current and the member for Nipawin had only suggested that western Canada become a separate nation, we would support their cause. But this connection with the U.S., we don't like that; we can't accept that. On that basis, Bill No. 105 was introduced to eliminate it. That is irony to the highest degree, or hypocrisy to the highest degree! To follow that, Mr. Speaker, if you wish, the member for Swift Current and the member for Nipawin today could declare to sit here as Liberals, and we would qualify. There would be no need for Bill No. 105. That would be most interesting.

June 10, 1980

I would like to be a witness in the gallery to see how the government would react to that sort of a situation arising.

The multiplicity of parties has a weakening effect on the democracies of continental Europe, and it is not at all clear that democratic government will work permanently where there are numerous parties of roughly equal strength.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to be one who believes we shouldn't have too many political parties. An example is France; I believe there are somewhere in the neighborhood of 20 to 30 political parties in the Republic of France, and that does not bode well for a political system.

It is ironic introducing Bill No. 105, to eliminate the Unionest Party (based on the fact that we hear conflicting comments from members opposite and members to my right) because we won't be here at the next election anyway. The member for Nipawin has already stated his intentions not to be a candidate in the next election. The member for Swift Current, should he run (I am told by members opposite and members to my right) will be defeated. I have to question again, what's the worry?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield the floor to the member for Arm River for introductions.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce a class from Holdfast from Shell Lake School. They are sitting up in the Speaker's gallery. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Rice, and school bus driver, Mr. Grund.

I welcome you to the Assembly; I hope you have a very good day. I understand you will be going to different places in the city. I will be meeting with you for pictures and a chat in a few moments. I would ask all members of the Assembly to join with me in welcoming this group to the Assembly.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Bill No. 105 (continued)

MR. HAM: — Mr. Speaker, my apologies to the class from the Arm River constituency. The debate on this legislation for the last several days has not been exactly exciting, so bear with me and I'll do my best.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that members of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan understand the functions of political parties in democracy so they can totally realize what Bill No. 105 is not attempting to do, but will do, to political parties in our system. The basic fact for analysis is adult suffrage. There are, it is true, minor restrictions on the suffrage, varying from country to country. In the United States, where the minimum qualifications for voting are fixed by state laws, the restrictions vary from state to state. In some states a significant number of adults are effectively excluded from voting, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 105, not directly but indirectly, will exclude members of this Chamber from voting. Bill No. 105 will eliminate the member for Swift Current and the member for Nipawin from House committees. It will eliminate us from speaking to ministerial statements in this House.

We effectively become independents, and as I mentioned earlier, it's just the first step in control of political parties in Saskatchewan.

Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I'll go on. Yet in the free countries generally almost every adult citizen has a vote to add to the total from which the will of the people for some common action has to emerge. Mr. Speaker, I have to question, as I was earlier, whether Bill No. 105 resulted from the will of the people. This government brought in potash legislation some four or five years ago which was not a direct result of the will of the people. There was no preliminary advertising in their literature in the 1975 NDP handouts, the New Deal for People program, and yet they brought in legislation which a great many of the people of Saskatchewan opposed. However, Mr. Speaker, that was a political decision by a socialist party which happened to believe in that kind of legislation. I don't support that kind of legislation (at the time we opposed it). Bill 105 and the potash takeover are completely different kinds of attacks on two different kinds of institutions. Bill 105 is an attack by this institution on itself.

Unfortunately, the people are far from planning spontaneous agreement or even spontaneous majorities on what ought to be done. I think the members should realize, the members of the government in particular, that because of the shock of the announcement by the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current when we resigned from the Conservative Party to become independents, followed by the shock of our organization to become the Unionest Party, a recognized party by law in this legislature, there was some mild reaction, in fact sometimes more than mild reaction, from the public. But I have to refer to it again, Mr. Speaker; it was significant on the CHAB radio station that, within hours of that announcement, 50 per cent of the people, who phoned in to respond to the question as to whether the Unionest Party should receive funding and be recognized as a party in this province, responded in favour by saying yes. That was within hours of the announcement.

I say today, Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of people from the informed majority in this province would oppose Bill No. 105, even though, Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of people in this province do not support the cause of the Unionest Party. They may never, or they may come in floods to support us over the next several months or several years. However, the fact is, Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 105 is an attack not on the political issue, and it's not an attack solely on philosophical grounds, although it may be in part. It's an attack on a minority regardless of whether you agree with the views of the two members who are espousing them. It's absolutely true, Mr. Speaker; the member for Moose Jaw North knows full well that's true. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'll continue for the sake of the member for Kindersley, and perhaps we can explain it in some detail as I go on in my speech.

The important assumption made here about the prevailing condition of the electorate is that given the freedom of thought, expression and association, which has marked the liberal democracies, individuals and groups produce a great variety of opinions on politics as well as on other matters. Maybe that answers the member for Kindersley. There's never a consensus publicly. The democratic system functions on the basis of an informed majority, an informed public.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated last night, Disraeli – I believe it was Disraeli – was quoted as saying democracy was the worst form of government ever devised by mankind, excepting all others. I accept that premise. It's a very inefficient system, but it is a system that through centuries has become one which gives those who live in democratic countries the basic freedoms of expression, thought, association and religion – the

gamut – until those governments (in this particular case, the Government of Saskatchewan) decide (whether through prejudice or ignorance or whatever) to start chewing away, eating away, sawing away at the roots of those deep democratic rights.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Is the U.S. system better, Dennis?

MR. HAM: — I would love to debate with the member for Moose Jaw North in that regard, but I'm sure the Speaker would rule me out of order.

It has already been argued (in the previous chapter) that even where there is widespread agreement on fundamental ideas – we have with Bill No. 105, Mr. Speaker, a disagreement on fundamental ideas – it seems inevitable that there will be a wide range of disagreement on the means of furthering the ideas. How, Mr. Speaker, does a group, two members of this legislature, who on principle and in sincerity perceive a problem exists, believe a problem exists . . . Say two members of this Chamber decided (two native members) to organize a party under the law of Saskatchewan (say, the Native Brothers of Saskatchewan Party) because they believe their rights are not being represented and there is deterioration, there is a serious problem in this province with native rights and the future of natives of Saskatchewan. In that case there's no question the Government of Saskatchewan would not in any way, shape or form have attempted to thwart the rights of that minority. It's not politically popular to eliminate that minority the way Bill No. 105 is attempting to do with the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I can only use the words hypocrisy and irony. It really dumbfounds me to think that they would consider, because of a particular philosophy or political opinion, getting rid of them, eliminating them, sweeping them under the rug. They don't exist.

Extensions and improvements of education may well diminish this disagreement, but not likely abolish it. Mr. Speaker, everyone is aware that the standards of education in society today are higher than they have been in history. As I said earlier, I'm sure that if we brought together constitutional experts and political figures and the informed public to debate Bill No. 105 at a forum, that there would be a refusal to proceed with Bill No. 105, and that more than the vast majority would oppose a bill such as Bill No. 105.

If ten men are asked what should be done to save the country, there would be several opinions.

Mr. Speaker, isn't that significant? If ten men were asked what to do to save the country, there would be several opinions. I guess the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current represent one of those several opinions. Soften the banks, abolish trade unions, forbid sale of goods on credit, teach religion in the schools – those are just a few examples of the kinds of things these several members would be alluding to. There are some members of this legislature suggesting that we have to consider other options. I tell you this, Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 105 will not stop the member for Swift Current and the member for Nipawin from espousing their causes, but it is in this legislature an attack upon itself, a reversal of the law which exists and was passed within the last several months. It's ironic, really ironic, Mr. Speaker. But I think it's safe to say, and I mentioned this last night (I apologize to the members who were here and for those who weren't here, I'll say it again), I've never witnessed so many Canadian flags flying as I've seen these last two or three months. I have never seen so many letters

to the editor from people talking and suggesting and dedicating themselves to the future of Canada. If the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current have accomplished anything to this date, it's bringing to light and making the people of this country aware that there are problems in this country. And this country may save itself. And if this country does save itself, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to take some credit for that.

Even when patterns of partial agreement are found (with Bill 105, obviously that's not going to exist; there's no partial agreement here) such as socializing the means of production and distribution (I think we are all aware of what that alludes to; distribution may be next) a little further inquiry reveals a multitude of counsel about the pace of advance toward and the means for reaching the desired end.

The desired end, Mr. Speaker, to the Unionist Party, and through Bill 105, is quite obvious. The Government of Saskatchewan wants to end the funding and the recognition of two individuals who, by law, qualify to be here and qualify to be recognized as a political party under the Government of Saskatchewan's laws.

Socialists practising utter self-indulgence have yet quarrelled bitterly for two generations and broken into dozens of camps over the question of means.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is another obvious example throughout the world, particularly in Europe. Socialist parties have split, not just once, twice and five times, into various groups. It's unprecedented in the world, Mr. Speaker, that a government in power anywhere in the democratic world has brought in retroactive legislation to eliminate one of those groups. I can only presume, Mr. Speaker, and I believe I am correct, that there are people in the world, in free democratic countries, who believe in this system, who do support democracies. People of the European nations, I am convinced, have a higher regard, a built-in protection against an attack on a minority.

There has been a vast majority of immigrants to this country over the last 100 years, people leaving their homelands because of an attack and an oppression upon minorities. Bill 105 is simply, absolutely, totally, an attack on a minority, and no one can convince me any differently, partly, Mr. Speaker, because no one wants to get up to debate this. They have had ample opportunity, both sides of the House . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Sit down. I hear it again, Mr. Speaker. I heard that last night. Today I sat down and everyone stood up to vote against the adjournment of the bill. Anytime the bill was adjourned, the members of this legislature could have debated it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the time will be coming. The members will have an opportunity. I can assure you of that. I hope we're not just hearing, as we've heard in the past, idle threats. Well, I guess we have to take them at their source.

The electorate, even after years of education by political parties or, in some cases, indoctrination, is still a mass of various opinions looking for salvation in different directions.

Mr. Speaker, that is all the two members on this side of the House, the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current, are attempting to do – give people an opportunity to seek another direction, to find another direction, to consider another direction. We're not going to decide whether or not the people of western Canada opt for independence or seek union with whomever.

Bill 105 is an attack on our opinions. It is an attack on our beliefs. It is an attack, as I

mentioned earlier, upon this institution.

The essential function of two completing parties is to draw the electorate together into majorities so that men can be governed by their own consent.

Well, Mr. Speaker, Bill 105 will not allow men to be governed by their own consent. The great merit of government by consent is not that it always makes justice prevail, but that it makes naked and arbitrary force unnecessary. I believed that to be true before Bill No. 105. As I said, I can accept the Government of Saskatchewan bringing in legislation to take over the potash or uranium or whatever they might decide to take over, because by philosophy they believe in that. But I can't and will not accept a bill that is brought in, which is not only an attack on members of the Unionist Party, but an attack upon themselves. I would like to suggest (forgive them for they know not what they do) that they have been told for 38 or 39 hours what they're doing.

As long as men can govern themselves by consent (and for how long that might be I don't know), they can keep government under control and ensure for themselves the large area of individual liberty within which they can struggle for justice and truth as they see it.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current believe that we are struggling for truth. We're not asking for the violent overthrow of Canada; we don't have five million troops sitting out in the hills to overthrow the Government of Canada; we're not conspiring with guerrillas to start an internal war in Canada. Within the law we have become a political party to simply put forward a view which people should consider. The electorate will decide the future. We have a bill brought in by the Government of Saskatchewan (not just a bill, but a retroactive bill) to try to quash, eliminate or otherwise justify (for whatever reasons) their animosity or their objection or supposedly their constituents' concerns about two particular individuals who happen to believe they're struggling for individual liberty and the truth.

Left to themselves, how would the voters in a constituency pick a representative to the legislature and instruct him what should be done to further the common interest?

Mr. Speaker, I have to read again a short quote. I wish members would keep this in mind as long as they are members of this Legislative Assembly, or should they go on to the House of Commons or work within municipal governments. Edmund Burke said:

Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays instead of serving you if he sacrifices it to your opinion.

So if the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current decided, let's not say anything that's unpopular, we might lose our jobs; we might lose our seats. The house is burning; don't phone the fire department, Mr. Speaker. The house is burning but the Government of Saskatchewan brings in Bill No. 105 to try to stop us from phoning the fire department.

At worst each voter would vote for himself and his own panacea. At best there would be numerous candidates. Any one of them, supported by a small faction that had agreed momentarily to back him, would get more votes than any other candidate.

That's the basis of our political system, Mr. Speaker. Bill No. 105 is not an attack on whether the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current become candidates

next time, not at all. They're not going to make it easy for us to represent our constituents.

Only in the rarest circumstances would any candidate get a majority of all the votes. It's obvious to suggest that for those who are not yet aware (and I'm sure the member for Nipawin explained it in the greatest detail), that the day you're elected, each member of this Assembly represents everyone in his constituency, regardless of his political opinion.

Mr. Speaker, for another member over there who wishes to get into the debate and won't, perhaps he should talk to some of the people in my constituency.

AN HON. MEMBER: — I was there Saturday. I talked to 2,000 of your constituents. Every one of them thinks you're nuts.

MR. HAM: — Mr. Speaker, it's strange, because I was to Assiniboia just the Saturday before and I had 3,000 of his constituents tell me he was nuts.

The members of the legislature thus chosen by haphazard and temporary combinations, in each constituency across the country, would themselves be of various opinions.

Various opinions — that's what is going on here; we have a different opinion than those people and those people have a different opinion than those people and that is fair game. That is what politics is all about; that is what human nature is all about, and it may be a good world because of that; but you don't bring in a bill to attack . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's it exactly — as long as you respect those opinions. Mr. Speaker, this government does not respect the opinions of the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current; otherwise we wouldn't have this bill. That is exactly the case.

I guess, Mr. Speaker, the members of this Assembly have to have it a third time and I apologize for being repetitious. Burke said:

Your representative owes you not his industry only, but his judgment, and he betrays instead of serving you if he sacrifices it to your opinion.

There are very few members of this Assembly who received more than 50 per cent of the vote, so I suggest to you, with deference to all members, that I guess you don't represent the other 50 per cent then, because they don't happen to vote for your cause. Those 50 per cent that voted for you, voted for you, not because you're NDP, not because you're P.C. or Liberal; the vast majority of those people voted for you because they wanted you as their representative. Well, Mr. Speaker, regardless of Bill No. 105, that will be checked out.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue:

The two party system does to this incoherent electorate what the magnet does to iron filings. It organizes the voters around the two poles, orients them in relation to specified alternative programs of political action. It selects programs more or less clearly outlined; it chooses candidates, and given a majority in the legislature, one or the other parties proceeds with its programs.

That's fair game; that is what the system is all about; there is no argument there. The Government of Saskatchewan brings in whatever legislation and attacks, supports or amends whatever they choose. Obviously with Bill No. 105, they have decided to attack two individuals they happen to think are not quite within the confines of the way they think. If you think our way, then you're fine; we're with you boys. If you go beyond that line then we're going to eliminate you.

Without the parties there would be no stable government and without the support of an enduring majority, it would be impossible to maintain steady drive behind a program for even a month, let alone three or four years.

So, Mr. Speaker, when a majority government, such as the NDP government, decides for numerous reasons (we hear them only through the press and by other means), to bring in Bill No. 105, they are in fact breaching their mandate as a government. They are (in so far as I'm concerned) stepping beyond their reason to exist as a government party.

For some of the members who were not here last night, I predict, Mr. Speaker, that this government, barring a major scandal (this may be part of it or the beginning of it – Bill No. 105 may be the beginning of an indirect scandal), barring any significant economic disaster in Saskatchewan or possibly Canada, I predict this government will be in power for many, many years. They will be unless they become quite arrogant and overbearing and they begin to make a lot of mistakes. People recognize this. There have been members on this side of the House that have stood up and harangued the government for all kinds of mistakes. It has been overplayed and dramatized sometimes and the reaction has come back the same way from that side of the House. We are not dramatizing Bill No. 105. We have been attempting for the past week and a half to bring it to you in sincere, honest, reasonable terms.

I guess probably what I'm doing, Mr. Speaker, is warning them that Bill No. 105 is going to pass; I'm warning you. I'm not a socialist; I would be on that side of the House if I were. But I'm warning you to be careful; the door is open. It's open enough to cause lots more problems. It will be your own defeat. You can be in power for a long time, but you may be tying the noose around your own neck.

When government performs so many important functions, Mr. Speaker, and builds up permanent public expectations, such a situation would be serious indeed. Unfortunately, or possibly fortunately, the NDP Government of Saskatchewan (aside from Bill 105) has built up permanent public expectations. I don't suggest the Government of Saskatchewan is entirely at fault there. There have been many governments that have done this, to the point where a vast majority of our citizens look to government for nearly everything. I think in some ways maybe that is why some people will accept Bill No. 105 and that's what is scary, Mr. Speaker.

The more people depend on or expect from government, the more they and their offspring and future generations live off it. It's just like the welfare system in some areas of the North American continent. There are three and four generations living on welfare because of the attitude that government can bring us everything and do everything for us and solve all of our problems.

Well how do political parties do it? Each sets itself primarily to the task of constructing a majority. As long as the majority is not used as a means to attack the minority, Mr.

Speaker, as does Bill 105, that's fine and the system functions properly.

Party politicians are not and cannot be crusaders, men of single-minded passion and purpose who drive straight to the realization of their ideals.

That, Mr. Speaker, is probably the most significant statement which I have personally used so far in this debate. Party politicians are not and cannot be crusaders, men of single-minded passion and purpose who drive straight to the realization of their ideals. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, if we had a few more individuals like that in this legislature we would have a better system. But, unfortunately under the British democratic system (or fortunately) these party caucuses are tied and nobody is going to remove himself from the ring or the control. Therefore, we have witnessed bills such as Bill 105 being brought in on a retroactive basis.

They are not even generally the inventors of the ideas which they expound. In the aptest phrase yet applied to them they are brokers of ideas.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the member for Nipawin is a broker of an idea. He saw; he realized; he perceived (and I agree that I had feelings similar to his for many, many months) that there was a wrong existing in this nation and something had to be done. Nobody, apparently, was able to change the course. We have only had a reprieve from the Quebec referendum. Just a reprieve, it's not going to go away; it is going to get worse. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I am not hoping that. Members can put words in my mouth all they wish.

Maybe, Mr. Speaker, it takes one or two or five individuals to take a foreign flag and stick it in the faces of apathetic Canadians to prove to them there is something wrong in this country. But there are few members of this legislature, I am sure, who have ever realized that. It is unfortunate that I have to tell them.

Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 105 attacking those kinds of people is really a strange sort of a paradox. Here are two individuals who indirectly may assist in saving this nation from self-inflicted pain and we are being attacked by the majority with Bill No. 105.

They are middle men, these men of ideals, who select from all the ideas pressing for recognition as public policy those they think can be shaped to have the widest appeal, and through their party organizations they try to sell us a carefully sifted and edited selection of these ideas.

That's fine. That is the way political systems function, Mr. Speaker. That's the way governments get elected or defeated, by presenting their programs. This Bill No. 105 in no way, shape or form can be considered, nor should it be, part of a policy platform or part of a party's constitution or basis for existence. The Government of Saskatchewan and the Conservatives with them have tied in forever, when this bill is passed, the unfortunate circumstance of attacking a minority. It's done, Mr. Speaker; it's going to be done.

It puts the activities of the politician at their lowest, to say that he seeks to gain power and a livelihood through traffic in the beliefs and ideas of others.

Now traditionally, it is not unusual to hear politicians of all political stripes be firm and flexible at the same time. But Bill No. 105, as you are well aware, Mr. Speaker, is not a flexible bill. It is a very firm bill. It is designed to do one thing; and it's going to

accomplish that purpose only by law, only based on party recognition within this House.

It is well to see things at their starkest . . . Mr. Speaker, if the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current have brought in anything to be seen at its starkest, it is the problems which exist now. But because we are attempting to, we were attacked. Bill No. 105 is an attack. In fact, most politicians have their own conception of the public good.

There you are, Mr. Speaker, that's another reason Bill No. 105 was brought in: because most politicians think (and the NDP is famous for that) they know better for the public than the public know for themselves. That is impossible without power. Power has to be disbursed among numerous electorate. It can only be concentrated in a democratic way by massing votes behind leaders and a program.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it's pretty obvious (and I am sure everyone in this Chamber is convinced) that the member for Swift Current and the member for Nipawin are not going to mass the public behind us over the next two, five or even ten years; maybe never, who knows?

The CCF, back in the 1930s would never have existed if the Liberal Party of Saskatchewan had decided to eliminate them because they didn't agree with what they were saying. They wouldn't be here as the Government of Saskatchewan. The very Prime Minister of Canada, 12 or 13 months ago, was defeated, dejected, rejected and was on his way out; he is now Prime Minister of Canada again. So perhaps that is the reason members of the opposition and members of the government are supporting Bill No. 105. Deep down they really are afraid. They are saying that we are not going to be around for long anyway. The hypocrisy and the irony I cannot understand. Bill No. 105 is unnecessary under those terms.

The party politician, unlike some others, has learned about the facts of life. (Well, most of them, Mr. Speaker.) He knows another happy phrase has put it, that votes are not delivered by the stork. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I think it probably does point out something, Mr. Speaker. One of the reasons Bill No. 105 is being brought forward is that some of the members of this Chamber feel it is good politics and will maybe gain them some support at the polls next election. Voters have to be attracted and organized. I guess this is one way of attracting voters, Mr. Speaker; you take popular political issues of the day, such as those two radicals for Nipawin and Swift Current, I don't agree with what they are saying and I have had a few calls from some of my constituents so let's bring in a bill. Let's really sock it to them. Let's stomp on them and draw some blood. We'll show those two they can't say things like that. They can't attempt to break up this country. We'll bring in a Bill No. 105, and I'll show those constituents we mean business, and next election they are going to be with me. I have those five or ten votes. Then, Mr. Speaker, we can carry on with maybe the elimination of another opposition.

Only when this has been done by nation-wide effort and co-operation of many politicians can any one of them hope to make some of his ideas come true. Well obviously the members of the Unionest Party have a long way to go.

AN HON. MEMBER: — I guess.

MR. HAM: — Yes, I appreciate that kind of reaction. We believe that too. We have a long way to go and what are they afraid of? The leader's grant has already been committed to

the Nipawin Community Fund. What's left cannot be used for us to organize. It's used for research staff and secretaries in this building.

He can never hope to realize more than a fraction of the population politically, or to get the co-operation of other politicians whose ideals differ from his, each has to give hostages. Each has to give up some portion of the good he sees to make room for some of the good that others see. I always thought that was the way the political system functioned. I would give some to get some, or they would give some, but not the majority in this House. No, they decided that this is the way it's going to be.

We don't like what these people are doing, even though it's the law, and we passed the law. We'll just slam the door in their faces. We'll get rid of them. Maybe it'll make me some friends back in my constituency and it embarrasses the Premier of Saskatchewan; he's Mr. Constitution in Canada. We can't have these people running around saying these things.

When the politicians united in a party come to appeal for the votes of the vast electorate, the program has to set aside much that the politicians personally think desirable in order to accommodate something of the diverse good held dear by the members of the electorate.

What members of the government and the opposition have failed to understand is there are people in western Canada who support the cause of the Unionest Party. There are people in western Canada and even a vast majority of people in western Canada who do not support the cause of the Unionest Party. However I am certain the vast majority of people in western Canada would oppose Bill No. 105. We have had all kinds of calls, not just from men on the street (and lots of those) but also from constitutional experts, judges who say they shouldn't do this to you; it's not democratic.

In so far as the initial assumption of a radical diversity of opinion in the electorate stands, it is here that the wider the appeal, the lower will be the highest common factor in which united action can take place. Mr. Speaker, I see it's approaching 12 o'clock.

The Assembly recessed until 2 p.m.